

THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

---

VOLUME XVII.

---

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE REVIEW.

1867.

VIETNAM  
AND  
WAR

285.175  
S. 12  
v. 17

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
BUCKLE'S HISTORY OF CIVILISATION, . . . . .	1, 178
THE BEAUTIFUL. By the Rev. J. M. P. OTTS, . . . . .	31
LIFE AND TIMES OF DR. SPRING. By the Rev. A. F. DICKSON, . . . . .	58
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1865, . . . . .	112
THE BENEFITS OF INFANT BAPTISM. By the Rev. Dr. C. A. STILLMAN, . . . . .	149
THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE AS A TRAINING OF THE MIND. By Prof. W. BLAIR, . . . . .	162
DEATH, THE RESURRECTION, AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE,	218
THE NORTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY (OLD SCHOOL) OF 1866,	244
RENAN'S ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., . . . . .	301
THE SCIENCE OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By the Rev JOHN RICE, D. D., . . . . .	330
MODERN INFIDELITY. By the Rev. DONALD FRASER, . . . . .	342
PASTORAL RELATIONS AND DUTIES. By the Rev. JOHN DOUGLAS, . . . . .	350
FEMALE EDUCATION. By the Rev. JOSEPH M. ATKINSON,	364
ROBINSON'S DISCOURSES OF REDEMPTION, . . . . .	441
THE FUTURE KINGDOM OF CHRIST. By the Rev. JOHN H. BOCOCK, D. D., . . . . .	467
THE CHRISTIAN'S DUTY TOWARDS HIS ENEMIES, . . . . .	492
THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE SECOND ADVENT. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., . . . . .	509

Hist 19 J / 44 Do 1000

561079

NAPOLEON'S HISTORY OF JULIUS CÆSAR. By Prof. Wm. J.

RIVERS, - - - - - 551

CRITICAL NOTICES :

Merle d'Aubigne's Reformation in the time of Calvin, 112. 378. Demarest on Second Peter, 117. Lange on Matthew, Mark, and Luke, 121. Ecce Homo, 124. Ticknor's Life of Prescott, 130. Mary Powell, 133. Colenso's Pentateuch, 138. Farrar's Free Thought, 143. The Schœnberg-Cotta Series, 285. Alford's How to Study the New Testament, 290. Cunningham's Reformers and Theology of the Reformation, 294. Alford's Plea for the Queen's English, 387. Otts's Nicodemus with Jesus, 391. Cunningham's Historical Theology, 396. Plumer's Studies in the Book of Psalms, 415. Plumer's Law of God, 422. The Faire Gospeller, Mistress Anne Askew. 423. Cunningham's Discussions on Church Principles. 429.

ERRATA.

- P. 45, tenth line, for "sympathy" read "symmetry."  
 P. 353, ninth line, for "time" read "tune."  
 P. 379, fifteenth line, for "be" read "he."  
 P. 380, fifth line from bottom, for "universal" read "unusual."  
 P. 381, twelfth line from bottom, for "superior" read "emperor:" sixth line from bottom, for "Augers" read "Angers."  
 P. 382, first line, for "one" read "our."  
 P. 383, fifteenth line, *dele* "a."  
 P. 388, fifteenth line, for "indication" read "vindication."

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVII.—NO. I.

---

JULY, MDCCLXVI.

---

ARTICLE I.

## BUCKLE'S HISTORY OF CIVILISATION IN ENGLAND.

“*History of Civilisation in England.* By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. *Volume I. From the Second London Edition.* New York. D. APPLETON & Co., 346 and 348 Broadway: 1858.”

No one can read a page of this imposing volume without recognising the hand of a master. By its publication, Mr. Buckle has risen, from a comparatively unknown man, into the position of a new power in the world of mind, regarded by general consent as the ablest, most honest, and least commonplace of modern British sceptics. Elaborated in the quiet of his study, his adventurous work was launched forth upon the ocean of speculative conflict as a Man-of-War, self-poised, *animus opibusque paratus*. Its influence upon the human mind will be profound and durable. A monument of erudition, labor, and thought, it will mark an epoch of opinion, and change the lines of attack and defence in the discussion of nearly all great social, political, and religious problems for the present age at least, if

VOL. XVII., NO. 1.—1.

not longer. It is a work of equal repose and power. The author, conscious of his strength, takes his own time, and conducts his investigation in his own way, indifferent as to who is pleased or offended, with the composure and dignity inspired by full confidence in his own conclusions. In the publication of such a work, he could expect nothing but conflict, and nothing else did he desire; for his chosen element is strife, and his work is designedly aggressive. Yet, although a very Quixote in enterprise, he is by no means so easily vanquished as the gallant Knight of La Mancha. His "History of Civilisation" is indeed a reconnoissance in force over the whole territory of human thought, followed not seldom by the armed occupation, in the name of his master, (shall we say?) of many a province of peaceful opinion. The title seems mild enough, promising little of polemics, but the volume breathes war upon established opinions generally, and startles echoes in many a quiet nook of thought long deemed sacred and safe from all incursions. The subject, indeed, furnished the ground for setting forth the author's opinions upon almost every topic of reflection, and the reader will find it to abound in a wonderful variety of views, fresh, striking, and often original, though not infrequently, as we shall endeavor to show, erroneous and pernicious. Nor are these views loosely hung together, but the book is a compact, though certainly not a consistent, whole, of unsurpassed freshness of sentiment and equal vigor of style.

The benefits of action Mr. Buckle sees distinctly, but seems to have no corresponding view of the advantages of repose. In every thing else he is eminently British, but he wants conservatism. He is John Bull on a raid. He hesitates not for a moment to throw a bomb into the peaceful city, startling not merely the armed man into the attitude of resistance, but the sick man from his couch, and the helpless women and babes into sudden alarm and perplexity. He means war on established opinion, and understandingly declares and enters upon it. He thinks mankind mistaken in many fundamental points, and assumes the leadership of those who concur with him in this opinion. Snatching the trusting and hopeful Christian from the hands of his

Almighty Friend, he consigns him, shrinking and chilled at heart, to a grand Automaton, which will, with iron fingers, move forward the wheels of the universe. The foundations he destroys, and breaks up the superstructure of his faith, and leaves him homeless and houseless in a brilliant intellectual sunshine, like that of the Arctic regions, of light without heat. And in doing this, he conceives that his startled victim should be delighted with the novelty of his sensations and the room afforded him for enterprising effort. For, with our author, sublimely indifferent to consequences, enterprise is the *summum bonum* of human life. Were physical exploration his *forte*, he would lead Cunningham and Livingstone to the Equator, and beckon to Kane from the North Pole. The flight of the balloon would charm him into ecstasy, and he would ride over Niagara with exceeding joy. Hazard and peril are his delight, and he glories in antagonism. The very Ishmaelite of modern literature, his hand is against every man—even against him whose weapons he appropriates. And yet he husbands his resources, and keeps marvellously cool and self-possessed, that he may not only fight a good fight now, but live to fight another day. The luxury of antagonism he cannot forego. He flings his glove to all classes of men alike—to rulers, and all who are in authority, to the clergy, to all religious leaders and thinkers, to metaphysicians, to men of letters, and historians. History being his own proper department, he ousts from it all its present occupants. All history has been written on false principles, and the whole fabric is to be reconstructed. Not only is the structure imperfect, but the very stones are to be quarried, and all the material now in use to be plucked asunder and remodelled. He says this in almost so many words. The opinions of men in matters of religion and morals, theology, law, and science, are all subject to re-examination. Nothing with him is fixed. There are no first principles left—no settled maxims. You cannot put your finger upon any opinion, saying, this at least is settled, and rest secure of its enjoyment. Read farther, and the odds are that you will find your title disputed, and be served with a notice to quit. The whole fabric is torn down, and amidst the wreck, the

falling timbers, the stones and the dust, sits Mr. Buckle, unperturbed, rejoicing like a strong man at the abundance of the pioneer work before him. He desires no allies. He would be jealous of their co-operation, and afraid of their conservative folly.

Such is the *debut* of Mr. Buckle into the world of letters. He has entered it as a giant dropped from the clouds. A detailed examination of his work will show that the picture is not overwrought. Of the advantages of such a mental earthquake, the vigorous and powerful author (as before remarked) has a clearer conception than of its evils. The latter are great and numerous, and will outweigh the former, unless vigorous efforts are made to shield from ruin the poor tenants of the habitations which he pulls so ruthlessly about their ears. No such effort, however, does he condescend to make. Did he replace their rotten tenements by better, he might claim to be their benefactor; but he simply leaves them under the houseless heavens, gazing upon the wreck, and afraid to take refuge any where, for fear of another shock. Already have their repeatedly changed homes been rudely assaulted again and again, till they feel safe no where. Such disturbances unsettle many minds, without leading them to seek new and fixed opinions, or to re-examine the foundations of the old. In anxious and perplexing doubt, they conclude that nothing is certain, unless tangible and sensible. "As to the future we know nothing. Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." As all improvement involves change, one is almost forced to conclude that Mr. Buckle holds also to the converse of the proposition—that all change is improvement. Yet in most things, and with most men, stability, gradual alteration, without needless shock or strain, works best—not a dead inactivity, but yet a cautious activity. *Inertia* plays perhaps as important a part in the universe as the laws of motion.

The candor with which Mr. Buckle discusses the most vital points is accordingly too easy, and not commensurate with the importance of the investigation. The true mental equilibrium in such cases is that of powerful *tension*—the balancing of immense



forces. In the examination of fundamentals, we need to be careful as well as honest. Consequences are by no means to be left out of the computation. Were an architect called upon to decide whether certain columns could be safely removed from underneath the dome of St. Peter's, his caution should rather be absurd in the way of excess, than by a hair's breadth in the way of defect. Not less careful should we be in undermining the faith and reverence of mankind. When we are dealing with fundamental truth, continual tests of the progress made, the constant use of criteria of every sort practicable, pauses for observation, and for the development of unexpected results, comparisons cautiously instituted, mark the safe inquirer after truth. No distinction (we appeal to every reader) characterises the great Christian authors more than this sobriety and thoroughness of study. The *temper* of their mode of investigation is that which leads to truth. Compare Butler, for example, with Mr. Buckle. Observe the tone of the former, befitting the gravity of the occasion and the danger of error, with the tone of the latter, often dogmatic, fierce, sneering, bearing down opposition. He may thus lead sometimes to new truths, but will often demolish old, and lead to new errors likewise. Boldness with him is in excess of caution. His harness is stronger in the traces than in the breeching—his engine wants brakes.

But it is time to pass from the author to the work. We have dwelt upon his character, because the work is really the outgrowth of himself. *He* shines through all its parts, and it thus becomes peculiarly necessary to understand the point of view from which he surveys his own great task. Carlyle has been considered to be in conflict with some of the truths of Christianity; in comparison with Buckle, he is an ally. His views may contain subtle errors, and lead by inference to heresy, while those of Buckle are more directly, though not avowedly, hostile—ininitely more fierce, and very attractive to certain orders of mind. The former is spiritual, the latter material. The faith of the former is luxuriant—while that of the latter is stunted and dry. The former sees God every where—in every thing—indeed, to him the universe so teems with God, that he

almost, or quite imagines it to be God. From Mr. Buckle, on the contrary, the universe hides God. It is opaque, and its builder on the other side, where he sees him not. To him, God is in perpetual eclipse.

Withal, he has all the faculties of a great leader—fertility, resource, invention, learning, originality, coolness, self-reliance. Vigor is perhaps the most highly prized quality of style. Such is the indolence of mankind that they delight to be carried along upon the stream of thought without effort of their own. Such motive power Mr. Buckle supplies, and so, to all who love ease (and their name is legion) he is very attractive, and many are ready to go with him whithersoever he may lead them; and as for the truth, why—let Mr. Buckle take care of that.

His dogmatism withal is astounding, and his display of learning rather ostentatious, yet are they both put forward in so decided a manner that you are scarcely able to gainsay him. His masterly tone qualifies him largely for leadership. When he has assumed his own place at the feast of letters, he will hear no voice saying "Come up higher." His own portrait of a historian—what he needs to be and to know—together with his assumption, after this portraiture, himself to write history as never before written, show that he is not likely to suffer from too humble an estimate of his own powers, and demonstrate that self-confidence which is apt to command also the confidence of others.

The task which he proposes to himself is truly Herculean. It is not simply to sift the annals of mankind, but to winnow from them the philosophy of human nature. Myriads of human beings inhabit the globe, each fearfully and wonderfully made, endowed with body, soul, and spirit, mysteriously connected. These myriads are divided into families, tribes, and races. Their culture is as diverse as their original characteristics. What a tangled mass is here: peoples, races, individual men! Out of this confusion to endeavor to bring something like order, to generalise this mass of particulars, to see whither tend the sympathies, the interests, the affections—the love and hatred—all the passions and whims of this turbulent human sea! To

gather something like a symphony from this chorus of many voices! And this chaos ever varying, seething, tumultuous, old materials decaying, and new materials entering in. One generation comes upon the earth, does its work, and gives place to another. Each child of each generation receives its education, and derives its shape, as it were, from the mould around it. The mutual modifications of man by nature, and of nature by man, go on, and there is something of what is called progression, good or bad—change, to say the least of it. Nor is there a moment's intermission in this great whirl.

Mr. Buckle grapples this huge problem with masterly strength, assuming and fully believing that it has its possible solution. With laws vastly more intricate and recondite than those of physical nature, human nature is still in some sort a system. It, too, has its laws, and these traceable, legible, capable of expression—bearing the same relation to physical laws, it may be, that those of physiology bear to those of ordinary chemistry. The observations and experiments are to be made under complicated conditions, which distract the attention of the observer from the law; but the law is there, nevertheless, and through blood from the wounded flesh, and the groans of the shrinking patient, the physiologist must narrowly watch for the obscured principle. So the historian, in the moving and restless mass, with its thousand embarrassments of complication, of real and concealed motive, must discriminate and select the truth. Eliminating, cancelling equal factors, he may on the grand scale find from all the particulars, from statistics often, what is essence and what accident. And thus, while the study of a limited field might be clogged with accidental phenomena, the study of a larger may lead to the knowledge of principles.

There has been a growing tendency for some generations past, as Mr. Buckle shows in detail, to turn away from the mere annals of a people, which constitute the materials of history rather than history itself; and from the lives of individual men, which are biography only, to the general principles of human action, and out of these to construct a philosophy of history. Special departments of this study have occupied many vigorous

intellects. In Mr. Calhoun's masterly Disquisition on Government, which has attracted the attention of thinkers and statesmen, though it has acquired little popularity, attention is given to a special department, and the principle of human nature which renders *government essential to society* is carefully sought for, discussed, and analysed. Guizot's History of Civilisation in France, is a more generic work, considering human progress rather than human actions—results rather than actors—being the history of institutions, forms of government, habits of life and thought, showing their rise, progress, and influence, their action and reaction, abstracted in great measure from the instruments conducting them. We have had valuable special treatises upon caste, slavery, the feudal system, chivalry, the crusades; upon political economy, and upon the different forms of government. Hallam, in his Middle Ages, and his History of the British Constitution, De Lolme, De Tocqueville, and other modern authors, have cultivated some portions of the same field. Wonderful contributions have been made by Cousin, Schlegel, Comte, Hegel, and other continental authors. Social science has been discussed largely, and the best modes of living together for mutual advantage.

The problem is large and full of complication, even with a special department alone undertaken. Yet it must be conceded that immense progress has been made in this intricate study; more amazing, perhaps, and furnishing a higher view of the penetration and comprehensiveness of the human intellect, than in any other department of thought. Mr. Buckle attempts, and with wonderful success, grasps the whole; not with absolute success, far from it; but yet with a marvellous power of combination. But Mr. Buckle is greater as an advocate than as a philosopher. His one-sidedness is as prodigious as any other feature of his character, and he fails not from want of power to combine elements, but because he overlooks them. He is as apt, moreover, to omit the large and important ones as the minor, and is often so derelict that you can scarcely decide whether he is disingenuous or simply wrong-headed.

It is not difficult to be irrecoverably lost in some of the

mazes of so vast a problem, never to find ourselves again, nor know where we are. To guide us safely, an exceedingly clear conception is necessary of its terms and scope, and frequent reference to fixed landmarks. Great principles are simple, it is true—it is wonderful how simple—but need to be *closely* adhered to. Once lost, we wander as in a mammoth cave or a great wilderness. The idea of a railway is but that of two parallel horizontal bars; but to realise this idea, what digging and ditching, what levelling of mountains and filling of valleys, bridging and tunnelling, are necessary! And after all, we are only able, with the aid of curves and grades, to approximate the simple idea. This is equally true of all great works—the conduct of a military campaign or of a government. How essential, then, to have at least a clear conception of the more complicated idea of human civilisation, which it is intended to investigate and realise. It is important to understand in advance the conditions of real *progress*, to distinguish between ends and means, between the resorts of infirmity and the desirable objects for society, to discriminate often between genuine and counterfeit advancement, to keep at all times in view the elements of a slippery and elusive problem. So vast are its dimensions, so infinite its details, that one may readily mistake a part for the whole, or omit important elements altogether. It is a continent, full of hills and valleys, deserts and cultivated places, not seldom dotted with tangled brushwood and wildernesses. Each department might well absorb the labor of a life. But with such preliminary aid as he can find, (and there had been many previous explorers, and much valuable observation,) Mr. Buckle undertakes to consolidate the data, and bring together all the material into one system of philosophy. And when he takes hold of the problem, there is fermentation. The caldron boils, and the work advances. Through many a slough his pathway leads him, but onward is his energetic course.

Treading the crude consistence, half on foot

Half flying—he —————

O'er bog or steep, through strait, rough, dense, or rare,

With head, hands, wings, or feet, pursues his way,

And swims, or sinks, or wades, or creeps, or flies.

Yet, while we thus acknowledge the perseverance and power of the author, we believe that his argument can and will be torn to shreds. Against this new structure of materialistic and infidel philosophy will be concentrated the fire of many lesser, of some perhaps equal intellects, until, proud even in ruins, the great fabric shall topple and fall.

Guizot, in his *History of Civilisation in France*, enters somewhat elaborately into the meaning of the term civilisation. He presents several stages of society under peculiar conditions, and inquires whether this or that stage may be said to possess it. His general conclusion seems to be that civilisation is a state of society promotive of the progress both of individual men and of the community; an important combination of elements not altogether so congruous as they may at first view appear. For there is in civilisation a marked and powerful tendency to swallow up individual men, and make them but wheels in a vast machine, with a one-sided culture intended to clip them into their allotted places. But that is not true progress which builds up society at the expense of individual development. Mr. Buckle gives no formal definition of the term, but leaves it to be gathered by implication. His view in substance seems to be that it consists in man's knowledge of himself and his relations. This knowledge, extending from the depths of savage ignorance on the one side, to the highest refinements of cultivation and the greatest power over nature on the other, measures the degrees of civilisation. This view of the meaning may be correct; nor should we care to consider it carefully, but for the fact that it seems to be farther assumed by our author that advancement in civilisation is the great end of man, and that whatever conduces to this is true human progress. In this view, a more generic definition of *progress* becomes necessary, as including something more than civilisation. To illustrate our meaning more fully by analogy. The civilised state of man we consider as analogous to the cultivated state of a plant. That is the proper culture of a plant which subjects it to the most favorable conditions of growth and development; but this development must be of all its parts, including flower and fruit and seed for

reproduction. The soil with its fertilising elements—the rain in its season, the sun and the air—must all act upon it, and so will it thrive. Man, too, is a complex being, an organism of greater complexity than a plant, and needing greater variety of culture. That is the truest civilisation, (as we regard it,) that certainly is the only true progress, which cultivates him as a whole, in body, head, and heart—his physical, intellectual, and moral faculties. If growth in knowledge is sufficient to realise the idea of civilisation, then is civilisation an insufficient culture, since it ignores certain great departments of the human constitution. Avoiding mere verbal disputation, we here present an important distinction which is independent of the meaning of terms.

The general and popular idea of what constitutes civilisation, and of the advantages it confers upon mankind, may be seen in the lively description by that sensitive observer, Charles Lamb, of life in its great metropolis, London :

“Streets, streets, streets—markets, theatres, churches, Covent gardens, shops sparkling with pretty faces of industrious milliners, neat sempstresses, ladies cheapening, gentlemen behind counters lying, authors in the streets with spectacles, (you may know them by their gait,) lamps lighted by night, pastrycook and silversmith shops, beautiful Quakers of Pentonville, noise of coaches, drowsy cry of mechanic watchmen at night, with bucks reeling home drunk; if you happen to wake at midnight, cries of fire! and stop thief! inns of Court with their learned air, and halls and butteries, just like Cambridge colleges; old book stores, ‘Jeremy Taylors,’ ‘Burtons on Melancholy,’ and ‘Religio Medicis’ on every stall. These are thy pleasures, oh London!”

Another intellectual expert we will introduce in the person of Sidney Smith, describing thus one of the feasts which it provides, its highest triumphs, to which all its resources and treasures are made tributary :

“An excellent and well-arranged dinner,” says this wise and witty writer, “is a most pleasing occurrence, and a great triumph of civilisation. It is not only the descending morsel and the enveloping sauce, but the rank, wealth, wit, and beauty

which surround the meats, the learned management of light and heat, the silent and rapid services of the attendants, the smiling and sedulous host proffering gusts and relishes, the exotic bottles, the embossed plate, the pleasant remarks, the handsome dresses, (not quite equal to Lamb's 'sparkling faces,') the cunning artifices in fruit and farina! The hour of dinner, in short, includes every thing of sensual and intellectual gratification which a great nation glories in producing."

These may seem light and almost frivolous quotations in so grave a discussion, but they are better presentations than any formal definition of the general idea of civilisation, with so much of intelligence, so much of physical science, and so much of worldly morality, decency, and propriety, as to render society attractive and fascinating. Protract these things, and men not a few will say, "The world, so constituted, is good enough for me; I desire no hereafter." Genuine goodness would add to the zest of such intercourse, but still it is essentially worldly—forgetful of human mortality and future destiny. If it have due reference to God, and taste his gifts with thanksgiving, it is well in its season, nor are we the ascetic to condemn it. But still it is not the be-all and the end-all of life.

Such a civilisation is consistent, indeed, with the most profound infidelity or heresy. A community of prosperous atheists may enjoy it. Of itself, this sort of progress in wealth is not sufficient or satisfactory, since it carries no man towards his goal. Those who float upon the bosom of this society would do well enough, perhaps, were there no hereafter. But we must insist that society has not discharged its duty, when men are absorbed by it entirely, as though it were really something everlasting, its ends final, and the great fact of our mortality a fable. So far from being false or irrelevant, this fact is the great condition of the problem, both for the individual man and for society. For those who are educated die, and new men arise, each to be educated anew. How to preserve, how to perpetuate, these are the difficult inquiries. The individual should have treasure laid up to take with him when the most certain of all events—death—overtakes him; an influence left behind to speak after



him. By expending the magnificent powers of man simply upon the entertainments of the present, he may doubtless have many enjoyments, as would a prince who should expend his ample revenues on sweetmeats and trinkets. But such conduct shows him to be a contemptible spendthrift, not a reasonable and wise man, endowed with ordinary foresight.

If we pass on, in every day life, from the dinner table to the great marts of business and commerce, to the House of Commons or of Lords, to the courts of justice, where the more serious business of life is transacted, we still fail to find, even in these more important affairs, worthy occupation of the whole man, unless the present life is conceded to be the last of him. His pleasures, his business may be innocent and honest, but they are not sufficient, not being commensurate with his being and faculties. Far be it from us to detract from the innocent pleasures of life, the bounty of him who has given us all things "richly to enjoy"; or to deny the wisdom of his precept who commands us to be "not slothful in business." But there must be a paramount regard to the great end of being, and, if we are immortal, its great end takes hold on eternity.

In the consideration of man's condition, to remember this truth is not the part of the preacher only, but also of the philosopher. As ordinarily understood, mere civilisation is not incompatible with infidelity, licentiousness, vice. The heathen, to some extent, possess it; the Japanese, Chinese, Hindoos, and Aztecs. The scribes and Pharisees, to whom were addressed the awful rebukes and warnings of the Saviour of mankind, were doubtless possessed of it in a far higher degree than his humble disciples. But such a civilisation is not true progress. Each department of life, and each human faculty, by turns, claims supremacy, and jealously demands exclusive culture. Art provides its peculiar feasts to which it invites its guests; and taste, and chivalry, and high and courtly breeding, each rears itself to excess at the expense of other departments, and lays high claims to the loyalty of its subjects, exalting itself into an *imperium in imperio*. We shall see what that authority is which alone preserves just proportion and subordination amidst these conflicting claims.

Until this superior empire, "the kingdom of God," is established in its proper supremacy, the grand drama of human affairs is the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet omitted. It is a law without a sanction, a court without a judge, a mock kingdom without a ruler. Does not Mr. Buckle omit it from his system?

Advancement in civilisation, in the usual sense of that term, may be the partial ripening of worm-eaten fruit, the symptom and precursor of decay—the premature ripeness of one part occasioned by the rottenness of another. It may be growth in intelligence, yet at the same time in vice. While this truth is fundamental, we do not think it is always clearly and fully recognised. Its recognition by Mr. Buckle is of a morality which stops short of God. This is one of those dangerous suppressed premises which elude the careless reader.

For it is ever to be remembered that knowledge, although a great good, is a means, not an end. We can easily put this matter to the test by carrying knowledge, as the mathematicians say, to the limit; *i. e.* supposing its indefinite expansion. Were the whole human family enlightened, a millennium of free schools and faithful students attained, true progress could not even then necessarily be predicated of the race. For, enlarge man's knowledge of nature, and extend his conquests over it to the uttermost, leaving his affections untouched, and his will unsubdued, and he would become thus a monster of iniquity, and society a pandemonium, rendered only the more wretched by the ingenuity with which men, wise to do evil, would torment one another. Such indeed is not improbably the constitution of hell. Self-control, love of others, virtue, and the restraining influences of human conduct in general, would not have kept pace with knowledge. The passions of children are strong, but their powers weak. Education is intended, as it strengthens the latter, to subdue the former. But let passion and power grow together, and what a malignant society is formed. The devils have knowledge, unrestrained by goodness: they believe and tremble. They want neither physical nor intellectual powers, but the possession of these renders them the more dread-

ful. Too strong to be resisted successfully—too cunning to be evaded—they become the objects of the most fearful apprehension, to be shut up with whom is the acme of all evil. These faculties belonging to enemies, and being arrayed against us, become the very instruments of our torture. *Cui bono* may be asked still, with more emphasis than before, of this state of society. And should it be said that increased knowledge necessarily carries with it increased virtue, it may be safely replied that such is by no means the uniform testimony of experience. The connexion is not necessary or invariable. All history and observation show not only the possibility of their severance, but that when severed, knowledge, which is power, becomes a power for evil. The immense advancement we have supposed would but have furnished the scaffolding for virtue, capable of appropriation to wrong uses, but which, if used aright, would be the means of enlarging and beautifying her magnificent temple—the only true building.

At the risk of growing tedious upon this point, we must be pardoned for sermonizing through one more paragraph. Let it never be forgotten or ignored, that true progress is in wisdom, not in knowledge alone. It consists not in information, but in conduct. It is growth in character. Whether called civilisation, or by some higher name, it is that condition of society which develops the whole man, teaches him his powers, and, at the same time, his duties; informs him of his relations, and (what is equally important) stimulates him in their fulfilment. Where these conditions concur, the man new-born into such a society, is cultivated by all its influences, received, as it were, into a matrix, and moulded into what he should be. He is made complete in himself, and by influence, friendship, the family relation, and other means, is furnished with the needful link to draw others after him in the paths of virtue. These conditions Christianity alone is capable of fulfilling. All progress is towards the ends which *it* proposes. In a word, *progress* perfected is *Christianity*, not civilisation. This far-off beacon, guiding us like a north star in all our wanderings through the mazes of this intricate problem, Mr. Buckle does not seem to

recognise. And so, although his observations possess great value, they all require to be referred to a fixed point, and adjusted by an unvarying standard, before they can be relied upon to lead us to truth. This inquiry is vital to the whole discussion. It is a worldly morality alone which concerns the author. How if there be, in fact, a higher standard? We may recur to the old tinker of Bedford for an illustration. Mr. Worldly-Wise-Man has, by his counsel, scarcely introduced us even to Legality, who himself dwells afar off from the king's highway, but only to "that pretty young man he has to his son, whose name is Civility," and, under his guidance, has left us to attain our journey's end, or perhaps to remain content where we are. But an awakened conscience cannot feel safe with nothing above it but the roof of Mr. Civility. Hearing the thunderings, and viewing the overwhelming crags of Sinai, it must seek securer refuge. If Evangelist be true, then "Mr. Worldly-Wise-Man is a liar, and Mr. Legality a cheat; and for his son Civility, notwithstanding his simpering looks, he is but a hypocrite, and cannot help thee." So much as to the true haven to which progress should conduct mankind. The author is, without doubt, an expert navigator, but while availing ourselves of his skill, we should prefer to make choice of our own destination.

Mr. Buckle approaches his work a democrat in politics, a free-thinker in religion, a free-trader in political economy, an iconoclast of the first water in every thing; deeply imbued with the spirit of the positive philosophy, but not a commonplace or railing doubter. His intellectual pride and taste are too elevated for that. He attacks what we still believe to be the foundation of all human hope, with dignity and coolness, with a strange mixture of sagacity and blindness, seeing some things afar off, and overlooking fundamental truth lying immediately under his eye. Although ranking high in their number, he is not the greatest of original thinkers. But as a translator, he is almost unequalled. His work is not in the jargon of any school, metaphysical or social. He does not use adjectives as nouns, or make free with any of the rules of grammar, but clothes

vigorous thought in his own vigorous vernacular tongue. He is not transcendental nor mystical, and so his views are easily understood. Omitting consciousness and intuitions, he confines himself largely to the more popular side of objective and historical truth. Complete in itself, needing no preliminary course of philosophy or history, his argument stands alone, and makes its unique impression. As we have bodies of Theology, so here we have a body of Infidelity, a comprehensive system already developed, and ready for instant use.

But a certain sadness—true, a defiant sadness—pervades the whole volume. It is a work suited to a strong, well man, in present prosperity, but utterly unfitted to ordinary human destiny with its mingled days of sorrow. “If a man live many years and rejoice in them all, yet let him remember the days of darkness—for they shall be many.” This is the counsel of the wise man. We may be mistaken, but think we can detect occasional faint traces of some secret misgiving on the author’s part, as though he felt that while his work could stand the test of human criticism, it yet might fail in some more awful crisis, when every man’s work is tried “so as by fire.” And well might he pause in the use of his immense powers as an advocate in the service of infidelity. He will make more sceptics than all of his contemporaries put together. Vigor and penetration in combination, pass ever for profundity, although one of the elements of the latter is wanting, viz. caution in investigation. His vigor is in excess, and carries him forward in impetuous, overwhelming attacks against truths standing in the way of his apparently exhaustive, but really partial and premature, generalisations. These attacks are against the most precious and fundamental truths which affect human destiny. And his errors, after all, are not wrapped up necessarily with his system, but, in many instances, gratuitously interwoven with it. Yet how mischievous will they prove during the gradual, but sure, process of separation, which will take place as the work is subjected to the ordeal of criticism through which it is destined to pass!

His work opens with a disquisition upon the resources for the study of history, and the immense mass of chaotic and

misapplied materials now accumulated in the rough state, like David's provision for a temple to be built by his successor. *He* is the successor, and enters vigorously upon the work. Proceeding to unfold his own view of the true method of study, he considers the first great generalisation to be, whether there is a method in human affairs at all, and if a method, how far this is controlled—1. By Divine Interposition; 2. By Human Action; or 3. By a Regular Train of established Sequences, (whether this be a third power, or a combination of the other two.) He is thus led into a very interesting discussion of the doctrines of Predestination and Free Will, which discussion conducts the author, as the result of his investigations, into what seems to us the most dire and absolute form of fatalism. His conclusions are based in great measure upon the data furnished by statistics, showing the uniformity of sequences on the large scale in apparently the most casual of phenomena; as, for example, in the number of murders and suicides committed annually; which uniformity, he contends, must be the result of fixed laws, under the guidance of which laws it follows that "in a given state of society, a certain number of persons must put an end to their own lives." The regularity of these phenomena he regards as decisive of the matter in question, viz., that men must act as they do, "and that the individual felon only carries into effect what is a necessary consequence of antecedent circumstances." So dire is the reign of law.

Having established, as he considers, conclusively, that all human actions are the result of laws, he classifies these laws under two condensed heads, viz. Physical and Mental. Under the former head, (the two being exhaustive of all the influences affecting man,) he classes food, soil, climate, and what he denominates "the general aspect of nature," each of which exerts a powerful influence over man. In the chapter on these external agencies, much valuable and suggestive matter is furnished, showing how they affect man's health and strength, vivacity, habits of industry, wealth and comfort. Man may be made sluggish or energetic by the food he eats, or the drinks in which he indulges. Climate may not only keep him in or out of

doors, but affect the regularity and results of his industry. It is obvious how large a field of observation lies in these external agencies. The view presented of the general aspect of nature is especially interesting; exhibiting its tendency in some countries to stimulate the imagination into great vigor and excess, and thus promote superstition and apprehension, as in countries where earthquakes and violent storms prevail. These causes have tinged the civilisations of the races inhabiting such countries, so that European, Asiatic, and African civilisations have distinct types, in which they can be partially traced. The influence of physical laws on wealth, both as regards its accumulation and distribution, is traced, and that, likewise, of the laws of inheritance. These largely affect the leisure of mankind, and their means therefore of self-culture, and of engaging in other pursuits than the mere supply of their physical wants. The treatment of these subjects is really magnificent, and forms perhaps the most interesting and unexceptionable part of the work. Yet even here the author is hasty and inaccurate, too impatient to build up his system.

Upon the relative extent of influences, external and internal, men differ greatly, and are apt to form extreme opinions according to their own temperament. Mr. Buckle seems to place a large estimate upon the former—the physical. In a very striking, yet one-sided book, Knox's "Races of Men," the opposite view is taken, that *race* is too strong for circumstances. To many minds the influence of individual constitution, of family resemblances, and of race, seems all-controlling. To others, the influence of education, in its largest sense, including all the circumstances in which the individual is placed, seems equally decisive of what the man will be. We think that the truth lies between the two opinions, almost equal importance being due to *blood* and to *training*. Conduct is the resultant of the two forces. Mr. Buckle, every where ascribing little force to the human will, and every thing to destiny, is consistent with himself in regarding man as the plaything of fortune. It is to be observed that peculiar races are usually subject also to peculiar external and educational conditions, under which there is a

wonderful tendency to assimilation. With all the variety of natural constitution which individuals possess, these outward conditions tend to make them alike. Sameness of language is one great assimilator, the necessity of using the same vehicle of thought. Each locality, however, is apt to have its own distinct dialect, used by those who associate most closely with one another. It is remarkable how almost every external condition leaves its trace, so that each section of a country has its "shibboleth." Those who live on the borders of conterminous states can generally tell, through all the varieties of age, sex, size, and condition, to which state almost any individual belongs. The more liberal the culture, the more cosmopolitan will be the man; yet rarely are all marks absent by which he can be adjusted to his proper geography. The denizen of the country differs from him of the city; and each profession has its ear-marks. Yet, with all these truths acknowledged, individuality asserts itself every where, and no two men can be found who are just alike. So even is the contest between nature and education; so alike and so unlike are individual men.

Before leaving this topic of external conditions, we would remark that perhaps not enough heed has been given by the author to parental influence or family training, and none to the Sabbath day or the house of God. Yet the "homes of England" are at the foundation of English civilisation; the Sabbaths of Scotland, of Scottish. These furnish the deep foundations which have prevented their revolutions from becoming reigns of terror. These are the great instructors in the difficult art of self-control, which underlies all other mastery.

From physical, the author passes to the investigation of mental laws, into which he enters more fully. Having included all influences in an exhaustive analysis, mental laws are found to be the chief agents of European civilisation. To ascertain and expound these laws is therefore the great task of the historian. And here Mr. Buckle must begin by exposing the errors into which metaphysicians have fallen in the investigation of these laws. They have commenced at the wrong end, and built their pyramid upon its apex. They have begun with individual consciousness with



all its partial and deceptive phenomena, instead of with the history of mankind, as the basis of induction. This is to begin with the abnormal instead of the normal, with the irregular instead of the regular, with the chance specimen instead of the ascertained and permanent type. He devotes a chapter to the method by which metaphysicians discover mental laws. They study each the operation of his own—that is, of one mind. The historical method is to study many minds. Casual disturbances may, indeed must, embarrass the former method. In the study of many minds together, as their operations are recorded in history, these disturbing elements are eliminated. Again, the very act of looking into one's own mind alters its *status*. And again, the results of metaphysical research vary widely according to the order of study, seeming to be one thing when the student begins with his *sensations*, and quite another when he begins with his *ideas*.

While there is much of truth in these observations, and certainly much that is worthy of thought, yet there are not wanting arguments *per contra*. For while it is undoubtedly true that we must judge of the future by the past, of what man will do by what man has done, it is also true that the conclusions of metaphysicians must have stood the test, not of their own consciousness alone, but of that of their readers, and of comparison with one another. So that the field of induction is not so narrow after all. And certainly, as to the extent to which mental causes influence man's action and condition, and as to his state of feeling and emotion, his own consciousness must be relied on for very important information. Action being the resultant of mental and physical laws, consciousness must tell what the mental forces were, and how influenced by the physical. Mr. Buckle seems to us to direct attention too exclusively from the *piece* to the *target*—from the instrument to its effects—from the constitution of man to his conduct. These throw mutual light on each other. Perhaps the method he discards is not less important than that which he proposes. Great caution is needful in the adoption of any exclusive mode. A new theory in such matters is like a new gambit proposed by a skilful player at

chess, which may beat his adversary for the time, yet not after all be the strength of the game. Many a thoughtful, sifting process is necessary to verify its conformity to true science.

Proposing the historical as the only valid method of determining mental laws, the author proceeds to investigate them in that way. They are divided into intellectual and moral laws. Of these two classes, in their effect upon the progress of mankind, the intellectual he regards as far the more important. The correctness of this estimate he argues from several considerations. Moral truths do not vary, while intellectual truths do. As the conduct of mankind varies, the cause is to be found in the variable element—the intellectual, and not in the stable element—the moral. Individuals are affected by moral considerations, but in communities these balance one another, and so, social progress is not dependent on virtue, but on knowledge. The mitigation of the two greatest evils which have ever afflicted society—war and religious persecution—is due to intellectual, and not to moral advancement.

The author next considers the influence of government, religion, and literature upon society. Under which grand division he would classify these powers, we are not informed. It seems to the writer that a third head is necessary for an obvious analysis of the great influences affecting human conduct, viz., man modified by man. The author has man modified by nature, and nature modified by man, being physical and mental laws. We would add, as the needful third division, man modified by man, or social laws. To this all the subjects above named could be readily referred, without circuitry or strain, and without ambiguity. This is to the full as important a division as either of the others, since almost the whole tenor of human conduct is most largely modified by society, which limits man on all sides, determining his education, wealth, habitation, indeed nearly all of his circumstances. His social relations largely affect both his physical and mental condition.

Under this third head, as above remarked, would naturally fall government, man modified by man, associated in certain relations. So the Church, another form of association. So

literature, by which influence is exerted in a less formal and authoritative way, by the interchange of thoughts, sentiments, and arguments with one another. The author finds, in the excessive action of this combined force called government, one of the greatest evils affecting humanity—governing men too much, according to mistaken principles of the duty of society, resulting in what he denominates the *protective system*; society assuming the guardianship of men, and depriving them unnecessarily of liberty of action. The excessive action of the Church has, in like manner, deprived men of liberty of thought, or the right of private judgment. Unless government can better adjust itself to the manifold exigencies of man than individual interest can, then its interference is simply a clog and hindrance. Unless the Church is really infallible, it must leave men to freedom of thought, contenting itself with being a witness for the truth.

We could wish here a discussion by the author of that singular but universal fact, that the weight of the crown seems sufficient, whether by organisation or by whatever means, to counterbalance the weight of an entire people. How is it possible for one man, or a few men to tyrannise over a community consisting of millions of souls? Why do the latter find any difficulty in overthrowing a tyranny? Upon this, which may be called the hydrostatic paradox of politics, a thinker of his great powers of penetration could throw most valuable and suggestive light. It is one of those first principles which needs to be thoroughly understood, and is fruitful of consequences.

To proceed: Mankind are usually too impatient merely to plant the seed of opinions, and wait for their growth. Social errors they desire to extirpate by persecuting those who hold them. For the healing of social evils, they have too little confidence in the *vis medicatrix nature*—a force rendered all the more important by our ignorance and empiricism in social science. Yet, however spiritual authority may have been abused, the Church has been by far the most effective, and, indeed, it has been an indispensable means of spreading religious knowledge and enforcing religious obligation; just as government,

although often itself oppressive, really secures the highest practicable degree of liberty, the least interference with our own way by others, saving continual clashing of wills and adjustment of conflicting ways. The impression left by Mr. Buckle in regard to the Church is in vast excess of the truth, representing it rather as itself an evil, than as a good which has been often abused. Church and State are both imperfect, but each far better in its own department than anarchy, to which, in the Church, the author would remit us.

In tracing the various influences affecting society, (falling under our third head,) important light is afforded by an inquiry into the character of history itself at different periods. History is, to some extent, the embodiment of the self-consciousness of mankind, its memoir of itself. Men have recorded what they regarded most worthy of record—most interesting to themselves and to posterity. It is with the race as with a child; there is a gradual development of reflection and self-consciousness; very considerable growth in other faculties precedes this power of looking within and measuring self. Humanity, in the most civilised states, is just beginning to know something of itself, to understand something of its own destiny, and the true mode of self-examination. But its powers of reflection are yet undeveloped. Its memory, like that of a child, has been rather of facts than of its own states of feeling or being, or of its own progress. However, as the world has enjoyed for six thousand years the opportunity of observing its condition and revising its conclusions, it cannot be denied that there have been good advantages for improvement. And in the numerous new readings proposed by Mr. Buckle there is room for much caution, and the probability of numerous errors, some of them, indeed, as we believe, prodigious, fundamental, and of ruinous consequence.

Of the transactions of mankind during this long series of centuries, a large proportion—ininitely the larger—has perished without record. The names even of the actors, as their deeds, are utterly unknown. So far as any light is to be derived from their conduct, whether of warning or example, they are to us as if they had never been. To preserve a record is extremely

difficult. Some effort has been made to preserve the names and deeds of those who have most interested, rather than benefited, mankind. Warriors, the curse of the race, have lived best in history. Some account has been kept, also, of political and religious changes. The influence of great men and of great thinkers, has found some record. But the bulk of all human transactions is in a huge chaos or limbo. So far as it has been preserved, it is sad and humiliating in the extreme. Men have, for the most part, been born and died, like weeds in a vast level prairie, undistinguished, like the grass of the field which in the morning cometh up, in the evening is cut down and withereth. Scattered along the six thousand years, a few civilisations are seen lifting their heads, as though the human plant were trying to blossom and bear fruit; the civilisations of the Egyptians, the Assyrians, Persians, Hindoos, and Chinese, the aboriginal Americans, the higher forms of Grecian civilisation, and Roman. It would be a valuable work which should study these different civilisations thoroughly, label and classify them, determine whether they followed any order of succession, were at all interdependent, or simply local, or by race. These great outlines, properly studied and set together as in a map, would be wonderfully suggestive, and successive approximations might be made towards some true theory of explanation. White's "Eighteen Christian Centuries" accomplishes some work in this direction. One astonishing fact remains under any and all systems—the slowness of human progress, and the apparently immense waste of material. The Grecian civilisation, merging into the Roman, came nearest to drawing all mankind into itself. But none of them had the necessary elements of unity. Each was the civilisation of a race, not of humanity, and so has perished. Dark ages have succeeded them all. That vital principle common to humanity was not to be found in any of them, which should struggle into permanent fruitage and wholesome development. How dead a level of insignificance, how painfully humiliating to man's pride, is the general story of human life; with all its alleviations, his condition perpetually reminds him of his sinfulness and mortality. This is the story of history, sacred and

profane, of experience, and of poetry. Born in pain and feebleness, reared with watchfulness and weeping; first, the infant mewling and puking in the nurse's arms, man passes through the stages of life, subject to disease and pain, to want, weariness, and disappointment, until the "last scene of all, that ends this strange, eventful history, is second childishness and mere oblivion."

Among the elements which mould human action, the author has given deserved prominence to public opinion. The history of human opinion would be one of the most interesting of books. Whence its germs? Small as the mustard seed, some accidental association, some slight parental or family influence; but it grows into a great tree, and *opinion* exercises greater control than *actual truth*; it *is the truth as we see it*. The preoccupation of the mind by one set of opinions is a formidable obstacle to the introduction of others. Commitment before the public adds to the difficulty of change, and the habit of conforming our conduct to certain currents of opinion still increases the difficulty. There is a stupendous influence of association against a national change of religion. Not only the direct opinions of mankind, but all their presuppositions and matters taken for granted, though unexpressed, are against it—their commitments, and their habits of thought and conduct. These habits wear deep channels for themselves. This explains the slow success of missions, which must, like water, gradually wear the stones. The slow propagation of a religion depends not so much upon whether it is true or false, as upon its being new, without a forerunner, either in the preparation of the people or by a messenger from heaven. It is specially to be remembered that in the problem of human progress, each man bears his part very much as a polype in the growth of the reef it constructs. The man dies, and it is the residual influence he leaves behind him which alone counts—the accretions of human industry, so to speak. Could there but be a law of inheritance of moral and intellectual wealth as of physical! But these always perish—wonderfully significant fact, in its relations to a future life,—just as they reach their culminating point.

Not tracing their connexions or classifying them according to any system, we will briefly refer now to some of the salient points of the work, the mountain peaks that catch the eye. The little scope left to the human will, as an agent or modifier of human progress, is one of the most prominent. The denial of consciousness as a good witness; the disquisitions on the invention of gunpowder and of steam, also upon the discoveries of political economists, and the effects of these improvements upon war and religious persecution; the alleged superiority of mental over moral laws upon the progress of society; the immense importance attributed to the census, and to statistical modes of study; the arguments against excessive government, and against intolerance; the generalization of the theories of idealism and sensationalism; the far-reaching effects of men's opinions as Calvinists or Arminians, the tendency of the former to democracy, of the latter to aristocracy; what the author calls the supreme importance of scepticism, scepticism leading to doubt, doubt to inquiry, and inquiry to truth; the rise of clubs, and their tendency to break down other distinctions, as those of wealth or rank, and substitute the association of intellect; the regulating power of the principle of demand and supply in the intellectual as well as the economical world; the view of politics as a temporising system, as yet empirical, and therefore only fit for alleviation and mitigation, not for the cure of the body politic; such are some of the topics discussed, usually at length and with great fulness of detail and amplitude of illustration. The impossibility, in the limits of a single review, of giving any thing like an exhaustive idea of the book, or criticism of its doctrines, is obvious; from the foregoing rapid summary, however, the reader may see how large a range of thought the author proposes: a history, not of dynasties or of wars, but of civilisation. His conception and the execution of it, are alike grand; but it is the grandeur of Cain, not of Abel; for while it is the great life work of the author, it is not offered to the true God as an humble sacrifice, or even like Cain's, the thank-offering of a proud spirit, but laid as a gift, rich and costly, upon the altar of the goddess of Reason, to whom he renders the hom-

age of his intellect, and even aspires, not without a certain hopefulness, to sit with her on her throne.

It is, indeed, the first work of Mr. Buckle in his system to put God afar off. If that were true which the fool said in his heart, "There is no God," not the smallest change would it produce in his philosophy. Let one, after reading this elaborate work, ask himself, "What part does God play in it?" Annihilate the Maker of this universal frame, or degrade him from the *true* and *living* to a dead and indifferent God, and it is all one with Mr. Buckle. Prayer, praise, any human feeling which looks up to Him as "having to do" with us; these things, if not ignored, are compassionated as relics of ignorance and superstition. So much for the relation of his philosophy to the great Author of nature.

Coming next to man, his first essay is to emasculate him of his will. Man is not a free and living agent, but only a waif, floating upon the tide of circumstances; and this, although it is admitted that his innermost consciousness imposes upon him a false conviction of such living and active freedom. Such would he have man, plastic enough under his moulding hand.

Having disposed of God and man—the two principal disturbing elements—Mr. Buckle proceeds with his greatly simplified task. The centripetal and centrifugal forces are thus withdrawn from the system. God is too far off for any conscious link to bind him to man. Man, without a will, is no longer an element of power. Consciousness, which assures him of the possession of a will, is a false witness, even universal consciousness. And so man, in the waves of fortune, is a dead thing, not a living soul! Alas, of what use then is philosophy? Man's powers are limited, it is true; but is he not, in the storm which overwhelms him, a strong *swimmer* still, even in his agony? With God and man set aside, away goes all of truth. Indeed, on what foundation is any truth to rest, if consciousness be discredited? Have we not here the germs of errors the most fundamental, which must necessarily be fatal to the health of any system? Nothing can be more hazardous to a conclusion than the omission of even one of the minor conditions of a problem. To



get them all together—all *in*—is more important than even the highest powers of combination. Yet, what elements does not Mr. Buckle here cast out of the count, lest some perturbation ensue, coming from the Author of nature, or from that perverse creature, man, and interfere with the dead mechanical action of the universe according to his scheme.

Proceeding with his work, he would separate theology, not from politics only, but from morality also; and this not for the mere sake of the division of labor, for his is a work of consolidation. We cannot here develop fully the effect of the stand-point from which the mind views objects. A theological stand-point is not the true one for the development of concrete truth in science or government. Man must get nearer the sources of knowledge. God, every where, sees all things from all points of view, and so sees the whole and at all times, before and after the event. Man, finite, local, on one side, sees that one side only, unless by continual movement he gets to other stand-points, and observes from thence. This is the law of limitation, affecting all human powers. There is a perspective view from any one point, but the distant objects grow too small for accurate observation. Only an infinite mind could make it available. It is therefore true that the theological stand-point, as above remarked, is not a proper one for the study of concrete truth. Nor is Mr. Buckle's single stand-point sufficient for the study of either morality or history. It is quite as fallible as the other, and far more pernicious. For of the departments of morality and social duty, revelation does purport to treat, as well as of theology. In any system of morality, the God of conscience, to whose approbation and wrath it refers, not only may, but must be included, and regarded, indeed, as the central point. The theological stand-point is in the very heart of true morality, whence its proper motives and most powerful sanctions are best seen in their just relations.

Not only is morality separated from theology in theory, but in practice also; all the ordinary means of enforcing moral obligation are disparaged. The Church of God has been one of the chief clogs to human progress. The clergy are seldom named but with stern reprobation; they are ever on the defensive.

The supreme importance of scepticism to the interests of humanity is inculcated, and intellectual, not moral culture, assigned as the great means of progress. It is difficult to see how an attack upon morality could be more radical than this. Such are among the startling propositions, not simply suggested, but distinctly stated and elaborately argued in this remarkable book; argued, too, usually with great power and every indication of honest conviction.

We are not of that class who tremble for the truth. It is safe, resting upon deep foundations. But we do tremble for the effect of false views, and false and partial conclusions, upon many a noble intellect. Partial truths, received as entire truths, are the foundation of all dangerous error. We tremble for many whose life-long convictions are shaken, and who can never again have confidence in any thing. The truth will triumph at last, and such truth even as seems adverse to other and established truths will attain its proper adjustment; but error meanwhile will have wrought its evil work, and slain its victims; and these, alas, our own friends, the men of the present age, in the generation to which our loved ones belong, and the time in which our own work lies.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

## ARTICLE II.

## THE BEAUTIFUL.

Every one feels the power of the beautiful; hence, it is a subject ever new and fresh in the souls and words of all who think and feel in every age. The artist seeks for the ideal beauty, and labors to express it in his productions; the philosopher interrogates his soul in its presence, and seeks to unfold the nature of the emotion he feels, and to discover the cause which excites it; and the divine sees it in his theology, and seizes upon it as a line to lead him up to his God. Nothing affords a more exquisite pleasure, or attracts more universal attention; and yet, perhaps, there is nothing more inadequately understood. What is the beautiful? And what is the nature of the emotion it excites? These are questions which every one asks; but who has given satisfactory answers? Philosophers conflict; they contradict each other, and often answer in unintelligible jargon; and if we appeal from the decisions of the schools to the voice of the people, we shall not find uniformity among them; for it often happens that what one calls beautiful, is pronounced by another to be absolutely ugly. All this shows that the question of the beautiful is a difficult one—a *quæstio verata*. It is, therefore, with much distrust that we approach a subject so difficult and confessedly intricate; but we hope that, if unable to unravel the difficulties in which it has become entangled, we shall not leave the matter in worse confusion than we find it.

Because the theories of the beautiful advanced by philosophers are so contradictory, and there is such a want of uniformity in the opinions of the people in regard to its nature, some have been led to doubt the real existence of any such thing as the beautiful. Voltaire, the arch-sophist, who, sacrificing every thing to the spirit of levity and wit, made the vain attempt to

laugh religion out of the world, also thought that he could laugh the world out of a belief in the beautiful. It was his way, when he could not refute an opponent with an argument, to silence him with an unanswerable sneer. He read Plato's Hippias, Phædrus, and Banquet, and saw theory after theory demolished, and the ruins repaired by nothing comprehensible to his intellect; and not being able to excogitate from his own mind any solution of the perplexities in which he saw this delicate point involved, he turned the whole matter into ridicule. After stating what Plato had said on the subject, and confessing that his understanding could get no clear idea from him, "Ask," says he, in his Philosophical Dictionary, "a toad what is beauty—the great beauty; he will answer, it is his female, with her two great round eyes coming out of her little head, her large flat mouth, her yellow belly, and her broad back. Ask a negro of Guinea; beauty to him is a black oily skin, sunken eyes, and a flat nose. Ask the devil; he will tell you the beautiful consists in a pair of horns, four claws, and a tail. Then ask the philosophers; they will answer with jargon; they must have something conformable to the archetype of the essence of the beautiful." In all this there is nothing but ridicule and ridiculous sophistry. He speaks of what is agreeable to the toad, the Guinea negro, and the devil; but what has this to do with the beautiful? The beautiful and the agreeable are not the same; and the jargon among the philosophers only proves that there are difficulties in the matter.

All the world knows that the human soul, (and we have nothing to say about toads and devils,) is susceptible of a peculiar emotion denominated *the feeling of the beautiful*. Every one has felt this emotion, and it is certain that it could not exist without a cause; and the cause which produces it, is *the beautiful*. The emotion itself is an undoubted and indubitable fact of consciousness, and, as it is an effect, it must have a cause. In looking for the beautiful, we are in search of this cause. We are not in pursuit of a phantom, or following a mere *ignis fatuus* of the brain through the bogs and fens of metaphysical subtleties. The beautiful is a reality, and the only question now is, Can it

be discovered? Let us spread our sails on the sea of investigation, trusting to the Author of the true, the good, and the beautiful, to guide us prosperously to the object of our search in this voyage of exploration.

The emotion of the beautiful is a primary *datum* of consciousness, the existence of which we can no more doubt than the existence of the soul. In our search for the beautiful, we assume this emotion as an effect, and proceed, *a posteriori*, to deduce from it its cause; and when this is discovered, we have the beautiful as it exists in itself and in nature. This is what we conceive to be the true Cartesian method of philosophizing, and the only sure method of arriving at the truth. Here let us premise a word of caution. In deducing causes from their effects, we must be careful that we consider a simple effect. It frequently happens that with an effect there are blended many accidental circumstances, which do not essentially belong to it. If these are not most carefully eliminated in our deduction from the effect in question, we will also include their causes, and thus become involved in interminable difficulties. This danger is greater no where than in the case of the beautiful, as this emotion seldom exists alone. The pleasurable emotions of the agreeable, the useful, and the suitable, are all so intimately connected with it, that each of them in its turn has been taken for it, and considered as identical with it. Now, in our consideration of the emotion of the beautiful with the view of deducing its cause, we must most carefully discriminate and separate from it all other emotions with which it is closely interwoven. If we would get the simple and single cause, we must consider the simple and single effect.

A correct insight into the philosophy of the feelings is necessary to an intelligible analysis of any emotion; therefore, we begin with a brief statement of our doctrine on this point. We adopt the Kantian tripartite distribution of all psychological phenomena into the powers of cognition, feelings, and conation. This is preferable to the old dualistic division into speculative and practical powers, which obtained from Aristotle to the great philosopher of K enigsberg. The importance of this distribution

to the matter in hand is found in the fact that it asserts for the feelings the dignity of a separate science, and places *Æsthetics* in correlative honor and glory with *Metaphysics* and *Ethics*. And also following the beautiful and perfect system of philosophy which Sir William Hamilton has erected as a compact superstructure on this solid foundation, we claim for the feelings their separate *phænomenology*, *nomology*, and *ontology*. A complete discussion of the feelings in these several aspects would fill a volume; and in an article like this, we can give only general outlines.

We begin with their *phænomenology*. We know that in the presence of certain objects we are conscious of certain feelings of pleasure or pain, and also that certain objects produce in our feelings certain permanent affections and sentiments; that the objects which excite our emotions are sometimes external and sometimes internal, and that our emotions vary according to the peculiar nature of the objects which occasion them; and moreover, that we are never conscious of pleasure except in a state of free and unimpeded activity, or of pain except in a state of forced or repressed exertion. These are the observed *phænomena* from which we are to evolve the laws and causes of the feelings.

Next we consider the *nomology* of the feelings. We have seen that they appear under, and are regulated by the grand law of energy. If the energy is spontaneous and unobstructed, the soul experiences pleasure; but, if forced into activity, or repressed when it springs spontaneously into exertion, it experiences pain. We also know, as we are conscious of certain permanent sentiments, that we have certain energies which may be either sustained in continuous exercise, or be continuously repressed, producing in the one case permanent affections of pleasure, and in the other of pain.

On this point Plato's doctrine is, that pleasure is nothing positive and absolute, but a mere negation of pain, the mere replenishing of a vacuum, the mere satisfying of a want. Aristotle denies this, and holds that pleasure is the concomitant of the free and unimpeded exercise of virtuous energy. Sir William

Hamilton shows that there is only an apparent contradiction between Plato and Aristotle, and that their counter theories are but the partial expression of one, which comprehends and consummates them both, which he proposes as his own theory of the feelings. This is correct as far as it goes, but, in our humble judgment, it does not go far enough; it does not adequately account for all the phænomena of the feelings. This theory makes the permanent affections merely the reflex of an energy. Love and hatred, joy and sorrow, admiration and disgust, are affections and sentiments which can not be accounted for on the supposition that they are merely inseparable concomitants of virtuous or vicious energies of the mind. It seems to us there must be certain peculiar and distinct powers in the soul, by which these feelings and others of a similar nature are experienced, which are excited into conscious activity when the mind perceives the appropriate object of each, and experiences the simpler feeling which the energy of that perception causes.

As to the ontology of the feelings, we infer from the above mentioned facts that the mind is endowed with certain powers of transient feelings and permanent affections; that certain external objects and internal conceptions have the property of exciting and sustaining these powers in conscious activity; that each peculiar property produces its own peculiar feeling or affection; and that there is a peculiar property in nature which produces the peculiar emotion of the beautiful.

In our remarks on these points we are compelled to be brief, but we hope that we have made ourselves intelligible to the careful reader, and that we have given a sufficient outline of the philosophy of the feelings to make plain our views of the beautiful. Let us now apply what has been said to the point in discussion.

It follows from the points already made, that, whenever a peculiar emotion is felt, this feeling proves the existence of a peculiar activity, and this activity demonstrates the existence of a peculiar power in the mind, and also of a peculiar cause in nature, which excites this peculiar power into exertion. There-

fore, the well-known and indisputable fact, that in the presence of certain objects, we experience a peculiar emotion, which we call the emotion of the beautiful, proves these two things: *the Beautiful does exist, and we are endowed with a power by which it is perceived and felt.* The emotion of the beautiful, like all others, is indefinable. We bring a person into the presence of an object universally admitted to be beautiful, and there he experiences a peculiar emotion. That emotion is an effect, and its cause resides in the object contemplated. We inquire for this cause, and when we find it, we have found the beautiful. What is this cause? The answers are many and various. We will notice some of the most prominent given by others and give our reasons for not adopting any of them, and then give our own opinion on the subject.

1. The disciples of Locke's sensational philosophy have attempted to reduce the Beautiful to the Agreeable. Consistency required this of them; but the truth is, this school has almost entirely ignored the existence of beauty. Locke has not left a single page on the subject, and his disciples in France, we are informed by Cousin, have treated it with the same disdainful silence. Francis Hutcheson, who published in Ireland, in the year 1720, his "Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue," can not be considered as an exception; for, while he professedly belonged to the school of Locke, he maintained in that work that in addition to the five senses, to which his illustrious master attributes primarily the origin of all our ideas, we possess also certain internal senses, one of which gives us the various emotions of beauty and sublimity, and the other gives rise to our moral feelings. This supposition of internal senses indicates a departure from Sensationalism, and shows a revolt from the authority of Locke, and gives to Hutcheson the honor of being the first to strike out the idea of a better and more satisfactory system of philosophy. The fact is, it only needed that some acute intellect should attempt to apply the principles of the sensational philosophy to the development of the ideas of Taste and Morality, to discover its weak side; and when Hutcheson made this attempt, he unconsciously gave a



mortal thrust into the vitals of the philosophy of which he professed himself a disciple. The only idea of beauty of which Locke's philosophy can admit, is one that finds the beautiful in that which is agreeable to the senses. We admit that every emotion of the beautiful is always agreeable, but it by no means follows from this admission that every agreeable emotion is that of the beautiful. If the beautiful were identical with the agreeable, they would both always coexist and be commensurate; but many things are agreeable which can in no proper sense be called beautiful. We speak of agreeable tastes and smells, but who ever speaks of a beautiful taste or a beautiful smell? It even sometimes happens that the agreeable dispels the idea of beauty. The image of Byron's Dudu expels from the soul the idea and emotion of the beautiful, and yet fills the corrupt heart of the sensualist with agreeable sensations. The agreeable is not only not identical with the beautiful, but it often exists apart from it, and frequently obscures it, and sometimes utterly obliterates all idea and emotion of beauty from the soul.

2. It is a very ancient theory that makes the beautiful identical with the useful. It was refuted by Plato in his *Hippias*, but was again revived and adopted by Berkeley and Hume and some other modern philosophers. A few words will suffice to set this view aside. We consider many objects, of whose utility, if they possess any, we are entirely ignorant, and because they never fail to excite the emotion of the beautiful, we judge them to be beautiful. On the other hand, we contemplate many useful objects in which we can see no beauty, and which never excite the feeling of beauty. A pitchfork may be very useful, and at the same time utterly devoid of beauty. It is true that the ornamental is not unfrequently combined with the useful in the same object; and when we contemplate such objects, we experience two emotions which must never be confounded with each other. Here we might notice the distinction of beauty into absolute and relative, made by Hutcheson in the work already mentioned. When a thing is beautiful in itself, he says it is *absolutely* beautiful; but when it is not beautiful in itself, but in reference to something else for which it exists, he calls it *rel-*

*actively* beautiful. This distinction is without foundation; for his relative beauty is no other than a skilful adaptation of means to an end—the useful. It is, as Sir William Hamilton remarks, “only a beautified utility or a utilized beauty.”

3. We next notice the theory of *association* advanced by Alison, and adopted and advocated by Jeffrey. These gentlemen deny that there is any intrinsic beauty in the qualities of objects, and hold that we only judge objects to be beautiful as they suggest, by the law of association, the pleasurable emotions of a prior experience. Alison says in Essay ii. chap. 1, “Although the qualities of matter are, in themselves, incapable of producing emotion, or the exercise of any affection, yet it is obvious that they may produce this effect from their association with other qualities, which are signs or expressions fitted by the constitution of our nature to produce emotion.” And Lord Jeffrey says, in his review of Dr. Alison’s Essays, “In our opinion, our sense of beauty depends entirely on our *previous experience of simple pleasures or emotions*, and consists in the suggestion of agreeable or interesting sensations, with which we had formerly been made familiar by the direct and intelligible agency of our common sensibility.”\*

We have given the theory of these learned gentlemen in their own words, and it amounts to this: objects are beautiful only as they possess the power of suggesting by the law of association the pleasurable emotions of our previous experience. The fundamental principle with them is, that the beautiful is identical with the agreeable, and, as we have seen the refutation of this idea, we must conclude that their theory can not stand, because its foundation is rotten. In the next place, if objects possess no intrinsic beauty, and are only beautiful as they express, by the law of association, the pleasurable emotions of a prior experience, we would wish to be informed *what first excited the simpler emotions thus suggested*. Lord Jeffrey replies, “the direct and intelligible agency of common sensibility.” This appears to us very much like raising a dust to cover a retreat. The

---

\* Edinburgh Review, May, 1811.

answer is very fine, but it lacks sense. It is a mere collocation of words without meaning, which serve only to disclose the confusion of the writer. Here this theory breaks down. But, to make the refutation complete, we add, in the third place, that it not unfrequently happens that objects, with which we have associated every thing averse to the excitation of pleasurable emotions, do, by the power of their intrinsic beauty, dispel all these vile associations, and in spite of them, excite the emotion of the beautiful in the highest degree. We give the following historical illustration: "When it was heard amongst the multitudes of Paris that their idol, Marat, had been stabbed to the heart by Charlotte Corday, every thing infamous was immediately associated with that young woman; the multitudes conceived her as a hideous fury, and were ready to tear her in pieces. When on her way to execution, she appeared dressed in the red chemise of the assassin, they sent forth hootings and execrations at the sight of the infamous garb so full of vile associations. But as the exquisite loveliness of her pure and serene countenance, and the sculptured beauty of her figure, became more and more fully revealed to their eyes, as she rode along the street to the place of her execution, all associations of crime and infamy gradually faded away, and the multitudes calmed and subdued and melted by so much loveliness, took off their hats in homage to the transcendent power of intrinsic beauty." Like mists before the rising glory of morning, the infamous associations were dispelled by the shining beauty of her person and bearing. The intrinsic beauty of her face and form awakened that exquisite pleasure of soul and homage of heart which the Creator has made the actual effect of beauty.

So far from beauty being dependent on association, it has power to overcome all influence of the strongest antagonistic associations; yet, we readily admit that an object, when present in consciousness with its proper thought, feeling, or desire, is not present isolated and alone, but draws with it the representation of other objects with their respective feelings and desires, with which it may happen to be associated. Thus it may happen that the effect upon the soul of the beauty of an object may be

enhanced by accidental or arbitrary association; but so far from the principle of association being competent to account for all the phænomena of beauty, it presupposes, as its condition, that there are emotions not founded on association; and the attempt to make this principle account for all these phænomena is guilty of the double vice of converting a partial into an exclusive law, and of elevating a subordinate into a supreme principle.

4. Some have thought that they could find the beautiful in suitableness, proportion, or order. All these are but partial statements of the theory that beauty is *variety in unity*. This theory is as old as Aristotle, was embraced by Cousin, and has been forcibly defended and supported by Sir William Hamilton. "To realise an act of the imagination," says the latter philosopher, "it is necessary that we grasp up—that we comprehend—the manifold as a single whole; an object, therefore, which does not allow itself, without difficulty, to be thus represented in unity, occasions pain, whereas an object, which can be easily recalled to system, is the cause of pleasure. The former is the case when the object is either too large or too complex to be perceived at once; when the parts are not prominent enough to be distinctly impressed upon the memory. Order and symmetry facilitate the arts of reproduction and representation, and, consequently, afford us a proportional gratification. But on the other hand, as pleasure is in proportion to the amount of free energy, an object which gives no impediment to the comprehensive energy of the imagination, may not be pleasurable, if it be so simple as not to afford to this faculty a sufficient exercise. Hence it is, that not variety alone, and not unity alone, but *variety combined with unity*, is the quality in objects which we emphatically denominate *beautiful*."\* It is with unfeigned regret that we are compelled to dissent from the voice of this illustrious philosopher, whom above all others we admire. Our only apology is to be found in the fact that he has taught us to be independent, and to think for ourselves. We cannot receive his definition, because we regard the beautiful as one and

---

\* *Metaphysics*, Lect. xlv.

invariable—the same always and every where—whether it be physical, intellectual, or moral; and this definition is, by no possibility, applicable to an explanation of spiritual beauty. The emotion which we experience in contemplation of the beautiful, whether it resides in a physical object, or a mental conception, or a moral deed, is always the same; and hence, the cause which produces it must in all cases be the same, only existing under different circumstances. Using the word spiritual as comprehending both intellectual and moral, we ask, Does spiritual beauty consist in “variety in unity?” Consider any moral deed you please which excites the emotion of which we speak, and which all the world pronounces beautiful, and answer, is its beauty found in “variety in unity?” Take for illustration the following example from Voltaire, which even he styles “un beau trait de desintressement.” He relates: “In one of the wars of Germany, a captain of cavalry was ordered with his company on a foraging expedition. He entered a lonely valley and found in it an humble hut, out of which there came, upon his calling, a very old man with a long white beard, whom he commanded to show him a field of barley where he might gather forage for his army. The old man led the way, and they soon came to an extensive field of fine barley. The captain ordered his men to dismount and to reap the grain; whereupon his venerable guide said, ‘Wait a while and go with me a little further, and you shall be satisfied.’ In a short time they came upon another field of barley equally as fine, but not so extensive as the former, yet amply sufficient for the captain’s wants. ‘Here,’ said the old man, ‘you may gather forage.’ ‘But,’ said the officer, ‘it was not necessary for you to bring us here, as the other field is sufficient for our need.’ ‘I knew that,’ replied the old man, ‘but that field is not mine; this belongs to me, reap here.’” Who will not agree with Voltaire that this old man exhibited a beautiful trait of disinterestedness? Here is moral beauty, but where is the *diversity in harmony* which invests the deed with its beauty? It is not seen; and hence, this definition does not explain the nature of moral beauty.

Let us next see whether this theory is competent to explain  
VOL. XVII., NO. 1.—6.

the phænomena of intellectual beauty. Now, according to Sir William Hamilton's definition of a mental concept, there is in each a plurality of attributes brought into the unity of a single conception. Now, if beauty be variety in unity, every concept and judgment of the mind ought to be beautiful; but this is not the case. Therefore variety in unity in intellectual conceptions does not always constitute beauty. And when a thought is judged to be beautiful, no one thinks of the variety in unity which exists in it. There is, therefore, a beauty in thoughts not reducible to this diversity in harmony. Now, every perfect definition embraces all the properties of the thing defined and excludes all foreign matter, and in both these respects this definition is defective as applied to intellectual beauty.

In the next place, we inquire, Can the beauty of material objects be explained on the principle of variety in unity? If we can find one instance in which we undoubtedly recognise the beautiful, and in which this variety in unity is not found, that instance will be sufficient to disprove this theory; and on the other hand, if we can point to one instance in which this variety in unity is perceived, and no beauty is recognised or felt, the theory will be met and refuted from another direction. Now, behold that purple smoke floating in the atmosphere, and curling gracefully as it gently rises. It is beautiful; but where is the variety in unity that invests it with its beauty? And now let us stand on the street and consider the wheel of a passing cart. It is strong and well adapted for the purpose for which it is intended, but it is heavy and clumsy. Who would call it beautiful? Not one of the dozen with me can see any beauty in it; yet that wheel has variety in unity. It has its clumsy hub, its strong spokes, its massive felloes, and its heavy tire; and all these are reduced to a perfect unity in the wheel. We see, therefore, that every variety in unity in material objects does not make them beautiful; and there are many which have beauty and yet do not manifest any variety in unity.

But we have a profounder objection to this theory than any yet mentioned; one that strikes at the root of the defective philosophy on which the hypothesis stands. It was intimated in

the closing remarks when we were giving the outlines of the philosophy of the feelings. It rests on the assumption that every emotion of pleasure is the mere reflex and inseparable concomitant of a spontaneous and unobstructed activity. The whole theory with Sir William Hamilton amounts to this: when a variety is perceived and the mind finds no difficulty in reducing it to unity, free play is given to its energies, as the reflex of which, a peculiar emotion is felt, which is the emotion of the beautiful. In all this we see nothing more than the energy of the mind in bare cognition. Then, is beauty nothing more than a bare cognition of relations, and the emotion of the beautiful nothing more than the mere pleasurable sensation that springs from the energy of perception? Is emotion nothing but the friction of the mind in action? To say this is to rob beauty of its beauty. But there is a sentiment as well as the mere pleasure of exercise in the perception of the beautiful, and any theory which does not account for this sentiment is insufficient, and despoils beauty of her charms.

Without transgressing further on the patience of the reader, in the refutation of false theories, we will proceed to give what we conceive to be the true theory of taste and beauty. In doing this we will have much to say respecting Cousin's views on this point; and we frankly acknowledge that we caught the suggestion of our ideas on this subject from him; but it will be perceived that his theory has undergone much modification in our hands, whether for the better or the worse the reader must judge. He holds that there is an absolute ideal of beauty, in which physical, intellectual, and moral beauty has its unity; and with him God is this absolute ideal. All things are beautiful so far forth as they suggest God *as he is the ideal of beauty*.

We agree with Cousin in supposing that there is an absolute ideal of beauty, in which all beauty, physical and spiritual, finds its unity, but we can not agree with him in regarding God as this ideal as it is conceived in the human mind. In his philosophy of the absolute, God,—the Infinite and the Absolute,—is conceivable, but in the Hamiltonian philosophy of the conditioned, which we adopt, God is only negatively conceivable. In our

philosophy, Cousin's ideal of beauty is only negatively conceivable, and we can not believe that the ideal beauty—the standard of human taste—is placed above the conception of created mind. God is the eternal and absolute beauty, but this is not the beauty we see in the world—in matter, in mind, and in morals. Our ideal of beauty is not God himself, as Cousin teaches, nor the *idea of the Divine Mind*, as Plato taught, but the perfect conception of beauty in the human mind. Not God himself, but his image as imprinted on creation is the archetype of the ideal of beauty in created minds. The image of God, as it was stamped upon our first parents in their creation, is our highest beauty. A perfect humanity is the ultimate beauty for man. This gives us an ideal that is finite and relative, and therefore conceivable. We conceive this ideal, and think away from it all finitude and relations, and thus arrive at a negative conception of the eternal beauty, which is God himself.

The image of God on man—a perfect humanity—is our ideal of beauty; and whatever exhibits or suggests this ideal is beautiful, and beautiful in the degree of vividness of the exhibition or suggestion of this ideal. But the beautiful is not the whole of this image; the true and the good are also found in it. We have a distinct power by which each one of these classes of properties is perceived and felt; the understanding perceives the true, conscience the good, and taste the beautiful. These three, the understanding, conscience, taste, find their unity in a higher principle—the *reason*. The reason is not, as Cousin imagines, something impersonal and divine that belongs to no particular individual; but it is personal and human, and belongs to every individual. The taste, the conscience, and the understanding, are correlative faculties, or rather correlative complements of faculties, which centre and find their bond of unity in the reason, which is that which constitutes man a rational and responsible being. In this essay we confine our attention to taste; and to its object, beauty.

Man is the most perfect of God's terrestrial works, and the perfections of his nature in body, mind, and morals, constitute the image of his Creator in which he was made; and in this



image is found the ideal of beauty, physical, intellectual, and moral. Before we go farther, we would better settle the question about this image extending to his body. This image has its seat in the soul, and principally in the moral nature; hence, moral beauty is the highest kind. While the image is spiritual, there is no part of the human body through which its glory is not reflected. This is not anthropomorphism. We do not suppose that God has a body, in the image of which man was created; but in his upright, noble, and dignified position, in the sympathy of his form and the divine expression of his face, we think lineaments of his Maker's image appear. As Calvin expresses it, and we hereby bring the authority of that great theologian to the support of our opinion, "though the primary seat of the divine image was in the mind and heart, or in the soul and its powers, there was no part even of the body in which some rays of its glory did not shine." This truth is so patent that it did not escape the notice of the ancient heathen philosophers and poets. Ovid refers to it in the following words:

"Pronaque cum spectant animalia cætera terram,  
Os homini sublime datum est, cœlumque videre  
Jussus, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus."

The sceptical, egotistical, and obscene Montaigne has attempted to ridicule this idea, but he has only succeeded in making himself ridiculous in a foolish effort to bring man and brutes on a level, by half brutalizing the one and half humanizing the other. Man is fallen and the glory of his original nature is beclouded in sin, the image of his Creator is defaced and almost obliterated; therefore, in our present state, it is impossible to get the perfect ideal of beauty. This accounts for the obscurity of our ideas on this point. This image has a second time been presented to the world in all perfection in the humanity of our Saviour. In him humanity, physically, intellectually, and morally, was perfect; and beauty, in every aspect, shone in him in all the brilliancy and glory of original perfection. And notwithstanding this image has been shivered to pieces in the fall, traces of it are still discoverable in man, and whenever we see them we recognise beauty and feel its emotion.

Do we, then, confine all beauty to man? By no means. We derive our ideal of beauty from the perfections of humanity; and then, whatever in nature corresponds with this ideal awakens within us the emotion of the beautiful. In God's image in the person of man we find the standard of taste; and one has a correct taste in proportion as he has a just conception of the ideal of beauty as it exists in this image; whatever conforms to taste, when taste itself conforms to this ideal, is beautiful; and whatever in nature exhibits or suggests this ideal, as it is conceived in taste, excites the emotion of the beautiful. We say, *exhibits* or *suggests* this ideal, because spiritual beauty is the direct *exhibition* of some spiritual excellence, which is a feature in the image of God manifested in a perfect humanity, and physical beauty is the mere *suggestion* of mental or moral excellences. Some make physical beauty consist in one thing and some in another. Suitableness, proportion, order, variety in unity, and many other properties of material objects, have been taken as the essence of beauty; but no theory that seeks the solution of the mysteries of beauty by supposing that there is a particular property of matter that is the essence of beauty, can ever give a full and perfect explanation of all the phænomena of taste. Beauty may arise in some instances from the suitableness of objects, or from their order, or from their variety in unity; but beauty is not tied to any particular property or combination of properties. Physical beauty is that in material objects which suggests spiritual beauty. Adam's body only suggested the ideal beauty by reflecting the image of God engraven on his soul; and it is only as the face and form and manners of man suggest an excellent soul within, that they are judged beautiful. It is only as the silvery clouds, the curling smoke, meandering brooks, and flowery meadows, suggest life, mind, and spiritual excellences, that they are judged beautiful. It is only as the picture, the statue, the poem, and the song, express life and mental superiority, that they are judged beautiful. Spiritual beauty is the image of God on the soul of man, and physical beauty is this image reflected in material objects.

It will not follow from what has been said that every superior

soul has a beautiful face, for the face is not always an index to the soul within. It often happens that persons whose minds are endowed with the highest types of beauty, possess faces far from beautiful when in repose; but it is true of these same persons when their souls begin to act, that their countenances kindle into radiance and glow in beauty. Byron said of Mme. de Stael, though mortally ugly, she could talk herself beautiful in ten minutes. Socrates had a face by no means beautiful according to the Grecian models, but it always shone with an unearthly beauty when his soul was animated in the delivery of his sublime discourses. And on the other hand, there are those who are endowed with no beauty of mind, and yet have forms and faces accounted beautiful. They are beautiful, not by the *exhibition* of the soul residing within, but by *suggesting* another and superior soul. The beauty of such persons is exactly the same as the beauty of a painting or the sculptured marble; and these are beautiful as they suggest, through expressions imparted to them by the genius and skill of the artist, some mental or moral excellences. Socrates, in conversation with the artisans, arrives at the true end of their work. He tells Cleito that the end of the statuary is to express the "workings of the mind by the form," and informs Parrhasius that the end of the painter is to represent the "dispositions of the mind in colors on canvas." While in the portrait and statue there is no mind, yet by color and form they suggest intellect, and it is in the power of this suggestion their beauty resides. So it is in regard to Nature's works. Every thing has beauty in the degree of its power to suggest mental or moral excellences. What we would here say has been so well expressed by Cousin, that we will use his words. "Consider," says he, "the figure of man in repose; it is more beautiful than that of any animal, and the figure of an animal is more beautiful than that of any inanimate object. It is because the human figure, even in the absence of virtue and genius, always reflects an intelligent and moral nature; it is because the figure of an animal reflects sentiment at least, and something of the soul, if not the soul itself. If from man and the animal we descend to purely physical nature, we shall still find beauty

there, as long as we find there some shade of intelligence, I know not what, that awakens in us some thought, some sentiment. Do we arrive at some piece of matter that expresses nothing, that signifies nothing? Neither is the idea of beauty applied to it. But every thing that exists is animated. Matter is shaped and penetrated by forces not material, and it obeys laws that attest an intelligence every where. The most subtile chemical analysis does not reach a dead and inert nature, but a nature that is organised in its way, that is neither deprived of forces nor laws. In the depths of the earth as in the heights of the heavens, in a grain of sand as in the gigantic mountain, an immortal spirit shines through the thickest coverings. Let us contemplate nature with the eye of the soul as well as with the eye of the body: every where a moral expression will strike us, and the forms of things will impress us as the symbols of thoughts. Form can not be simply a form; it must be the form of something. Physical beauty, therefore, is the sign of an internal beauty, which is spiritual and moral beauty; and this is the foundation, the unity of the beautiful." Physical beauty is, then, the power which material objects possess of suggesting spiritual beauty; that is, the ideal beauty as it exists in the soul. Cousin says this ideal is God himself; and we say it is a perfect humanity, or the image of God in which man was created. Our ideal is conceivable, because it is limited in time and space; in our judgment, Cousin's is not; but according to his philosophy, it is, because he holds to the conceivability of the infinite and the absolute. .

There is a power in nature which suggests the supernatural, and objects which possess this power are said to be sublime. The emotion of sublimity is essentially different from that of beauty; the latter is one of pure and unmingled pleasure, and the former is a mingled feeling of pleasure and pain. There is pleasure, because a faculty is called into activity, and pain, because it is afterwards repressed in its energy. Why is it repressed? Because the idea suggested transcends the power of the mind's comprehension. These facts justify the distinction which we have made. The mind has grasp enough to comprehend

the ideal of beauty, which is the image of God; and hence in the perception of the beautiful, no energy is repressed, and the emotion is one of unalloyed pleasure: but the emotion of the sublime is one of mingled pleasure and pain; as an energy is called into activity, there is pleasure, but as the mind can not grasp the ideal suggested, which is the supernatural, its energy is repressed and pain ensues. The sublime is that in nature which has the power to express or suggest the supernatural.

Each of these emotions is accompanied with its appropriate sentiment. The sentiment of the beautiful is love, and that of the sublime is adoration. Each of these sentiments exists in two degrees. Physical beauty, which is the mere suggestion of the spiritual, is liked; spiritual beauty itself is loved. That which only suggests the infinite is admired; but the infinite itself is adored. So far as we conceive of God in his image, we love him; but when our notion of the Deity rises above the conceivable into the infinite and absolute, we cover our heads and adore him.

In a brief recapitulation we give our theory of taste as follows: The æsthetic ideal is found in the image of God in which man was created. In other words, it is perfect humanity. This ideal is not all that is in this image or perfect humanity; the ideals of truth and goodness are also comprehended in it. These ideals are distinct, but not necessarily separate, for the same thing may be true, good, and beautiful at the same time. Each of these ideals has in the soul its appropriate faculty, or rather complement of faculties, by which their proper ideas and objects are perceived; the understanding for the true, the taste for the beautiful, and the conscience for the good. The ideal of beauty, which is the standard of taste, is but imperfectly apprehended in our present fallen state; but the nearer our conception of it approaches what it was in our unfallen integrity, the purer the taste. Whatever conforms to taste, when taste itself conforms with the ideal, is beautiful. This ideal has its seat in the soul; therefore, all beauty at bottom is spiritual beauty. Physical beauty is the power which mate-

rial objects possess of expressing or suggesting spiritual excellences.

The last point raises the inquiry, Do we at last adopt Dr. Alison's theory of association? By no means. He and Lord Jeffrey deny the existence of intrinsic beauty, and hold that objects are beautiful only as they suggest pleasurable emotions with which they have become associated through a prior experience. In our opinion physical objects suggest the ideal beauty on an entirely different law; to wit, through an intrinsic power inherent in them—a power which excites the emotion of the beautiful in spite of the vilest associations which may be linked to the object that possesses this intrinsic beauty. It is impossible to say what in every instance this intrinsic beauty in objects is. In some it is one thing, and in others it is something else. Whatever in form or color invests a material object with the power of suggesting spiritual excellences, is the intrinsic beauty of that object.

In regard to the fundamental principles of taste, there is a proximate uniformity in the opinions of men; but in regard to their details in their application, there is a great diversity of views. Can this circumstance be explained on the theory we propose? Let us see. At all events, the circumstance is not to be wondered at, for the same thing obtains in the operations of the understanding and conscience in regard to the true and the good. This fact made such a deep impression on the master mind of Pascal, that it gave birth to the following remarkable words: "We see," says he, "scarcely any thing, just or unjust, that does not change its nature in changing its climate. Three degrees of higher latitude reverse all jurisprudence. A meridian determines a truth. Fundamental laws are changed by a few years possession. Right has its eras." This shows that there is as great diversity in the opinions of men in regard to the true and the good, as there is regard to the beautiful; and as there have been sceptics in metaphysics, and sceptics in ethics, we naturally expect sceptics in æsthetics. As there was a Pyrrho to deny the existence of truth, and a Hobbes to deny the reality of moral distinc-

tions, we might expect a Voltaire to deny the existence of beauty.

As the difficulty here alluded to is found in precisely the same way in the understanding and conscience as in taste, it is very probable that, if the solution can be found in any one instance, it will be applicable to the other two. At least there is such a striking analogy between taste and conscience that we can safely reason from the one to the other. We find in the opinions of men a proximate uniformity as to the fundamental principles of virtue, and at the same time a great diversity of views as to their application in detail. Now, right itself is immutable, and these variations must be found in the conscience itself, and not in the things about which it is conversant. The explanation is found in the fact that we are a fallen race. In the fall, the conscience was vitiated; not destroyed, but darkened and perverted. The image of God, which is the ideal good, as well as the ideal true and beautiful, is defaced and almost entirely obliterated by sin. However, the striking outlines of the ideal good in this image are easily perceived; hence the proximate uniformity of men's opinions in regard to the fundamental principles of right. The finer lineaments of this image can be but dimly and uncertainly traced, and hence the great diversity in the nicer discriminations in morals. These same facts will form a solution to similar difficulties in taste. Taste is fallen, vitiated, and darkened by sin. The ideal beauty was defaced and obscured by the fall. Its bold outlines are yet easily perceived; hence the proximate uniformity in the fundamental principles of taste. The finer traces of the beautiful are with difficulty found in the shattered image; hence the great diversity in the details of the application of the fundamental principles of taste. A man's taste is pure in proportion to its degree of conformity to the original ideal of pure and perfect beauty, as it existed in the image of God in which man was created.

As a consequence of this striking analogy between taste and conscience, for every error in taste, there has been a similar error in conscience. As Voltaire denies the existence of beauty,

Hobbes denies the existence of moral distinctions; as Locke's sensational philosophy makes the beautiful identical with the agreeable, the Epicureans make virtue and pleasure the same; as Berkeley and Hume see the beautiful only in the useful, so Dr. Paley finds in his own mind the thought that virtue is identical with one's self-interest; as Dr. Alison would find the beautiful in our sympathy with the object by the law of association, so Dr. Adam Smith would find the principle of virtue in our sympathy with the moral agent; and as many would find the foundation of the beautiful in suitableness, so Dr. Samuel Clark conceives virtue to be the doing of that which is suitable to be done. We might trace this parallel farther, but it would only weary the patience of the reader.

We may be permitted to add a single remark, in order to point out the analogy between our theory of beauty and Bishop Butler's theory of virtue, with which we will close this article. Virtue, according to him, is a peculiar quality of certain actions of moral agents, which quality is perceived by conscience. The perception of this is accompanied by a peculiar emotion, which is distinct from all others, and is called the emotion of the good. We would define beauty to be a peculiar quality of certain objects, actions, thoughts, and expressions, which quality is perceived by taste; and which perception is accompanied by a peculiar emotion, distinct from all others, which is called the emotion of the beautiful.



## ARTICLE III.

## LIFE AND TIMES OF DR. SPRING.

*Personal Reminiscences of the Life and Times of* GARDINER SPRING, *Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the city of New York.* New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER & Co. 1866.

We owe our thanks to Dr. Spring; for the work is autobiographical, though, curiously enough, there is no acknowledgment of that fact upon the title page; we owe him our thanks for publishing this extraordinary book during his life. Putting it thus outside all the bounds of legitimate literature, he has relieved us of the necessity of general criticism, which could not be just to the community, the Church, or ourselves, without a severity of censure upon its taste, its style, and its principles, from which we are cordially glad that his years and his former eminence protect him.

We should therefore have passed it by without notice, had not its author seen fit incorporate in it two chapters on the Rebellion and the suppression of it, which we can not ignore, lest our forbearance be mistaken for an admission of their justice, wisdom, or historic truth. Far from our hearts be the thought to rake open the fires of the war-furnace, or repeat a controversy which God's mysterious providence has practically decided against us. *Practically*, we say; for Providence never decides among theories, though it often settles duties, and thus renders theoretical discussions barren and vain, for the time being. As a matter of duty, the question is settled. We of the Southern States ought to accept, and we do accept, the Union. We desire a much "more perfect union" than at present we are permitted to enjoy.

On the question of justice, however, the debate is not so readily closed. We can, indeed, as a bereaved and ruined people, veil our heads in sorrow and indignation, while the

common clamor runs dry. What is the annoyance of that empty outcry, to the ashes for beauty, the mourning over our dead, which is given us for the oil of joy their presence erewhile poured upon us? We need say nothing, when voices which were long the echo of our own break forth in borrowed wrath. We can "be silent to him" who, in pursuance of his gracious purposes, strikes the cup of national life from our lips, binds down (for a time) the arm of human help, even in the loftiest places, and commits us to the mercies of them that hate us. But when the age and reverence, which once walked side by side with our most venerable and good, forsakes and assails them, the case is changed. When Eliphaz and Bildad and Zophar bring their pitiless railing accusations, Job *must* speak. Not for the Sabeans that have spoiled him, nor the Chaldeans that have slain his servants with the edge of the sword, nor the whirlwind that has smitten his sons, will he break that reverent, patient silence. Yea, though foul disorders and temptations at home beset him about, still from his dunghill shall he lift up his eyes and bless his God. But when old friends grow cruel, and heap up injustice upon his agony, dab his impatient brow with vapid sympathy, and foul his helpless back with slander, he would not be a man if he did not speak out.

And though we decline, for sufficient reasons, to apply such bitter terms as these to our accusers, yet these two chapters, and the similar language which flows in rivers from the northern press and pulpit, seem to lay upon us the necessity of putting on record our earnest protest and denial.

It would appear that the pastor of a great church of merchants must have learned, in the course of his fifty-six years, that there are many lawsuits in which, though only one party can be legally right, neither, or both, may be morally wrong. We waive all accusations upon the general issue against the North, for the nonce. We assume, for the argument's sake, that they were honest and patriotic in their belief that secession could not take place. Does it follow necessarily that we were traitors for believing that it could take place? Is it something unheard of, before 1860, that one class of men should be honestly impressed

by the facts and arguments that make for one conclusion, while another class are equally, and as honestly, impressed by those that make the other way?

But there is a portentous allegation, clamorously insisted upon by Dr. Spring, which will carry us much farther than this. It is, "that a system of slavery in any form is incompatible with a republican government;" p. 186. We will not pause here upon so trivial a matter as the Doctor's "record" (as the cant phrase runs) in connexion with this dogma. True, he tells us that this is one of two conclusions he had "long" adopted, (p. 185); having previously rashly explained that "a personal inspection of Southern habits (whatever that may mean) and the condition of the slave population both in the cities and on the plantations, *together with the bonds of domestic relationship*, threw me (him) outside of the ranks of abolition," p. 177; and again, "Some considerations \* \* \* led me, even just before the eruption of the South, to espouse the Southern cause," p. 178; which stirs a good many lively questions in one's mind. But let that pass. It is clear that now, and for "long," Dr. Spring has come to be a believer in "the irrepressible conflict." Denied and denounced, not so very long ago, by many men in high places, who nervously and with angry, frightened haste, daubed their untempered mortar over the crevices of a crumbling union, it is an axiom of their political faith now. But does it not occur to them—have they so lost their shrewdness and their memory as not to know—that *was precisely the postulate of the first secessionists?*

Does the South need any other defence for endeavoring to escape from her bonds—the chains, stronger than steel, as it seems, which fettered her to this people—than the doctrine that their government is incompatible with the laws of her life? Has not that been our protest, aye, and our lamentation, for years, that Northern republicanism was putting on a form, and breathing a spirit, to which our institutions could not be reconciled? And now, after being denounced and abused, these five long years, for a causeless and wanton insurrection—Dr. Spring himself says, (p. 207,) that we had not "any just ground of complaint against the government," that government which

was just now incompatible with any form of slavery—rises up this Nestor to tell us that our institutions and theirs could not live together.

So long as God has mercy on us, so long as he has not doomed this great people to anarchy and ruin, he will preserve, in the South or elsewhere, the leaven of a better system than Northern republicanism. Some thing or other will, in that case, always be found “incompatible” with it.

Nor will it serve the purpose of our assailants any better to make their allegation indefinite, as, indeed, Dr. Spring has done, and say that “slavery is incompatible with a republican government,” meaning *any* such government. No man who is not utterly ignorant either of political history or political geography, will risk the assertion that the government of the Southern States was not republican. Suffrage in South Carolina, with the white race, has long been what is loosely called universal: that is, all white males of twenty-one years of age and over, were entitled to a vote. In the other States, the control of the government by the people was even more direct and rapid than it was here. Stated in this way, therefore, the allegation is untrue; taken the other way, it vindicates our attempt to escape from the Union.

But the Doctor’s magisterial air (if he were younger by a generation, we should call it dogmatical) is still more impressive when he delivers himself upon the history of the Rebellion. “It is amusing,” quoth he, “to hear some persons attributing it (the said rebellion) to Northern Abolitionism; *when the historical fact is patent to the world, that it was projected by the ‘Knights of the Golden Circle,’ twenty years before Northern Abolitionism was thought of;*” p. 208.\* Now, since Dr. Spring has struck a vein of history so rich and remarkable, we respectfully submit that he ought to work it much more vigorously than this. The phrase—“the fact is patent to the world,” must surely mean that the evidences of it are easily accessible; for we can vouch for one section of the world—*videlicet* our own—that knows

---

\* The italics are ours.

nothing of any such "project" of the necessary age, and would be glad of any light that might be cast upon the subject. For ourselves, we readily acknowledge having seen those cabalistic initials, "K. G. C.," some five, six, or possibly eight years ago. They broke out occasionally, in journals of the Southwest and West; and some horrid nonsense was talked about them in certain New York papers, doubtless at so much per line. But that we beheld then, or can discover now, any indications of a "conspiracy," wrought out by "K. G. C.," or any other letters of the alphabet, we can and do most positively deny.

We would, therefore, earnestly request the reverend discoverer of so great a fact, to tell us all about it. And inasmuch as Northern abolitionism is, to be very modest with it, at least thirty years old, we particularly desire Dr. Spring to say positively whether the "Knights of the Golden Circle" constituted an active secret society *fifty years ago*. Who were those Knights? In what consisted their power? For what particular object were they conspiring? *On what did they found their hopes of success?* Where did they acquire their wonderful gift of secrecy, among a people whose bane and weakness it has been, to be too boastful of their purposes and powers?

We dislike to be peremptory with any body, but the story is simply ridiculous. You might as well indict the conspirators of the east wind, or the hail storm, as the "projectors," by any secret conspiracy, of this continental upburst. The South had dinned its indignation and its fears in the ears of an unbelieving and prejudiced world. It has been pointing for years to the limit, at which its forbearance would be exhausted, and the Union become a yoke intolerable to our necks. So far were the politicians from forcing the people on, that at the last moment, and here in South Carolina, they refused to take the responsibility of calling a convention to withdraw the State from the Union, unless the people would voluntarily test their own determination by some pledge, which would guarantee the ostensible movers in the matter against a sudden revulsion of public feeling. That pledge was given by enrolments, organisations, mass meetings, sufficient to convince the world, or so much of it

as can be convinced by evidence, that the thing was done by an uprising of the people, and not by a handful of demagogues, as the North will have it. And so solemn and earnest an act was it, that many who had done all they could, by word and vote, to bring it about, wept, when the work was done, with tender remembrances of the Union they believed themselves to be quitting forever.

But the God of Israel has interposed, not against *us*, as so many hasten to proclaim it, but against our earthly hopes and passionate desires. He has decided, and we cordially accept his will. How often have our hearts swelled in sympathy with faithful preachers, who, while discoursing of our sorrows, our perils, and our duties, pointedly inquired, "Suppose it should prove, after all, that our national success is not God's way to his coming, and his kingdom: which would we have? which is our blessed hope?" and answered for us as for themselves, "COME LORD! nor let THY chariot wheels delay!" Our consolation for this sore defeat, and the desolation it has brought upon us, is not sought in the present dispensation. We have not now to learn that his gracious purposes roll steadily on, oftentimes whelming his people's hopes and joys in ruin, and burying them deep, as the seeds of the husbandman are pressed into the soil, to find their resurrection and immortal fruit and beauty, in another age. We remember the great apostle, who has taught us by precept and example (Col. i. 24) to "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ for his body's sake, which is the Church." And now that his providence has taught us that this is his will, we look past the cruel hands that have wrenched them away; and we bring the possessions, comforts, homes, sacred affections, which made this wilderness as a garden of the Lord, and lay them uncomplainingly in the hands of a Redeemer, who, while he chastens us, withholds not his sympathy, nor the light of his love.

The wail of our anguish is hushed; as an afflicted Christian people, we resolutely turn our eyes from the bitter past, and address our faith and willing service to the future, in that new direction to which his providence impels us. That future,

clouded to us, is clear as noon to him. His summons cheers our hearts, and challenges our courage, and kindles our hope. In the name of our God have we veiled our banners, as we set them up: He will teach us, and lead us, and send forth judgment unto truth.

We pass over a good many points of interest suggested by these two chapters, to call attention to one which, though somewhat personal in its bearing, seems to us of very grave and serious import. Dr. Spring is, as he says, "an old man, and a ruler in the House of God." In his day, he was one of the foremost men of the Church; and wisdom, meekness, self-command, and heavenly charity, ought to have been commended and enforced by his example. Especially was he bound to such deportment by the fact that he had so long leaned toward us, and away from "Northern abolitionism;" insomuch that he confesses his leap from side to side: "The North was bent on the abolition of slavery, and the South was bent on secession; *there was but one alternative, and under the pressure, my views and my conduct were revolutionized.*"\*

How becoming, in such a case, would have been delicacy, forbearance at least, temperance of speech! How natural to have been modest in utterance, and charitable in judgment! But Dr. Spring tells us that he "cannot well restrain his pen," p. 198; he writes such English as this, "There is no *government of the world* which the God of heaven is so set on humbling, as the pride of man," p. 199;\* and he calls the "Act of Secession" "so causeless, so rash, so ruthless, so suicidal, and in its treachery and *spoils* so unequalled in wickedness," p. 200. He prints an incredibly coarse and silly *anonymous letter*, written from the South in the first effervescence of secession; and adds, "There is a *smack of the Southern pulpit* in this.\* We have no objection that it should fall under the eye of the Rev. Stuart Robinson, or his faithful coadjutor, the Rev. Mr. Hoyte," (*sic*) p. 194. He raves about the murderer of President Lincoln, after he had been killed and buried, in language that one really hesitates to quote:

---

\* The italics are ours.

“Language fails to depict the hate, the revenge, the madness, of the hellish deed in the heart of that accursed assassin.” “Let his name perish, and rot, like a dog’s carcass, in a defiled grave.” P. 211.

We look back to these words again and again, with an almost invincible incredulity that we can have read them aright. Let the crime be ever so horrible, (and we yield to none in our abhorrence of it,) we pause to ask, has the Church of our fathers indeed come to this—the Church immemorially “decent and wise” and “glorious to behold?” Have her “old men, and rulers in the House of God,” learned to revile in terms like these, and in despite of Scripture? But to return: the paragraph about Mr. Davis must be quoted entire:

“There is reason to fear that our Martyr-President was the victim of a deep conspiracy, well understood and approved at Richmond, if not concocted, by the Cabinet of the revolt. We do not assert that it received the seal of its *chivalrous head*; that Jefferson Davis was privy to it, and its responsible adviser, though his position unfitted him to strike the blow. A kind Providence has now made him our captive. ‘In his iniquity his *heels* were made bare.’ The prophecy was literally fulfilled, ‘In thine iniquity are thy *skirts* discovered.’ He has paid dear for his chivalry. Instead of being hailed, as was predicted in the English Parliament, as the founder of a nation, he is remembered as its would-be destroyer. His very subjects, awakened from their delusion, have awoke (*sic*) only to reproach him. He sowed the wind, and he has reaped the whirlwind. No amnesty could save him; no act of oblivion swept deep enough to blot out his infamy. No appeals for mercy ought to stay the claims of even-handed justice. Should the proud and boasted career of this worthless leader be closed on the gallows, no veteran armies would weep at his funeral. Even faction might be silent; it would not be safe for it to pay any kind of devotion to his memory. Jefferson Davis is but another name for indelible infamy.” P. 213.\*

---

\* The italics are Dr. Spring’s.



Before passing to the general remark we have had in view in making these several quotations, we linger a moment upon this deliverance. We confess to having copied these sentences with a feeling of poignant distress. Not for Mr. Davis, however; the vindication of his spirit and character is begun already, and advances too rapidly to need a word from us. But here is an eminent octogenarian, a divine of sixty years, who deliberately indites, revises, and publishes—1. A cautiously guarded accusation against a man who cannot defend himself, that he was the real projector of a foul murder; 2. A repeated sneer at his “chivalry;” 3. A demand for his execution; 4. A threat against any one who should dare to lighten the anguish of his condemnation and death with one word of sorrow or pity; and 5. A reference to a false report concerning his capture, conveyed in quotations from God’s word, which must be called ribald.

In reference to these various excerpts we have now to say, that there are only two ways in which justice could be fully done upon them. One would involve denunciations as harsh and bitter as the writer’s own; the other would be, to hold them up between finger and thumb, *naso adunco*, for the—instruction and wonder of men. But we cannot bring ourselves to adopt either course. The burden of sorrow on our hearts forbids it; sorrow for a lost cause; sorrow for

“The touch of a vanished hand,  
And the sound of a voice that is still;”

Sorrow for the honor of a Saviour who “reviled not again, who “brake not the bruised reed, nor quenched the smoking flax,” who forgave and redeemed a murderer upon the cross, and prayed for them that slew him, but whose followers so often forget his example, and tarnish his glory. Let them curse, but bless Thou!

And now, we would redeem the little space that is left us, for a subject far more worthy of universal attention than Dr. Spring’s unfortunate book: the condition and prospects of the negro race. We decline all theoretical discussions; yet a word of explanation must be permitted us, by way of preface.

Waiving all party terms and technicalities, the great question which underlies the whole controversy about slavery, is the question of the proper relation, in a given case, between work and wealth. England and New England have maintained, and, for the present, have persuaded the world, that there is but one relation proper in any case; and that is, current demand and supply. *Current*, we say, to express the idea characteristic of their scheme in principle and practice, that the moment the laborer has met the capitalist's demand, and been paid for supplying his want, the relation between them is at an end. This is the secret of "strikes;" the deep heresy that draws want and vice and mutual hatred in its train. This, enlightened Christian reason in Great Britain has discovered and maintains to be a heresy; but with no change, as yet, in the principles or practice of the nation at large.

A late Glasgow paper contains a very striking extract from a periodical called "*The Truth*," which clearly sets this forth. We quote a few sentences, without regard to their order in the article: "We are firmly convinced that as long as there are no relations between employers and employed but merely those of a pecuniary bargain, they will have unfortunate disputes, such as give rise to strikes." "A supercilious selfish employer is cordially detested by his people." "Such a mind may be *literally soaking with sectarian piety*." "A living sponge, which absorbs every fluid near it; a maelstrom which draws to itself every contiguous object; a parsimonious desert which drinks greedily the April showers and morning dews, without returning so much as a blade of grass in gratitude—all these are more tolerable to contemplate than a supercilious selfish employer."

But it is evident that there is not, and cannot be, any organic connexion, any standing and enforcible obligation between the two classes, without an entire sacrifice of the vital essence of the scheme. Things must be as they are, so far as any objective reciprocal bond is concerned; or there must be substituted for this order, a scheme which will give the capitalist a lien upon labor, and the laborer a lien upon wealth: in a word, some form,

however modified or disguised, however guarded against oppression, *some form of servitude.*

Nor have we, in this statement, any *arriere pensee*, any looking back to the abolished "institution." Let the dead past bury its dead. We are reasoning with a heavy heart upon the future. It is clear, from such statements as the above, and from facts notorious to the world, that this system, or no system, of transient connexions, will work well and secure liberty to both parties, only in the rare and almost impossible case of a *double equilibrium*; 1. Equilibrium in the supply, *i. e.* of wealth and labor; 2. Equilibrium in the force or weight, in other respects, of the laboring class and the class of capitalists. And wherever wealth is paramount, *i. e.* in nine cases out of ten, as regards unskilled labor, even of the white race, oppression, beggary, rancor, vice, follow by a law of nature.

But suppose, instead of Scotch or English peasants and "factory hands," a visibly inferior race of laborers: no matter how the inferiority originated, so long as the classes are congenitally and permanently distinguished; the natural and wholesome tendency of things will be to a permanent interdependence; whether formal, in the shape of clientelage, serfdom, or slavery; or informal, as a feudal or patriarchal spirit. Natural, because the one class habitually looks up for protection, and the other habitually regards the race beneath it as entitled, alike in honor and in humanity, to dwell under its grateful shadow. Wholesome, because the proper outflow is, on the one hand, a thankful, on the other, a benignant, friendship.

What, now, will be the operation of any power, however kindly intended, however faithfully worked—and the Freedmen's Bureau, as a rule, is neither—which interposes incessantly, openly, efficiently, to prevent the establishment of this relation, whether formal or informal, and to compel the unhappy victims of its government to accept only those perilous conditions which are barely endurable when applied to the white race alone? The flow of human affection is not like that of magnetic electricity, which pours on its undiminished volume, however often you form, or break, its "circuit." Its ties are like the tendrils of

the vine, that if rubbed away too often, are not renewed, but leave the plant prone and helpless in the dust.

An institution such as this, therefore, throws the employer, and the employed likewise, back upon the sole consideration of his own interests. It sets up the two great elements that form the community in opposition to each other, like two great cliffs that have been rent asunder. It tempts the white man to drive hard bargains, and to lose sight of the needs, the morals, or the future, of his servants. It teaches the black man to suspect those who alone can effectually befriend him, and who can so befriend him, only while they have his confidence. The Freedmen's Bureau, therefore, by a necessity of its nature, and viewed in the light of sociology alone, is the corrupter of the white race, and the betrayer of the black.\*

That its appropriate work of ruin is not complete, is due, partly to the fact that it is not absolutely ubiquitous; partly to the conscientiousness and good sense of some of its officials, who have bent their efforts to neutralise its inherent mischievousness; but chiefly to its rapid, its prodigious loss of influence during the last few months, with the freedmen themselves. For, as we see, it is one of those happy inventions of officiousness, whose best possible achievement it is to be zero. When it *only* squanders its \$11,000,000 per annum; when it *only* feeds a shoal of hungry office-holders who deserve not to be fed, the Freedmen's Bureau will have attained perfection.

Meanwhile, what does Northern philanthropy think of a floorless small-pox hospital for winter use? of "a little bacon and cornmeal," as rations for small-pox patients? of such patients stripped in the open air, with the thermometer below the freezing point, to change their clothes? How do the poor fellow's "friends" like the revival of the tortures of the Inquisition,

---

\*So true is this in practice, that to quote no other instance, an eminently noisy, busy, and acceptable chaplain connected with the Bureau, in a public address to the negroes, said: "The white men will drive as hard bargains with you as they can; if I was living here, that 's what I would do." *In nostris auribus didicit.*     •     •

for his behoof? as, for instance, tying his hands behind his back, and then suspending him by his wrists, so bound together?

Nor is this a digression; the question is of the prospects of the colored people; and we answer, in view of these two facts, viz., 1. The violent, tyrannical, persistent disruption, between the white employer and his colored laborer, of every tie except that of "hire and work," the intermeddling which has that disruption for its express object; and 2. The rapid loss of confidence in these officials, through the oppression and treachery of which they have too often been guilty; and in view, also, of the consequent privation of the help and guidance which is essential to the negro race—the regular daily food, the faithful and intelligent nursing in sickness, the systematic care of their infant children; privation, as well, of moral help—the discipline and police regulations, and the force of the example of those whom they habitually respected, and often revered: having these several, obvious, vital considerations in view, we mournfully declare that they are visibly doomed, as a race, and that under the present regime we are nearly powerless, even to delay that doom.\*

Are we asked, now, impatiently, perhaps scornfully, what we would have? We answer at once, NOT SLAVERY. We trust in heaven's mercy never to reimpose upon us that tremendous responsibility and burden, in our altered circumstances. Not any organic institute, or legal bond, whatever. Human relationships, provided for in nature, never do well when created or revolutionized by human law. All we ask is, *the elimination of foreign matter*—the removal of the interfering force which prevents the healing of the wounds of society. It is, to be left to the benignant operation of the laws of nature, as penetrated, redeemed, and vitalized by grace.

---

\* These pages are not the proper place to withdraw the veil from one portion of the evidence on which this declaration is founded—we mean the diseases due to licentiousness, which burst out, like lava from a volcano, at every military station. But we call attention pointedly to the fact that *this outburst is characteristic of those neighborhoods*. So kind, sometimes, are "friends!"

No imaginable arrangement, in this sinful world, will completely exclude oppression; least of all, an arrangement which recognises no responsibility, either to law or to public opinion, for anything more than paying the market price for labor. But what bids so fair to bless and help us all as a standing claim, on the part of ignorance and weakness, upon the protection and guidance of the strong, and a frank recognition of their right to it, on the side of wealth and knowledge? A national clientelage, and a national patronage?

Wherever the baleful shadow of the Bureau is growing less, the negroes are returning to the churches and pastors of their former love. Their children crowd into our Sunday-schools; ministers and laymen delight in teaching them those words whose entrance giveth light; as fast as it proves safe, they will have weight, if not formal place, in the management of their spiritual affairs. We will strive, white and black, to be true friends, and fellow disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ. By his grace helping us, we will live, and pray, and toil, and die, and triumph over death, side by side.

Is it better that they should perish, than that we should work out our heart's wishes thus?

## ARTICLE IV.

## THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1865.

When the General Assembly of 1864 was dissolved, another Assembly was required to meet in the city of Macon, on the third Thursday of May, 1865. This meeting could not be held at the time appointed. A victorious army had occupied our Southern cities, had destroyed our railways, and rendered the convening of that body not merely difficult but impossible.

Meanwhile the Confederate States had failed to achieve their independence. The armies of the South, after untold hardships and heroic efforts to establish a cause believed by them to be just, overwhelmed by superior numbers, had capitulated on the field of battle. Twenty millions, with a well appointed army and navy, and the resources of the world before them, had conquered six millions, who were without a navy, and, at the inception of the war, without an army, and were shut out from other nations by a strict blockade of all their ports.

It may not be amiss to rehearse briefly

THE CAUSES WHICH GAVE ORIGIN TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES  
OF AMERICA, AND HAVE PERPETUATED IT UNDER ANOTHER  
NAME.

The first of these causes was the rise of the Confederate Government. The people of the Southern States had felt themselves wronged by a persistently partial, sectional, and unfriendly legislation on the part of the North. The safeguards of the Federal Constitution by which the rights of the South were protected, were more and more infringed upon. They saw no longer any security in the Federal Union for themselves and their institutions, and regarded the compact made by the free and independent States of the South with the free and independent States of the North, after the Revolution of

1776—1781, as annulled *foro conscientiæ*, by the progressive infraction of the covenant by the people of the North and their State legislatures. The doctrine of State sovereignty, hitherto relied on as the only protection from the tyranny of majorities, was now powerless in the Union; and under these circumstances, the people of these several Southern States, in convention assembled, withdrew from the Federal Union and created a new confederacy under the old constitution; hoping to live in peace by the side of their brethren of the North a virtuous and Christian people, discharging their duties more fully and freely than they were able to do amid the angry debates and controversies which disturbed their peace and endangered their safety. They believed, and perhaps they still believe, that if Providence had crowned their efforts with success, the spirit and immunities of a free republican government would have thus been best preserved; the sectional interests in both republics been more amply provided for; a consolidated government, too strong and unscrupulous for human liberty, been rendered impossible; and the true interests, gradual improvement, and greater happiness of our servile population, been better secured. Such were the hopes of the South; and had the North agreed, all would have been accomplished without the shedding of blood, without the loss of these tens of thousands of the choicest of our people, without this annihilation of Southern wealth, these ruins, these ashes of *our* homes, these broken hearts, and those desolate hearths, and that enormous debt of the North. Of the energy and resources developed among ourselves, of our improvement in the arts during this sad *quinquennium* that is past, now, alas, brought to an end by the wholesale destruction visited upon us by our conquerors, we can all speak. If not stimulated in the same degree amid the quiet labors of peace, they would, in a few more years, have led to even greater and certainly happier results. What is now to be our future,—whether this great country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Lakes, perchance to Labrador, as some wish, can dwell together in one republican household, with such widely variant interests as will be developed even more and more by



difference of climate and pursuits; with all the selfishness, grasping for power, and greed of wealth engendered in the human heart, baffles all reasonable conjecture.

But the point specially important to us at this moment is, that during four or five years a new government was permitted by God to exist, emanating from the hearts of our people, the government of the Confederacy, with its written constitution, (which is no other than the old one re-adopted,) with its rulers, its courts of justice, its laws, and its army. And the same divine law which makes it incumbent on us to be subject "to the powers that be," not only justified us in obeying it, but required us to do so, or to receive to ourselves "damnation." Rom. xiii. 1-5; 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14. If there were individual dissentients among us, they could leave the country, or refrain from positive disobedience. But while under the Government, they were bound to obey it. It was no longer possible for the Presbyteries of the South to meet in an Assembly which held its sessions in what was now to them a foreign land, at war with their own Government, and where the persons of their delegates would be subject to bonds and imprisonment. That fundamental principle of Presbyterian Church government, the unity of the Church, and the subjection of inferior to superior courts of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, could only be realised by the formation of a new Assembly, which was organised by delegates duly appointed by the Presbyteries in the Confederate States, who met in Augusta, Georgia, on the 4th of December, 1861.

But there was another reason, still more imperative than this. The General Assembly which met at Philadelphia in May, 1861, although professedly exercising control over the Presbyterian Church in the old United States, including the South, took upon themselves to declare their obligations, as a Church, to promote and perpetuate, so far as in them lay, the integrity of the United States, and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under the Constitution. And this they did, when fourteen of their thirty-three Synods, and sixty-three of their one hundred and seventy-one Presbyteries, were within the bounds of the Southern States,

most of which had seceded from the Union, and entered into the new Confederacy. In so doing, they decided the political question then agitating the country, violated, to use the language of Dr. Hodge, in his noble Protest, "the constitution of the Church, usurped the prerogative of its Divine Master," and made allegiance to the Federal Government a term of membership in the Presbyterian Church. These Synods and Presbyteries and churches of the South could no longer remain in connexion with that Assembly which had set itself up against the government under which they lived, and to which, as of "the powers that be," the allegiance of their members was due. This was their Cæsar, to whom they were to render the things that are Cæsar's, while they rendered to God the things that are God's. They violated the constitution of the Church, which declares, (Conf. chap. xxxi. sect. iv,) that "Synods and Councils are to conclude and handle nothing but that which is ecclesiastical, and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs." It sinned against the example of the Master, who declared that "his kingdom is not of this world," who affirmed that, in their civil relations, no one "made him a judge and a ruler over them," and who, in the case of the tribute money, avoided any deliverance, though strongly tempted by the Herodians, as to the right or wrong of the *de facto* government then and there in power; against the example, too, of the apostles, who, in times of war and fightings and political change, held themselves aloof from all such decisions.

The Church of Christ cannot fulfil its destiny as a universal Church, unless it can exist and flourish under any form of human government. This it cannot do save as it holds itself aloof from all questions of state. It is bound to keep silence as a Church in all times of revolution and change, as to what form of government shall be established, as to what Cæsar or dynasty shall bear sway. In their civil capacity, its members can contend in concert with their fellow-citizens for their just rights; but if the Church bears the sword of the civil magistrate in any sense, it shall perish as to its spirituality and power by the very sword it has assumed. The instructions of Christ and the apostles as to marriage, divorce, and suits at law before heathen men, cannot

prove the contrary of this. As once understood, when the province of the Church and State were not properly distinguished, these matters, as well as all questions of wills and testaments, were adjudicated in ecclesiastical courts. But for a long time they have been remitted wholly to civil tribunals, and the official robes of judges in this and perhaps some other States, are the robes of the clerical canonists of a former day. The Presbyteries of the South could no longer meet in an Assembly which denounced them and the government under which they lived.

The old Assembly stigmatised the course of the South, in which we were all implicated, as "treason, rebellion, anarchy, fraud," "contrary to the dictates of natural religion and morality," affirming that it was "the solemn duty of the national government to crush force by force," "that if in any case treason, rebellion, and anarchy can possibly be sinful, they are in this case." (Minutes of 1862.) It declared "the Government of the United States, our government; and its honored flag, our flag." (Minutes of 1863.) It says of the attempt of the South to set up her independence, that it "threatens the annihilation of the principles of free Christian government, and thus has rendered the continuance of negro slavery incompatible with the preservation of our own liberty and independence." (Minutes, 1864.) In 1865, it speaks of our effort as an "atrocious rebellion against the Government of the United States for the perpetuation of slavery;" declares that it "does not intend to abandon the territory in which our churches are found;" orders all its presbyteries to examine every applicant from the seceded States as to whether he has at any time aided or countenanced the rebellion; and makes his confessing and forsaking his sin a prerequisite to his reception; it requires him to renounce and forsake the doctrine that the slavery of the South is sustained by the Sacred Scriptures. The same duties are enjoined upon Synods in relation to Presbyteries, upon sessions in relation to applicants for membership in the Church; if any have favored the rebellion, have borne arms against the United States, have held slavery to be an ordinance [*i. e.* an appointment] of God, only by a repenting and renouncing of these specific sins, can

they be admitted to the communion of the Church. It declares the secession of the Southern Presbyteries and Synods as unwarranted, schismatical, and unconstitutional, institutes measures for dividing and breaking down these Presbyteries, and inaugurates, under its Board of Missions, a system of proselytism throughout the South for the purpose of embarrassing the Southern Presbyterian Church, and introducing into it divisions with the view of regaining here the territory they had lost.

Let us notice, at this point, the remarkable coincidence between the circumstances through which we have passed, comparing them with those of our fathers in the period of the Revolution. The contemporary literature of that period and of this, are strikingly similar. If the Southern struggle for independence has been called "treason," an "atrocious and wicked rebellion," so was the revolutionary uprising of our fathers. If there has been naught but revenge against *us*, so there was in England, and especially in Scotland, naught but cries of revenge against *them*. If Tarleton's march through Carolina in 1780 and 1781, was marked with the ashes, and smoking ruins, and demolished churches of our fathers, so, but on a wider and more terrific scale, was Sherman's in 1865. If the *spolia opima* of modern warfare, if casks of plate were borne away from this soil by a British soldiery then, so, only in vastly larger amounts, and with a more greedy spirit, were they by a Federal soldiery now; if a price was set on the heads of Hancock and Adams in that day, and George Washington was denounced as the arch-traitor of all, so has it been in these months just past, with Jefferson Davis, the civil head and commander-in-chief of the Southern Confederacy. Especially was this indignation expressed by the *perfervidum ingenium Scotorum*. And had the Presbyterian churches of America sustained the same relations to the Church of Scotland that the churches of the South have done to those of the North, and had our fathers failed, as we have failed, in their struggle for independence, we might have seen the Scotch General Assembly, closely wedded as it was to the State, passing the same laws against our fathers, as the Assembly of 1865 has done against the Presbyterians of the

South. As to the moral right and the moral wrong, the two struggles stand on the same basis; both were struggles for constitutional and self-government; and if the one has been accepted as being no sin *foro Dei, foro conscientiæ, et foro Ecclesiæ*, so also should it be with the other.

Had the Assembly which met at Pittsburgh possessed the friendly spirit towards their brethren of the South, manifested by the Episcopal Church at the North, towards the Episcopal Church at the South, and abstained from all invasions of the province of the State, the return of the Southern Presbyterian Church to their former ecclesiastical relations would have followed, if not immediately, yet probably in due time. But when they required of them repentance, humiliation, and confession of sin for views of the rights of the States as sovereign which have always been held from the very commencement of the Federal Government, and for their effort to recover their original rights, and this as a condition of their return, there was but one voice throughout the Southern Church as to their duty.

#### CALL AND ORGANISATION OF THE ASSEMBLY AT MACON.

The meeting of the Assembly at Macon having failed for the reasons named on page 67, the Moderator and Stated and Permanent Clerks, at the request of many private members of the Church and several Presbyteries, called upon all the Presbyteries of "the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America" to send commissioners to a General Assembly to meet at Macon on the 14th of December, 1865. This call was obeyed; and notwithstanding the difficulty of travelling was great, the delegates assembled were sixty-two in number, forty-three of whom were ministers; the largest clerical representation since the first meeting in Augusta. The Assembly was opened with a sermon by the Rev. John S. Wilson, D. D., Moderator of the last Assembly, from Joshua xiii. 1. The Rev. George Howe, D. D., was chosen Moderator, and the Rev. H. G. Hill, from the Presbytery of Orange, Temporary Clerk. The Rev. John N. Waddel, D. D., resigned his office as Stated Clerk, and the Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., was elected to this office; and the

VOL. XVII., NO. 1.—10.

Rev. William Brown, D. D., to that of Permanent Clerk, vacated by Dr. Wilson's election. The Assembly adjourned on the 19th of December, after a laborious session of five days, to meet in the city of Memphis on the third Thursday—the 15th day—of November, 1866.

It was the fifth Southern Assembly, an organisation which, as is affirmed in the Pastoral Letter addressed to the Churches, “was formed out of elements among the oldest in the history of the Presbyterian Church in this country, carrying with it nearly one-third of the whole original Church, including a territory of twelve States, embracing ten Synods, forty-six Presbyteries, one thousand ministers, and about seventy thousand Church members.” As we are desirous of preserving in our pages a record of the proceedings of our highest judicatory from year to year, we shall proceed to present a historical view of the various matters which were determined.

#### NAME OF THE CHURCH AND OF THE ASSEMBLY.

This item, which had already been discussed to some extent in those religious journals of the Southern Presbyterian Church that had survived the war, was brought up on the third day of the sessions by the report of the Committee on Bills and Overtures.

The following names were proposed:

1. The Committee reported, recommending that the name of the Church should be THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. It had been previously agreed that other members should present such names as they preferred, and that all speeches should be limited to five minutes, and that the names should be voted on *scritim*.
2. The Rev. T. W. Hooper proposed “The Southern General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.”
3. The Rev. J. H. Gillespie, “The American Presbyterian Church.”
4. Another member, “The Evangelical Presbyterian Church.”
5. Col. J. T. L. Preston, for a friend, “The General Assembly of the Protestant Church in the United States.”
6. The Rev. S. S. Gaillard, “The Southern Presbyterian Church.”
7. The Rev. F. H. Bowman, “The Free Presbyterian Church of the United States.”
8. The Rev. A.

H. Caldwell, "The Protestant Presbyterian Church." 9. The Rev. Dr. Kirkpatrick, "The 2d General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States." 10. Prof. Charles Phillips, "The 3d General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States." 11. James Miller, ruling elder, "The Constitutional Presbyterian Church in the United States." 12. The Rev. John Miller, "The General Assembly of the Presbyteries of the Church in the United States." 13. The Rev. Dr. Ross, "The Presbyterian Church South." 14. The Rev. Dr. E. T. Baird, "The Protestant Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States. (His second choice.) 15. The Rev. Geo. A. Caldwell, "The Presbyterian Church of Christ." 16. The Rev. Dr. Patterson, "The Presbyterian General Assembly."

Dr. Baird, Chairman of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, advocated the name proposed by the Committee. Other names had been before them by overture and otherwise, and the name they all disliked at first, commended itself more and more to their minds, and was finally unanimously agreed to. He did not like the word "Free;" it needs too much explanation to make it understood. It is the name, too, of an Abolition body at the North. The name proposed differed from that of the Church North by the omission of two words, "of America." This difference was sufficient for all purposes of law, and the name was simple and significant. If the name Protestant, suggested by Col. Preston, met favor, he would like the word *Reformed* prefixed. Some would suppose that we adopted the word *Protestant*, because we protest against the errors of the Assembly North. We have no more to do with them. Our views are embodied in the Confession of Faith. If they of the North adopt that, we do not protest against them for doing so. But we belong to the great Reformation from Popery as truly as they. Because we have waded through seas of blood, we have not changed our religious views. We are Presbyterians still. In relation to the name "Constitutional," if adopted, our Confession would read curiously, "The Constitution of the Constitutional Presbyterian Church."

The Rev. T. W. Hooper preferred the "Southern General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church." It was the name by which we would be known. It was not a political designation. It would mark our position on important subjects, as contending, for example, for the Headship of Christ.

Col. Preston regarded the "Protestant Presbyterian Church in the United States" as both descriptive and distinctive. He did not like "Evangelical," for this would seem to imply that some other churches were not so. He liked Protestant simply as a mere titular distinction, and without reference to any other Church, and as having an old historic sense. In the name proposed by the Committee, there might seem to be a little of the old leaven, as if we practically assumed the name of the old Church, which would indicate hostility in a small way.

The Rev. Dr. W. H. Mitchell wished for something *distinctive*. The Committee's name might do in law, but he thought it no name. He did not like the word South, or any other sectional designation. He was Southern all over, from head to foot, but he would not give the slightest offence to that noble band of brethren who have sympathised with us, and are bravely battling for us and the truth. He would interpose no barrier between us and any with whom it may one day be our lot to stand side by side. No one name can express the whole truth. We are Evangelical and Old School Presbyterians; but these terms describe others as well as ourselves. The term *Protestant* is peculiarly appropriate. We do protest against the violation of the law of Christian love, of Presbyterian, scriptural truth, as well as the course others once with us have pursued towards us.

The Rev. F. H. Bowman objected against the term Protestant, that it was assumed already by a portion of the Methodist Church. He preferred the word "Free." It was distinctive and Presbyterian. It was borne by the Free Church of Scotland, and there, means separation from the State. He was unable to see any connexion between the word Southern and the Headship of Christ.

The Rev. Dr. Kirkpatrick preferred the name "The Second General Assembly," etc. We wanted a name corresponding



with the facts. He desired to be called by no other name but *Presbyterian*. And we ought to choose a name which would not be spiteful, or offensive, or sectional. We wanted a name which would prevent mistakes in matters of gift and bequest. A name which could not be mistaken, would be more acceptable to legislators when asked for a charter. In calling ourselves the Second General Assembly, we would have a name which could not be mistaken, and would only claim to be second in point of time. Let us be modest. God has humbled us. Let us claim nothing that does not belong to us.

Prof. Charles Phillips advocated "The *Third* General Assembly, etc." The New School was the *second* in the order of time. Ours was the third.

The Rev. John Miller said if the Assembly should adopt the title he preferred, "The General Assembly of the Presbyteries of the Church in the United States," it would exhibit in the very name the manner in which the Assembly is constituted. It might not furnish a popular title; yet churches are often called by names they do not prefer, *e. g.*, *Old School* and *New School* Presbyterians. The "Established" Church of Scotland, and "Roman" Catholic, are not found in the Symbolical Books of those Churches. Names of ecclesiastical bodies should indicate something real and historical, as, for example, the *Free* Church of Scotland, and the general term Protestant. He objected to the word, constitutional, as untasteful, unwise, and undignified. Let us not move a brick in the old building that can be avoided. He hoped all adjectives "Free," "Protestant," "Reformed," etc., would be discarded. We need but a few points for lawyers to hang a title to in the charter.

The Rev. Dr. Ross liked "Presbyterian Church, South." 1. It expresses the truth. 2. It would harmonise different parts of our body. We are not going to unite with the Church North; let them, if they wish, unite with us. 3. This name indicates the rightfulness of our withdrawing from the Assembly North in 1861. Constitutional had been used by the New School body and gave great offence to the Old School. "South" was a simple name and a modest one.

The Rev. H. G. Hill plead for "Constitutional," that it was—  
 1. Distinctive. 2. Truthful; for we claim to be opposed to the unconstitutional proceedings of the Church from which we are separated. 3. It was a catholic name; none that might wish to join us would object to it.

Dr. Smyth came to the Assembly desirous to have the word "*Free*" adopted. That is classic; it is truthful. He loved it because of its history in Scotland; but when he heard the word constitutional, he preferred it. It was no objection that the New School had for a time adopted it. Let it be understood that we hold on to the Constitution. It is our sheet anchor to hold us to our moorings.

The subject was disposed of after this discussion, (the words, General Assembly, being first stricken out,) by the following vote:

For the American Presbyterian Church, . . .	2
For the Protestant Presbyterian Church, . . .	2
For the Presbyterian Church, South, . . .	7
For the Presbyterian Church in the United States, .	42

On motion, the vote for the latter name was made unanimous. Thus was this somewhat vexed question disposed of, by adopting as much of the old, time-honored designation of the Church as could well be done, and have it in any degree distinctive; and avoiding, in the name, any unauthorised hypothesis that we are contending for merely temporary and sectional ends.

#### FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Report of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions was read by the Secretary, the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson. The war had interrupted our communications with our missionaries during the year, and greatly circumscribed our efforts. No letters at all had been received from Southern missionaries in foreign lands, and communications with those in the Indian country had been infrequent. There had been much distress among the Indians, owing to desolations occasioned by the war, and misunderstanding with the Government in settling their affairs. The missionaries are deeply impressed with the impor-

tance of continuing their labors among this people, and a sum of six thousand dollars will be required for the support of this Mission during the year. Dr. Kalopothakes, missionary in Greece, formerly under the care of the United Synod, desires connexion with this committee. The Rev. H. B. Pratt, of North Carolina, stood ready to resume his mission at Bogota, in South America; and there were others waiting to be employed by this branch of the Church.

The Standing Committee reported the following resolutions on Foreign Missions, which were adopted:

“*Resolved*, 1. That our Foreign Missionary organisation be continued, and that the Executive Committee is authorised to go forward with their work, and occupy, as far as practicable, whatever openings may present themselves in the providence of God in any part of the world; and especially to direct their attention to Africa as a field of missionary labor peculiarly appropriate to this Church, and with this view to secure as soon as practicable missionaries from among the African race on this continent who may bear the gospel of the grace of God to the homes of their ancestors.

“2. To sustain and carry forward this work, this Assembly solemnly and earnestly exhorts all our people to make liberal contributions to this object, according to their ability, to offer their fervent prayers for God’s blessing upon our efforts, and to consecrate their sons to the service of him who counted not his own life dear unto him, but gladly gave it up for us all.

“3. That an opportunity may be stately offered for special prayer for Foreign Missions, this Assembly recommends the observance of the monthly concert of prayer in all our congregations, and that contributions be made at the same time to this object.

“4. That this Assembly tenders to our missionaries among the Indians, and those among whom they labor, our hearty affection and sympathy in all their distresses and desolations, and pledges the churches to an earnest effort as soon as practicable, to raise the amount stated by the Secretary to be necessary to their support, and the relief of their present distress.

“5. That in our colleges, theological seminaries, and Sunday schools, this subject be brought to the notice of our children and youth, and an effort be made to interest them in behalf of this cause.”

## DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

The Executive Committee of Domestic Missions presented its report from May 1, 1864, to May 1, 1865, through the Secretary, the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson; for the two Committees of Foreign and Domestic Missions, since 1863, have consisted of the same persons. The Committee appears to have prosecuted its work with energy and wisdom, and not without tokens of the divine favor. Owing to the want of laborers and the unsettled state of public affairs, little was done towards promoting religion in destitute and frontier settlements; only one new missionary having been commissioned for that work. More than one hundred, however, were commissioned for the army, nine-tenths of whom were in active service for longer or shorter periods, receiving their support in whole or in part from the contributions of the churches. A large proportion of these had been connected with the army from two to four years, performing labors and enduring hardships which may never be fully understood in this life. Thousands of our brave soldiers were converted by their instrumentality, some of whom have entered into rest, while others have been spared to uphold and beautify the Church of Christ on earth. The contributions of the churches during the year were generous, amounting to \$63,189 82; and the expenditures were \$61,631 90.

“Whatever disappointment,” says the Report, “may have been experienced by us as a people, in relation to the establishment of our independence, as a Church we should ever be grateful to Almighty God for the repeated and abundant outpouring of his Holy Spirit upon our armies during the progress of the bloody conflict. That our camps should have been made nurseries of piety, is something not only new and unprecedented in warfare, but may be regarded as an encouraging token of God’s purpose to favor and bless our future Zion. If these rich and spiritual fruits are carefully gathered and husbanded for the Master’s use, we may soon have occasion to forget our temporal sorrows in the abundance of our spiritual joys.”

“In the judgment of your Committee, three departments of missionary labor claim the attention of the Assembly at the present time, viz., 1. The building up of our crippled and broken down churches. 2. The extending of the knowledge of the

gospel to the destitute and frontier regions of the country.  
3. Providing religious instruction for the colored people among us.

“The first of these is undoubtedly the most urgent, but, it is hoped, will claim the attention of the Assembly only for a limited period. The second is a permanent work, and must come up for consideration from year to year. The third has claims of the most weighty and serious character, and like the second, will come up for consideration as often as the Assembly shall meet. In the present undeveloped state of feeling among the negro population, it is impossible to decide what general course of instruction would be best suited to their circumstances. Perhaps the best course for the Assembly at its present session, will be to remind the churches under their care of their duty to instruct these people in the way of salvation, leaving it for each church to pursue that course which in its judgment will seem best, and appoint a committee to report to the next Assembly some general plan to be adopted by all our churches. It would be well for that committee to be composed of individuals from the different sections of the country, so that all the varied aspects of the subject may be before their minds in preparing the report.

“The restoration of our crippled and broken down churches is undoubtedly the object which claims the immediate and earnest attention of this Assembly. These churches are to be found in every section of our country that has been occupied for any length of time by Northern soldiers, and especially along the broad track of those desolating marches that were made through most of the central Southern States. Wherever the armies have gone, the country has been desolated, the people have been impoverished, and in the great majority of cases, the sanctuaries of the living God have either been entirely destroyed, or so much injured as to be unfit for use. In many places our people are not only without houses in which to worship, but are without ministers to break to them the bread of life. Some of our ablest and most earnest ministers have been compelled to betake themselves to school-keeping, or some other secular employment, in order to provide their families with the means of subsistence. Worse than all, in the very midst of this distress and prostration, an enemy threatens to invade our borders, sow dissensions among our people, and gather our flocks into folds which they have not known.”

“What seems especially necessary at the present time, in the judgment of your committee, to rally the whole Southern Church, and bring out all her disposable resources, is to bring forward some

feasible plan by which their gifts may be brought together and be laid out wisely and judiciously in relieving the distresses of the suffering churches. The committee, therefore, would recommend the appointment of what may be called a *Sustentation Committee*, somewhat after the plan of the Free Church of Scotland, whose duty it shall be to raise and disburse funds in connexion with this great object. That committee need consist only of a chairman, a secretary, and one commissioner from each Synod."

"It is confidently believed, also, that by this plan, all our crippled churches may be placed on their feet, at least so far as the support of their pastors is concerned, before the meeting of the next Assembly."

Dr. Wilson then proceeded to address the Assembly. He said that a flood of destruction had passed over the land, wasting and exhausting our resources. If ever there was a call to lend a helping hand to needy brethren, to aid in sustaining our feeble and impoverished churches, such a call comes to us now. These churches are our brethren, the purchase of Christ—the bride of the Lamb. A march of devastation had been made through his Presbytery; they were reduced to great destitution. But a plan of *sustentation* had been adopted there such as had been recommended here; this would not give them large salaries, but would so help them that they could live. If other Presbyteries would do the same, the work would be accomplished. He alluded to one church where, knowing as he did their straitened condition, if the question had been asked how much they ought to give, he would have said \$25 for one, or \$100 for all our four schemes would be a good contribution. Yet the effort was made for this single cause, and \$150 was obtained. We are in no worse condition than the Free Church of Scotland, when their exodus from the Established Church threw upon them such a vast burden.

The Rev. Dr. Wm. Brown said that he had from his position been obliged to know a great deal concerning the desolations spoken of. He had seen much, and heard and read a great deal more of the sufferings of our people. Our homes, our property have been destroyed. Some of this was the necessary, unavoidable effect of war. Most of it we know was done in a spirit of

lawless, wicked plunder. How often have our people lifted up the cry with sorrow and tears, as they said: "Our holy (if not our beautiful) house where our fathers praised God, is burned with fire, and all our pleasant things are laid waste." He well knew that mourning and lamentation and woe were written over the face of the whole land. And yet, blessed be God! we can say, "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed."

Never had he felt daily so much impressed, encouraged, and comforted, with the great truth set forth in that noble 46th Psalm which brought support to the heart of Luther in some of the darkest hours of the Reformation—"God is in the midst of her, she shall not be greatly moved; God shall help her, and that right early."

He doubted not, that when the Lord had tried us, he would "bring forth our righteousness as the light, and our judgment as the noonday." Let us hope we shall be a blessed illustration of what has so often occurred, that our "deep poverty shall abound unto the riches of our liberality." This truth has been wonderfully exhibited in the Free Church of Scotland. Our brother, the Secretary, has said our condition is no worse than was theirs. Why, sir, it is not nearly so bad. Scotland is comparatively a poor country. The congregations went out from every house of worship, their pastors out of every manse. They built new and often better ones all over the land. They established theological seminaries, colleges, academies, and parochial schools; they sustained their schemes of foreign and domestic missions, and education, and whatever was needed for vigorous action and healthful progress. It was "*the power of the littles,*" which under Chalmers' eye accomplished the work. When a section in the Highlands expressed almost a despair of succeeding in its part, he declared he would undertake their whole support, if the people would give him *their pinches of snuff*. We are to succeed in our struggle, not by the few great gifts of the rich, but by the manifold and oft-repeated gifts of the humble

poor. He rejoiced in all that brethren in Kentucky or elsewhere were doing to help us; it is right and blessed for them to give, and it is right and blessed for us, as in the day of our calamity, to receive it, even with tears of gratitude to them, and to their Lord and ours. But our reliance, under God, must be upon ourselves.

The Rev. Dr. Ross said he had no *thought* prepared, but his *heart* was full of this subject. He had heard many in the Church say, 'We do not submit to this dispensation of Providence.' Others say, 'We do submit, because it is God's will, and we can't help it.' There is no submission in that—none at all. Job said, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away." What then? "I cannot help myself, I am under his sovereign hand?" No, sir, not that, but, "*Blessed be the name of the Lord.*"

Do we contribute according to our ability? He had asked a young man recently, "How much do you spend for tobacco?" A little estimate ran the amount up to four hundred dollars a year. I asked another of moderate means; and the amount was one hundred dollars. Mr. Moderator, we have been *too rich*, and I do not only submit to God's providence, but I thank him that it has pleased him to *make us poor, that we may be rich.*

The Rev. Mr. Berry said that our experience has shown that it is good to be afflicted. There is a blessing in the chastisements of God. It has been every where conceded that in the war through which we have passed, the people have nobly vindicated their *manhood*. "All is lost, save honor." Now let our people vindicate their Christian manhood by self-devotion to the cause of the Redeemer. They must come up fully to the help of the Lord against the mighty. It is no disgrace to be poor. It is dishonorable to have riches and abuse the trust. Let us recognise our work, our obligations to rely, under God, chiefly upon ourselves. We owe this to the Church, to its Divine Head, and by his help *we will do it.*

The Rev. Dr. Kirkpatrick, as chairman of the Standing Committee on Domestic Missions, reported the following resolutions



touching the Sustentation scheme of the committee, which were adopted by the Assembly :

“1. That the General Assembly adopt the suggestions of the Executive Committee in relation to the raising of a ‘sustentation fund’ for the exigencies of our churches, but assign the conduct of this agency to the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions, also that a member from each Synod be appointed to co-operate with the general scheme set forth in their report.

“2. That the Rev. T. R. Welch, Little Rock, Arkansas, be the commissioner from the Synod of Arkansas; Rev. R. Nall, D. D., Tuskegee, Ala., from the Synod of Alabama; Rev. D. Wills, Macon, Ga., from the Synod of Georgia; Rev. J. O. Stedman, Memphis, Tenn., from Memphis; Rev. J. A. Lyon, D. D., Columbus, Miss., from Mississippi; Rev. W. E. Caldwell, Pulaski, Tenn., from Nashville; Rev. J. Rumble, Salisbury, N. C., from North Carolina; Rev. S. A. King, Milford, Texas, from Texas; and Rev. J. D. Mitchell, D. D., Lynchburg, Va., from Virginia.

“3. That the General Assembly order collections in behalf of the sustentation fund, to be made in all our churches on the second Sabbath of February next, or as soon thereafter as practicable; and that the proceeds be forwarded immediately to the Treasurer of the Executive Committee, Professor James Woodrow, at Columbia, S. C., or to the Synodical Commissioners.”

We are happy to know that up to this time thirty thousand dollars have been contributed to this cause, partly from the Kentucky Board of Aid, partly from the churches in Baltimore, and partly from our own churches; and that all the severe cases of suffering among Southern pastors, which have come to the knowledge of the Commissioners, have received substantial relief. The Committee is now addressing itself to the work of rebuilding and restoring the houses of worship which have been utterly destroyed or greatly injured by the ravages of war. Of the number of these in the Presbyterian Church in the South, we have no full knowledge, but about sixty have been brought to the notice of the Committee.

#### EDUCATION.

The Report of the Executive Committee of Education was exceedingly brief. They had no beneficiaries receiving aid since

their last report. Down to the close of the war, our young men were in the army, the amount of funds collected was small, and this amount, like others much more considerable in the hands of other Committees, became worthless when the Confederate Government was overthrown. The report of the Standing Committee was presented by the Rev. J. M. Sherwood. It enlarged upon "the increasing need of ministers of the gospel to enter upon the labors of the vast field" suggested in the report of the Committee; upon the fact that during the last four years, very few have entered the ministry; that nearly all of those who were in the various stages of preparation for the sacred work, were called into the field of civil strife, and forced to suspend their studies; not a few had given up their lives in the conflict; others were broken in health and compelled to abandon the hope of preaching the gospel; others still, by the delay incurred, had entered upon secular pursuits. An interruption of four years in all the stages of preparation for the ministry creates a gap not easily filled, the evil effects of which the Church will soon feel. Ministers with us are not made in a day. A large increase will be needed for the work of Domestic Missions now opening before us, and for the foreign field, upon the cultivation of which we may hope that the Church will be anew permitted to enter. Those, too, who a short time since, were abundantly able to pursue their preparation for the ministry without aid from the Church, have suffered the loss of all their worldly substance. Years of comparatively little profit to themselves or the Church would elapse before they could enter the ministry, unless the Church should come up heartily to their aid, if indeed they could enter it at all.

The resolutions reported by the Committee and adopted by the Assembly, call upon the churches to contribute to this cause, as God shall prosper them; upon Presbyteries, to relax none of their vigilance in selecting those upon whom the charities of the Church are to be bestowed; for one unworthy subject receiving aid from public funds, may do an injury which scores of worthy recipients will not be able to repair; they are urged also to carefulness in maintaining fully the requirements of our stan-

dards in regard to education, even under the present strong temptations to depart from them. Ministers and people are called upon to remember the injunction of the Saviour, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest," and parents to dedicate their sons to the blessed work of preaching Christ.

The Rev. Dr. Kirkpatrick suggested the appointment of a day for special prayer, and instruction from the pulpit on this subject. He illustrated its importance by a reference to Davidson College. At the commencement of the war one half of the students were professors of religion, and more than half of these had the ministry in view. But of them all, he knew of only one still looking to the ministry. Of the others, some have fallen in battle, some have felt that the opportunity of preparation has been lost, "and it pained him to say, some had lost all their interest in matters of religion." But if this was so, according to our belief, it was because the root of the matter was not found in them.

The fourth Thursday in February was recommended by the Assembly to be observed as a day of special prayer for the youth of our country, with a view to the increase of the ministry, and the Sabbath preceding as a day of special instruction from the pulpit on that subject.

Subsequently, a discussion arose on the method of conducting beneficiary education.

An overture from the Presbytery of Lexington had been presented to the General Assembly at Columbia in 1863, asking the appointment of a committee to revise the whole subject of beneficiary education, and report to the General Assembly next ensuing. This committee reported through its Chairman, the Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., at Charlotte, in 1864, and the report was adopted as setting forth the views of the Assembly with much clearness and force, was printed in the Appendix to the Minutes of that year, and recommended to the Committee of Publication as one of their permanent tracts. The report of that committee embraces the results of the observation and experience of some who have had the largest opportunity of testing

the whole workings of the system of beneficiary education as administered in this branch of the Church. The committee was continued, with the addition of the Rev. Dr. Kirkpatrick and William L. Mitchell, Esq., to report to the next Assembly on the question "whether the support of candidates for the ministry should be provided for and superintended by the General Assembly, or by the Presbyteries, or in what other way." In the times of confusion and trouble which intervened, there was no consultation on the part of the Committee, and a report prepared at Macon by the Rev. John Miller, (who dissented from the Committee's previous report,) and submitted to other members of the Committee in attendance, was presented to the Assembly recommending, in substance, that the support of candidates should be provided for and superintended by Presbyteries.

To this the Rev. Dr. Smyth objected that the fields open for Domestic Missions lie within certain Presbyteries, still this work is not left to Presbyteries. Yet every argument in favor of remitting the education of the future ministry to the Presbyteries, and providing for their support, applies with equal force in favor of the abandoning of our missionary fields to the Presbyteries within whose bounds they lie. It is *as a Church* that we are bound to take up and educate the young men God gives us as ministers.

The Rev. Dr. Kirkpatrick was prepared for it as a temporary measure to meet existing difficulties. He thought it might work well as a permanent rule, but would be glad to adopt it in such a way that we could easily change it if it should fail to meet our expectations.

The Rev. R. S. Gladney, of Mississippi, advocated the change. If an appeal be made to a Presbytery in behalf of a man that is known, the response will be far more liberal than if made in behalf of some stranger afar off. Dr. Smyth replied that action through the Assembly's Committee secures a concentration of *all* our energies. It fixes the responsibility on certain men. "What is every body's business is no body's business." If the education and support of candidates be left to the several Presbyteries, it may be neglected. The advantages of a com-

mittee concentrating the energies of the Church upon foreign and home missionary fields are appreciated. It is equally important in securing ministers for the Church.

Dr. Wilson hesitated about dissolving this Committee, for it might be an entering wedge for revolutionizing the whole method of the Assembly's operations. The Publication system may be remitted to Synods, and the Domestic Missionary system to the Presbyteries, and thus the bonds that unite us be severed, one by one, and we become Congregationalists. He would retain the system in use another year.

The Rev. John Miller did not see the slightest analogy between the four objects given to the several committees. The Presbyteries, individually, could not conduct Foreign Missions. The old established Presbyteries able to support Domestic missionaries are the very ones that have not the Domestic missionary fields. So, too, with the Publication work. Could each Presbytery have its printing presses and depositories? This Committee has the beneficiaries in the several Presbyteries in about the same proportion as the means contributed by those Presbyteries. The amount of means required in this work is much smaller than in the other spheres of labor. The Presbyteries could easily do it. And in his view, the operation of this Board [the Philadelphia Board, we suppose,] is pernicious. The statistics of the Educational Board show the remarkable fact that there are not so many ministers, living and dead, in our Church, as have received aid from the funds of the Church. Great care, then, is necessary, in the use of the means contributed for the purposes of education, and it is impossible for a great Board, hungering after new candidates, anxious to publish a large list of beneficiaries, and who know nothing about the applicants, not to misapply them. It multiplies the number of guardians of these young men—professors, pastors, Presbyteries and Committee, who shift the responsibility from one to another, so that no judgment as to their qualifications is expressed by any one. He would like to trace the history of all these beneficiaries, where they now are, what they have been doing in the recent great strife.

The Rev. Dr. W. H. Mitchell, of Alabama, said that this Board, as constituted, did all its work *through* the Presbyteries; so its transfer to the Presbyteries would not correct the great evils incident to the mismanagement of the Philadelphia Board of Education, to which Mr. Miller had referred.

The Rev. J. H. Gillespie spoke from personal observation. The men, the *great men*, the *laboring men* of the Church, had been educated by our Boards. He did not know a young man who had been assisted by the Board in the bounds of his Presbytery who did not enter the ministry. The work of educating the young men of the Church is so *important*, that this department, of all others, ought to have a head to stir up and direct the attention of the churches to this subject.

Dr. Baird felt the force of the argument on both sides. First, as a professor, he discovered that the colleges would not be faithful in reporting the morals, manners, and scholarship to the Board. If they told the truth in the cases of unworthy beneficiaries, bills would not be paid by the Education Committee—if they suppressed the truth they would. He had tried the experiment of sustaining the beneficiaries by individual Presbyterian action—his Presbytery was going to do generous things—they had two candidates, and several hundred dollars. But in a very short time their money was gone, the students were left dependent, with no one to look to for a support. Now, with a general committee, the little streams will keep the river always full. If one Presbytery fails to contribute one year, the contributions from the others will equalise the annual receipts. He knew some of the unworthy men educated by the Philadelphia Board. Such men would occasionally arise. And this will be the operation of the Presbyterian system. A young man wishes to study for the ministry. He is a man of high promise, but turns out badly. The members of the churches will lose confidence in the judgment of the Presbytery, and withhold their contributions. To a Board or General Committee, they will be more willing to contribute, in the hope that if some portion is lost on one unworthy man, the rest will be blessed in aiding worthy recipients. The trouble with all systems is that human nature

is too corrupt. "Old Adam is too strong for young Melancthon." As this is a special meeting of the Assembly, he thought it better not to make any change until another meeting. After further discussion, the subject was recommitted to the same Committee.

We are not sorry that this whole subject was ventilated at this meeting of the Assembly. It is second to none of the great branches of Christian effort and beneficence in which the Church has embarked. A large portion of the ministers of the gospel from the apostles down, have come from families dependent on their daily toils for a support. From Luther onward, many have been aided by others in the expenses of their education. Some of the brightest lights in the Southern and the Northern Church have been so. And of the hundreds whom we have personally known to have received a beneficiary education, we remember but a single instance of one who has proved unworthy. These young men should be treated with a becoming generosity and delicacy. Many of them could have risen to honor and wealth in other spheres, as the associates of their youth have done. While pursuing their studies, the very moderate aid which by the usage of the Church is afforded them, should be certain, regular, and uninterrupted, that they may pursue their studies without the drawback of corroding care, and without having their minds occupied by exhausting efforts, commanding their most precious time, to obtain a livelihood. Our own experience convinces us that if this matter is remitted wholly to Presbyteries, there will be great irregularity, and great inequality in furnishing the needful aid, the course of study will be interrupted, and our young men will turn aside by a kind of necessity, to secular pursuits.

#### PUBLICATION.

The office of this Committee, with its contents, was entirely consumed in the fire which laid so large a portion of the city of Richmond in ashes on the 3d of April, 1865. Dr. Leyburn, the Secretary, finding his work suspended, and being left without the means of pecuniary support, withdrew to another part of the

country, and the report was read to the Assembly by Dr. William Brown, acting as Temporary Secretary. The receipts for the year ending the 31st of March, 1865, were \$93,555 42, and the expenditures \$79,124 71, leaving a balance in Confederate money of \$14,430 71. A large number of Bibles, Testaments, and other religious books and tracts, obtained from England, and valuable tracts of our own publication, had been put in circulation, chiefly among Confederate soldiers. Of "The Soldier's Visitor" a large edition continued to be published, and with other religious reading was eagerly sought for by the brave men that were engaged in the unequal contest for our independence. The "Children's Friend" had been kept alive, but with a diminished circulation. Its highest circulation in the Spring of 1863, was 12,000. At the time of the suspension of the Committee's operations it had been reduced to 3,000. The Synod of Virginia having requested the Committee to take immediate measures for the supply of Sabbath-school books, and having, on the spot, raised \$1000 to begin this work, an agent was sent to visit various publishing houses at the North, to make such selections as were suitable, and was received with much courtesy. The house of Robert Carter & Brothers supplied the Committee with such of their publications as were selected at half their usual price, and the Presbyterian Board of Publication made a present of all that had been chosen for the same purpose from their large and valuable list. A thoroughly good paper for children is greatly needed, but the "Children's Friend" has not been resumed, both because communication by mails has not been restored, and from the apprehension that a paper of this kind cannot be sustained by one denomination alone. The Committee submitted to the Assembly the following scheme of operations for the present: That the Committee of Publication be charged with the duty of most carefully selecting from every available quarter, whether in Europe or America, the very best tracts and books suited for Sabbath-schools, and other religious reading; that a descriptive catalogue of these publications be prepared and distributed among the churches, from which to make selections and send orders: that the pro-



ceeds of sales be reinvested; that a small profit be laid upon purchases to cover expenses; that there be annual collections, as heretofore, from which donations may be made, and such books and tracts, original and selected, may be published, as may be specially demanded.

The Standing Committee on Publication, by their Chairman, Dr. J. L. Wilson, presented resolutions which were adopted by the Assembly, embracing these suggestions of the Executive Committee, the books selected to go out with the Committee's *imprimatur*; depositories to be established at such points as in the judgment of the Committee will facilitate their circulation; an effort to be made to raise the sum of \$50,000 as soon as practicable to put this scheme in operation, and to print such books and tracts as may be specially demanded. Thanks were tendered by the Assembly to Dr. Leyburn, for his past and very effective services as Secretary, and Dr. E. T. Baird was appointed, under the recommendation of the Committee, to fill his place. Dr. Baird has entered upon his labors, and is industriously engaged in carrying these plans into effect.

#### PSALMODY.

The Chairman of the Committee on this subject, the Rev. Dr. Palmer, informed the Assembly that the original revised copy of the Hymn Book prepared by the Committee was destroyed, with his own private papers and effects, in the general conflagration of Columbia by the Federal army. It could, however, be easily reproduced from the detailed reports from time to time made to the Assembly. He recommended the appointment of a new and *local* committee, who should enter into the labors of the old one, and carry them on to completion. The Assembly adopted the suggestion in part, by appointing a committee including a portion of the old in the new, making Richmond the seat of its operations, and Dr. T. V. Moore, of the old committee, chairman. They were instructed to initiate measures for the compilation of suitable music for the Hymn Book, to select from it, and from other sources, such hymns as would be

especially suitable for Sabbath-schools, to be printed in a separate volume. In connexion with this, Dr. Kirkpatrick expressed himself disapprovingly as to the Sunday-school hymn books now in use, charging them with vitiating the taste of the children, filled as they were with creature worship, with the praise of Sunday-schools and Sunday-school teachers, instead of Christ, with self-glorification instead of the glory of God. This committee is composed of gentlemen of taste and judgment, and have a most important work in hand, but they have no enviable task before them, and will not be likely to give entire satisfaction to all where there are so many tastes to gratify, and so many critics to comment on their labors.

#### KENTUCKY BOARD OF AID FOR SOUTHERN PASTORS.

One of the most pleasing incidents connected with the meeting of the Assembly, was the arrival of a special messenger from Louisville, Kentucky. On breaking the seals, and unrolling his credentials, they proved to be a letter on parchment from "The Kentucky Board of Aid for Southern Pastors," formed only the week before, couched in words of the most fraternal sympathy and kindness, words full of the consolations of the gospel. This Board, through their Commissioner, the Rev. Robert Morrison, proffered to the Assembly for its suffering pastors, and their families, the sum of \$6,000 already in hand, and other amounts yet to be raised, with the earnest wish expressed that they might reach the suffering objects of these benefactions ere the rigors of winter should fall heavily upon them. The Rev. Mr. Morrison addressed the Assembly, stating the circumstances under which the Association had been formed, and that four thousand dollars had been obtained at its first meeting; that it was long after the shock of arms ere they could hear from their Southern brethren, and that when they did hear, they learned that great destitution and suffering prevailed among them. Their hearts were moved in sympathy, and he had come as their messenger in all haste to our relief. They freely gave these offerings to us without conditions, only desiring that some chan-

nel should be indicated through which they might reach those who were suffering at the earliest moment. The tear of gratitude stood in many eyes as these communications were made. We were, then, not quite forgotten. Amid the strife of tongues, and words which were "drawn swords," there were those who sympathised with us. Suitable thanks were expressed for this generous sympathy, and the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions was made the agent for the disbursing of these funds, who, through the Commissioners appointed in each Synod, were able to reach quickly each case of suffering. About twelve thousand dollars have been received down to this time from the Kentucky Board of Aid, nearly seven thousand dollars from the Presbyterian churches in Baltimore, and other sums known to us, for the same benevolent ends. Amid the unkind words spoken of us, and the unkind deeds done, the Southern heart is deeply moved by these ministries of tenderness and love.

#### OUR RELATION TO OTHER MINISTERS AND CHURCHES.

In reference to this, the Assembly declares in its excellent Pastoral Letter "concerning other Churches, in the most explicit manner, that in the true idea of 'the communion of saints' we would willingly hold fellowship with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; and especially do we signify to all bodies, ministers, and people of the Presbyterian Church, struggling to maintain the true principles of the same time-honored Confession, our desire to establish the most intimate relations with them which may be found mutually edifying, and for the glory of God." The same sentiment is expressed in Overture No. 8, sent up from the Synod of South Carolina, and adopted by the Assembly, "extending a welcome to our communion and fellowship, to all who cordially adopt our standards and sympathise with us in our principles as to the province of the Church; and warning our churches against all schismatical intruders." But the Overture No. 4, "What is the duty and Christian course of a Church Session when a minister or agent of the Old School General Assembly (North) presents himself amongst us, with a request to labor in our churches, or occupy one of our vacant

houses of worship?" was answered by the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, 1, That the Presbyterian Church of the North (Old School) is to be looked upon simply as a separate and distinct ecclesiastical body; and that the ministers and agents of that church have no further or higher claims on our courtesy than any other churches of the same section of the country, which hold to the same symbols of faith and order with ourselves.

2. That this Assembly has no reason for recommending any other usages or rules in respect to our fellowship with other ecclesiastical bodies than those that have long been familiar in all our Sessions and Presbyteries; and will not attempt to define afresh in what cases and in what degree errors in belief and practice shall exclude from our pulpits, or suspend ecclesiastical communion.

3. That our ministers and churches be, and hereby are warned against all ministers, or other agents, who may come among us to sow the seeds of division and strife in our congregations, or to create schism in our beloved Zion. And owing to the peculiar reasons for prudence which now exist, we enjoyn it upon our ministers and sessions to exercise special caution as to whom they admit to their pulpits; and in cases of doubt, to refer to the judgment of the Presbyteries the whole question of the nature and extent of courtesy or countenance they may extend.

4. That the Assembly would remind sessions that in no case is it proper for them to invite ministers of other denominations stately to occupy any of our pulpits without the consent of the Presbyteries, and the known purpose of such ministers, at the earliest suitable opportunity, to unite with us in ecclesiastical relations.

The churches were thus put on their guard against any attempt to disturb and divide them, and were assured that the Presbyterians of the South under this Assembly, are a branch of the Church as complete in organisation, as harmonious, as distinct, and as secure as any other in the land.

#### RULE FOR THE EXAMINATION OF MINISTERS.

This came up in the way of Memorials from the Synod of Alabama, and Presbytery of South Alabama, respectively, requesting the Assembly to amend the rule requiring the examination of ministers on their reception by the Presbyteries, so as

to make it optional. These memorials were put into the hands of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, who recommended that as there is no evidence that the rule has not worked well, the Assembly decline to make the change requested. This report of the Committee was adopted.

It was understood that there were members of the Associate Reformed Church who desired to unite with one of our Presbyteries, but objected to this rule. There was a willingness to receive them if they came as an organised ecclesiastical body, on their well known adoption of the Confession of Faith. It was understood, however, that they would come as individuals, and objected to the rule. Dr. Stillman and others argued in opposition to the rule that the cause requiring its adoption had passed away, and that it was humiliating to the parties examined. Dr. Baird, as Chairman of the Committee, advocated the report, and gave an instructive history of its origin. "The allegation," he said, "is that the rule was established with special reference to our brethren of the New School body. But this is not so. It was enacted in 1837, on the motion of Dr. Alexander, before there was any New School body; before the division, which did not take place until 1838. Moreover, the ordinances of the Assembly for the purification of the Church after the disruption, made ample provision for the return to the Church of all who desired to do so without requiring any examination; and in point of fact, whole Presbyteries, and even Synods, were organised under those ordinances. Nor was there any thing to prevent the return of the whole New School body (except the four excised Synods) under the provision of those ordinances."

"The history of the matter," said Dr. Baird, "was simply this. In 1832, Dr. Lyman Beecher entered the Presbyterian Church to assume the position of Professor of Theology in Lane Seminary. He took a dismission from the Congregational Association of New England with which he was connected, and forwarded it to the Third Presbytery of New York, by which he was received without appearing in the body, and at the same meeting he was granted admission to the Presbytery of Cincin-

nati, into which latter body he was received without examination; the majority of the Presbytery claiming that he had a right to a seat on his credentials, which were good, and that the Presbytery had no constitutional right to examine him. This matter came before the Assembly of 1834, by which it was determined that regular credentials ought to be a good passport from one Presbytery to another, thus placing the whole Church in the power of a single Presbytery. In 1835, the constitutional right of Presbyteries to examine applicants for admission, was settled, and has never been called in question since. But it was soon discovered that the rule was inadequate to the case, and that it was not calculated to promote the purity and harmony of the Church. The rule was optional, as the Memorials before us request the Assembly to make it now. It could accomplish little or nothing. There was a feeling of delicacy about proposing to examine any one, and Presbyteries were divided into parties by it, and so Dr. Alexander, in 1837, proposed the general rule requiring every body to be examined, which has prevailed ever since, but which it is now proposed to modify. If you grant the request, and modify the rule by making it optional, you have in effect repealed it, for thereafter every examination would be invidious. The truth is, you must either repeal the rule, throw down the fences, and let every one come in who wants to, or sustain the rule, keep up the fences, and let all enter in at the door—the door at which we entered.

“The rule has worked well. It has kept our Church free from doctrinal divisions and disputations; for no man will propose to join us who has any doubt of his ability to stand the required examination.

“Dr. Stillman says that brethren are unwilling to be placed in the position of students again, to be examined like boys at college, or candidates for licensure or ordination. But here again is an error. Candidates for the ministry, previous to licensure, are examined on their whole college course, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Mathematics, etc., and on the details of their Seminary course. But in this examination the subjects are experimental acquaintance with religion, theology, church gov-

ernment. That is, we have to tell our brethren our views of the glorious scheme of redemption; our reasons for believing we have become partakers of its benefits and blessings, and our views of the order of God's house. It is not scholarship that is inquired into, but beliefs. And now, is it not a good thing for us, when we come to be associated together in church courts, to know each other, to compare our views concerning the things of the kingdom, and thereby to remove the possibility of suspicion? Besides, it is profitable to all concerned. One of the most interesting meetings of a Church judicatory he (Dr. B.) ever attended, was the meeting of the Presbytery of Baltimore, when the Rev. Dr. Plumer, and the Rev. Dr. Lewis W. Green, were examined for reception at the same time. Some of the Presbytery wanted to dispense with the rule, because of the high character of the brethren to be received. But the two youngest ministers present objected, saying they wanted to examine them, not with any expectation of convicting them of heresy, but to learn something from these excellent brethren, and they called upon Dr. Plumer to say whether the rule was not obligatory. Dr. P. arose and declared that the rule was imperative, and explained why it had been made so. Said he, if you now receive me because we have long known and loved each other, it will do damage, for when some other brother comes along and wishes to unite with you whom you do not know, when you order his examination he will feel wounded; he will think himself received with suspicion and unkindness, and will be discouraged.

But when every one is examined, no one can feel hurt; thereupon the Presbytery proceeded to the examination of those learned brethren, and for two or three hours, the young men of the Presbytery gathered around them, asking questions and receiving answers to their own great profit. Dr. Baird declared himself more edified by attendance on that meeting of the Presbytery of Baltimore than he was by attendance on any single meeting or session of any Presbytery from that day to this. He was then a candidate for the ministry.

Again: One of the memorials says, that the Assembly has set aside the rule in the case of the United Synod, and gives that as

a reason why we ought not to exact it from ministers coming from other denominations. He was free to say whenever any judicatory comes to us making application for union with us, we will inform them on what conditions this can be effected. The case of the United Synod, however, was peculiar. The Assembly was exercising its power of "suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations;" it was engaged in healing a schism which had already existed too long. But the examination was most thorough; the United Synod examined us, and we examined them. It was done by correspondence; by the committees of conference which spent several days together in comparing views, and in preparing a statement of beliefs on the disputed points in the old controversy, by discussions in the newspapers and Reviews, and finally, by discussions in all our judicatories. The result was, we found we were agreed, and came together; he doubted not that it was done under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, as we found ourselves one, indeed we became so in delightful Christian fellowship and co-operation. "Do you believe," asked Dr. Baird, "we would have sat down together in the courts of Christ in such sweet concord and confidence, had we not thus fully understood each other beforehand?"

"But the Memorial says it is *humiliating*. He greatly regretted that the Presbytery had used this language, nor did he see how brethren could feel thus with regard to a regulation adopted for the preservation of the unity and purity of the Church.

"Were the rule made optional, as it is proposed, he could very well understand why brethren might consider it as humiliating, and might refuse to enter our Presbyteries if subjected to its operation. But when it is universal, when it operates on all alike, without discrimination, what is there humiliating about it?"

These reasons, as presented by Dr. Baird, satisfied the Assembly to retain the rule unchanged, and it was hoped that the action might be so explained to the Presbytery and Synod as to satisfy all parties that no unkindness was intended.



## OUR RELATIONS TO THE COLORED POPULATION.

This subject came before the Assembly in different forms. The following preamble and resolutions from the Committee on Bills and Overtures was adopted :

Whereas, the colored people never stood in any other relation to the Church than that of human beings lost with us in the fall of Adam, and redeemed with us by the infinitely meritorious death and sacrifice of Christ, and participants with us in all the benefits and blessings of the gospel ; and whereas, our churches, pastors, and people have always recognised this claim to Christian equality and brotherhood, and have rejoiced to have them associated in Christian union and communion in the public services and precious sacraments of the sanctuary :

*Resolved*, 1. That the abolition of slavery by the civil and military powers, has not altered the relations as above defined, in which our Church stands to the colored people, nor in any degree lessened the debt of love and service which we owe to them, nor the interest with which we would still desire to be associated with them in all the privileges of our common Christianity.

2. That whereas experience has invariably proved the advantage of the colored people and the white being united together in the worship of God, we see no reason why it should be otherwise, now that they are freedmen and not slaves. Should our colored friends think it best to separate from us, and organise themselves into distinct congregations under white pastors and elders for the present, or under colored elders and pastors, as soon as God, in his providence, shall raise up men suitably qualified for those offices, this Church will do all in its power to encourage, foster, and assist them.

3. That the Rev. J. L. Girardeau, of Charleston Presbytery, Rev. David Wills, of Hopewell Presbytery, Rev. H. C. Alexander and Rev. Alexander Martin, of Roanoke Presbytery, and Dr. J. L. Wilson, be appointed a committee to report on this whole subject, and to recommend action to the next General Assembly.

4. That the committee appointed in the above resolution, be also the committee provided for in the Report on Domestic Missions.

The following resolutions from the Standing Committee on Domestic Missions, thus referred to, had been previously adopted :

That the General Assembly solemnly admonish all our ministers, churches, and people, and do enjoin upon them not in

anywise to intermit their labors for the religious instruction of the colored people in our land. Whilst the change in the legal and domestic relations of this class does not release the Church from its obligation to seek their moral and spiritual welfare, by all the means which it is competent to the Church to employ, their helpless condition and their greater exposure to temptation, and leading to vice, irreligion, and ruin, both temporal and eternal, which result from that change, make the strongest appeal to our Christian sympathies on their behalf, in their spiritual destitutions, and demand of us, whether we are office-bearers or private members of the Church, redoubled diligence in supplying them with the saving ordinances of the gospel.

That there be a committee to prepare and submit to the next General Assembly, for review and approval, a practical scheme or plan for the religious instruction of the colored people adapted to their now altered civil and social condition, and that this committee be earnestly desired to give to this task their best attention and efforts.

Again, in the excellent Pastoral Letter from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Brown, the Assembly holds the following language :

While the existence of slavery may, in its civil aspects, be regarded as a settled question, an issue now gone, yet the lawfulness of the relation as a question of social morality, and of scriptural truth, has lost nothing of its importance. When we solemnly declare to you, brethren, that the dogma which asserts the inherent sinfulness of this relation is unscriptural and fanatical; that it is condemned not only by the word of God, but by the voice of the Church in all ages; that it is one of the most pernicious heresies of modern times; that its countenance by any Church, is a just cause of separation from it, (1 Tim. vi. 1—5) we have surely said enough to warn you away from this insidious error, as from a fatal shore.

Whatever, therefore, we may have to lament before God, either for neglect of duty or for actual wrong towards our servants, while the relation lasted, we are not called, now that it has been abolished, to bow the head in humiliation before men, or admit that the memory of many of our dear kindred is to be covered with shame because, like Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, they had bond-servants born in their house, or bought with their money; and who now, redeemed by the same precious blood, sit down together in the kingdom of God.

The other consideration connected with this subject is *the present condition of this people*. We may righteously protest

that with their wretchedness, already incalculably great, that with their prospects, to human view dismal as the grave, our Church is not chargeable; that it may hold up its hands before heaven and earth, washed of the tremendous responsibility involved in this change in the condition of nearly four million of bond-servants, and for which it has hitherto been generally conceded they were unprepared.

But in this dispensation of Providence which has befallen the negroes of the Southern States, and mainly without their agency, your obligations to promote their welfare, though diminished, have not ceased. Debtors before to them when bound, you are still debtors to them free. You are bound to them not only by the ties of a common nature, a common sin, but a common redemption also. They have grown up around and in your households, have toiled for your benefit, ministered to your comforts and wants, and have often tenderly, faithfully nursed you in sickness. They are still around your doors, in the bosom of your community. Many of them are your fellow-heirs of salvation. Together with you, they all need it; greatly need it for time—for eternity. We are persuaded you will not turn away from them in this day of their imagined millenium—we fear of terrible calamity. Do all you can for their best welfare, and do it quickly, for they already begin to pass rapidly away. “By pureness, by knowledge, by long suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of God, by the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by honor and dishonor, by evil report and good report,” let it be shown to all men that nothing shall withdraw the sympathy of your heart or the labor of your hand from a work which must of necessity and ever rest chiefly upon those who dwell in the land, not upon the strangers who visit it. If their condition is made better, if souls are plucked as brands from the burning, you will have the comfort of knowing that you were, under God, instrumental in such happy results. Should our worst fears be realised, and their doom be sealed, you will have a pure conscience at the bar of the final Judge.

#### THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

The downfall of the Confederacy has reduced greatly the resources of both the Union Theological Seminary and that at Columbia. The funds of the former were represented as being reduced to ninety or one hundred thousand dollars, none of the

endowments yielding an income; and those of the Columbia Seminary as being reduced from two hundred and seventy, to sixty-nine or seventy thousand dollars, only three thousand of which yields an income. Probably both of these institutions could make a better exhibit of their endowments at the present time. The market value of the Columbia endowments is now stated at ninety-five thousand dollars, and the ultimate value at over one hundred thousand. These funds, however, are unproductive, none of the stocks paying a dividend, and the coupons having a very low market value. They are, therefore, entirely inadequate for the support of these institutions, and they are necessarily dependent upon the contributions of the Church, both for the support of their professors and the relief of beneficiary students. It is hoped and believed that the Church will not allow these schools of theological learning, at which so large a portion of its ministers have been trained, to suffer long and irretrievably. Surely their numerous alumni will not forget to urge their claims on the constant benefactions of the Church, and the people of God will still bear them on their hearts to the throne of grace. And surely our ministers and people will not be wanting in prayer to the Lord of the harvest to send forth more laborers, nor in efforts to direct their attention, and aid them on their way, to these schools of the prophets, where provision is made for their instruction and training.

#### POPULAR AMUSEMENTS.

Overture No. 9 was a paper from the Rev. Dr. Ross, on the subject of fashionable amusements, containing three inquiries, with their proposed answers. The Committee on Bills and Overtures recommended that the inquiries be answered as follows:

1. "Whether every Church session has the right to make it a rule that dancing and other amusements are disciplinary?"

Answer.—No church judicatory has a right to make any new rules of Church membership, different from those contained in the constitution; but it is the undoubted right of the church session and of every judicatory, to make a deliverance, affirming its sense of what is "an offence," in the meaning of the Book of Discipline, ch. 1, sec. 3.

2. "Whether such rule commonly exists in Presbyterian churches?"

Answer.—Probably none of our judicatories are as faithful as they ought to be; but it is believed that the churches generally do, in some form, discountenance dancing. And the Presbyterian Church, through its supreme judicatory, has repeatedly borne its testimony against dancing, and other worldly amusements.

3. "Whether such rule is expedient; or what should be the mind of the whole body, and what its action?"

Answer.—It is the duty of every judicatory to enforce the teachings of our standards on this and other fashionable amusements, such as theatrical performances, card-playing, etc. And while the Assembly believes that the "lascivious dancings" declared to be forbidden in the seventh commandment, by the answer to the 139th question of the Larger Catechism, are not those usual in our best society, yet it is our belief that the tenor of the teachings of the Scriptures and of our standards, is in direct opposition to this social usage. Christ's kingdom is not of this world; and the apostle exhorts Christians not to be conformed to the world. Though we do not say that all these worldly amusements are "in their own nature sinful," it is clear that they "may tempt" those who engage in them, and others, to sin: and moreover, the Scriptures condemn them as worldliness. If the practice of the dance in mixed assemblies be not conforming to the world, it is difficult to name any offence against the injunction of the apostle. Nor need the Church of Christ have any hesitancy in announcing its position on this subject; for the men of the world, with one consent, agree that it is inconsistent with the nature of the Christian profession, for members of the Church to engage in the dance.

In this connexion, the Assembly would take occasion to exhort our Christian people to avoid the excesses into which they are in danger of being drawn by the demands of fashion. The Scriptures forbid "revellings," and all intemperate self-indulgence; with which teachings the prevalent custom of protracting social assemblies, with or without music and dancing, to the hours of the morning, but especially when accompanied with drinking or card-playing, is manifestly inconsistent. Moreover, the Assembly, observing that parties of pleasure are usually composed almost exclusively of unmarried young people, would give it as its earnest advice that the best form of social reunion be made

to partake as much as possible of the style and tone of the family circle, in which youthful enjoyment is tempered by the presence of the older and married members.

The Assembly expresses itself with the more earnestness on this whole subject, because of the disposition which is observed in all parts of our borders to run into the inordinate indulgence of worldliness at this time, in forgetfulness of the mighty chastenings of God which are even yet upon us; and because we see members of our churches and our beloved baptized youth, in forgetfulness of the covenant of God, which is upon them, carried away with the world's delusions, to the subversion of the divine influences of the sanctuary, and to the neglect of the interests of their souls. Wherefore, the Assembly would urge our people to take the word of exhortation; to abstain from all forms of evil; and to study and pursue that sobriety which becometh the gospel, so that the Church of Christ shall indeed be "a peculiar people." And we hereby exhort our ministers and church sessions to a discharge of their duties. Let them proceed by affectionate and faithful instruction from the pulpit, as well as in private; by admonition, and by such other measures as Christian prudence may dictate; but when all other means fail, then let them proceed to such methods of discipline as shall separate from the Church those who love the world and practise conformity thereto rather than to the law of Christ.

Dr. Ross argued the main topics of this report at length. "There were two views," he said, "in regard to amusements; one was that all amusements were wrong. So the Methodist Church once thought. Now, there is a reaction.

"I think there is nothing in itself sinful, but

"1. All things forbidden by the law of God are wrong. Some things, 2. Are wrong, as we learn *by inference* from God's word; and 3. Those things that are evil in their tendency are wrong. And amongst these are the Roman gladiatorial shows, Spanish bull-fights, bear-bating, cock-fighting, and American duels.

"The ladies of the South have been greatly to blame because of their countenance of duelling. In such contests there is great disappointment if no one falls, and even if no one is *killed*. We all love excitement, and the highest excitement most, which concerns human life. Some amusements are innocent, as the oratorio, the concert, etc. All may be known by their effects.

Those that are evil, so shown by their fruits, are cards, drinking, billiards, in itself nothing but marbles, but made sinful in its use; the theatre, watering places, and dancing.

“The world has taken the drama to itself—it has erected a building for it, and the chief character of the plays acted there is marked with depravity, and the players, as a body, are men of infamous character.

“I remember a sermon preached in Philadelphia some years ago by Dr. Bedell, from the text, ‘In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird;’ and in that sermon I was astonished to learn, that four out of five of all the young men coming from the country to the city who attend the theatre go to ruin; and so too do three out of five of all *such as do not board in private families*. I think the theatre to be *the broad road to hell*.

“As to the cards, the charm about them is their combination of intellect and chance.” The Doctor gave some sketches of his own observation and experience, when a man of the world, of the danger and ruin brought on by that fascinating amusement. He felt a thrill of horror now, whenever he saw a young man playing cards.

“So those who year after year go to watering places, are in great danger, for these are places of great temptation. You would be astounded to hear what is going on in an English watering place. So if you *do* go North—choose the best place.

“Some, for excitement, read novels; most of them are either trashy or pernicious. I would, however, in passing, mention one not so, viz., ‘*My Novel*.’ This inculcates a spirit of forgiveness better than some men’s sermons.

“*Dancing* is claimed to be one of the fine arts. It is an old amusement, and among all nations its history has ever been *the history of immorality*.” The Doctor quoted for proof, various, and even heathen testimony. He then recounted the whole catalogue of dances, and added—of the fancy dances and waltzes, *they are all immodest*, and the world says so.

Dancing parties as conducted now, he thought should be regarded as *revelling*, and quoted Doddridge on Gal. v. 21, and Milton and Byron, to confirm his view.

Before the Doctor had concluded his argument, he gave way to a vote, and the report of the Committee was unanimously adopted.

There have been two parties in the Christian Church in all ages. One party endeavoring to live blameless lives, and careful not to grieve the Spirit of God, whereby they were sealed; another, conforming to the world, and engaging with evident zest in its amusements. Against these last, the Chrysostoms and Augustines of former ages have lifted up their voice in warning and denunciation. Innocent relaxation is certainly demanded by the body and mind, and a joyful, happy, and social life belongs to Christianity in its purest form. To hit the just mean is what is required of God's children, and to aid them in this, are these decisions of the Assembly directed.

#### THE SYMBOLICAL IMPORT OF BAPTISM.

An Overture, No. 15, from the Presbytery of Central Mississippi, dissenting from the language used in the Minutes of the last Assembly on the subject of valid and invalid baptism, requested of this Assembly that it make a new and more satisfactory deliverance. The original question was, Whether, if a person was baptized having it as his sole apprehension of the nature of the ordinance, that it symbolised the burial and resurrection of Christ, and the administrator entertaining the same view, his baptism was thereby invalidated? The reply made was, that errors, even serious ones, on the part of the recipient or the administrator, do not invalidate baptism. The administrator baptizes by authority from the Church which ordains him, and by authority from Christ, expressed through the Church, and the baptism is to be construed according to the doctrines of the Church, and not according to the views of the administrator. To make the validity dependent upon the subjective view and intention of the administrator, would be a popish error, and leave it in the power of the administrator to make baptism void. If the recipient and administrator should believe that baptism by its *mode* symbolises the burial of Christ, and that it should therefore be by *immersion*, it would simply be an error, since there is



no analogy between the laying of Christ away in the tomb of Joseph, a great stone being rolled to the door, and the immersion of a believer, nor between his resurrection, when he stepped forth, having laid aside his grave clothes, into the open air, and the emerging of a believer from beneath the wave, since the symbolism of baptism would have been the same if cremation or burning had occurred to his body, according to the Grecian rite. Our being "buried with him by baptism into death : that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life," can only mean that in our baptism we professedly have part with him in his atoning death, and his new life ; as *he* died unto sin when he was offered a sacrifice, so we die unto sin, as to its controlling power, by our union with him ; and as he rose again in a new life, so do we rise, if we are his, and should ever strive to rise, in the exercise of a new spiritual life. Perhaps there was a desire felt that the Assembly should declare baptism symbolical of the regenerating and sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit alone ; that they should represent, that, as the one sacrament of the supper had reference to the work of the second person in the Godhead, so the sacrament of baptism has reference to the third, and the two sacraments have reference to the two divine agents in man's salvation. But while baptism is referred to in the phrase "washing of regeneration," (Tit. iii. 5,) we are also baptized for "the remission of sins," (Mark i. 3 ; Acts ii. 38.) Christ "came both by the water and blood," (John v. 7.) Purification was made both by the blood of sprinkling and by ablution with water in the old economy, and neither our own standards nor our old divines make baptism significant only of the Spirit's work, but of the cleansing of Christ's blood, and the sanctification of the Spirit, of our deliverance both from the guilt and the pollution of sin.

#### ORDINATION OF LICENTIATES.

This subject was brought up by an Overture, and was answered in full accordance with the principles announced in the deliver-

ances of the General Assembly in 1842, and of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia in 1764 and 1771.

Overture No. 12.—An inquiry from a member of this Assembly, asking whether a Presbytery has a right to ordain a licentiate to the work of the gospel ministry, simply because he desires it, although neither one or more churches have requested that he should be ordained.

The Committee recommend the following answer, viz.: Every office in the Church of God, according to the Scriptures and the standards of our Church, is a definite charge; and hence no man can lawfully be ordained to the gospel ministry unless it be to the performance of some work appropriate to that office according to the constitution. And as one great evidence of a divine vocation is a call from a particular church, no man ought to be ordained, except in cases extraordinary, without such a call. Moreover, as persons are liable to mistake their calling, and as the office of the ministry is a permanent one, by divine institution, Presbyteries ought to exercise great caution in ordaining evangelists, lest the ministry be filled with intruders, and the Church be afflicted with a vagrant and secularised clergy. Nor ought they ever to do so, until full proof has been made of the licentiate, by the Presbytery which ordains him, and it has received such a favorable report concerning him from the churches, as gives the promise of wide usefulness.

The case mentioned in the memorial seems to violate all these principles. If the licentiate be not called to a particular church, and if he be not looking to the work of the evangelist in frontier and destitute settlements, his ordination, *sine titulo*, would be not only irregular and unconstitutional, but manifestly unscriptural.

Such were the proceedings of the Macon Assembly of 1865. They were conducted, at all times, with dignity, calmness, harmony, and fraternal love, with no allusion to that body with which its churches were connected before the war, except in the single instance of the deliverance respecting ministers coming from abroad to sow divisions amongst us. Let us pray that dissensions in the Church in whose bosom we once dwelt may cease, that she may be led to see more distinctly that the kingdom of Christ is not of this world, that, in the language of the Augsburg Confession, "the ecclesiastical and civil powers are not to be confounded," that it is not to "prescribe laws to the

magistrate, touching the form of a commonwealth;”\* and let us pray for ourselves, that we may be found faithful; that the Holy Spirit may be poured forth in all our borders; and that we may be assisted by our Lord and Head, to “rise and build” the fallen walls of our Jerusalem, every one “over against his” own “house.”

---

\* Augsburg Confession, Art. 28, De Potestate Ecclesiastica. This celebrated Confession, written by Melancthon, approved by Luther, and subscribed by the Protestant princes of Germany, was submitted to the Emperor, at the Diet of Augsburg, on the 25th of June, 1430. It thus speaks:

“Non igitur commiscendæ sunt potestates ecclesiastica et civilis. Ecclesiastica suum mandatum habet; evangelii docendi et administrandi sacramenta. Non irrumpat in alienum officium, non transferat regna mundi, non abroget leges magistratuum, non tollat legitimam obedientiam, non impediatur iudicia de ullis civilibus ordinationibus aut contractibus, non præscribat leges magistratibus de forma reipublicæ, sicut dicit Christus: *Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo*. Item: *Quis constituit me iudicem aut divisorem super vos?* Et Paulus ait Philipp. iii. *Nostra politia in cælis est*. 2 Corinth. x. *Arma militiæ nostræ non sunt carnalia, sed potentia Dei, ad destruendas cogitationes*, etc. Ad hunc modum discernunt nostri utriusque potestatis officia, et jubent utramque honore afficere et agnoscere, utramque Dei donum et beneficium esse.”

\* \* \* \* \*

“Si quam habent aliam vel potestatem, vel jurisdictionem in cognoscendis certis causis, videlicet matrimonii, aut decimarum, etc., hanc habent humano jure; ubi cessantibus ordinariis coguntur principes vel inviti, suis subditis jus dicere, ut pax retineatur.”

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*History of the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin.*  
By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D. New York: Robert  
Carter & Brothers. 1866. 3 vols., 12 mo., pp. 433, 475,  
463.

Merle D'Aubigne is an author of established reputation. His merits and his defects as a writer and a historian are well known, and these volumes exhibit all his peculiar characteristics in perfection.

This work is not the history of Calvin, but of the Reformation in Europe in his time. It is a history of civil as well as of religious liberty during that period. It opens with a brief sketch of the ancient liberties of Geneva, and the Roman and German elements which entered into them from the beginning. It traces these liberties down through the period of Charlemagne, to the eleventh century, when the counts of Geneva began to threaten them; and then to the thirteenth, when, first, the bishop-princes, ousting the counts, threatened still the popular franchises; and afterwards, the dukes of Savoy took advantage of these two sets of enemies, and came in themselves to possess the prey; A minute and detailed account of Geneva's struggles, both with her bishops and the dukes of Savoy, begins from the year 1513. This detail runs through the whole of these three volumes. The Reformation does not fully appear in Geneva, even at the close of them. Calvin is introduced in volume first, appears again occasionally in volume second, and figures considerably in volume third; but that volume closes before his first entrance into Geneva. We must wait for the fourth volume for an account of his life and labors and struggle there. It is to appear soon, and we suppose it must of course be Dr. Merle's design to devote more

than one small volume to such a great theme. We shall await the appearance of these books with the profoundest interest; for we believe there is no subject in the history of the Church having superior claims on Presbyterian ministers and elders, (and especially in a day like this, and in our country,) to those belonging to Calvin's times, ideas, and testimony; and moreover, we do not know of any living writer, qualified to treat this subject so thoroughly and skilfully as he who has now undertaken the task.

These volumes present us with many well-drawn portraits of the leading actors in this drama. There are the two bishops, John, the wretched bastard of Savoy, and the gluttonous and avaricious and cowardly De la Baume. There is Francis Bonivard, (Byron's Prisoner of Chillon,) Prior of St. Victor's, of little faith and little morality, satirical and keen, the Erasmus of Geneva, eloquent and enthusiastic for liberty, and, according to our author, one of the best French writers of the beginning of the sixteenth century, though little known. There is Besançon Hugues, the noble and patriotic citizen. There are Levrier and Berthelier, the martyrs of liberty. And there are the martyrs of the gospel, Berquin, the gentleman and the scholar; the friar De la Croix, whose case, along with others that same year (1534) introduced the practice of cutting out the martyrs' tongues; Nicholas (Peter?) Valetton, the receiver of Nantes, whose young and inexperienced wife was trapped by Morin, the skilful lieutenant-criminal, into delivering up her husband's concealed but guilty treasures, the books of the Reformers,—whom they burnt expressly with wood from his own house, fastening him to the end of the *strappado*, suspending him by this means over the fire, and raising up and letting down the martyr by turns, to the amusement of the king, the priests, the nobles and the people, till the merciful flames burnt off the cords that fastened him, and he fell into the fire and was shortly reduced to ashes; Bartholomew Milon, the shoe-maker's paralytic son, whose room was at once a workshop of Christian benevolence and an humble school of the gospel, and who, burnt at a slow fire, uttered words of peace surprising to his murderers;

the heroic Du Bourg, master of the large draper's shop, the *Black Horse*, at the entrance of the Rue St. Denis, whom neither money nor kindred could ever turn aside from the truth; Poille, the poor bricklayer, captured in his wretched hut and burnt alive on the 18th of November, 1834, who got down from the cart, in great peace and joy, to be bound to the stake, uttering aloud his sentiments of devotion to Christ, and to "stop whose prating" they bored a hole in his tongue, made a slit in his cheek and drawing the tongue through, fastened it there with an iron pin, so that he could only announce his joy with his eyes. There is Francis I., the absolute monarch of France, who ruled both Church and State in his realm, and was jealous to madness of his royal dignity; full of courage and fire, yet capable of the meanest deceit; a disciple of Machiavelli, and so giving one hand to Clement just while he held the other out to Philip; a tender and loving brother to his sister Margaret, but not sharing with her in the experience of the power of the gospel; affecting to be the patron of learning and father of letters, yet, upon one occasion, decreeing the abolition of printing all over France, under pain of the gallows; holding out to the Protestants of Germany the hope of his protection of them, but persecuting the same people in his own kingdom; and when angered by the insult of one of the placards against the Mass being posted up on his own chamber door at night, taking direful and bloody revenge of them; walking himself in the expiatory "procession of the relics" bareheaded, with a lighted taper in his hand, and at each *reposoir* kneeling and humbling himself publicly, not for his adulteries and perjuries, but the audacity of those who did not like the Mass. And there is his sister Margaret, Queen of Navarre, "the best head in Europe," firmer than her brother, prudent, skilful, decided, learned, eloquent, beautiful, a Martha and yet a Mary, with a warm heart and lively imagination, of humble, earnest faith, anxious for reform and her dear brother's conversion and salvation, though weakly dreaming of a *via media* between the Church of Rome and that of Christ. And there is Catherine de Medici, young, brilliant, and gay, but in her train Death, who served her by striking down successively her husband

and all her sons, and made her supreme in France, and therefore to this sinister ally, forty years afterwards, she gives a magnificent entertainment in the streets of Paris, even a lake of blood to bathe in; a woman false and dissolute and vile; a mother bearing only enervated, idiotic, distempered, vicious children; a queen infecting the whole of a brilliant society, and instilling her deadly venom into the veins of France itself. There are, also, on the other hand, several pleasing pictures of French reformers with whom the world is not much acquainted, Olivetan, Calvin's first cousin and first teacher in the knowledge of the truth, subsequently translator of the Bible into French; and Froment, the meek and timid young school-master, who was the first really successful preacher of the gospel at Geneva, and others.

One great charm to us, of these volumes, especially the third, is the very full, and, so far as we know, hitherto inaccessible record of Farel's life and labors. The Protestant Church may now become well acquainted, for the first time, with one of the greatest evangelists of her faith that ever lived. Of course, we esteem very highly Dr. Merle's account, so far as he has advanced with it, of the immortal Calvin; but we look on that part of his work as not yet fairly begun.

One of the most valuable lessons of these books is as to the nature of true freedom—of chartered and inherited political franchises. The rights of man are one thing, and a sacred thing, though often made the merest fanaticism's tool; but the rights of freemen are quite another thing. What was given in God's good providence to the Genevese, is not given to all men, and the strength and power of these rights of Geneva lay in the fact that they were an inheritance from their fathers of old. True liberty is always of slow growth; always a development from within a people. As the philosophers say, it is *subjective*. It is not a thing that can be given to any people. And the reason why Genevans so highly esteemed their franchises, endured so much, and sacrificed so much in their defence and maintenance, and were constituted by means of them such grand heroes, both of action and of suffering, was that these rights were old rights,

and chartered rights, and had come down to them from their own sires.

Repeated testimonies (of especial value in our day and country,) are contained in these volumes against all unions of Church and State. Upon this point, Dr. Merle is very clear and distinct. "The confusion of the two provinces is a source of continual disturbance. \* \* \* Yet ambition is always endeavoring to unite these two irreconcilable powers." Vol. ii., p. 350.

Another and kindred topic upon which his testimony is just now timely and impressive, is the fatal effect of civil intolerance, whenever resorted to in any form or shape, or for any objects or purposes by the Church. He shows how *doctrine*, which is the Church's life, in this way, loses its power; how, whenever the Church resorts to any weapon of civil intolerance, straightway there are "no more combats round the expiatory cross, the eternal word, the fall, grace, and regeneration." It is only "struggles, entirely spiritual struggles, that can save religion." Vol. iii., p. 197.

History constantly repeats itself. These books present us many parallels to the woful condition of our Southern people at this time. It is an excellent book to read in these dark and sorrowful days. "Geneva was crushed," and that more than once. She lay more than once "with her funeral pall stretched over her. No one stirred, no one spoke, all was motionless and silent, the air of despotism could be felt as it hung over and benumbed the soul." But the Genevan spirit was a spirit of constancy and endurance, and frequently of heroic moderation and self-control. That they might conquer their enemies, they "conquered themselves." They knew, as Dr. Merle expresses it, and this made them patient, that "violence could not annul right," that "outraged justice" would speak in due time. And accordingly they did not "lose hope, but waited in silence till God should make the cause of liberty triumphant again in their country." And there were some of them who had faith to say, "God designs to chastise, but not destroy. His stripes are not for death, but to improve us." "It is the defeated cause that is



dear to God." And time, as it rolled along, brought gracious interpositions of Providence, so that Geneva flourished again in the enjoyment of "ancient rights." Vol. i. pp. 198-207, and p. 254.

We must not omit all reference to the charming description given of the flowing together of the old Waldenses in the remote valleys of the Alps of Piedmont, Dauphiny, etc., and the infant churches of the new Christianity that were now forming between the Alps and the Jura. It was an opportunity for reformers and apostles, as it were, to shake hands, and Farel and his brethren encountered danger and hardship for the sake of this delightful and mutually advantageous union. We have never read a more pleasant history.

Another item of interest is the author's account of the origin of the name Huguenot. Vol. i., p. 88. But our space is exhausted.

We can only add that we are grieved to notice the number of typographical errors which disfigure these books. Such errors occur in vol. ii., pp. 61, 67, 282, 372; vol. iii., pp. 131, 165, 204, 235-238, 312, 314. Those on p. 61, vol. ii., and p. 131, vol. iii., are particularly awkward. If the Messrs. Carter are the only American publishers at liberty to put forth these books according to the author's desire, they are bound to see that his work is not disfigured in their hands.

*Commentary on the Second Epistle of the Apostle Peter.* By

JOHN T. DEMAREST, D. D., Minister of the Reformed Dutch Church, Pascack, N. J. New York: A. Lloyd, 115 Nassau street: 1865: pp. 225, 8 vo.

Dr. Demarest published a commentary on the First Epistle of Peter in 1851. The preface to the present volume is dated in 1862, but its issue seems to have been withheld until 1865.

On the first Epistle, we have the rich evangelical and practical commentary of Archbishop Leighton, the more recent Expository Discourses of Brown, the commentary of Steiger, translated by Fairbairn. Still older are the special Commentaries of Hassel, of Louvain, the Sermons of Byfield, the Expositions of

Laurentius, Schlichting, Crellius, and Semler, men of various schools of theology, none of whom have written on the second Epistle. Indeed, special commentaries on this epistle are very few. The Commentary of Thomas Smith, quoted by Dr. Demarest, we have never seen, nor the Pulpit Expositions, in 4 to., of Thomas Adams. An exposition therefore of the Second Epistle of Peter, able and thorough, would be an acceptable present to the student of the Scriptures. The epistle is indeed a short one, containing but three chapters; the external evidences of its genuineness are much fewer than of the other New Testament Scriptures; but the internal evidence is to us striking, for it is written with the glowing warmth, spirit, and even fire, which belonged to the impulsive Peter, and were, (these writings being the evidence,) retained by him in old age, down to the days immediately preceding his martyrdom. The personal references to some of the most remarkable incidents in his own life are unusually definite and full, with every appearance of being uttered by himself.

The first seventy-three pages of this work are occupied by the usual introductory matter, in which there is an inquiry, I. Into the historical evidence for the genuineness or authenticity of the Epistle, which was doubted even by Calvin, in a qualified sense, who thought it written probably by a disciple of Peter, just before his martyrdom, approved by him, and so published. II. Into the internal evidence. III. As to the persons addressed. IV. The scope of the Epistle. V. Its occasion and date. VI. The term catholic, as applied to the Epistle. VII. An analysis of its contents.

The remarkable resemblance between the second chapter and the Epistle of Jude is not discussed by the author in detail. He does not agree with Hug and Davidson that Peter made use of Jude's epistle, but regards Jude as quoting from this, and thus affording additional and inspired evidence of its apostolic origin.

Although we dissent from specific interpretations of the author, we regard the commentary as the result of careful study, in the main rightly directed, and useful therefore to the earnest student of the Holy Scriptures.

Yet, if we understand the author, we cannot receive his eschatology, or doctrine of the last things, as expressed in his interpretation of chap. iii. of this Epistle. We might agree with the author, that when it is said, v. 10, that “the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works therein, shall be burned up,” there is denoted a real and physical change of our earth, and of all that pertains to it, by the action of fire. We might also agree that this does not imply the annihilation of this globe, since fire only changes the form of bodies; that this earth also is to be renovated, so that there shall be a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness; that righteousness is a quality of intelligent beings, and by metonymy is put for the persons in whom righteousness dwells. And we might see no improbability in the supposition that Christ, with his redeemed people, shall make this earth, renovated and gloriously fitted to this end, their permanent and happy abode, so that the creature (creation) subjected to vanity, “shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God.” Fairbairn and others have held these opinions. But then, Christ’s second advent will *precede* these stupendous changes. He will come, and every eye shall see him, for the dead shall be raised, the living changed, and the judgment take place *before* this final conflagration. His theory seems to point, if we do not mistake him, to a personal reign of Christ on the earth *before* the judgment. For he is amazed that “Barnes informs us that nothing is said by Peter of such a personal reign of Christ,” viz. of his eternal reign upon this renovated earth. But the distinct avowal of Barnes is, “that nothing is said of a personal reign of Christ; nothing of the resurrection of saints to dwell with him on the earth; nothing of the world being fitted up for their abode, *previous* to the judgment.”

The view of Dr. Demarest, if we can rightly gather it, is, that Christ will come to destroy false teachers and scoffers; that at his coming the earth and the works on it shall be burned up, yet not annihilated as to its material substance; that ungodly men and scoffers will be destroyed by this all-consuming fire; that

the atmospheric heavens shall pass away, as now constituted, and that these fires will remove all that is noxious in the earth and air; that the heavens and the earth will then be immediately renovated and fitted for the eternal home of the righteous; that he will bring all the disembodied spirits of the saints with him to the earth, from the heaven they have occupied, and unite them to their glorified bodies, and simultaneously with this, the living saints shall be changed from mortal to immortal; that Christ will then give up the vice-royalty of the universe to the Father, and reign forever and ever on the earth.

And yet, he says, all men are not to be removed from the earth, appealing to Is. lxvi. 18, 19, 20, and Zech. xiv. 16, compared with 1-5. But how does he provide for these living men amidst these tremendous changes; how for the living saints? He has not distinctly told us. But he says the phrase, "the earth shall be burned," may be used by synecdoche, the whole for a part; as in Math. xxvii. 51, 'The earth did quake;' which quaking was confined to Jerusalem, or Judea." And he gives it as the opinion of some, that the conflagration on the earth's surface will be at the place or places where the obstinate enemies of Christ are assembled at his coming. But if this earth is to be burned up, and the curse, and every thing noxious is to be burnt out of earth and sky, what mortal flesh can endure? And how could the conflagration be limited to the territory of old Rome, according to some, or to Christendom, according to others; and, if thus limited, would not the earth's renovation, which seems to be coequal with its destruction, be limited also? Dr. Demarest has not told us in what miraculous ark of safety the inhabitants of "the heavens and the earth that are now" are to be floated over this universal deluge of fire into "the new heavens and the new earth," where they are to abide. Nor has he distinctly told us whether this second advent of Christ is his advent to the *final* judgment, when the books are to be opened, and the dead, small and great, are to be judged out of the things written therein, or whether there is to be another, even the great day of final judgment, at a period far more remote. More distinctness on this and other allied topics,

might have rescued his views from misapprehension. The difficulties attending the premillennial advent and personal reign of Christ on the earth we have never been able to surmount in consistency with the general teachings of the prophetic scriptures.

*A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, with special reference to Ministers and Students.* By JOHN PETER LANGE, D. D., in connection with a number of eminent European Divines. Translated from the German, and edited, with additions original and selected, by Philip Schaff, D. D., in connection with American Divines of various Evangelical denominations. Vol. I. of the New Testament: containing a general Introduction, and the Gospel according to Matthew. By John Peter Lange, D. D., translated, with additions, by Philip Schaff, D. D. Fourth edition, pp. 568, royal 8vo. Vol. II., containing the Gospel according to Mark. Revised from the Edinburg translation, with additions, by William G. T. Shedd, D. D., Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York. First edition. And the Gospel according to Luke. By J. J. Van Oosterzee, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht. Translated from the second German edition, with additions original and selected, by Philip Schaff, D. D., and Rev. Charles C. Starbuck. First edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. Royal 8 vo., pp. 405.

The work of which the preceding is the title, has been well characterised as the greatest literary enterprise of the kind undertaken in the present century. Never has the Bible been attacked and defended with a greater array of talent and learning than now, and never have the results of antiquarian and philosophical research been brought to bear so extensively upon its interpretation. No age has been so fruitful in labors tending to the elucidation of the Scriptures. The time has come when the attempt can be made to combine all the valuable results of these studies with original research, in the preparation of a comprehensive commentary for the use of ministers and students.

VOL. XVII., NO. 1.—16.

This can not be done except by a division of labor, by associating for this purpose distinguished divines who have made the elucidation of the Scriptures their life-long study. The excellent commentaries of Henry and Scott on the whole Bible, are greatly valued for sound and practical exposition. But greater thoroughness could only be secured by combining the labors of ripe scholars who have devoted their studies to the exposition of particular portions of the inspired volume. This is the aim of the *Biblical Commentary* of Dr. Lange, Professor of Evangelical Theology in the University of Bonn. He is represented by the American editor as a man of rare genius, varied and deep piety, an able and pure divine, and distinguished alike as theologian, philosopher, preacher, and poet. His theology is represented as being essentially biblical and catholic, "more decided than that of Neander and Tholuck, and more conciliatory than the orthodoxy of Hengstenberg;" yet "not the fixed exclusive orthodoxy of the old Lutheran, or the old Calvinistic Confession;" as "conservative" in fine, and "yet progressive." He is an uncompromising opponent of German rationalism and scepticism, making no concessions to the modern attacks on the gospel history. The design of this work is to embrace gradually the whole Old and New Testaments. Dr. Lange has prepared the commentaries on Matthew, Mark, John, Romans, and Genesis, and associated with himself distinguished divines of Germany, Switzerland, and Holland, extending his own editorial supervision over the whole. Most of the New Testament has already appeared in Germany, but of the Old Testament, as yet, only the commentary on Genesis.

The Anglo-American edition is edited in an English translation, under the superintendence of Philip Schaff, D. D., so well known by his works in Church history, and in general theological literature. He has secured the services of other eminent American scholars, who have in hand already most of the books of the New Testament.

The plan of the work is as follows: It contains, first, Introductions, both critical and homiletical, to the Bible, and each particular book. The text of the Scriptures in the German

edition is given in a new translation, based upon the Greek text of Lachmann and Tischendorf. In the American edition, the text is the authorised version of 1611, with corrections and improvements, included in brackets, sometimes with and sometimes without the Greek text, and justified in critical notes below. The principal readings of the Greek are given in footnotes with short critical remarks; and in these, the American editor has attempted to popularize so much of the immense critical apparatus of biblical learning as could be made available for practical uses. For this purpose he has made use, among others, of the Sinaitic manuscript rescued from the obscurity of the Convent of St. Catharine, on Mount Sinai, and edited by Tischendorf in two editions, in 1862 and 1863. This is the only complete and perhaps the oldest of the uncial codices of the Bible, certainly as old as the celebrated Vatican manuscript, supposed to be of the fourth century.

Then follows the Commentary itself. This is threefold, consisting, 1. Of exegetical and critical notes, in which the aim is to give the results of original and previous labors, as briefly as possible. 2. Of doctrinal and ethical thoughts rising out of the text. 3. Of homiletical and practical hints and suggestions.

The exegetical notes are enriched by Dr. Schaff, not only from the products of his own studies, but by selections from the most esteemed older and modern commentators of England and America. The homiletical and practical hints or suggestions, are designed to aid the preacher and student in the matter of invention, *i. e.*, in the discovery of apt topics, either for private thought or public inculcation. In these, the subjects contained in the text are viewed in a great variety of lights, as they would present themselves to different thoughtful minds. If read rapidly together, they will confuse, perhaps, rather than edify; but if dwelt upon in concentrated thought, and successively, they can not do otherwise than stimulate our own powers, and set them in motion on the journey of discovery. And this is the best fruit of reading, when we thereby transplant the nobler thoughts of others into the soil of our own minds, to grow there perhaps in grander proportions, and to produce a new and plentiful harvest.

This portion of the work will be profitable or otherwise, as it is subjected to the rules of logic by the student, and used with that judgment which every teacher of mankind should possess.

We expect to be greatly profited by the study of these volumes, but we are always watchful in using the labors of German scholars. Even some men of true piety among them have inadequate views of the inspiration and miraculous character of the Scriptures.

We are advocates of free, but regulated thought, up to the limits of human reason, up to the farthest bounds of what is revealed. But the tendency of the German mind is to transcendental speculation, and it has little regard to those established opinions, which, after the controversies of centuries, were embodied in the creeds and confessions of the Protestant Church. These things make the German scholar an uncertain guide in theological doctrine. Nor, in our view, is the dogmatic theology of Germany equal to that of some other countries. But there is a wealth of learning in their philological and exegetical labors, and we will thankfully receive from them the valuable aids they proffer, and strive to use them for God's glory.

We think it an infelicity in a work of this kind, designed for general circulation in this country, that there should be any allusion to the contest in which we have been lately engaged, and therefore regretted to see the extract from Dr. Schaff's diary of June 18, 1863, on p. 423 of vol. 1, as an illustration of the effect of "rumors of wars," a phrase occurring in Matt. xxiv. Let these things be detailed in books of history, if they must be, but not spread out, *ad invidiam*, in comments on the Scriptures.

*Ecce Homo: a Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ.*

Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. Tacit. *Ann.* 1. 15. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1866. 18 mo. pp. 355.

This book is the result "of dissatisfaction with the current conceptions of Christ." It is an attempt to reach conclusions



respecting him, not such as "Church doctors or even apostles have sealed with their authority, but which the facts themselves, critically weighed, appear to warrant." The author had "read a good many books on Christ, and felt constrained to confess that there was no historical character whose motives, objects, and feelings remained so incomprehensible to him." And so he makes this effort to comprehend Christ, and that independently of the very apostles! How any man was to get at "the facts themselves" for a critical weighing of them, without recourse to "the authority of the apostles," who were the witnesses to those facts, we do not see; nor yet how he could ever hope to fathom the depths of the "great mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh." But such is this author's own account of his design and plan. It is in this spirit he begins his work. Apparently all unconscious of our native blindness, and confident in the powers of the human mind to search and find out the truth, he encounters no difficulties in his investigations, and makes every thing perfectly plain. It is the solution upon humanitarian grounds of all the secrets of Christ's life and work. As the title signifies, it is a holding forth of Jesus *as a man*, although in some respects the greatest individual of the *genus*. But then it is, at the same time, a covert assault upon the distinctive peculiarities of the system Christ has set up. It was well therefore that this title should be borrowed from no other than Pontius Pilate. "Behold the man! I find no fault in him," said that impartial and unbiassed investigator of Christ's life and work, "but take ye him and crucify him."

We say this book is a covert assault upon the chief doctrines of revealed religion. There is no feature of that scheme more fundamental than the supreme divinity of our Lord. But that great doctrine is utterly irreconcilable with the contents of almost every chapter of this book. The personality of the Spirit, another leading doctrine of the gospel, is in several places unceremoniously scouted without the trouble being taken of making any apology or defence of the contrary position. The author quietly assumes that there is no Holy Ghost except "an elevated condition of mind," or the "enthusiasm of humanity of

which Jesus was full." So, also, the doctrine of atonement is no part of Christianity, if we are to believe this writer. And as for the inspiration of the Scriptures, it is only here and there a page which does not evince the author's perfect contempt for the very idea. "They think," he says, "they must needs be most Christian when they stick most closely to the New Testament, and that what is utterly absent from the New Testament cannot possibly be an important part of Christianity. A great mistake, arising from a wide-spread paralysis of true Christian feeling in the modern Church! The New Testament is not the Christian law; the precepts of apostles, the special commands of Christ, are not the Christian law." P. 218.

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about this work is the cool audacity with which its author asserts his opinions, as if unquestioned and unquestionable. For example, when the Baptist said, "Behold the Lamb of God," all that he intended was simply to set forth Christ as having a "steadfast peace no agitations of life had ever ruffled." The image was drawn from that "conception of a Lamb of God" in "one of the most striking of the Psalms," where "the Psalmist describes himself as one of Jehovah's flock, safe under his care, and absolved from all anxieties." That "is the most complete picture of happiness that ever was, or can be, drawn"—and John, when he spake of Christ as the Lamb of God, was just doing "obseance to the royalty of inward happiness." Pp. 12, 13.

Again: "In the agitation of mind caused by his baptism, \* \* \* Christ retired into the wilderness, and there in solitude, \* \* \* matured that plan of action which we see him executing," etc. P. 15.

Again: "What is called Christ's temptation, is the excitement of his mind, which was caused by the nascent consciousness of supernatural power." "None of our biographies point this out, and yet it is visibly the key to the whole narrative." P. 18. There was no devil, and there was no contest with the tempter by the second Adam.

Again: "This monarchy [of Christ] was essentially despotic, and might, in spite of the goodness of the sovereign, have had

some mischievous consequences, if he had remained too long among his subjects, and if his dictation had descended too much into particulars. But he shunned the details of administration, and assumed only the higher functions of an heroic monarch—those of organisation and legislation.” P. 119.

Again: Our Saviour was overcome with “an intolerable sense of shame” when they brought to him the woman taken in adultery. He could not look on them, least of all upon the guilty female; and hence, “In his burning embarrassment and confusion he stooped down so as to hide his face, and began writing with his finger on the ground.” “It was his “glowing blush” that awakened first the older and then the younger men, “with astonishment,” to a sense of their conduct. “Not till left alone could he bear to stand upright,” and then he dismissed the woman. P. 116.

To these specimens of the author’s opinions and manner of presenting them, let us add that he is an enemy of creeds, (pp. 78–84); that he makes an elaborate apology for unbelief, while at the same time he caricatures the Christian doctrine of faith, (pp. 80–90); and that he is sometimes guilty of the fraud of using old and common religious terms in new senses, so as to disguise the poison of his real sentiments.

There is much pretty speculation in certain parts of this volume. For example, chap. v., on Christ’s credentials, it appears to us, is truly admirable. We consider chap ix., on the nature of Christ’s society, very striking, and for the most part perhaps true. There is, as we judge, a fine description of the Roman world, pp. 144, 148; some excellent and discriminating observations upon slavery, pp. 148–54; a fine delineation of Christianity, as distinguished from philanthropy, p. 230; some striking and perhaps well founded remarks upon Zaccheus and Mary Magdalen, pp. 263–9; a fresh and wholesome account of Christian enthusiasm, pp. 275–8; and some very hearty and earnest and refreshing utterances about resentment, pp. 298–300. The whole of the last chapter seems to us much higher in tone than the volume of which it forms the conclusion, and the very last paragraph of the work we like better, perhaps, than any part of

it. And yet, viewed as a whole, the work is, as the reader may well suppose from the statements already submitted, utterly deficient of Christian soundness; bad in much that it expresses, and worse in much that it neglects to say; pretending to guide the blind, yet apparently blind itself to the great truth of the ruined condition of man; a hypocritical book, claiming to be Christian, and addressing Christians as brethren, and as such, undertaking to give them advice and counsel, and yet endeavoring by many a secret thrust to stab Christianity to the heart; while yet it claims that "no theological questions whatever are here discussed." (Preface, p. 4.)

To give the reader a more distinct idea of the book, let us say it professes to be simply an endeavor to answer the question, "What was Christ's object in founding the Society which he called by his name, and how is it adapted to attain that object?"

It has two parts. The first, contains nine chapters, as follows:

- I. The Baptist.
- II. The Temptation.
- III. The Kingdom of God.
- IV. Christ's Royalty.
- V. Christ's Credentials.
- VI. Christ's Winnowing Fan.
- VII. Conditions of Membership in Christ's Kingdom.
- VIII. Baptism.
- IX. Reflections on the Nature of Christ's Society.

The second part consists of fifteen chapters, as follows:

- X. Christ's Legislation compared with Philosophic Systems.
- XI. The Christian Republic.
- XII. Universality of the Christian Republic.
- XIII. The Christian a Law to Himself.
- XIV. The Enthusiasm of Humanity.
- XV. The Lord's Supper.
- XVI. Positive Morality.
- XVII. The Law of Philanthropy.
- XVIII. The Law of Edification.

XIX. The Law of Mercy.

XX. The Law of Mercy, (*continued.*)

XXI. The Law of Resentment.

XXII. The Law of Forgiveness.

XXIII. The Law of Forgiveness, (*continued.*)

XXIV. Conclusion.

The authorship of the book is kept secret, and it would seem that various devices have been employed to excite the public curiosity on this point, and to give the work *eclat* and circulation. For example, it has been ascribed to Mr. Gladstone, and also to Napoleon III. We have heard also of sixteen literary gentlemen being invited "to breakfast with the author of *Ecce Homo*" (by the publisher, we presume,) and parting in wonder, each one whether his neighbor at the table had or had not been the great unknown. These things look like tricks, and yet not tricks of John Bull, but of a certain smart cousin of John's. The book was certainly published in England, and ran through several editions there, before it first appeared from the Boston press. But that also may be a trick. It is not difficult to go astray in judging of such a matter, but in reading *Ecce Homo*, we have sometimes been strongly impressed with the notion that its birth-place was not far from Boston. The general run of its theology accords exactly with such a supposition, and there is not only an *American air* about the whole style and manner of the book, but particular allusions and expressions abound which seem to favor the idea we have suggested. Not to name a dozen other places where we met with these allusions and expressions, any reader, it appears to us, will be able to detect such on pp. 28, 69, 80-81, 208, 209, 212, 299. Perhaps, however, the fact is simply that the English writer of the book has had the misfortune to learn theology as well as style from a certain class of American teachers.

We do not consider this, in any sense, a great work. The author is not original, though he is ingenious. He is sprightly, but he is not profound. It takes no profoundness, no originality, no great force of intellect to write such a book as *Ecce Homo*, although it has power enough to make it dangerous to some

VOL. XVII., NO. 1.—17.

readers. A little smartness, and a flow of words, joined to a freedom from all reverence for the external authoritative standard of truth, and from all fear about receiving and propagating a lie; and then a fair amount of classical erudition and a familiar acquaintance with the disguised infidelity which abounds in our day; these qualifications are all that are requisite for the purpose. We think that we should hazard little in saying that there are a score of men now in almost any New England State, capable of producing just such a work as this.

*Life of William Hickling Prescott.* By GEORGE TICKNOR.

Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1864. One volume, 12 mo.

The memoir of this great New Englander is a tribute from the hand of friendship, "written in part payment of a debt which has been accumulating for above half a century." The writer has well executed his task. An acquaintance begun in the school-room of the Rev. Dr. Gardiner, of Trinity Church, Boston, and continued throughout life cemented by bonds of closest intimacy, certainly gave him the rarest opportunities for portraying the life of the world-renowned historian of Ferdinand and Isabella. Whilst the book is not without great attractions for the general reader as furnishing a noble example of untiring zeal and determination in overcoming the almost insuperable obstacles to literary effort arising from impaired sight and enfeebled health, there is much more to interest his wide circle of intimate friends and acquaintances from the *minutiæ* laid before them of his school days and early life.

The family-moving from Salem to Boston, young Prescott entered upon his college course at Cambridge, where he graduated with honors as a classical scholar, but evincing so great a repugnance for mathematics as to require the forbearance of the professor who insisted merely upon his attendance in the classroom without calling upon him for recitations.

Upon page 18, we find an interesting account of the sad accident that occurred during his Junior term, which cast a gloom over his whole life, whilst it tended to make him what he afterwards became. The loss of sight in his left eye was caused

by a blow received from a hard crust of bread thrown by the hand of a fellow-student across the Commons Hall; it struck the open disk, causing a deep paralysis of the retina, beyond the reach of the healing art, from the moment the blow was given. A few weeks of absolute rest from all physical or mental exertion enabled him to resume his studies. Months after, his vision was again impaired by an attack of acute rheumatism, which resulted in total blindness for a time and left him a life-long sufferer.

This was the turning point in his career, leading him to give up the study of the law, upon which he had entered in his father's office, and to choose a life of literary occupation. Now begins to appear the wonderful earnestness of Mr. Prescott's nature. It is a Herculean task he assumes. With "knowledge shut out as to its main entrance," he undertakes to master English, French, Italian, and Spanish literature. Let us hold up this brave New Englander as an example to the young students of the South, mourning now over the loss of four years given to their beloved Confederacy. See what he accomplished after losing six of the most important years of his life, much of this period spent on a suffering bed and in rooms so dark that his friends had to grope their way in and out of them; and discover the secret of his marvellous success in the invincible resolution with which he begins his task in his twenty-fifth year, and prosecutes it notwithstanding impaired health and the constant prospect of total blindness.

The history of the literary life and labors of a man nearly blind must of course present many interesting passages. One of these occurs on page 73, where we read of the first entrance into his mind of the idea of his work, "Ferdinand and Isabella," after having witnessed his anxious reflections upon the choice of a subject for his pen. It is with the liveliest interest we accompany this suffering devotee of learning through all his labor and toil to the completion of his grand effort. On page 156 is a very pleasing correspondence with Washington Irving, who courteously relinquishes to him the subject of the "Conquest of Mexico." With similar magnanimity, we find Mr. Prescott,

after he had made preparations and arrangements for many years for the "History of Philip II," nevertheless warmly and earnestly encouraging (p. 260) Mr. Motley, then a comparatively young man, to proceed with his "Rise of the Dutch Republic," which must necessarily traverse the same ground. It is also very interesting to peruse the account of the immense pains and cost with which he collected his materials from the archives and libraries of Europe. But perhaps the most impressive part of this biography is the evidence it furnishes of the unwearied labor and pains taken continually by this nearly blind student of history to secure for his works the completest possible accuracy. The slow and laborious gathering of materials, the patient studying of his subject in all its details before he commenced to write a word, the careful balancing of conflicting testimonies before he suffered himself to be committed to any representations, evince his integrity of mind, and how fully he was possessed with the true spirit of his profession as a writer of History. And then his toilsome and painful labors in putting down on paper by means of his "noctograph" or writing case, the descriptions he could not see while he wrote them, so that sometimes he allowed his pen to pass twice over the same lines; and his subsequent careful weighing and closely analysing and correcting every page, as it was read to him after having been deciphered by his secretary; and finally his re-perusing these corrected sheets written out for his use "in a large, clear, pike-staff hand," and giving them another thorough and careful examination; these exhibitions of conscientious painstaking to avoid unjust representations do him great honor. That all this should be gone through with, whilst the nerve of Mr. Prescott's eye—his only eye—was gradually decaying, and he could use it but one hour a day, and that divided into two portions at considerable intervals from each other, proves, as his biographer says, that his life for more than forty years was one of almost constant struggle; of an almost constant sacrifice of impulse to duty; of the present to the future.

Of the eye that had been struck we are told, "no external mark indicated the injury that had been inflicted upon it," and



to common observation in society or in the streets, as in the well known case of the author of "Paradise Lost," no difference was perceptible between the injured eye and the other.

In the political questions of his country, Mr. Prescott took but little interest. "He was wont to say that he dealt with political discussions only when they related to events and persons at least two centuries old."

*The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell, Afterwards Mistress Milton.* Printed for M. W. Dodd, at 506 Broadway, New York. 1 vol. 12mo, pp. 271.

This charming work, the earliest and probably the best known of Miss Manning's many pleasant contributions to that remarkable species of literature of which DeFoe's "History of the Plague" is the type, well deserves the handsome form of publication which graces the little volume now lying before us. The restoration of the antique model, in type, margin, and the *cue* at the foot of the page, is in excellent keeping with the quaintness of the language, spelling and modes of thought preserved in the text. This is in admirable taste, and helps to impress upon the reader the *tone* of the age. The text, indeed, conveys this impression so perfectly that the illusion is complete without any adventitious aid; only it is pleasanter to contemplate a picture in the style of framing suitable to the period represented. The style in which a young lady of the time of Charles the First would write, is happily caught and kept up with graceful ease throughout. One would imagine the author had thought and written in the quaint, old-world manner from childhood, so cleverly does she assume it, and so perfectly does she maintain it to the end. There is a rare grace in it, which no richness of modern phraseology, no stately march of rounded periods, no sparkling brilliancy of neatly-poised antithesis can match in real effectiveness. All other styles, compared with the Doric simplicity and Gothic strength of this, seem debased with the frippery of meretricious ornament. Test it and them by the tones they evoke from the human voice; and the false ring and hollow sound of prose in the modern measure will make you turn gladly

to sweet chimes of the speech our forefathers used. For prose has cadence and musical measure as well as verse; and both are the sweeter to hear for being attuned to the ear with artistic taste.

In this delightful Diary all is so natural, simple, and pleasant, that we linger over each incident with a strange unwillingness to leave it behind us. There is such a sweetness and grace in the way in which the young wife's tale is told that one must read the book itself to get any fair idea of its winning beauty of expression. But to those who have never seen it, some slight sketch of the story may not be unacceptable.

The occasion of this gay, country maiden's first meeting with Mr. John Milton (now spoken of without that needless title of respect) was when she, with brother Dick and the two Ponies, was enjoying that "mad Scamper through the Meadows and down the Lanes," which gives us so good a notion of the kind of life she has been leading hitherto. Let us see how she describes him on his first appearance. Riding in hot haste this madcap young lady comes "shorte upon a Gentleman walking under the Hedge, clad in a sober, genteel Suit, and a most beautiful Countenance, with Hair like a Woman's, of a lovely pale brown, long and silky, falling over his Shoulders." She sees him several times after this encounter, hears him much praised as a great scholar and a poet, and soon begins to dream about him. Very speedily Mr. Milton does his wooing; and, though the young heart of seventeen flutters a good deal with all the contradictory emotions that belong to such a time, she yields a ready assent, with the secret fear that she has "been too quickly wonne." After this comes a pretty confession, recorded on the morning that follows the betrothal:

"At first waking this Morning my Mind was elated at the Falsitic of my Mother's Notion, that no Man of Sense would think me worth the having; and soe I got up too proude, I think, and came down too vain, for I had spent an unusuall Time at the Glasse."

But the courtship discourse of her lover she finds rather too grave and wearisome for her taste; and, as specimens are given,

we confess a hearty sympathy with the lady. Then, the mother's return, her displeasure at the match, its hurried consummation, and the forebodings that accompanied it are described. The dreary home in London does not keep the young bride's spirits very bright; and when her husband leaves her alone for the first time, being about to resume his daily occupation, we find her making quite forlorn reflections. "Methought," she writes, "how much more I should like a Ride upon Clover than all the Books that ever were penned; for the Door no sooner closed upon Mr. Milton than it seemed as though he had taken alle the Sunshine with him; and I fell to cleaning the Casement that I might look out the better into the Churchyarde, and then altered Tables and Chairs, and then sate downe with my Elbows resting on the Window-seat, and my Chin on the Palms of my Hands, gazing on I know not what, and feeling like a Butterflie under a Wine-glass." Poor young wife! She was certainly out of place, joyous, light-hearted, little country-girl that she had been, now cooped up in a dismal city-room, hemmed in by London fogs, with wearisome old books for her only companions. After a time, however, she begins to take more pleasure in the life she leads, seeing occasionally people of somewhat congenial natures. But soon, in the midst of this dawning of better days, all prospects of wedded happiness are cut off by her fatal visit to her father's family, permission being obtained from her husband by a stratagem of brother Dick's. Just at this time, the bitter rancor of party-spirit is at its highest pitch, Mr. Milton's Puritanism exciting the disgust of her own family who are warm royalists. Mr. Milton's letters during her stay do not mend matters, for they are stern and fault-finding. A more gentle and loving tone would have been far more effectual with a nature like hers. Still, she loves him, and would go back at his bidding; but her father, incensed against "the Roundhead," most improperly detains her, sending away in a passion her husband's servant who had been sent to fetch her.

During the separation she sets to learning Latin, that she may surprise and please him when they meet again, and spends much time with her cousin, Rose Agnew, at Sheepscote, where

she had passed her first week of married life. While her good friends, Roger Agnew and his wife, are endeavoring to clear away the misunderstanding, the offended and ungentle husband publishes his book on Divorce. This unforgiving conduct naturally displeases the young wife and makes her averse to seeking reconciliation; and so, when her father sends to Sheepscode for her, she parts from her friends, though with an unhappy heart. On the death of Rose's child, she pleads with her father and gets leave to return to Sheepscode. There, Roger Agnew reasons with her, and gently but firmly condemns her wilfulness and waywardness. In that pious household she grows thoughtful and prayerful, at last finding the peace of heart that can only come from trust in God. After this visit, full of profit to her soul, she returns to her father's house, where she discovers in herself a new-found pleasure in reading, and also devotes much of her time to visiting the poor. She is thus being educated by sorrow and trial for sympathy with her husband's tastes. After a time spent here in improving her mind and wisely employing her hours, she makes another visit to Sheepscode. It is during this visit that she hears from Roger Agnew the pretty story of Milton's adventure in youth with the Italian lady, which we will repeat in the narrator's words:

“Why, I need not tell you, Moll, that John Milton, as a Youth, was extremelie handsome, even beautifull. His Colour came and went soe like a Girl's, that we of Christ's College used to call him ‘the Lady,’ and thereby annoy him noe little. One summer Afternoone he and I and young King (Lycidas, you know,) had started on a country Walk (the Countrie is not pretty, round Cambridge,) when we fell in with an Acquaintance whom Mr. Milton affected not, soe he sayd he would walk on to the first rising Ground and wait us there. On this rising Ground stood a Tree, beneath which our impatient young Gentleman presentlie cast himself, and having walked fast, and the Weather being warm, soon falls asleep as sound as a Top. Meantime, King and I quit our Friend and saunter forward pretty easilie. Anon comes up with us a Caroché, with something I know not what of outlandish in its Build; and within it, two Ladies, one

of them having the Fayrest Face I ever set eyes on, present Companie duly excepted. The Caroché having passed us, King and I mutuallie express our Admiration, and thereupon, preferring Turf to Dust, got on the other Side of the Hedge, which was not soe thick but that we could make out the Caroché, and see the Ladies descend from it, to walk up the Hill. Having reached the Tree, they paused in Surprise at seeing Milton asleep beneath it; and in prettie dumb Shew, which we watcht sharplie, exprest their Admiration of his Appearance and Posture, which woulde have suited an Arcadian well enough. The younger Lady, hastilie taking out a Pencil and Paper, wrote something which she laughingly shewed her Companion, and then put into the Sleeper's Hand. Thereupon, they got into their Caroché, and drove off. King and I, dying with Curiositie to what she had writ, soon roused our Friend and possest ourselves of the Secret. The verses ran thus:

Occhi, Stelle mortali,  
 Ministre de' miei Mali,  
 Se, chiusi, m'uccidete,  
 Aperti, che farete?

Milton coloured, crumpled them up, and yet put them in his Pocket; then askt us what the Lady was like. And herein lay the Pleasantry of the Affair; for I truly told him she had a Pear-shaped Face, lustrous black Eyes, and a Skin that shewed 'il bruno il bel non toglie'; whereas, King, in his Mischief, drew a fancy Portrait, much liker you, Moll, than the Incognita, which hit Milton's Taste soe much better, that he was believed for his Payns; and then he declared that I had beene describing the Duenna! Some Time after, when Milton beganne to talk of visiting Italy, we bantered him, and sayed he was going to look for the Incognita. He stooode it well, and sayd, 'Laugh on! do you think I mind you? Not a Bit.' I think he did."

How thoroughly feminine is the young wife's unspoken reflection upon this tale! See what her Journal says: "First class Geniuses are alwaies modest, are they?—Then I should say that Italian Lady's Genius was not of the first Class."

In the midst of the pleasant life at Sheepscote, she is called back to her father's house by her brother Robin's being brought away from the army very ill. She nurses him tenderly; and to the general joy his health is at last, though slowly, restored. Some time after, the nearness of Fairfax's army forces the whole family to retire to Oxford, where news soon reaches them of the sacking of Mr. Powell's house by the Parliamentarians. On the fall of Oxford, they return to the plundered home, from which Mistress Milton goes to stay with her uncle in London. Here the reconciliation takes place. Hearing her husband's voice in the next room, shortly after her arrival, she rushes in and falls at his feet. He gives her his forgiveness and takes her to his heart once more. Their future life is one of trust and love, though she notes a change in him, as he in her. "With Payn," she says, "I perceive a more stern, severe Tone occasionallie used by him; doubtlesse the Cloke assumed by his Griefe to hide the Ruin I had made within. Yet a more geniall Influence is fast melting this away." Reconciled at last, they find a happiness in each other's presence they had never felt before, confidence not being so much restored as created for the first time; and, when her father's ruined household leave no refuge to resort to, she is delighted by the hearty good-will with which her husband invites them to take shelter beneath his roof. The Journal ends here with an enthusiastic laudation of her husband, and with the prayer, "May it please God that my Mother shall like John Milton."

*The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined.* By the Right Rev. JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D. D., Bishop of Natal. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864.

It is not strange that this work of Bishop Colenso has created a sensation in the religious world. When the professed enemies of Christianity assail its foundations, no body is surprised; but in this case, a deadly attack is made upon its records by one who wears a mitre; one who, while he aims a mortal thrust at the faith of the Church, discharges the functions and enjoys the emoluments of a Christian bishop.

It is always a matter of some importance to know who an opponent is, and what are his position, his *animus*, and the end which he seeks to accomplish. The author's writings furnish us satisfactory information upon these points in regard to himself. It is significant that he professes to be shackled in his search after the truth and in his proclamation of it, by the creed of the Church with which he is connected. He has no use for Church formularies. They are the badges of slavery. Now we have always regarded it as self-evident that no man can definitely oppose a particular creed without having one of his own. He who contradicts a doctrine, holds one which is its contradictory; and he who opposes a system of doctrines, does it because he advocates another system which he regards as inconsistent with the first. The adherent and opponent of dogmas have, each of them, a creed. It is therefore but shuffling to declaim about the fetters of a creed. The real question in reference to any formulary is, Does it set forth the truth? If it does, then it cannot enslave, as it is the truth which makes us free. If it does not, then let it be rejected simply *because* it does not, and not on the ground that it is the property of creeds to fetter free inquiry. It makes nothing for Bishop Colenso's fairness that he speaks, in the outset of his work, in the dialect of the infidel. But what is the Bishop's creed, by which he is not shackled in his investigations of the truth? It is, according to his own confession, substantially that of the deistical school of infidelity. To show that we have not assigned him a false position, let us hear him speak for himself:

“Our belief in the living God remains as sure as ever, though not the Pentateuch only, but the whole Bible, were removed. It is written on our hearts by God's own finger, as surely as by the hand of the apostle in the Bible, that ‘God is, and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.’” (P. 53.)

That is to say, if we had no authoritative revelation of the gospel, the principles of natural religion would be sufficient to conduct us to a knowledge of the true God. Again, the author says:

“And it is, perhaps, God's will that we shall be taught in this our day, among other precious lessons, not to build up our faith

upon a book, though it be the Bible itself, but to realise more truly the blessedness of knowing that he himself, the living God, our Father and Friend, is nearer and closer to us than any book can be—that his voice within the heart may be heard continually by the obedient child that listens for it, and that shall be our teacher and guide in the path of duty, which is the path of life, when all other helpers—even the best of books—may fail us.” (P. 54.)

Having alluded to the fact that he had endeavored to show “the groundlessness of that notion of Scripture inspiration” which is held by believers, the bishop anticipates the demand which may be made upon him by those who may receive his theory, to supply the loss it has occasioned them, by saying that he cannot at present “answer fully to such a demand,” but trusts that he will be enabled to do so before his work is brought to a close. (!) Meanwhile, until this awful vacuum is filled, he refers troubled minds for comfort and support to his lately published Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. We have examined this work, and have no hesitation in saying that it is an attempt to make Paul inculcate the system of natural religion, while professing to expound the principles of redemption. If Lord Herbert could have been induced so far to depart from the morality of his creed as to have entered the Christian ministry, he might have produced just such an exposition of Romans as that furnished by this bishop’s hands. We cannot, in a brief notice like this, enter into detailed proofs. An examination of the Commentary will satisfy a candid reader that we have not misrepresented the author. Now he tells us himself, that though *published* after he had formed his opinion of the real nature of the Mosaic story, it was *written* long before. It is, therefore, clear that the bishop came to the study of the Mosaic records with the foregone conclusions of the deist. His difficulties, notwithstanding what he tells us in his Preface, did not arise from his examination of the writings of Moses. His principles led him to investigate them for the purpose of overthrowing them.

In addition to those already presented, other proofs from his work on the Pentateuch might be alleged to evince the deistical



opinions of the author. He tells us that we should teach our children not to rely on the Bible as an infallible record, and to receive its teachings only so far as they are authenticated by the judgments of "their own hearts." (P. 220.) He informs us that he could not accept the Pentateuch as a divinely inspired document, because it manifestly endorsed slavery, and that was shocking to his "heart and conscience." (P. 51.) We are also apprised that his "knowledge of some branches of science" had led him to discard as facts certain occurrences narrated in the Mosaic writings. His scientific knowledge convinced him that they never could have taken place. He "knew for certain," for example, "on geological grounds \* \* \* that a *universal* deluge, such as the Bible manifestly speaks of, could not possibly have taken place." He denies that the record admits of the supposition that it was a *partial* deluge. There could have been, therefore, no deluge at all. (P. 6.) In the same easy way he disposes of all that is supernatural and miraculous in the Mosaic records. Yet the bishop assures us in another place that he had been led to reject the miracles and supernatural phenomena of which an account is given, simply because of his discovery that the records themselves were historically untrue. Otherwise he could have swallowed all the stories of miracles, however stupendous they may have been. He confesses that he takes up the Pentateuch with the certain conviction induced by his scientific knowledge that these events could not have taken place, and yet he could have believed them had not the records been chargeable with historical inaccuracy! Of these two opposing statements, both given by himself, we are at liberty to take our choice. It is plain to our minds that his preconceived notions—founded upon his own judgments and his scientific knowledge—led him to deny first the facts of the miraculous events related in the Mosaic records, and then the historical accuracy of the writings themselves.

We have occupied so much space in considering the author's point of view, and the *animus* with which he undertook the critical examination of the Old Testament records, because we are persuaded that they materially affect the whole course of his

argument. The first part of his book consists of an attempt to destroy the authenticity of the Pentateuch, taking the term authenticity to indicate the truthfulness of its matter. Grant him his fundamental postulate that all that is supernatural and miraculous in the record is *impossible*, and his argument is formidable. Deny him that, and much of what he urges is wholly irrelevant and impertinent. The book is a challenge to believers in inspiration and miracles to meet him on his own ground—one on which no allowance whatever is made for the miraculous intervention of Almighty power. Who would meet him with this fatal concession? As well ask Samson to meet the Philistines when shorn of his locks. The *professed* argument of the author is: The Mosaic records state as facts events which could not possibly have taken place; they are consequently historically false; therefore, the accounts which they give of miraculous operations cannot be depended on. Substitute for the first proposition of the above series the impossibility of miracles, and you have his *real* argument: miracles are impossible; the Mosaic records state that they occurred; those records are therefore untrue. Assuming that miracles are impossible, the bishop's argument is a requisition upon believers in the authenticity of the Mosaic writings to show that, *on natural principles*, the events which they record are not impossible. Our answer is, that such a demand is absurd, since we only affirm the possibility of certain events recorded by Moses on the supposition of miraculous agency, and we deem the fact of that agency having been employed susceptible of proof. It would be suicide in us to give up miracles. We will not enact the folly of the Highland chieftain who, on the eve of mortal combat, threw down his targe, and thus exposed himself to the thrusts of his expert antagonist. Many of the bishop's impossibilities, based upon labored arithmetical calculations, would vanish if taken into the miraculous light that beamed from the Pillar of Fire.

The second part of the author's book consists of an elaborate effort on philological grounds to subvert the genuineness of the Pentateuch—to show that Moses could not have been its author. The reasoning of the bishop upon this question, we regard as

characterised by nothing more than specious ingenuity. We cannot, however, in consistency with the limits of a notice like this, enter into a detailed examination of his arguments, and must simply refer our readers to writers upon the genuineness of the Pentateuch, and to those especially who have undertaken to answer him.

This attack of bishop Colenso upon the authenticity and genuineness of the Mosaic writings is nothing short of an assault upon the whole canon of Scripture and the integrity of Christianity itself, so far as it is differenced from natural religion; for it is clear that our Saviour and the apostolic writers endorsed the credibility of the Pentateuch, as being both authentic and genuine. The author feels the force of this consideration, and endeavors to set it aside by the extraordinary assertion that the limitation imposed by ignorance upon the human faculties of Jesus rendered it impossible that he should see the difficulties which have not escaped the scrutiny of a bishop!

The records of our Faith have withstood the storms of ages, and we are not without hope that they will survive the recent onset of this Episcopal sceptic—this redoubtable champion of arithmetical infidelity. Memory suggests the fact that a bishop (Acts i. 20) betrayed the Saviour himself, but only contributed by his treachery to the accomplishment of redemption.

*A Critical History of Free Thought in Reference to the Christian Religion: being the Bampton Lecture for 1862.* By ADAM STOREY FARRAR, A. M., Michel Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. D. Appleton & Co. New York. 1866. 8vo. pp. 487.

A book worthy of its place in the Bampton series of Christian Apologetics. It proposes a critical analysis of scepticism and unbelief *in one direction* chiefly, viz., the intellectual causes which have helped to produce it. The emotional or moral causes, (perhaps the more important,) the author thinks more appropriate to a biographical treatment of the subject; and for the super-human or Satanic influences, which may be traced in this fearful war of human opinion against the glorious gospel of the blessed

God, he refers us to Bishop Van Mildert's *History of Infidelity*. (Boyle Lectures.)

Thus disencumbered, the subject is still very extensive, quite too much so for satisfactory treatment in eight popular lectures. The historical picture is somewhat indistinct. The canvass is too narrow, for all the characters and all the phases of thought which have to be crowded upon it, and consequently the impression made upon the eye is confused and indefinite. The author himself feels this, and hence, like his predecessors, he has been forced to resort to explanatory notes and preface, which occupy more than a fourth of the volume, and sadly disfigure it. We have sometimes wished that the whole series of the *Bampton lectures* could have been rewritten, so that both introduction and explanatory notes might be incorporated, and the *Lectures* constitute one undivided whole.

The Preface and Introductory Lecture, together with the latter half of the Eighth Lecture, are the best part of the book, unfolding the philosophical principles upon which the whole is based, and deducing conclusions justified by the analysis. The author takes occasion to allude to the terms "free thought" and free thinking," as being "now commonly used, at least in foreign literature, to express the result of the revolt of the mind against the pressure of external authority in any department of life or speculation." We must here notice the self-satisfied vanity of the sceptics who have evidently had the making up of this name, and who have overlooked the motto of Paul, (a greater free-thinker than any of them,) "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

The eighteen centuries of Christian history, the author divides into four periods or "crises." The first crisis was produced by the conflict of Christianity with pagan philosophy, A. D. 160 to A. D. 360; the chief opposers being Lucian, Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles, and Julian the Apostate. With the death of the last named the hopes of heathenism depart. It lingers only in the prejudices of the people, for Christianity is firmly established. In the West, paganism only pleads for toleration, and murmurs that Teutonic invasions evince the displeasure of the neglected

gods. In the East, it disappears and doubt expires, for speculation ceases and Christian thought is fixed. Thus truth has gained, not lost, in this first conflict of reason with Christianity. The Church meets unbelievers by apologetic treatises, and Gnostics by dogmatic decisions. The truth which is thus brought out in the literature stimulated by Gnosticism; in the apologies created by unbelief; and in the creeds by which heresy was protested against; this is the permanent result which the world has gained from this first struggle.

A period of more than seven hundred years passes—a period of social dissolution and reconstruction when new races appear, new institutions enter on the stage, and new languages take the place of the old. The second crisis begins when the scholastic philosophy begins to influence religion, and ends when classical learning is revived. It runs from A. D. 1100 to A. D. 1400. This is a conflict of deeds as well as ideas; a social as well as a religious struggle. There is the dissolution of the feudal system; there is the theocratic centralisation in the popedom; there is the struggle to vindicate the liberty of the State against the undue power of the Church. Free thought in the middle ages is at once Protestantism, Scepticism, and Ghibellinism.

The intellectual action in this crisis is marked by four forms: 1. The scholastic philosophy applied to theology becomes the means of producing heresy or scepticism. The renowned Abelard, famous alike in philosophy and in song, was a Nominalist, and nominalism was essentially the spirit of progress, of inquiry, and of criticism. 2. The idea that Christianity as then existing, was to be replaced by a better religion, embodies itself in the “everlasting gospel” of the abbot Joachim, and creates unspeakable alarm. 3. Another potent idea was that of the comparative study of religions. The crusades were expiring, for both the danger that evoked them and the enmity that supported them were passing away. Europe had relations of commerce, if not of amity, with Mahometan nations; and through contact had come to measure them by an altered standard, and to acquire the idea of *comparing religions*. Thus commenced a latitude of thought in many parts of Christendom. 4. The doctrine of

VOL. XVII., NO. 1.—19.

absorption of souls in the Mahometan philosophy of Averroes, a commentator on Aristotle and contemporary of Abelard, in some degree gave rise to the disbelief in immortality to which there appears a tendency at the close of the thirteenth and during the fourteenth century.

The third crisis runs from A. D. 1400 to A. D. 1625. The classical revival now stimulates activity of mind and freedom of inquiry. A new world is discovered. The great religious changes of the Reformation occur. Meanwhile there are two principal movements of unbelief—the one literary, the other philosophical. In the former movement, we see the burlesque poetry of the time ridiculing religion, and we hear distinguished men, such as adorned the court of the Medicis, expressing anti-Christian sympathies. In the second movement, we find pantheism, derived from Averroes, manifesting itself in the philosophical studies of the University of Padua. Both these movements were confined to Italy. Protestantism is a form of free thought, but only in the sense of a return from human authority to that of Scripture. Among the Reformed nations, there is hardly now a trace of scepticism. The spiritual earnestness which mingled with the intellectual movement in the Reformation, kept free thought from producing rationalism or unbelief.

The fourth crisis begins with the seventeenth century through the effects of the philosophy of Bacon and DesCartes, and runs on to the present time. Deism in England, and infidelity in France, Germany, and America, are fully detailed in successive lectures. And the work closes with a valuable summary of the whole, and with inferences as to our present dangers and duties.

This volume opens up a department of "mental pathology" full of interest to the Christian student, and very affecting to the heart of the Christian pastor. Few can look round upon the circle of their friends or upon their congregations without observing some in whom faith is stifled by sceptical doubts. The author calls repeatedly on the Church to awake to her important duties in this regard. Whatever may be attempted ought to be attempted in that tone of Christian kindness which marks this

volume. We must not drive away the honest doubter from us, and from the truth, which it is given to us to maintain. Argument should never be lost in vituperation, nor the *error* be passed by to attack the *man*.

We rise from a perusal of this book with an adoring sense of the mysterious wisdom of Providence, who suffers his truth to advance through antagonism; and we turn with increased love and confidence to his Holy Catholic Church, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail.





# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVII.—NO. II.

---

SEPTEMBER, MDCCCLXVI.

---

ARTICLE I.

## THE BENEFITS OF INFANT BAPTISM.

It is not our purpose, in this article, to show the warrant which the Church has for the practice of infant baptism; either by reproducing the arguments and proofs which her talent and learning have so abundantly furnished, or by the presumptuous attempt to bring forward new arguments. We propose the humbler but important task of considering the advantages of this practice, of answering the utilitarian question so often asked, *cui bono?*—asked with triumph and complacency by the polemic, and yet with honest doubt by some who seek to know the truth. We wish to look at the subject on its practical side. Let us premise, however, that the validity and obligation of this practice do not by any means turn upon the question of its advantages. No matter how many benefits we might show to arise from it, unless we believed that we have divine authority for it, we would not dare to continue it. We have no right to

VOL. XVII., NO. 2.—1.

originate or to perpetuate religious ordinances even for the good they may do, however great. God has prescribed these in his inspired word, and it is presumptuous for us either to add to, or take away from their divinely appointed nature, number, form, or application. So, on the other hand, if we were unable to see any advantage arising from the application of baptism to the infants of believers, we would feel ourselves and would be bound by the word of God to continue it. As we have no right to make beneficial results a warrant, so we have no right to demand them as a condition for our observance of any law or institution of Heaven. Still, as the minds of many are biassed against infant baptism by their failure to see and appreciate its benefits; and as many, even in pædo-baptist churches, have very inadequate views of this point, which influence both their convictions and their conduct, there may be logical as well as practical worth in this discussion. A correct estimate of these benefits, and such a participation in them as is fully within the reach of the Church, would remove the prejudices which are so common, and which prevent many from appreciating the scriptural warrant for this practice.

Let us, in the outset, make two disclaimers, that we may run no risk of being misunderstood. First, we ascribe to this ordinance no necessary saving efficacy; either as securing pardon and eternal life without that change of heart which produces faith in Jesus Christ and repentance for sin, by what is called *sacramental grace*; or as securing that change of heart by what is called *baptismal regeneration*. We believe that many who have been lawfully baptized, both as adults and infants, may have been lost. As our Confession teaches, "Grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated." Secondly, we do not claim that parents who are unfaithful have any right to expect any benefit whatever, either as above described or any other that is truly spiritual. Baptism even to the children of such parents may involve blessings, but they do not come in the parental line. The general position on which this disclaimer rests is true with respect to all

the means of grace, all the ordinances and institutions of religion, and all the promises of God's word. All these imply that those who avail themselves of them do so in good faith, with sincerity and honesty, with faith in God, and with a full purpose to comply with the conditions annexed. To expect benefit in any other way from any observance, either human or divine, is both preposterous and presumptuous.

But we have to guard not only against the extreme of superstition and presumption, but also against the opposite extreme of placing too low an estimate upon the practical value of this ordinance of God. And doubtless the second extreme is a reaction against the first. Protestants are in danger of despising the sacraments of Christ, by placing them upon a level with human ceremonies as depending for their wholesome influence wholly upon their moral power; by ignoring that feature of them which consists in *sealing* the benefits of which they are visible signs; by overlooking the fact that they are attached to a divine *covenant*, in which God has distinctly and positively promised spiritual blessings to all who truly enter into covenant with him in the observance of these sacraments; and thus depriving them of all real efficacy. This is to make void the ordinance of God. The sacraments have indeed no intrinsic power to save, renew, or sanctify. Their power is all of God. Nevertheless, power does attach to them, because God does employ them as channels and means of saving grace, and does invite us to approach and seek him through them, and to expect in their due observance blessings which, ordinarily, he does not confer otherwise. Why shall we say that baptism has no efficacy whatever, because its benefits are not tied to the ordinance, and both invariably and exclusively associated with it; because they are not therefore in the hands of the administrator? Is there but one kind of efficacy, and but one method and condition of its operation? Baptism seals a divine covenant promising certain spiritual blessings; and when duly observed, those blessings, we contend, will be conferred. If this be not so, then we are at sea as to the meaning and value of a covenant, and do not understand the faithfulness of a covenant-keeping God.

We are now prepared to state what are the real benefits connected with the administration of Christian baptism to the infants of believers.

The first, most important, and that which virtually includes every other, is that in the due observance of this practice, such parents secure the fulfilment of God's promise in the salvation of their children. This may seem, thus stated, a startling proposition, and may need explanation. Our preliminary remarks, however, show that we do not mean that God will save such children, or any of them, without those spiritual qualifications which his word elsewhere demands, whether we suppose them to die in infancy or in maturity. If he saves at all, 'it is through Christ's atoning blood and the Spirit's renewal of the heart. The promise to save is the promise to regenerate, pardon, and sanctify. But further, we do not say that God will save, or that he promises to save all baptized children, even if their parents are sincere Christians, and do some or even many things to carry out their covenant engagements. This is what we mean: that those parents who heartily and truly dedicate their children to God in baptism, faithfully comply with the covenant in their training, and finally believe God's promise therein, do secure thereby the salvation of their souls. This is only a practical form of the doctrine of our Confession on this subject: "The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, *by the right use of this ordinance*, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and *conferred* by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time." Chap. xxviii. sec. 6. Without embarrassing this discussion by introducing the subject of election, we simply remark that we regard "the right use of this ordinance" by parents as consisting in that faith and fidelity of which we have just spoken; and that as God executes "the counsel of his own will" by the use of appropriate means, he saves the baptized children of his people through that "right use of this ordinance." Those parents who dedicate their offspring to God truly, in humble reliance on his covenant, and

prove that sincerity and faith by due care and diligence in their training, secure not merely the probability, but the certainty of the salvation of their children, "in God's appointed time." Certainty is the distinguishing attribute and advantage of a covenant. God enters into such a compact in order to assure his people that, in the due observance of the conditions upon their part, they may confidently expect the promised blessings.

We are aware that this explanation narrows down the application of our position, since such faith and fidelity are rare. But they have existed and do now exist in the Church of God. And we firmly believe they have secured, and will secure, in every case, the salvation of those children on whose behalf they are exercised. If we are faithful to the covenant, we may feel sure God will be. This alone constitutes the ground of absolute certainty. And yet our position does not utterly discourage those who exhibit only a less degree of this faith and fidelity. According to our faith, so will it be unto us. The more firmly a parent is enabled to believe God's promise, and the more earnest, constant, spiritual, and prayerful he is in his teachings, discipline, example, and general influence, the greater certainty will he attain of securing the covenanted blessing.

Will any complain that this advantage is worthless or insufficient, because thus limited and conditioned? If so, then they are demanding that God shall bestow the promised blessings of a mutual compact, while they refuse or fail to meet the obligations which that compact imposes upon them. If there are no such conditions, then God must grant his saving grace to the offspring of worldly, prayerless, unfaithful parents, and even of hypocrites, simply because they have been baptized. We might just as well expect him to bestow the blessings of the covenant without baptism at all, and thus adopt universalism at once. The observance of such conditions is required by the best interests of parents themselves, as well as by the universal law of the divine administration.

Again, it may be objected, that this view shows that there are no advantages peculiar to baptized children, since, after all, it makes their salvation turn upon the faithfulness of their parents.

We have two things to say in reply. First, the same objection, if it has force, applies equally to the use of all the sacraments, ordinances, and means of grace. Of what use is it to hear the gospel, if you do not believe and obey it? Of what use is prayer, if not accompanied with faith, repentance, and a good life? Of what use is the Sabbath, if it be not kept holy? Of what use is the Lord's Supper, if you do not therein discern, by faith, the Lord's body, sincerely remember him, and truly dedicate yourself to him? Yea, of what use is baptism to an adult, if he have not faith and a new heart, and be not true to his baptismal engagements? Who, then, shall say that since your formal dedication of your child to God in holy baptism, can do him no good in your failure to act in accordance with that solemn covenant transaction, therefore this practice has no benefit whatever attending it, and may be neglected? Secondly, this objection overlooks all the advantages pertaining to God's covenant, in compliance with which this parental faithfulness is required, and by which the success of that faithfulness is secured. All know that the utmost parents can do has no efficacy in itself. The efficacy is of God alone. What assurance have we, however, that God will ever exert his renewing power? Is it not his promise? But the particular promise to save the seed of his people is contained in his covenant, of which baptism is the seal. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." This was the Abrahamic covenant, of which circumcision was the certifying seal, which was administered to infants eight days old, and yet promised spiritual blessings. It was to this covenant Peter evidently referred on the day of Pentecost when he said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children." As God required the Jew to bring up his circumcised children in the way of truth and godliness as the condition of becoming "their God," so does he require the Christian parent to bring up his baptized children in the nurture

and admonition of the Lord as the condition of his becoming their Saviour. There must be care and faithful effort. But they must be exercised in faith—faith in God's covenant—a faith which recognises our unworthiness of the blessing and the inefficacy of our efforts to secure it, and which relies on the gracious promise of God. Now, we contend that since this promise is contained in the covenant of which baptism is the appointed seal, the true and proper expression of our faith in that promise consists in the dedication of our children to God in the ordinance of baptism. We contend that doing thus, we lay claim, in the most legitimate and emphatic manner, to the fulfilment of that covenant. We do not, indeed, create an obligation on God's part to convert our children; but by thus entering into covenant with him, affixing to our children his appointed covenant seal, we do obtain a hold upon him not otherwise obtained. We urge a plea strong as his word, his throne, his immutable faithfulness. And we gain an argument in prayer, and a ground of hope as well as a stimulus to effort on behalf of our dedicated offspring. No Christian can fail to appreciate this advantage. When we tell you, therefore, that in offering your children to God in baptism, you enter into a covenant with him, in which he promises to bless your Christian efforts, weak and worthless in themselves, to the salvation of your children, we tell you of a benefit connected with this practice worth more than ten thousand worlds. We admit that many Christian parents are faithful in training their children, who yet do not have them baptized, and that such are often blessed in the conversion of their children. And yet no one can show that such efforts have not an assurance of success immeasurably greater, when connected with the application of the covenant seal. This is God's chosen way of honoring himself, and in both dispensations he has sought to lead his people into it. He would have us use all means, but not trust in them. He would teach us that all our blessings are of grace, and accordingly, as Paul teaches, both in Romans and Galatians, makes them the subjects of promise or covenant. He prefers, therefore, that our faith rest on his covenant rather than upon his mercy alone. The Church has

lost just in proportion as it has disregarded the doctrine of the covenants which underlie the whole plan of salvation and all God's relations to his people.

But to resume. We seem to have conceded an equal degree of faithfulness in the training of children in those who neglect and in those who observe the practice of infant baptism. But we admit this, not as a general, but only as an exceptional fact. Hence we notice as a second or rather secondary and subsidiary benefit of this practice, that it has a powerful influence in securing the required faithfulness by the parent. The very nature of baptism, and all that is involved in the act of having it administered to his children, must impress him with the importance and sacredness of his relations to them. We speak of the father as the head of the family and the leader in this act, but of course it is understood that the mother is associated with him in every part of this proceeding. Consider what it includes and signifies. God has intrusted these children to him as his own subjects, as immortal beings, as members of his visible Church, as destined for solemn responsibilities, and as candidates for immortality. The parent now recognises this trust and acknowledges that his children belong to God; he gives them up to him; solemnly dedicates them to him; and promises to bring them up for his service and glory. How fearfully solemn his position; how tremendous his responsibilities! He is now called on to act, not merely as a parent having a natural interest in his offspring, and led by parental affection to seek their highest good, but as God's agent in their training, and as their spiritual representative in their relations to God. He stands between these two parties, and acts for both in this important transaction. In an inferior, but still a significant sense, he is their mediator. Let no one be shocked by this use of such a sacred term. But when we consider all that is involved in the position of the parent, and all the offices he has to perform, we cannot fail to see a most striking analogy between his relations and offices to his children and those of our great Redeemer to his people. We write it with reverence. We refer to it only as an analogy, with due regard to the immense difference in dignity, authority, and excellence.



We use the comparison because it illustrates the true position of the parent, and shows that he is to seek the same great and blessed ends with Christ himself, viz., the enlightenment, purification, and salvation of the soul.

Thus: Is he not the prophet of God in the midst of his household, to instruct them in all divine truth, to receive from God and deliver to them his inspired word, the law, the ordinances, the revealed purposes, the promises, and the doctrines which he has given, and by repetition, explanation, and exhortation, to seek to imbue their minds with these holy and saving influences?

Is he not a priest, first to stand before his children as God's representative, then to present them as an offering to Jehovah, not indeed as an atonement, but in recognition of God's covenant claim to them as the lambs of the Redeemer's fold, and then to intercede for them, before his domestic altar and in his closet, pleading continually for their salvation, especially while they are incapable of praying for themselves?

And is he not likewise a king in his household, invested by God with authority over his children to guide, to govern, to restrain, to chastise, and, in all respects, to regulate their conduct? Does he not also act as their defender against all enemies?

Who, then, can fully estimate the sacredness of this position and the importance of these offices? The mere thought ought to be enough to impress him most deeply with a sense of the awfulness of his functions as a Christian parent—functions which are the result not merely of the parental relation, or even of sanctified parental love, but of a covenant relation in which he has a conspicuous and responsible part. But when associated with the solemn administration of baptism to his children in his own name, in God's house, and by God's minister, by a public and formal ceremony, how much must this impression be enhanced! How must it arouse every feeling of his pious and parental heart, sanctify his natural affections, and turn the whole current of his domestic influence into a sacred channel! He must act now not simply as a parent, but as God's minister, and the divinely appointed priest to the church in his house, and guardian of the souls of his children. He is an under-shepherd to the lambs

which Jesus has intrusted to his hands and placed in the paternal bosom. It would be very strange if all this failed to exert a powerful influence in securing parental faithfulness. Facts, however, prove that it does not.

But further, the parent who presents his children for baptism takes upon himself solemn vows to discharge all these sacred functions to his now consecrated offspring, and to that God to whom he has thus formally surrendered them. He binds his own soul by an awful invocation of the divine name, and deliberate pledges of fidelity. Reckless and hard must that parent's heart be, if this does not deepen his impressions of responsibility; and false indeed must it be, if this fail to stimulate him to effort, to care, to diligence, and to prayerfulness in his great work! And every recurrence of this solemn scene in the sanctuary, though it be not the baptism of his own children, must revive and strengthen these impressions.

This leads us to notice a third advantage arising from this practice in connexion with its influence upon the Church and its officers. They, too, are parties in this covenant. These baptized children, born indeed in the Church, are now by this act formally recognised as within its pale. They are in the Church, not to enjoy all the privileges any more than to attempt all the duties belonging to adult membership, but to prepare for them. Their position is analogous to that of the minor in the State. They are entitled to the constant care, protection, instruction, training, and prayers of the Church, which becomes responsible for their spiritual welfare as far as that lies within its power. The injunction, "Feed my lambs," came from the same lips which uttered the command, "Feed my sheep," and was addressed to the same parties. If there be any difference, more care, exertion, prayer, and tender and solicitous affection, should be lavished upon the children than upon the adult members. Every possible means should be employed to train them for holy usefulness and final salvation. This, in fact, is the grand work of the Church. It should make wise and ample provision for these precious souls, not only by Sabbath-school instruction, which, though a most valuable auxiliary not to be dispensed

with, but faithfully sustained, has been made too generally a substitute for both parental and ecclesiastical instruction; but also by pastoral visitation, instruction, prayer, and watchfulness, in which the eldership ought fully and diligently to co-operate; by mild and gentle but faithful admonition; by constantly reminding these minor members of their real connexion with the Church, and the consequent obligations resting on them even now, and the higher obligations and privileges to which they are destined, and for which they should be preparing.

These duties have, indeed, a partial basis in the general obligation to do good to all within its reach. But they have a broader basis and a stronger claim in the covenant-relation recognised by baptism—a rite which seals their membership in God's house, and constitutes their visible and admitted title to all the Church can do for them in this relation. This truth should come with fresh power upon the conscience of the Church every time an infant receives the covenant seal. We do not say that the Church performs these duties faithfully. We admit great delinquency, neglect, and sin. But it is because in every thing which man touches, there is so much difference between duty and performance; between theory and practice; between inculcated and professed truth and truth lodged in deep conviction and issuing in right action. Still, we affirm that wherever in the Church, the doctrine and practice of infant baptism in its true import are maintained, there is a deeper sense of obligation to the children of the Church, and more earnest and faithful effort to train them for God and heaven. Others, indeed, engage in such efforts; but necessarily with lower views of this great duty, with less encouragement, and, we believe, generally with less success. Much of their actual interest, we have no doubt, is due to the collateral influence of pædo-baptist churches. We say this in no spirit of arrogance. We boast not of triumphs in controversy in the way of proselyting others to our denominational practices. We claim a nobler and far more valuable influence in the inculcation of higher views of the position of children in the kingdom of God, its importance, its sacredness, its responsibility. We believe that just in proportion as the

views which we advocate have obtained in any particular locality. so much the more attention has been given to the religious training of children, and so much the deeper impressions of parental obligation have prevailed, even amongst those who reject infant baptism. As an illustration of this, we have known one instance, at least, in which a Baptist minister of high standing, habitually dedicated his children to God, not indeed by baptism, but in a public and formal manner in God's house. The heart of the truly Christian parent is bound to respond to the great truths which underlie this practice. It is that response which we seek, both in our own and in other communions, by all we are now saying.

We are persuaded that it is not the theoretical and controversial, but the spiritual and practical view of this subject which makes the truest and best impression. Fidelity on the part of the Church to her baptized children would end all dispute, and eventually bring the whole Christian world to the adoption of this practice. Even as it is, the benefit of infant baptism is amply shown by facts. It has exerted a powerful influence. It has elevated the views, touched the consciences, strengthened the faith, encouraged the hopes, and enlarged the efforts of the Church on behalf of the young. But whatever may be done outside of our own Church by the circulation of the truth on this subject, we feel sure that it would do more than any other one thing to save our own children, now in so much peril, and to extend the borders of our Zion. We need more instruction as a Church in regard to the practical aspects of this subject, and greater efforts should be made by our ministers to arouse the hearts of our people until they shall feel and endeavor to discharge this paramount duty, from the neglect of which we are now suffering sadly.

We cannot close even this partial enumeration of the benefits of infant baptism without referring to its direct influence upon the baptized child himself. This of course is not felt at the time of administration. We freely admit that this ordinance cannot exert any spiritual influence upon the ignorant and unconscious babe. He can be benefited then only through the faith and

prayers of the parent; just as the child of Jewish parents, circumcised at only eight days of age, when presented in true faith. Such faith always secures God's blessing. But this whole discussion shows that the benefits of this practice do not depend upon the knowledge or feelings of the child at the time of its administration, nor are they to be expected in the absence of all faithfulness on the part of the parent. The influence to which we now refer is that which is felt when the child arrives at years of discretion, under the teachings of the Church and of his parents. If allowed to grow up in spiritual ignorance, without religious culture, without restraint, and under the impression that he is an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, of course we can expect no good results from his mere baptism. But let both the Church and the parents teach him his true position, remind him of the obligations of his baptism, which bind him as well as them, assure him that he has been solemnly set apart from worldly and sinful ends for God's holy service, that he really belongs to God's Church, and can never annul the obligations which have been assumed for him; let them instruct him faithfully in divine things, teach him the truths signified and the vows implied by his baptism, endeavor by earnest efforts to persuade him to assume these vows, seek to restrain him from vice and evil companionship, and by all means, and constantly, cling to him as a member of Christ's kingdom; let this course be pursued, and we venture the assertion that no one will then have occasion to doubt the utility, much less to affirm the evil tendency of this practice. The fact must be admitted that both the Church and parents are greatly at fault as to all this. The children of Zion are too often treated as strangers. Their sacred relation is ignored. Their birth-right is denied them. Many are careful to affix the seal, but as careless to secure the inheritance for their consecrated children. It is time the Church were more practical in her views of this subject, and had ceased to end her efforts with the mere ceremony of baptism, or with mere early training. We must treat this minor membership more as a reality. This will silence cavils. This will wipe off the stigma so often affixed to us, unjustly, it is true, but having some prac-

tical ground in our unfaithfulness. Above all, this will secure from a faithful God, for ourselves and our children, the priceless blessings of that covenant whose sacred seal we have had applied to us and to them.

---

ARTICLE II.

THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE AS A TRAINING OF  
THE MIND.

The question, which, at the present day, most of all divides opinion among the friends of liberal education, is the relative amount of time and the scope which ought to be assigned, in our schools and colleges, to the study of the languages. In this country especially, where a readier hearing is given to every demand for what is practical, and men approve by preference what is promptly available for profit in life and learning, the advance of a more materialistic theory of education seems to threaten an ascendancy which is alarming to those who hold to the old and long undisputed belief, that the study of language, but especially of the so-called classic languages, provides the best and most varied forms of excitement and practice for the opening and strengthening mind. The present writer belongs to this class; and desires in the observations which follow, to offer a sincere, if inconsiderable, contribution to the defence of this discipline.

We propose to confine our view to one single aspect of the subject; for a general defence of the "humanities," did it seem otherwise more called for than it does, could hardly be embraced within our present limits, nor would it necessarily contain the argument which in our opinion should now be principally opposed to the most serious objections urged against the study of lan-

guage—objections urged, if not with justice, yet with an apparently increasing practical effect.

The study of language, in the larger and current sense of these words, is not restricted for its material to that objective mass of thought-bearing sounds or signs which are collected in lexicons and described in grammars, that is, to words and their necessary and actual relations: it is popularly and commonly extended to embrace the artificial records of language, that is to say, *literature*, and that inclusive of both its form and its contents, and by consequence therefore, in some sense, to the whole field of human knowledge and sentiment. Accordingly, the teacher of languages in our schools is allowed or expected to teach poetry, rhetoric, and eloquence; more or less of logic, metaphysics, and philosophy; and the history of arts, of manners, and of nations.

Concerning a school which is active in all these departments, it would be simple to ask, whether its discipline were a healthy and useful one or not.

It is evident, then, that an inquiry growing out of the words which stand at the head of this article, must be far less extended, if it shall acquire any scientific interest, or have any practical bearing on the interests of education. The philology which we have here to treat of, must be purely linguistic in its character; and we shall address our attention strictly to the study of language considered as such.

It is to modern scholars that we owe it that this inquiry can be advanced beyond a few hesitating and uncertain steps. While it was the glory of the Greeks—the first fosterers of that spirit and practice of the speculative study of nature which constitutes the momentum of modern science—to develop a language unsurpassed for its richness of material, its variety and faithful delicacy of form; yet, for a long time, they made no effort to scrutinize the laws of this development, or to comprehend or portray the nature of this wonderful organism.

Plato *commenced* the inquiry in philosophic spirit, but with the smallest results, as we see from his Dialogues. And the subtle question disputed with so much sprightliness between

Socrates and Hermogenes in the *Cratylus*, whether words were from *nature*, or by *imposition*, was then, no doubt, incapable of the solution which remained to be evolved from the toilsome labors of students of our later time, who have observed, classified, re-examined, and reclassified phenomena in language which those men saw and heard, but did not heed; principles which they practised and contributed to establish, but all unconsciously; till finally, these men, beginning at the last and struggling back to the first, have left tracks behind them upon which the logician may advance; and men are now moving every where with the sure tread of scientific confidence through the midst of the vast mass of words and forms of speech, which formerly appeared obscure, fantastic, various without limit, and utterly intractable to scientific method.

If it were our object, at this time, to vindicate the claims of modern scholars to the conquest of the material of this department of study, to an advancement of the confines of this inductive method into the field of language, an examination would become necessary into the history of philology. But the comparative progress so laid bare, though highly interesting, and, in its place, important for the student of language, yet bears not upon the essential nature of the question which we now have in hand. Nevertheless, a decent respect seems to forbid us, in an inquiry of this kind, to pass by without any mention the names of men of whose accumulations and example we are the heirs; men who have devoted themselves to these pursuits now with keen ardor and bold, if often fruitless speculation, and now with patient and prodigious labor, unrewarded sometimes to them, but fruitful to us. A rapid survey of the most prominent points in the history of philology will be found also to subserve our present purpose.

It is in the dialogues of Plato that we see the first evidences of the Greek mind separating itself so far from the external part of the organism of language as to make it the object of observation and scrutiny. The speculative philosopher, however, addressed himself, not to a painful investigation of the laws of speech as his end in view, but leaped at once over the whole field now occupied by the science of grammar, and labored at the



ultimate problem of the origin of language, an inquiry which, in the Cratylus, is conducted on *a priori* principles. As might be expected from the application of this method in a region as yet unexplored, many of his conclusions or fancies as to the nature and application of names, are as false and ill-founded in reason as any of the word-derivations of a more or less superficially specious but inwardly hollow character, which in modern times have, until lately, kept the discipline of etymology in such ill repute. But whatever Plato may have failed to do, this at least he did, and apparently was the first among the Greeks to do: he pointed out language as an objective reality—a system of phænomena which invited research.

Since Plato, the study of language has never slept. The Stoics practised it with interest, adopting it among the materials of their philosophy. They regarded words, however, only in their relations to the mind, and contributed therefore little or nothing, it seems, to the establishment of a positive science of grammar.

First in the Alexandrian school of literati and philosophical critics, do we find a real step forward—and yet not many steps—made in this direction. Their business was to expound the mass of classic Greek literature, whose period of bloom had come to a close. While the character of their studies was principally literary and antiquarian, and the observations which they made upon the language were more critical and lexicographical than grammatical, yet they used at least the division of words according to the classification by “parts of speech,” which is still retained among the rudiments of rational syntax.

These studies had flourished at Alexandria for a hundred years, when the same spirit and the same method were transplanted to Rome, already deeply imbued with Greek literature, by Crates of Mallos (A. U. C. 588).\* And down to the latest days of the Latin literature, grammar in this sense was cultivated, till, if we stop our reckoning at Priscian,† we can count

---

\* See Suetonius, *Ill. Gramm.*, c. 2.

† Priscianus *Cæsariensis* fl. A. D. 510.

at least fifty names, extending over nearly seven hundred years, of men (including now and then one of great fame in other departments)\* who wrote upon the subject of language. But of not one of all this list can we find, either by what remains to us of their writings, or from the account given by Suetonius and others, of their studies, that they found,† or at least that they practised with efficiency any more rational method of philology than that of Erastosthenes or Apollonius of Alexandria. Their functions were primarily and mainly to expound the poets. And this they did by reciting them, and by editing‡ and annotating their text; the annotations containing antiquarian, historical, or other lore, and parallel passages from other authors, collected often by immense reading, and adduced for the support, in point of usage, of the forms of speech before them.§

In the earliest days of the study of grammar among the Romans, the character of this study was thus given|| by Terentius Varro (“*doctissimus Romanorum*”): “The functions of the grammarian consist of reading, verbal exposition, emendation, and criticism.” And none of the long line of subsequent Latin grammarians ever distributed their subject under categories more nearly coinciding with those under which the modern science of grammar is prosecuted. As to their method of treatment, let it suffice to refer to the laborious, indeed, but purely empirical

---

\* E. g.: M. Terentius Varro (*nat. A. U. C.* 638, *mort.* 727) and C. J. Cæsar.

† It is to be regretted that we have no remains (see the fragment in *Aul. Gell.* xviii. 8, 3 sq.) of the composition “*de Analogia*” addressed to Cicero, and written by the clear-headed and scholarly J. Cæsar. The title, the author’s name, and the words of Gellius (*Noct. Att.* 1, 10, and 19, 8) and Fronto, lead us to suspect that herein was contained at least an essay at a more rational treatment of languages. Fronto says that “during the fierce struggle of the Gallic war, he carefully elaborated the two books *de analogia*, and amid the shower of weapons he discussed the declension of nouns, the breathings, and the relative functions of words.

‡ As Varro did Plautus. See *Aul. Gell. N. Att.* iii. 3.

§ See Varro ap. *Diomed.* ii., p. 421, ed. Putsch.; *Quint. Inst. Orat.* i. 4; *Suet. Ill. Gramm.* c. 1; *Cic. Orat.* i. 42.

|| *Ap. Diomed.* l. 1.

handling of the division called prosody in our modern hand-books, and which we have by direct transmission from these writers; to which we add a brief quotation from the grammarian Diomedes, who wrote in the early part of the fifth century after Christ.

“Faults of speech,” says he, “may be generally described as these: obscurity, inelegance, and barbarism. Obscurity has eight species: acyrologia, pleonasmus, perissologia, macrologia, amphibologia, tautologia, eclipsis, and ænigma. Inelegance has five species: tapinosis, æschrologia, cacophonon, cacozelia, and cacosyndeton. Barbarism is divided into two parts: solœcismus and barbarismus, of which again there are many sorts.”\*

The same author says of the conjunction *et*, that it is used “first simply; then simply, but figuratively; then interrogatively; then indignantly; then confirmatively; then with a causal sense; then in an adjunctive and promissory sense; then adjectively; then ordinatively; then superlatively; and finally, diminutively.”†

\* Diomed. lib. ii. ap. Putsch. p. 443.

† Diom. lib. ii. ap. Putsch. p. 411. Seneca (Epp. 108) points out the different ways in which the same subject was treated by the philosopher, the philologist, and the *grammarian* of his time. He says: “Cum Ciceronis libros de Republica prehendit hinc philologus aliquis, hinc grammaticus, hinc philosophiæ deditus, alius alio curam suam mittit: philosophus admiratur contra justitiam dici tam multa potuisse. Cum ad hanc eandem lectionem philologus accessit, hoc subnotat: duos Romanos reges esse, quorum alter patrem non habet, alter matrem: nam de Servii matre dubitatur; Anci pater nullus. Eosdem libros cum grammaticus explicuit primum—*reapse* dici a Cicerone, id est *re ipsa*, in commentarium refert, nec minus *sepse*, id est *se ipse*. Deinde transit ad ea quæ consuetudo seculi mutavit.” The business of a grammarian, of which we here have a glimpse, was considered by this philosopher as so unworthy of a great mind, and so small a pursuit compared with the other aims in the study of literature, that, in the same chapter from which we have quoted, he goes on to say: “Sed ne et ipse, dum aliud ago, in philologum aut grammaticum dilabar, illud admoneo, auditionem philosophorum lectionemque ad propositum beatæ vitæ trahendam, non ut verba prisca aut ficta captemus et translationes improbas figurasque dicendi, sed ut profutura præcepta et magnificas voces et animosas, quæ mox in rem transferantur: sic ista ediscamus, ut, quæ fuerint verba, sint opera.”

So far our object has been to indicate, from an historical point of view, the prominent points in the history of grammar. This we have felt at liberty to do only in the most cursory manner to this point, and find ourselves obliged now to turn from it altogether. For the period which would next come under view,—that which intervenes between the revival of letters and our own day,—while it is brilliant with the discoveries which have remodelled old sciences and founded new ones, is big also with such important labors in the science of language, that the merest sketch in outline of the successively advancing phases of this discipline in modern times could hardly be compressed into a subordinate part of a short essay.

Petrarcha, Scaliger, Bentley, Wolf, Bopp have reached by a series of bold, successful, and sustained advances, a fixed and solid point, from which now the troops of eager students who have followed them can discern the tides as by generations and by ages they ebb and flow in the wide sea of words. To these great names, (and especially to the last three,) we chiefly owe the application of strictly scientific discrimination to the phænomena of language,—a process which has already produced a profusion of the richest results, bringing to light certain permanent and clearly discernible marks, according to which human speech may be divided into families, and, in each of these families, the principles which have ruled it in its rise, its bloom, or its disintegration and decay.

We claim then that the study of language can now be prosecuted as a science; and this is the one point which, in connexion with the subject before us, it concerns us to prove; for it is too plain to be denied that the discipline which is devoid of scientific principle cannot furnish a healthy exercise for the reason and its attendant functions; while, on the other hand, any system which requires the constant use of the logical powers, in the large sense in which this word is used, must be a useful training for the mind. “Science brings its own exercise,” is a remark of Tacitus. And this exercise is its use, so far as education is concerned. We need not ask for brilliancy nor for any other character of *discoveries* which are to be made; nay, no discov-

eries at all are necessary, but the free, unhindered, lawful play of the observation and the reason. It is the faculty of observation or discernment especially, whose training brings strength to the mind. This is the power which is born with the genius, and by this have all great inquirers been distinguished. We said discoveries need not be made. Mr. Stewart describes Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding as "the richest contribution of well-observed and well-described facts which was ever bequeathed by a single individual;" while Sir James Mackintosh remarks, "if Locke made few discoveries, Socrates made none, yet both did more for the improvement of the understanding, and not less for the progress of knowledge than the authors of the most brilliant discoveries."\*

But this faculty can find no play on material of artificial source or arbitrary character. We must decide these questions, then: Is a scientific method possible in grammar? or are the pretensions of modern philologists boastful? Is language an organism? Is it, in its elements, and in their internal and mutual relations, a system in such a sense the offspring of natural sources, as that natural laws do govern it? Are its phænomena the fruit of man's caprice; or are they, though vying almost in variety with the countless forms of human thought and fancy, yet subject nevertheless to these never-yielding laws which fancy too, even in its frolics, obeys—the laws of necessity? Such are the laws which form the woof and warp of all the web of nature: and as it is from their calm contemplation that the purified mind looks up to the Great First Cause, so their pursuit is the noble calling of science, a pursuit equally ennobling, elevating, strengthening to him who conducts it with a proper spirit, whether it carry him among the insects or among the stars.

The arguments to show that the material of speech is proper stuff for science, are *a priori* and *a posteriori*. In following the former method, we shall meet at once the question of the origin of language: If it be made by man upon arbitrary principles,

---

\* Essay on Bacon and Locke, by A. Potter.

then its laws—if, in that case, it can be said to have any—are certainly not natural laws; while, if it be the work of nature, even though framed by the instrumentality of the mind of man, then such laws must prevail, and a science of language is certainly possible.

We decline here to approach this obscure and abstract speculation, which since Plato has exercised many minds, and which, while it has been plied since the middle of the last century with particular interest and zeal, yet has not, even in the hands of Wilhelm von Humboldt, reached any positive or satisfactory issue.

It is with confidence, however, that we turn to the *a posteriori* evidence of our point, inasmuch as a glance at the proceedings actually instituted and successfully practised in grammar will be enough to show that a scientific treatment of language is possible, by showing it to be an accomplished fact—a treatment not indeed fully developed, but growing daily in inward strength and outward favor. Glancing backward for a moment, we might well ask whether the reasoning powers or their attendant functions of observation and memory could find any wholesome training in such exercises as those which we have quoted as a sample of the ancient treatment of grammar; and we might have quoted many similar examples from a more modern period. But it was only because grammarians were so long unconscious of, or, when they suspected, were at least unable to pursue the natural laws which pervade the matter with which they deal, that their classifications were effected in so arbitrary and artificial a manner.

Ordinary phænomena were listed according to any plan which might appear to have the advantage of convenience; and the anomalies, instead of being traced to new causes, natural and uniformly operating—in other words, to other laws, were huddled together, invested with learned names, and set aside in a sort of curiosity-shop of their own. “There is a kind of change of form in words,” says Diomedes, speaking of an appearance whose rise has been since rationally accounted for, “which is a barbarism, but which the learned, when they use it, call met-

aplasmos." This purely empirical method of procedure, while it is waning, and rapidly waning now,—even in England, at last, that conservative stronghold of the ancient and respectable,—yet has by no means disappeared; nor indeed can it be entirely dispensed with, until the scientific method has been sufficiently extended to occupy all the ground. But we have to show that such extension has already proceeded far enough to make it manifest that it shall certainly continue, and to invest this discipline with a scientific character.

Let us compare then, for this purpose, some of the laws of grammar with others of the so-called positive sciences. A law of natural philosophy relating to motion of free liquids says, "Running water will find a level equal to, or beneath the elevation of, its source." The law of "number" in grammar says, "In a given language a given form or forms will express an undivided conception of the mind; and another given and corresponding form or forms will express a group of similar conceptions." Both laws are reached precisely in the same way. Are both equally valid? Exceptions prove not any rule, but disprove it; hence, if we can find exceptions to either of these laws, their truth is destroyed. A number of apparent exceptions can easily be brought to the rule of grammar. Confining ourselves to one language, we have the words *populus* and *arena*, (which we may take as representatives of a large number of others,) denoting a group of things, while they wear the form appropriate to the expression of an undivided conception; while, on the other hand, we have *ædes*, for a house, *quadrigæ*, for a four-horse chariot, *altaria*, for an altar, *ligna*, for firewood, and *mella*, for honey.

We have said that these exceptions are not fatal to the law, since they are not real but only apparent. This will be seen after considering that the function of words is not to express *things*, but *ideas*. However divisible and actually divided may be the matter designated by *populus* and *arena*, yet the idea in the mind corresponding to these realities on the one hand, and these words on the other, may be and often is a unit. Again, however compact and isolated a house may be in fact, the conception of it may involve, and, in the Latin habit of thought,

actually did involve the idea of its group of apartments; so the thoughts in the conception of the thing designated by *quadrigæ* are separated, and form a group. This separation, occasioned by a consideration of the horses, is not logical indeed, when understood of the whole chariot, but there is no sort of necessity that it should be logical, as logic is but a very small part of what is represented by language, which may, of course, present ideas wholly irreconcilable with logic. So *ligna*, fire-wood, is a plural conception such as is natural, not only to the Latin mind, but also to the English, as we see by a similar use of the word *coals*, which is common in England.

Fronto\* was puzzled to know why *mella*, a plural form, was often used to denote the substance *honey*, while *milk*, for instance, was not similarly designated. But very brief reflection will serve to explain an Italian's conception of this substance in a multiplied sense, especially when we have read Pliny's three chapters† on the varieties of this favorite diet. Here we have described honey Sicilian, Hymettan, Hyblian, Cretan, Cyprian, and African, honey dark and honey bright, honey thick and honey thin, and honey of the spring, of the summer, and the autumn: surely a sufficient variety of aspects.‡

The law of grammar, as above enunciated, is good and firm then. How fares it with the law of physics? From the spheroidal form of the earth, it is plain that the mouth of the river Mississippi, among others, is farther from the centre of the earth than is its source: so that here we have a river actually flowing up hill. This is an exception, not apparent, but real and valid,

\* Aul. Gell. N. Att. 19, 8.

† Nat. Hist. lib. xi. c. 13, 14, 15.

‡ That such plural conceptions are natural and regular, and not arbitrary, may be illustrated, by the way, by a reappearance of this same tendency in regard to an appellative derived from this very word, and applied, in the English language, to a similar substance. From the plural of the word *mel* was formed, within the Latin language, the derivative word *mellaccum*, which denoted a sweet decoction from the must of wine. From this the French have the name *melasse*, and the English the word *molasses*, which we again find invested with the plural form.



so valid as utterly to overthrow the scientific value of the familiarly known law of a department of science much praised for its severity.\* That the physical phænomenon in question can be accounted for by another and more general law, is not here to the purpose to be remarked; the design being merely to vindicate for grammar its due, face to face with the other sciences, by a comparison of the strictness with which the canons of induction may be, and actually are applied in the fields respectively occupied by them.

There is great need, as we cannot but think, for a detailed exhibition of the state of this case. In the pursuit of such details alone will appear the proper force of the argument which we have designed to maintain, and which all the preceding remarks have been intended to subserve; but the undertaking is too large for our present limits; we commit and commend it to the interest and consideration of the reader, confident that the more his intelligent attention is directed to this matter, the better will he feel the claim which we have set up for the genuine nature of science in Language—a claim which, although no novelty, has been as yet too little acknowledged, or too slightly esteemed.

A late Latin grammarian† declares that the ruling principle which has guided him in the framing of his system is “the desire to trace the facts and phænomena of language to a philosophical or rational source”; and from his book you may illustrate the four methods of induction as given by Mr. Mill in his “System of Logic” as beautifully as this author has done from the region of physical science; and that too with a variety of material measured only by the possibilities of utterable forms of thought. Thus the signification of the moods is to be established by the “method of agreement;” the negative sense implied by the use of the words *quisquam* and *ullus*, in the Latin, by the “method of difference;” the phænomena known as attraction in language, by

---

\* We doubt whether the scientific value of this law of physics, rightly understood, can be invalidated. [Eds. S. P. R.]

† Zumpt, Lat. Gram., Introduction.

the "method of residues;" and the agreement between adjective and substantive words, by the "method of concomitant variations." Deduction has also ample play in this discipline. It is employed as well in the investigation of the formation of words and analogical forms of inflexion within the limits of a given language, as also, in the comparison of languages, in the determination of certain forms of words in one language, which, by clearly ascertained laws, must bear a given correspondence to certain other forms in another language occupying an antecedent or parallel place in the historical development of the parent stock to which they belong. A general law of this nature within the Latin language is, that "when to a stem ending in *on*, *ion*, the suffix for the diminutive, *ulus*, *ula* is added, the *o* in the stem becomes *u*."\* From this we may deduce the following: Out of *carbon*, the stem of *carbo*, we have *carbunculus* for a diminutive; out of *homon*, we have *homunculus*; from *avon* (a derived stem, *avo* enlarged by the formative *n*.) *avunculus*; from *oration*, *oratiuncula*; and from *concion*, *conciuncula*; all of which forms actually occur. Again, from a general law we deduce, that, the Sanscrit form being *aswas*, the Latin will be *equus*; Sanc. *sam*, Lat. *cum* (*quum*). Similarly, by a law controlling French formations from the Latin; the Latin being *manus*, the French will be *main* (by discarding the final syllable, and enlargement of the first); Lat. *panis*, Fr. *pain*; Lat. *canis*, Fr. *chien*; Lat. *rem* (acc.), Fr. *rien*; Lat. *carmen*,† Fr. *chdrme*; Lat. *facilis*, Fr. *facile*. Let these few random instances serve to suggest the countless others, by which it could be shown that deduction and induction are both at home in the study of language.

But if the study of language is thus seen to stand on an equal footing with the other departments of science, considered as a field for the exercise of the reasoning powers of the mind, are there not some other considerations which entitle us to assign it a comparatively higher place? The following appear to be some

---

\* See Corssen, *Aussprache*, etc. Vol. I., p. 263.

† Sansc. Vkr.

good claims to this distinction : 1. The material to be worked upon in the discipline of language is richer perhaps in its variety than that of any of the other sciences, a circumstance which offers a larger scope for the sharpening and exercise of the powers of observation and analysis, by which the marks of classification are discerned and fixed. 2. While we cannot go so far as to regard philology as coextensive with the whole field of human knowledge, as certain modern scholars seem still to hold, and as some of Plato's utterances would lead us to suppose was virtually his opinion, yet the history of this study has shown it to embrace the impulses, at least, of many sciences ; while a further consideration of its nature will make it evident that it necessarily involves the actual elements of some.\*

A word consists essentially of two parts: the outward sign and the thought. A word, therefore, cannot be known unless the thought be discerned; and to classify words and the forms of words is to classify thoughts and the forms of thoughts,—the principle of the classification in the case having as much right to be determined by the thought as by the sound. Hence the study of language necessarily involves the elements of a mental science.

But further, language is not a given, fixed, and unchangeable thing. As a system it grows, enlarges, culminates, declines, disintegrates, reassembles around new centres, and vanishes, perhaps, in some of its forms, from the face of the earth. To trace this history is a part of the business of the student of language, and to observe and arrange or logically to deduce the causes of these changes, is the now much-practised occupation of comparative grammar.

But what are these causes? To a large extent they are identical with the rudiments of the important science of ethnology,

---

\* NOTE. B. G. Niebuhr says, in a letter to the mother of a young friend: "Since philology is an introduction to all intellectual pursuits, he who plies this discipline in his school-days with such zeal as if he thought it were to be his life-long employment, prepares himself thereby for any other career which he may select to enter upon at the University."

and make up the primary data of historical criticism. It was by viewing the application of philology in this direction that the great philologist, Fr. Aug. Wolf, was led to say of the study of the ancient languages: "The aim of this study is no other than the knowledge of the men of antiquity themselves, which knowledge arises out of the observation of the organic and significant development of a distinct national growth,—an observation which is dependent upon a study of the ancient remains." In order to show a practical application of this remark, we may be allowed to make a short extract from the introductory pages of the great work of Mommsen, a man whose brilliant achievements in the field of Roman history, are pointedly and unmistakably due in large degree to his successful studies in philology.

He says: "Whilst the now separated Indo-Germanic people formed a stem possessed of the same language, they reached a certain grade of culture, and their language developed a certain corresponding stock of words, which, as a common provision, all the separating branches took with them in a use conventionally fixed, and upon this stock, as a foundation, they then built further and independently for themselves. We find in this original stock, not only the simplest relations of being, of action, of perception, as *sum, do, pater*, but also a number of words marking an advance of civilisation, and these words, not merely in their roots, but in their forms developed in use, words which must be regarded as common property of the Indo-Germanic race, and which cannot be accounted for by the supposition of a parallel formation among the different separated branches of this family, nor by the hypothesis of a later adoption. In this way we possess evidence for the development of pastoral life, in that distant epoch anterior to the separation of the branches, in the unalterably fixed names of the domestic animals: Sanscrit *gaus* is Latin *bos*, Greek *bous*; Sansc. *aswas*, Lat. *equus*, Gr. *hippos*; Sansc. *hansas*, Lat. *anser*, Gr. *chen*, etc., just as *pecus, sus, porcus, taurus, canis*, are Sanscrit words. From this is to be inferred that in that distant period, the race, from which proceeds for us, since the times of Homer, all intellectual develop-

ment, had already advanced beyond the period of the mere huntsman's and fisher's life, and arrived at least to a relative fixedness of abode. On the other hand, we can command no proof as yet, that they had commenced to till the ground: the Græco-Latin names for the different kinds of corn, for example, do not, with one exception, appear in the Sanscrit. Corresponding to the Latin *ager* appears, indeed, a word in the Sanscrit, but not with its special signification. Again, for *aratrum* we have Sansc. *aratram*, but in the signification of *oar*, (or rudder,) *ship*.

“Evidence, on the other hand, for the knowledge of house and hut-building before the period of separation, exists in the words, Sansc. *dam(as)*, Lat. *domus*, Gr. *domos*; Sansc. *vesas*, Lat. *vicus*, Gr. *oikos*; Sansc. *dwaras*, Lat. *fores*, Gr. *thura*; and for boat-building, in the words, Sansc. *naus*, Gr. *naus*, Lat. *navis*, and others. So, for the use of wagons and the breaking of draught animals, in the words, Sansc. *akshas* (axle and car), Lat. *axis*, Gr. *axon*, *amaza*; Sansc. *jugam*, Lat. *jugum*, Gr. *zupon*. So the wearing of clothes and the art of weaving, and finally, the common primitive ideas at least of religion, which prevailed among the separate branches of the Indo-Germanic stock, may be shown or inferred with the highest probability from a comparison of their languages.” (Rom. Geschichte B. I., p. 14 seq.)

The importance of such investigations as these need not be enlarged upon; it is ours only to remark that they constitute a part of the discipline of the study of language.

Some may be disposed to object that the scientific method, whose practice we have sought to vindicate in language, is confined to the “higher walks” of this pursuit, and that its application can only be made by the advanced student. If such were the case, then indeed we should not have touched this question in its practical and useful bearings.

But that such is not the case is, in fact, involved in the very nature of our proposition itself. If the study of language is a science, then grammar must be a system pervaded throughout, even in its earliest elements, with firm and certain laws; and the student, if properly guided, will have, upon the very outset of

his studies, exercises for his mind of precisely the same nature as he will find any where within the limits of the vast field before him.

That this may be more and more recognised as a truth; that its value may be more and more appreciated; and that the practice of the study of language, from its earliest to its latest stages, may be more and more adjusted in accordance with this idea, ought to excite the desire, and to elicit the efforts of all the friends of this old and honored discipline.



### ARTICLE III.

## BUCKLE'S HISTORY OF CIVILISATION IN ENGLAND.

[CONCLUDED.]

*"History of Civilisation in England. By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. Volume I. From the Second London Edition. New York. D. APPLETON & Co., 346 and 348 Broadway: 1858."*

In entering upon the review of the general scope and tendency of the work, there are certain matters which deserve special attention. Prominent among these is the relation of Mr. Buckle and his philosophy to Christianity—a relation which, though not distinctly defined, is yet not very equivocal. The Christianity left, when Mr. Buckle has done with it, is a very meagre affair. With occasional respectful allusions, (not too great, if it be but a human invention,) he has shorn it to a thing of nought. Stripped of its evidences, its doctrines, its dignity, denied its weight as testimony, its interpretation of man's relation to God disputed, its canon doubtful, its inspiration more than uncertain, its doc-

trines superstitions or whatever else suits the occasion; the Bible, in one word, is not in the way of Mr. Buckle. His undeviating pathway goes through, or over, or upon it, at convenience. It possesses no *authority*. Discreetly behaving itself under this treatment, it escapes any wanton brutality at his hands, but very fierce is he at stupid opposition; while the peculiar and official friends of the book—the clergy—are seldom safe from a side blow or a slap in the face, if in the vicinity of his subject. They are, indeed, the great incubus upon humanity. But for them, what might not have been realised before this late period of the world's history!

But Christianity cannot accept this negative and equivocal position. It will not *down* at Mr. Buckle's bidding. It is impossible for any philosophy in the present day to ignore revelation. Its force is too vast, comes in contact with all theories too fully, to be passed by as irrelevant in any such discussion. It stands in the way, and no man can evade it or pass around it, saying, "As for this, we know not whence it is." It is before the philosopher, for assent or dissent, and admits of no neutrality. For it professes to come from God, to be his intervention in behalf of man, a positive scheme of human salvation, an elevating power, letting down a cord from heaven. It speaks with authority, and its pretensions are very high. In the presence of any philosophy, it bates no jot or tittle of these high pretensions, but claims to be higher than it—its teacher and its guide. And rightly so; for there can be no middle ground. If there be a God, He is Alpha and Omega. If he has spoken to man, man must reverently hearken and obey. It is to be decided by any one who would write of human destiny, whether this gigantic power called Christianity is a verity or a falsehood. For the scheme of human progress as conceived by the deist, cannot correspond with that which is recognised by the Christian.

Mr. Buckle seems to regard religion as an effect, not a cause. As the limits of Christianity and of the highest civilisation concur, it seems probable that the two things are related to each other, and that their relation is that of cause and effect. This is

admitted by Mr. Buckle, but the relation is reversed; civilisation being made the cause, religion the effect. A very important investigation, truly, arises here, but which, however, does not seem to be a difficult one. It is vital to Mr. Buckle's line of argument and general train of thought, yet he does not seem to apply the simple tests. The relation of cause and effect is a familiar one, nor is it difficult to tell which is which. The doctrines of Christianity did not take their origin from the most highly civilised of people, or from the people of the most catholic spirit. It existed in its purest form among the comparatively unenlightened, had with them its origin (if of human origin) and its best exemplifications. The Scriptures are far in advance of every age; not added to, as men become more enlightened, but simply better appreciated. They came from above, and lead mankind upward; not rise with mankind. All these indicate it clearly to be cause, not effect. If effect, the Bible should be constantly improving with the progress of mankind. The Bible should be brought up to the age, and not the age to it. The operations of this cause are sometimes impeded. The good seed of Christianity is often choked and unfruitful. Conditions of growth are needed; but the seed is not the soil, nor the soil the seed, for all that. The seed is still from without.

Were Mr. Buckle's view of Christianity accurately defined, we think it would in substance be this; viz., that Christianity is the best religion ever yet invented by man, and that it will improve greatly as he improves. The acceptance or rejection of Christianity he regards as of more intellectual than moral significance. Quite a different view had its Author, when he instructed his disciples to "shake off the dust of their feet" as a witness against those who rejected it.

Mr. Buckle's view of an objective revelation may have some light thrown on it by the following extracts:

"Bigotry," he says, "darkens with its miserable superstitions those sublime questions that no one should rudely touch, because they are for each according to the measure of his own soul, \* \* \* and because they are as a secret and individual covenant between man and his God."



But is there no light, we would ask, shed on these sublime questions, save what arises from the darkened soul of man, itself the fountain of the very bigotry he deplors? Is this secret covenant between man and his God a separate revelation to each individual man? Or what is it; what are its terms; and how communicated and authenticated? Is it a substitute for Christianity, an appendix to it, or a commentary upon it? "According to the measure of his own soul" man never yet found out God. The measure is too short. "This individual covenant between man and his God," what covenant is it? Is it a covenant of merit, or of favor? The intuitions of man, aside from revelation, and so unchecked by objective truth, are a poor substitute for Christianity. Tell the peasant to evolve for himself, according to the measure of his own soul, a system of astronomy. You do but mock him. Worse mockery still, if you tell him to evolve, from his own dark soul, theology and his relations to God. Tell the guilty man of the "secret covenant between himself and God." Alas, conscience speaks too loudly—universal conscience—of its violation, and tells the man of wrath. Perhaps Mr. Buckle will consider its voice but an echo to the miserable superstitions of bigotry. Very potent it certainly is, whether uttering truth or falsehood. We are fain, too, to think that the more enlightened the conscience, the more sensitive it becomes as it appreciates the awful holiness of God, and searches for a daysman between itself and his eye.

Again, he says: "If each man were to content himself with the idea of God which is suggested by his own mind, he would attain to a true knowledge of the divine nature."

Upon this principle, would not a wild man of the woods (unencumbered with false traditions) attain the knowledge of God in its greatest perfection? We know not how to characterise this sentiment, even coming from Mr. Buckle, otherwise than as marvellous and idle folly. This, too, from the contemner of metaphysics. He would have man evolve God from himself, without even the observations of others to aid him. Not by comparison and criticism; not by the revelation God has given;

but while he cannot learn human nature from within, he must from within learn the divine nature.

The importance of the inquiry whether or not the Almighty Maker "has to do" with the affairs of mankind, Mr. Buckle admits. Why not, then, the positive and paramount urgency of the question, demanding distinct and unequivocal decision, whether he has made known his will? But waiving what consistency would require on this point upon the part of the author, let us accompany him into the investigation of the subject of God's sovereign sway, admitted by him to be a fundamental point for determination.

The doctrine of predestination, which, according to the author, "owes its authority among Protestants to the dark though powerful mind of Calvin," and which, in the early Church, was first systematised by Augustine, who borrowed it, says Mr. Buckle, from the Manichæans, is traced, as he is aware, by very many Christians, to a yet more ancient and venerable origin, viz., to revelation itself, as one of its distinct doctrines, taught most fully by the inspired apostle Paul, and only of authority because so taught. In the discussion of it, however, the infinite reasonableness of the doctrine of providence is not to be disregarded. Given a Supreme Being of infinite faculties, and providence seems to follow as a matter of course, though its details may embarrass us. The foreordination of events as believed by Calvinists, was not, however, as Mr. Buckle would have it, "arbitrary," but according to the attributes of God; his wisdom being infinite, and his will holy, just, and beneficent. And so his decrees are not arbitrary in any odious sense, but holy, just, and good. They are independent, it is true, and sovereign; but they find their limitations in his own perfections. And in the dispensation of punishments, men are punished "for their sins," not on arbitrary principles of despotic power.

The difficulty of fact, viz., the prevalence of human sin and misery, is not evaded by denying the doctrine of predestination. Mr. Buckle states the case well, thus: "All antecedents are either in the mind or out of it." But God made both. The mind and the circumstances of the mind, its original constitution,

•

and all its susceptibilities and powers of change or modification, and the modifying circumstances—all without exception, are his handiwork. The metaphysical difficulty lies, therefore, in the *possibility of freedom*.

Yet that very freedom, on the other hand, is taught alike by revelation and reason. Mr. Buckle denies the freedom of the will. Of all the faculties, this is the one of which we should have supposed Mr. Buckle most tenacious; that the will he would have surrendered last. But the most wilful of men denies the existence of free will; and the most perverse, the possibility of perverseness. As well might Falstaff, himself a mountain of mummy, have denied the existence of obesity.

The evidence of this freedom is based on consciousness, and Mr. Buckle doubts whether consciousness is a faculty; and, if a faculty, denies that its testimony is trustworthy. This is an intrepid position; but it is necessary to his theory, and he boldly assumes it. He seems, we think, to admit the fact that our freedom is attested by consciousness, but to deny the truth of the matter so attested. We are conscious of freedom, yet still not free. This we understand to be his position. Carried to its legitimate consequences, his appetite for scepticism will be certainly satiated. For on this disputed foundation, viz., confidence in our faculties, the belief of all testimony depends. This is the necessary condition and foundation of all reasoning, as well as of all faith. There must be something ultimate, and, as such, conceded. Upon no smaller postulate than this can reasoning be conducted at all. If consciousness be not itself a faculty, it is the only medium of communication with our faculties; and with it, all means of attaining truth utterly fail.

All reasoning must begin from something admitted. What is that fundamental thing? Take away consciousness, and it is gone. There may be such a thing as truth left, but not to us. The bottom is knocked out. Mr. Buckle rests on statistics; but that is no bottom, unless faith in the truth of our faculties underlies it. Faith in something is really presupposed by all reasoning. Upon what principle would he proceed to reason; to what make his appeal? And is he so sure after all, that we do

not know what consciousness attests? We cannot here dwell upon what seems to us a general error in the application of the laws of evidence, as to the degree of evidence necessary in particular cases. That it should be exclusive, however, of all other hypotheses than the truth of the proposed matter attested, although often demanded as a necessary condition, is usually impossible, and therefore not reasonably to be required.

The belief in the freedom of the will rests, therefore, on the same ground as in the fact of our own existence, and of our power to exercise our faculties and be led by them to the truth. It would be more vain to deny that men generally know whether they are asleep or awake, than whether they are or are not free. Our wakefulness is to be distinguished from sleep by nicer scrutiny than our freedom. "You are surer," said Dr. Johnson, "that you can lift up your finger or not as you please, than you are of any conclusion from a deduction of reasoning."

The relation of the will to motives finds an analogy in the power of self-motion possessed by all living creatures. Among inanimate bodies, there are certain laws which govern motion, requiring a force to be impressed from without, which force governs the direction of the motion and its continuance. In like manner, certain forces from without may be impressed upon living beings, and affect their movements. But there is a separate and independent force in each of these, which can resist and modify external force, or can originate motion without it. This is a pregnant analogy in regard to the power of the will: operated upon by some motives, it is true, which are irresistible; but yet in regard to the strongest, able to some extent to modify them, others to resist entirely, and itself to originate action. The alleged necessity of a motive for the will finds here a perfect physical parallel, in all its arguments and mysteries. In a certain sense, power has been conferred upon all animate beings. "Ye shall be as gods." Power—the power of originating—has been conferred. External force and internal power of motion, compare as motive and sheer will. Conduct is influenced by motives, yet the will supplies a factor. Man is conscious of struggles of the will, detailed, protracted, often severe—with ups

and downs, triumphs and defeats—of struggles especially with conscience. In all these, he is not merely the theatre of a conflict, but himself a conscious actor; and if there be no truth in these experiences, then is man a liar to the depths of his nature. The scepticism which denies these realities would find no impediment in the adoption of a theory of pure subjectivity—rejecting altogether the existence of an external world.

Yet it cannot be denied that this doctrine of the freedom of the will, established as it is alike by reason and revelation, seems incompatible with the sovereignty of God, resting, as we believe, upon the same impregnable foundations. How are the two doctrines to be reconciled? In this lies the mystery of mysteries, ever baffling the inquiries of mankind. Many reject the one or the other, to meet the same difficulty at another point, after trampling upon irrefragable evidence by the way. To reject them both is Mr. Buckle's method. But this is no solution. Two entities do not make a non-entity. Two truths do not destroy each other. The doctrines are both true upon sufficient evidence, though the higher truth which would harmonize them is unknown—perhaps, by finite minds, unknowable. This is that hidden link in the hand of Deity which unites the chains of causation and free will, reaching from the throne of God to the material and spiritual universes—the dead and the living works of God.

Mr. Buckle's relation to these doctrines may perhaps be better defined by saying that he denies free will, and carries predestination into the extreme of fatalism. The moral difficulty—in regard to the origin of evil—does not seem to press him, but some mechanical difficulty rather. Does he, however, evade either difficulty, after the violence done to evidence? By no means. It stands still in full force. Let but the question be answered as to the origin of the evil admitted to exist, and the solution is found for all other inquiries, mechanical or moral. Until this is accomplished, the insoluble condition remains, and we should leave it where evidence puts it, viz., in the reconciliation of the two truths, not in the denial of either.

Of the exact extent to which evil exists we are ignorant.

That it exists at all is enough to raise these perplexing questions; and that it does exist is undoubted by any. It may be that this world is its only theatre, save the world of gloom in which it is all ultimately to be shut up. Whatever the aim of evil, whatever its need, or inevitableness, or its object, for aught we know its scope is as limited and insignificant, and its purposes achieved on as small a scale as that of one or two little worlds among unnumbered millions. Yet it were to be expected that powerful arguments could be used, to attack the faith of man in God, issuing forth from the dark region of our ignorance of this mystery. Let us shift our ground as we may, still, from the same dark territory will equal arguments come forth. Reason and revelation both carry us into the cloud by the same pathway, and returning, emerge in company. We must accept the evidence as to what is really true, letting the equal difficulties of apparently conflicting truths cancel one another.

Nor more philosophical is he in the rejection of prayer. In nothing is the antagonism of the author to the Christian system more antipodal than in the contemptuous slight with which he refers to prayer—prayer, man's noblest privilege, taught to him by every instinct of humanity, by his conscious dependence and weakness, by all the analogies of nature, and by the unvarying tenor of revelation. We hold it to be clear that any view of God's government consistent with man's *acting* at all, is consistent with the philosophical propriety of prayer. The course of nature, the author considers to be a long chain of sequences, each consequent dependent on its antecedents. "When we perform an action, we perform it in consequence of some motive or motives; these motives are the results of some antecedents; and therefore, if we were acquainted with the whole of the antecedents and with all the laws of their movements, we could with unerring certainty predict the whole of their immediate results." True; and perhaps not of their "immediate" results only, but the more remote also. Now, we ask, may not prayer and its answer be incorporated into the grand march of sequences, of cause and effect? If effort and action and their results are so incorporated, why not prayer and its answer? Is it

incredible or unworthy of the Deity, thus to connect with himself creatures whom he has made capable of knowing him, of obeying, loving, trusting in, praying to him? Prayer and effort of any sort, conscious effort, are analogous. The argument of the author proves too much, lying against all active effort and conscious exertion of the faculties. Man may pray, unless he must simply float supinely on the stream of events, not attempting even the gratification of his senses or any exercise whatever of his will.

Upon his principles, moreover, praise is as absurd as prayer; such praise as the psalmist offers for individual care bestowed. Whole provinces of scriptural truth are out of all harmony with Buckle. Those manifold expressions of David, of Isaiah and the prophets, of Paul and John, are rebuked by his philosophy as contemptible ravings of presumption. Prayer is presumption before, and praise presumption after God's blessings.

The principles of the author seem to us, indeed, destructive of all voluntary action or effort, as well as of prayer. His system seems to fit one as a rigid mould of iron. The mental as well as the physical, the spiritual as well as the material, is at a dead lock. Said Pope,

"And binding nature fast in fate,  
Left free the human will."

Not so, says our author. The will too is bound fast in fate. Does not your own blood, Mr. Buckle, curdle within you, and the deadly nightshade creep through your veins, as your doctrines take practical hold of your own brain? When we turn from your gigantic system of fate to the simple gospel adapted to man, to this large and free wide world, to our own conscious freedom and lift our hand, we breathe freely once more; we thank God that he is a *living* and true God, and that we yet believe him to *be* and to be the hearer and answerer of prayer, and that we find ourselves once more in a large place. Mr. Buckle's doctrines fit round us closer than a coffin; we cannot stir hand or foot, mind or spirit. The atmosphere under his enchantments has thickened about us, and embraces us like

amber. We gaze on the great head of Medusa, with its stony eyes, and feel the growing petrification, till we turn shuddering away. Why learn history or biography, we ask ourselves; why study physical science or mental, or statistics, if we are but the passive creature of circumstances, with no endowment of *will*? Why call on you to hold your hand or to spare us? You cannot hold; you cannot spare; you too are the victim of destiny, and exhortation or dehortation are alike folly, addressed to you as to any other.

Does Mr. Buckle regard even God himself as free? or is he too in the close embrace of the anaconda of destiny? Does the Almighty so fill space and time, as to have (so to speak) no room to move or act? The doctrine of his infinity may be so held as to make space his prison-house. But surely there is margin to him for action. Things are at least (says Butler) "*as if free*;" not an exact mechanical fit. They feel so, they seem so, and action based on this supposition, succeeds. This exactness of fit does not seem to accord with the analogies of nature, which is profuse and bountiful. To illustrate: Animal life is sustained by food. It is necessary that food should be provided, and an instinct implanted in the animal to seek it. This is done; but there is no exact apportionment of so much food—no more, no less. On the contrary, the animal is sometimes full, sometimes hungry. The instinct is not just so much; there is enough and to spare. To continue the race of birds,—of sparrows, for example,—there are thousands upon thousands of eggs, of which very many perish, others produce the young birds. In the profuse excess of material, the race is kept alive. A thousand acorns fall; a score of oaks live. This is the method of nature; lavish and profuse, not exact and mechanical. So neither God nor man is hampered. Space is not so filled that no arm can move, no interstice exist in the universe.

*Cui bono*? all of Mr. Buckles theories, unless action is voluntary? Fold your arms, and let the stream of fate carry you onward. Vain is prayer, thought, or effort. All you are destined to act will develop itself in due time, without a thought or care of yours. The whole discussion of the means of progress



assumes that man can adjust himself to the knowledge acquired; that Mr. Buckle is *free* to study, and men free to learn and profit thereby. Omit the freedom of the will, and the condition is gone upon which alone rules of action or thought serve a purpose. The end of this is mere quietism.

The leading argument of Mr. Buckle is derived from Statistics. This science furnishes the great reinforcement which he has brought to the aid of fatalism, most of his other arguments being the same heretofore presented, with some difference of form and arrangement, by other authors. This argument from statistics is the supplement and finishing touch to their otherwise imperfect schemes. The fundamental idea of the book being fatalism, and the fundamental argument for this, statistics—disprove the connexion between statistics and necessity, and the system falls. Accordingly, he builds up this relation with peculiar diligence, and assigns to statistics remarkable prominence in his work; not overestimating, though, we think, misapplying it. This science furnishes well ascertained and definite facts upon a grand scale, large enough for partial deviations to counterbalance one another, and the true result to be read. There will yet in process of time be great use made of statistical tables, so arranged as to assist the human intellect as a chess-board assists the player, rendering the mind independent of much stress of memory, and leaving it full play for analysis and combination. Professor Maury's tables furnish the means not only of explaining, but even of discovering truth. By what may be called rows or runs of contiguous appearances, these tables manifest certain facts and suggest great truths. The effect of repetition or omission strikes the eye. The general view can be translated, like a formula in analytical geometry, into ordinary language, and thus made to yield a truth or a law. In figures there are sometimes rows of similar types—tendencies to cycles—which, like the serried ranks of an army seen at a distance, are suggestive of new ideas for experiment and verification. The exactness attainable by these indirect mechanical helps is often wonderful.

The census, with its increasing fulness of detail, begins a new era in the study of the laws of human action, enabling

us, however, to understand not the whole of history, as our author seems to intimate, but rather its anatomy. Well directed census inquiries and reports are to exercise a wonderful influence in teaching us what man is and does—his condition and the phenomena connected with it. But these constitute only the meagre skeleton of truth. The most wonderful event in the history of mankind was the crucifixion of Christ. The census returns of Judea, had they been taken during the days of Pilate, would have presented this stupendous event to the attention of mankind by the record of three more malefactors crucified. This would be the impression made upon statistics—the increase of three in the number of those who perished upon the cross.

Chronology, by being thoroughly accurate and discriminating, and following the exact order of events, becomes thus almost invaluable, suggesting the relations of cause and effect. It should keep separate the exact stages of progress; for in government and in human affairs generally, it often happens that one soweth and another reapeth. The fruit makes its first appearance long after the true laborer is forgotten. Take as dry a thing as a bank or a railroad report, (usually regarded as the *ne plus ultra* of accuracy,) and the management of a particular year may seem good or bad according to a very trivial alteration of action. The reaper, not the sower, usually carries off the praise as well as the harvest. Often by neglect of the future, present appearances are rendered plausible; by regard to the future, they seem unpromising. A fine historical example is furnished by Mr. Buckle in the false estimate usually put upon the reign of Louis XIV., whose age is signalised by a brilliant literary galaxy, for which he gets credit as the Mæcenas of the age, but which he did not light up, but on the contrary actually extinguished it, so that at the close of his career, not a single eminent writer was left.

Concurring with Mr. Buckle fully in the importance assigned to statistics, the argument derived from it by him in favor of fatalism, seems to us of no validity. He seems to consider that general certainty is inconsistent with individual liberty. But it

is not necessary to suppose any law controlling the freedom of the will. The uniformity of crime, on the large scale, is evidence not of the slavery of the will, but of similarity, on the large scale, of character and circumstances, of temptation and opportunity. The falsity of the reasoning may be illustrated by an analogy drawn from dice, the usual analogue expressive of chance. There being but six faces, one of the six must be turned up at every throw. If the dice be perfect, then out of a large number of throws there will be an equal number, with almost exactness, representing the times each side was up. Now suppose the dice were alive, and had some power in determining their own position. This would introduce an element of uncertainty, according to Mr. Buckle's view, and uniformity would cease. There are two or three conditions on which, however, this would not be true. If they were all substantially equal in power of motion, and had some common motive for endeavoring to keep a particular side up, the uniformity would still be retained. Or if each of six dice had an inclination to a particular different side, that would not destroy uniformity. Or if the number of separate dice vastly exceeded the number of faces, the uniformity would not be sensibly disturbed. It is evident therefore that new powers are not necessarily destructive of the law of uniformity of results. Now, similarity of circumstances and similarity of temptations do exist largely among men, on the grand scale, and it is on the grand scale only that the rule holds good. The philosophical principle obtains as well with life and volition introduced as without it. Among the ways presented to the choice of men, one is the way of suicide. Some will choose this, some will avoid it. Men are similar to one another, and have like temptations; and so on the large scale there will be uniformity of choice. Try the argument closely, and it has in it the certainty of a mathematical law.

The same illustration will serve to explain the hopelessness of our ever attaining such skill and knowledge in human nature as to be able to foretell events. The number of elements determining the fall of the die is small, physical, near at hand. Yet it is the synonyme of uncertainty. How much greater the complexity

in the ordinary affairs of life, and more hopeless, therefore, the power of prophecy.

In accordance with his general principles, our author disparages the study of *final causes*. Yet that we can ascertain with as much certainty the final causes of many things as we can any of their relations, is undoubted. Should the man supposed by Paley to find a watch, observe the hinges of the outer case, could he have any room for doubt as to the object for which they were made? Seeing the transparent crystal, could he consider it doubtful whether it was intended at once to protect and exhibit the face? Could he doubt that the hands were intended as indexes? And so in the human body, can any one doubt that the eye was made to see, and the ear to hear? Rash conclusions as to final causes need to be guarded against; but with caution in determining them, they are as trustworthy as other means of investigation, and throw light to be cautiously followed far in advance of us, often giving us hints which closer scrutiny proves to be truths. They furnish pointers to numerous discoveries, misleading only the unwary.

We now approach the consideration of one of the most striking and original views of the whole book, and one, too, of the most dangerous, in the contrast drawn between moral and intellectual causes as to their influence upon human progress. It is the most radical form of the argument which staggered David, and has staggered good men in every age—the prosperity of the wicked; which yet is one of the great and necessary means of probation, and a powerful proof of human depravity, showing that men are affected more by interest than principle. It seems to be a very remarkable and startling conclusion that virtue exerts far less beneficial influence than intelligence. The author therefore elaborates it with great care, and brings forward several arguments of a most striking sort. Perhaps the fact itself, if admitted, is not so dangerous in its tendency, as some false conclusions which men are prone to draw from it. The author holds that moral considerations largely affect individual men, but are little felt by society at large, being balanced, swallowed up, and lost in society, as the casual incidents of

phænomena are lost in statistics. He holds that as society is progressive, while moral truth is stationary, the progressive effect cannot be due to the stationary cause. Intellectual truths are enlarged, and with them society advances. Indeed, ignorant men, destitute of intellectual truth, are the more mischievous in exact proportion to their sincerity; for this is the measure of their ignorant and hurtful intermeddling.

There is a vein of valuable truth, capable of practical application in directing the efforts of men, underlying these views, while there is great danger of its perversion. Men will draw false inferences, in their extreme anxiety to shake off the fetters of moral obligation, a disposition which Buckle does not recognise. Nor is the argument itself correct in all its parts and applications. This discussion of Mr. Buckle's is really a branch of the more general inquiry already had as to what constitutes *true progress*, as distinguished from mere civilisation. The proportions of truth and the subordination of human faculties are ever to be borne in mind; and that a partial culture will produce a partial and imperfect development in favor of the faculties specially cultivated. According to taste and favoritism, a partial errorist would cultivate the physical man, and take delight in the brawny muscle which fitted one for a pugilist. Mr. Buckle would pay special attention to his head. A devotee would regard the mortification of the flesh and culture of the spirit exclusively. The true culture, as we have elsewhere seen, cultivates all the faculties, not, however, forgetting their subordination. Now, the highest of man's faculties is his conscience. It rightfully asserts lordship over the whole man, and relates him to God. It needs enlightenment, but it is higher than the intellect for all that; just as the intellect needs physical support, but is higher than the body. Whatever their actual strength and efficiency, conscience among the faculties is the king upon his throne, and all the lords and commoners of this little kingdom, man, owe him obedience and reverence.

This subordination is real, and no true philosophy can subvert it. And in so far as any would be led by Mr. Buckle's views to subordinate the moral to the intellectual faculties, they would

greatly err, even though it were true that upon social progress the latter should be more influential. We have seen in the earlier portion of this review that virtue is an end, while knowledge is a means. Yet is it assuredly true that moral progress does tend to intellectual and physical, and is the necessary condition of its permanency. Its tendency to promote wealth is not so direct as that of intellectual progress; but it does lead indirectly and upon the whole to social growth, conquest of nature, and all the fruits of civilisation. It includes within it, prudence, economy, temperance, and many worldly virtues, which directly promote the welfare of society. It is, however, the tendency of the book rather to depreciate it. Mr. Buckle is the special friend and advocate of intellect. He seems to have a peculiar jealousy of man's moral nature and its claims, and strives in all respects to subordinate them, rather than exalt them as an end. If, in the division of labor, too little justice has been done to the subordinate parts, let there be no jealousy between the hands, the feet, and the head. Let him take the new province of inquiry, but not depreciate the labors and laborers in the other departments. Physical training has been often neglected, and dyspepsia has contributed to make conscience morbid. Mental training has been defective, and ignorance has made conscience fanatical. Yet, after all, conscience is entitled to the throne. It should be enlightened, healthy in tone, and supreme.

Intellect, will, and conscience, like nerve, muscle, and bone, are mutually dependent, and in fact inseparable in the living subject. Fortunate it is for us that the truth does not vary with our speculations concerning it, but is made of sterner stuff; else what a tumble would Mr. Buckle give to the whole constitution of things, and how would man especially fall to pieces, the moral from the intellectual part, and the will (the back bone of all) be broken. What a catastrophe, physical and mental, would the world witness, as these things, which God has joined together, were by man put asunder.

With similar partiality, he appreciates highly the influence of physical science, but not always, we think, with proper discrimination. So far as it has a tendency to promote inquiry and to

enlarge the conquests of man over nature, it is a most valuable means of progress. But its not infrequent tendency to make men forget or disbelieve invisible, immaterial, but eternal truths of a spiritual sort, is a false and fatal tendency. "Physician, heal thyself," may be said to many thus made wise, who have contributed to human progress in this department, but been lost themselves in the wilderness of natural laws. Without a clear head and an humble heart, it is easy for a natural philosopher to become bemired in second causes. Tracing back, a few links farther than his neighbor, the chain of causation, he forgets the necessity of a first cause, be there never so many links. Each step backward in physical causes overthrows the faith of some. Phrenology, physiognomy, cosmogony, the knowledge of nature or of man—but more especially of man—giving explanations of points previously unexplained, make men hope they can do without a foundation entirely. The new science which clears Mr. Buckle of all dependence is Statistics. In this he is narrow and has had warnings enough for a man so full of knowledge.

Conceding the great though not supreme importance of knowledge, it is important to understand what it is most necessary to know. We certainly need to know something of *nature*, *i. e.* of God's works and modes of action. It is yet more necessary to know something, much, all that we can, of God's character, of his will, of his will concerning us, if such knowledge is attainable—"what he would have us to do." If he takes any interest in man, then of all possible knowledge, this is the most indispensable.

It is also important to know ourselves, our faculties, our obligations, (though Mr. Buckle seems to place less stress on this,) our destiny. Again, one of the chief means of civilisation is to know our fellow-men, so as to be able to interchange services with them. Men have immense capacities for serving each other. Most of our wants can be supplied by our fellow-men, and we in turn can supply theirs. In the mutual relation of wants and services, consist most of the advantages of civilisation. We have demands; our fellow-men the corresponding supplies. Ready means to make known these wants and supplies, is one of the

chief agencies of civilisation. We have seen the great divisions of law into physical, mental, and social. The latter largely controls the other two. If each man knew who could supply his want, on the one hand, who desired his services, on the other, how immense and radical the uses of such knowledge! This added facility, in regard to the exchange of services, would improve every department of social life. One of the greatest means of improvement, accordingly, has been the newspaper press, teeming with notices of wants and supplies. Advertisements, in the most improved form, are to be a great means of advanced civilisation. Means of teaching men, of conveying knowledge, of doing this to the best advantage, are among the most hopeful means of progress; and in these, men are daily growing.

It is not only necessary to know concerning the exchange of services, but to know who are our friends, who are willing to do us good without reward. To understand how to gain friends—this is one of the most valuable of acquirements. What must it be, then, to know how to obtain the favor of God! No knowledge is equal to this. This is wisdom indeed.

In the comparison of social with individual progress, does not the author overestimate the relative importance of the former? Suppose man as an individual, immortal, and society, as such, transient. This supposition is true in fact. Individual discipline is the great matter with immortal beings. The utilitarianism of the author is temporal and extreme, and will not stand the test of real utility. How far he seems to be from recognising that kingdom of God, which cometh not with observation, and yet is the highest and truest interest of man. Does such a thing exist? Then all other gain pales before it.

The dispensation of the New Testament is styled by Bacon, the *dispensation of adversity*, showing how completely the infinite matters of man's future being overshadow all present advantage. This dispensation, with its thorough discipline, its inward unseen supports which give rest to the outward sufferer, and enable the dying to walk in strength; these things Mr. Buckle forgets in the turmoil of busy life. Yet these things must needs be; they occur daily, and their need is as broad as humanity itself; for



all men suffer, and all men die. This is no narrow occasional provision for the wants of exceptional cases in the human family. Man has numerous relations to society, and a great interest in its progress; but still his chief relations are, so to speak, to himself (*i. e.* of his own present to his future) and to God.

Again, in considering moral truth as stationary, and therefore put out of competition with intellectual, does he properly consider the fact that the moral education of each individual man is a slow process, requiring line upon line, precept upon precept, yet that the result, when attained, is the grandest and most valuable possible, *viz.*, *character*, compared with which social progress in all other respects is as nothing? Nor does the mere knowledge of moral truth suffice. Intellectual truth requires comparatively little culture. It is principle, not knowledge, that is difficult of culture; obedience to the truth, not mere acquaintance with it. To teach man his duty is an easy task; but so to teach that he will do it, *hoc opus, hic labor est*. Every preacher of righteousness understands this. Intellectual truth is complete, when understood; moral, when practised. The former is something to be known, the latter something to be done. "Whosoever heareth these sayings and doeth them, he shall be likened unto a wise man." This was one of the truest and wisest sayings of one who was greater than Solomon.

How easy to learn the ten commandments, and how quickly it is done. But when learned, they are then a life-long law to be kept, and the keeping them spiritually not so easy a task.

Ploughing the head is easy culture enough; but ploughing the heart—here we encounter stone. Here is needed the power of God. It is not what a man accomplishes that is material, but what he becomes; not his learning, but his training; not his accumulations, but himself.

It is to be admitted that conscience is not a light, of itself, but needs enlightenment from without. Although it be king, yet in its subjects resides its power. Let it control a sound mind and an active body, and its reign will be beneficent. The influence it can exert for good will depend, of course, upon the force it wields and the wisdom which guides it. The best man can but

do the best he knows how. Yet, according to the author's own favorite science of statistics, it would scarcely seem possible for men to act in accordance with their convictions of duty, and for the effects on the large scale, as compared with the effects of an opposite course of conduct, not to be discernible and palpable.

There is truth in the remark of Mr. Buckle, that the best informed and most judicious men are most charitable in their judgment of others, but error in the inference he draws from it. It is not because evil is wanting in evil men, but because these charitable judges see it to be generic to the race. It is equally true that the purest and best of men are the humblest, and have the least confidence in themselves, because they compare themselves, not with an imperfect standard, but with the purity of God, and recognise the scrutiny of his eye.

The leading argument Mr. Buckle uses to depreciate the value of moral laws, viz., that they have not sufficed to control and mitigate religious persecution and war, furnishes one of the most powerful of all arguments in proof of that human depravity of which he intimates doubts. The fact, (so far as it is true,) that increased knowledge rather than increased virtue has lessened these great evils, shows that men are swayed by their interests, and not by their principles. Railway communication, steam ships, and commerce, are more operative in restraining human passions than faith, hope, and charity. Rather a sad comment upon human nature, but as true as it is sad. God has been, as it were, constrained so to constitute society that *interest* would protect it against crimes, against which *virtue*, in this imperfect state, presents no adequate barrier. Perhaps, however, the mitigating influence of moral improvement will be found not so much in these greater matters, controlled by those high in authority, as in the daily intercourse of life, and the thousand actions in which good principles soften its ruggedness and charm away its asperities. And indeed, in respect to war, it is perhaps premature to regard it as dying out under the influence of either knowledge or virtue. Greater power of concentration has made it a shorter struggle than in former times. To a large extent in many wars, the rulers are responsible rather than the people.

In the great war recently waged on the continent of America, both rulers and people were responsible, and both were possessed of unsurpassed advantages for moral as well as intellectual culture. The lesson taught by all experience seems rather to be this, "Put not your trust in man, for wherein is he to be accounted of?" The human will is one great disturbing element which Mr. Buckle rejects. Not far wrong is the explanation of war given by the thoughtful author of "Friends in Council," that whole nations, in their folly, often fight on very much the same grounds as school boys, "to see which can whip." It is hard to say which predominates, folly or wickedness.

The progress of the human race has ever been zig-zag. Whether upon the principles of revelation, or upon those of human science, it has been slow and stately. God has not made haste. Generations pass away, each leaving some deposit of influence, some legacy of knowledge and example. The rapidity of this growth has been wonderfully increased by the press, preserving knowledge from waste. This deposit by a shifting race is one of the most significant and pregnant facts in the whole inquiry.

One or more generations pursue truth in a particular pathway, and pass beyond the truth. Another generation reverses its course, and goes too far the other way; till at length the swing of the pendulum ceases at the proper point, and a new investigation begins of other truths, to be attained by a like process. Meanwhile the moral improvement wrought by Christianity has been a great means of aiding intellectual progress, keeping up in some degree the balance of man's powers. It has furnished restraint and guidance, as knowledge has supplied active power.

On the whole, what moral impression does Mr. Buckle's work make upon the reader? It confounds moral distinctions and saps the principles of moral obligation. If the sanctions of revelation are removed, if man is at the mercy of fixed laws, and so not accountable for his actions, if moral truth is much less important than intellectual, what then are we to hope of the men so indoctrinated, if now, with the weighty sanctions of God's law and their own consciences, it is still so difficult to

restrain the powerful impulses and propensities of human nature? We observe in one place a reference by Mr. Buckle to licentiousness in terms of contemptuous reprobation. We are glad to see this. Yet what adequate motives does his system supply for its restraint?

It will be seen from the tenor of this review of Mr. Buckle's position, that he plies with great power as to general human progress, the same argument which is so obvious and staggering as to individual wickedness. There is a disposition to look for some active intervention of God against the wicked and in favor of the good. But no such intervention occurs. The laws of nature are not suspended in favor of the good man. There is no immediate display of favor or of wrath. This is the radical line of argument, and plausible and staggering enough. "Ye shall not surely die" is the inference it draws from delay. But is this the end indeed, and will there never be a just reckoning? The disposition to judge by immediate results, to make expediency the test of morality, runs counter to the whole tenor of revelation. God could accomplish his own ends without human co-operation or obedience. But he chooses to accomplish them *through* these in many instances. God sends myriads of human beings, like swarms of flies, to the grave. Yet to man is the command none the less imperative, "*Thou shalt not kill*"; the object being, not to save life, but to educate man. God could make a revelation of scientific truth, but he lets man exercise his faculties to ascertain such truths. In a word, *training* is the law of his dealing with man. Great immediate results may be obtained by over-reaching and fraud or by assassination; but such means react upon the character and lower the moral tone of a whole people. They are forbidden, although perhaps they would for some time improve the census returns.

God has not merely attributes of strength and wisdom, but moral attributes. He can approve and disapprove. He can love, reward, punish. It is through these attributes that we are chiefly related to him, not through the physical or intellectual. We have corresponding attributes. To please him, to behave as his children, to love him, to glorify him: these are the great

ends of being. And these are precisely the ends which revelation teaches, but which Mr. Buckle omits. He introduces us to God the Mechanic; not to God the Saviour, God the Father.

After all, we doubt not that the intellect, with all its boasted results, is the rightful servant of the moral man; and if it serve not, then knowledge is power for evil. If it be weak, then the good man cannot with feeble instruments accomplish much good. If it be perverted and false, he may even be mischievous. But goodness is beautiful in and of itself; the good child as well as the good man, the feeble as the strong. And in reference to its influence on society, love worketh no ill to his neighbor, and is therefore the fulfilling of all law.

No proper limitations and guards are set about Mr. Buckle's general truth. May we not well take ground stronger than merely defensive or negative against these views of his, and hold that a Christian ministry, faith in God, belief in human responsibility, and the machinery for impressing upon man the reality of a future life, and the sanctions of eternity, are wretchedly substituted by his system of negations?

Mr. Buckle has much to say upon the principle of intolerance, culminating in political and religious persecution. This is another outgrowth of the human will. It is because man has a will of his own, and this will imperious, yet fails to recognise that other men have like wills alike imperious, and so claims submission of theirs to his, that intolerance is common. Again, man has opinions of his own, and fails to recognise the equal right of others to their opinions. Such being the origin of intolerance, it is displayed by the strong towards the weak. Its cure is to be found in the joint action of the intellect and the conscience, the former teaching us the equal rights of others, the latter enforcing our observance of them. The strong are intolerant towards the weak, the many towards the few, in a word, those who are able to enforce their wishes and opinions towards those who are unable to defend themselves. Reverse the parties, and the old persecuted become usually the new persecutors. *Will*, which the author so much ignores, lies at the bottom of the

whole of it. The will, the will, is *the man*. His faculties are but instruments.

The intellect may cure intolerance, by assuring us we have no interest in the matter in question. Indifference or intolerance is the normal state of the human mind, and charity, which is neither, is the fruit of culture. Scepticism, which the author seems to regard as the parent of toleration, rather begets indifference. When not indifferent, it follows the usual rule—being tolerant when it is the weaker party, otherwise bitter and relentless, as much disposed to propagandism and more unscrupulous in its means than bigotry itself. Is there not, indeed, in Mr. Buckle a remarkable development of what in a somewhat peculiar but intelligible sense may be called the *odium theologicum*? No-faith is to the full as uncompromising as faith. In the domestic circle, many a poor wife and child can tell what the tolerance of scepticism is, unrestrained by power. When it grew strong in France, it grew rampant and fierce. It may operate in the way of rendering men indifferent; nothing but charity exorcises the evil principle. Decided opinion, unless checked by charity, whether found in the churchman backed by civil authority, or in the dissenter, in the sceptic or the blasphemer, is ever intolerant.

In a discriminating view of the subject of toleration by that profound thinker, Dr. Thornwell, he says that philosophers of no less note than Sir James Mackintosh, Lord Brougham, and the author of "Essays on the Formation of Opinions," have contended that no moral character can attach to our opinions. "They wished to transfer opinions from the jurisdiction of the magistrate, and to rebuke the clamors of bigotry, intolerance, and sectarian zeal. But for this purpose it was not necessary to prove that man is not responsible for his opinions at all, but only that he is not responsible to his fellows. Persecution is not the offspring of the doctrine that responsibility attaches to opinion, but that this responsibility is directed to the magistrate." We are responsible, indeed, but to God only. To his own master each man stands or falls.

Intolerance, after all, is the abuse of a good principle. It is

natural for man to endeavor to have others act as he desires, and think as he thinks. The more important the truth and the more practical in its bearing, the more earnest he is in its promulgation and in the endeavor to render it operative. This explains the intensity of religious and political zeal. This is one of the active principles of human nature; dreadful as its abuses have been, it has also its noble uses. Restrained by a just sense of the rights of others, it is one of the greatest, and indeed most essential powers for good, going forth like a good Samaritan, on errands of mercy to mankind. Carried farther, it becomes meddlesomeness; still farther, intolerance, then persecution. Proselytism, propagandism, have an honest father, but a dishonest mother. They are begotten of zeal, but not of knowledge. The legitimate offspring is the great antagonist to selfishness, obeying the precept, "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." It is the principle which underlies the family relation, in which a man must act for others and choose for them. It is eyes to the blind and feet to the lame. In its just bounds, it is public spirit, generous and elevating; carried too far in the State, it becomes the protective spirit; in the Church, the intolerant spirit. Disregarding its proper limitations, it interferes with the rights and interests of others. To be purged of its excesses is part of the long education of man. In defect, it is selfishness. By nature men endeavor to use substitutes for an enlightened head and a corrected will; to use constraint instead of implanting principle, to hold the hands instead of teaching the heart. The love of power is the love of exercising the will, just as the love of knowledge is that of exercising the understanding. Almost every controversy, whether upon matter of fact or principle, becomes at last a struggle of *will*. The will becomes interested, and men are then governed more by what they have committed themselves to, and begun to do, than by their original convictions or by argument. The more we study history, the larger seems the part played by the human *will*, that sturdy combatant.

It seems impossible for human progress to be properly guided, and not run into extremes. From intolerance men run into

indifference, from superstition into irreverence. A chapter might be written upon the decay of reverence among men. Mr. Buckle seems to think it still exists in excess. The tendency of his philosophy is to depreciate it. But there are still things which demand man's awful reverence. No high self-respect, no powerful, constraining influence towards the great and noble in conduct and character, is possible without this sentiment. The reaction from contempt of superstition and idolatry should never lead men to other sentiments than those of profoundest adoration for the true God, and reverence for him from the depths of the spirit.

In reading Mr. Buckle's lofty commendation of scepticism, one may not easily escape the conviction that in his view an unreasoning faith is advocated by the friends of revelation. Far from it. Paul, in apostolic days, was one of the most powerful of reasoners. The Bereans were commended for their diligence in investigation. Dr. Thornwell states strongly a principle which the much-abused clergy are among the foremost to uphold. "There is no principle which needs to be more strenuously inculcated than that evidence alone should be the measure of assent." But let evidence be adduced which shows that God has spoken, let this be sifted and tested till the proof is ample, then faith becomes reason; man the finite, learns from God the infinite, the Great Teacher instructs his pupil, the Father, his son. Let the evidence be satisfactory that the Author of nature is the Author also of revelation, and the authority of the latter is indisputable. The objective truth of Christianity once admitted, and it is the guide of man's faith and reason, and becomes upon all those topics on which it gives information, a necessary part of the basis of induction, which no true philosophy can omit. Not that physiology or mathematics or materia medica are to be learned from it; but in all its proper relations, which are large and important, it is the standard of reference, especially as to theology and morality, man's duty to God and to his fellow-men.

Instead of the cramped and hampered posture which Mr. Buckle seems to attribute to them, what a noble freedom has been enjoyed by the great Christian authors. They have entered



upon their investigations, not from a one-sided point of view, but with their eyes, as it were, in the centre of space, free to look round upon all sides, and search for the truth. They were willing, too, to find it and to practise it; for no "sophistry of the heart" bewitched them. They felt the inspiration of the promise, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free;"—the truest freedom, for they were willing to know it, and when known, to obey it, without which there can be no real freedom. Our author really would seem to have persuaded himself that the only reason why man cannot fly into the open firmament of truth is, not the lack of wings, but because burdens have been laid on his back, especially by the clergy. Those really have mounted highest who bore the easy yoke and carried the light burden of the Redeemer of men. They have seen most of the truth, received it with most readiness, and incorporated it most thoroughly into their being and life.

Little attention seems ever to have been paid to the great extent to which human ignorance is a means of probation and moral discipline, and that even with the most enlightened. This whole view of our present condition as one of discipline, seems to be very much ignored by Mr. Buckle. We look in vain for this as one of the great ends, indeed *the* end, to be accomplished by the divine government. God seems to be our heavenly Father principally as he gives us our stock in trade. We get from him our real estate and personal. The prodigal son asks for his living; it is separated to him, and he goes at once into a far country.

But this will not always do. After a time the prodigal, if he comes to himself, is constrained to return, having wasted his goods, and hungering for something better than husks. Faith in God is man's only sure and safe resource. Uncertain of the future, we, who cannot control events, must lean on him who can. Our uncertainty of what may befall us, our ignorance of the means of relief from danger and pain, the limitations of our faculties, and the immensity of our relations, naturally lead the thoughtful man to the Almighty, and make prayer the most obvious and natural of duties. The only reason why prayer is

not universal and delightful to all men is that they usually are at conscious variance with God, not at peace with him, unwilling to obey him thoroughly. Their unsettled debt to God keeps them from approaching him. Remove obstacles, and the natural tendency becomes operative, and men love to draw near to the source of all strength and hope. How much do we necessarily depend upon him! With the greatest of attainments in knowledge, even of the past, we are children still. That of which we are ignorant is as an ocean to a drop compared with that which we know. Buckle himself, with his massive erudition, in this august Presence is a little child, and can but cover his face and blush, yea, feel utterly inadequate to express his own littleness. So great is the interval between the finite and the Infinite. Great as may be the importance of scepticism in its place, vastly greater is that of faith, and its place much larger, and its time more frequent. Scepticism and superstition are set over against each other. Faith is the true middle ground. That faith which is commended by the Scriptures is really the faith of the heart, viz., confidence in God. It is needed by all men from the cradle to the grave. The child needs it. The man who fails to exercise it, loses half the profits and much more than half the happiness of life. Nay, faith is needed also in our fellow-men, and faith in our own faculties. The first step in reasoning is faith. We defy any attempt at a process of reasoning not founded upon faith, and that faith really based upon God.

From the constitution of things there must be leaders in human thought and in every enterprise; and faith is needful, since many men are safer in following others than in choosing their own pathway. Not a blind following, however, of whomsoever shall take upon himself to guide. Faith looks to his moral and intellectual qualities, his capacity to judge and honesty of purpose. Still every where we see leadership. Mr. Buckle is a leader. In any assembly of men, in any deliberative body, there arise leaders, and the mass are guided by faith in the judgment of others. In the ship at sea, is every man a pilot? In the army, is every man the general? Men in daily life are

obliged to trust one another largely. No man would take a journey, but for faith; for he cannot inspect for himself the needful conditions of safety. He trusts to the vigilance of others. Even so in those higher and spiritual matters in which the All-wise has made known his will, we must walk by faith. No other guide is furnished us, and an honest heart will trust a faithful Creator.

To come now to the marrow of the whole matter. To suppose that there is some guiding principle in history is strictly philosophical, and we may concur in Mr. Buckle's view of its high probability. What is that guiding principle? It is in reality the struggles of free will, the struggles of man for independence of the Almighty, and God subduing all things ultimately to himself. The great fact of human history is Free Will struggling with the Sovereignty of God. When in the great din and chaos which we have described of this multitude which no man can number, we listen attentively, there is one key-note which must attract our ear and fix our attention. Each of this mighty number has a *will*, a will of his own, the guiding principle of all its activities, to which all his energies and all his knowledge are made subservient. This lawless thing, the human will, to which Mr. Buckle gives the go-by, distinguishes mind from matter. Each one desires to have his own way, and the resultant force is composed of the aggregate of these individual ways modifying one another.

If human history has a beginning, a middle, and an end, if an all-embracing civilisation is possible, if all men are to be related to one another, if there is any sort of unity in mankind, if men are not isolated beings, but parts of a system, what is that unity? Wherein is it to be found? In the infinite diversity of individual beings, is there any unity of aim, of feeling, of sympathy, of active effort? Or are men, as Professor Teufelsdröckh describes them, like an Egyptian pitcher of tamed vipers, each striving to get his head above the others? Not a number simply, but a society, capable of sympathy in aim and effort.

Look around for the common link, search where you will, and Christianity alone supplies it. The tendency of Christianity

is to turn the feet of these wandering sheep all towards one fold. These wildly struggling human wills it leads to harmony with one will, and so with one another. Under its sway, the will of man is brought into unity with that of God, and all men become co-laborers with him. Mr. Buckle struggles under the load, like Atlas with the world on his shoulders; but alas! he only leads us to the grave and there deposits his burden. Fighting uncertainly, beating the air, he "finds no end, in wandering mazes lost." Christianity brings all wills into harmony with the divine, and so with one another. This alone is peace and order; all else is war and discord. Here only are realised the highest aspirations of philosophy and philanthropy—that men being severed, the good from the incorrigibly bad, all the good may be one with and in Christ, as he is one with the Father.

But in this knowledge of human nature and its ultimate ends, there is vouchsafed no scientific accuracy of detail. The idea of Mr. Buckle that it may yet be possible to predict events—to become prophets—is the wildest dream of enthusiasm. It has been remarked that man can predict eclipses, discovering the truth concerning the most distant bodies, but cannot tell the day of his own death, and the events most nearly concerning him. Man understands the laws of motion; but he cannot follow or trace them accurately enough to keep up with the fall of the die or the shuffling of cards. These are guided by acknowledged laws, yet to us are all chance. How infinitely greater the complexity of human conduct, and how much more recondite its movements.

There is a certain parallelism in the history of a people to that of an individual, and in the history of the race to that of a people. This triple analogy holds good in very many particulars, almost runs on all fours. The history of the human soul as set forth in the Scriptures, reveals it best to itself. It is the most perfect of all mirrors, exhibiting depths of consciousness otherwise unexpected, and showing lengths and breadths of experience in no other wise understood. We do not think Mr. Buckle has read this book thoughtfully and in a docile spirit, to imbibe its lessons. The Holy Book gives also a national history,

that of the Jewish people, from which more is to be learned of human nature in the mass, (that strange inexplicable compound,) of the actings of a whole people, than from all other histories. These may perhaps have borrowed enough to furnish special grounds of rivalry. But the Jewish history sets forth all the phases of national life in a like mirror with that which before reflected individual life. The tendencies of mankind in prosperity and adversity, in peace and war, in their relations to other peoples and their internal relations, are portrayed. Ever and again with the vary circumstances of a people, some chord is struck to which the counterpart is found in the Bible. New light is thrown by our own history upon it, and by it upon history, as we pass through the experience it has recorded. No phase is omitted, from the birth to the death-throes of a nation, in all its varying circumstances, from the bondage in Egypt to the magnificent prosperity of Solomon.

The progress of the human race is the tripartite of these two, the man, the people, the race. The great lesson of each is human depravity, weakness, dependence on God, and that in all relations and combinations of men. Doubtless, this world being but a tiny part of the universe, the history of the race bears its relation to the grander destiny of the universe. Without doubt, each individual being endowed with immortality, the history of his present life is but the first step, yet the most important, in the total history of the man. The history of individuals and of peoples, has its relations to that of the entire race, and through the race to other parts of a great connected system. This world as a whole is as one leaf on the great tree of God's creation, drawing its sap and nourishment from other parts, and reacting in turn upon them. While it may not be necessary to understand all in order to gain considerable knowledge of humanity, yet the more extended the knowledge of other parts, the better it is understood and its relations. As Mr. Buckle requires in the historian, natural science, geography, statistics, metaphysics, vast and varied knowledge, as necessary to the interpretation of his problem, why does he reject theology, the knowledge of God? Has man no relations to him? Is not this indeed the chief

relation whether of persons or of peoples? Is it no element, then, in the problem?

In thorough geographical studies, several maps are necessary, and on different scales; the map of the world, of the country, of the state, the township. The minute student would have one of his own farm or lot. The scales of these maps vary, and the minuteness with which they represent the relations of objects to one another. The profound work of President Edwards, the "History of Redemption," is in some sort a map of the universe, drawn from the Scriptures as a basis, exhibiting the general course especially of human history, showing whence man is and whither he is going. It does not purport to be a history of the merely animal or intellectual life of man, or of the means of progress. This does not suit its scale. In the division of labor necessary to the perfection of knowledge, he assumed to speak mainly of the divine element. To the thorough understanding of human progress, another work is necessary on a different scale, showing the action of the human element. Still another could exhibit the human element in particular countries or ages. Had Mr. Buckle held the truth in regard to Christianity, he might have made the noblest contribution yet made to the study of human nature. To pursue the illustration: his want of faith has led him to much false location of the features of his map. He has not the points of the compass right. In his jealousy of the divine element, his north has not been determined by the polar star. The relations of his map to other territory are not true. To exhibit this in its more literal form: In the consideration of human progress the true view must be based on man's relation to God. Discipline on the large scale, individual and national, the vindication of Providence, the harmony of all wills with his (save of the incorrigible); these are the ends of the universe, its final causes, and worthy ones, too, of infinite wisdom; that men, intelligent creatures, may know God, and love him, and serve him, *i. e.* co-operate with him. The history of man, in its most radical idea, is the history of a rebel. This is the grand characteristic feature, the undertone of all history. The human will overruled by the divine, is its radical element,

studied as well in itself (metaphysically) as in its operations (historically). Rectifying each method of study by the other, the philosophy of history is to be learned, guided on the way by the light of revelation as to man's whence and whither and God's ultimate designs with him.

It has been the lot of Christianity to encounter constant attacks, so that from the summit to the base, no stone has escaped assault. No Sebastopol ever stood such a siege. Not the least dangerous of these attacks is that of Mr. Buckle, who with all his genius seems little aware of the tendencies of the scepticism he so much lauds, could it but become universal, and the restraints of faith all be relaxed. The being of God, the fact of revelation, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the truth of their records, have each in its turn been the subject of attack by the enemies of Christianity. Physics, metaphysics, history, geology, statistics, have been brought to bear against it. Mr. Buckle has marshalled all the forces of infidelity, reorganised them, reinforced them, skilfully disposed them for battle, surprising this point, taking that by storm; using all the arts of consummate generalship, with no formal declaration of war. This work is the culmination of the infidelity of the nineteenth century; its blossom and fruitage, its concentrated power, its aggressive and vigorous attack, proud, stately, confident of success, in which materialism, utilitarianism, worldly policy, statistics, concentrate their energies under a skilful leader, and make war upon Christian truth; endeavoring to conciliate into neutrality all who occupy a doubtful position by artful concessions, and making overtures to its friends by propositions of compromise. He makes many a side attack; elbows this doctrine, that statement of fact, that general principle out of the way; treats as absurd what Christians regard as true, sneering many out of their convictions. So bold and defiant, and at the same time collected and cool is he, that one hesitates out of mere courtesy to contradict, and apply the simple answer or obvious comment. His respectful references to Hume and Gibbon, his enthusiastic praise of Voltaire, his light and contemptuous references to the replies elicited by their reasonings,

his praise of great sceptics as great thinkers, his matter of course denials of many Christian opinions as exploded and conceded so to be by thinking men, incline men to side with the infidel, and not accept the low position to which he assigns the faithful, whom he classes with the superstitious, the ignorant and bigoted. None of these authors excelled him in boldness, subtlety, vigor and intrepidity, and probably honesty of attack. He has the tone of one who has confuted Christianity; and he addresses himself to others as though all thinking men had settled that question long since. Many of his arguments seem to presuppose its falsity, as a pretended revelation, well understood by men of superior penetration. Indeed, we have in Mr. Buckle, in the midst of the nineteenth century, and in the heart of Christendom, a great heathen philosopher, not occupying the position of one who has not heard of Christ, but of one who has witnessed his downfall, (so far as his pretensions were supernatural,) apparently unconscious of his large indebtedness to the Christian system in which he has lived, moved, and had his intellectual being. The whole God-appointed ministry of reconciliation is to him foolishness and a stumbling-block. The positive scheme of redemption he ignores. He takes the initiative, and keeps Christianity constantly on the defensive, yet makes it appear rather as the aggressor, the oppressor of the human intellect and great foe of progress. The argument *ad invidiam* is abundantly plied against the clergy, the natural and official allies of Christianity, while the reader is kept well pleased with himself and his new-found freedom. Meanwhile his style is fresh, vigorous, and he is ever presenting new views, and carrying the reader forward without conscious effort, afloat in his own current; scattering sceptical opinions in his path, staggering ordinary convictions, leaving men at sea, depriving mankind of faith, and making them proud of scepticism. No wonder that he is hailed by his fellows as the modern apostle of infidelity, its champion and Magnus Apollo.

There is one element of strength of which he seems to have a peculiarly clear perception, viz., of the loss of power by generalisation of statement. He clings to the particular. If a



particular truth be classified and referred to its place in a system, the edge is taken off, novelty and surprise are gone, explanation makes it tame. To illustrate: He says "an ignorant man is mischievous in proportion to his sincerity," and dwells forcibly upon this truth. This is much more striking than if he should explain that sincere ignorance is nothing but fanaticism, and fanaticism always hurtful, yet always honest; or that good motives are no substitute for wisdom. Again: all his assaults on the clergy, given in many particular indictments, may be summed up in one, viz., that they have overstepped their spiritual province. How much more effective the numerous particulars than the one general proposition. In this seems to us to lie one of the principal secrets of Mr. Buckle's power.

His attack upon the originality of the Gospel is the most unfair and disingenuous in his whole work, and is wholly unworthy of him. As well might the originality of the *Paradise Lost* be attacked, because here and there an idea or a figure could be shown which it might have borrowed, or of some perfect work of statuary, because of the resemblance of an occasional feature to the productions of another master. The wonderful novelty of the Bible, the variations from natural religion, not by contradiction, but by completion of it, can be rendered very striking. Take the topics of natural religion, then the topics of revealed; and you will find in the latter a wonderful fulness and individuality which the former entirely wants. In the margin by which revealed *overlaps* natural religion—observe this statement thoughtfully—will be found the territory from which all *heresy* springs. Revelation as far exceeds man's conceptions formed from nature, as the description in detail of a country by one who has travelled through it and lived in it, exceeds the conjectures of those who judge of it only by its products and manufactures. The whole scheme of revelation is indeed worthy of him whose name is called "Wonderful, Counsellor."

It is comparatively easy to inculcate the knowledge of duty. It is by new motives and new sanctions that Christianity enforces obedience to the truth. The knowledge of God's paternity, and in general of his character, his awful holiness, his intimate

presence with and knowledge of us, his interest in human affairs, man's accountability, real and to be enforced, the knowledge of man's own character and condition, of sin and of judgment to come, of repentance, of faith rendering the far-off influential, of prayer as a duty and privilege; these are the fruits of Christianity. Theology, in a word, is the sanction and sanctifier of knowledge.

These things wonderfully enlarge the mind, give scope to all its powers, and discipline it to higher thoughts and broader views. This is motive as well as knowledge, knowledge as well as motive. This knowledge humbles yet elevates, stimulates yet subdues man. It is the proper culture of all who yield to it, and do not trample on their better nature.

Christianity rewrites the law once engraven on man's heart. It adds to the certainty and efficiency of the code of morals. It furnishes us with rules definitely prescribed, solves our doubts, and illustrates by numerous examples. The scattered fragments of truth it combines into a beautiful and symmetrical whole. But its crowning work is that it supplies new sanctions and new motives, new views of God, new tests of character, and demands the obedience of the heart. Responsibility, close, heart-searching, universal responsibility, is its great lesson. It reveals the strictness and exceeding breadth of God's law, taking hold of the conscience. It teaches of a God near at hand, and not afar off. Nay, more; it proposes a new power, even the operation of the divine Spirit, mysteriously but really moving the hearts of men. It points man, with sanctions immeasurably increased, to the retributions of the future. If the interval is great between John and the least in the kingdom of heaven, how much greater that between the heathen and the Christian who has attained the stature of a perfect man in Christ.

As compared with the Christian system, how sapless is Mr. Buckle's philosophy, without enthusiasm, aroma, or spirituality, a *caput mortuum*, a *post mortem* examination of society, the anatomy of *dead* human nature. The effect of his creed on morals and public virtue would be withering, causing the decay of every ennobling sentiment. The blood thereof, which is the

life thereof, is wanting. In its eye there may be speculation, but there is no soul. The glad tidings it brings to mankind are tidings of absolute fate and doubtful responsibility, loosing the yoke of conscience and untying the cords which bind man to God. The food and poison in his work are impartially blended, perhaps inextricably. Its magnitude will probably preserve from infection all classes except students, but among these it will lead many willing captives. For man is easily led whither he wishes to go. Those who have studied little of Christian evidences, statesmen and lawyers and other professional men, especially physicians, naturally inclined to scepticism, will never have seen any thing so striking on the side of the truth.

The distinctions between truth and error, indeed, are often exceedingly nice, requiring the closest and most sober investigation. This is equally true with moral as with metaphysical or scientific truth; nay, more impressively true, as the temptations to error are greater. Such is our fallibility of judgment, that while many assaults upon Christianity have been made on false grounds, ultimately abandoned, the weakness of the human intellect has been exhibited likewise in its defence on false grounds. If geology attacked Christianity as inconsistent with its discoveries, Christianity was defended by denying those discoveries. And so it has frequently happened that both attack and defence have been on false issues. We have earnestly endeavored to avoid this common error, to deal with candor and criticise honestly and fairly; with what degree of success, our readers must judge. Not improbably we too have fallen into some errors in reply to this new production, and others may do the same. Mr. Buckle evidently thinks he has some strong points against revelation, in which we doubt not that he is mistaken. In reply to these points, a like mistake may be made by its defenders. Nevertheless, truth is mighty and will prevail; and his book, so far as it contains the truth, will ultimately settle to its just level, and Christianity, strong in its divine power, will continue to heal the nations. His conflict with the Bible is frequent, with the spirit of the Bible, perpetual; and in this conflict he will necessarily come to grief. Fortunate is it for mankind that no such

system of stone can live; founded upon hard, dry intellect, unmoved by any sympathy, unwarmed by any human affection.

Christianity as a phænomenon, he does not attempt to explain. If a religion be, as he represents it, an effect, not a cause; the result, not the moving power, of mental progress; the consequent, not the antecedent; then is revelation undoubtedly supernatural. For it came either from God, or from the Jews, a people not intellectually advanced. Neither the old Jewish system nor the Christian, can be accounted for on his own principles, except by divine interposition, nor the strange aptitude of the former for the latter, and the wondrous development of the system of types and shadows into that of reality and substance. What wisdom was displayed in the mode of revelation, opened by miracles of power, directly and effectually awakening the wondering attention of men, followed by miracles of wisdom, requiring and repaying more attentive investigation. It is in all respects adapted to man's nature, and wonderfully illustrates how the world is a parable, the whole physical universe in all its parts and processes full of spiritual instruction. It solves the problem, cultivates man in all his parts, and in each in the right way, preserving the subordination of the physical to the intellectual, and of both to the spiritual. The Bible is not indeed a system of theology, but it contains one; even as nature is not a system of natural philosophy, but contains it, open for our study, and in the knowledge of which we may continually grow.

In this instance it will be found true as in all others. God is not mocked. He that soweth to the flesh, reapeth corruption; to the spirit, reapeth life. Mr. Buckle soweth to the intellect; what shall he reap? Pride, and a fall. No system can abide, which pretends to explain man's destiny and progress, rejecting theology. Mr. Buckle himself, in some sense, begins with it. His first inquiry is theological. It is indeed the highest point of observation. In regard to his own progress, God has too much to do with it for man to be independent of revelation; and only in so far as he borrows from it (with or without acknowledgment,) will his system have a good foundation. In the actual constitution of man, all other improvement, all other progress, is subsid-

iary to that of character, which has relation to God, both for means and end, and is the resultant of many strokes gradually laid on. This is the temple, all else is scaffolding; this is the fruit, all else is ordure to be laid at the root. Civilisation is but the handmaid of Christianity, wonderfully improved by its association. The former is earthly and temporal; the latter heaven-sent and not to pass away.

Of the vast myriads who have inhabited our globe, how little is known! Their names have perished and their deeds. If they were immortal, then there is still a great congregation of them, somewhere, and in some condition. If not, how transient is human life and how pitiful is man. And of how little service to any generation that there should have been a record. For it is past, and what boots whether its deeds are known or unknown. One generation passeth away and another generation cometh. Is the chief use of one to be an example and basis for the next? What of *itself*, of its own destinies? The generation is gone; but what of the individuals who composed it? The influence of society upon the morals of individuals is really the great point which gives it importance. Perishable otherwise, and so not very significant; not to be underrated, it is true, but only thus to be duly estimated.

And what, according to Mr. Buckle, is the conclusion of the whole matter? We have the conclusions of revelation. How do his conclusions compare with them? What is the grand upshot of his system? Lame and impotent conclusion! Journey ending no where! Reject theology, reject revelation, and it knows not whither it goes. All this grand march has no destination. Society can no more be solved without God than can individual man. Its chief relation is to him; towards him is all true progress, even in the knowledge and love of God and its co-ordinate, the love of man. Society is composed of individuals, to each of whom the loftiest source of hope and strength is that derived from promised communion with a personal God; without which, the principal motives of noble conduct are ignored. Human *brotherhood* arises from relation to a common Father, and is the purest and most beneficent of earthly sentiments.

What is it that gives dignity and stability to the Universe, that preserves it from being the mere plaything of an Almighty child? It is responsibility. Aside from this, God might make and unmake worlds, in the sportful caprice of unlimited power. This is the weight which prevents us from being blown away by the mere breath of caprice. This it is which gives sobriety, dignity, awful seriousness to the present constitution of things. God has made, and he will conduct to its consummation. Life and responsibility are inalienable. Much light and many valuable hints have been afforded by this work of Mr. Buckle on the history of civilisation, but his scheme of disconnecting the world from its Author is an impossible condition in his problem. He will have to concur with the clergy and the mass of mankind in Christendom in the view that God has something to do with it, and not leave this element out of his count. Else will his great expedition, Armada though it be in all its grandeur of appointment, remain forever at sea, and never reach the only haven—God.

---

ARTICLE IV.

DEATH, THE RESURRECTION, AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

There are perhaps no points of doctrine about which the Christian world at large is more divided than those which have reference to death and the second advent. We speak not merely of religious dogmas, but of popular opinions; and that, for the reason that popular forms of belief very readily grow up *beside*, and sometimes in direct conflict with a Church's accredited standards, and because they alone have an operative power for good or evil.

In the Romish Church, it is held that the souls of all "the faithful" pass at death into purgatory;\* where they remain in sore distress till by masses said for their repose, or by their own penal sufferings, or by the efficacy of both combined, they are perfected and then admitted into heaven. At the last day all who still remain in this sad duration receive their discharge.

A large class of Episcopalians, chiefly those known as High Church people, with some perhaps of other churches, maintain that the souls of none of the redeemed are yet in heaven; that they occupy what they call "the intermediate state," which is construed to mean the intermediate *place*, also known as "paradise," where, in a condition of tranquil hope and blessedness, they await the resurrection and the day of judgment.

Every student of ecclesiastical history ought to be aware that this doctrine, in connexion with the dogma of sacramental grace, (and the two usually go together,) was the germ out of which was gradually developed the Romish doctrine of purgatory. Except for this tendency, it might be regarded as comparatively harmless. Bloomfield (Notes on Luke, xxiii. 43,) cites Chrysos-

---

\* Several years ago we were struck with a public notice, posted by archiepiscopal authority on the doors of the cathedral in Bogota, New Grenada, inviting "the faithful" to repair to the cemetery on "All Souls' Day," (Dia de los difuntos—day of the dead,) to pray and make "offerings" for the relief of "the blessed souls in Purgatory," with especial reference to that of the late "illustrious Archbishop Mosquera"; and granting by pontifical authorisation special indulgences to all who would do so. Archbishop Mosquera was a man eminent for his talent, learning, probity, and zeal for his religion. His private character was above reproach even by his political enemies—no mean distinction among the clergy of a Romish country; his friends esteemed him almost a saint, and he died in exile, a martyr to his zeal for his Church. He had been dead five or six years already; and was presumed to be still in purgatory! What, then, could persons less eminent expect? In theory they hold that some few persons of most saintly life, who have expiated every trace of even venial sins, go straight to heaven; but in practice all are presumed to go alike to purgatory; and the presumption holds good till the "saints indeed" are canonized, which seldom happens till they have been long dead and are well-nigh forgotten. But the fires of martyrdom exempt from those of purgatory. "The faithful" are all who belong to their fold—believers, as opposed to infidels, heretics, and schismatics.

tom as asserting that it was the universal faith of the orthodox in his day. But inasmuch as sacramental grace was found inadequate to the purpose of sanctifying the heart, and renovating the outward life, and left most of its participants manifestly unfit to "see God," lest it should fall into discredit, as being of no practical benefit, the intermediate place little by little came to be regarded as a place of further preparation for heaven; where the Church's children who had been laggard or remiss on earth, might perfect the work of salvation already begun. When, in the progress of corruption, penal sufferings, sacerdotally or self-imposed, were esteemed the indispensable means of expiating post-baptismal sins, this further notion was engrafted on the finally established doctrine of the intermediate place; and so sins, that through indolence, passion, or stress of worldly-mindedness, had not been expiated in this life, might, or rather must, be atoned for by penal sufferings in the place of separate spirits. And when the Church learned to grant dispensations and indulgences to the living, it could not refuse them to the dead. Purgatory has been an inexhaustible gold mine to the Romish priests; but it was not, as many Protestants recklessly assert, invented by them for this purpose. Like other mines, they found it ready made; it was the gradual growth of ages—the legitimate and necessary development of errors held and taught even by good men.

There are individuals scattered through different Churches, but forming no distinct school or party, who hold that the soul sleeps with the body, in blissful unconsciousness of all mortal woes, until the resurrection; a dreamless sleep, unless, perchance, it be sometimes lighted up with visions of coming glory. John Milton and the late Archbishop Whately are examples of this class. If deference to the teachings of Scripture with regard to the second coming of Christ and the resurrection unto life, with the accompanying salvation and exaltation of his people, (which is undoubtedly THE BLESSED HOPE of the Church, and of individual Christians, as well as the glorious burden of New Testament expectation and promise,) be the ground-work of this and of the immediately preceding opinion, the error, though by



no means trivial, is at least directed toward a laudable end, viz., to keep ever in view that great hope of our calling, which no disciple of an absent Saviour should allow for a day to lapse from his memory. But surely it is not necessary to "shut up in prison" the souls of Christ's redeemed, nor yet to bury them in the dark, dank grave, in order to render "the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour" an object of desire and hope to his people in this rude conflict of life. Richly must we merit the kind but severe rebuke of the Master to his doubting disciples, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets [and apostles too] have spoken," if the former dangerous doctrine, or the latter dismal expectation, is needful to force us to "love His appearing."

Among the more strictly evangelical Protestant Churches, that well-founded and scriptural doctrine is almost universal, which is thus expressed in our Shorter Catechism: "The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory; and their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection." And lest there should be any doubt as to where or what that "glory" is, the Confession of Faith thus amplifies: "They are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, *waiting for the full redemption of their bodies.*" Ch. xxxii. 1. No less than this did the dying martyr Stephen hope for, when "looking steadfastly up into heaven, he saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God," and cried "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" No less than this did the holy Paul expect, when he wrote, "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; (for we walk by faith, not by sight;) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." 2. Cor. v. 6—8. Of his manifested and bodily presence he speaks, because he could not be absent from his spiritual and divine presence in life any more than in death. Nor could the active and zealous apostle, though toil-worn and wearied with the buffetings of a wicked world, have had so earnest "a desire to depart and

VOL. XVII., NO. 2.—10.

to be with Christ, which is far better," (Phil. i. 23,) if he expected his burning, busy soul to sleep in unconsciousness till the resurrection, before he should be blessed with the presence of that Saviour he so loved.

But as there is on earth no good thing which is not liable to abuse, or to misuse, so, in our view, does it seem to have fallen out with this delightful doctrine. There seems to be a growing tendency in evangelical Protestant Churches to magnify and exalt the intermediate state at the expense of the ultimate. By the intermediate state we mean, of course, the condition of a disembodied spirit—the state intermediate between death and the resurrection, or in what we take to be well-applied Scripture phraseology, intermediate between "this life" and "the life to come." It is common with us to say of the departed servants of God, that they have gone to their reward and inheritance, have come to their eternal rest, have entered into the joy of their Lord, they tread the golden streets of the new Jerusalem, and gather the fruit of the tree of life, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations; in a word, that they have "obtained the salvation which is in Christ Jesus, with eternal glory." These and other attributes of a finished redemption, (of which Scripture says never a word in relation to the blessedness of "the dead who in die Lord,") are transferred without stint or hesitation to the state of "the spirits of just men made perfect." It is neither disingenuous nor uncharitable to say that the popular notion of salvation with most of those who attend our churches, as well as of those who never attend them, is summarily comprehended in "going to heaven when they die;" so that death (rather than the resurrection,) is made the gate of life and effects the consummation of our hopes. Of course the resurrection is assented to when brought into view; but it is regarded as so remote, so nearly extraneous, or so nearly one with the glory that precedes it, that it is seldom taken into the account, nor ever retentively kept in view. "*The hope and the resurrection of the dead,*" which Paul seemed to regard as embracing every thing else, is lost sight of in that salvation for which many of the most pious people are looking. This may be said to be the

blissful immortality of the soul with Christ—not to the exclusion, but almost without any regard to the resurrection of the body.

In the type of religious opinion referred to, we transfer to the state after death what is spoken only of that which follows the resurrection; so that when we come to treat of the latter, there is very little to add, except an indefinite increase of the blessedness already possessed. When we have assimilated the state of disembodied spirits as nearly as possible to what is spoken of those who are “accounted worthy to obtain that world (to come) and the resurrection from the dead,” what remains to be done but to conform the latter also to the former? The distinction between the blessedness of dying in the Lord, and that of living by the power of Christ to die no more, is almost lost. To this tendency, perhaps, even more than to any ambiguity of scriptural language, is due the fact that the resurrection body is by many regarded as little different from the disembodied spirit; and the “spiritual body” is supposed to be a body attenuated, refined, *spiritualised*, till it has lost nearly every attribute of matter, is as unlike as possible to its former self, and little more substantial than a phantasm. A “spiritual body,” thus understood, is a contradiction in terms. “All the dead shall be raised up with the self-same bodies,\* and none other, although with different qualities.\*” Conf. Faith, ch. xxxii. 2.

---

\* It is hardly to be supposed that God made Adam at first essentially different from what he intended his creature MAN to be. Nor is the supposition more probable that the artifice and malice of Satan should cause the great Designer to abandon his primary purpose, change his plans, and produce a new creature out of fallen man, essentially unlike the manhood in which he was originally created. That Satan achieved any such triumph cannot be for a moment supposed; we lost no real blessing in “the first Adam” which we have not regained, and will not repossess with usury in “the last Adam.” “From what the apostle here says of the contrast between Adam and Christ, of the earthly and perishable nature of the former as compared with the immortal and spiritual nature of the latter, it is plain that Adam was not, as to his body, in that state which would fit him for immortal existence. After the period of his probation was past, it is to be inferred that a change in him would have taken place analogous to that which is to take place in those believers who shall be alive when Christ comes: they shall not die, but they shall be changed. Of this change in

Some perhaps may be disposed to defend this confusion as tending to render death the more desirable; others may perhaps regard it as a harmless error, if an error at all, which had better be let alone. We think otherwise; and of many hurtful consequences we will mention two.

I. It gives to proselyting errorists a serious advantage, of which they are not slow to avail themselves. The simple Scripture doctrine that the souls of believers, when absent from the body, are present with Christ in heaven, is as strongly defensible as any other point of Christian doctrine. But our cause is weakened by the extra-scriptural additions made to it. The gospel observes a remarkable reticence in respect of the intermediate state, as though the Holy Ghost would lead us to the habitual contemplation of our ultimate and everlasting state. We are assured, indeed, that the dead who die in the Lord are "blessed;" that "they do rest from their labors;" that their perfected spirits are with Christ, who is at the right hand of the Father; that they are in "paradise," which is elsewhere spoken of as "the third heaven;" and here the veil is drawn. But of the "crown," the "kingdom," the "reward," "the glory that shall be revealed in us," of "salvation" and "eternal life," nothing is said in this connexion.

---

the constitution of his body, the tree of life was probably constituted the sacrament. For when he sinned he was excluded from the Garden of Eden, 'lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever.' Some change therefore was to take place in his body to adapt it to live forever." Hodge on 1 Cor. xv. 45.

Calvin thus comments on 1 Cor. xv. 50: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." "What I (Paul) have said as to bearing the image of the heavenly Adam, means this—that we must be renewed in respect of our bodies; inasmuch as our bodies being liable to corruption cannot inherit the incorruptible kingdom of God." "Hence there will be no admission into the kingdom of Christ otherwise than by Christ renewing us [body and soul] after his own image. '*Flesh and blood,*' however, we must understand according to the condition in which they at present are; for our flesh will be a participant in the glory of God; but it will be as renewed and quickened by the Spirit of Christ." This was Calvin's conception of a "spiritual body." Compare the corresponding expressions, "spiritual gift," "spiritual man," "spiritual meat," "spiritual drink," "spiritual rock."

“Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just,” says the Master. “The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, *and then* shall he reward every man according to his works.” The aim of Paul in winning Christ, in knowing him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings, was, as he says, “If by any means I might attain to the resurrection from the dead.” Their faith is commended who though “tortured, accepted not deliverance, that they might attain a better resurrection.” The object which the sainted Paul kept daily in view, while troubled on every side, perplexed, persecuted, cast down, and always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, was “that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in his body;” and this he repeats with emphasis, “that the life also of Jesus *might be made manifest in our mortal flesh.*” When exposed to the most imminent peril of his life, his trust was “in God which raiseth the dead.” “The crown of righteousness” the Lord will give “in that day,” “to all them that love his appearing.” It is “when the chief Shepherd shall appear, that we shall receive the crown of life that fadeth not away,” and for it we are to be “faithful unto death.” The inheritance, with the accompanying salvation, is “reserved in heaven, ready to be revealed in the last time.” It is “in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory,” that his faithful servants shall “receive an hundred fold and inherit eternal life.” The trial of our faith, more precious than of gold, is to be “found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ.” It is from his judgment throne that Jesus is yet to say to his people that have believed and followed him, “Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.” For all these and other reasons, St. Peter exhorts us, “Wherefore, gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace [the unmerited favor] which is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.”

Now, when the advocate of the so-called “intermediate state” urges these and other Scriptures like these, of which there are many, in favor of his opinion that the souls of believers are not

admitted into heaven until they are reunited to their bodies, the unwary and simple are easily ensnared; and the man who superadds to the scriptural statement the popular additions enumerated above, will need to possess more than ordinary skill to hold his ground against an able antagonist. The difficulty is, not that the other is right, but that he undertakes to defend too much, and therefore fights at a great disadvantage; and there is too much of truth on both sides for either to gain a signal victory. The gospel truth is as simple as it is glorious. Christ "after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting [waiting] till his enemies be made his footstool." But inasmuch as it is impossible that the successive generations of his people can tarry till he come without sin unto salvation, he takes their souls, at death, to await with him "the day of redemption." And "all things remain in suspense," as Calvin says, "till Christ appears as the Redeemer." Paul is as truly an expectant of redemption now, as he was when he wrote, "And not only they, (the whole creation,) but we ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for the adoption, to wit, THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY.*" Rom. viii. 23.

Unless we have greatly misconceived the teaching of Scripture on this most interesting subject, "eternal life" is as truly life manifesting itself through a corporeal frame, as is that vain life which we spend as a shadow on the earth. It would seem to be the essential and unalterable law of our nature, that *the manifestation of all human life is bodily*. It is so now, it will be so hereafter; it is not so in the intermediate state. The believer, therefore, when mortal life ends, is said to be asleep, sometimes to be dead. "David is not ascended into the heavens," for "he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." Acts ii. 29, 34. Believers now "have eternal life;" the seed of immortality is in them, but the life is not manifested, for "the body is dead because of sin." They have it still more gloriously at death, but it is not manifested; the body sleeps in the dust. "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God;" and so it will continue hidden till "Christ who is our life

shall appear." For this cause, Paul speaks of the resurrection as "the manifestation of the sons of God" in their true character, life, and destiny; for which the material creation is waiting with eager desire and longing solicitude. The glorious destiny of the elect is that they "shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ;" but this may not be while "death reigns over all, from Adam to Moses," and from Moses to the end of the world; nor can it be till, like "Christ, being raised from the dead, they die no more; death hath no more dominion over them."\* Paul and Peter and David can no more be said to live now, than Christ lived the three days he was in the grave; and they do live in no other sense than Jesus did, while yet he was dead. As Christ's humiliation continued till his resurrection, so does the humiliation of his people continue till the promised "times of refreshing," the times of restitution, when God shall send Jesus Christ "the second time without sin unto salvation." Nay more; it may be said that in an important sense Christ's humiliation is still continued and prolonged in that of "the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

II. The second consequence of the confusion we are deprecating is much more serious; to wit, that by it the second

---

\* This, as we suppose, unfolds the full import of Christ's words, "Who-soever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." Find what? Not merely the life of his soul; he did not lose that; he shall find all he lost, only better and more abundant; he lost it a mortal life, he shall find it immortal. "He that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal." "Some of you they shall cause to be put to death; but there shall not a hair of your head perish."

It is very remarkable that in the only passage in the Bible in which the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, takes specially in hand to comfort Christians in bereavement, no allusion is made to the disembodied spirit's blessedness; as if this were so overshadowed by the glory that excelleth, that there was no cause for any special mention of it. "Sorrow not, concerning them which are asleep, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him, etc. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." 1 Thes. iv. 13—18. But for some change of popular sentiment since Paul's day, "these words" would be oftener used as our sweetest consolation in bereavement, adversity, and sorrow.

coming of our Lord, the resurrection of the body, and the awards of the last and great day are reduced to a place of secondary importance. When we regard the promised blessings of the gospel, almost in their totality, as already the heritage of "the dead who die in the Lord," that grand passage with which St. Peter opens his first epistle quite breaks down, and his stirring appeal falls on listless ears: "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." The adversary could devise no more effectual means of banishing from our minds all habitual love of Christ's appearing, and care about the resurrection, than to lead us into the common error that the blessedness immediately subsequent upon "the death of the righteous" is the only "salvation" about which we need concern ourselves.\* We have heard intelligent persons inquire what need there is for the second advent of Christ, for the resurrection, and for the general judgment, since each individual is judged when he dies and receives his reward according to his works. The inquiry is a very natural one, all things considered; and the difficulty of answering it may have given rise to a frequent representation of the day of judgment, in which the idea largely predominates that it is a day in which God will vindicate before the assembled universe his righteousness in the distribution of rewards and punishments already made, so far at least as the dead are concerned. As we have till now spoken exclusively of the righteous, it may not be amiss to speak once for all of the wicked. The Bible representation is simple but terrible: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust [their souls in hell, their bodies in the prison-

---

\* "If the second coming of Christ is to Christians of the present day less an object of desire than it was to their brethren during the apostolic age, it must be because they think the Lord is 'slack concerning his promise' and forget that with him a thousand years is as one day." Hodge on 1 Cor. i. 7. A more satisfactory reason, perhaps, may be found in the fact that they have in general lost that intelligent apprehension which characterised the apostolic Christians, of the inestimable blessings which will never be theirs until Christ come in his glory.



house of the grave,]—to *reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment TO BE PUNISHED.*” 2 Pet. ii. 9. As the blessedness of dying in the Lord is completely overshadowed by that greater blessedness of “reigning in life” with Christ, and as the benefits accruing to believers at death would seem to be a forestalment only of “the glory that shall be revealed in us at the manifestation of the sons of God,” so the misery of the Christless at death would seem to be a dreadful prelibation of what is comprised in that woful destiny, “the resurrection of damnation.”

We offer no apologies for quoting here a few sentences from the writings of Calvin, as showing the views of the Protestant Church three hundred years ago. “He alone, therefore, has made a solid proficiency in the gospel, who has been accustomed to continual meditation upon the blessed resurrection.” “Therefore I have observed that the advantage of Christ’s benefits is solely enjoyed by those who elevate their minds to the resurrection. Thus Paul also sets before believers this object, towards which he tells us he directs all his own efforts, forgetting everything else, ‘if by any means he may attain unto it.’” Institutes, B. iii., ch. xxv. 1 and 2. This language, which may seem harsh in our day, is somewhat modified in the next extract. “But this we may positively conclude, that no man has made any good proficiency in the school of Christ, but he who joyfully expects both the day of death and that of the final resurrection.” “Let us therefore acquire a sounder judgment; and notwithstanding the blind and stupid cupidity of our flesh, let us not hesitate to *desire the advent of the Lord AS OF ALL EVENTS THE MOST AUSPICIOUS.* For he shall come to us as a Redeemer, to deliver us from this bottomless gulf of all evils and miseries, and introduce us into that blessed inheritance of his life and glory.” “To conclude in one word, the cross of Christ triumphs, in the hearts of believers, over the devil and the flesh, over sin and impious men, only when their eyes are directed to the power of the resurrection.” Institutes, B. iii., ch. ix. 5, 6. It is possible that some persons may regard the great reformer as but partially enlightened on the blessedness of the pious dead. It may be so;

VOL. XVII., NO. 2.—11.

but, judged by the same rule, it would not be easy to exclude Paul and Peter from the same condemnation.\*

We have sometimes heard the opinion expressed, that "the redemption of our body" is not necessarily essential to salvation; that we can conceive of a "salvation of the soul" of which the redemption of the body forms no part. So we can, and the conception is lamentably familiar; but it is essentially a different salvation from that which the gospel announces.† It may with equal reason be said that the resurrection of Christ formed no essential part of his atonement; albeit, if Christ rose not, our faith is vain and the gospel is a fable; a dead Redeemer could not give life to us. We can conceive of a work of redemption of which this formed no part; but it would be one essentially different from that which Christ accomplished. We can conceive of either of the two, and the two conceptions would naturally go together; but they are both equally unscriptural. Christ did not leave his body in the grave, as if he assumed it merely to qualify himself for suffering. And since he rose, they **MUST** rise; because he lives, they **SHALL** live, in him, with him, like him, by the power of his own endless life. Christ rose from the dead not merely in attestation of his Father's acceptance of his person

---

\* Paul only, with Luke and John, of all the New Testament writers, make any distinct allusion to the state of the holy dead until the resurrection. Even these references are few, though amply sufficient to show that they are with Christ in his glory.

† "The salvation of our souls," of which Peter speaks, (1 Pet. i. 9,) is that which is "ready to be revealed in the last time," and of course embraces the whole person, body as well as soul; "eight souls" (ch. iii. 20) is eight persons. "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own *soul*," does not mean the soul as distinguished from the body. It is the same word which in the preceding verse is twice translated *life*, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it," etc.; "but here denotes *that which lives, enjoys, and suffers*—to lose his soul, his life, himself." Alexander *in loc.* The reason Christ immediately assigns is confirmatory of the same view: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. xvi. 25—27. In Luke ix. 25, the same truth is thus taught: "What is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose *himself, or be cast away?*"

and work for us, but that, of all the dead, he first might obtain that life and immortality which we now possess in him, and shall one day receive from him. "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." To this end, "as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Here then, as Calvin beautifully remarks, we enjoy peculiar consolation, "that we find life in our own flesh." Inst. B. iv., ch. xvii. 8.

It may, however, appear to some, that since the holy dead will infallibly attain to the "resurrection of life," the alleged errors as to the state after death, can be productive of no harm; and that while laboring to bring souls to Christ, it were better to let harmless opinions alone. Granting all that is claimed, it does not follow that the errors are harmless. The Church may suffer fatally from an error which is not fatal to the individual. All Church history bears testimony that false opinions held and defended by devoted and holy men, have been seeds of most pestilential heresy to subsequent ages. "Errorists seldom see the consequences of the false opinions which they embrace. Many allow themselves to entertain doubts as to this very doctrine of the resurrection of the body, who would be shocked at the thought of rejecting the doctrine of the atonement. Yet Paul teaches that the denial of the one involves the denial of the other."\* The first step towards the denial of a doctrine is to undervalue it. The setting a light esteem on the resurrection and the blessings attendant thereupon, may seem to some a harmless error now; but the next generation may doubt what we undervalue, and yet the next may deny what the former doubted. When true and warm-hearted piety declines, latent errors spring up and grow apace. The popular errors on which we are commenting, may in two generations, with an increase of worldliness and formalism, lead a large portion of what is now called "evangelical Protestantism" to question and ultimately to deny the associated doctrines of the second advent, the resurrection of the body, and the general judgment. Individuals too

---

\* Hodge on 1 Cor. xv. 17.

often have an exclusive regard to the immediate and personal consequences of their acts and opinions: an error to which warm-hearted and zealous men are especially prone. But a Church is longer-lived, and in love and faithfulness to her children yet unborn, ought to hold fast all the truth, and retain the form as well as the spirit of sound words.

Believing that the errors indicated are dangerous in their tendency, as well as wide-spread and popular, perhaps increasingly so, let us endeavor to ascertain their cause, that we may apply the remedy.

I. It would seem that the heart of fallen man has a secret and strong repugnance to the doctrine of the resurrection. In theory we would have judged the reverse to be true; but facts and theory are here in conflict. Sin has stupefied as well as darkened our minds. The popular mythologies of the Greeks and Romans taught that the spirits or "shades" of men were happy or miserable after death, according as their lives had been virtuous or impious. The same belief may be more or less distinctly traced in all the religious systems that have prevailed among men. There is, therefore, nothing distinctively Christian in the doctrine of a state of rewards and punishments for the soul after death. We may regard some notion of it as natural, if not congenial, to men of all races and religions. It would seem to be easily apprehended and readily retained. The better class of the old philosophers taught "the immortality of the soul" as probable and desirable; and their arguments are as conclusive as unassisted human reason could produce. We cannot censure them for knowing nothing of the proper immortality of man, because the resurrection of the body is purely a doctrine of revelation, undiscoverable by human wisdom. We should have thought, however, that once revealed and proposed to the minds of men, it would have been hailed as heaven's best boon to a dying race. But such does not appear to be the case. The church of Corinth was early distracted by religious teachers who maintained that the resurrection of the body was neither possible nor desirable. Others, as Hymenæus and Philetus, subverted the doctrine by teaching "that the resurrection was already

past"—understanding it figuratively, perhaps. The "wise of this world" in our day, who hold to some form of a future life, reject the doctrine of the resurrection with as much contemptuous scorn as did those of the Epicureans and Stoics who encountered Paul in Athens. There seem to be multitudes in Christian lands to whom the preaching of "Jesus and the resurrection" appears to be almost a setting forth of strange gods. More wonderful still, yet strictly in keeping with our argument, is the fact that many *Christian* philosophers argue the question of man's future life so exclusively on the principles of the old philosophers, as to leave the impression that the blissful immortality of the soul bounded their highest aspirations. Unreasonable, therefore, as it may appear, it seems nevertheless true, that man naturally turns away from the hope of the resurrection; hence it is the less surprising that "many allow themselves to entertain doubts as to this doctrine, who would be shocked at the thought of rejecting the doctrine of the atonement;" and that multitudes of sincere Christians, while giving it an honored place in their creeds, allow it no corresponding place in their hopes and affections. Calvin represents the devil as having a special enmity against the resurrection; and no wonder, since it is he "who had the power of death." "But Satan," says the reformer, "has not only stupefied men's minds to make them bury the memory of the resurrection, together with the bodies of the dead, but has endeavored to corrupt this point of doctrine by various fictions, with an ultimate view to its total subversion. Not to mention that he began to oppose it in the days of Paul, not long after arose the millenarians, who limited the reign of Christ to a thousand years." Inst. B. iii., ch. xxv. 5. We have no sympathy with the peculiar principles of ancient or modern millenarianism, nor any desire to defend them. But if Calvin speaks so severely of them, because by their incessant reference to the millennium, they seemed to limit the blessedness of Christ's risen saints to a thousand years, and thus debased the doctrine of the resurrection, what would he have said, or have not said, of the errors on which we are animadverting, which tend to bury the doctrine in deep forgetfulness, by trans-

ferring nearly all of its peculiar glories and blessedness to the state after death? If we expect, or seem to expect, the sum of Christ's blessings at the hour of our death, to what end shall we, with Paul, be "groaning within ourselves, waiting for *the adoption*, to wit, *the redemption of our body*," and not rather the destruction of our body beneath the power of death? Or how shall we, with Peter, be "looking for and hastening unto the coming of the day of God?"

II. In assigning a second, and the only other reason we shall offer, we would do so with becoming modesty, as involving a question about which learned and good men differ much; to wit, the time of the second advent. But we would suggest the inquiry whether the lamentable and wide-spread indifference to the resurrection and the second advent, be not partly due to the fact that, by very general consent, they are put at a great distance in the future? An extended explanation may be needed to bring this inquiry fairly before us.

In Scripture the day is usually spoken of as indefinitely near; by us, as indefinitely far off. There, it is a day to be desired above all other days, yet to be waited for with patience; with us, the tendency is to put death for that day, so that it is the less strange that many should expect death to bring them the grace and glory promised "at the appearing of Jesus Christ. Then, it was a day to be looked for and hastened unto, and looking for such things, to "be diligent that they might be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless;" now, we hand it over to our descendants at least a thousand years, thirty or forty generations, in the future. It is of first importance to bear in mind that what the apostles wrote on this subject, as on all others of general interest, was spoken to the Church in all ages, and not to the Apostolic Church particularly. Yet this only makes it the more evident that Christ would have his people *by hope* to bring near that day, while *by faith* they waited for it, even as "the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it." The very terms in which the Church in all ages is to express its hopes and fears—"Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be

changed;" "This we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," etc; "And now, little children, abide in him; that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming;" "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief"—bear out the same representation; while teaching that those who sleep have as much interest in that day, as those "who are alive and remain unto" Christ's personal coming.

We quote the admirable words of the late Professor Butler: "But to seek to penetrate more closely into these awful secrets is vain. A sacred obscurity envelopes them; the cloud that shrouded the actual presence of God on the mercy-seat, shrouds his still expected presence on the throne of judgment. It is a purposed obscurity, a most salutary and useful obscurity, a wise and merciful denial of knowledge. In this matter it is his gracious will to be the perpetual subject of watchfulness, expectation, conjecture, fear, desire—but no more. To cherish anticipation, he has permitted gleams of light to cross the darkness: to baffle presumption, he has made them *only* gleams. He has harmonised with consummate skill every part of his revelation to produce this general result: now speaking as if a few seasons more were to herald the new heaven and the new earth; now as if his days were thousands of years; at one moment whispering into the ear of his disciple, at another retreating into the depth of infinite ages. It is his purpose thus *to live in our faith and hope, remote yet near, pledged to no moment, possible at any; worshipped not with the consternation of a near, or the indifference of a distant certainty, but with the anxious vigilance that awaits a contingency ever at hand.* This, the deep devotion of watchfulness, humility, and awe, he who knows us best, knows to be the fittest posture for our spirits; therefore does he preserve the salutary suspense that ensures it, and therefore will he determine his advent to no definite day in the calendar of eternity."\*

No language could more eloquently and forcibly express the

---

\* Archer Butler's Sermons. First Series. Sermon I.

*doctrine* of our own Church; for it is as truly part of our doctrine as justification by faith and the sovereign decrees of God. "As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, both to deter all men from sin, and for the greater consolation of the godly in their adversity, *so will he have that day unknown to men*, that they may shake off all carnal security, and be always watchful, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come; and may be ever prepared to say, Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly. Amen." Conf. Faith, ch. xxxiii. 3. Thus, in all the ages of his past absence, and in his absence, perhaps, for as many ages to come, the day of the Lord, that great day of grace and glory, is always near, because it is always impending. This doctrine of the constant pendency of the day of Christ, (not merely in our day, but from the beginning,) is distasteful to some persons; but we think it no less certainly the doctrine of Scripture than it is the fully accredited doctrine of our Church. How, indeed, should the idea of pendency be expressed, if it is not in scores of passages in the New Testament, which can refer, even by accommodation, neither to death nor to the destruction of the Jewish state and dispensation? Nor is there anything preposterous in it, as some assert. In a sermon intended to demonstrate the author's belief that "the end is not yet," nor will be for ages to come, the late Dr. J. A. Alexander says, "Upon any of these various suppositions it is still true that the primary fulfilment of the prophecy was in the downfall of the Jewish state, with the previous or accompanying change of dispensations; yet it was so framed as to leave it doubtful, until the event, whether a still more terrible catastrophe was not intended. However clear the contrary may now seem to us, there is nothing absurd in the opinion, which so many entertained, that the end of the world and of the old economy might be coincident. This ambiguity is not accidental, but designed, as in many other prophecies of Scripture."\* Calvin, in his Commentaries, expresses the same idea of pendency in every possible variety of language.

---

\* Alexander's Sermons. Vol. I. Sermon xxi.



It would seem that the New Testament was constructed on this very principle, so as to keep the end ever near in our apprehension, and at the same time leave the amplest scope for all the inscrutable designs of Providence: at all events, this was the effect produced. The declaration of Paul that the day of Christ would not come till the man of sin had been manifested, seems to us, after a lapse of eighteen hundred years, to have very evidently postponed the day to a future then very remote; but it could not have seemed so to the Church of that age, as the apostle proceeds to redirect them to "the patient waiting for Christ," and especially as John shortly after said, "It is the last time (Greek, *hour*); and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time (hour). That "last hour" is still unspent, and may still run on for ages, though the language does not favor the opinion of some, that a quarter of a million of years will not by any means have exhausted it.\* The few passages which seem to point to a literal conversion of the world to Christianity, would indicate that the end is very far off, did not many others seem as clearly to teach that wickedness and oppression and idolatry would continue to the end of the world, when "in that day a man shall cast away his idols of silver and his idols of gold, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth." The "glorious day of grace," with which "all the promises do travail," would seem to us to be subject to no mutation, nor end; and would suggest that then death and he that hath the power of it will have been cast into the lake of fire forever; no more shall men learn war, when the ransomed of the Lord "shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." The eleventh chapter of Romans would seem to teach the national restoration of the now unbelieving Jewish race, did not other passages seem to teach that their rejection (excepting always the remnant according to the election of grace) was final; and did not the apostle, in the same passage, give some ground for the opinion of the Reform-

---

\* Fairbairn on Prophecy. Rev. xx. 4.

ers\* and others, that in the restoration of Israel he merges the present with the eternal state, and that nothing more was taught than that God would continue to take out of the Jewish race, as out of the Gentile nations, a people for his name, who should show forth his glory. However the fact be accounted for, the impression was almost or quite universal for the first three centuries, and even later, that "this present world" would last rather a short than a long time. As to the course of events symbolically represented in the Apocalypse, we need not wonder at the belief that they were nearly all fulfilled at the rise of Constantine, when the same opinion is not wanting of advocates in our day; and when even now, each new writer on the book interprets its symbols on a system of his own. As to the "thousand years" which are to precede the final scene before the new heaven and new earth appear, no passage of Scripture seems so mysterious and uncertain, nor is there any, perhaps, about which so much has been written and so little is really known.† Christ himself, as a human prophet, says he did not know how near or how far off the day of judgment was, (Mark xiii. 32); and if from the great Prophet and Apostle of the Church this knowledge was withholden, it would hardly be imparted to any subsequent prophet or apostle. The impressive lesson taught by our Saviour is: "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own

---

\* Hodge on Romans, (unabridged,) ch. xi. 15—25—27.

† Dr. Hodge, after combating the theory of the two resurrections, wisely adds, "All this, however, is said with diffidence and submission. It may prove to be otherwise. The predictions of the Old Testament produced the universal impression that the first coming of Christ was to be attended at once by events which we learn from the New Testament require ages to bring about." Hodge on 1 Cor. xv. 54. And Dr. Alexander, in the sermon already quoted from, after a full exposition of reasons for believing that "the end is not yet," but is still distant, acknowledges that even these reasons are not conclusive, "so that after all it is a doubtful point."

Unfulfilled prophecy furnishes us with a very doubtful clue to God's future purposes; it was not his purpose to write history beforehand. He will fulfil every word he has spoken in his own time and way, and we will then conclude that it is best done as he will have it.

power." (Acts v. 7.) If it was once the deliberate purpose of God to hold this knowledge in his own keeping, we cannot suppose that he subsequently changed his mind. They, therefore, who affirm that the day will occur within a given term, and they no less who deny, would seem to be too wise in the secret purposes of God. Christ tells us that many would be saying, Lo here, or lo there, when the time of his appearing was yet far distant: he tells us also, on the other hand, that most of his people would be fully persuaded that he had yet a great deal to do in heaven before his advent, when in fact his work there was quite accomplished, and he was already coming in his glory: "In such an hour as YE think not, the Son of man cometh." "Watch, therefore, for ye know not when the time is."

Many of the Reformers, and Luther particularly,\* cherished the belief that the day of judgment was very near at hand, and readily gave heed to supposititious omens of that event. Calvin, wiser than his contemporaries, says that we are all affected by two contrary evils, too much haste, and slothfulness; and that Peter, like Paul, applies the corrective when he exhorts us to be "looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God," which he renders *waiting for*, and hastening unto, implying that we should be neither impatient nor indifferent; that we should hasten always, but, as he says, "hasten slowly" unto the coming of the day of God—a lesson as much needed now, apparently, in both its parts, as in the days of Peter or of Calvin. It may not be amiss to add that the Reformers regarded the thousand years of the Apocalypse as passed or passing. Calvin says they are emblematic of the season of change and trouble through which the Church militant is passing on earth. Institutes, B. iii., ch. xxv. 5. -

The revival of the old millenarian doctrines in the seventeenth century, and a more careful study of prophecy, were accompanied or followed by an opposite theory of the millennium, the same that is common in our day; to wit, that it is a period of about a thousand years preceding the coming of Christ, during which the

---

\* D'Aubignae's Reformation.

Church is to attain its greatest glory and prosperity on earth, and to achieve its most splendid triumphs over error, ignorance, and sin. It is not our purpose to combat this theory, to deny, or even to question it; it may, for aught we know, turn out to be a true exposition of God's future purposes. But the inquiry we have suggested is whether the general prevalence of this expectation, (a very confident one with many,) may not have affected the Church's hopes prejudicially.

A thousand years in God's sight are but as yesterday when it is past; but to our limited faculties, it is necessarily a long time. And as the impression gained currency in the Church that the great hope of its calling was not to be realised for a very long while to come, it was scarcely possible to avoid this as one result, that Christians should be unduly concerned to know more than God has been pleased to reveal as to that mysterious state of separation between soul and body which begins at death and ends forever at the resurrection. Once ascertained that it was to be of very long continuance, nothing was more natural than particular inquiries as to how we are to fill it up. If we know that we are to wait at least a thousand years for the resurrection, how shall we avoid supplementing the little that Scripture says of the disembodied state, by adding thereto as much as we feel justified in doing of what God says only of the state of believers raised from the dead? Or how avoid drawing on the imagery of "the new heaven and the new earth," in order to give completeness to our conception of the disembodied spirit's abode and pursuits? Antedating, thus, the true blessedness of the just, the hope of the resurrection and its associated blessings must fall into the back ground, and by many be lost sight of. Thoroughly trained teachers may avoid it, perhaps, but our people will not.

It is a remarkable and distressing fact that the nearer we approach the day of Christ's manifestation and of his people's glory, the farther we seem to recede from it. Until about the seventeenth century, a hundred years after the Reformation, no one seems ever to have ventured the assertion that the day was at least a thousand years distant; and this was done at first with

much diffidence. And yet by the time that the Church is well accustomed to this view, the doctrine is advanced, and readily finds advocates,\* that the years are prophetic years, and that "the day of redemption" is at least three hundred and sixty thousand years beyond us. Creatures of a day may hardly be censured for regarding three hundred and sixty thousand years as a small eternity; and men who expect to live in the disembodied state near half a million of years, cannot be severely condemned for regarding that as nearly the whole of salvation. Truly it is a "salutary suspense" in which God has left us respecting that day! For if the above-named opinion ever gain general currency in the Church, it may be safely predicted that "the memory of the resurrection will be buried with the bodies of our dead" too securely for even an occasional remembrance, so far at least as the Church at large is concerned. It is not easy for man to look intently at more than one object at a time. If we fix our mind habitually on the state after death, we are apt to lose sight of the resurrection; if we look fixedly and with absorbing interest on the resurrection, we leap instinctively across the chasm which separates us from it, and the more readily as God has left its breadth uncertain to us. For this reason, the Bible bids us fix our eye habitually on what is most important, and live always with direct reference to that great day the issues of which will make us supremely blessed, or unutterably, inconceivably miserable. "God now commandeth all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained," and distribute to all men "life or death, blessing or cursing," according to the several character and deeds of each.

Inquiries as to the time of these things, commonly turn, in our day, on the millennium: as whether we are to expect them at the beginning, or not till after the close of the period so designated. But there seems to be a heaven-sent answer to such inquiries, which is free from all the uncertainties which will

---

\* Quoted with seeming commendation by the Rev. Dr. Lowrie, in the opening sermon of the late Old School General Assembly at St. Louis.

always beset every theory of the millennium: "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." 2 Pet. iii. 9. Now, as the apostle is expressly assigning a reason for the Lord's apparent forgetfulness and negligence to fulfil the promise of his personal coming, it is manifest that his reference is not to God's general forbearance and longsuffering towards the impenitent; because these perish, and will continue to perish, just the same whether he come soon or late; indeed, the longer he tarries, the greater the number of those who perish. But, if we understand it of the "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," the reason assigned for his seeming delay is conclusive and satisfactory. "All that the Father hath given me shall come unto me," said Jesus. "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." Christ, therefore, is waiting only that all who are "ordained unto eternal life" may come unto him. Did he hasten his appearing before they had all been born into the world, he would lose part of those the Father had given him; did he come before any part of these had "come to repentance," they would "perish." If this exposition be correct, no words could more expressly teach that the work of redemption ends, and the numbers of the Church of the redeemed are fully made up, when Christ comes. *All then impenitent, perish!*

The promised glory and blessedness of the saints—the finishing of "the mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations," and into which the angels desire to look, "the glory which shall be revealed in us, with which the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared," "the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us, through Jesus Christ, which *in the ages to come* he is to show," the glorious destiny to which the redeemed from among men are appointed: all this is in suspense, and waiting only that all whom the Father hath given the Son may come unto him—all those "who shall

be heirs of salvation." But as he only who keeps the book of life knows how many or how few remain to be gathered out of all nations, so also he only knows how near or how remote is the day of his appearing. It may be many, many ages yet; but still we would ever pray that the kingdom of glory may be hastened. We have no such love for the possible generations of some remote future, as to accept or find any pleasure in the opinion that, in their behoof, we are yet to wait near half a million of years for the promised good—not, at least, without some positive assurance of it, which, thank God, (whatever may be his secret purpose,) he has not given us: such an assurance would be only less dreadful than to be told that he abandoned his purpose altogether.

How the aggregate numbers of the saved will compare with those of the lost, God has not been pleased to inform us; and therefore all speculations on the subject are frivolous and unprofitable. We are assured that "the Lord knoweth them that are his;" that "of all which his Father hath given him, he will lose nothing," and that it will be "a multitude which no man can number." But whether those who have entered in at the strait gate will be "many" or "few" as compared with those who have passed the gate that leads to destruction, we know that Christ "shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied.

## ARTICLE V.

THE NORTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY (O. S.) OF  
1866.

Although we are not connected with the denomination represented in this Old School General Assembly, and hence have no direct interest in it, or in what it may do, there are many reasons why it is becoming and necessary for this Review to take notice of some of the extraordinary proceedings which have characterised the recent sessions of that body. Among these reasons, we may mention, 1. That the said Assembly is the supreme court of the largest body of orthodox and evangelical Presbyterians on earth. This fact gives to its proceedings an artificial importance which can attach to no other such body, and which do not belong to the proceedings themselves. 2. The acts of the recent Assembly have put the great principles of Presbyterianism to a test to which they were never subjected before; certainly not on this continent. 3. The Constitution of our Church and that which controls the said Assembly, is the same; and all the decisions which that body has reached concerning it, cannot fail to arrest attention among us; for whatever is constitutional with them must needs be so also with us. 4. The attention which that Assembly continues to bestow on our Church forces us to observe its proceedings narrowly, and to weigh their influence and probable effects upon us as a denomination. 5. We were ourselves members of that Church until recently, when forced out of it by the action of its General Assembly. And although, if we know our own heart, we are thankful, and daily render thanks to God for the fact, that we are out of it; that we are free from its contests, alienations, and divisions; and that we are permitted to address ourselves to the great work which is before us, in peace, quietness, and harmony; nevertheless, we look with more hope toward it than we do toward any other body of the North; and we expect, for the sake of "auld lang syne,"



and notwithstanding all that has happened, to observe its proceedings with a more abiding interest than those of any other denomination except our own. 6. And last, though not least, the effect which these recent proceedings is likely to have on the general interests of evangelical Presbyterianism, challenges the thoughtful interest of every man who loves the doctrines of grace and the order of God's house, as set forth in our common standards.

We take no pleasure in the divisions which afflict the Old School body. Again, as good old David Nelson used to say, we have Presbyterian arrayed against Presbyterian; the strength, the energy, and the talents, which ought to be employed in promoting the common cause, and in carrying the war into Satan's camp, are exerted for the triumph of party; and stalwart arms hurl powerful blows, Presbyterian against Presbyterian. We do not love these scenes; and while we can fully understand and appreciate the position of those who, in that Church, are called on to take part in unhappy controversy, nevertheless, we mourn over the necessity for it. Yea, we would have rejoiced before God, had the action of the last Assembly been such as to commend itself to the Christian conscience of the whole denomination; such as to restore peace to that Church and harmony to its courts.

We do not design to give anything approaching a history of this Assembly, or a review of its entire proceedings. Those that are prominent, possessing special and permanent interest, because of their extraordinary nature, are all we shall pass under our criticism. We must refer our readers to the newspapers, for the current debates, and other matters of interest pertaining to it.

The Assembly was very full—not the largest Assembly which ever met, but the fullest delegation ever present from the Presbyteries now belonging to it. Throwing out the eight foreign missionary Presbyteries, but one of which was represented, every ministerial delegate was present, except two from California. All the ruling elders were present except fourteen. An unusual number of the members had long occupied prominent positions, and exerted a commanding influence in the Church. The del-

agation of the eldership, in proportion, was as distinguished as that of the ministry.

On examining the reports of the respective Boards, we observe that while the Boards of Domestic Missions, Publication, and Church Extension, enjoy an average of prosperity, that of Foreign Missions suffers greatly with diminished resources; and these subject to heavy discount in making remittances in gold or its equivalent to the foreign stations. Moreover, the abstract in the minutes says nothing about it, but the newspapers represent a falling off in the receipts and in the number of candidates of the Board of Education. These lamentable results as to the two Boards most likely to be affected by them, may be accounted for, partly, because of the alienations and divisions now existing in the Church, as their immediate and necessary effect, creating a want of confidence; partly, because the things of Cæsar, in the courts of the Church, and even in the worship of the sanctuary, have assumed so much prominence in many places, that the true work of the Church has dwindled into insignificance; partly, because under the instructions of the Assembly of 1865, the funds contributed by the churches must all be used in the interest of the dominant party in the Church; and partly, by the necessity laid on the minority in the Church to contribute to the support of their brethren, who are under the ban of the Boards. There may have been other reasons, but we doubt not all these have had a most potent influence in preventing a large increase in the receipts of all the Boards, at a time of unprecedented prosperity throughout the whole North.

The Seminaries enjoy an average of prosperity, except Danville, which has finally succumbed to the circumstances which surround it, and has closed its doors. The wide division of sentiment on the questions now agitating that Church in the Synod of Kentucky, within whose bounds the Seminary is located; and especially the fact that the oldest and the youngest professors have been out of sympathy with a majority of the Synod on these distracting topics, and in full sympathy with the current influence in the Church; while the remaining professors have been in full sympathy neither with the Church, the Synod,

nor their colleagues, has led to a result which Dr. Breckinridge foresaw, and one year ago wished to anticipate. The proceedings of the Assembly seem to look toward a removal of the institution to some other point. If removed, certainly it will not be sent further South; and we cannot suppose that those funds contributed to the Seminary in the South-west, simply because of the nearness of the location of the institution to that section of the country, can be taken to any point more remote.

Dr. E. D. McMaster was appointed to the chair of Theology in the Chicago Seminary. Two or three times before, his claims to a similar position have been canvassed in the Assembly; and although his attainments have always been recognised, he has heretofore been passed over, because he was not in harmony with the Church on the subject of slavery. But now, as the Church has been converted to his views on these subjects, and he and it are in full concord on "doctrine, loyalty, and freedom," we think it was very suitable in this Assembly to acknowledge their accession to his position by electing him to the very chair from which he had previously been excluded because of this variance of opinion. The Assembly have made the *amende honorable* in the most honorable way to Dr. McMaster.

But these matters pertaining to the ordinary work of the Church, occupied but an insignificant share of its attention. The absorbing matter was the "Declaration and Testimony," prepared and issued by the Presbytery of Louisville, and which was subsequently signed by a large number of ministers and elders, principally within the bounds of the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri. This document, and the papers connected with it or occasioned by it, occupied three-fourths of the time of the General Assembly; and like the lean cattle of Pharaoh, consumes almost every thing else in the portly pages of the Princeton Review.

This Declaration is quite a large pamphlet—entirely too large for insertion here. We must content ourselves with a brief synopsis of it.

After a solemn preamble, in which the gravity of the occasion and the imminency of the dangers which surround the Church

are set forth, the signers proceed to testify against error in doctrine and irregularity in the practice of the General Assembly, in the following fourteen particulars, viz. :

“1. Against the assumption, on the part of the courts of the Church, of the right to decide questions of State policy.”

“2. Against the doctrine that the Church, as such, owes allegiance to human rulers or governments.”

“3. Against the sanction given by the Church to the perversion of the teachings of Christ and his apostles upon the subject of the duty of Christians, as citizens, to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to be subject unto the higher powers.”

“4. Against the action of the Assembly on the subject of slavery and emancipation in 1864, and as confirmed in '65.”

“5. Against the unjust and scandalous contradiction of their own recorded testimony, and the well known facts in regard to the labors of the Presbyterian Church and ministry, for the Christianizing of the slaves of the South, and the preaching to them of the gospel of Christ.”

“6. Against the doctrine widely taught in the Church, and even countenanced by the Assembly, that the acts and deliverances of the courts of Christ's commonwealth may properly be based upon and shaped in accordance with the ordinances and laws of State legislatures, the orders and proclamations of military chieftains, and even the results of popular votes given at the elections.”

“7. Against the doctrine that the will of God as to the duty of the Church and of his people is to be learned from particular providential events, and that the teachings of the Scriptures are to be interpreted by these providences.”

“8. Against the sanction which has been given, both directly and indirectly, to the usurpation, by the secular and military power, of authority in and over the worship and government of the Church.”

“9. Against that alliance which has been virtually formed by the Church with the State, by which the State has been encouraged and even invited, to use the Church as an instrument for giving effect to its various schemes of a political character.”

“10. Against that persecution which has been carried on for these five years past, and with increasing malignity, toward all those who have steadfastly refused to sanction or acquiesce in these departures of the Church from the foundations of truth and righteousness.”

“11. Against the wide-spread and destructive perversion of the commission of the ministry and the province of Church courts.”

“12. Against the action of the Assembly in reference to the churches in the seceded and border States, and against the basing of that action upon an assertion of what the Assembly had the clearest evidence was not true.”

“13. Against that act of the Assembly by which the Board of Domestic Missions (that is, the Executive Committee at Philadelphia or its Corresponding Secretary,) are constituted a court of final and superior jurisdiction, to judge of the orthodoxy of the ministry and the soundness of their views touching the nature of the government of the United States, the doctrine of State rights, the freedom of the negroes, and the various important questions touching their social and civil *status*, now and prospective.

“14. Against all and every movement in the Church, however cautiously or plausibly veiled, which looks to a union of the State with the Church, or a subordination of the one to the other, or the interference of either with the jurisdiction of the other. We testify against any test of a religious character, in order to the exercise of the rights of citizenship; and against any political test whatever as a qualification for membership in the Church, or the exercise of the functions of the gospel ministry.

“REASONS FOR THIS TESTIMONY.

“Against each and all of these errors in doctrine and practice, we testify:

“1. Because they are contrary to the word of God, and subversive of its inspiration and supreme authority, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice.”

“2. Because they are contrary to the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church, as taught in her Confession, Catechisms, and Constitution.”

“3. Because they tend to obliterate all the lines of separation between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, to confound their jurisdictions, to identify them with each other, and so to destroy the freedom of both.”

“4. Because they have brought the ministry and the ordinances of religion, and the authority of the Church into public disrepute.”

“5. Because they tend to keep up strife and alienation among

brethren of a common faith, and thus delay the pacification of the country."

"6. Because they are schismatical."

The closing paragraph of this branch of the Declaration, and the concluding part of the whole document, we give in full, as follows, viz. :

"Against this corruption and betrayal, therefore, we testify in the sight of God and angels and men. We wash our hands of all participation in its guilt. We declare our deliberate purpose, trusting in God, who can save by few as well as by many, to use our best endeavors to bring back the Church of our fathers to her ancient purity and integrity, upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, and under the banner of our only King, Priest, and Prophet, the Lord Jesus Christ. In this endeavor, we pledge ourselves to assist and co-operate with each other. And, by the grace of God, we will never abandon the effort, no matter what sacrifices it may require us to make, until we shall either have succeeded in reforming the Church and restoring her tarnished glory; or failing in this, necessity shall be laid upon us, in obedience to the apostolic command, to 'withdraw' from those who have departed from the truth. Compelled to this course, we will go, bearing with us the true Presbyterian Church with her doctrine, order, worship, and freedom, as they have been given her by her Divine Head, and transmitted from generation to generation, by the hands of saints and confessors and martyrs.

#### "ACTION PROPOSED.

"And now, dear brethren in Christ, that without delay we may begin this arduous and most important work, to you who like ourselves are servants of the Lord Christ; 'who adhere to the plain doctrines of the cross as taught in the Standards of the Westminster Assembly; ' to all of you who love your ancient and pure Constitution; to you who are grieved for the afflictions of Jacob, and desire to restore our abused and corrupted Church to her simplicity, purity, and liberty; we a portion of yourselves, ministers and elders of your churches, would propose, most respectfully and kindly, and yet most earnestly :

"1. 'That we refuse to give our support to ministers, elders, agents, editors, teachers, or to those who are in any other capacity engaged in religious instruction or effort, who hold the preceding or similar heresies.'

"2. That we refuse to take any part in the discussion or decision by any ecclesiastical court, of those questions touching

the policy and measures which do properly pertain to the civil commonwealth.

“3. That we will recognise no authority in the decision of questions of Christian doctrine or morals, or concerning the rights of the Church or the duties of its members, other than the written word of God.

“4. That we will not take any oath prescribed by civil or military authority, as a qualification for sitting in a Church court, or for worshipping God, or for preaching the gospel, or exercising any of the functions of the ministry. Nor will we sit in any judicatory thus constituted.

“5. That we will extend our sympathy and aid, as we may have opportunity, to all who in any way, are subjected to ecclesiastical censure or civil disabilities or penalties, for their adherence to the principles we maintain, and the repudiation of the errors, in doctrine and practice, against which we bear this our testimony.

“6. That we will not sustain, or execute, or in any manner assist in the execution of the orders, passed at the last two Assemblies on the subject of slavery and loyalty; and with reference to the conducting of missions in the Southern States; and with regard to the ministers, members, and churches in the seceded and border States.

“7. That we will withhold our contributions from the Boards of the Church (with the exception of the Board of Foreign Missions) and from the Theological Seminaries, until these institutions are rescued from the hands of those who are perverting them to the teaching and promulgation of principles subversive of the system they were founded and organised to uphold and disseminate. And we will appropriate the moneys thus withheld, in aid of those instrumentalities which may be employed, for maintaining and defending the principles affirmed in this Declaration, against the errors herein rejected; and in assisting the impoverished ministers and churches any where throughout the country, who agree with us in these essential doctrines, in restoring and building up their congregations and houses of worship.

“8. ‘We recommend that all ministers, elders, church sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods, who approve of this Declaration and Testimony, give their public adherence thereto in such manner as they shall prefer, and communicate their names, and, when a Church court, a copy of their adhering act.’

“9. ‘That inasmuch as our only hope of improvement and reformation in the affairs of our Church depends upon the

interposition of him who is King in Zion, that we will unceasingly and importunately supplicate a throne of grace, for the return of that purity and peace, the absence of which we now sorrowfully deplore.'

"10. We do earnestly recommend that on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ A. D. 1865, a Convention be held in the city of \_\_\_\_\_

composed of all such ministers and ruling elders as may concur in the views and sentiments of this testimony, to deliberate and consult on the present state of our Church; and to adopt such further measures as may seem best suited to restore her prostrated standards, and vindicate the pure and peaceful religion of Jesus from the reproach which has been brought upon it, through the faithlessness and corruption of its ministers and professors.

"'And now, brethren, our whole heart is laid open to you, and to the world. If a majority of our Church are against us, (as we have too much reason to apprehend it is,) they will, we suppose, in the end, either see the infatuation of their course, and retrace their steps; or they will, at last, attempt to cut us off. If the former, we shall bless the God of Jacob; if the latter, we desire to stand ready for the sake of Christ, and in support of the Testimony now made, to endure whatever suffering may be required of us by our Lord. We have here frankly, openly, and candidly, laid before our erring brethren, the course we are, by the grace of God, irrevocably determined to pursue. It is our steadfast aim to reform the Church, or to testify against its errors and defections, until testimony will be no longer heard. And we commit the issue into the hands of Him who is over all, God blessed forever. AMEN.'

"NOTE.—Some portions of the above recommendation, together with most of the closing paragraph, are taken from the Act and Testimony, A. D. 1835."

Whatever else may be said of this document, no one can hesitate to attribute to it the meed of praise for marked ability. Nor can any one fail to perceive that the spirit which animates it is that of intense earnestness and concern for the interests of the Church of God. The names appended to it are, in large part, certainly those of men who have been zealous and faithful officers in Christ's house, and who have done much for the up-building and strengthening of the Presbyterian Church in by-gone days; many of them are men whose praise is in all the churches. For their number, a list of greater character and



respectability could not readily be secured to any document on any subject.

The paper itself, however, is liable to some criticism. On our first reading of it, we were impressed with the belief that it would fail to produce the effect designed. As a declaration of principles, it is entirely too voluminous. The authors of it could scarcely expect the argumentative parts of it to be largely signed. Men who agree in their opinions do not often arrive at their convictions in exactly the same way; and hence multitudes who might have held views coincident with those of the signers of this paper, would be deterred from affixing their names to it, because they did not concur in some of the reasoning contained in it. Moreover, there was a vehemence of expression which would be distasteful to many who might approve of it in every other respect. Many who were anxious to testify against the erroneous and hurtful doings of the General Assembly, might be slow to use such strong language about the Assembly itself.

But while some may hesitate to approve of the forms of expression occasionally employed, on the other hand we may affirm that Presbyterians have always indulged in a very free criticism of the doings of their church courts. Indeed, this has been deemed their birth-right; and arises out of the doctrine of the Church that Synods and Councils are liable to err. This doctrine is designed to be incorporated in the very vows of ordination where the candidate simply promises to be subject to his brethren "in the Lord." This is at once a confession of the supreme right of Christ as King and Head of the Church, and of the fallibility of tribunals composed of fallible men. Now, though these brethren have exercised this right with great freedom at a time of intense excitement, and in the pressure of a strong provocation, the question is whether they have carried it beyond the boundaries of right, and justly subjected themselves to the summary discipline of the Church.

If we understand the recent discussions, the points in which they have offended, are, their denunciation of the General Assembly as having, on the questions at issue, become apostate to the truth; their refusal to obey the orders of the Assembly

prescribing new terms of communion; their withdrawal from participation with the Boards of the Church, except that of Foreign Missions; and their declared purpose of withdrawing from the Church, in case they should fail to bring it back to its ancient landmarks. These are strong positions assuredly; but is there not abundant precedent for them all?

1. In the Old and New School controversy which agitated the Church about thirty years ago, the respective parties were wont to use strong language; and whilst a rotundity and chasteness of expression may have been used in the formal deliverances of that day which are not affected in the Declaration and Testimony, yet the charges go to the full extent of this document against the action of the supreme judicatory of the Church. The difference between the pronouncements of that day and this, in this particular, is simply one of rhetoric. A chastened rhetoric is certainly an excellent thing in its place; but a failure to employ its rotundity and to use dilettante language in speaking of public evils, is scarcely an unpardonable sin.

2. As to the refusal to obey the orders of the Assembly, this has been done before. The examination rule was set aside by many Presbyteries, who refused to obey it, declared it unconstitutional, etc.; and it was not till many years after its passage that it became established as the law of the Church. But no summary measures were adopted against recusant Presbyteries; a solemn vote of disapproval of their records was generally, but not always, made in their respective Synods, and there the matter ended. The spirit of the Church has always been that of conciliation; it has been its uniform course to aim at the satisfying of the consciences of weak brethren, without resorting to extreme discipline, on every matter where the great truths of the gospel of Jesus Christ were not involved. Hence it has always avoided pushing matters to an extremity.

3. For many years the existence of irresponsible voluntary organisations for doing the appropriate work of the Church in evangelization was not only suffered in the Presbyterian Church, but much encouraged. And although, in the great reform of 1837, the Church formally undertook this work itself, it has

never to this day forbid the operation of other societies within its bounds. It has never required the various Presbyteries and Synods, on the pains and penalties of exclusion from its fold, to contribute to the ecclesiastical Boards, and operate through the channels of their organisation. Various Presbyteries have, at different times, cut loose from the Board of Domestic Missions, and undertaken to conduct missionary operations for themselves. The same is true with regard to the Board of Education, and we know of no principle of Church order violated thereby, which would require the interposition of the General Assembly: certainly not, anterior to an injunction from the General Assembly requiring co-operation with its plans, and an abstinence from independent efforts. If voluntary societies may operate within the bounds of the Church, assuredly the Presbyteries and Synods are not justly liable to anathema for acting for themselves in their ecclesiastical capacity.

Finally, as to their threat of withdrawing from the Church in case it could not be reformed, this is nothing new. To address that language to the Assembly itself might be deemed an act of defiance, and hence be censured as a contempt. The Declaration and Testimony, however, was not addressed to the Assembly, but to the Church at large, just as the Act and Testimony of 1834. But the Presbytery of Chillicothe not only threatened the Assembly with withdrawal, about twenty-five years ago, but actually abstained from sending commissioners to the Assembly for two or three years; and declared they could not do so, as long as slaveholders were allowed to commune in the Church. Of this conduct the Assembly took no notice. Moreover, what did Dr. Gurley do in this very Assembly at St. Louis, but to its face declare that if it did not exercise discipline on these recalcitrant brethren, he would seek ecclesiastical cover elsewhere? This was deemed no offence to this Assembly, because Dr. Gurley had become a leader, and was simply hectoring them a little. What did Mr. Galloway do, in this same Assembly, but declare that he would not sit in an Assembly with a man who had called him vulgar; and so the vulgar threat had its desired effect, and in order to retain so distinguished a leader in their counsels, the

Assembly had to redress his private grievances by expelling a member. But both these gentlemen, Dr. Gurley and Mr. Galloway, were guilty of great disrespect to the Assembly; and at the very least, ought to have been called to order by the moderator. Had such language been employed by a member of the minority, by Dr. Boardman, Dr. Van Dyke, Dr. Anderson, or Dr. Brookes, we have no doubt they would have felt the power of the majority of four to one, in a decisive form.

But this shows the difference between my ox goring yours, and your ox goring mine. The Declaration and Testimony men were in the minority in the Assembly and in the Church; but these men were in the majority. That majority were flushed with their unexpected power, and the great accessions they had gained to their party after the Assembly met; and fell into the very error which they charged on the minority, viz., that of pushing matters to extremes, instead of pursuing methods of conciliation.

In all the particulars which we have mentioned, however, no candid man will deny that the brethren who issued the paper in question pushed their right of dissent, remonstrance, and protest, to its extreme; and in their strong and stirring appeals to the Church, nothing could justify them but the pressure of urgent conscience under a deep sense of impending danger. Their course has been censured as schismatical; and assuredly, schism is the result. How extensive it will become, none can now tell. But on whom does the charge justly rest? Let the proceedings which have been had in reference to this matter be first examined; after which, we can the better judge of the question of responsibility.

The document under consideration having been adopted by the Louisville Presbytery, was immediately published to the Church. Great offence was taken at it in many places by the party which has been in the majority. And when the Synod of Kentucky met, Dr. R. J. Breckinridge moved to exclude the signers of that document from seats in that body, charging that by signing it they had disqualified themselves to sit in any Church court. This measure having failed, Dr. Breckinridge and others took a

complaint to the General Assembly at St. Louis. As all this matter came before that body in other forms, and as there was some failure to secure its full presentation according to previous arrangement, Dr. Breckinridge dropped his complaint for the present, and allowed it to be postponed to the next Assembly.

The deep agitation of the Church, in Kentucky, Missouri, and elsewhere, by this document, and the discussions which grew out of it, led to considerable uneasiness on the part of those who had hitherto been in the majority, not knowing whereunto this thing might grow, and fearing that the party of the Declaration and Testimony should prove stronger than had been expected. Lest any damage should accrue to their interest, and the Church should be induced to abandon her testimony on loyalty, freedom, State rights and the like subjects, strenuous exertions seem to have been put forth by the leaders of the majority. Especially we may mention that Dr. R. J. Breckinridge put forth a call for a convention or caucus of the party of the majority, to determine what course should be adopted in the Assembly pertaining to this subject. Many of the oldest ministers of the Church afterward united in this call, and a convention of more than a hundred members met at St. Louis a day or two before the convening of the Assembly, and continued in session until after the organisation of that body.

The Presbytery of Louisville, which had adopted the obnoxious document, was represented in the Assembly by a most able delegation, viz., the Rev. Drs. S. R. Wilson and Stuart Robinson, both of Louisville, and the Hon. Charles A. Wickliffe, a ruling elder at Bardstown, and Mark Hardin, Esq., a ruling elder at Shelbyville.

Immediately after the organisation of the house, Dr. D. V. McLean moved the following resolution, which was adopted by a decided majority, viz. :

“ *Whereas*, It is understood that the Presbytery of Louisville has openly defied the General Assembly, and refused to submit to its orders, in a pamphlet adopted by it, of which the following is a specimen, viz., ‘We will not sustain or execute, or in any manner assist in the execution of the orders passed at the last two Assemblies, on the subject of slavery and loyalty, and with

reference to the conducting of missions in the Southern States, and with regard to the ministers, members, and churches in the seceded and border States; and

“*Whereas*, Said Presbytery has commissioned, and sent to this Assembly, at least one Commissioner, who, if the order of the last Assembly had been faithfully executed by said Presbytery, there is the strongest ground for believing would have been suspended from the functions of the gospel ministry: Therefore,

“*Resolved*, That until the Assembly shall have examined and decided upon the conduct of said Presbytery, the Commissioners therefrom shall not be entitled to seats in this body.”

This minute thus adopted is assuredly extraordinary; it has no precedent. The excuses and pretexts offered for its justification only the more clearly show the unwarrantable nature of the action taken. It is immaterial what may be the nature of the offences charged, or whether the charges be true or false, the fundamental maxim of justice is that every man is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty; he must be accounted innocent until his guilt has been established, by satisfactory testimony, after a formal judicial investigation.

It was maintained that this action was competent to the court, because the Louisville Presbytery was under process, and the constitution authorised the court to exclude it from representation until its case was issued. But, 1. The minute makes no allusion to Dr. R. J. Breckinridge's complaint at all, which it must do, if it be a part of that trial; but it assigns entirely different reasons for the action taken. 2. The complaint was not then before the house; so far as the Assembly, in its official character, was concerned, it did not know the case was to come up: hence this could be no part of it. 3. What right had Dr. Stanton to sit in the moderator's chair, if this was a part of that trial, since he himself was one of these parties to it? 4. When that case did come up, it was found that it was not the Presbytery of Louisville that was on trial, but the Synod of Kentucky; and so the house decided. Fifth, and lastly. The case never was tried at all, but was practically abandoned. Now, if this proceeding was part of this process, as Mr. Clarke argued, when the case fell through, why did not the excluded

commissioners have a right immediately to resume their seats? But no such right existed under this minute, nor was it dreamed of.

Again: It was claimed as a right inherent in a church court to judge of the qualifications of its own members; and the Houses of Congress, and of our various State Legislatures were referred to for illustration. In answer to this, we observe, 1. This power in these legislative bodies is expressly provided for in the Constitution of the United States, and of the respective States. A constitutional right in a political legislature cannot infer the existence of the same right in a similar ecclesiastical body; but the fact that it is not granted by the ecclesiastical constitution immediately infers its non-existence. For, if it required a constitutional provision to confer it on the political legislature, certainly it would require a like constitutional provision to confer it on the ecclesiastical court. But granting its existence, what does it amount to? What is meant by qualifications? Is worthiness meant? Assuredly not, but simply that the man possesses the constitutional requirements, and has been elected according to the forms of law. That is, Are Drs. Robinson and Wilson ministers properly ordained and lawfully connected with the Presbytery of Louisville, and in good and regular standing? And a similar inquiry, *mutatis mutandis*, with regard to the ruling elders; and then, Have these brethren been regularly elected? The question is not whether Dr. Stuart Robinson is the best abused or the most abusive man in the Church. Nor whether he went to Canada or was banished there. Nothing of the sort. Nor yet, as to whether, if he were tried, he would be found guilty of the specified offences; but simply, Is he constitutionally qualified, and constitutionally elected? The whole object is to ascertain, in a regular and lawful way, whether the action of the constituency has been in accordance with the constitution; and by the American constitutions, as well as by that of Great Britain, this power is conferred upon the legislature simply to prevent confusion and disorder. It is important to have it exactly determined where the power resides to examine into the legality and constitutionality of public elections. It is

the only resort against violence. Hence this authority is made determinate in the legislature, lest the exercise of this power elsewhere might lead to an interference with its independence. But this same necessity can scarcely be predicated with reference to ecclesiastical courts. 2. The manner in which the preamble deals with the subject, is to determine the worthiness of these members: a right which, under the constitution, is lodged in the Presbyteries, and in every representative body is inherent in the constituency. 3. The paper is really a judicial finding, with a penal sentence. It asserts facts, as to crimes committed; and cutting like a two-edged sword, it strikes now at the Presbytery, and now at the commissioners; and ends by ejecting the commissioners, because, by possibility, on a supposed trial which actually never took place, that Presbytery might be found guilty of grave offences. For high-handed tyranny we think there is no parallel to it, except in the action of the present Congress of the United States in the matter of Southern representation. (We mean, of course, in making this statement, to judge of that Congress and its conduct by its own principles, established by the most convincing of all reasoning, the logic of the bayonet.)

But to return. How would it have sounded, in 1837, had Dr. Baxter arisen and offered a resolution to this effect: "That whereas Dr. N. S. S. Beman, a commissioner from the Presbytery of Troy, is understood never to have adopted the Constitution of this Church; and whereas, it is probable that his Presbytery would have deposed him from the ministry, had they obeyed the injunction of the Assembly of 1835 on the subject of trying men for their doctrinal errors: Therefore, *Resolved*, That until the Assembly shall have examined and decided on the conduct of said Presbytery, the said commissioner shall not be entitled to his seat." Would it not have startled the Assembly, and shocked its moral sense, at that day, before the Church had run wild with political excitement? It would have been said that no charges had ever been tabled against Dr. Beman. Neither have charges ever been tabled against Stuart Robinson, notwithstanding all the hue and cry which have been raised against him. It would have been said that no one could be pronounced guilty by



a legislative action, until proved guilty by a judicial process; that innocence must be inferred until guilt has been judicially established. This, again, is a principle recognised every where, except in the case of Dr. Stuart Robinson and the Declaration and Testimony men. It would have been said that the forcible and unconstitutional ejection of a commissioner from the Assembly had destroyed its integrity, and rendered the whole of its proceedings null, since it could no longer claim to consist of an equal delegation of ministers and elders from every Presbytery, and hence that it did not represent in one body all the particular churches of the denomination. And had such an outrage been perpetrated, it would have weighed in the balances against the Old School before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in Bank in 1839.

This latter point was, indeed, raised and argued with great force against the action of the St. Louis Assembly now under consideration, by Dr. Van Dyke, of Brooklyn, in his able protest. The answer to it, prepared by Dr. West, also of Brooklyn, and adopted by the Assembly, cannot be considered any thing less than a complete acknowledgment of the validity of the objection. The reply is that Dr. Van Dyke's principle would vitiate every meeting of the Assembly, because some delegates fail to attend at every meeting. This may pass for good fencing; such weapons may answer to foil an adversary; but surely Dr. West and the Assembly must have known that this argument, if we may call it such, did not, in the slightest particular, touch the difficulty raised by Dr. Van Dyke. That silence gives consent, is a law of all deliberative bodies; and voluntary absence is the most potent form of silent acquiescence. This is more especially the case when the law of organisation, by which the members are bound, specifies the quorum to whose decisions they all agree to submit. But is there any analogy between the voluntary absence and silent acquiescence of Presbyteries or their commissioners, and the forcible ejection of lawfully delegated members? Is there ever a quorum present in any deliberative assembly, when any man is forcibly ejected? Can it be called a General Assembly of the whole Church, when any Presbytery is denied

representation? This is Dr. Van Dyke's point, which Dr. West does not touch, does not even approach; thereby confessing his inability to meet it.

Indeed, one member, Mr. Galloway we believe, defended the action taken against the Louisville commissioners, by charging that the Assembly of 1837 had ejected the commissioners from the "four Synods" from the house without giving them a hearing. He said the Assemblies of 1837 and 1838 had cut off Presbyteries and Synods in this manner. Mr. Galloway must get the history of his own Church from the New School; for this is precisely what they have always charged on the Old School, but which the Old School have always denied. The New School have charged that those Presbyteries and Synods were excinded; but the Old School have always, until Mr. Galloway became their champion, claimed that they were simply disowned. The Assembly of 1837 examined into their origin, the source whence they came; they repealed the Plan of Union of 1801, under which they were organised, declaring it unconstitutional, and that, hence, every thing done under it was unconstitutional. Therefore, those Presbyteries and Synods which were organised under it, never having been constitutionally organised, were no part of the Presbyterian Church; and so the Assembly of 1837 decided, and Judge Gibson pronounced it good law in 1839. But no man, at that day, ever dreamed that any commissioner could be ejected from the Assembly, or any member excluded from the Church, after he once had obtained admittance by the constitutional door, without regular trial and condemnation; or that a lawfully constituted Presbytery could be denied representation, on any ground. The Assembly decided that the Presbyteries of the dismissed Synods had never been lawfully constituted; but nobody has yet denied the legality of the organisation of the Presbytery of Louisville. Hence, the case of the disowned Synods is not analogous to the case in hand, and forms no justification of the recent action of the Assembly.

Indeed, such a proceeding was never dreamed of in 1837. At that day it would have been denounced as an arbitrary assump-

tion of tyrannical power by an irresponsible majority. And undoubtedly, all unprejudiced men outside of the Old School body must so account their recent course toward the Louisville commissioners. Men must be tried and convicted before being condemned. And this was precisely the course Dr. R. J. Breckinridge aimed at. He does not often secure his objects by indirection; but comes up to the issues before him squarely, meeting them face to face. In this case, he endeavored to arraign the lower court on direct charges, condemn it on them, and execute sentence accordingly. This course would have challenged the respect of all men, whatever might have been the final result; for it would at least have shown a decent respect for the forms of justice.

But in an evil hour the Assembly fell under the lead of Dr. D. V. McLean, who understands nothing of the forms, and would seem to care but little for the ends of justice; and consequently brought on itself the indelible discredit of its tyrannical course towards the Louisville Presbytery.

The resolution having been adopted to exclude the Presbytery of Louisville, on the motion of the same extraordinary leader, Dr. D. V. McLean, it was "resolved that a committee of seven be appointed, composed of four ministers and three elders, to examine into the facts connected with the alleged acts and proceedings of the Louisville Presbytery, and whether it is entitled to representation in this General Assembly; and to recommend what action, if any, this General Assembly should take with regard to the said Presbytery."

They first exclude the Presbytery of Louisville, and then appoint a Committee to inquire into its conduct, and report whether it ought to be excluded. First, they hang the men, and then inquire whether they ought to hang them. This would scarcely be recognised out west or in the south-west, as "rough justice," under the unwritten code of Judge Lynch; as, always, under that code, a formal trial is had, and a formal sentence pronounced, antecedent to execution. This Assembly, however, was filled with admiration of the Congress of the United States, and tried to justify every arbitrary proceeding by a reference to

the rights and corresponding action of its two Houses. But did any body ever hear of such proceedings in either House of Congress? We admit that in its past history, and especially in more recent proceedings, precedents of a most extraordinary nature may be found. But just here, the appeal to Congress fails. It sometimes has adopted very startling measures, and by most unaccountable votes has vacated seats filled by men whose views were antagonistic to those of the majority. But we believe there is no instance on record where they have vacated the seat first, and then inquired into the grounds of their action afterwards. Recently four or five seats have been declared vacant, in one or other of the Houses of Congress; but in every case the members were allowed to hold their seats until the investigation of their cases was had, and a presumed ground of ejection ascertained. The forms of justice and of law have always been recognised, and, at all events, an *outward* respect has been manifested for them, while it may be true their spirit has been flagrantly violated, and that for partisan purposes.

The report of this Committee, through its Chairman, the same Dr. D. V. McLean, enlarges on the three following points, viz. :  
 1. The acts and proceedings of the Presbytery of Louisville;  
 2. The right of the Presbytery to a representation in the Assembly; and 3. What action the Assembly should take in the premises.

On the first point, it quotes various expressions in the "Declaration and Testimony" which charge error in doctrine and illegality in the action of preceding Assemblies; and cites the recommendations of that paper, as to the proper course to be pursued by the signers thereof, in the circumstances under which these alleged departures from the truth on the part of the supreme judicatory had placed them. After carefully reading over these specifications, we are still unable to see that the charges made against the General Assembly, or the expressions of apprehension for the consequences, are more schismatical than those contained in various documents issued during the period from 1831—37, pending the Old and New School controversy. Indeed, we think no man can read this remonstrance, and then

compare it, for example, with the Act and Testimony, without becoming satisfied that it was penned with the manifestoes of that day lying before the authors of it as their model. True, there is a vigor of language, an emphasis in its tone sometimes, that is a little startling; and what the men of 1835 express in the positive, those of 1865 express in the superlative; but the objects aimed at were manifestly the same, viz., to arrest the attention of the Church to grievous departures from her standards on the part of the present majority, and to secure, if possible, a reform of the Church by a return to the spirit and letter of her ancient standards.

On the second point, as to the right of the Presbytery to representation, it claims the authority of the Assembly to exclude from their seats parties who are under process. But it happens that the Presbytery was not under process, unless this was the beginning of it; and unfortunately the Presbytery was excluded first, and process was subsequently undertaken, even according to that view of it. But the word "process" is technical, and hence has a constitutional definition, of which this paper is utterly oblivious. True, every proceeding may be called process; but it cannot be called process in the constitutional sense, until trial has begun, the first step in which is the tabling of charges. When these are formally adopted, or at least formally ordered, constitutional process has begun. In that event, we suppose it is the right of a judicatory to exclude the parties on trial from their seats in it, *i. e.* in the court that tries, until the case is issued. All the precedents quoted by the Committee simply go to sustain this point.

On the third point, they recommend summary measures, viz., the dissolution of the Presbytery, and the organisation of a new one out of those who had not signed the unsavory remonstrance. The case was already before the house, in two judicial cases. 1. The complaint of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge against the Synod of Kentucky for a failure to eject the Presbytery. The decision of this case might have decided the whole matter just as the majority wished. The court could have determined the case, by censuring the Synod of Kentucky for neglect of duty, and

enjoining on them an attention to it, with specific instructions at its coming meeting; or it might have taken up the case itself as thus brought before it, and issued it, involving a determination of the fidelity of the court below, as well as an issuing of the original case. Again: There was an appeal of the Rev. J. P. McMillan from the decision of the same Synod, in postponing the case of complaint which he had made against the Presbytery to its next meeting. This case would have involved the same issues, and hence the two were merged by order of the Assembly. But judicial forms are always annoying, when an object has to be gained, and when the minds of men are already made up. A Republican Congressman asserted that the Bureau of Military Justice was organised to convict men, not to acquit them; and so, the General Assembly sets aside the rules of constitutional order, ignores the existence of causes pending at its bar, and appoints extra-judicial committees to produce extra-judicial findings; all because the decree had gone forth, the Presbytery of Louisville must be ejected, *per fas aut nefas*. The predestined purpose was conviction. Some may consider it a small matter how a result is reached; but the accomplishment of such results as those obtained at St. Louis, and by such means as those employed, is abhorrent to every feeling of justice; and it need create no great astonishment that the prevalence of such a spirit in the Assembly has caused a profound sensation throughout the whole of the Old School body. Dr. Humphrey urged this point upon the Assembly, viz., the absolute necessity of proceeding according to the forms of law, in order to secure the ends of justice; but while his speech is said to have produced considerable impression on the lachrymal organs of the majority, it would seem to have made none on their hearts or heads.

After much debate, however, the Assembly began to hesitate. The inklings of public dissatisfaction were too manifest; and an effort to avoid the constitutional issues which thrust themselves before the Church, was made. Dr. Gurley, of Washington City, offered a paper, which condemned the Declaration and Testimony as a slander against the Church, schismatical in its character and aims, and its adoption as an act of rebellion. It, more-

over, postponed the whole subject, report and all, to the next Assembly; and summoned the Presbytery and all the individual signers of the Declaration and Testimony to the bar of the next Assembly; but in the meanwhile suspended them from their ruling functions in every court above a church session. Moreover, it provides for the dissolution of any Presbytery or Synod which may refuse to obey these mandates in making out their roll. This is the substance of the whole minute.

The Assembly seem to have been very much surprised, and proportionately gratified at the accession of Dr. Gurley to the ranks of the majority. At the opening of the Assembly, he was run for moderator by the more moderate brethren; but before the Assembly got through, he had become the leader of the majority. And now the unprecedented vote was adopted of recording his speech as well as his resolutions. The speech is nothing but a rehash of the resolutions; a re-statement of the same things in different language; and the recording of it was just the manifestation of the majority's intense delight at the accession of the Doctor to their party.

All these proceedings, and all the attempted measures of the majority, are in an equal degree unprecedented, and were justified on the floor of the Assembly, and have been by their apologists since, on the same grounds. Some of these only can we notice.

H. K. Clarke, Esq., of Detroit, made what Dr. Hodge calls a "powerful speech" in defence of the summary measures of the Assembly. He began by informing the Assembly that the executive, legislative, and judicial powers in our church courts are not distributed as they are in the state and national governments; which he said *necessitated* a great difference in the modes of procedure. The meaning of which, if it has any meaning as an argument, is, that because these various functions all belong to the same body, they must necessarily be confounded in actual practice. As every thing in this Assembly was illustrated by allusions to political tribunals instead of the Scriptures and the standards, we will once more imitate the example, and call the attention of our readers to the Senate of the United States, in which unquestionably all these powers are exercised. But

though that tribunal is sometimes called on to try causes, as in cases of impeachment, sometimes to take part with the President in the executive administration of the government, and sometimes to unite with the House of Representatives in the ordinary duty of making laws; yet we do not suppose that it ever occurred to any grave senator that the fact that these three kinds of power were lodged in that body *necessitated* a confounding of all distinctions, after the fashion practised by Mr. Clarke. The men who compose that Senate have a method of ascertaining what kind of business they are doing; and know well that when sitting in a legislative capacity, they can perform no judicial functions whatsoever; and they know, moreover, that under the constitution of the United States, they can make no judicial determination of any matter that may come before them, unless it be as a decision of a cause regularly tried. Until this Assembly met, we supposed that the same point was well settled in the Presbyterian Church; that every judicatory had to constitute as a court, before passing to the consideration of judicial business. Mr. Clarke, in his great speech, showed that *necessarily* a different mode of procedure must be adopted, because all these powers were to be exercised by the same tribunal. This point having been established to his own satisfaction, the learned gentleman proceeded to inquire whether the Assembly had the power to do the thing proposed to be done. And having established this point, as he supposed, he jumps to the amazing conclusion that the Assembly may adopt any mode of procedure it may see fit, "in itself just," provided no particular mode is pointed out in the constitution; the meaning of which is, that the Assembly possesses all power not absolutely forbidden. We utterly deny his conclusion, although we fully grant his premise. Undoubtedly it is the right of the General Assembly to cut off a synod, a presbytery, or a church. But it has not this right, unless the inferior court, thus subjected to punishment, has been guilty of such flagrant misconduct as to justify such high measures. How is this guilt to be established? Mr. Clarke says, if there is no positive constitutional order on the subject, the Assembly may act in any method it sees fit. The inference is, that the Assem-



bly may, while sitting in its ordinary business capacity, make judicial determinations, even to the exclusion of whole church courts (arriving at its knowledge of their offences in any way it may, and without the slightest reference to judicial forms,) because the actual form of trial of an inferior court is not specified in the written law. This is new and astounding doctrine. The laws of our Church are very few; the Church has for the most part been content with the statement of principles; and with the practical application of them, as circumstances might seem to require. The principles applicable to the trial of causes do not change their nature, because the offending party is a church court, instead of being an individual. Mr. Clarke is a lawyer; and we suppose knows something about bodies corporate or politic. In trials where corporations are parties before civil tribunals, the same safeguards are thrown around and about them which belong to the individual citizen; and their causes are conducted in precisely the same manner as if they were real individuals. The inferior church courts occupy precisely the same relation to the ecclesiastical commonwealth which corporations do to the civil commonwealth; that is, they are bodies ecclesiastical. And though the written law does not prescribe the exact method of procedure, the Church has deemed her principles entirely applicable to the trial of church courts; and during her whole history until now, has strictly conformed her practice to those principles. This is proven by the history of almost every General Assembly; and even this very matter was actually before the house, on two pending judicial cases against the Synod of Kentucky.

Mr. Clarke's next point was that the Presbytery was guilty of such offences as justified the measure of exclusion which he was advocating. This point we shall not discuss; for guilty or not guilty, the Assembly had no right to pronounce them so, until the Presbytery had first been subjected to a trial according to the principles of the Constitution of the Church.

But now we return to inquire whether it is so that the Assembly possesses legislative, executive and judicial powers? In the sense in which we use those terms, in applying them to the civil

state, it is false that the Assembly possesses any legislative authority whatever. The Confession asserts that all Church power is ministerial and declarative; because Christ is the only Lawgiver in Zion. He commissions the Church to proclaim his will, and to execute his orders. The powers which it employs in doing this are called dogmatic, diacritic, and diatactic. Her dogmatic or didactic authority is exercised in making her symbols of faith, and in bearing testimony on the subject of doctrine; her diacritic or judicial power she exerts in all her judgments in bringing men into the Church and its respective offices, in trying causes, etc; and her diatactic or regulative power is asserted in the canons she adopts to cause all things in the worship and government of the Church to be done decently and in order. These regulations are also found in the standards. All else which she does is in its nature executive, just as the regulations of a head of one of the departments of the government is not legislative in its nature, but executive. In this very subordinate sense, the Assembly possesses, in common with all other church courts, legislative authority; but this is confined strictly by the constitution and by the law of Christ, as well as by the previous practice of the Church, to what is sometimes called executive, or more properly still, administrative action. This, moreover, is all the executive power which the Assembly or any church court can possibly exercise. And if we term it legislative, as Mr. Clarke does, then where is its executive power, and how does it exercise it? But the discussion of this fruitful theme we cannot pursue now. It takes in too wide a range for the limits of this article.

The leaders of the Assembly, however, did not agree among themselves as to the manner in which the Presbytery was before the Assembly. While some contended, as we have seen, that it was under process, upon the appeal and complaint against the Synod of Kentucky, others contended that it was now under process because of these proceedings. But as neither of these views seemed satisfactory, Dr. Thomas attempted the rescue of his cause, and claimed that the Presbytery was before the Assembly under the power of review and control. We cannot take

the time nor the room to examine all the points raised in this interminable discussion; but as to this claim of power, we simply refer our readers to the chapter on Review and Control in the Book of Discipline, where they will see how widely the course of the Assembly differed from the course prescribed, if this was the kind of power which was aimed at.

Dr. Hodge comes to the aid of the Assembly, in his article on its proceedings in the July number of the *Princeton Review*, and, in the one important aspect of constitutional right, justifies all that was done. True, he thinks the punishment of the Declaration and Testimony men was excessive; but he says, "it is comparatively a small matter that a court should inflict an unduly severe penalty; or that the judge should be harsh and overbearing in his spirit and manner, provided he has the law on his side." This is new doctrine. We always supposed that the end of discipline was the maintenance of justice, not the assertion of power: and in our simplicity, we supposed that it was a matter of great importance for a Christian man to get his rights; far more so than for a church court to exert its power, even though it may have the law on its side. Two Presbyteries, we believe, petitioned the late Assembly either to remove Dr. Hodge from his chair, or make him keep quiet concerning the unwonted proceedings of the Assembly. Undoubtedly the Assembly had the power to remove him: the law would have been on its side. But we scarcely think Dr. Hodge or his friends would have thought it a small matter had the Assembly put forth such an exercise of its power. It would have been an act of unquestionable tyranny. And when Dr. Hodge teaches the Church that it is of small moment what the Assembly does, provided it has the law on its side, he is whetting a sword for his own neck. Nor is this the first time that just such a thing has happened in history.

But is it so, that the powers of the Assembly to do such things as these are clearly defined in the constitution, and has it become so important for the Assembly to assert them, that the rights of private parties pale into insignificance in the presence of the law? In paving the way for the defence of this Assembly, the Doctor

gives us decidedly the most clear statement of Presbyterianism which we have ever seen from his pen; and, moreover, he states the true and only limitations of the powers of church courts, viz., that they are only to handle things ecclesiastical to the exclusion of secular affairs; that they are governed by a written constitution, and are restrained by the law of Christ. This is sound doctrine. But the decrees which the Declaration and Testimony men protest against, are those which the Assembly had passed pertaining to loyalty, freedom, State rights, and the like; which subjects sound so much like secular matters, that it would be difficult for us to name any secular thing, if these are not to be so called. The constitution assuredly gives them no power over such matters, and the word of God expressly excludes the things of Cæsar from his household. Moreover, the very power to deal as they have done with their condemned brethren is not conferred by the constitution, but expressly withheld.

True, Dr. Hodge advocates the high ground that this power arises from the very nature of the Assembly, as the supreme court of the Church. He contends that, to all intents and purposes, the Assembly is the Church; that the Church is there by its representatives. But this is only true in the assertion of the powers constitutionally conferred. The Assembly is the highest court of the Church, but only a court after all. Powers not conferred are reserved to the Church itself, and the constitution expressly points out the manner in which they are to be conferred and exercised; that is, how the voice of the Church is to be ascertained. The Assembly is first to propose; then the Presbyteries are to approve. That is, it takes the votes of a General Assembly and of a majority of the Presbyteries to give any new grant of power; and this is what the constitution recognizes as the voice of the Church.

Dr. Hodge attributes to the Assembly the "power to correct abuses or evils immediately in any part of the Church." This language is not found in the constitution. There is a clause somewhat resembling it, viz., the one about "suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations." But will Dr. Hodge contend that this provision signifies that the Assembly is to exercise this

authority without rhyme or reason, without mode or manner? When the constitution prescribes a mode of doing any thing, that is the law; and every other mode, not authorised, is thereby excluded. Refer to the chapter on Review and Control, and the whole method of procedure in such a case is marked out. In like manner, the Book of Discipline prescribes the only way in which ministers and private members of the Church can be dealt with. The assumption of the power by the Assembly to ride over inferior church courts, to treat their constitutional authority with contempt, and to lord it over those made subject immediately to the inferior courts, is a clear act of tyranny, unauthorised by the constitution; and the principles upon which the right to do so is maintained are clearly those of despotism.

Dr. Hodge's argument consists of a discussion of three points. The first is: Had the Assembly the constitutional right to exclude the commissioners, and dissolve the Louisville and other Presbyteries on account of their Declaration and Testimony members. He lays out his whole strength to prove what we suppose hardly any person will dispute, namely, that in extreme cases the Assembly may defend itself and the Church from intolerable evils by extra-constitutional measures. The revised Book of Discipline provides for cases without process. Dr. Hodge merely shows that such remedies for extreme cases are necessary and are inherent in our courts. If any Presbytery should openly and officially declare itself Socinian; or if the commissioners of any Presbytery should avow to the Assembly that they were no Presbyterians and no Christians, the Assembly would be bound to dissolve such Presbytery, and reject such commissioners; just as if a man should rise in the Assembly and blaspheme, he ought to be immediately expelled. This, in brief, is the whole of what Dr. Hodge is able to say in his elaborate defence of the constitutional right of the Assembly at St. Louis to pursue the course it adopted relative to the matter now under consideration. But when Dr. Hodge comes to his other two points, viz., Assuming the Assembly's right, had it reason? and, Was the manner of its action right or wrong? we find him speaking briefly, yet clearly and pointedly for truth and for justice, thus: The

Assembly had no adequate reason for such action. 1. The penalty was too severe; 2. No important object was to be gained; 3. The men whose presence was to dissolve any Presbytery were allowed to sit in this Assembly itself; 4. This action will stir up instead of allaying strife; and 5. It only throws all things into confusion. And as to the manner of the action, Dr. Hodge declares there is "little difference of opinion," and "even the leaders of the majority themselves deprecated the action of Dr. McLean, which for some reason they felt constrained to adopt."

It is not for us to harmonize these discordant utterances. Nor can we explain how Dr. Hodge could get his own consent to reason from any such extreme case as that of a Presbytery or its commissioners avowing infidelity, to the case of the Louisville brethren. Nor yet can we undertake to inquire how he comes to speak of Dr. Hill, the immediate successor of Principal Robertson in the leadership of the Moderates in the Church of Scotland, as "the highest modern authority on the discipline and government of the Scottish Church."

Considering how clear and how pointed is Dr. Hodge's censure of the *unreasonable* decision of the Assembly upon this case, which so long absorbed and so much excited them, and of the *utterly indefensible* manner in which they carried out that decision, our readers will probably be surprised to learn that dismissing this topic, and looking back over the proceedings of the Assembly, Dr. Hodge says they contain "much for which the Church should be thankful, and much which promises great good in the future." When we first read this, we almost thought it was irony; but after carefully reading it we came to a different conclusion. He specifies five points, for which these thanks are due. "1. The Assembly recognised the right of protest and of free discussion, as belonging not only to its own members, but to all the members and ministers of the Church." "2. The Assembly recognised the principle that adhesion to its deliverances and judgments cannot be made a condition of Christian or ministerial communion." "3. The doctrine taught by the Assembly respecting schism is the scriptural doctrine on that subject, as it

has ever been held in our Church." "4. This Assembly teaches the scriptural doctrine concerning slavery." And "5. The Assembly takes scriptural and liberal ground on the subject of Christian union."

The longer we live and the more we see of men and of things as events actually occur, the more does our youthful ardor cool and our capacity for astonishment diminish, whilst we daily learn more and more the truth of Solomon's words, that "there is nothing new under the sun." And yet, when we found that Dr. Hodge was in earnest, we confess that we began to regard his five grounds of congratulation with something approaching astonishment. These felicitations, however, seem to us decidedly the severest criticisms we have seen of the doings of the Assembly. Suppose we agreed with the Doctor in his estimate of the work done at St. Louis, what do his congratulations amount to? He sends greeting to the Church, because the Assembly has recognised the right of protest! Men must submit to the behests of the Assembly right or wrong; but the Assembly did not strike the chapter on protests out of the Book! True, you must swallow the pill; but you have the right to say you do not like it. Nor did the Assembly make its own acts, terms of communion! Men have still the right to sit down at the Lord's table without expressing their belief in the Assembly as they do in the Saviour! And then, again, the Assembly holds to the Scriptures on the three points of schism, slavery, and Christian union! The Declaration and Testimony men had asserted that the Assembly had become apostate to the truth on certain points pertaining to the relation of the Church to the State; and Dr. Hodge is in an ecstasy because they did not apostatize on certain other points! The Assembly said the former statement was slanderous; and if Dr. Hodge's statements about the points he names are not equally slanderous, if he does not assert that the Assembly had apostatized in regard to them, he clearly intimates that he had feared they would do so. The idea seems to be, that although the Assembly did not apostatize on the points suggested, the members of that court were the exact kind of men of whom the Church might justly be afraid; and hence he calls upon all the

true men of the Church to give thanks that they did not. Although the right of protest was formally recognised, provided it was done very feebly and submissively; yet the lash had been applied with such vigor, and the guillotine had fallen with such a sharp stroke upon those who had ventured to exercise that right, that men who had tender backs, and whose necks were in danger, had sufficient warning to be very cautious. Those dreadful forebodings which the Doctor manifestly had, he is thankful were not fully realised. And so, he turns his fears into congratulations, and “damns the Assembly with faint praise.” With uplifted hands he sings pæans because the Assembly still shows a sort of respect for the constitution of the Church, and because it has not absolutely rejected the Scriptures! And this is all—absolutely all, for which he gives thanks; very large thanks for very small favors.

This matter leads us to look very briefly at the action of the Assembly with reference to our Church. Dr. Hodge says, “The Assembly takes scriptural and liberal ground on the subject of Christian union.” Again we ask, is Dr. Hodge in earnest? Dr. Van Dyke offered a paper looking toward a re-union of our Church with the Assembly, which was immediately consigned to oblivion. He proposed to include us in the overtures for a closer union of all Presbyterian Churches, which motion was forthwith laid on the table. The narrative says this was done because of our errors or sins of rebellion and slavery; and gives the *liberal* information, that whenever we repent of those sins, the Assembly will cordially receive us back. The Assembly would have said the like to the Hottentots or Camanche Indians. Moreover, the Memorial of the Convention was adopted, which charges on us various sins and offences, and reaffirms all that the Assembly had ever said about us; Dr. Lowrie’s minute does the same; and still Dr. Schenk’s minute does the same. Not satisfied yet, the Assembly adopts a Pastoral Letter, whose main purpose seems to be to misrepresent us and our position, and discredit us before the Christian world; in which, sentences are quoted in such a way as to make the readers thereof believe they are taken from our records, but which they are not. Besides, Dr. Schenk’s



minute expresses great sympathy for the men among us (thank God, they are very few,) who during the war pretended to be with the South, but were not; and ends of course, as we have already said, with the inevitable reaffirmation of the decrees of Pittsburgh. After all this, because Dr. J. T. Smith got the Assembly to pass a resolution couched in terms of seeming kindness towards the South, and hoping for a reunion of the whole Church "on the basis of our common standards, *and* on terms consistent with truth and righteousness;" Dr. Hodge ventures to call the ground taken by the Assembly "liberal," and declares the platform to be broad enough for all to stand on, "north, south, east, and west." And yet the Assembly had practically turned out of doors the Declaration and Testimony men, mainly because of their sympathy with us in our principles; and had expounded "truth and righteousness" as understood by it, in multiform ways, none of which consisted with either our honor or our peace and safety. This is the liberality of the Assembly, and this also is the liberality of Dr. Hodge towards his Southern brethren!

But this declaration of Dr. Hodge has a deeper meaning than lies on its surface. The ground, he says, which the Assembly takes on the subject of Christian union, is "*scriptural* and *liberal*, and their platform is "broad, scriptural, and just, on which the whole Church, north, south, east, and west may unite." We restrain ourselves from saying with what feelings we read this language. The radicals would not have said this about their former Southern brethren. Their purpose was to prevent the possibility of our returning to the Church from which we had been driven. They took us for honest men at least, and knew well when they prescribed their terms of re-union that no honorable Southern minister would ever think of submitting to them. We did not feel insulted at their doings; we knew what they meant. But when Dr. Hodge utters such language, with the Minutes of the General Assembly lying before him, in which he finds condemnations of us piled upon condemnations, until the Minutes groan with the burden thereof, we have a right to feel indignant. The Assembly's grounds are "scriptural;" then

we must be sinners against God for not accepting them. They are "just;" then we ought to be satisfied and sue for readmission. Finally, they are "broad" and "liberal;" then we are exorbitant—nay, we are turbulent schismatics, if we expect their alteration in any whit. The most objectionable of the Assembly's papers against us, Dr. Hodge suppresses (as he does also the rejected because "disrespectful" (!) protest of his friend Dr. Boardman,) and so, while holding us up as the party to blame for the division of the Church, denies his readers the opportunity of knowing fully what the Assembly did respecting us, and how often they cast out our names, as evil, during this very meeting. The effect of what he says must be to increase prejudice against us. We are exhibited as guilty schismatics, offenders against both God and man, persistent rejectors of terms of union, "broad, scriptural and just," aye, even "liberal"! Well, in the view of all these circumstances, we shall not, of course, be expected hereafter to read with patience any more exhortations from him in letters to his Southern brethren, urging on them to forget the past. There are many things in that painful past which our charity towards Northern brethren, and Dr. Hodge himself, would make us wish to forget, if he and his Assembly would let us. He must excuse our saying we feel very sure that no two Presbyteries, nor yet one, will be found, next year, overturing the Assembly to interfere with his writing such reviews of their proceedings as this.

We regret that the duty of defending our own Church should compel us to write as we have done. We have no inclination to defend the principles of the Declaration and Testimony men, except in so far as these are the principles of eternal truth and righteousness. As servants of Christ, we wish to know no man after the flesh. Men are nothing to us, but truth, every thing. Certainly, had our zeal for the truth of Christ permitted, we should have rejoiced in the continued unity of the Old School Presbyterian Church. As for reunion, sincerely and earnestly as we might have desired it upon terms consistent indeed with "truth and righteousness," it does not appear to us that resolutions couched in doubtful phraseology to satisfy one party, while

pastorals and memorials replete with our abuse are adopted to satisfy another party, can possibly be the methods of conciliation which the case requires.

Upon one more topic, we have a few statements to record. Zion Church, in Charleston, South Carolina, was fully organised some years before the war, by a Presbytery then in full connexion with the Assembly we have been reviewing. It had a large membership of both whites and blacks, with a full bench of elders and a pastor. What distinguished its organisation, however, from that of our Southern churches generally, was the fact that all the white members of the church were pledged to regard the religious benefit of the colored people as a special object of attention and pursuit. An immense church-building was erected at the expense of the white people of Charleston, all the internal arrangements of which contemplated, primarily, the comfort and advantage of the black membership. This building, costing not less than \$25,000, was taken possession of by a missionary of the Assembly soon after Charleston fell, the chief portion of the congregation, both white and black, having been long before compelled by the constant shelling from Morris Island to abandon the city. When they returned to Charleston, the corporation petitioned Gen. Saxton, of the Freedmen's Bureau, to restore their church. He referred their petition to the missionary, and he to the Freedmen's Committee at Pittsburgh, who returned it to Gen. Saxton with their "*claim*" endorsed upon the document, to the effect that the church was "the property" of their Assembly. A correspondence subsequently took place between Dr. Adger, formerly minister of the congregation, and the Rev. S. C. Logan, the Secretary of the Freedmen's Committee at Pittsburgh. The Secretary acknowledges that "the *claim*" was made, but "without any knowledge of the case by any member of the Committee present," upon representations from parties in Charleston to the effect that the Assembly had twice contributed money to the object; alleges that they made the claim under pressure, to save the church from "being handed over to parties having no shadow of claim to it;" declares that after making the claim, he "immediately began an effort to

discover the truthfulness" of it; but acknowledges that after "following the matter up carefully until within the last two weeks," he had "failed in finding any evidence that the Church had been aided in any measure by the Assembly," and that he intended to write to that effect to "our missionary." At the same time he insists, that as the church was built for the benefit of the colored people, his Committee cannot, in justice to those "poor Christians," consent to give it up to their old pastor and his friends of the corporation. All this is a perfectly fair statement of the ground taken by Mr. Logan, in his first letter of date March 4th, 1866.

The points made by Dr. Adger in his reply to Mr. Logan, dated March 27th, were, 1. That supposing the information upon which the Committee acted had been correct, it did not justify them in setting up that claim to the whole property; 2. That a Committee of Presbyterian ministers and elders may not first set up claims to other people's property, and then afterwards examine into the grounds of them; 3. That it was unaccountable how it should require *ten weeks* of "careful following up" (as alleged by Mr. Logan) to find out whether the Domestic Missionary Board at Philadelphia or the Church Extension Board at St. Louis, had contributed money to build a church in Charleston; 4. That it was strange Mr. Logan should allow to pass by even two weeks of confessed persistence by him and his committee in an unjust claim; and 5. That it is incomprehensible how, with the petition of the corporation of Zion lying before him, sent on from Gen. Saxton's office, the Secretary could speak of their being pressed to make that unjust claim, in order to save the property from being handed over to parties who had no shadow of claim to it.

This letter Mr. Logan acknowledged on the 18th of last April, and promised to reply to, at an early date, but has not yet done so.

Now, the Assembly at St. Louis had "explanations" from Mr. Logan of "the nature of the tenure" by which the church is "held by the Committee" as follows: "It had been claimed by a New School minister in behalf of an Aid Society; the Gen-

eral in command had decided that the Old School Presbyterian Church was entitled to its use; that Mr. Gibbs, our missionary, had taken possession; that the church might be used for the purposes for which it was originally founded; that the Committee had made no claim upon it as our property; that the whole matter is now before the proper authorities in behalf of the colored congregation by the act of its officers; in short, that the contest is really between the former white trustees and the present colored congregation."

The Hon. Mr. McKnight, late a member of the Freedmen's Committee, alluded to Dr. Adger's letter as censuring the agents of the Church on account of having taken possession. "But," said the speaker, "the church was not responsible for the retention of that church at the present time. As soon as they ascertained the facts, they relinquished all claim. It was then that Mr. Gibbs, a colored preacher of much ability, instituted proceedings for the possession of the church under the provisions of the civil rights bill. There the matter rests; the colored men contending they are as much entitled to the property as the white men."

The Rev. Mr. Allison, also a member of the Committee, said "the impression seemed to have got abroad that they had come into a collision in this field of labor, but this was altogether a mistake. They had carefully avoided establishing themselves in any place where the Southern Church and Freedmen's Aid Societies were operating." "In all cases teachers and missionaries had been instructed to avoid infringing on the labors of others."

The Standing Committee's report on the business of the Freedmen's Committee, says in regard to the Zion Church case, only this: "The General Assembly regard the avoidance, as far as possible, on the part of the Committee, of all unpleasant collision with the Southern churches, as wise and judicious; and inasmuch as the jurisdiction of the civil authorities has been re-established in South Carolina, the question as to the occupancy of said house in the future is a question of law, and must be left to the adjudication of the civil courts."

That Committee also “bear cordial testimony to the fidelity, zeal, and efficiency of the Assembly’s Committee on Freedmen,” and especially to the “faithful and successful work of their Secretary during the past year.”

Let the reader observe now, that Mr. Logan declares to the Assembly that his Committee “had made no claims upon the church as their property;” and yet that “claim” was endorsed by him upon the back of the Corporation’s petition sent to the Committee from Gen. Saxton, and by them returned to the General. And Mr. Logan’s letter of the 4th of March says: “First then, this Committee did lay before Gen. Saxton, on the 11th of December last, a claim to Zion Church as the property of the General Assembly.”

Let the reader also observe, that whilst Mr. Logan declares to the Assembly that it was the post-commander’s adjudication which gave the use of the property to his Church, and so shifts the responsibility for their holding it from themselves upon him, yet it is certain and plain that the said post-commander refused to give possession to the owners of the building, because Mr. Logan and his Committee claimed it as the property of the Assembly.

Let the reader observe further, that the responsibility is shifted again to the missionary, by both Mr. Logan and Mr. McKnight. The latter says, it is “a colored preacher” that claims the church, under “the provisions of the civil rights bill;” and both declare it is the colored congregation that is contending with the white people who built the church. And yet the Committee supports the missionary who makes this unjust claim for his colored adherents. And so the Northern Presbyterian Church is made to sanction the effort to transfer twenty-five thousand dollars’ worth of property, from its rightful owners to other parties, on the ground of an *ex post facto* law of Congress. The excitements of the present may blind men’s eyes; but bye and bye the question for all parties will be, whether to be more astonished at the injustice fathered thus upon the church, or the dishonesty practised thus in laying all of the Committee’s responsibility upon a colored man.

Let the reader observe again, to his own amazement, the

absolute denial, by another member of the Committee, that any collision had taken place at all. Such an impression seemed to have got abroad, but it was altogether a mistake. They had carefully avoided places where the Southern Church was at work. Their missionaries could not infringe on the labors of others. All a mistake! The Committee's claim of the property, and their missionary's holding it, and the corporation's asking for it and being refused, and Dr. Adger's correspondence about the matter with Mr. Logan, and Mr. Girardeau's congregation being supplanted by another congregation, his session by another session, and himself by another preacher, these are all myths and not realities at all! Bravo, Mr. Allison! What a bold stroke was that for the exculpation of your Committee!

Now, the worst part of this case is, that a printed copy of the whole correspondence between Mr. Logan and Dr. Adger, including Gen. Saxton's own statement respecting their claim endorsed on the corporation's petition, was, all of it, plentifully circulated in the Assembly at St. Louis, and was in the hands perhaps of every member thereof. And yet the Assembly is so absorbed and so excited, or else so prejudiced against their Southern brethren, that it cannot see any of these things in their true light, but absolutely commends the Committee and the Secretary for their whole course!

Our brethren of the Northern Church have allowed themselves to be put by their agents into a false position on this subject. We can afford to do without our property in Charleston until the military authorities, by which all matters relating to the colored people there are still regulated, shall turn over to us what is our own. But *the Northern Church cannot afford* to continue to hold this property until we shall so obtain the restoration of it. Whether their Committee or their missionary hold it, they are involved in the act. Whether their Committee or their missionary incite the colored people connected with them to make an unrighteous claim to what does not belong to them, the Church of the North is involved in the injustice. It will not read well in history, if we should actually be indebted to military tribunals for a measure of justice refused to us by Christian

brethren, by Presbyterian ministers and elders. It is now eight months that this endeavor on the part of those old and tried friends of the black man in Charleston has been making to get justice from a Presbyterian Committee and Assembly. First in one form and then in another, first upon one ground and then upon another, the effort has been persisted in to deny the Charleston men their plain rights. At length the military authorities are under pledge to yield up the property with one condition, viz., that the missionary schools of the Northern Church be furnished with school-room accommodations in the basement of the building for a definite period. To this extent we have succeeded in getting the hold of our brethren upon our property broken. With a very deep and strong sense of the wrong they have done to us throughout, we do regret most sincerely for their sake and for the honor of our common name and Master, that it should be only to force, and not to right, they will yield up what does not belong to them, and that to the Government and not to the Church, we should have to be indebted for justice.



## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Chronicles of the Schœnberg-Cotta Family; Diary of Mrs. Kitty Trevelyan; Winifred Bertram; Early Dawn; Mary, the Handmaid of the Lord; The Martyrs of Spain; The Song without Words; Cripple of Antioch; Tales and Sketches; Two Vocations; Wanderings in Bible Lands; Christian Life in Song; The Black Ship.*

This is a formidable list of volumes; but who that has read them could wish one to be absent from the bright collection? They are all the production of an authoress, these fruits of whose rare genius have filled a large portion of the Christian world with wonder and with praise. We allude to Mrs. Charles, an English woman whose modest worth as a wife, whose gentle humility as a follower of Christ, and whose neighborhood usefulness in the private walks of life, are said to distinguish her heart as much as the works we have named exhibit the superiority of her noble intellect. She is yet in the prime of her life, and from her pen we may expect other—though assuredly not better—contributions to a department of Christian literature which she may be said to have created. Her vein is not exhausted, nor is it exhaustible; but it, perhaps, cannot, by any possibility, be worked more efficiently, certainly not with more delightful results, than it has already been. What and where is this rich vein, the treasures from which have proved so abundant? The reply to this question will, if correct, strike the key-note to the one song of all these impressive volumes, and reveal the secret wherein their great power over the human heart is to be found.

We answer, then, that the innermost wealth of Mrs. Charles's writings consists in their display of religious experience in its softest and cheerfullest aspects, and which she has brought to the

surface of Christian life from beneath the sunniest slopes of gospel truth. It is Bible doctrine transfigured into the mildest and sweetest evangelical character. It is the radiance, heaven-imparted, that hallowed the head of the apostle John, transferred to every-day scenes, where it beams the light of repose and peace and joy. Love, in the dress of humility, with her deep, mild eye lifted by faith to heaven, from whose open gate she expects only the descent of hope: this is the form which practical Christianity wears throughout these remarkable volumes. But yet, how wonderfully free from sickly sentimentality—such as sometimes appears in the rhapsodies of Fenelon, and often in those of Madame Guyon—is that strong, robust, well-poised love which our authoress exhibits as her type of this spiritual affection! It is love at work, as well as love at prayer. It is love in the gymnasium, as well as love in the closet. It is love surrounded by the largest circle of duties, as well as love rapt in the upper regions of contemplation. It is love that denies no earthly relation, and that despises no worldly condition, as well as love that has willingly given up all for God. It is beautiful, but also hardy; soft, but also helpful; singly devoted to one supreme aim, but also universally sympathetic. It is humane, like that of Jesus Christ, and goes about doing good: self-sacrificing, full of charity, never forgetful of its warfare with sin, and that casteth out fear.

Such, as it seems to us, is the pervading and the contagious spirit of these remarkable volumes: their one great characteristic and most winning feature.

We shall not undertake the task of analysing the great mass of material to which we have thus introduced our readers. Nor is it necessary. Most of those whom we address are already familiar with the books we have named, and have seen for themselves their charming pictures of Christian life. It would be unfair, however, were we to rank them all equally high on the scale of merit. Whilst any one of them would, in the absence of the others, assign to their authoress a lofty place among the literary celebrities of the Church, yet now that we have them all before us, we can readily discern the marked superiority which

distinguishes some when compared with the residue. After reading, for example, the "Chronicles of the Schœnberg-Cotta Family," or the "Diary of Mrs. Kitty Trevylyan," or "Winifred Bertram," if then we place alongside of these, the "Early Dawn," or the "Cripple of Antioch," or "Mary, the Handmaid of the Lord," we will be likely to experience something like a feeling of disappointment at the comparative deficiencies of the latter works. To derive the highest pleasure from a perusal of the entire set, we must begin with the smaller and more fragmentary volumes, and ascend from these to the larger and more finished productions. Nothing can be finer than the "Chronicles" or the "Diary," whilst the others seem to be but dim copies of those exquisitely-wrought two. The former of these is undoubtedly the chief, and, (if not in the order of time,) in the order of excellence, the original. But it contains a series of pictorial lessons on practical godliness, which, from their extreme richness of suggestive thought, can well bear to be often repeated through all the varieties of their presentation in the remaining writings of this gifted authoress. And so, even the "Diary" is but the different-colored reflexion, to a considerable extent, of the "Chronicles;" the others again partial reflections of these. Yet, in each reflected image, as one by one they present themselves in the several members of the large family, there is undoubtedly many a separate and independent beauty detected, which, without calling away our attention from its resemblance to the rest, renders it sufficiently unlike them all to be distinctly charming in itself. They appear to us as if they were successively given back to the eye from water, whose mirror-surface has been again and again touched and broken by a hand whose mysterious skill, whilst ruffling it enough to make each likeness strangely unique, yet never disturbs it to an extent that can distort that likeness into a mere grotesque repetition of the original face. There is always the same lovely countenance, but, at each disturbance of the yielding mirror, it assumes new, yet regular features. It is nature's own marvellous variety in unity.

Look, then, at the "Chronicles," as that great leading member of the series which imparts its peculiar life and grace to them

all. It is a domestic story, which begins to develop its incidents and its characters as far back as the year 1503, and lets fall the curtain as late as the year 1547. The family which it presents to us is thoroughly German. They reside first in Eisenach, "nestling in the valley under the shadow of the Wartburg," and afterwards in Wittenberg, on the bank of the rapid Elbe, "fringed with low oaks and willows." The members are Else, Fritz, Thekla, Chriemhild, Pollux, Christopher, Eva, the visionary but noble father, the gentle mother, and the dear old grandmother—a large, poverty-straitened, loving, and, for the most part, happy household, each unit of which is surrounded by peculiar interest. Their linked and yet various story winds in and out through the growing volume in a manner the most picturesque and pleasing. Among its threads is woven an exquisite pattern of Christian experience, which is artistically but naturally interlaced with the well-known and exciting public history of that stirring period, with whose events all the world is so familiar. The early friend of the Cottas is Martin Luther, with whom they continue associated, more or less directly, throughout his and their chequered career. They are all, at the outset, devout Roman Catholics, with the exception, perhaps, of the venerable grandmother, whose husband seems to have suffered as a martyr long ago in Bohemia. But, one by one, through a hundred admirably depicted vicissitudes of spiritual and other trial, they gradually share in the great uprising of the German mind in its struggles to throw off the papacy, and become evangelical Christians of the finest types which those eventful reformation days could have presented. The narrative is autobiographical, and is unfolded in a series of quaintly-written Chronicles, composed now by one of the family, and now by another, but all dovetailing into each other in a manner that rapidly carries their united fortunes forward to their bright close: a close that leaves some of the characters in heaven, but most of them in circles of ever-enlarging usefulness on earth.

From these imperfect hints, those of our readers who may not have perused this marvellous volume, can readily obtain an inkling of the treat they have yet to enjoy; whilst those whose

reading of it is still fresh, will have their recollection warmed and their hearts renewedly touched by the emotions which that never-to-be-forgotten reading first excited. Did our limits permit the indulgence, we would like to point out, in detail, many of the manifold beauties, both of style and thought, with which this exquisite work abounds. But after all, we would hardly know where to begin, or where, having begun, to leave off. It is all of a piece, and it is all a master-piece. The portraiture it draws of Luther is extremely life-like and refreshingly vigorous. The manner in which it brings out those struggles which he and his friends of the Schœnberg-Cotta family underwent, in their efforts to throw off the superstitions of the papacy, and to reach the glad light of a genuine and happy trust in Christ, is fine beyond description. The best portions of its truth-teeming pages are those in which is described, or delineated by the softest touches, the character of a true believer in the Son of God, as that believer is carried through the various scenes of public and domestic life amid his thousand doubts and fears. It is here that that *love* shines of which we have spoken—divine love, calling out a responsive love from the human heart—and which makes its possessor so contented, so useful, so triumphant, and so resolute and strong for the Lord and for himself. It is here, too, that the contrast is so sharply drawn between the despair which the slavish fear of God causes to settle over the heart of the miserable drudge who vainly expects to be saved by his works, or by his asceticism, or by his painful adherence to prescribed forms, and the blessed ever-brightening hope which illumines the soul whose faith has once finally laid hold upon the only Redeemer of God's elect, and whose obedience of love is all wrought under the sweet but powerful influences of the Holy Spirit. To the latter, the Father above is likewise the Father on earth, whose reasonable service is a freedom which nothing can fetter, submission to whose will is a peace which nothing can disturb, and walking with whom in the galleries of grace is a delight which nothing can long charm away.

Most heartily do we commend these noble "Chronicles" to all those parents who wish their children to learn what genuine

religion is, as shown by a hand of consummate skill, and by a heart of rare experience, from the very innermost kernel of the gospel. And the entire set of these works we advise old and young alike to read, if they would be refreshed in the purest waters of Christianity. They verily constitute a contribution to our religious literature which stands by itself, and which will, we dare say, serve to draw thousands of heavy-laden souls to him who was "delivered up for us all." And we thank God for the sanctified genius which has been enabled to produce such volumes as these, and to send them forth upon their errand of peace laden with the richest treasures of divine grace. They are not without faults; but these are overborne by numerous and rare excellences, and are so excusable in themselves, as to merit but little attention.

*How to Study the New Testament: The Gospels: The Acts of the Apostles.* By HENRY ALFORD, D. D., Dean of Canterbury. Alexander Strahan, Publisher: London and New York. 1865. 1 volume, 18 mo., pp. 355.

This work may be regarded as consisting of four general parts: 1. An Introduction. 2. An analysis of the peculiar features which distinguish the several Gospels. 3. A collation and comparison of the four narratives of the passion and resurrection of our Lord. 4. An examination of the Acts of the Apostles.

In the Introduction the author calls attention to the fact that the records of our Lord's life and teaching are not comprised in "one indubitable plain historic account." They are distributed through four narratives which are not always in exact verbal accord, but sometimes differ widely in expression even where facts and things said are evidently the same. In this arrangement he recognises a beneficent purpose, and regards it as furnishing a necessity for an accurate and comprehensive investigation of the Gospels in their connexions with each other. At the same time he admits that even a partial study of the sacred records, provided it be sincere, is suited to confer incalculable benefit; and desires not to be understood, when he concedes the existence of discrepancies between the respective narratives, as at

all impugning "the special inspiration of the writers of Holy Scripture by the Spirit of God." We are glad to see that Dean Alford comes out thus explicitly in favor of inspiration. What, however, his theory on the subject precisely is, it is somewhat difficult to gather. We would not assign him to the *ad verbum* ranks. Yet, though he admits that some of the statements of the different Evangelists are irreconcilable by us in the present state of our knowledge, he holds that these independent and discrepant accounts are fully inspired, and that we shall perceive their harmony when we shall reach a higher stage of information.

The author next lays down the requisites for a right use of the Gospels, and of the Scriptures generally. The first which he mentions is Faith. Convinced that the sacred records are the only source from which we can derive spiritual life, we should approach them "from the side of trust and love, not from that of distrust and unchristian doubt." We should neither tremble for them, nor cavil at them. Their integrity is no more affected by verbal differences than the light of the sun is impaired by the spots on its disc.

The next requisite is Intelligence. While enforcing the necessity of this qualification for a true understanding of the Gospels, the author insists on an intelligent appreciation of the following considerations: First: The Gospels are not given to us in "one record, indivisible, indisputable," but were written by "four instruments, four inspired men"—a fact which is not the result of accident, is not to be lamented, and is not to be passed over. Secondly: In the case of three of the Gospels—those of Matthew, Mark, and Luke—we are dependent on tradition alone for our warrant in believing that they were written by the men whose names they bear. Thirdly: The Gospels have not come down to us in one undisputed and authorised copy of them in their original language. The authorities from which we derive the sacred text are ancient manuscript copies, of which there are more than five hundred, all of them differing more or less from each other. We must be intelligent enough to recognise these differences, and believing enough not to be afraid of them.

Fourthly: The ordinary reader possesses the Gospels in a translation, which, noble as it is, "abounds with errors and inadequate renderings." In connexion with this point, the author earnestly recommends a revision of the English version. He advises that "a commission of men learned in the Scriptures be appointed, chosen from the different Christian denominations, with definite powers as to this weighty matter." Such an undertaking would be hazardous, and the Church has been averse to incurring its perils; but the current of opinion in its favor among Christian scholars seems to be gathering strength, and we are inclined to think that the measure will be adopted at no distant day. The subject deserves sober discussion.

Two other requisites are briefly urged: *Honesty* and *Charity*. Upon these points the author's remarks are in the main admirable, but we confess that we cannot see why the largest charity should be regarded as inconsistent with a spirit of honest and unflinching advocacy of the truth. A disputatious temper is not to be confounded with fair disputation. Paul continually disputed with the Jews, and the author himself contends strenuously for his own views. The charity which is not born of the truth is a bastard.

The next section of the work consists of an examination of the contents of the several Gospels, in order to bring out the distinctive feature of each. To these analyses is appended a list of those passages in which the received text is not that of the most eminent authorities, and those in which the English translation does not give the force of the original. The author's statements in reference to these alleged differences are worthy of attention, as some passages which have been employed as proof-texts are affected by them. After propounding the hypothesis—which we are disposed to regard as the true one—that the Evangelists in composing their accounts acted in entire independence of each other's narratives, the author proceeds to point out the peculiarities of each writer. That of Mark he considers to be a detailed particularity and graphic minuteness of descriptive narration. The distributive idea in the mind of Matthew is the kingly authority of our Lord as the Messiah of the Jewish people, and



the kingdom which he established. The peculiar characteristic of Luke is that he gives special prominence to the humanity of Christ, and to that catholic feature of the gospel which adapts it to universal diffusion.

The Gospel of John, the author holds, differs from all the others in the fact that it was undertaken for the purpose of proving the great and leading doctrine of our Lord's divinity. To the elucidation of this central truth, all the incidents which are narrated, and all the discourses which are cited, directly tend.

The author's theory may, in the main, be correct; but we are satisfied that it is pushed too far. It is too exclusive. It is doubtful to our mind whether the prophetic and priestly character of our Saviour, for example, is not as distinctly brought out by Matthew as his regal authority; and it is confessed that the only peculiarity which distinguishes Mark is one which attaches to his style.

Next follows a comparative view of the different narratives touching the passion and resurrection of our Lord, which is striking and impressive. There are some fine passages in it, that, for instance, on page 216, in which the thrilling effect of the resurrection is eloquently portrayed, which, did our limits permit, we would like to quote. There are difficulties growing out of the apparent inconsistency of the several accounts which the author satisfactorily clears up; but there are others which he does not undertake to solve. And it strikes us that he has, in reference to some of these, displayed a little extravagance of concession, which has the air of a chivalrous magnanimity. We admire his boldness and honest independence. But where the Church has been satisfied that a reconciliation of difficulties is not impossible, and has accepted the solutions which have been furnished by wise and learned expositors, one should hesitate before he pronounces an explanation to be out of the question. The Dean is deservedly severe on evasive solutions of difficulties, but it is at least questionable whether some which he assigns to that category are deserving of the sentence he inflicts.

The latter part of the book is occupied with an examination  
VOL. XVII., NO. 2.—19.

of the Acts of the Apostles. The author first discusses the question of the origin and design of the book. He takes the view that as Luke's "former treatise related what Jesus *began* to do and teach, this relates what he, the same Jesus, *continued* to do and teach;" the difference being that, in the one case he acted through his personal presence, and in the other through the agency of the Holy Ghost. And, therefore, the author thinks the book wrongly named. In the progress of the preliminary discussion, while speaking of the promise of the Spirit as the peculiar blessing of the new dispensation, we regret that he takes the ground that "the entire renewal of man by the indwelling Spirit" was "a blessing unknown to the earlier dispensation, and by virtue of it, "the least under the latter covenant is greater than the greatest under the former one." (P. 260.) This is surprising. That an evangelical German—as Olshausen is reputed to be—should take such a view, is sufficiently wonderful; but that an evangelical Englishman should enounce it, is passing strange. "Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?"

The author next reviews the events which occurred at Jerusalem during the organisation of the Church, then those which took place while Christianity was consolidating itself at Antioch, and lastly those which attended the missionary operations of the great apostle of the Gentiles, of whose character, labors, and sufferings, he gives a most beautiful and eloquent portraiture.

*The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation.* By the late WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, D. D., Principal and Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh. Edited by his Literary Executors. Second edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street: 1866: pp. 616, 8 vo.

This volume is the first of four, which together make up the WORKS OF WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, D. D. Dr. Cunningham's literary executors and the editors of these works are Drs. Buchanan and Bannerman, of New College. Absolute authority over his whole writings and manuscripts was conferred on them expressly by their dying friend. But the alterations made by

them in the original text have been more numerous (they say) than important, and have in no case affected the substance of the thought or reasoning, whilst they have all been warranted by many years of confidential intercourse with the author on the subjects handled, as well as by his last instructions to them.

The volume before us consists of a series of articles contributed by Dr. C. to the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, with a few additions from his MS. Lectures on Church History. That quarterly was edited by him, and contained usually eight or ten articles, several of them generally selected from American theological quarterlies, and two, three, and sometimes four of them from his own pen. Amongst the quarterlies from which he drew his contributions most frequently, was the *Southern Presbyterian Review*. The articles in this volume were originally prepared for his class in the theological school where he taught. They were written upon a plan, were intended from the first for publication, and now constitute a full and systematic view of the leading agents and of the spiritual principles of the great theological and ecclesiastical movement of the sixteenth century.

It would not be easy for us to express in words our estimate of the value of this volume. Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin, and Beza, are here portrayed distinctly by the hand of a master. Dr. C. is familiar with their works as well as history. He gives us no second-hand information. Nor does he deal in generalities, but his accounts are discriminating and thorough. And being himself both a Calvinist and a Presbyterian in the full sense of both those terms, it is refreshing to read his elaborate disquisitions upon these Reformers and their principles and writings and actions.

The volume opens with a thorough and searching review of a work put forth in 1859, by Principal Tulloch, Professor of Theology in the Established Church of Scotland. It is a popular sketch of Luther, Calvin, Latimer, and Knox, and it is entitled "The Leaders of the Reformation." He depreciates them all. Luther's intellectual powers he underrates, and Knox, "save perhaps on political subjects, takes no rank." As for

Calvin, our author says that Dr. Tulloch was unable to do him justice because of his own hearty dislike of any "distinct and definite system of theological doctrine," or any "church organisation upon the model of apostolic precept and practice." The theology of the Reformation he manifestly gives up "as unsound and untenable, and he evidently thinks that all liberal men who are abreast of this enlightened age must do so likewise." Dr. Tulloch's name, a few months since, was often connected in the religious papers with the charge that he was busy unsettling the foundations of the Confession.

The sixth essay in the volume is a magnificent tribute to the genius and worth of John Calvin. Our author says, "The systematizing of divine truth, and the full organisation of the Christian Church according to the word of God, are the great peculiar achievements of Calvin." Of the Institutes he speaks as composed of "materials which are in almost every instance the true doctrines really taught in the word of God, and exhibiting the whole substance of what is taught there on matters of doctrine, worship, government, and discipline: and the whole of these materials being arranged with admirable skill, and expounded in their meaning, evidence, and bearings with consummate ability. This was the great and peculiar service which Calvin rendered to the cause of truth and the interests of sound theology, and its value and importance it is scarcely possible to overrate." "His great principle of the unlawfulness of introducing any thing into the worship and government of the Church without positive scriptural sanction, evidently went to the root of the matter, and swept away at once the whole mass of sacramentalism and ceremonialism, of ritualism and hierarchism, which had grown up between the apostolic age and the Reformation, which polluted and degraded the worship of God," etc. Elsewhere he says of Calvin, "His own contributions to the establishment of principle and the development of truth, were greater in regard to church organisation than in regard to any other department of discussion—of such magnitude and importance, indeed, in their bearing upon the whole subject of the Church, as naturally to suggest a comparison with the achievements of

Sir Isaac Newton in unfolding the true principles of the solar system."

The essay which interests us most of all is the fifth, on Zwingle and the Sacraments. There is "great confusion" in men's minds upon this whole subject, as the author well says. Dr. Cunningham traces this prevalent "ignorance and confusion" to the lack of discussion of this topic. He believes there is scarcely any subject set forth in the Reformed Confessions less attended to and less understood, and that many of those who have subscribed these confessions rest satisfied with some defective and confused notions on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, "while they have scarcely even a fragment of an idea of a sacramental principle or of any general doctrine or theory on the subject of sacraments."

Zwingle receives great honor from Dr. C. for the achievement Luther never reached, of throwing off entirely "the huge mass of extravagant absurdity and unintelligible mysticism which, from a very early period, had been gathering round the sacraments, and reached its full height in the authorised doctrine of the Church of Rome." "His mental constitution gave him a very decided aversion to the unintelligible and mystical, and made him lean towards what was clear, definite, and practical." He held that "the right mode of investigating this subject was not to follow the example of the Fathers in straining the imagination to devise unwarranted, extravagant, and unintelligible notions of the sacraments for the purpose of making them more awful and more influential, but to trace out plainly and simply what is taught in Scripture respecting them." Yet he "came short indeed of the truth in his doctrine as to the nature and efficacy of the sacraments, by not bringing out fully what God does, or is ready and willing to do through their instrumentality in offering to men and conferring upon them, through the exercise of faith, spiritual blessings." "It is not wonderful that he did not succeed perfectly in hitting the golden mean." "There is some ground to think that, towards the end of his life, he ascribed a higher value and a greater efficacy to these ordinances than he had once done."

Dr. Cunningham states that "since Calvin succeeded in bringing the churches of Geneva and Zurich to a cordial agreement on this subject in the adoption of the *Consensus Tigurinus* in 1549, there has been no very great difference of opinion concerning it amongst Protestant divines." This is to give Calvin great and well deserved glory. He quotes as true and just, also, Calvin's expression that the sacraments are "appendages to the gospel—that is, merely means of declaring and bringing before our minds in another way, by a different instrumentality, what is fully set forth in the statements of Scripture." It is, he well says, "just God telling us" by symbols instead of words, his truth. In other words, it is a sealing or confirming, by visible signs which he institutes, his own promises to us. This is what Calvin says, and it is what our Confession and Catechisms teach.

Dr. Cunningham finds no fault "with the substance of Calvin's statements." He does condemn, however, what he describes as "an effort to bring out something like a real influence exerted by Christ's human nature upon the souls of believers, in connexion with the dispensation of the Lord's supper—an effort which, of course, was unsuccessful, and resulted only in what was about as unintelligible as Luther's consubstantiation. This is perhaps the greatest blot in the history of Calvin's labors as a public instructor; and it is a curious circumstance that the influence which seems to have been chiefly efficacious in leading him astray in the matter, was a quality for which he usually gets no credit, viz., an earnest desire to preserve unity and harmony among the different sections of the Christian Church." He refers to Calvin's well-known desires and earnest endeavors to harmonize Luther, and Zwingle, and their respective followers on the sacramentarian question.

We have great respect for William Cunningham, but more for John Calvin. We cannot allow that this criticism of Dr. C.'s is well founded. Calvin maintains that there is always a promise antecedent to a sacrament, and that the promise sealed in the Lord's Supper is the promise that "his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed," by faith through the Spirit to our souls.

He insists that this eating and drinking is not mere "believing," but that the Lord "intended to teach something more express and more sublime in that noble discourse of John vi. He insists that "by virtue of true communication with him, his life passes into us and becomes ours, just as bread when taken for food gives vigor to the body." He insists that it is not said by our Saviour "to no purpose at all that his flesh is meat indeed." But he does not pretend to explain the "mystery" here which "the mind is inadequate to comprehend or the tongue to explain." Now, if Dr. Cunningham finds Calvin's doctrine, founded as it is on our Lord's own words in John vi., "unintelligible," does he presume to say that he comprehends those mysterious and sublime utterances themselves? We do not know any modern writer we esteem more highly than our author, and we consider this "the greatest blot" in his writings that we have yet discovered.

Dr. Cunningham's style is lumbering, but he is so eminently judicious, so fair, honest, and candid, and he takes so much pains to set his meaning clearly before his readers, that we peruse every thing from his pen with delight.





# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVII.—NO. 3.

---

NOVEMBER, MDCCCLXVI.

---

## ARTICLE I.

*Origins of Christianity. Vol. I. The Life of Jesus. Vol. II. The Apostles.* By ERNEST RENAN, Membre de l'Institut. Translated from the original French. New York: Carleton, Publisher, No. 413 Broadway. Paris: Michel Levy Frères. 1864 and 1866: pp. 376, 353, 12mo.

The cordon of war thrown around us on land and sea by the late civil contest, if it has kept from our knowledge much that is useful and good, has shut out also much that is evil. The first of the volumes whose title is given above, was published in Paris in 1863, and had a wide and almost unexampled circulation in France, having reached the seventh edition in 1864. It soon appeared in an English dress, both in Great Britain and America. Like the *Life of Jesus* by Strauss, it contemplates the Author of Christianity from a point of view wholly rationalistic, and is suited and was designed to unsettle the faith of men in the evangelical history as a divinely inspired record, and in Jesus Christ as any other than a merely human and fallible teacher. Joseph Ernest Renan, the author, we learn from other sources, was born of humble, it is said of Jewish parents, at Treguier, in Brittany, Feb. 27, 1823, and was educated for the

VOL. XVII., NO. 3.—1.

Romish priesthood in the Seminary of St. Sulpice, at Paris. Before taking orders he was compelled to leave the institution on account of religious difficulties. He then turned his attention to philological studies, and in 1847 and 1848, gained the Volney prize for essays, one of which was expanded into his celebrated "*Histoire Comparée des Langues Sémitiques*," in which he attempted to do for the Semitic languages what Bopp had accomplished for the Indo-Germanic. His contributions\* also, to the "*Revue des Deux Mondes*," brought him into notice; and he was elected in 1856, (in place of Augustin Thierry,) a member of the Institute of France. Under the appointment of Napoleon III., he was the director, in 1860 and 1861, of a scientific commission for the archæological exploration of the sites of supposed Phenician cities, and on his return published a large collection of monumental inscriptions from the times of the Assyrian rule to that of the Seleucidæ. He was, at the same time, appointed Professor of Hebrew in the College of France, but lost his position by attacking, in his inaugural address, the clerical party, and the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. While residing on the frontiers of Galilee in which our Saviour dwelt, he was led to traverse it frequently. He visited also Jerusalem, Hebron, and Samaria; scarcely any locality important in the history of Jesus escaped him. "He had before his eyes in the landscape around him," to use his own language, "a fifth gospel, torn but still legible, and thenceforth, through the narratives of Matthew and Mark, instead of an abstract being, which one would say had never existed, he saw a wonderful human form live and move." At Ghazir in Mt. Lebanon, in a Maronite hut, with but five or six volumes around, he sketched the "*Life of Jesus*," which, after his return, he labored incessantly to test and verify. "To the pure spirit of" his "sister Henriette, who died at Byblus, September 24th, 1861," of a disease which struck them both, but from which he arose, is the book dedicated. "You sleep now," says he, "in the land of Adonis, near the

---

\* The best of these were collected into a volume under the title "*Etudes d' Histoire Religieuse*."

holy Byblus and the sacred waters where the women of the ancient mysteries came to mingle their tears. Reveal to me, O my good genius, to me whom you loved, those truths which master Death, prevent us from fearing, and make us almost love it."

There may be human tenderness and poetry in such, as it were, votive offerings, but it is pagan, not Christian in its spirit, and would have comported well with the character and times of Celsus, Porphyry, or Jamblicus, those early opponents of Christianity in the third and fourth centuries.

"A history of the 'Origins of Christianity,' " he says, "would consist of four books." The first which he presents to the public, treats of the person of its founder. The second treats of the apostles and their immediate disciples, closing about the year 100. The third (not yet written) would set forth the condition of Christianity under the Antonines as it slowly developed, comprising the whole of the second century. The fourth would show the progress of Christianity from the Syrian emperors to Constantine. "He knows not that he will have enough of life and ability to complete a plan so vast. He will be satisfied, if, after having written the Life of Jesus, it is given him to relate, as he understands it, the History of the Apostles." Vol. i., pp. 9, 10. These two portions of the work we see are now completed; the closing chapters of the second volume indicate a manifest preparation for others to follow. And it may be "given to him" in the inscrutable providence of God, that he may show forth his shallowness and folly and afford opportunity for a further defence of Christianity against sceptical objections, to carry out his plan to its final completion.

The fundamental error of M. Renan, is the denial of every thing supernatural in Christianity. In order to this, and to prepare the way for it, he begins by casting doubt on the reliability of the four gospels. They are not true history in every part, but are "in part legendary," "since" and the reason will be noted, "*they are full of miracles and the supernatural.*" "The formulæ, 'according to Matthew,' 'according to Mark,' 'according to Luke,' 'according to John,' do not imply that

these narratives have been written, from one end to the other, by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John," but only that these were traditions coming from each of these evangelists and covered by their authority. It does not suit M. Renan to adopt the true interpretation of this phrase, viz., that the whole of these four treatises was originally called "the Gospel," that it was regarded as having a fourfold form, and that "The Gospel according to Matthew," etc., etc., is the Gospel as it came from the hand of these several evangelists. M. Renan says of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, that "they are impersonal compositions," that "a proper name at the head of such works does not mean much," though with us it means every thing, and we have no doubt that it was so when these gospels were written; that in the first two gospels we "do not have the original compilations;" that "Matthew wrote originally a collection of discourses, and Mark a narrative of events;" that the owners of these copies, desiring to make them complete, copied the anecdotes of Mark, mingling them with the discourses of Matthew, or *vice versa*. "There was no scruple about inserting additions, combining them diversely, and completing some by others. The poor man that has but one book desires it to contain all that speaks to his heart. They lent these little rolls to each other; each transcribed on the margin of his copy the sayings and parables he found elsewhere, and which touched him. The finest thing in the world thus resulted from an obscure and entirely popular elaboration." Vol. i., pp. 17, 23.

As to the third Gospel, that of Luke, it was written, he says, after the siege of Jerusalem. This siege is alluded to in chapter xxi. 9, 20, 24, 28, 32. That these are prophetic utterances of our Lord and Saviour does not accord with his philosophy! "It is a document," he says, "of second hand. The sayings of Jesus are more premeditated. Some teachings are falsified. He has a wrong idea of the temple, which he imagines to be an oratory whither men went to perform their devotions. He tones down passages which had become embarrassing from the stand-point of a more exalted idea of the divinity of Jesus; he exaggerates the marvellous; commits errors of chronology; is totally ignorant of

Hebrew. He is a very precise devotee; he makes it important that Jesus performs all the Jewish rites; he is an exalted democrat and Ebionite, that is, thoroughly opposed to property, and persuaded that the day of the poor is at hand." Vol. i., pp. 35, 36. "We can place our finger," he further alleges, "on the places where he dislocates or mixes up anecdotes, and can perceive the manner in which he colors facts according to his personal views, and adds pious legends to the most authentic traditions." Vol. ii., p. 24. Of the book of Acts, written also by Luke, he speaks in the most derogatory terms. "The author betrays discrepancies still more remarkable than those existing in his gospel. His theory of forty days; his account of the Ascension, closing by a sort of final abduction and theatrical solemnity; the fantastic life of Jesus; his manner of describing the descent of the Holy Ghost, and of miraculous preaching; his method of understanding the gift of tongues—all are different from St. Paul: all betray the influence of an epoch relatively inferior, and of a period when legendary lore finds wide credence. Supernatural effects and startling accessories are characteristic of the author, who, we should remember, writes half a century after the occurrences he describes; in a country far from the scene of action; upon events which neither he nor his master, Paul, has witnessed; and following traditions partly fabulous." Vol. ii., pp. 25, 26.

He says of the Gospel of John, that "it discovers continually the preoccupations of the apologist, the afterthoughts of the sectary, the intention of proving a thesis, and of convincing adversaries. Not by pretentious, heavy, badly written tirades, saying little to the moral sense, did Jesus found his divine work." "On every page the intention is betrayed of showing that he was the favorite of Jesus, that upon all the most solemn occasions he held the first place." He speaks of John's "rivalry with Peter," and his "hatred to Judas;" of his "obscure gnosticism and distorted metaphysics." Vol. i., pp. 28, 29. "This style of extolling himself, and demonstrating himself incessantly, this perpetual argumentation, this scenic representation without simplicity; the long moralizing at the end of each miracle; these

stiff and awkward discourses, the tone of which is often false and unequal, and unendurable to the man of taste by the side of the delicious sayings of the synoptics:" "we have here evidently artificial pieces, which represent to us the teachings of Jesus, as the dialogues of Plato render to us the conversations of Socrates. They seem in some sort the variations of a musician, improvising on his own account on a given theme." Vol. i., p. 31.

This is the language, not of a friend, but of a bitter enemy. By others, John has been described as being not without faults as a man, but having a predominating character of singular mildness, gentleness, modesty, and love. "He is unquestionably," says Schaff, "one of the highly gifted natures, endowed with a delicate, contemplative mind, lively feeling, glowing imagination, and a tender, loving heart." "Not unaptly has Peter been styled the apostle of hope; Paul, the apostle of faith; and John, the apostle of love." If John speaks of Judas with horror, it was because he had committed a dastardly and horrid crime. He is no apologist for the traitor, nor does he say with Renan, that "he [Judas] bought for himself a field near the old necropolis of Hakeldama, to the south of Jerusalem, and there lived a retired and peaceful life." Vol. ii., p. 109; Vol. i., 360.

How differently did even a Herder regard the *writings* of John! "They are still waters which run deep, flowing along with the easiest words, but the most profound meaning." In his deep admiration he exclaims, "It is written with the hand of an angel." "He knew," says another appreciating writer, "how to communicate, in the most simple child-like dress, the profoundest truths." His inspiration did not destroy his individuality, and yet, to use the language of still another, "more than any other apostle, he formed his language on the model of Christ's manner of expression." And these are the judgments, not of any scientific commissioner for the exploration of ancient Phenicia, but of learned, polished, and truthful men, who made the writings of John and other writings of the New Testament *their life-long study*.

Renan adds that "the historical sketch of the fourth Gospel is the life of Jesus as it was known in the school of John, and

that in his opinion this school was better acquainted with the external circumstances of the life of the founder than the group whose memories made up the synoptic gospels." The whole he says "are neither biographies after the manner of Suetonius, nor fictitious legends like those of Philostratus; they are legendary biographies. I would compare them with the legends of the Saints, the Lives of Plotinus, Proclus, Isidorus." Vol. i., pp. 33, 39.

The whole reason Renan has for denouncing these writings of the New Testament, is that they represent Christianity as a supernatural revelation. "The first twelve chapters of Acts," he says, "are a tissue of miracles. It is an absolute rule of criticism to deny a place in history to narratives of miraculous circumstances." Vol. ii., p. 37. This is the key of his unscrupulous warfare against these documents so revered by the Church of God. If we could possibly imagine that this book of Renan now before us, could survive the eighteen centuries which may yet roll on, *it* might in like manner be supposed to be a work of gradual increment compiled by various sceptical men, one adding one sentence, another others, some borrowed from Baur, another portion from Strauss, another from Schleiermacher, a learned Jew, furnishing, as he acknowledges was the case, *con amore*, the various references to the Talmud, with which some portions of the work abounds. It might even be held that it had passed through many hands, and took years to reach the state in which it is now found. So fallacious is the whole matter of textual criticism. Now, if honest and ingenuous writers ever existed, these were such, having no motive but to tell the truth, and adhering to their testimony amid persecutions, loss of place, of worldly goods, and life itself,—Matthew, writing from eight to fifteen years after the ascension of Christ; Luke, from seventeen to twenty-five years; Mark, some thirty years; and John, from thirty-seven to forty-two years subsequent to the death of his Master. These are periods in which it is possible and easy to gather up all the threads of history, when the actors and spectators are yet alive, and when facts, open, striking in their character, and notorious, can easily be ascertained, and could

not be successfully falsified; for these things "were not done in a corner." They are periods too brief for the growth of legendary story, Renan's absurd hypotheses to the contrary notwithstanding. If the New Testament history is not true, then all history, even that of the last and present century, is a fable. And as to these additions and changes in the sacred books held to be written by apostles and prophets, it is an act which the common sentiment of Christian\* and Jew† has alike condemned in all ages. And the most awful threatening of heaven in the closing verses of the New Testament is fulminated against it as a damning sacrilege. As to the alleged inconsistencies paraded with such an air of triumph by Renan, they all disappear before the candid eye of a true and honorable student of the Scriptures, and no such scholar can regard this laborious effort to set them forth but with a disgust little removed from contempt for his honesty of heart and discrimination of mind.

Let us consider for a moment the question whether a miracle is *possible*. To this no one can give a negative answer who believes that there is a God who is self-existent, and the Creator of all things. With God all things are possible save those which may be contrary to his own nature and attributes. Only the pantheist, who holds that every thing is God, and all phænomena are modifications and revelations of the one and only substance that exists, can deny the possibility of miracles. Were it not for certain expressions used by him, we would at once assign Renan to this class of speculative men. To deny the possibility of miracles, is to deny that God, who created man, can have access to his mind whenever he wills it.

The *probability* of the miracle rests upon the probability of a revelation. The disordered condition of human nature, the guilt which oppresses the conscience, the craving of the heart for intercourse with God, and the inadequacy of human reason to suggest

---

\* Dionysius of Corinth, as quoted by Euseb. Hist. Eccles., Lib. iv., ch. xxiii.

† Trypho in Justin Martyr.



a remedy, all combine to render it probable that God would make a direct revelation to men, which should be authoritative and binding. This revelation must rest on a divine testimony, and that the testimony is divine, the miracle establishes. The miracle is a work involving a deviation from the known laws of nature, a direct and manifest act of God, wrought to authenticate the mission of some religious teacher, or some truth which he utters. Nicodemus felt the attesting power of our Saviour's miracles when he said to Christ, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." And Christ himself appeals to the miracle in confirmation of his own declarations. He claimed the prerogative of forgiving sins; and to prove that he had that power, he commanded the palsied man to "arise, take up his bed, and walk." "And the multitude glorified God which had given such power unto men." "Go your way," says he to John the Baptist's disciples, "and tell John what things ye have seen and heard, how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised."

The *credibility* or *certainty* of miracles can also be shown. If we were the *first* witnesses of a miracle, were it the restoration of a man we knew to be dead to life, or the restoration of sight to a man born blind, or the miraculous parting of the Red Sea and our own passage through it, we could believe the *reality* of what we thus saw. And if these are things cognisable to our senses, they can be made cognisable to the minds of others by the testimony of credible witnesses. Were the witnesses sincere? Can their belief be accounted for only on the hypothesis that the facts to which they bare witness really took place? If so, we are bound to believe their testimony. These criteria of miracles usually laid down, being all satisfied, the miracle is to be received: 1. That the fact be one of which the outward senses can judge; 2. That it be notorious, and performed publicly in the presence of witnesses; 3. That there be memorials of it, or monuments, actions, and customs, kept up in commemoration of it; 4. That such monuments and actions commence with the fact. Whatever has

these four marks cannot be false. To these can be added a fifth, which is peculiar to the Scriptures, that the book in which the facts are recorded should be the *law* and statute-book of that people to which it belongs.\* The books of Moses have ever been the law of the Jews, and the New Testament the law of the Christians.

These points being premised in relation to miracles, the rashness and absurdity of M. Renan's "Life of Christ," and "the Apostles," will be apparent. All these criteria meet in the historic events, the miraculous and the natural alike, of the gospel history; and it requires far more faith to believe in Renan's "Origins of Christianity," than to receive the miracles of the Gospel. The one addresses itself to our reason, judgment, and moral sense. The other is but the merest romancing or poetic dreaming, and is as remote as possible from the limits of the probable.

But we proceed with the statements of our author.

"Jesus was born," says Renan, "in Nazareth, but not of the family of David, nor by any supernatural birth." "This last presumption arose from the notion generally received by the ancients, that the extraordinary man cannot be born of the ordinary relation between the sexes, and from a misunderstood chapter of Isaiah, affirming that the Messiah should be born of a virgin." "Did he by his silence authorise the fictitious genealogies which his partisans imagined in order to prove his royal descent? Did he know any thing of the legends invented to fix his birth at Bethlehem, and in particular of the feat by which his Bethlehemite origin was connected with the assessment made by Quirinius?" Vol. i., p. 218. "His legend was the fruit of a great, altogether spontaneous conspiracy, and was worked out about him while he was yet alive." Vol. i., p. 219. "Jesus had never thought of passing for an incarnation of God." "He believes himself more than an ordinary man, but separated from God by an infinite distance. He is the Son of God; but all men are so, or may become so, in different degrees." Vol. i., p.

---

\* Leslie's Short Method.

221. As to his education, "he learned to read and write, doubtless according to the method of the East." "It is doubtful whether he really understood the Hebrew writings in the original tongue." "It is not probable that he knew Greek." "He had no knowledge of the general condition of the world." Vol. i., pp. 72, 73. Coming upon the stage of action subsequently to John the Baptist, "the two young enthusiasts, full of the same hopes and the same hates, might well make common cause and reciprocally support each other." But "during all the time he spent with him, Jesus recognised him as his superior, and developed his own genius but timidly." [!] "During some weeks, at least, he was the imitator of John." [!] Vol. i., p. 125. "The only thing he owed to John, was, to a certain extent, lessons in preaching and popular agitation." [!] "From this time, in fact, he preached with much more force, and impressed himself upon the multitude with authority." But not only does Renan represent Christ playing a subordinate part to John, and being taught by him, he represents him as mistaken in his own conceptions. "Our principles of positive science are offended by the fancies which are included in the programme of Jesus. We know the history of the earth; cosmical revolutions of the kind Jesus expected, are only by geological or astronomical causes, the connexion of which with moral powers has never been established." "But, to be just toward great creators, we must not pause at the prejudices they may have shared. Columbus discovered America in consequence of very erroneous ideas." Vol. i., p. 438. He gathered disciples around him. "Three or four Galilean women always accompanied the young master, and disputed among themselves the pleasure of listening to him and caring for him in turn. One of them, Mary of Magdala, according to the language of the time, had been possessed of seven devils; that is to say, had been affected by nervous diseases apparently inexplicable. Jesus, by his pure and gentle beauty, calmed this troubled organisation." [!] Others are also mentioned, some of whom were "rich, and by means of their fortune, placed the young prophet in a position to live without working at the trade which he had hitherto followed. Besides these,

there were men whom he gathered around him, most of whom were fishermen of Galilee. Jesus owed these numerous conquests to the infinite charm of his person and his speech. A penetrating remark, a look falling upon a simple conscience, which needed only to be awakened, made for him an ardent disciple. Sometimes he made use of an innocent artifice, which Joan of Arc also employed. [!] He would aver that he knew something intimately of him whom he wished to serve, or he would recall to him some circumstance dear to his heart. It is thus that he touched Nathanael, Peter, and the Samaritan woman." Vol. i., pp. 157, 158, 164.

The gospel was for the poor and the outcast, for the publican and the sinner. Their affections gathered around him. "Thus he traversed Galilee in the midst of a perpetual holiday." Vol. i., p. 184.

But his contemporaries required miracles and the fulfilment of the prophecies in attestation of a divine mission. "Jesus, and especially his disciples, employed these two methods of demonstration in perfect good faith." "By reason of their constant preoccupation they saw references to him in the Psalms and Prophets. The exegesis of the times consisted almost entirely in plays upon words and citations made in an arbitrary manner." And this is the proof from prophecy! Not, Renan graciously intimates, a designed deception, but yet an entire mistake, or "artifice of style."

As to miracles, "the legends of Elijah and Elisha were full of them." Simon Magus, a magician near at hand, "created for himself by his illusions a character almost divine." "Jesus had therefore to choose between these two alternatives, either to renounce his mission or become a wonder-worker." He did this with reluctance, and became "a thaumaturgist only at a late period and against his will." "Most of his miracles were miracles of healing. Medicine in Judea was in no respect scientific, but abandoned to individual inspiration. In such a condition of knowledge, the presence of a superior man, treating the sick with gentleness, and giving him by sensible signs the assurance of recovery, is often a decisive remedy. Who dare say that in

many cases, the contrast of an exquisite person is not worth all the resources of pharmacy? The pleasure of seeing him heals. He gives what he can, a smile, a hope, and that is not unavailing." "Persuaded that the touch of his garment, the imposition of his hands did good to the sick, he would have been unfeeling had he refused to the suffering an alleviation which it was in his power to accord. Epilepsy, and mental and nervous diseases, were then assigned to demoniacal possession, and the vocation of an exorcist was a regular profession. Jesus had the reputation of possessing the deepest secrets of that art. And over those unfortunate lunatics who were permitted to wander about, as now, living like other vagrants in abandoned sepulchral caves, Jesus had great power. They were told on the subject of his cures a multitude of strange stories, in which all the credulity of the time gave itself full scope. But the disorders which they explained as possessions were often very slight. At this day, in Syria, those are regarded as lunatics, or possessed, who are only somewhat singular.\* A gentle word often sufficed in this case to drive away the demon. Such were doubtless the means employed by Jesus." [!] Vol. i., pp. 230-240.

And such, according to Renan, is the proof from miracles!! Christ was simply a thaumaturgist of a higher order! "In his miracles," says Renan, "a painful effort is perceived, a weariness, as if some thing had gone out of him." "It is impossible to know whether the ungracious circumstances of exertion, groaning, and other traits of *jugglery* are really historic, or are the fruit of the belief of the compilers, much inclined to magic."

We are sick at heart of such disgusting recitals, such perversions and misrepresentations, such travesties of the sacred record; such irreverent and horrid blasphemies of the person and character of one whom he sometimes praises with much sweetness, tenderness, and eloquence of language. But we will still rehearse one more, which will cap the climax of these absurd and

---

\* So with us in figurative speech. "She" or "he is possessed." But what then? Is there nothing but figure in the possessions of the New Testament? And would gentle words cure *them*?

wicked parodies of the miracles of our Lord. It is as follows: "Wearied out by the ill reception with which the kingdom of God met in the capital, the friends of Jesus desired a great miracle which should have a powerful effect upon Hierosolymite incredulity. The resurrection of a man well known at Jerusalem would be more convincing than anything else." "In this impure oppressive city of Jerusalem, Jesus was no longer himself. His conscience, by the fault of men, and not his own, had lost something of its primitive clearness. [!] Desperate, pushed to extremities, he no longer retained possession of himself. [!] His mission imposed itself upon him, and he obeyed the torrent." "It is impossible to decide in the present case (the resurrection of Lazarus,) whether the whole is a fiction, or whether a real event occurring at Bethany served as a basis for the rumor which was bruited abroad." "We think that something took place at Bethany which was regarded as a resurrection." "The family at Bethany may have been led, almost without suspecting it, to the important act which was desired. Jesus was there adored. It seems that Lazarus was sick, and that it was indeed in consequence of a message from his alarmed sisters that Jesus left Peræa. The joy of his coming might recall Lazarus to life. [!] Perhaps also the evident desire to close the mouths of those who furiously denied the divine mission of their friend, may have carried these enthusiastic persons beyond all bounds. Perhaps Lazarus, still pale from his sickness, caused himself to be swathed in grave clothes as one dead, and shut up in the family tomb. [!] Jesus desired to see once more one whom he had loved, and the stone having been removed, Lazarus came forth with his grave clothes and his head bound around with a napkin. The apparition must naturally be regarded by all as a resurrection. Faith knows no other law than the interest of what it believes to be the truth. The end which it pursues being in its view absolutely holy, it makes no scruple in invoking bad arguments in behalf of its proposition when good ones do not succeed." [! !]

And thus this Jesus, whom Renan elsewhere represents so pure and holy, and his followers, whom he characterises as simple-

hearted and true, lend themselves to these vile, impious, and awful impostures, and he who is "the truth and the life," practised deception, and acted falsehood, to bring in the kingdom of that God who "is of purer eyes than to behold evil, or to look upon sin with allowance" !!!

Shall we accompany the profane feet of this *Membre de l'Institut*, this Director of the Scientific Commission for the exploration of the antiquities of Phenicia, to the sacred garden of Gethsemane? This scene he describes, but cannot refrain from throwing a veil of doubt over the time of its happening, and casting dirt upon the fair fame of the sacred historians. "By virtue of that *instinctive art* which presided over the compilations of the synoptics, and which often makes them obedient to considerations of propriety or effect in the arrangement of events, it *has been assigned* to the last night of Jesus, and to the moment of his arrest. Were this the true version, we could hardly understand how John, who must have been the intimate witness of so moving an episode, should not have spoken of it." "The immense burden of the mission he had accepted weighed cruelly upon Jesus. Human nature awoke for a moment." But does M. Renan have any conception of what it was that made him exceeding sorrowful even unto death,—caused him to pray the more earnestly, and sweat as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground? No. "He began," says he, "to doubt of his work. Terror, hesitation seized upon him, and threw him into a dejection worse than death." But mark the poor unworthy thoughts he presumes may have agitated him. "Perhaps some one of those touching recollections which even the strongest souls preserve, and which at times pierce them like the sword, came upon him at this moment. Did he recall the clear fountains of Galilee where he might have refreshed himself, the vineyard and fig tree under which he might have been seated, *the young maidens who might perhaps have consented to love him?* Did he curse his bitter destiny, which had forbidden to him the joys conceded to others? Did he regret his too lofty nature, and, the victim of his own grandeur, did he weep because he did

not remain a simple artisan of Nazareth? We do not know." Vol. i., p. 318.

Ah yes, we do know. The awful load of our redemption rested on him. He was to endure the curse, to bear the load of our guilt, to wrestle for us with the Father's wrath.

M. Renan describes the trial of Jesus, the scene of the crucifixion and his death, and as a poor atonement for the grievous wrongs he has done him, or perhaps, as a cloak to cover the dark deeds he has perpetrated in this vile romance, apostrophises in exalted language "the noble founder whose work is finished, whose divinity is established!" He follows him to the tomb, and in reference to the story of his resurrection, asks "what had taken place?" He says, "In treating of the history of the apostles, it is that we shall have to examine this point, and seek the origin of the *legend* relating to the resurrection." "Had his body been taken away, or did enthusiasm, always credulous, afterwards generate the mass of accounts by which faith in the resurrection was sought to be established? This, for want of peremptory evidence, we shall never know. We may say, however, that the strong imagination of Mary Magdalene here enacted a principal part. Divine power of love! sacred moments," he exclaims, "in which the *passion* of a hallucinated woman gives to the world a resurrected God!" Vol. i., 351, 357.

To this subject he recurs in his second volume, "The Apostles," after having done what he could to affirm the legendary and doubtful character of the book of Acts, the second part of Luke's treatise on the "Origins of Christianity." "The first twelve chapters are a tissue of miracles. It is an absolute rule of criticism to deny a place in history to narratives of miraculous circumstances." Vol. ii., p. 37. With this as his justification, he receives and rejects whatever suits his purposes. "Many words of their Master which they remembered might be interpreted to mean that he would rise from the tomb." "Such a belief was so natural, that the faith of the disciples would have been sufficient to have invented it in all its parts. The great



prophets Enoch and Elijah had not tasted death." "Heroes do not die." "Could they consent to allow him to the decay of the tomb? No." "The day which followed the burial of Jesus (Saturday, the 15th of the month Nisan,) was occupied with such thoughts as these. All manual labor was forbidden on account of the Sabbath. The Christian conscience had on that day only one object: the Master laid low in the tomb. The women, especially, overwhelmed him in spirit with the most tender caresses. Their thoughts leave not for an instant this sweet friend, lying in his myrrh, whom the wicked had slain. Ah! doubtless the angels are surrounding him, and veiling their faces with his shroud." "He shall live again; God will not leave his Son a prey to hell." "They had no choice between despair or heroic affirmation. A man of penetration might have announced during the Saturday that Jesus would arise. The little Christian society, on that day, worked the veritable miracle; they resuscitated Jesus in their hearts by the intense love they bore towards him." "Only let a material fact, insignificant of itself, allow the persuasion that his body is no longer here below, and the dogma of the resurrection will be established forever." Vol. ii., pp. 54-57. After speaking of the arrival of the women at the sepulchre on Sunday morning, who on Friday evening had hastily embalmed the body, he says, "that in the two most authentic accounts which we possess of the resurrection, Mary of Magdala plays her part alone." "The stone was not in its place. The vault was open. The body was no longer there." "The disappearance of this cherished corpse had taken away from her the last joy on which she had depended. She could never touch him again with her hands." "The idea of a profanation presented itself to her." "Without losing a moment, she runs to the house where Peter and John are reunited. 'They have taken away the body of our Master,' she said, 'and we know not where they have laid him.'" After the departure of Peter and John from the garden, she "remained alone at the edge of the cave." "Suddenly she hears a light rustling behind her. There is a man standing. She believes it to be the gardener. She says, 'Oh, if thou hast borne him hence, tell me

where thou hast laid him, that I may take him away.' For the only answer, she *thinks* that she hears herself called by her name, 'Mary!' It was the voice that had so often thrilled her before. It was the accent of Jesus. 'Oh, my Master!' she cries. She is about to touch him. A sort of instinctive movement throws her at his feet to kiss them. The light vision gives way and says to her, 'Touch me not.' Little by little the shadow disappeared. But the miracle of love is accomplished. That which Cephas could not do, Mary has done." "The glory of the resurrection belongs, then, to Mary of Magdala. After Jesus, it is Mary who has done most for the foundation of Christianity. The shadow created by the delicate sensibility of Magdalene wanders still on the earth. Queen and patroness of idealists, Magdalene knew better than any one how to assert her dream, and impose on every one the vision of her passionate soul. Her great womanly affirmation, 'He has risen,' has been the basis of the faith of humanity." Vol. ii., pp. 57-61.

In this style are all the circumstances connected with the resurrection of Christ explained. The other women "told of a man clothed in white whom they had seen in the cave, and who had said, 'He is no longer here.'" "Perhaps," says Renan, "it was the *white linen clothes* which had given rise to the hallucination. Perhaps again they saw nothing at all." "The news spread, they were on the watch for new visions, which could not fail to appear." "If the entire Church had been assembled, the legendary creation would have been impossible; those who knew the secret of the disappearance of the body would probably have protested against the error." Vol. ii., pp. 52, 63. One cannot help asking, why did they not have the honesty afterwards to correct it, when this rumor reached their ears?

"About the year 80 or 85, when the text of the first Gospel received its last additions, the Christians invented the circumstances of the guard of soldiers and the seal affixed to the sepulchre. This circumstance, related only in the first Gospel, is in no respect admissible." Vol. ii., p. 79. In this way he construes as legendary every thing which works in favor of the historic truth of the gospel narrative. In his first volume, he

says the owner of the tomb was probably "some believer," and refers to Matt. xxvii. 60, as giving the tradition that it belonged to Joseph of Arimathea. In his second, he says, "he was a stranger to the sect." He says, "We can scarcely admit that those who so bravely believed that Jesus had risen again, were the very ones who had carried off the body." "It is possible it was taken by some of the disciples and carried to Galilee. It is permissible to suppose its disappearance was the work of the Jews. Perhaps it was effected by the proprietor of the garden, or by the gardener, dissatisfied with this mode of taking possession of his property. The details of the fourth Gospel, of the linen clothes left in the tomb, and of the napkin folded away carefully by itself in a corner, scarcely agree with such a hypothesis. This last circumstance would lead to the conclusion that a female hand had slipped it there." Vol. ii., p. 80. He suggests that it may have been Mary of Bethany. Note 37, p. 314.

But, how clearly does the careful folding of the napkin and laying away of the burial clothes put all ideas of robbery of the tomb out of the question. He should have denounced this too as legendary, if he would carry out his hypothesis. How clearly does it indicate that our blessed Lord really assumed the life he had laid down, that he released his person from the grave clothes which bound him around, and carefully and leisurely folded or rolled up the napkin, and laid it aside. Whatever doubts John may have had hitherto, when he entered into the sepulchre and saw this, "he believed." John *xx.* 8. "The question, 'In what place did the worms consume the lifeless corpse which on Saturday evening had been deposited in the sepulchre,' surely does not admit of easy solution," as Renan confesses. Vol. ii., p. 78. It was very important also to his theory that he should make the setting of the guard and the sealing of the stone a legend. The Jews either took these precautions to prevent the robbery of the tomb, or they did not. If they did not, what hindered them, when they had such opportunity and so many motives to do it? If they took these precautions, the timid and

disconcerted disciples would not have made the attempt, or making it, would not have succeeded. It is incredible that a Roman guard, probably a large one, posted for such a purpose, should all be asleep at one and the same time. If they were all asleep, they were incompetent to testify as to the matter of theft. Christ might have risen and come forth while they slept.

Renan proceeds to explain away other appearances of Christ. "The disciples believed in phantoms; they imagined they were surrounded by miracles." The stranger, for example, who accompanied the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, "was a pious man, well versed in the Scriptures." As he brake bread with them, they *imagined* it was Jesus. Again: It was night, and they were assembled in Jerusalem, and each communicated what they had seen and heard. The story of Emmaus was told, and how Jesus was known to them in the breaking of bread. "The silence within the house was frequently profound. During a moment of silence, some slight breath passed over the assembly. At these decisive periods of time, a current of air, a creaking window, or a chance murmur, are sufficient to fix the belief of peoples for ages. At the same time that the breath was perceived they *fancied* that they heard sounds. Some of them said that they had discerned the word *shalom*, 'happiness' or 'peace.' This was the ordinary salutation of Jesus, and the word by which he signified his presence. No possibility of doubt; Jesus is present; he is in the assembly. That is his cherished voice; each one recognises it."!!! Vol. ii., pp. 67, 68. Truly it could no longer be said of them that "they were slow of heart to believe."

But they were *not* the credulous men Renan pretends. "Some doubted," and the most obstinate of these doubters was Thomas. It was not enough for him to *see* the prints of the nails, he must *feel* them, and even more, he must thrust his hand *into the Saviour's side*. But even he was compelled to believe, and uttered, in his overpowering conviction, "My Lord and my God!" It could be no myth, and no illusion. His incredulity overthrows the whole theory of Renan, and becomes to us a

convincing proof of the resurrection. *Dubitatum est ab illo ne dubitetur a nobis.\**

Renan explains away the other appearances of Christ in Galilee in the most childish and absurd manner. The appearance on the shore of the sea of Galilee, for example, was a mere fancy. They had toiled all night, and had caught nothing. "It *seemed* to them that some one had told them from the shore, 'Cast your nets on the right.'" Peter *dreamed* that he heard Jesus ask him thrice, "Lovest thou me?"—*dreamed* the conversation recorded about him and John. In the same fantastic way does he deal with the scene of the Ascension. "More than five hundred persons were devoted to the memory of Jesus in Galilee. These obeyed the chief of the disciples, and above all, Peter. One day, following their spiritual chiefs, they climbed up one of the mountains to which Jesus had often led them, and they *fancied* that they saw him again. The air on these mountain tops is full of strange *mirages*. The same illusion which had previously taken place in behalf of the more intimate disciples," [the Transfiguration,] "was produced again. The whole assembly *imagined* that they saw the Divine spectre displayed in the clouds; they all fell on their faces and worshipped. The feeling which the clear horizon of these mountains inspires is the idea of the immensity of the world and the desire of conquering it. They came down from the mountain persuaded that the Son of God had commanded them to convert the whole human race, and had promised to be with them even to the end of the world." "Nearly a year passed over, during which they lived this charmed life, suspended, as it were, between heaven and earth."!! Vol. ii., pp. 75-77.

Thus does Renan dispose of the story of the resurrection and the eleven distinct appearances of Christ after his resurrection, in which he was seen by between five and six hundred persons, not including the Roman guards posted at the sepulchre. It requires a far stronger faith to believe in his theories than in the history which the evangelists have given us of these events.

---

\* Leo the Great.

Their stories, notwithstanding the alleged discrepancies, are perfectly consistent when harmonized by arranging them in their true historic order, and are marked by a beautiful simplicity and truthfulness. That they should have attempted to deceive on an event so public, and challenge the world to disprove it, and especially the civil and ecclesiastical rulers under whose power it all was; that they should permit themselves to be deluded when the profession of the fact would expose them to the loss of all things; that they should proclaim with great power the resurrection of their crucified Master, when, if it were not so, they might have been easily silenced, exceeds our power to believe. That these trembling, despondent disciples should, after three days, be filled with hope and joy, should, at the Pentecost which followed, come forth boldly and proclaim, "Him hath God raised up, whom with wicked hands ye have crucified and slain," surpasses fable. That Paul, the disciple of Gamaliel; a man of such powers of intellect; learned in all the discipline of his day and nation; independent, bold, and proud of his own acquisitions; in favor with the Sanhedrim, holding in his hands their commission; on the high road to preferment; who might perchance some day sit in the chair of the same Gamaliel, an equally distinguished teacher; that he should receive the story of our Saviour's resurrection, if it were all a dream, is more than we can account for. But he did believe it and regard it as the miracle of miracles. "If Christ be not risen," says he, "then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified that he raised up Christ." 1 Cor. xv. 14, 15. Dr. Baur, the greatest of modern sceptics, who was the teacher of Strauss, of whom, in his turn, Renan is the disciple, was greatly stumbled at the conversion of Paul. "He acknowledged that it remained a mystery to him, which could not be solved by any psychological analysis." He speaks, in this connexion, of the *miracle* of the resurrection, "which alone could disperse those doubts of the older apostles that seemed to doom faith itself to the eternal night of death, and of the miracle of Paul's conversion, which appears the greater, since he, in the sudden change from the most violent

enemy to the most determined herald of Christianity, broke through the barriers of Jewish particularism, and dissolved it in the universal idea of Christianity.”\*

Of this apostle, Renan gives a description. “He was small, ugly, stout, short, stooping, broad-shouldered, bald, sallow; with an aquiline nose, piercing eyes, heavy eyebrows joined across the forehead; timid, embarrassed, unimpressive in speech; unhealthy; badly educated, unacquainted with [pure] Greek; haughty; of exaggerated pretensions, capricious.” And yet, “his politeness was extreme, his manners exquisite, of rare intelligence, of lofty sentiment, amiable hesitations, animation, wealth of charming sayings, polite, earnest, affectionate, liberal, intelligent, tolerant, of large ideas, great, reticent,\* susceptible.” Such are the terms in which, on different pages, he delineates his person and character.

He describes him on the way to Damascus. “His mental excitement was at its greatest height, and he was alternately troubled and depressed. Like all strong minds, he quickly learned to love that which he had hated. Was he sure, after all, that he was not thwarting the design of God? Perhaps he remembered the calm, just views of his master Gamaliel. Often these ardent souls experience terrible revulsions. He felt the charms of those whom he had tortured, and the better he knew these excellent sectarians the better he liked them; and than their persecutor none had greater opportunities of knowing them. At times he saw,” [in imagination] “the sweet face of the Master who had inspired his disciples with so much patience, regarding him with an air of pity and reproach.”

If, in the environs of Damascus, the ‘Paradise of God,’ “Paul met with terrible visions, it was because he carried them in his heart. Every step in his journey towards Damascus awaked in him afflicting perplexities. The odious part of executioner, which he was about to perform, became insupportable. The houses which he just saw through the trees, were perhaps those

---

\* Baur, *Das Christenthum*, quoted by Prof. Fisher, *Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity*, p. 461, and in Schaff's *Person of Christ*, p. 233.

of his victims. This thought beset him and delayed his steps; he did not wish to advance; he seemed to be resisting a mysterious influence which pressed him back. The fatigue of the journey, joined to this preoccupation of the mind, overwhelmed him. He had, it would seem, inflamed eyes, probably the beginning of ophthalmia. In these prolonged journeys, the last hours are the most dangerous. All the debilitating causes of the days just past accumulate, the nerves relax their power, and reaction sets in. Perhaps, also, the sudden passage from the sun-smitten plain to the cool shades of the gardens heightened his suffering condition and seriously excited the fanatical traveller. Dangerous fevers, accompanied by delirium, are always sudden in these latitudes, and in a few minutes the victim is prostrated as by a thunder-stroke. When the crisis is over, the sufferer retains only the impression of a period of profound darkness, crossed at intervals by dashes of light or of images outlined against a dark background. It is quite certain that a terrible stroke instantly deprived Paul of his remaining consciousness, and threw him senseless on the ground. \* \* \* It was the state of St. Paul's mind, it was his remorse on his approach to the city where he was to commit the most signal of his misdeeds, which were the true causes of his conversion. \* \* \* The incident, nevertheless, was not wholly unlike a sudden storm. The flanks of Mt. Hermon are the point of formation for thunder-showers unequalled in violence. The most unimpressible people cannot observe without emotion these terrible showers of fire. It should be remembered that in ancient times accidents from lightning strokes were considered divine relations; that with the ideas regarding providential interference then prevalent, nothing was fortuitous; and that every man was accustomed to view the natural phenomena around him as bearing a direct relation to himself individually. The Jews in particular always considered that thunder was the voice of God, and that lightning was the fire of God. Paul at this moment was in a state of lively excitement, and it was but natural that he should interpret as the voice of the storm the thoughts really passing in his mind. That a delirious fever, resulting from a sun-stroke or an attack of ophthalmia, had suddenly seized him; that a flash of lightning blinded him for a time; that a peal of thunder had produced a cerebral commotion, temporarily depriving him of sight—nothing of this occurred to his mind. The recollections of the apostle on this point appeared to be considerably confused; he was persuaded that the incident was supernatural, and this conviction would not permit him to entertain any clear consciousness of



material circumstances. Such cerebral commotions produce sometimes a sort of retroactive effect, and greatly perturb the recollections of the moments immediately preceding the crisis. Paul, moreover, elsewhere informs us himself that he was subject to visions; and this circumstance, insignificant as it may be to others, is sufficient to show that for the time being *he was demented.*"

"And what did he see, what did he hear, while a prey to these hallucinations? He saw the countenance which had haunted him for several days; he saw the phantom of which so much had been said. He saw Jesus himself, who spoke to him in Hebrew, saying, 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?' Impetuous natures pass immediately from one extreme to the other. For them there exist solemn moments and crucial instants which change the course of a lifetime, and which colder natures never experience. Reflective men do not change, but are transformed; while ardent men, on the contrary, change and are not transformed. \* \* \* With the assistance of his companions, who led him by the hand, Paul entered Damascus. \* \* \* For three days Paul, a prey to fever, neither ate nor drank. It is easy to imagine what passed during this crisis in that brain maddened by violent disease. Mention was made in his hearing of the Christians of Damascus, but especially of a certain Ananias who appeared to be the chief of the community. Paul had often heard of the miraculous powers of new believers over maladies, and he became seized by the idea that the imposition of hands would cure him of his disease. His eyes all this time were highly inflamed, and in his delirious imaginations he thought he saw Ananias enter the room and make a sign familiar to Christians. From that moment he was convinced that he should owe his recovery to Ananias. The latter, informed of this, visited the sick man, spoke kindly, addressed him as his 'brother,' and laid his hands upon his head; and from that hour peace returned to the soul of Paul. He believed himself cured; and as his ailment had been purely nervous, he was so. Little crusts or scales, it is said, fell from his eyes; he again partook of food and recovered his strength. Almost immediately after this he was baptized." Vol. ii., pp. 171-175.

Such is Renan's account of the conversion of Paul. It is not impossible that such thoughts passed through his mind. They are natural enough. But unless his own description of his conversion, given in the twenty-sixth chapter of the Acts, is also legendary, he saw a light from heaven, at noon-day, above the

brightness of the sun. It is not possible that a man of intelligence, reared in the East, and acquainted with its meteorology, should be unable to distinguish between the thunder-gusts of Mt. Hermon and a miraculous light from heaven, which so terrified his probably numerous escort, that they all fell to the earth; not possible that this should be a mere phantom-vision, nor these imaginary voices which he heard in the Hebrew tongue and replied to, nor that it was a distemper of body or mind which struck the whole escort suddenly to the ground. It was a real event, and the point of departure from his zeal for Judaism to his zealous labors for the Church of God. "Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision: but showed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance."\*

There are other suggestions in the remaining part of the second volume of more or less importance touching the progress of Christianity in its early missionary age, but the extent to which our exhibitions of the spirit of these volumes, which, notwithstanding their offensiveness, are marked often with great beauty and liveliness of style, have already been carried, forbid any further details.

The English writer, Woolston, explains all the miracles of the Scriptures as allegories, and not real facts; as spiritual truths, expressed in a historic form.† The German, Paulus, represented

---

\* It is stated by the Rev. T. T. Biddolph, that Lord Lyttleton and his friend Gilbert West, Esq., both men of acknowledged talents, had imbibed the principles of infidelity. Believing the Bible to be an imposture, they were determined to expose the cheat. Lord Lyttleton chose the conversion of Paul, and Mr. West the resurrection of Christ, for the subject of hostile criticism. Both sat down to their tasks full of prejudice, and both were converted by their efforts to overthrow Christianity. This is the origin of two of the most valuable treatises in favor of revelation: "Observations on the Conversion of Paul, in a Letter to Gilbert West," by Lord Lyttleton, and "Observations on the Resurrection of Christ," by Gilbert West.

† Large packages of his tracts were forwarded to these American colonies between 1727 and 1731.

them as merely amplifications of natural events. The tempter of our Saviour was a cunning Pharisee; the opened heavens and the voice at his baptism, was the clouds riven by lightning and muttering thunder, of which "This is my beloved Son," was the interpretation; the dove was a real one, by chance flying near, or as Meyer explains, a meteoric form just then visible; the tribute money was the coin obtained by Peter for the fish he sold in the market. Schleiermacher held them to be *relatively* miraculous, seeming so to the observer, but yet the result of the greater insight into the powers of nature, and skill to use them, which the wonder-worker had. Strauss represents them as myths, as religious ideas clothed in a historical form, approximating thus to the theory of Woolston. Renan admits the larger portion of the New Testament to be historic, but this intermingled with legends proceeding from various sources, whose object is to honor Christianity and its Author, but which do not rise, in any degree, to the dignity of history. He is utterly opposed to the idea of a miracle. "They only exist when people believe in them." "A miracle never takes place before an incredulous and sceptical public. Credulity on the part of the witness is the essential condition of a miracle. There is not a solitary exception to the rule that miracles are never produced before those who are able or permitted to discuss and criticise them." "Why do people no longer believe in angels and demons? Simply because the existence of an angel or demon has never yet been proved."

There are declarations and insinuations in these words which we cannot allow. Miracles have not extended over the whole period of the world's history. They existed under Moses and Joshua; under Elijah and Elisha; and in the times of our Saviour. In the days of Abraham they were infrequent. In the days of David and Solomon, we almost never read of them. From the Captivity to Christ, they were unknown. They have ceased from the early ages of Christianity till now. It is true in reference to the so-called miracles of the Romish Church, that "a miracle at Paris, for instance, before experienced savans, would put an end to all doubts. But, alas, such a thing never

happens." It is true that these modern pretended miracles "only exist where people believe in them," and that "discussion and examination are fatal to them." There is no occasion for them. But when God introduced into the world his own Son, himself the greatest miracle of all, mighty works showed themselves abroad to attest his mission. They were now, miracles of knowledge, now, miracles of power. Not simply *mirabilia*, wonders wrought by art in accordance with the laws of nature, nor the deceptive tricks of legerdemain, but *miracula*, wonders, תְּפִלָּאוֹת, deeds which excite wonder, because wrought by the direct and immediate power of God, the privy seal of the great King of Heaven, authenticating the commission of Him whom he sent. They were many in number, and various in kind; "infallible signs" wrought in synagogues among assembled and intelligent crowds, in private houses, in streets, on highways, at the thronged gates of cities, before the people in open day, in the presence of his disciples, before other disinterested men like Nicodemus, who acknowledged for himself and others of his class, that no man could do these miracles except God were with him. They were appealed to by Christ and his apostles in proof of their mission. They are enumerated in the Bible with other evidences of its divine origin. They caused men to forsake their homes, earthly honors, estates, and friends; to encounter countless hardships, as in the case of Saul of Tarsus, and to die by the most cruel and opprobrious deaths in testimony of their faith. The miracle may be above and beyond *our* experience who now live, and yet not be beyond the experience of other men in other ages. When Christ appeared, the divine power came from behind the veil of natural laws and revealed itself in peculiar acts interposed among those which were the result of second causes, before the senses of men, so that they could not fail to own them as the acts of God attesting the mission of his Son and the apostles whom he sent. If there is a chain of natural causes and effects in the physical and spiritual world, and if sin has entered the world and death by sin, disturbing its harmony, God may introduce another and remedial system, and attest its introduction by miracles. Renan would seem to imply "that the forma-

tion of humanity itself was not a sudden, instantaneous thing." But certainly man came into existence by a direct creative act, and not by any process of development. There is a spiritual world which is beyond the ken of the philosopher; and even as in this world of sense, "lower laws are held in restraint by higher, mechanic by dynamic, chemical by vital, physical by moral; as when I lift my arm the law of gravitation is held in suspense by my will, and in a regenerate man, sin by the law of the spirit of life;"\* so, may a divine power interpose amid the ordinary course of nature in support of that remedial system devised for man's salvation. "The appearances of our globe," says Dr. Thornwell, in his able article on Miracles, in a former volume of this Review,† "are said to be utterly inexplicable upon any hypothesis which does not recognise the fact that the plan of creation was so framed from the beginning as to include, at successive periods, the direct agency of the Deity. The earth proclaims, from her hills and dales, her rocks, mountains, and caverns, that she was not originally made and placed in subjection to laws which themselves have subsequently brought her to her present posture. She has not developed herself into her present form, nor peopled herself with her present inhabitants. That science which, at its early dawn, was hailed as the handmaid of infidelity and scepticism, and which may yet have a controversy with the records of our faith not entirely adjusted, has turned the whole strength of its resources against the fundamental principle of rationalism. It has broken the charm which our limited experience had made so powerful against miracles, and has presented the physical government of God in a light which positively turns analogy in favor of the supernatural. The geologist begins with miracles; every epoch in his science repeats the number, and the whole earth, to his mind, is vocal with the name. He finds their history wherever he turns, and he would as soon think of doubting the testimony of sense as the inference which the phænomena bear upon their face. Future

---

\* Trench on Miracles, pp. 21, 22.

† Vol. X., p. 200.

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

The method of M. Renan would destroy the genuineness and credibility of all those ancient writings which are the study of scholars, and have been the instructors of all succeeding generations; and it would extinguish in respect to salvation all the yearnings of the anxious and guilty soul, and annihilate the hopes of man.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE SCIENCE OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY.\*

We believe that there is a SCIENCE of Pastoral Theology; though we can hardly tell why we think so, unless we infer that it exists from its manifest necessity. There has never been made, so far as we know, a distinct enunciation of its fundamental principles, much less has there ever been a systematic combination of them in scientific form.

---

\* These pages owe their origin to the question, "Is there such a thing as a *Science of Pastoral Theology?*" very earnestly propounded to the writer, by a young friend and relative, who was, at the time, engaged in the study of the subject under the direction of a recently appointed Professor in a Theological Seminary.

Science is systematized knowledge. A complete science of any subject, is the orderly arrangement of all the knowledge that we possess concerning it, in such a manner as to exhibit the mutual relations of all the parts to each other and to the whole system. In order to a perfect science, it is necessary that we have all attainable knowledge consistently wrought into one grand system. We had fondly hoped that the creation of the science of pastoral theology was to be the special work of the Church of our own age; but from the manner in which the subject is treated by the leading minds of the Church, and especially from the manner of dealing with it in the theological seminaries, we begin to fear that the task is reserved for a future generation.

The idea of pastoral theology which has prevailed up to this time, is exemplified in such works as Baxter's *Reformed Pastor*, Bridges on the *Christian Ministry*, sketches of striking incidents of pastoral life by various authors, and with some little attempt at scientific statement in the work of Vinet. We may therefore safely affirm that, so far as there is now existent any thing claiming to be a science of pastoral theology, it is simply empirical, consisting of generalisations from very limited personal experience and observation. We do not mean the experience of the individual writer alone; but his own combined with that of a few others upon whose wisdom and sagacity he has been accustomed to rely.

The greatest difficulty in the way of constructing a true science of administrative theology, is that the whole subject has always been regarded as a matter of purely subjective experience. No one seems willing to learn any thing except from what he himself has felt, or from the experience of some other man, to whom he has committed the duty of doing his thinking and feeling for him. On this subject hardly any one seems ever to suppose that any thing can be learned from the experience of the whole Church in all past ages.

Take, for example, the "revival measures" with which young ministers are so often brought in contact. By this we can test the question, whether there exists any science to guide us in so important a matter. We can at the same time convince our-

selves of the necessity of having one for this and many other cases of momentous practical interest. Indeed, we shall find that the whole subject of revivals of religion, the most important with which pastoral theology has to do, is in a state of absolute chaos. No man seems to know what principles are involved or how they ought to be applied to the practical government and guidance of the Church.

Let any one ask a dozen or more of his friends or acquaintances who advocate the use of "anxious seats," why they employ that measure or instrumentality? It is probable that each one will give a different answer. The difference may not at first be very apparent; but if he will push his inquiries, so as to ascertain how the subject lies in their minds, he will find that hardly any two of them agree. If they answer with one accord, that they adopt the "measure" only as a convenient method of finding out who are deeply concerned for their soul's eternal salvation; then let them be asked why they wish to know, and require them to give their whole theory from that point: it will be found that their views are very various. If the opponents of such measures are asked why they reject them, there will be found just as great a diversity, going even to the extent of discrediting revivals, or dictating to the Lord how he shall carry on the administration of his grace. On both sides, as a general rule, they proceed upon the results of their own experience, upon what they themselves have felt, or upon what their eyes have seen. One will say, I was present in the church at A. during a great revival of religion or a powerful and glorious work of grace, and the Rev. Dr. B. (*clarum et venerabile nomen*) employed the "anxious seat" with great success. Many were hopefully converted, and there was no manifestation of undue or injurious excitement.

A careful analysis will show that the reasons contained in these answers may all be referred to the personal experience of the individual combined with his unbounded confidence in the wisdom of Dr. B. Whatever science there is here, is simply empirical. It is a generalisation from the very limited experience of two individuals, or rather, as a farther analysis would



prove, from the exceedingly contracted experience of the man himself. But suppose that the other party has felt, in precisely the same circumstances, something which he regards as injurious, he will draw the inference that such measures are calculated to work mischief, and ought never to be used. This is very unsatisfactory. Both will then try to fortify their own experience by the testimony of others. To which then shall we incline? To him who can produce the longest catalogue of names? But who shall decide as to the relative weight and importance of the cited testimonies?

If the question is to be determined empirically, that is, by experience and observation, it is evident that we ought to have an induction from the experience of the whole Church at least of one age, if not of the Church universal from the beginning. Here we see at once the necessity and the absence of science.

*“Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.”*

We want a true science to determine the very data of such a controversy. We must verify the accuracy of the observations. We must ascertain the truth of the experiences. Did the one really derive benefit, and the other incur injury from the use of these measures? Is the question to be settled by the feelings of either party or by their judgment as to the feelings of others? Or is there some higher and well ascertained truth to which the feelings and observations of all may be referred as to a test or standard? The discovery of such higher truth and the method of its application to this case, will constitute the science of pastoral theology so far as it relates to “revival measures.”

This casual glance, simply for purposes of illustration, at one aspect of one part of the great subject of revivals of religion, may well convince us of the necessity of a true science in this department of administrative theology. We want something more than a mere experimental science, even though our generalisations should embrace the experiences of the whole Church of all ages.

If we take up the subject of church discipline, we shall find the same chaotic confusion. So also of Homiletics, or the

science of preaching, and indeed throughout the whole range of the Christian activities of the pastor, elder, and also the deacon.

It is not enough, however, for us to find fault, or merely to indicate the necessities of the case. Although it may argue unusual temerity, we are bound to show that a *science* of pastoral theology is possible, which we can not do, without making an effort, however feeble, to construct it.

If there be a science of pastoral theology, all its materials must be found in the Sacred Scriptures. We do not believe that it is possible to build up *any* science of theology from the materials given in Church history, *i. e.* from the recorded experience of the Church of all ages, much less from that of one age, one country, one denomination, one congregation, one minister, one man, one woman, or one child. The office of ecclesiastical history is rather to illustrate than to originate the science of theology. It exhibits the actual working, in the midst of a thousand discordant elements, of the true principles of this eminently practical science.

History may be a clew to guide us to the principles of true science. This is emphatically true of Church history in its relations to theology. The clew is fastened at one end in the truth of divine revelation, the other hangs loose in our individual experience. With reference to administrative theology, we may begin at either end. Taking up the thread at its loose end, we may trace it back along the line of the experience of the Church, and we shall then have an inductive or experimental science, which will be true and valuable, if we actually ascend to the great principles taught in the word of God. In point of fact, however, the clew is too attenuated, and it has been too much deflected from its course by the disturbing forces which have convulsed the Church, to make the experimental method sure and safe.

Having the infallible source of all knowledge of God and duty in the Holy Scriptures, by far the wiser and safer process is to begin with the great principles as God has revealed them, to arrange them in system according to their mutual relations, and then to trace their action and influence along the track of time

until we come to our own days and the sphere of our own personal and official activities in the Church of Christ. Therefore, in arranging the departments of the one great science of Theology, we would place them in the following order :

1. Exegetical Theology.
2. Didactic or Dogmatic Theology.
3. Executive or Administrative Theology.
4. Historical Theology.

The two departments of dogmatic and administrative theology really constitute but one science. They can be distinguished by the analysis of thought, but they can not be disjoined. They are related to each other as light and its effulgence.

The great work of Exegetical theology is to ascertain, by all legitimate means, the exact meaning of the Scriptures,—to learn just what God has revealed of himself, and of our relations to him. The results thus obtained are handed over to the second department, and are by it arranged into a harmonious system, which leaves out no truth of revelation, but shows them all in their mutual relations and dependence.

This beautiful system thus arranged, so that every part may be brought forth at once and used for the special ends for which it was designed, is passed over to the third department, or administrative theology, in order that it may be actually reduced to practice.

The historical department shows how this divine system has wrought in the actual life of the Church of God, amidst all the disturbing elements from within and without, which have retarded her onward march toward the grand consummation of God's glorious plans and purposes.

From these statements it would appear that the sphere of each of these departments is identically the same. They each work by different instruments and diverse processes in the same field, and in all parts of its broad area. In order that we may have a complete science of theology in its widest acceptation, every one of these separate departments must embrace and systematize, according to its own specific nature and design, but in mutual harmony with all the others, every truth and principle

contained in the Scriptures. It must also rigidly exclude every thing not given in the revelation of God. They must all embrace and teach "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." Every result given by the interpretation of the Scriptures must be wrought into the system of Christian doctrine. The practical working of this whole system, in the life of the Church in its conflicts, its disasters, and its triumphs, amidst heresies, sins, and apostasies, must be clearly exhibited by ecclesiastical history. All the results thus obtained, but especially those embodied in the great system of Christian doctrine which we call didactic theology, must be wrought into the science of pastoral or administrative theology, or into whatever system claims to be a scientific statement of the principles by which the government of the Church of Christ is to be administered.

A science, constructed of these materials and based upon this broad foundation, ought to supersede the shallow empiricism which has hitherto regulated the practical operations of the Church.

There is another arrangement of the four great departments of theological science, by which our views may be brought out more clearly. It assigns also a higher position to the department of history, especially the history of Christian doctrine.

1. Exegetical Theology.
2. Historical        "
3. Didactic         "
4. Administrative "

According to this classification, the first and second furnish the material of which the third is constructed, while the fourth takes the finished result, and working it over again, moulds it all into forms and formulæ which render the whole system practical. Thus every truth taught in the Scriptures, illustrated in the history of the Church, and systematized by the labors of gifted and pious men, is incorporated and actually reduced to practice by the science of pastoral theology. Thus viewed, the department of administrative theology, demands more learning, profounder views, and more constructive genius, than any of the others. Whoever undertakes to teach this science, will find

himself under the necessity of creating it. He must not only construct it out of the materials furnished by the other three departments; he must also use up all those materials, and leave no rubbish which could not be made to fit anywhere in his building. So far as we know, the first course of this grand edifice is is yet to be laid.

It would be presumptuous in us to undertake to build up a complete science where none of the great men of the Church have dared to make a beginning. We may, however, without subjecting ourselves to the charge of arrogance, volunteer to do the work of the common laborer in clearing the ground and preparing the way for the master-builder. We will first suggest an analysis of the whole science of theology, which we do not present as exhaustive, nor do we claim perfection for our nomenclature. It is offered as simply suggestive.

We place, then, first in order, Exegetical Theology, embracing Introduction and Hermeneutics. Introduction embraces criticism, including all that belongs to the text of the sacred writings, inspiration, natural history, botany, geography, and archæology. Hermeneutics includes philology, linguistic grammar, and logic, resulting in version or translation. The whole is summed up in Exegesis, or the bringing out of the fulness of the meaning of God's word—the complete exhibition of the mind of the Spirit as expressed in the Sacred Scriptures.

The second grand division is Dogmatic Theology, which may be divided into two departments, sometimes designated as theoretical and practical, the same as that intended, as we suppose, by Dr. Breckinridge, in his distinction of Objective and Subjective. We prefer to characterise them as the theology of the truth and the theology of the life, which, according to our scheme, must be absolutely coincident. As all the revealed truth of God is practical, so every thing given in the theology of the truth must be shown in its practical bearings in the theology of the life. The science of the truth will embrace the knowledge of God and of man,—theology proper and anthropology.

Theology proper will embrace the whole teaching of the Scriptures concerning God, the Trinity, Christ, and the Holy Spirit :

and the whole plan and purpose of God with reference to human salvation. Anthropology will consider man under three aspects, as unfallen, as a sinner, and as a saint.

The science of the life will show how all the truths and doctrines of revelation are wrought into the experience of the saint as the source of his eternal life, and all the means and instrumentalities by which his salvation is accomplished, comprising soterology, and then ecclesiology or the science of the Church.

The next grand division is historical theology, which traces the operation of divine truth in producing eternal life, together with the influences of all kinds which have withstood its working or modified the results actually accomplished in the world. The great problem of Church history is to determine precisely what results are to be attributed to the truth of God, and what to other and adventitious causes, and to discriminate accurately between them.

Then comes the science which is yet to be created, by which the relations of the Church to the life, then to the truth, are to be clearly ascertained and scientifically stated. The great central idea of administrative theology is **THE CHURCH**, as the sphere of its operations. The science will therefore show the relation of the Church to man the sinner, and man the saint; to salvation as a present reality, to faith, repentance, and all graces; then to effectual calling, to election, to the persons of the Godhead, the Spirit, the Son, the Father. It will show also the reverse process, the relations of the Church to the Father who chose, the Son who redeemed, and the Spirit who effectually calls; and so through election, redemption, calling, faith, repentance, and every grace, we come back to the sinner saved, or the saint—the member of the Church of God. Then, as the second branch of the subject, it will be necessary to trace the relation between all that we have thus learned, to the visible organisation of the Church, the form of its government, its nature and powers, its officers, courts, members, and ordinances. A true science of Church government must necessarily exhibit the correspondence between the great end for which the Church was instituted, viz., the glory of God in the salvation of men,

through the work of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, and the form which, under divine direction, the Church has assumed, with all its officers and their functions.

Then the administration of the affairs of this Church, so constituted and so related to man and to God, is the business of the pastoral office, by whomsoever exercised. Pastoral theology, therefore, is the science by which the details of this administration are shown in their relations to the design of the Church, and the whole of the grand system of truth of which the Church is the pillar and ground.

The system, as God has revealed it, is a grand harmonious unity, and a true science of pastoral theology will exhibit this harmony and unity down to the minutest details of daily pastoral work. It will show the principles embodied in the whole system of divine truth in accordance with which all the functions of the Church, its officers, courts, and councils, ought to be used and exercised.

Pastoral theology will then include the discussion of the functions of the officers and courts of the Church, and the time and manner of their exercise. These functions are two, teaching and ruling; the use of the key of doctrine and the key of discipline—the actual employment of the *potestas ordinis*, and the *potestas jurisdictionis*. The fundamental principle of pastoral theology as a science is that every power and function of the Church must be used in accordance with the system of doctrines taught, and the end for which Christ gave his Church authority to rule. The science must show this agreement. The Church, to its minutest fibre, must be pervaded by the energy of a divine life, and this life must be supported by the truth as it is in Jesus. Orthodoxy and living piety must be inseparably blended in the manifestations of the activity of the Church. Take away the life, and the Church of course is dead; take away the truth, and she is insane. We shall then have madness first, and then death. The theology of the truth and that of the life must be coextensive.

In this we have the germinal principle of the science of revivals of religion. If from this we would develop the science so

far as revival measures are concerned, which is the case selected for illustration, we must determine the following points: 1. The end aimed at; 2. The agent in its accomplishment; 3. The method of the agent. It is obvious, then, that the action of the instrument must conform itself to the nature of the work, the character of the agent, and his mode of operation. The nature of the subject to be operated on must also be taken into consideration, and our views of the work of the instrument will be very much modified, according as we make the agent or the subject most prominent. It will therefore be necessary to decide which of the two ought to exert the greater influence in determining the acts of the instrument. This question can only be solved by one who is well acquainted with the science of theology proper, and with the science of anthropology also.

The great end to be accomplished is the glory of God in Christ. The agent is the Holy Spirit. The method is the building up of Christians in all the graces of the Spirit, and the regeneration and conversion of sinners, through faith and repentance. The means employed is the truth of God as revealed concerning his Son Jesus Christ. The instrument is the preacher of the gospel. The subject upon whom this work of regeneration is to be performed, is either a child of the covenant—a member of the Church—or else an unbaptized person, both now considered as unconverted, and standing in equal need of the grace of the Holy Spirit, yet certainly standing in very different relations to God, his truth, and his Church. It must therefore be carefully examined and decided whether this difference requires any diversity in the treatment of the two cases.

In order, then, to determine any question relating to the employment of revival measures upon truly scientific principles of pastoral theology, it is necessary to take into consideration all these points; and to show the correspondence of the proposed measure with the whole system, and to point out its own peculiar place in the scheme of administration of which the end is the glory of God; the agent, the Holy Spirit; the means, the truth of Christ and concerning Christ; the instrument, the Church of God, in teaching and ruling, by the action of its divinely



appointed offices; the subject a sinful man, either in the Church or out of it. The functions of the Church being restricted to teaching and ruling, it will be necessary to inquire whether the measure proposed is for purposes of instruction or discipline. If for instruction, what is its significance? What does it teach, and is this lesson in accordance with the system of truth revealed? If it is a measure of rule and government, does it come within the scope of the authority committed to the Church; and is it adapted to accomplish the ends of discipline? We do not propose to enter upon the discussion of all these grave questions. Our whole design is to give an example of what we suppose to be essentially requisite to the satisfactory determination of this question upon the principles of a scientific pastoral theology; and to give some faint illustration of the stupendous nature of the work which yet lies before the Church. It is a work which, sooner or later, must be accomplished. The science of administrative theology must be built up and settled as truly and strongly as our science of dogmatic theology.

We are well aware of the crude and undigested character of these suggestions. We are travelling in an unknown land, where a few pilgrims have preceded us, but no surveys have been made, no highways cast up, no land-marks established. If we have succeeded in giving ever so rude and incomplete a map of the country, it is more than we dared to hope for, perhaps more than any one will allow that we have accomplished. If, however, what we have written shall induce some abler mind, and more vigorous and graceful pen, to discuss this subject, which to us seems to be of transcendent importance, our utmost expectations will be realised.

## ARTICLE III.

## MODERN INFIDELITY.

The devil is doubtless an intelligent spirit, and learns wisdom from his frequent conflicts with men, whether victorious or vanquished. This one thing he seems to have learned most thoroughly, that it will never do to make an open attack upon the Bible. He tried this to his sorrow. That Bible which is so venerable from its antiquity, so sacred from its associations with the departed sire and mother—the Rock upon which they rested as they went down to Jordan—so admirable in the equity of its precepts and its restraints upon the lawless; that Bible cannot be thrust aside without coming in contact with the prejudices of the multitude, and thus would Satan injure his own cause and defeat his own designs. Hume, it is true, was bold enough to attack Christianity openly on the ground of its evidences. He admitted, if miracles were proper evidence, he would be bound to receive the whole Bible upon its own authority, however contradictory its teachings to human reason. For a while there was hope in hell that the troublesome enemy (the Bible) was forever destroyed. But Hume's argument was so powerfully answered, and its very foundations so demolished, that Satan persuades his emissaries not to risk an open fight any longer. They may laud the Scriptures to the skies, profess unbounded love and admiration for them, and denounce with severest execrations those who seem to doubt them as a whole; yet they must be certain to deny some part of them. Let us glance at Hume's argument, and the answer; and then examine the various modifications of the same argument, interpenetrated by the same spirit.

Hume could not believe the miracles of the Bible, because a miracle is contrary to human experience. By this experience he meant the testimony of former generations, though he desired to have his own experience incorporated with it. Ask the ques-

tion, How came we by a knowledge of this experience? Was it by a written or unwritten tradition? Truth compels the answer, unwritten. Is the nature of that unwritten testimony positive or negative? The answer must be, negative. Then this is the state of the case: An unwritten tradition entirely of a negative character is brought to overthrow a positive written history. But the answer does not stop here. To take Hume's position, a man would be compelled to deny the testimony of his own senses. The Hottentot could plead that it had come down to him from all antiquity that the freezing of water was an impossibility. Neither his father, nor his grandfather, nor his great-grandfather, had ever heard of such a thing; therefore it could not be true. You might bring twenty men who could swear that they had seen water so hard and strong that you could drive an artillery wagon across it; he would not believe it. They might suffer torture, and still assert it; you might take the Hottentot by force and carry him to a latitude where he could see for himself; he might test it by his senses, melt it by the fire, drink it, wash with it, cook his food with it; and yet he would be bound to deny that it was water, or maintain that it was a deception of his own senses. In this manner was the great argument against the revelation of God to man annihilated. The devil is too shrewd to attempt any thing of the kind as long as the memory of that defeat lasts in the minds of men. But mark how he changes front. Now the universal cry is: The Bible is the revelation of God. This cry the Unitarian takes up. He is just as ardent an admirer of the Bible as any one can be. In fact he has a more intelligent appreciation of it than any other class of its readers. But he cannot believe the doctrine of the Trinity. Why? Because it is contrary to his idea of arithmetic: one cannot be three, and three cannot be one. Mark the answer; for it is characteristic of the whole class of infidels. He does not say: Because God does not reveal it. This is an after-thought. He does indeed attempt by all the devices of criticism to thrust out the doctrine, and succeeds to his own satisfaction. The Unitarian is a fool; much worse than Hume. What is God? He answers very readily, "A spirit." What is

a spirit? Here he is puzzled: "Not matter." Beyond this he cannot go. Well, how preposterous for him to take his ideas of number gained from material objects and transfer them to a spirit! And how sublime the folly for him to deny the predicability of trinity or unity to a spirit, of which he confesses that he knows nothing. Now here is all the subtlety of the serpent: under a pretended love and reverence for God's word, denying its authority the very moment it comes in conflict with our sinful and prejudiced ignorance.

The Universalist next claims membership with God's people. He too is loud in praise of the Bible, and professes to receive all his arguments and doctrines from the word. He submits with grateful reverence to its sacred teachings. But he cannot receive the doctrine of eternal punishment. Why? It is contrary to his ideas of God's mercy. Where did he get those ideas? Surely the word of God was given to teach "what we are to believe concerning God." But here is a man well instructed as to what God ought to be, long before he opens the Bible, and, indeed, possibly would have the same ideas if the Bible was out of existence. He does not need a revelation to teach him. How absurd his position! Discarding the principles of Hume, and professing to receive a divinely authenticated revelation, he rejects the first one of its teachings that comes in conflict with his feelings! Fortunately for the race, Universalism is so gross, and its consequences so hurtful, that it carries its own refutation. Doubtless the great majority of men would gladly embrace this error if they could. But the plainest teachings of the Bible, and every man's own conscience and experience, require a vast distinction to be made between the virtuous and the vicious. Suppose for one moment that the doctrine of endless punishment was true, and God wished to communicate this truth to man, and should cause fifty miracles of different kinds to be wrought in confirmation of it, would it not still be contrary to the Universalist's ideas of God's mercy? Plainly, the position is that of Hume: No miracle can authenticate the doctrine of future punishment. The Bible is good enough to give us instruction about things indifferent, but whenever it attempts to teach any doctrine

that we do not wish to be true, its testimony is worth nothing. Hume took a nobler stand.

The next class of errorists is the Arminian. He derides and abuses Hume, and has no sympathy with the Unitarian, but is a little more soft towards the Universalist. He believes the Bible, and yields to no man in veneration for its teachings. But he cannot believe the doctrine of Election. Why? Because it is contrary to his ideas of God's justice. Surely God is the best judge of his own character. If he reveals himself as just in this doctrine, it is not for men to find fault. It will be perceived that there is more truth received by this class than those who have been already mentioned. This is the very reason that Arminianism is so hurtful. But is not its spirit the same with that of Hume, who rejected the whole Bible? If we receive any part of revelation because we can find no objection to it, or because it does not conflict with any prejudice or sentiment of ours, do we receive it upon its own authority at all? Is it to us a divine revelation in any sense? There are hundreds of professed Christians who refuse to admit this doctrine of election; there are hundreds of pious persons among them who reject it. We would not brand them indiscriminately with infidelity. But this much is clear, if any man will say that he cannot believe this doctrine because it is contrary to his ideas of God's justice, he is an infidel. This heaven has been at work for ages. It has produced an enormous amount of evil, and all the more easily because it has numbered in its ranks so many devoted and faithful ones. These, through ignorance and false teaching, have been led to reject election upon the ground that it was not revealed. For such we have sympathy, but do by no means consider them exempt from either blame or injury. But the spirit we have been pursuing is that infidelity which refuses God's testimony. Let the conflict be sharp and severe upon the ground of evidence. Bring all the criticism possible to the field. Sift every argument in favor of, and weigh every objection against the Bible as God's testimony to man. But when that question is once settled, ground the arms of rebellion, and receive instruction with the spirit of a little child. The plea that is so

often put in, that it is only our interpretation of that doctrine that is objectionable, is perfectly fallacious. If there was no conflict seemingly with man's free agency and responsibility, there would be no objection to the doctrine. Neither would there be with the Unitarian, if he could see how three could be one. But if we could understand this mystery, we would receive it upon the testimony of reason, and not on God's authority. But is not the objection "that it is so difficult to find out the truth in the word" itself the offspring of infidelity? Would God give a revelation so difficult that the humble inquirer could not know what he taught? If any man will come to the Scriptures with the spirit of a little child, willing to be instructed, and does not find the doctrine of election there, God will not hold him accountable. There are many inferences that have been drawn from this doctrine which shock the sensibilities of the pious. Reject the inferences, but believe what God reveals. It may be said in favor of this doctrine's being taught in the Bible, that it is certainly not taught in the hearts of men. Reason does not teach it. The heart hates it. It is very unpopular. Those who advocate it feel that they are upon the unpopular side. This very hatred and opposition is evidence of its divine origin. Men would not willingly render themselves odious to their fellows. "If ye were of the world, the world would love its own." It may be added that the very objections urged against our doctrine of election were urged against Paul's. See Romans, chap. ix.

There is a lurking spirit of infidelity among many of those who admit that the doctrine of election is taught in the word of God, but maintain that it ought not to be preached because it will do harm. This is the meanest and most cowardly spirit of all. What! the word of God do harm! Are you more interested in the salvation of men than God? What have you ever done for their salvation? God sent his Son to die for sinners, his Spirit to testify of Jesus, and his word to make us wise unto salvation. And yet you say that God did not know what was best, and that if you had been consulted, you would have left out those objectionable parts of his word! The apostle says, "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and

election sure." But you advise to keep it out of sight. It is very good to have it laid up in confessions of faith to be used on extra occasions. We firmly believe that the spirit manifested in the rejection of this doctrine has done more harm than all the others. It has paved the way for Abolitionism, which is the last form of infidelity that we notice.

The abolitionist believes the Bible, admits the evidences of its divine origin, and the doctrines of the Trinity, future punishment, and election; but he cannot receive the doctrine of slavery. Why? It is contrary to his ideas of human rights. Where are these laid down? Right and obligation are reciprocal. If we have these rights, God is under obligation to respect them. If freedom be a natural right, God did wrong to curse with slavery any portion of the race in any period of its history. The abolitionist is more humane than God. He is angry every time he reads, "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren." It seems as if our right (if we can lay claim of right) to life is dependent entirely upon God's sovereign pleasure. It would seem, then, that it would at least be respectful to go to his will as revealed to us to find out to what he has given us a right. But the abolitionist ideas of human rights are not drawn from the Bible; and if God should command in an audible voice from heaven the institution of slavery, it would still be contrary to his ideas of human rights. And this is the spirit of the age. Alas, for the days in which we live! The devil has his emissaries among the eminent professors of Christ's name, and thus accomplishes his work which never could have been done otherwise.

This spirit, in all the forms it assumes, is contrary to the spirit of true piety. It is in fact infidelity. This will account for the fact that the Presbyterian Church of the South is unwilling to return to its old communion. It is said, Why waste words upon the subject; is not slavery a dead issue? Would God it were a dead issue. The spirit of infidelity which abolished it, still lives. It is this which gives pain and causes anxiety to every pious heart. We mourn over the separation, but more over the cause. If our former brethren will confess that they have departed from the plain teachings of the Bible, and have

been carried away with the spirit of the age, and that they now heartily receive the word of God upon its own authority, we will heartily rejoice, and with glad songs will *go back to them*. Then slavery would be a dead issue. Let not our views be misunderstood. It is not the loss of property, though we feel that heavily; not the loss of the pleasant relationship of master and servant; not the embarrassed condition of things, that causes our sorrow. It is the spirit of infidelity which brought it about. God may overrule this to the prosperity of the South. We would have preferred less material prosperity, with more sound piety. The view which gives us unfeigned sorrow is the fact that this spirit of hostility to true religion has advanced so far and deceived so many. If it would only announce its mission and put on its own uniform, we would not fear it. But under the garb of piety, it dishonors God. "It steals the livery of heaven to serve the devil in." If we know our own hearts, we would gladly suffer the spoiling of our goods, if this would put an end to impiety. Whenever brethren will meet us on this common platform of revealed religion, and receive and believe what God declares because he declares it, we will hail that time as the dawn of the millennium. We will gladly forgive past injuries, and spread the veil of charity over faults. We have charity for human frailties; for error, none.

We have now run hastily over the different forms of modern infidelity in the Church. Put them side by side, and there will be found but one spirit that animates the whole. Hume tells us: I can't believe the Bible; its evidence is contrary to human experience. The Unitarian declares: I believe the whole Bible except the Trinity; but that is contrary to my ideas of numbers. The Universalist exclaims: I can't believe in endless punishment; it is contrary to my ideas of God's mercy. The Arminian says: I can't believe in the doctrine of election; it is contrary to my ideas of God's justice. The Abolitionist proclaims: I can't believe slavery; for it is contrary to my ideas of human rights.

Of all these, Hume alone is consistent. Now what a creed, or rather no-creed, is presented by all the others! Hume was open



in his denial; he affected no piety towards God or reverence for his word. These betray the Master with a kiss. If one man has the right to reject any part of the testimony from any earthly consideration, Hume had the right to reject the whole. "*Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.*"

No one professing Christianity, or even natural religion, could object to the following propositions, which lie at the foundation of all piety:

1. God has a perfect right to make out of the same lump very different creatures—an ant and an elephant, a man and a monkey.

2. God has a perfect right to deal with his sinful creatures in the way of punishment as he pleases. Government to man is both an evidence and a punishment of man's sin. Slavery is only a form of government. "The powers that be are ordained of God." Slavery was ordained of God as one form of those powers.

3. Whatever God does is right.

4. What God claims is just.

5. What God says is true.

Against one or other of these propositions this modern infidelity in the Church is directed. It is this which has caused all the divisions, strifes, and perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, which have torn asunder our beloved Zion, and deluged our land in blood. Let the godly of every name awake and call upon God for help. Let them cast out the old leaven of corruption, resist the devil, though he is clothed like an angel of light, cast out of their communion all that handle the word of God deceitfully, and stand up fearlessly and unflinchingly for the faith once delivered to the saints. O that God would help all of his true disciples to forget father and mother; all former ties and relationships, and all fear of man; to cleanse his temple from idols. Unless the Church awake to this interest and institute vigorous reform, the darkness of the Middle Ages may enshroud the world, our Jerusalem be trodden of the Gentiles, and true piety betake itself to the dens and caves of the earth.

VOL. XVII., NO. 3.—7.

## ARTICLE IV.

## PASTORAL RELATIONS AND DUTIES.

What is embraced in a call to preach the gospel? What are some of the reciprocal duties of pastor and people? How are these duties to be performed? What makes the relation so sacred, and fraught with such dread responsibilities? These are grave questions and expand over a vast field of thought, and are deserving of the most serious consideration by both office-bearers and private members of the Church.

Familiar as we may be with the forms necessary to be observed in order to procure the services of a pastor, yet how little is generally understood of the mutual obligations of the parties forming this alliance, and what each binds himself or themselves to do, and neither must omit to do. A regular call to a pastorate presumes these three things: 1. It must express the voice of the church that calls; 2. It must have the approval of the Presbytery, to which the minister called, belongs; 3. It must be accepted by him who is called. Thus the church, the Presbytery, and the minister, are all parties in forming and consummating this solemn union. It is a relation, the duties of which are the most important and sacred, its vows the most binding, and its responsibilities unending as eternity. All covenants imply two parties, on each of whom devolve mutual obligations. The fidelity of the one party will by no means absolve the other from the full performance of its duty. As the Church at large is one body, "fitly framed," that is, compactly built, though composed of many members, so it is also with an individual church or particular congregation. There are many members and different functions in the Church, such as the hand and the eye and the ear and the foot perform for the body. All these different members are so entirely identified, bound together by such tender ligaments, and so indispensable to one another that the hand

cannot say to the foot, I have no need of thee. If one member suffers, all suffer with it. "For no member has its power for itself, nor applies it to its private use; but transfuses it among its fellow-members, receiving no advantage from it but what proceeds from the common convenience of the whole body."\* Hence it is revealed that when a member is deranged, or fails to perform its appropriate functions, it is better that a right eye be plucked out, or a right hand be cut off, than that the whole body be cast into hell. Each member must do its part.

Hence, when it is asked, what is requisite to keep a church in a thriving condition, the answer to be given is, that each and every member must faithfully discharge his or her duty, and this, at the proper season, and as God gives the ability. They must not wait for others, nor expect the pastor, as the imagined head, to do all the work. Each must do what he is specially required to do. The ministers with the elders may direct, and control the management and operations of the whole outward economy of things; but the efficiency and strength are in the body. The pastor is only the exponent of his own office.

When it is asked what it is to preach the gospel, we must ascertain the answer by tracing out the lives and labors of the most faithful, and successful ministers of the gospel. When a pastor goes into the pulpit Sabbath after Sabbath, and preaches one or more sermons, no matter how elaborate his preparations, how much "study, meditation and prayer," he may expend on them, this is perhaps the least part of his labors, and may be called his pleasant work. What more, you ask, can be expected of him? Does not his call imply, and the very nature of his office make it imperative, that he should visit the sick, and administer to them instruction and consolation, warn the ungodly to flee from the wrath to come, dispense spiritual and sustaining food to the dying, bury the dead, comfort the mourner, be a friend to the widow and orphan? He must search the Scriptures, prove himself a workman that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word so as to give each a portion in his season. He must be

\* Calvin.

well reported of for good works, having a good report of them which are without; must be vigilant, of good behavior, given to hospitality, instant in season, out of season; must reprove, rebuke with all long-suffering; must give attendance to reading, to exhortation and doctrine. He must be an example to the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity, in all things adorning by his life the doctrines he teaches. "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things," says the apostle, "thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ." "Meditate on these things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all." We can readily conceive why Moses, when directed to take command of God's ancient Israel, should plead, he was a man "slow of speech," and why Jonah, when commanded to preach to Nineveh, should flee to Joppa. What fallible, mortal man should not shrink back, under the dread responsibilities of the pastoral office? Where will not such a man's influence go? When will it end? "Though dead, he yet speaketh," and "his works do follow him."

It is not a minister's work to *make doctrines* for the Church of Christ, but fearlessly and faithfully proclaim, maintain, and defend those which Christ has declared to be essential and fundamental. These he must not hold back, or be ashamed of; but he must preach them in all their terrible solemnity to every creature, whether men will hear or forbear.

It is likewise the pastor's duty to direct the praises of the sanctuary. Not that we mean to say he must compose the pious words or sweet melody which shall constitute the praises of God's house; but make such selections, so regulate and direct this interesting part of public worship, as will make it a joyful praise to God, and edifying to his saints, that all may offer, not merely the "calves of their lips," but sing with the spirit and understanding also, making joy and gladness in the heart, while "the lips like lilies drop sweet-smelling myrrh." Here we take occasion to remark, that according to our convictions, those selected or authorised by the Church to lead its praises, should not only be members of the Church, respecters of sacred ordinances, who would neither pervert nor in anywise make light of holy things.

but such as would on all occasions endeavor to worship God in a reverent and becoming way, both in sound and manner. "Not singing men, that make a profession of it;" "for great caution" says Calvin, "is necessary that the ears be not more attentive to the modulation of the notes, than the mind to the spiritual import of the words." They should be capable not only of singing a tune correctly themselves, but should possess such a knowledge of the language or spirit of music, as like the chief musician of old, to be capable of adapting the time to the sentiment. This was manifestly the practice of the Church of the Old Testament, although we would reason very cautiously from its appointed modes of worship to those of our New Testament times. Turn to the sixteenth chapter of the first book of Chronicles. There you have the account of David's festival sacrifice, where he not only selected psalms, appropriate to be sung, but put them into the hands of Asaph, the chief of the choir, that he might set them to suitable tunes. Heman and Jeduthan were also chosen to give thanks to the Lord. So it is expressly stated in the titles of many of David's Psalms, they were given to "the Chief Musician," that he might set them to suitable tunes, as there stated, "on Nehiloth, Neginoth, Shiggaion, Gittith, Muthlabèn," etc., for these, we understand to be the names of the tunes, to which these psalms were to be sung. The praises of the sanctuary are not intended to be a mere interlude, a pastime, a performance or musical exhibition, in which we are to show our skill combined with operatic attractions; but they form an important part of the direct and solemn worship of Almighty God. And as it is the only part in which the whole congregation audibly unite, we should endeavor to improve and cultivate this holy art, so as to be able to praise God in a becoming manner with our voices, as well as with our hearts, with the music of the soul, so that our profiting in this art may appear to all, and we be prepared to unite hereafter with the ransomed of the Lord in higher and nobler anthems of praise to him who sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever. "Let the people praise thee, O God: let all the people praise thee." "Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord."

“ All people, that on earth do dwell,  
Sing to the Lord with cheerful voice,  
Him serve with mirth, his praise forth tell,  
Come ye before him and rejoice.”

“ Let mortals ne'er refuse to take  
The Hosanna on their tongues,  
Lest rocks and stones should rise and break  
Their silence into songs.”

Prayer is another part of public worship, the conduct of which is involved in the call of the pastor. It should be the preface to all his instructions, and the conclusion of all his arguments. “It is the indispensable duty of every minister to prepare and qualify himself for this part of his work, as well as for preaching, not by confining himself to set or fixed forms of prayer, but by endeavoring to acquire both the spirit and the gift of it.” Thus the fire that descends from heaven to kindle his sacrifice, may also burn in and purify the devotions of many others. The minister's call is the answer to prayer, no less when the church asks the Lord to “give them a pastor according to his own heart, to feed them with knowledge and understanding,” than when the pastor himself inquires, “Lord, to whom shall I go?” “If thou wilt go with me, then I will go.” Prayer is the thermometer by which we may determine the piety and growth of grace, not only of the pastor himself, but also of the congregation committed to his care. How much is the minister encouraged in his arduous work, when he is assured that those amongst his people who constantly lift up their hands before God, have *his* name engraven on both their palms; when he feels, while in the sanctuary, as if he were surrounded with and was inhaling an atmosphere of prayer, that the office-bearers and private members of his church, not only then but daily wrestle at a throne of grace in his behalf; and are the Aarons and Hurs to hold up his hands, that Israel may prevail. Would we see the strongholds of the adversary broken down, the heathen given to Christ for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; the wilderness bud and blossom as the rose; Ethiopia stretch forth her hands unto God; the wrath of man

restrained, and the remainder made to praise God; the work of the Lord prevail in the midst of us, and the graces of the spirit distil as the dew, and come down as the early and latter rain: we must all unitedly pray for the conversion of those who have been early dedicated to God in baptism, for the peace of Jerusalem, for the salvation of the impenitent and ungodly. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."

The offering of our substance is another part of worship—an implied agency in the pastor's call. This is no invention of man or exaction of the priesthood, but has been incorporated, by a divine command, as a part of worship in every dispensation through which the church has passed. It formed no unimportant part of worship under the Levitical dispensation. The Saviour commanded it in all his lessons of duty. And did not the apostle Paul place charity at the head of all Christian graces? As Christ makes the love of his Father to him the measure of his love to us, so he makes our love to the brethren the test of our love to him. "As the Father loved me, so do I love you." "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen?" Does not the apostle Paul, in nearly all his Epistles, either directly or indirectly, enjoin this as a Christian grace not to be neglected, but cultivated and practised on all proper occasions? Did he not engraft it as a fruit-bearing branch on the tree of life, on the vine planted by the Lord's right hand? He did not assess the Church, as under the Levitical law, to give one-fifth or one-tenth of her income. He did not prescribe any particular amount to be given; but he lays down, as a general rule, that every one should lay by him in store, as the Lord hath prospered him. By this standard our charity to the poor, our contributions to support the gospel must be regulated. And this is to be taken, not from the gleanings, but the first-fruits of our harvest. "The Lord loveth the cheerful giver." If this is really a Christian duty, and constitutes a part, as we maintain, of worship, it should not be performed grudgingly, but cheerfully and conscientiously as prayer or any other part of religious worship. "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth: and there is that withholdeth

more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty." "He that watereth others, shall be watered also." What we give to the poor, as God's needy ones, if but "a cup of cold water;" or what we cast into the treasury of the Lord, to advance the interests of his kingdom, if but "two mites," is a lending to the Lord—a "gift that maketh room for us." It tendeth not to poverty, but "maketh rich, and addeth no sorrow." "Give and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again." He clearly teaches us that what we do for his deserving poor, he regards as done to himself. "Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another," and "do good to all men as ye have opportunity."

"The mite my willing hands can give,  
At Jesus' feet I lay;  
Grace shall the humble gift receive,  
Abounding grace repay."

Discipline is another important service, which is implied in a call to the pastoral office. This is not an arbitrary power assumed or created by the officials of the Church, but is ordained of God. "Discipline," says Calvin, "forms the ligament which connects the members together, and keeps each one in its proper place." "It depends chiefly on the power of the keys, and the spiritual jurisdiction." "The spiritual jurisdiction of the Church, which corrects sins according to the word of the Lord, is a most excellent preservation of health, foundation of order, and bond of unity." Why was the priest, as well as the sacrifice, appointed under the Levitical law? Does not the appointment of officers, presume duties to be performed and laws to be obeyed? If God has established laws for the government of the natural, why not for the moral world? The prophet tells us, when God planted his vineyard, *i. e.*, his Church, "he gathered



out the stones and fenced it," by which we understand he ordained such a government as was necessary for its protection and prosperity. This discipline, however, is not to be either hasty or rash. Our Master himself did not favor the immediate uprooting or extermination of the unfruitful tree; interceding for it, he said, let it alone this year also. He would have it borne with, and nourished, and "if it bear fruit, well; if not, then thou shalt cut it down." In another place, he forbade his servants to gather up the tares, "lest, while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them." Again, he says, "The axe is laid unto the root of the trees," as if to show the patience and long-suffering forbearance, which God manifests. In order to healthfulness and fruitfulness the vine must be pruned; for "every branch in me that beareth fruit, he purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit." It is not more necessary that we should maintain wise and strict discipline in the family than in the Church. Here, too, we must cultivate, instruct, admonish, and discipline, until all unworthy and unfruitful members are removed, and the plants of the Lord "are called trees of righteousness," each bearing not only his fruit in his season, but an hundred fold to the honor and glory of God. What we have before stated as to the minister's power in making doctrines, we also affirm, as to the office-bearer's power to make laws. The officers of a session do not make laws for the government of the church, yet, it is their solemn duty honestly and faithfully to enforce the rules they have sworn to obey and observe. According to our Directory of Worship, "as in the preaching of the word, the wicked are doctrinally separated from the good; so by discipline the Church authoritatively makes a distinction between the holy and the profane." "As rulers in the house of God, her officers want no sceptre, but a pruning knife to cultivate the Lord's vineyard." They need not act as those of whom the prophet Ezekiel speaks, who consider nothing as safe, unless they rule "with force and with cruelty." A session need not officiously or invidiously seek out offences, neither should they wink at, or attempt to cover up what they know is a sin against God. Upon this subject, the divine direction is, if the offence be

of a private nature, tell the offender his fault "between thee and him alone." If the sin be notorious, Paul says to Timothy, "Then that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear." And yet it should be done in the exercise of the rule: To your godliness "add brotherly kindness." But "mark them which cause offences." A church session, (which is the fountain of power, in our ecclesiastical polity,) in the discharge of its duties, should "know no man after the flesh;" should pass over no offence because of the elevated position its perpetrator may hold among his fellow men, or because, on the other hand, he may grind at the mill, or be the keeper of swine. Elevation tends to aggravate and make notorious an offence. And surely no one will flatter himself for a moment that an humble station in life, will afford any palliation or justification for his violation of covenant vows. Membership in the Church, is like the naturalization of a foreigner in the State; it is a voluntary act, a thing of one's own election. But when the vows have been assumed, or the oath of allegiance taken, it is then no longer a thing of choice, as to whether we will obey the laws or not. The presumption is that all who join the Church know what its laws and regulations are, and do solemnly bind themselves to respect and obey the same. Can he be considered a worthy member of the Church of Christ who wilfully violates its laws, does despite to the Spirit of grace, tramples under foot the solemn covenant wherewith he has bound himself, and then turns round and says to the ruling powers, "Your laws are neither just nor equitable, I will submit to them no longer?" How would such a plea avail one who had violated the laws of the land? Would it relax the grasp of the officer, or absolve him from the penalties he has incurred?

Such is the genius of the Presbyterian form of government, that it respects the rights of all its members alike. It affords the opportunity of trial and appeal, and this too, before a tribunal of officers of the people's own election, and to whom they have given the right to rule. In a church session, *the elders rule*; the power is in their hands. The pastor presides and joins in counsel with them, but has no vote, except when there is a tie;

then he gives the casting vote. We do not advocate a severe discipline; but would have the Church adhere strictly to its laws and doctrines. Let its officers fear God rather than man. "He that ruleth, let him do it with diligence." How important the office and responsible the duties of a ruling elder! Where are the metes and boundaries of his labors? How solemn his vows! How much of the interests of a congregation, and the prosperity of the Church at large, depend upon the fidelity of the eldership! This office is no sinecure, but one of labor and love. An elder must not think his work done, when he has served a communion table, or sat silent in the session house, while some important question involving the peace and prosperity of the Church was being discussed and decided. The pastor's duties equally devolve on the elders, excepting that they "do not labor in the word and doctrine." They too, must have a good report of them that are without, and be well indoctrinated in the Scriptures. They must visit the sick, and pray with and for them, and be Aarons and Hurs to hold up the hands of their pastor, lest Amalek prevail.

There is one aspect in which we must regard the elder's connexion with a particular congregation as more important than that of the pastor. He is there a permanent officer, elected by the people to supervise its interests, and expected naturally to continue there for life. The minister is there, only so long as encouraged by the success of his labors. He may be at any time called away to another field. In case of his removal, by death or otherwise, it is the duty of the elders to look out for the services of another pastor. They should be capable of judging, not only as to his aptness to teach, but as to his soundness in doctrine. It is likewise the duty of the elder to represent his church, in the various courts of the Lord's house, there to deliberate and vote, on all questions involving its purity, peace, or order. "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor." It is not to be expected that all the members of a church should be heads, *i. e.* rulers. All cannot have things their own way; but as members of the same body, one must be subservient to another, and each act for the good of the whole,

“for if one member suffers, all suffer with it.” The elders, from the nature of their office, and the manner in which they were elected to it, should be presumed to have the interests of the church and good of the people at heart, and should therefore command the sympathy and co-operation of all the other members, rather than the suspicions or opposition of any. Our firm conviction is that no outward service contributes more to the peace and prosperity of a church than the strict enforcement of its rules, especially when these are properly understood, and judiciously administered.

“The tainted branches of the tree,  
If lopped with care a strength will give,  
By which the rest shall bloom and live,  
All greenly fresh and wildly free.”

“The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind. Neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.”

Can the steward of God’s house expect the prosperity of Zion, so long as he winks at, or attempts to cover up, what he knows to be prejudicial to her best interests? No church member should be allowed to make his judgment, or his impressions of right, the rule to direct and govern him, in any matters pertaining to it; but “to the law and testimony.” Otherwise, how many would be ready to say, in defence of their conduct: “Because other church members have indulged in this habit, or taken part in this worldly amusement, and my conscience does not disapprove of it, therefore, to me, there can be no sin in it.” Two wrongs will not make a right; others doing wrong, or our thinking a thing right which we had previously vowed to abstain from as an evil, will not make it right. All things that are lawful, are not expedient. Hence we should conclude in reference to such matters, as Paul did, as to his eating the meat that

was offered to idols. "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." On the other hand, the elder must not be censorious or fault-finding; but when a brother is overtaken in a fault, let him be kindly and affectionately warned. "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver."

Such are a few of the duties and responsibilities devolving on the ruling elders.

The pastor is brought into close relations with another class of officers in the Church of Christ: those, namely, who hold the office of deacon. This office, too much undervalued, contributes in no small degree to the success of the pastor's labors. It is the duty of the deacon to see that those who sow to the people's spiritual things, shall reap of their carnal things. That ministers "may be free from worldly cares and avocations" and able to give themselves wholly to the work, they must needs receive "all proper support and encouragement." The deacons must see that the people meet promptly the pledges of the church to them. They should be punctual in their collections for the poor, and should wisely "distribute among these the collections which may be raised for their use." Does not our holy religion teach us to be kind and charitable to the needy and destitute? What can more highly commend the gospel of the blessed God to the world, than to see the Church, in her organised form and by her authorised officers, seeking out and liberally performing the part of a foster-mother to the poor and orphans belonging to her fold?

The Church puts a high estimate upon the sanctity of the Sabbath, not only as a day set apart for the worship of God, but a day to be kept holy. Does not the influence of this day tell upon every individual or community where it is properly kept? "The proper observation of the Sabbath is indeed the hem and hedge of the whole law." How apparent are the evils and disorders which prevail where it is neglected. This is the day God hath made, and declared to be holy. "Those that honor me, I will honor."

Another important agency implied in a call to the pastoral

office, is the circulation of the Scriptures. The great commission is, "Go, preach my gospel and disciple all nations." "For how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." "The entrance of thy word giveth light." "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me." "It is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my path." "The true light, which lighteth every man." This is the manna we must daily gather around our tents. What a powerful agent is the word of God, not only in breaking down the strong-holds of the adversary, but in building up the Redeemer's kingdom in the world. It is the sword of the Spirit, the hammer to break the hard and stony heart. "Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them, when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up, and thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes, and thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house and on thy gates."

The pastor must also urge upon parents and officers in the church, the importance of faithfully discharging their duties to the children and youth of the congregation. He should see that their religious education is early and faithfully attended to, that they are not only instructed in the Holy Scriptures and catechisms in the Sabbath-school, but at home. Trained up in the way they should go, when they become old, they will not depart therefrom.

He should further urge the importance of giving early attention to the sacraments of the Church. These are the two great pillars of the Church. An early dedication to God is to be desired, of the fruit of the body, concerning whom he has said, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." "The promise is to you, and your seed." They must be early impressed with the necessity of dedicating themselves to the service of God. Let them early be taught to say with the apostle, "I must by all means keep the feast;" and let them early be instructed in the tender

claims of that precept of the Saviour "Do this in remembrance of me."

Every pastor who would be successful in his work, having promised to study "the purity and peace of the Church," should make it his constant aim to win the esteem and confidence of the people of his charge. What encouragement can he have to labor, if his honesty, his piety, or zeal for the cause of Christ, is suspected? What grounds would he have in this case to expect them to receive the word at his mouth? On the other hand, they should be as candid and honest, in all their intercourse and counsels with him. For without this intimacy and confidence, how could he expect doors of usefulness to be opened to him? Or how could he possibly ever obtain access to all the private avenues of usefulness in his congregation? It must not be presumed that a minister is either omniscient or ubiquitous, that he knows every thing, or is every where in his field of labor at the same time; or that he can, as by instinct, find out every case of sickness, or death that may take place in the congregation. There may be cases of sickness, and even of death, where it is impossible for him, in the ordinary course of things, to know it, or to be present. Or while there may be many young and timid persons under deep religious conviction and anxiously desiring some one to take them by the hand to lead them to the living waters, or to tell them what they must do to be saved, how is the pastor to know this, except through the faithfulness and zeal of a parent or some other interested friend? In such cases, to those about the sick, there might be the appearance of neglect or want of interest on the pastor's part; but who is to blame? Should he be censured for not doing what he does not know is required to be done, or for not being where it is impossible for him to be? In all such cases, those who desire religious instruction or consolation, should make it known before it is too late.

A pastor in his visits or public instructions should regard all his people in the same light—be equally faithful to all. He should exhort, entreat, and admonish; be instant in season and out of season; "sow in the morning, and not withhold in the evening," not knowing whether this or that will prosper. He

should labor earnestly, as one who must give an account of his stewardship, and fearing lest by any means, when he has preached to others, he himself should be a castaway.

It is a great honor, and any man may well esteem it the glory of his life, if God has called him in these troublous times to aid in building up again the broken down wall of our Southern Zion! And it must be an unspeakable delight to any such man to see the work of the Lord prospering in his hands. Solemn indeed are the relations of the pastor with his fellow-laborers and with his people, and high and holy his duties! No other relations or duties can compare with these. Faithful labors in this glorious sphere, all imperfect as they must be, can not fail through grace of a glorious reward.

---

ARTICLE V.

FEMALE EDUCATION.

In the present circumstances of our country, no subject can be considered of higher speculative interest or of higher practical importance than Female Education—the objects which it should seek to accomplish and the principles on which it should be conducted. The education which woman should receive is determined by the sphere which God in his providence has assigned her. The general idea of what education for a man should embrace, was perhaps never more adequately set forth than by Milton. “I call therefore a complete and generous education, that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously, all the offices, both public and private, of peace and of war.” The education of woman should surely be not less comprehensive and complete, within its own proper sphere and with reference to her specific duties.



Education is for all an inevitable process. It is not a matter of choice, whether or not we shall receive impressions, convictions, beliefs, prejudices, methods of thinking, feeling, acting, looking at men and things, possessing a certain definite character and existence in this world and in the world to come. This is not the question; but the question is, Shall this education be good or bad; deliberate or random; in the school of Christ or in the synagogue of satan, for heaven or for hell? What is the world? What this great universe but a school into which the infant mind is introduced; in which and from which, by countless methods, it is to learn to think, to act—and the consequences are to endure—forever! Some years ago, Sir James Johnson, physician extraordinary to William IV., published a volume in which that distinguished authority remarks that the first seven years of life should be devoted to the development of the mind and body, to the total exclusion of books. His idea is that a child need not learn even the alphabet until seven years of age; that the opening years of life should be left to observation and oral teaching; and that as much even of what books can teach, will be learned between the years of seven and twenty-one as between the years of one and twenty-one. Probably more is learned during the first seven years than during any equal period in after life. Then the seed is sown in the virgin soil and between the clefts of the rocks. Then the foundation is laid invisibly deep under ground, on which the stately and shining superstructure is to repose in perpetuity. Then every thing in this breathing and beautiful world is absolutely new. Then the first notes of our life's harmony are struck, and they never cease, in after years, to vibrate and thrill. Then the first beams of the glorious morning brush along the eastern sky. Then the impulses, which in after years are to bear us on over life's sunny or stormy sea, begin to heave. Then the prejudices which are to endure, or the principles which are to bear fruit, in coming time, are woven into one texture or planted in the soil of the immortal spirit.

There was a time when meadow, grove, and stream,  
The earth, and every common sight,  
To me did seem

Appareled in celestial light,  
The glory and the freshness of a dream.  
It is not now as it hath been of yore ;  
Turn wheresoe'er I may,  
By night or day  
The things which I have seen I now can see no more.

Alas, then, the glories of childhood have departed ; its blissful visions can never more revisit the soul !

It should be the study of parents and teachers to make the long golden days of childhood the happiest days of life ; as they were plainly intended by a beneficent Providence to be. Pain and trouble, darkness and sorrow, will come soon enough to the most favored of us all. Let there be one period of life to which we can look back as clothed in sunshine and gladness. It is a great blot in some of Dickens's stories that he seems to take a sort of morbid delight in the sorrows of little children.

The first years of life should be devoted to the development of the physical constitution, and the planting, by oral teaching, of the precious seeds of virtue and piety. Then the life-inspiring wisdom of God treasured up in the Bible, the lessons of most sublime truth conveyed in the simplest forms of speech, the matchless narratives of Holy Writ invested with the brightest colors of heaven, that grand old Hebrew poetry redolent of the fragrance and the freshness of an earlier world, should be made familiar to the imaginative spirit of childhood and blend with its brightest visions.

Any proper understanding of the present aspect of human society, and of the phenomena of the days gone by, must proceed upon the recognition of the actual state of human nature as fallen and depraved, alienated from the life of God, and therefore under his sore displeasure, but still as possessing reason, conscience, the natural affections, and the principle of immortality ; as therefore capable of redemption by the blood of Christ and regeneration by the Spirit of God. These great facts cannot be ignored ; they must be assumed in any rational interpretation of what is daily passing before our eyes in this universe and by the providence of God ; and in any rational endeavors to remedy or

mitigate the manifold evils under which the creation "travaileth and groaneth."

The whole theory of the right conduct of education turns upon the two-fold fact: 1. That there are in every human being the latent seeds of evil; false, foolish, base, wicked, and hurtful affections which need to be checked in their growth, and, if possible, altogether eradicated; 2. That, on the other hand, there are certain good principles, or seeds and susceptibilities of good, certain traits and tendencies of our spiritual nature even in its apostasy, which God himself appeals to in Scripture, which need to be addressed, enlightened and renewed; that, in a word, our nature now is a garden in which weeds of noxious quality and rapid growth spring up side by side with flowers of most beautiful aspect and sweetest odor. That most charming of our earlier English essayists, Addison, says that the great difference between a wise man and a fool does not consist so much in the thoughts which occur to each respectively, as in the fact that the one knows which to suppress and which to utter, and the other passes forth profusely and without distinction, good and bad alike. This idea may be extended and applied to our moral impulses, vices, and affections. The difference between a good man and a bad man does not so much consist in the original character of the feelings and tendencies of the mind, as in clearness of reason, the supremacy of conscience, the royal authority of an enlightened will; in a word, the superior discernment and conscientiousness with which the wise man resists the rebellious affections and corrupt suggestions within him, and obeys the nobler dictates of truth and reason. He, therefore, is a wise and fit guide of youth who addresses himself to the moral part of our nature, who seeks to educate conscience and develop reason, to impart to our innate sense of good and evil a finer edge, a sensibility more keen, and give to goodness, modesty, and worth, a higher lustre in the eyes of ingenuous youth. And he is a foolish and a mischievous teacher; who neglects to chastise and control—not to say positively encourages and exasperates the baser tendencies of our nature. How does a blind self-love pervert our moral sentiments. How utterly unlike will the same act seem when

contemplated as our own or another's. How reversed is the rule of judgment. How much more sensible are we of an injury which we sustain than of one equal or greater which we inflict. And so deceitful is the heart, and so blinded is the eye, that even our own act will appear altogether different to us when passion is inflamed and appetite rages, and afterwards when reflection and conscience are heard, when appetite has been satiated and passion has subsided!

In passing through life, we run a thousand risks of fatal shipwreck. As each coast has its own perils—its own rocks and shoals and breakers—as each climate has its own peculiar diseases, so each successive stage of life—youth, manhood, old age—each occupation, business, trade and calling, has its own specific peril for the soul. When we consider the weakness of our nature; the inveteracy of our spiritual malady; the power of our infernal foe; and the strength of our temptations; it is wonderful not that so many make shipwreck, but that any of us should manage to get through life without some great crime and infamy; still greater is the wonder that any should attain and persevere in that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord.

So indisposed is *the will* to the choice and pursuit of duty, that it will choose and persist in it only under these two considerations: 1. The perception of divine truth through an understanding clarified by the Spirit of the Lord, and emancipated from ignorance and error; 2. Affections powerfully drawn towards heavenly things, attracted by the beauty of holiness, the loveliness of Jesus, the sweetness of grace, the glory of God. Let these two conditions be satisfied, let heavenly truth be seen in its incomparable glory and tasted in its ineffable sweetness, and the will, so renewed, cannot but choose it and win it. The heart of fallen man, sanctified by grace, and shone upon by the Sun of Righteousness, though so weak by nature and so defiled by sin, doth yet, like a polished mirror or a pellucid stream, reflect the ethereal purity and beauty of the heavens.

The life that we now live is an education for eternity; and on the proper exercise and discipline and consequent development

of our powers on earth, may depend our progress, the variety, the largeness, and the comparative glory of our attainments in heaven. This may be true, and most likely is true, even of our purely intellectual attainments; certainly of our moral and spiritual. The talent which is now wisely laid out will then be found to have multiplied exceedingly. So that at death there will not only be an immediate, but a progressive and endless reward for our present faithfulness and diligence. Every stroke will go sounding on through the voiceless slumbers of the tomb—through the dateless ages of eternity! The first thing to be considered then, in the education of any man, especially of any woman, is the religious element—the moral and spiritual nature. There is nothing so lovely on earth as piety, and in none is piety so lovely as in woman. As Luther, with his great soul full of the highest and most heroic poetry, said; “There is nothing on earth so holy as the heart of a pious woman.”

The elevation of the female sex, social, intellectual, and moral, is inseparably connected with the Christian system. No where in the ancient world does she appear so lofty and so lovely as in the records of the Old Testament—no where in the modern world as in the “holy women” of whom we read in the New, and in Christian females formed upon the precepts and patterns of the New. Compare the classical conception of woman in its most perfect purity, in its most ancient glory, when invested with the beautiful lights of the eldest and the most glorious of the sons of song—in the Andromache and the Penelope of Homer—with the picture of Elizabeth, the blameless mother of the Baptist, and Mary, the honored mother of our Lord.

As there is nothing so lovely as piety in woman, so congruous, so seemly and sweet—more beautiful than ornaments of gold and gems and costly array—so there is nothing so hideous, so shameful, and so revolting, as impiety in a female. It quite unsexes her. A profane and atheistic woman is a sight more abhorred and horrible “than the sea-monster.” Whatever the “strong-minded” and aspiring among themselves may imagine, there is no man, however impious, who does not respect sincere

piety in a woman—who does not dread, detest, and despise anything approaching to profaneness in her. When Harriet Martineau, an ill-omened bird, was reciting her impieties in the hearing of the late Lord Macaulay, he turned to Lord Carlisle, and quoted those lines from Johnson's description of London—

“ Here falling houses thunder on your head,  
And here a female atheist talks you dead.”

The Bible, then, as the repository of inspired truth, as the chart, the compendium, the standard, the guide and the test of human duty, should have the first place in any scheme of a complete and Christian education for women. ●

Next in importance to the education of the moral and spiritual nature, is the education of the intellect. The best method of conducting intellectual education, the objects to be aimed at, and the relative order in which they should be sought, all these deserve to be carefully considered. In this, as in other matters, the behests of common sense are to be obeyed. They are too often despised and violated. As in the rules and duties of morality, justice goes before generosity; as in political and social economics, necessaries go before luxuries; so also in education. The useful, the necessary, the solid, the practical, should take the precedence of the showy and the ornamental. There are certain parts of knowledge, which are indispensable to every woman, whatever her sphere or duties in life. Other things, however desirable as ornaments, may be dispensed with; but these must be possessed as preliminaries. The elements of an English education, grammar, geography, arithmetic, should be thoroughly taught, and taught early in life. Even with regard to those objects for which these attainments are so often sacrificed or slighted, they are of the first necessity. If any thing could disenchant a lover, a letter written indicating deficiencies in the received rules of orthography might be expected to achieve the disastrous result. No mouth, however lovely, can neutralize the painful impression of bad grammar; and it dreadfully disturbs the harmony of song to hear the words pronounced in an ignorant and vulgar style.

The great error in female education is two-fold: in the first place, the endeavors to adorn that bright period of life which is naturally so charming—the period of youth—and doing comparatively little to fit the woman for the duties of after life; and in the second place, making every thing tend to the grand consummation of marriage, and not seeking to impart such an education as will enable the woman to be respectable and happy, though her lot in life should be solitary.

It was a custom among the ancient Hebrews to have all the males—the children of the rich not less than the poor—trained to some useful mechanical employment, by which, in case of necessity, they might gain an honest livelihood. Thus, we know that Saul of Tarsus, ultimately so distinguished as an apostle, was by trade a tent-maker, and there are few passages even in his writings, more nobly pathetic than that in which he said, “These hands ministered unto my necessities.” Our Lord himself, during the greater part of his life upon the earth, (as there is every reason to believe,) wrought at the trade of a carpenter. Most of the apostles were fishermen, one had been a tax-gatherer. These facts are not alleged to vindicate the dignity of labor, of honest industry in a mechanical employment, but assuming this in the case of men, to apply the principle to the matter in hand—the education of woman.

Every woman should be able to take care of herself, to be in the strictest and noblest sense independent. And this every highly educated woman may be. If she is able to teach, she may always command a handsome provision for her own support. The best investment a father can make for his child is in the mind, not in the bank. Let the capital be in the brain, where nothing can touch it but death or madness.

It is, in this point of view, not less important that a girl should be thoroughly taught than a boy. In another point of view, the neglect of education is an act of impiety toward God. When he bestows an intellectual gift, it is a token that he means it to be cultivated and used. This great truth lies at the foundation of the parable of the talents; and is the purest principle of action when we contemplate the education of our own faculties, or the

improvement of others. Whatever gift any of us may have by nature, is a religious trust, for the development of which and its right application, the Giver will hold us responsible. In a well constituted female seminary, provision will be made not only for the harmonious development of the intellectual powers generally, but for the most perfect culture of every special taste or talent ; as for example a taste for music or a talent for painting.

The education which our country and our times demand should be Christian, thorough, and practical. The spirit of Christianity should pervade it. Whatever is taught at all should be taught thoroughly, so far at least as the subject is prosecuted. The ground gone over should be conquered territory. No unsubdued Canaanites should be left in the land to harass and vex in after journeyings. The importance of the practical element has already been affirmed—the necessity of having every young lady thoroughly grounded in grammar, geography, and arithmetic. It may be added that not only should female education be thorough, but the standard should be high. The standard cannot be too high for those who have talent and industry. It is worse than useless to waste money on those of either sex, who have no capacity or zeal for learning ; but a parent can make no sacrifice too great for the thorough education of a noble and gifted child. It might be easily shown by impregnable arguments, that all education rests ultimately on the education of women, that mothers, standing as they do at the fountain heads of all human society, determine the color, the direction, and the force of the thousand streams which flow forth to enrich or to lay waste, to poison or to give health. But it is intended now to point out the bearing of a high standard of female attainment on the interests of education generally, and to show, by reference to the past and the present, what heights of knowledge women may attain without detriment to the delicacy of their modesty, to the tenderness of their affections or to the dignity or sanctity of their moral nature. We are aware that learned ladies have been and are stock subjects of ridicule to unlearned gentlemen. Nor can it with truth be denied that ladies, with some pretensions to science, have sometimes rendered themselves liable to ridicule by



an unseasonable and ostentatious exhibition of learning. It is nevertheless true that the very best method of raising the standard of education among men, is to raise the standard of education for women.

There are certain accomplishments proper to women which are not at all needful or becoming in a man, and there are certain intellectual pursuits, (mainly professional or military, however,) which men must engage in exclusively. But there is no reason why the female mind should not receive as high and generous a culture as that of the man; nor is there any intellectual pursuit in which women have not shone with a far-beaming lustre. Not to speak of Corinne, who five times gained the poetical prize over Pindar, the most charming of lyric poets; or Sappho, to whom her admiring countrymen paid divine honors, and erected temples and altars; or Aspasia, who taught the Athenians eloquence, and numbered Socrates among her pupils, whose manifold charms of mind and person made a captive of the eloquent and accomplished Pericles, for forty years at the head of the government and for fifteen the sole administrator; we draw attention to two Christian women of two different nations, but alike accomplished and adorned: the one an Italian, the other an English woman: the one, Olympia Morata, the other, Lady Jane Grey.

Olympia Morata was born at Ferrara, in the year 1526. She received her first lessons in the Greek language from a foreign teacher, Chilion Sinopi. Her progress in learning was so rapid that in a few months she was able to converse in the language of Virgil and Homer with ease and fluency. When only sixteen years of age, this extraordinary being wrote Greek poems of such beauty as to call forth the enthusiastic praises of eminent scholars. So great was the vigor of her understanding and so splendid were her attainments, that she was called the Tenth of the Muses, and the Fourth of the Graces. Nor was she less renowned as a Christian than as a scholar. The purity of her life surpassed the brilliancy of her verses; and men of all countries delighted to do honor to so much worth and to so much wisdom.

Lady Jane Grey is one of the most beautiful characters recorded in the annals of our race. In the loveliness of her person, in the elevation of her intellect, in the goodness of her heart, in the dignity of her station, and in the greatness of her misfortunes, she combines all the elements that can touch the imagination and the heart. The favorite pupil of Roger Ascham, and pronounced by him the first Greek scholar of the young women of her age in England; spending that time in the profound and absorbed study of Plato in his own unrivalled tongue, which others spent in the pleasures of society and of the chase; yet, more devoted to the inspired volume, which records the words of him who "spake as man never spake," and treasures up the precious words of heaven-taught evangelists and apostles; she had, still, a heart alive to all the tender and generous affections of our nature, and she threw around the most sacred relations of life—the relations of daughter and wife—the consecration and the charm of a heroic and tender fidelity, inspiring the manly heart of her husband with a more noble courage, by the example of her own invincible constancy in the prospect of a speedy and a bloody death. No poem is so truly grand as such a life and such a death.

Sometimes God, in his ineffable grace, sends a beautiful human spirit into this world, like Lady Jane Grey, so wise, so good, so pure, so heavenly, so early sanctified from earthly stains, so wonderfully delivered from the pollutions of the world, as to remind us of our unfallen nature, and foreshadow the spiritual glory of the heavenly state; as to enlighten the atmosphere around us, and make it fragrant as if a bright angel shook his wings.

The education which is commended therefore, contemplates not the period of youth only, but the whole of life; not the present life only, but an eternal existence; not certain branches of virtue only, but the whole sphere of duty. Still it is to be remembered that we never can attain perfection here below, that all progress on earth, whether in knowledge or virtue, is limited; and that to desire rather than to enjoy, to strive after, rather than to attain absolute good, appears to be our appointed portion on earth.

The illustrious women of whom we have spoken were noted for their skill in the languages of classic antiquity. The English women of this period, who received a liberal education, were generally acquainted with these tongues. Lady Jane Grey, although personally so eminent for her attainments and her virtues, was by no means alone in her intellectual accomplishments. Queen Elizabeth was noted for her classical acquirements. We learn from Macaulay, himself one of the finest classical scholars of our time, that all the daughters of Sir Anthony Cook were distinguished for their classical proficiency; that one of them, Lady Katharine Killigrew, wrote admirable Latin verses; that Mildred, the wife of Lord Burleigh, was second only to Lady Jane Grey in the knowledge of Greek; and that Ann, the mother of Lord Bacon, was distinguished both as a linguist and theologian.

There is no earthly reason why women of superior talents, industry, and leisure, should not be acquainted with those "dead but sceptred monarchs, who rule our spirits from their urns." Hardly anything can be imagined more inane and vapid, more perfectly useless and wearisome, than the lives of many—shall we say of most—young women of fortune during the interval of their leaving school and getting married. This period might be spent in laying up a store of pleasant and profitable knowledge, in forming tastes, habits, sentiments, and associations, which would dispose and enable them to discharge the sacred duties devolved on the wife and mother, with exalted fidelity and success.

The knowledge of these languages is important, 1. As an instrument of intellectual discipline, which the experience of the ablest and most accomplished of all the nations of modern Europe has pronounced the very best; 2. As a key to the choicest literature known among men. We should never read any but the very best authors in our own or a foreign language, except with a special purpose either of intelligence or confutation. This key, language, unlocks the secret chambers where are deposited the richest treasures of the master-minds. To use it, therefore, to gain access to vicious or ordinary writers, is as if a

man with a key in his hand to open indifferently rooms in which ingots of gold and lacs of rupees and bags of silver and precious stones were stored, should prefer to enter an apartment in which there was nothing better than painted glass and beads, and old clothes infected with the plague. If we wish to be really superior and to have a cast of greatness in our thinking, we should be careful not to throw away our time on middling or inferior writers. Almost all persons who read at all, read too much; if not in bulk, in variety. The habit of aimless, indiscriminate and desultory reading, is in every way pernicious, as consuming time, which might be much better employed, and as bringing before the mind many things of which we should willingly be ignorant.

In the proper conduct of female education, it is scarcely less important to secure salutary ignorance than sound knowledge. There are many books which it is important that a Christian woman should not have read, which she should blush to know. A large part of wisdom consists in an intelligent ignorance, and never perhaps does human nature appear at once so grand and so lordly as in one who unites the ignorant simplicity of a little child with the splendor of a highly disciplined and gifted mind. This is, indeed, Coleridge's conception of genius.

Thus far we have considered female education principally in its relation to the individual, as giving her the means of gaining an honorable living, as developing the gifts bestowed on her by her Maker, and as opening to her fountains of the purest joy. We should not, however, overlook altogether its relations to society and the State.

All the highest interests of the human race are bound up with the intellectual and social elevation of woman. As the purity and dignity of the individual man may be measured by his estimate of the female sex, so those nations which have honored woman have themselves been worthy of honor; and those periods of the national history in which she has been most highly regarded have been the purest and the happiest. The annals of Judah and Israel show that woman is the fountain of virtue in a community. No matter how pious the father, the defections and

idolatrics of the son are fully explained, when it is added that his mother was of the wicked house of Ahab. And even the wise heart of Solomon was turned aside from the worship of Jehovah to the service of Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians, and Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites, through the seductive agency of his idolatrous wives.

Public morality is dependent on private morality, and private morality is dependent on the character and influence of woman. Even the physical well-being and ultimately the very existence of the State itself, is dependent on public morality, incorruptible fidelity, unblemished honor, invincible courage, self-sacrificing patriotism. This is clearly illustrated in the corruption and overthrow of ancient Rome. The destruction of private morality is peculiarly fatal; is a blow aimed at the very vitals of the commonwealth; the poisoning the very fountains of the public health; the smothering in the very cradle the infant prosperity of the nation.

On the contrary, no deed of magnanimity or virtue is ever lost or spent. Not only is it recorded in heaven and treasured there, but it is added to the permanent and most precious treasures of this earth. It is the inspiration of coming centuries, and the diadem of all after ages.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*History of the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin.* By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D. Vol. IV. England, Geneva, France, Germany, and Italy. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers: 1866: pp. 491, 1:2 mo.

This volume appears to us to be characterised by fewer of the defects of D'Aubigne's peculiar style, than either of the preceding.

As the reader would infer from the title page copied above, it recounts a portion of the history of the Reformation in several different countries of Europe. Calvin, however, does not appear at all upon the stage; has not yet reached Geneva; and is in fact barely referred to, and we believe not more than once named. It is a book full of interest and instruction. It certainly is better suited to attract young readers of high intelligence than most of the works published for their use; while at the same time the oldest, wisest, and most learned divine, the greatest statesman, the profoundest philosopher, would be well employed in studying carefully its pages. We would rather have a Christian family furnished with these four volumes of church history than with fifty of the ordinary religious books that are bought and read for edification by pious people. No young man in all these suffering Southern States, whether in college, on the farm, or behind the counter, could spend his leisure hours more profitably or pleasantly than with this writer. And whenever any Protestant has the opportunity to recommend a good book to a Roman Catholic friend, let him persuade them to give

D'Aubigne a candid reading. So, too, we would earnestly recommend this book as well calculated to benefit any reader whose mind has been poisoned with infidel opinions.

We take occasion here to remark that a number of typographical errors disfigure this edition, as may be seen on pages 19, 33, 235, 305, 315, 382, and 433.

The portrait of Henry VIII., King of England, is drawn in the following terms: "Then the king rose; his princely stature, his royal air, his majestic manners, overawed the crowd." P. 105. "Henry VIII. united strength of body with strength of will; both were marked on his manly form. Lively, active, eager, vehement, impatient, and voluptuous,—whatever he was, he was with his whole soul. He was, at first, all heart for the Church of Rome; he went barefoot on pilgrimages, wrote against Luther, and flattered the Pope. But before long he grew tired of Rome without desiring the Reformation. Profoundly selfish, he cared for himself alone. If the papal domination offended him, evangelical liberty annoyed him. He meant to remain master in his own house—the only master, and master of all. Even without the divorce, Henry would possibly have separated from Rome. Rather than endure any contradiction, this singular man put to death friends and enemies, bishops and missionaries, ministers of state and favorites—even his wives. Such was the prince whom the Reformation found King of England." Pp. 20, 21. And yet the king could listen to a petition "with his characteristic dignity, and also with a certain kindliness." P. 12. And when Father Forest, superior of the monks of St. Francis and confessor to the unfortunate Queen Catherine, attacked Henry violently in a sermon at St. Paul's cross, and was summoned for it to the court, "What will be done with him?" asked people; "but instead of sending him to prison, as many expected, the king received him well, spoke with him for half an hour, and 'sent him a great piece of beef from his own table.'" P. 104. But "like all the Plantagenets, Henry VIII. would not suffer his clergy to resist him." P. 17. "Accordingly, he sent for the Speaker of the Commons, and said to him: 'On examining the matter closely, I find that the bishops, instead of being wholly my subjects, are

only so by halves. \* \* \* I refer the matter to your care.'” P. 89. And when the Bishop of Rochester, the only bishop who frankly opposed the divorce and the royal supremacy, had narrowly escaped being poisoned by his cook, and calumny even aimed at the throne, Henry hearing of this “resolved to make short work of all such nonsense; he ordered the offence to be deemed as high-treason, and the wretched cook was taken to Smithfield, there to be *boiled to death*. This was a variation of the penalty pronounced upon the Evangelicals.” P. 68. Finally, “Henry VIII., of little interest as an individual, though great as a king, and who was truly the father, predecessor, and forerunner of Elizabeth and her reign, even while striving ineffectually to preserve the Catholic doctrines in his realm; separated it decisively from the papacy, and by so doing, laid the foundations of the liberty and greatness of England.” P. 348.

On the subject of Henry's divorce from Catherine, D'Aubigne maintains, and we believe correctly, that not “passion alone urged him to action.” “The question of the succession to the throne had for a century filled the country with confusion and blood. This, Henry could not forget. Would the struggles of the two Roses be renewed after his death, occasioning perhaps the destruction of an ancient monarchy? If Mary, a princess of delicate health, should die, Scotland, France, the party of the White Rose, the Duke of Suffolk, whose wife was Henry's sister, might bring the kingdom into endless wars. And even if Mary's days were prolonged, her title to the crown might be disputed, no female sovereign having as yet sat upon the throne. Another train of ideas also occupied the king's mind. He inquired sincerely whether his marriage with the widow of his brother was lawful. Even before its consummation, he had felt doubts about it. But even his defenders, if there are any, must acknowledge that one circumstance contributed at this time to give universal force to these scruples. \* \* \* \* He loved another woman.

“Catholic writers imagine that this guilty motive was the only one. It is a mistake; for the two former indisputably occupied Henry's mind. As for parliament and people, the king's love



for Anne Boleyn affected them very little. It was the reason of state which made them regard the divorce as just and necessary." P. 21.

In 1530, the king sent a deputation consisting of the earl of Wiltshire, (the father of Anne Boleyn,) and two English bishops, to explain to Charles V., the nephew of Catherine, and to the pope, his serious motives to separation. Thomas Cranmer, afterwards archbishop, appeared one day at the king's closet with a manuscript treatise, in which he proved that the word of God is above all human jurisdiction, and that it forbids marriage with a brother's widow. Henry read it, and demanded if Cranmer felt strong enough to maintain his propositions before the Bishop of Rome. Cranmer assenting, was added to the deputation. When they appeared before Clement VII., the cunning, false, and cowardly occupant of the Roman see, whom Charles V. and Henry VIII. were now pressing so hard from opposite directions, the pontiff graciously put forth his slippered foot according to custom, that the envoys of the "*Defender of the Faith*" might kiss it. The proud earl refused to do so. But a fine spaniel with long silky hair, brought with him from England, flew at the foot and caught the pope by his great toe. Clement hastily drew it back. The ambassadors hid their faces and their laughter behind their long rich sleeves. "That dog was a *protestant*," said a reverend father. When the pope was closing the interview, he proposed to introduce the embassy to Charles V., then at Bologna with the pontiff. The superior gave them a cold reception, told the earl he could not be heard, being a party to the affair, and soon ended the conference by abruptly turning his back upon Wiltshire.

Henry at the same time invited all the Universities of Christendom to express their opinions. First Cambridge, then Oxford, and likewise Paris, Orleans, Angers, Bourges, and Toulouse in France, and then Bologna, Padua, and Ferrara in Italy, all declared the marriage sinful and the divorce imperatively necessary. With some of these learned bodies, threats upon the one hand and money on the other, were employed; but others of them gave their judgment freely and conscientiously.

Amidst this harmony of the whole papal world, one author tells us that there was dissent and opposition from an unexpected quarter. Some have said the divorce caused the English Reformation. But "the fathers and the children of the Reformation," says D'Aubigné, "opposed the divorce." "The Swiss and German reformers having been summoned to give an opinion on this point, Luther, Œcolampadius, Zwingli Bucer, Grynæus, and even Calvin, all expressed the same opinion." He proceeds to quote Luther as condemning the sinful marriage, but maintaining that the divorce would be a greater sin; for God's law is, *a man must cleave unto his wife*. And he adds, "The collective opinion of the Lutheran doctors was in conformity with the just and Christian sentiments of Luther." P. 42.

We are not prepared to assent to the author's estimate of these sentiments. But without entering into that discussion here, we wish simply to say that we are persuaded he has fallen into an error in classing Calvin with the Lutherans as disapproving of the divorce. He undoubtedly held that marriage with a brother's widow is always sinful, and his opinions on that point (as expressed in the letter referred to by the author) are set forth in the strongest terms. So far he agreed with Luther. But that letter certainly does not contain a word against the divorce, nor are we aware of any evidence existing that Calvin did condemn that divorce. Indeed, we are satisfied that he did not. And we suppose that D'Aubigné's language on this point was just a *lapsus penne*.

Henry's embassy to Clement and to Charles had failed. Meanwhile the two archbishops, the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, sundry marquises, earls, bishops, barons, abbots, and eleven members of the Lower House, in a written petition besought the pontiff to yield to Henry's wishes. Clement revolved the subject two months and a half more without answering. What perplexed him was how to harmonise the will of the English king, who desired another wife, and that of Charles V., who insisted that he ought to keep the old one. The pontiff could conceive of but one mode of satisfying both the princes at once—let the king have the two wives together! Cardinal Wolsey had entertained

this idea. Two years before, (that is, in 1528,) the pope had hinted at it. He now recurred to it. Sending for Da Casale he said: "This is what we have hit upon; we permit his majesty to have two wives." The infallible pontiff proposed bigamy to a king! Again, two years after this period, (viz. in 1532,) he again advised Henry to commit the crime of bigamy. Again, for the third time, Henry declined the suggestion. Full of fears that Rome was at length about to lose England, the unhappy pope resolves to make another effort to persuade Charles V. not to oppose the divorce. In the worst season of the year, on the 18th November, accompanied by six cardinals and a few other attendants, he travelled on a mule's back over muddy roads and across dangerous fords and through torrents of rain twenty days' journey to Bologna, which he reached in a miserable plight indeed. Here he wrought with a zeal and craft to change the emperor's mind. But just about this time, Henry came to the conclusion that the pope was trifling with him, and accordingly followed the inclination of his own will, and the course of his people's interests, and made Anne Boleyn his wife. On the following 23d May, the decree of divorce was pronounced by Archbishop Cranmer, and the archiepiscopal court. On the 28th May, this court declared officially that Henry and Anne had been lawfully wedded. Shortly afterwards this union was sealed with the pomp of a coronation. There was a procession of barges and barques richly and gaily ornamented, conveying, some of them, the nobility of England, and others the different companies of London city, whilst a thousand boats and skiffs covered the river. The procession set out from Greenwich, and landed at the Tower-gate. There, amidst countless trumpets sounding and a peal from all the guns of the fortress, Henry met Anne and kissed her, and the new queen triumphantly entered the Tower from whence three years later she was to issue by his order and mount, an innocent victim, the cruel scaffold. This unfortunate woman ascending now the throne of England, there was another unfortunate woman at the same time descending from the same giddy height. The latter, says our author, represented the old times and the Roman papacy; the former the

new times that were then coming in and the life and liberty they brought with them. The one died in disgrace but in peace, with friends and servants attending her to the last; the other, so young and beautiful, upon a scaffold, praying God to bless the prince who was taking her life.

Amongst the actors of this period in England, whom the author sets prominently before us, Sir Thomas More, Thomas Cromwell, Cranmer, Tyndale, Fryth, and Latimer, we select the last only that we may present the bold and faithful preacher to our readers. Henry VIII. had made this evangelical doctor one of his chaplains. It was a fearful thing to undertake to lead such a monarch. But Latimer nobly resolved to make Henry understand that he must begin at home, if he would have any real reformation. "Wherefore, gracious king," he wrote to Henry, "remember yourself. Have pity on your soul and think that the day is even at hand when you shall give an account of your office and of the blood that hath been shed with your sword." Pp. 48, 49. The absolute monarch was sometimes generous, and Latimer's faithfulness did not anger him. Latimer's idea of oratory was to preach a crucified Christ. He even held up also before Henry that Scripture is above all the powers of the earth, being the word of the great, eternal, almighty, everlasting God. Every ruler of men must give credence to this word. At the same time, Latimer did not "put 'the two swords' into one hand. 'In this world God hath two swords,' he said; 'the temporal sword resteth in the hands of kings, whereunto all subjects—as well the clergy as the laity—be subject. The spiritual sword is in the hands of the ministers and preachers of God's word to correct and reprove. Make not a mingle-mangle of them. To God give thy soul, thy faith; \* \* \* to the king tribute and reverence.'" Pp. 49, 50. More than all the ministers of the word in London did Latimer exasperate the friends of Rome. In the midst of the costly trappings, solemn banquets, the excesses of pride, the floods of pleasure and debauchery, which marked the magnificent, worldly, wicked court of Henry, priests on the one hand, and courtiers on the other, could not endure Latimer's sermons. He had the

dangerous gift of sarcasm, and with this he would also lash the persecuting prelates who had just put Bilney and some other martyrs to death. Preaching from the text, "Ye are not under the law, but under grace," he exclaimed, "What, St. Paul say No more law! St. Paul invite Christians, to break the law! Quick! inform against St. Paul; seize him, and take him before my Lord Bishop of London! \* \* \* The good apostle must be condemned to bear a fagot at St. Paul's cross. What a goodly sight to see St. Paul, with a fagot on his back, before my lord in person, seated on his episcopal throne! \* \* \* But no! I am mistaken, his lordship would not be satisfied with so little! \* \* \* he would sooner burn him." P. 96.

This language was to cost Latimer dear. He was denounced and summoned to appear before the bishop. He was sick at the time, and like most men of ardent temperament was easily dejected. Yet, against the advice of his friends, he set out for London. He was not Latimer's ordinary, but he was Bishop Stokesley, an able and a violent man, and he persuaded the archbishop to empower him to lay hold on the reformer. Sixteen articles on purgatory, invocation of saints, etc., were presented him to sign. He refused. Repeatedly he was brought up to go through the same scene. Then they changed their tactics and labored to tease and embarrass him with innumerable questions, successive relays of these adversaries being allowed, without any interval, to bait their unfortunate victim. On one of these days, entering the hall of his persecutors, he observed some change in the arrangements of the furniture. Some tapestry covered up the fire-place. There was a table in the middle of the room. Latimer was seated betwixt the table and the chimney. One of the more aged of the bishops, whom he had considered to be his friend, pleaded his own deafness, and called upon the reformer to speak a little louder. Latimer was aroused by the remark, and heard in the fire-place a pen moving upon paper. From that moment he was more cautious in his replies. After this the effect of kind blandishments was tried in vain. At last they threatened him with the stake, and did finally proceed to excommunicate and shut him up in the Lollard's

Tower. But the rule of the papacy was coming to an end in England, and Latimer was the king's chaplain. Some dexterous prelates suggested to obtain some concession from him, be it ever so little, and then report every where that he had recanted. "Accordingly, some priests went to him. 'Will you yield any thing?' they demanded. 'I have been too violent,' said Latimer, 'and I humble myself accordingly.' 'But will you not recognise the merit of works?' 'No!' 'Prayers to the saints?' 'No!' 'Purgatory?' 'No!' 'The power of the keys given to the popes?' 'No! I tell you.'" Then one of them referred to Luther's sanction of the crucifix and images of saints used to remind us of them, but not to worship them. Latimer declared he was of the same opinion. They hastened to carry the news to the bishops. It was a signal defeat. Little had been gained. Yet they knew the king would not suffer his chaplain to be burnt. Convocation decided that if Master Latimer would sign the two articles he should be absolved from the sentence of excommunication.

One of the most striking features of that part of this volume which relates to England, is the very kindly spirit its author cherishes towards the Established Church of that country, his disposition constantly to apologize for its defects, and his manifest desire by words of love and charity, to provoke that body to perfect the reformation in its bosom. It is a noble and Christian purpose, worthy of all imitation. We would welcome every manifestation of the disposition amongst evangelical Protestant Christians to draw together, instead of apart. Fruitless this effort will probably prove—yet not in vain.

We have dwelt so long upon the English portion of this volume, that no space can be allowed to any criticism of the extremely interesting details it furnishes relative to Geneva, France, Germany, and Italy.

*A Plea for the Queen's English. Stray Notes on Speaking and Spelling.* By HENRY ALFORD, D. D., Dean of Canterbury. Tenth Thousand. Alexander Strahan, London and New York. 1866: pp. 287.

This quaint title is a good introduction to a very sensible book; written in that homely and vigorous English which has become classical in England since the days of Arnold of Rugby. What we have to say of it can be best reached by a word or two on the course of a language, and the law of its progress.

Idioms are peculiarities: *idioma*, what is one's own; then, what bears the mark of being one's own; *i. e.* what is unlike other people's. The word had no original reference to language, but we have appropriated it to those peculiarities which characterise languages. But peculiarities can only be predicated of one tongue, as compared with others, on the assumption that there are other things in common among them. There must be *general laws* of language, or there could be no *idioms*. Rules must exist, or there can be no departures from them.

A step farther: laws of language are laws of the utterance of thought, and therefore, almost necessarily, laws of thought. An idiom, therefore, marks a departure from the common way of thinking out one's thought: out, that is, into speech. Its origin must be either accidental, *i. e.* due to some quaint talker and his happy hit, long ago, (many idioms are the *debris* of proverbs;) or historical—founded on some now obsolete usage of the language; or moral—growing out of some characteristic temper of the people in earlier days.

Much of this Dean Alford has noticed; but he has failed to remark, as Dr. Trench had failed before him, that the gradual enriching of a language, through the nation's commerce with other nations and their tongues, tends directly and strongly to remove these exceptional phenomena from our speech. This, in many ways; of which, let two suffice for present mention.

One is, the instinctive impulse of a people who court the society of the world, to remove the barriers which keep out foreigners from the free use of the vernacular. The other, far deeper, more

silent, more important is, the increasing need of regulating a language, as its complications increase.

Within our memory, our dictionaries have advanced from forty-five thousand words to eighty thousand. The volume of our speech has thus nearly doubled. If idioms had increased in the same ratio, the language would have been intolerably overloaded, before this time, with exceptional phrases which could be retained in use only by the memory, and in the face of the nobler faculties. Around the actual speech of man, the shadow projected by Thought upon Life, there will always be a *penumbra* of obsolescent words and forms. Better, perhaps, describe them as sparks, once part of the locomotive's fire and propelling force, now glimmering a moment in the rear, and now extinct.

What, then, is the only indication of an idiom? Usage, unquestionably, as the Dean admits in paragraphs 67, 69. What is the proper corrector of idioms, and gradual restorer of the dominion of law in speech? Usage, again, beyond all doubt. And under what impulse does usage obliterate idioms, and replace them with terms conformed to rule? The impulse to remove complexities and perplexities out of a language which is spreading as our race is spreading, over all lands and the waste places of the earth; which must either conform its graceful movements to the laws of thought, or break up into endless dialects.

It will be seen, then, what a hopeless task Dr. Alford has undertaken, if he thinks to read back into the language such phrases as "it is me," "it is him," "it is her." Par. 192 seq. Nor will Dr. Latham's etymological defence, quoted *in loco*, viz., that "me" is a secondary nominative, and not the proper objective case of "I," relieve the matter, or prevent the language from *growing right* in that particular. "Me" had long ago ceased to be a secondary nominative in any other case than this; the English-American instinct of thought has written "*dele*" against it; and *deletum* it is, accordingly. The same may be said of the attempt to perpetuate "those kind," "these sort," (par. 95); "as thee" for "as thou," (par. 1996); the placing "both" and "only" at the wrong point in the sentence, as in



the phrase, "They broke down both the door of the stable and of the cellar"; and the like.

Much the same must be said of the endeavor to arrest the elimination of the letter "u" from a large class of words, such as labor, favor, and honor. The curious part of the matter is, that Dean Alford is compelled to admit that "emperor," "orator," and several others, once had the "u" which it would now be an affectation to restore. Yet "honor" and "favor," are "abominations," as Archdeacon Hare and he agree! They can no more prevent the one rectification, made not by pedants, but by the general instinct, than they can undo the other.

The author has marked the phrase, "doubt *but that*," instead of "doubt that," as a vulgarism. It is singular that so good a scholar should not have recognised it, on the contrary, as a *classicism*. "*Dubito quin*" is the parent of it.

It must not be inferred, however, either that Dean Alford is a blind conservative, or that we accept the infinite purisms of New England, in spelling and grammar, as legitimate progress. Many of these are as offensive to the taste as the corresponding pronunciation is to the ear. Nothing would more surely and utterly vulgarise our noble tongue than to intrust it to such "tailors' 'prentice hands," to snip and cabbage at their will.

The above exceptions apart—these, and some smaller of the same sort,\*—the book is, as we said, a capital one. The comparison of the Queen's English and the Queen's Highway, (par. 4,) is a model of scholarly wit. The general treatment of abuses of language is exceedingly good; the reasoning occasionally lucid and forcible to a delightful degree. See, as an example, the discussion, (par. 183,) on "the three first," or "the first three." And we confess the spicy flavor, to us, of the paragraph (8) which "touches up" our Northern friends about their English and their morals.

---

\* E. g. "Summons" should not have been tolerated as a verb; nor "leaving," used absolutely, defended; nor "on to," for "on," pronounced good grammar; and "reliable," for trustworthy, should have been handled more severely.

Some of the stories told are excellent, and lose nothing in the telling; while the collection of blunders from various quarters is more laughable than Punch. And the advice in the concluding pages, both as to the style of it, and the spirit of it, is above praise.

We have reserved two notes to the last. The first relates to Dean Alford's omission, in criticising the use of the objective "whom" for the nominative "who," to point out that grammatical error—where such errors are so rare—in our English Bible, (Matt. xvi. 13, 15,) "*Whom* do men say that I, the Son of man, am? *Whom* say ye that I am?" The test is, "Ye say that I am"—not him, but "he." "Who" must take the place of "he," and "whom" only of "*him*."

The second relates to the very tame and slight censure set down against the word "female," used for "woman" or "lady." If there is a supreme vulgarism "leaking up" into good society from the regions below, it is that. All the instincts of refined thought and language repel us from applying the name of a class to the highest member of the class. Contrariwise, the tendency of generic words is to *settle down* upon the less honorable species contained under it. The word "limbs," if used restrictively, invariably suggests, not arms, but legs. "Speech" means prose, unless you specify poetry. "Man" and "woman," are felt not to designate, though they include, gentlemen and ladies.

The apparent exception, as respects this last example, is just such a one as proves the rule. We do sometimes employ the word "man" to express something more than can be conveyed by the word "gentleman;" but it must be noted that the very emphasis put upon the word, when that idea is to be conveyed, shows that it is used exceptionally. Without that special emphasis, importing that for the nonce the very highest attributes of man are alone remembered, the word conveys a lower, and not a higher epithet than "gentleman."

The term "female," therefore, applied to woman, bears down the idea of woman to the lowest class of predicates indicated by it. It has not a lingering trace of that aroma of grace and sweetness which lingers about every honest name of the gentler

sex. It is dusty, ill-flavored, unhandsome, materialistic; learned from the dollar-mad people who *love us so well*. And as for "Female Institutes," "Female Colleges," etc., etc., grammar abominates the heresy, as refinement denounces the vulgarity. Is a book, written by a woman, a "Female Book?"

*Nicodemus with Jesus: or Life and Light for the Dark and Dead World.* By the Rev. J. M. P. OTTS. Philadelphia: Jas. S. Claxton, Successor to Wm. S. & Alfred Martien, 1214 Chestnut Street. 1867. Pp. 230; 16 mo.

The author of this little work says he is "actuated in publishing it by a desire to do good, and to preach the gospel of Jesus to a larger number of persons" than assemble before him every Sabbath. It is a worthy motive, and our personal knowledge of the man gives us confidence in his claim to be influenced by it. And would God that others of our young Southern Presbyterian ministers, who have the requisite gifts, were moved by the same impulse to make use of their pens. Stuart Robinson, whose name is a passport to any sentiment all over our Church, said recently at Memphis, that our ministers must stop talking and go to writing and publishing, if we mean to stand in our lot. The press, that omnipotent engine, we must indeed subsidise for the defence, as others are doing for assaults on the truth. Mr. Otts believes in using the press as one of the talents intrusted to us to be used for the glory of our Master. Let him go on to use it, only taking ample time for preparation; and the Church will bless his name long after he shall sleep in the grave. If we had a trumpet's tongue, we would cry aloud to our young men to awake to the noble ambition which has stirred him,—that of preaching not only to a few hundred souls, but to many thousands, and to generations yet unborn.

The idea of writing this little work was suggested by the interest taken in the study of our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus, first by a large class of Christians of various denominations which the writer instructs every Sabbath evening, and subsequently by his whole congregation, when he preached to them the substance of the lessons in sermons.

Our author considers, and very properly, that every word in this conversation is pregnant with some most important truth, and that the whole scheme of redemption, including every essential part acted by God and by man in it, is here condensed very marvellously within the limited compass of twenty-one short verses. It is an epitome of the whole gospel. It is precious as the diamond, which concentrates the greatest riches in the smallest compass. Whoso reads and understands this conversation, will know truth enough to save his soul, and be inexcusable if it is lost.

Mr. Otts supposes Nicodemus not to have come to Jesus by night out of any fear of the rulers, and indeed not at all upon his own individual responsibility, but as the willing commissioner and representative of those members of the Sanhedrim who were Pharisees. He infers the dreadful guilt which attaches to their subsequent persecutions of him whom they confessed on this occasion, at the lips of their messenger, *they knew to be a teacher sent from God*. The great aggravation of their awful crime in instigating the Romans to nail him to the cross, is found, says Mr. Otts, in the fact that it was perpetrated against the honest convictions of their minds. "His crucifixion sprang from the pure malice of their hearts; and the greatest of all crimes, is that which is perpetrated by an enlightened mind through the promptings of a malicious heart."

Amongst numerous passages of great force and beauty, we are especially charmed with the exhibition of "the miracle," on pages 29-34, and the "grounds of faith," on pages 118-120. We select several passages as specimens of the author's simple, forcible, and direct style.

Speaking of the chief and essential qualification to fit a man to be a minister of the gospel, Mr. Otts says:

"What most of all wholly and utterly disqualified Nicodemus for the office which he pretended to fill, was the the fact that he was not only theoretically ignorant of the doctrine of the new birth, but he had no experimental acquaintance with it. He had not himself entered into the kingdom of God, and how could he conduct others into it? A teacher in religion, who is intel-

lectually ignorant of the doctrine of regeneration, is bad enough; one that is spiritually a stranger to it, is tenfold worse. The man who sets himself up as a teacher in Israel, and pretends to preach the way of life, and at the same time denies the necessity of the new birth, and scouts the idea as something that is absurd and impossible, is an emissary of Satan in the camp of Immanuel." P. 113. "This great change of heart and life is an essential and indispensable qualification to fit one to be a teacher with Jesus, and all those who were sent out by him before his incarnation, or that have been sent out since, to proclaim the doctrines of religion, and to teach the mystery of regeneration, speak what they know by their own internal experience, and testify what they have witnessed in the cases of others converted under their observation. This was an additional reason why their testimony should be received, and a farther rebuke to Nicodemus's unbelief. This fact also contrasted Nicodemus, and the Jewish teachers whom he represented, in a very unfavorable point with the true teachers of religion. It showed that the former were destitute of an essential qualification that must be found in all worthy teachers of religion. The destitution of regenerating grace was the secret of their unbelief, and the real cause why they would not receive the testimony of Jesus and his disciples. They were carnal, and could not receive the things of the Spirit. They rejected the gospel because it condemned their lives. Their depravity was the cause of their unbelief, and their unbelief was the source of their transgressions." P. 122.

Describing a sad and an awful sight which we may have ourselves all witnessed, Mr. Otts says:

"How many Nicodemuses have we in the pulpit at this day! Men, proud of their talents, and vain of their learning, and yet experimentally unacquainted with the very first elements of religion! Men, as unfit to teach religion, and preach the gospel, as the clown who has not learned his alphabet, is unfit to teach a grammar-school! If they do not belch out shocking blasphemies into the face of heaven, they babble nonsense from the sacred desk. They may entertain their hearers with learned

disquisitions in philosophy, or sublime discourses on astronomy, or smooth and flowery discussions of morals, but they cannot preach the gospel, simply because they have not yet learned the very alphabet of religion." P. 115.

Depicting the dreadfulness of the sin of unbelief, Mr. Otts says :

"If we refuse to believe a fellow-mortal's word, by that refusal we implicitly charge him with falsehood. On the same grounds, when we refuse to believe the gospel, which is God's word, we thereby charge the great God with lying. But the unbeliever, astounded at the malignity of the sin of unbelief, cries out, 'You cannot fasten on me the enormous sin of charging falsehood on my Maker, by your fine-spun argument. I never thought of such a thing!' Well, if the argument does not please you, take the conclusion in the words of Scripture. Open your Bible and turn to 1 John v. 10, and read, 'He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son.' It is just as certain that every unbeliever gives the lie to God, as it is certain that God cannot lie to him. And there is another scripture which says, 'He that believeth, hath set to his seal that God is true.' John iii. 33. Now, as the faith of the believer sets to his seal that God is true, so the unbelief of the unbeliever sets to his seal that God is false. O unbeliever, you cannot escape this condemnation, for both reason and Scripture fasten it upon you! Your unbelief charges the great God with falsehood, and while you refuse to believe the gospel and trust in Jesus, you are doing all you can to make God a liar. Your unbelief is the most enormous and malignant of sins, for it is a most contemptuous slander cast upon the name of your holy Creator, and it goes as far as mortal power can, to undeify the Deity of heaven, and to make him like the devil of hell, who is the father of lies. He that believeth not is, therefore, most justly condemned already.

"Unbelief does not only aim a blow at the character of God in general, but it directs a particular blow at the Saviour. You cannot view Jesus in any aspect of his character, in which unbelief is not an outrage and grief to him. He came to this

world in love, and has suffered the full penalty of the law in the sinner's stead, that the world through him might be saved. Not to believe in him, is to despise his love, and to reject his mercy, and to do all in the unbeliever's power to render his sufferings of no effect. Suppose that all men should follow the unbeliever's example so that not a single soul should believe in him, then his death would be in vain, as not one soul would be saved by it. Would it not be an awful outrage to the love of the crucified Saviour, if not one soul should be saved by his inconceivable sufferings and death? The unbeliever is doing all in his power to bring about this very result, at the mere thought of which the heart is appalled. Unbelief is a greater outrage to Jesus than was his crucifixion; for it is an attempt to render his crucifixion of no effect." Pp. 187-190.

Our author has evidently pursued a wide range of investigation in the study of his subject, and the fruits of his familiarity with the more recent as well as the older expounders of the passage he treats, appear on every page. So also he is a student of philosophy, and it appears in his handling of his theme, while at the same time he never makes any offensive display. His book is divided into a chapter for every verse of the Scripture which records the conversation between the divine founder of the gospel and the learned doctor of the law who came to him by night; but the chapters are short, and no waste words are employed. The writer is too earnest to lose time in spinning out what he has to offer. And although he is called upon to discuss a large variety of subjects besides the doctrine of regeneration, many of them of equal importance with that, we feel bound to say that his effort is well sustained throughout.

A few not very important errors of the press and slips of the author's pen disfigure the book. On page 16, we should prefer to have no comma in the third line. On page 73, fourth line, we should substitute the name *Jesus* for the pronoun *he*. On page 78, line twelfth, the word *are* should be *is*. On page 113, the last line of the page, *at* after *scouts* is superfluous. On page 114, line twelfth, there is a faultiness of expression. On pages 178, 179, and 180, there is a general manifestation of haste in

composition. But on pages 75, 79, and 201, there are instances of what we consider a greater blemish than any of those yet referred to. A degree of coarseness marks the illustrations there employed which Mr. Otts would do well to remove in his next edition.

*Historical Theology: A Review of the Principal Doctrinal Discussions in the Christian Church since the Apostolic Age.*

By the late WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, D. D., Principal and Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh. Edited by his Literary Executors. 2nd Edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street: 1864. 2 vols. 8vo., pp. 639; 614.

Dr. Cunningham does not in this work "enter upon any portion of the history of the Church recorded in the Old Testament and preceding the manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh." He confines himself to the Christian dispensation, "because it affords the largest amount of materials bearing upon theology properly so called." He holds that the chief interest of man is to acquire a knowledge of what God has revealed; and that that department of Church history which affords the most ample materials for learning the system of Christian theology is "just the history of the Church *since the completed revelation of God's will was put into its hands*, and especially the history of the principal discussions which have taken place in regard to its meaning and import." So much for the author's design in the work before us.

Different historians adopt to some extent a different periodology; but there is a general uniformity in the chief starting-points they select. Let us compare those of our author and the distinguished German professor, Dr. Kurtz, in his *Manual of Sacred History*.

The latter makes two grand divisions of Church history, viz., 1. The Creation and Fall of Man; 2. Redemption and Salvation. Division 1, of course, is necessarily discussed and despatched in a few pages. Division 2 is divided into two parts: the one entitled, *The Plan of Salvation in its Introductory Stages*; and the other, *The Plan of Salvation in its Fulfilment and Final Results*. Part I. is again divided into three chapters, viz.:



Chapter I. From the Fall to the Deluge.

Chapter II. From the Deluge to the Calling of Abraham.

Chapter III. From the Calling of Abraham to the Birth of Christ.

This third chapter is again subdivided into seven periods, as follows :

First Period. The Age of the Patriarchs.

Second Period. Moses and the Giving of the Law.

Third Period. Joshua and the Conquest.

Fourth Period. The Age of the Judges.

Fifth Period. From Samuel to the Temple and the Division of the Kingdom.

Sixth Period. From the Building of the Temple to the Cessation of Prophecy.

Seventh Period. From the Cessation of Prophecy in the Old Testament to its Fulfilment in the New Testament.

Part II. is divided into four chapters, as follows :

Chapter I. The Manifestation of Salvation in the Person of the Redeemer.

Chapter II. The Promulgation of Salvation by the Apostles.

Chapter III. The Appropriation of Salvation by the Church.

Chapter IV. The ultimate Consummation of Salvation.

Now, we hold Dr. Kurtz in the highest respect, and consider his Manual one of the most clear, comprehensive, and suggestive works within our knowledge. But this division of his subject is not to our taste. Let us look at Dr. Cunningham, and see how the Scotch Presbyterian excels the German Lutheran in simplicity and distinctness.

Our author makes three dispensations cover the whole ground, viz., the patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian. The patriarchal dispensation extends from the fall to the giving of the law through Moses. It admits of obvious division into three principal periods. The first of these runs from the fall to the deluge; the second, from the deluge to the calling of Abraham; the third, from the calling of Abraham to the giving of the law. The Mosaic dispensation likewise naturally divides itself into three

periods, marked, first, by the giving of the law; secondly, by the establishment of the Hebrew monarchy, or perhaps better, the building of the temple; and thirdly, by the Babylonish captivity. The Christian dispensation admits also of a threefold division: the ancient Church, the mediæval Church, and the modern Church.

Much the most important period in the history of the Church, Dr. C. holds to be that of the Reformation and the centuries from that era to the present, because at and since the Reformation every topic in Christian theology has been discussed with more ability and learning, more rationally, systematically, and satisfactorily, than during the whole previous period. He puts up the Reformers and the divines who succeeded them as "immeasurably superior to the theologians of preceding generations." The Fathers and the Schoolmen, he holds to be "mere children," compared with the Reformers and the divines of the seventeenth century, in point of intrinsic merit as authors, or of clear, intelligent, or exhaustive exposition of Christian truth. Of the main topics of Christian theology which are still the subject occasionally of controversial discussion, and so are still of practical importance, almost the only ones satisfactorily discussed before the Reformation were the Trinity and some of the leading points involved in the Pelagian controversy; and even these have been much better and more fully discussed in modern than in ancient times, *i. e.*, in the Socinian and Arminian than in the Arian and Pelagian controversies. Hence, according to our author, the last three centuries are of more consequence to be studied than the preceding fourteen; the two first not entering into this comparison.

We content ourselves with simply stating these opinions of Dr. Cunningham without either endorsing or rejecting them, because, in the first place, our space does not admit of much discussion, and secondly, our main object in this notice is to introduce this author to the acquaintance of our readers.

What we have quoted above will prepare the reader to expect that much the larger part of this work is occupied with controversies as between Rome and the Protestant churches. The

general plan as stated by the author is, first, to advert to the discussions which have taken place as to the nature and definition of the Church itself; then to give some notice of what is commonly called the Council of Jerusalem as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, at which the first controversy which ever arose in the Church was taken up and disposed of; and then to proceed and consider the chief controversies which arose after the apostles were removed, and the chief doctrines which have been controverted in more modern times.

Speaking of what the Church is, the proper definition of it, its qualities, prerogatives, and marks, our author dwells on the anxiety usually displayed by Papists when in controversy with Protestants to give prominence to the general subject of the Church. He suggests two reasons for this: first, because they think—nor are they wholly mistaken in the opinion—that they can say something on this topic somewhat more plausible than they are able to adduce in regard to many of the particular doctrines controverted between them and Protestants, and have found in experience the discussion of this topic more successful than any other in making converts to Popery; and secondly, because their views on this topic once established, all further discussion of individual doctrine is superseded; for they put the Church into God's room, both as the revealer of all truth and the dispenser of all grace; or at least they put the Church in the room of God's word as the only standard of faith. To our mind, the remarks of Dr. C. upon this point are suggestive of very serious and grave considerations for Protestants. That they generally make far too little of the Church is not to be questioned. The fact referred to by our author of Rome's anxiety to encounter them on this point, shows her instinctive and clear perception of where their weakness lies. The other fact which he signalizes, that this is the point where Rome succeeds in perverting most of her victims, speaks volumes. Christ is a King, and he hath a kingdom in this world. That he hath given no particular form to it, established no regulative laws for it, instituted no binding rules and methods for its administration, is so absurd that mankind in general cannot believe it. And until Protestants abandon

this untenable ground, and, accepting the idea of a *jus divinum* for Church government, begin to study and find out what the Scriptures do teach on this subject, Rome will always have the advantage upon that field.

Upon the subject of the Council of Jerusalem, our author remarks that Papists, Prelatists, and Presbyterians, have usually held that this transaction was fitted and intended to instruct us respecting the way and manner in which the government of the Church should be permanently conducted, while Congregationalists, not finding in it any countenance to their views of Church government, have generally contented themselves with maintaining that it affords us no clear or certain instruction upon the subject. Papists, finding that Peter took a prominent part in the discussion, infer that he was vicar of Christ and head of the Church. Prelatists, finding that several centuries afterwards the notion was broached that James was appointed by the apostles to be Bishop of Jerusalem, profess to get scriptural evidence of this fancy, in the prominent part which he took in the discussion. Now, in the narrative itself, there is no trace of any superiority in office or jurisdiction on the part either of Peter or James. The substance of the popish argument then is virtually this: Peter spoke *first*, and therefore he was superior to the other apostles; while the prelatist argument is: James spoke *last*, giving shape to the decision of the council, and therefore he was diocesan bishop, and so superior in some respects even to the apostles. As for the Congregationalists, they strive to make out that this transaction was so peculiar and extraordinary as to afford no pattern or precedent for us. But our author forcibly urges that the apostles *in this matter* did not act as inspired expounders of the will of God, but as ordinary office-bearers of the Church, using the ordinary means of ascertaining the divine will, and enjoying only the ordinary guidance and influences of his Spirit; so that this council is a pattern for the Church in ordinary circumstances, and the affair was expressly so arranged and ordered for the very purpose. For, had it been the purpose of God to settle the controversy by an inspired, infallible decision, the apostles would have settled it without any meeting and any

discussion. Any one of them was competent to do this, and to confirm his decision by the "signs of an apostle." Paul could have settled it thus at Antioch without the matter being brought up to Jerusalem at all. But it *was* brought up, the apostles and elders assembled to deliberate respecting it publicly in presence of the people, and much disputing concerning it took place in the meeting. The apostles who took part in this discussion, instead of at once declaring authoritatively God's mind and will respecting it, formally argued the question upon grounds derived from providence and from Scripture. In this way they carried conviction to all minds, and in this way produced a unanimous decision.

Our author proceeds to show from the history of this council, that the Church is bound to be guided wholly by the word in executing the functions which her Head has committed to her. Everything must be brought to that standard. She is not only not bound to be guided by any other rule, but is not at liberty to regard any other. But the attempt is frequently made to escape from the practical application of this great principle by questioning whether God's word furnishes materials for deciding all disputes that can arise in the administration of the affairs of the Church. Dr. C. insists that it does. If men, says he, were really anxious to know his will that they might do it, and if they would diligently and prayerfully search his word, they would find materials there for regulating their opinions and conduct in all circumstances. Many of the applications made in the New Testament of Old Testament statements seem to have been intended, besides their direct and immediate object, to convey this general idea, that much more is to be learnt from the Old Testament—and, of course, from the Scriptures generally—than might at first sight appear.

"Men desirous to evade or abridge the authority of Scripture, in its practical applications, seem to think that they are not called upon to regard anything but what appears plainly and palpably upon the surface of Scripture, and is set forth there in distinct and explicit assertions or requirements. But the mode of applying Old Testament statements frequently adopted by our Saviour and his apostles, points to a very different conclusion.

We have a specimen of this in the statement made by James on the occasion we are considering. There was nothing very direct and express in the Old Testament upon the precise question to be decided; and the way in which he does decide it, by an application of Old Testament statements, is one of the many instances of a similar kind, occurring in the New Testament, which are fitted to impress upon us the conviction, that much more is to be learnt from the written word than what can be found on the surface of it." Vol. I., pp. 49, 50.

Another scriptural principle derived from considering this Council of Jerusalem, is the right of office-bearers appointed thereunto to decide judicially all disputes respecting Church affairs. The apostles and elders alone composed this assembly, and alone pronounced the decision. We have, says our author, the regular formal minute of *sederunt*, as it might be called, in the sixth verse, where we are told that "the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter;" and at the fourth verse of the sixteenth chapter, the decrees of the council are expressly described as "the decrees that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem;" and these decrees it is manifest were authoritative and binding upon the churches. There is, indeed, a clear distinction kept up in the New Testament between the office-bearers and the ordinary members of the Church, the one being rulers and governors, the other bound to submission and obedience. But there are several obvious limitations of this authority and this obedience. First, the authority is purely ministerial and not lordly. Secondly, even in their proper sphere, church-rulers are not infallible. Thirdly, they have no exclusive right to interpret Christ's laws, but every man has the right of private judgment, and may interpret the word of God for himself and upon his own responsibility in the regulation of his own opinions and conduct. Nor has Christ conferred upon any class of men, any power that interferes with the exercise of this right.

The history of the council next suggests, that, in important ecclesiastical affairs, the members of the church ought to be consulted, and, if possible, their concurrence obtained. That the assembly which gave decision, says Dr. C., was composed

properly and formally only of the apostles and elders, is too plain to be controverted. What is said of the members, must, therefore, be interpreted consistently with this. They are first mentioned in the twelfth verse, where we are told that "all the multitude kept silence and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul." They were present, therefore, but nothing more is implied; for anything that here appears they might have been mere spectators and auditors. Next they are mentioned in the twenty-second verse: "It pleased the apostles and elders with the whole Church, etc." Here it is plainly implied that they did not stand upon the same platform with the apostles and elders, but that after the office-bearers had made their decision, it was brought before the people for their judgment. They concurring in what had been decided, it was natural that the public letter should run in the name of the whole body of those at Jerusalem who had adopted it. Dr. Cunningham adds to this argument some interesting and important testimonies from Henderson and Gillespie, to the effect that while jurisdiction is not in the hands of all, yet that the consent and approbation of all is a thing to be desired and sought after.

Another principle of church government derived from this history is that of the subordination of courts.

Another is that of the obligation of apostolic practice. We dwell on our author's treatment of this question, because it affords a fine specimen of the eminent moderation and justness of his spirit. He remarks that Presbyterians have generally conceded that there are some limitations of this principle in its practical application, but that the principle itself is clear; first, because Christ certainly did commission the apostles to organise his Church and make provision for perpetuating it to the end of the world; and secondly, because they, in executing this part of their commission, have manifestly taught us more by pattern than by precept; more by what they did than by what they have written. One of the limitations to the principle accepted as being obvious, is, that whatever practice of the apostles is adduced as binding, must be recorded in the word of God, and not be derived from the traditions of the Church; for the written word is the only rule of faith.

It is generally conceded, however, (and this is a second limitation,) that not everything done or sanctioned by the apostles concerning the Church, even when contained in or deduced from Scripture, is universally and permanently binding upon the Church. For example, the decrees of this Council of Jerusalem, simply as such, and irrespective of anything else found in Scripture, it has been generally allowed on all hands, were not intended to be of permanent obligation. And, accordingly, certain things obtained in the apostolic Church, which must be viewed as local and temporary in their character, suited only to the peculiar circumstances of the Church in that age and in those countries, such as the washing of feet, abstinence from blood, the kiss of charity, (or, as it has been called, the ordinance of salutation,) and the love-feasts. Partly from the nature of the case, partly from the manifest relation of the practices to temporary and local circumstances, partly from the manner in which they are spoken of in Scripture, and partly from other statements in the New Testament, it is not difficult to show that these things are not binding upon Christians and churches in all ages. Now, this concession, of course, introduces some degree of doubt in the application of the general principle of the permanent binding force of apostolic practice in the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs. But this doubt as to *some* of the applications of the principle, does not warrant the rejection of the principle, or the denial that apostolic practice ordinarily, and as a general rule, forms a binding law. This general position is established by considerations before adverted to, and cannot be overturned by any qualifications that have to be conceded, or by any difficulties or objections that have been raised. The practical difficulties which have been raised, do, in fact, relate to questions of no intrinsic importance.

In the right adjustment of this general topic, two great questions are involved. First, is it lawful for Christian churches now, to *omit* any observance introduced or sanctioned by the apostles; and secondly, is it lawful to *introduce* into the Church any observance which they did not sanction or require. To maintain the affirmative on either of these questions, as a general



rule, seems to amount, says Dr. C., to something like a negation of the place assigned to the apostles as supernaturally authorised and guided by Christ for organising his Church. It is to reduce them, with reference to one main portion of their work, to the level of ordinary uninspired men, and to ascribe to the office-bearers of the Church in subsequent times an equal right and fitness to determine the arrangements of Christ's kingdom with that which the apostles possessed. But there is a wide distinction betwixt these two questions. As to the former, it is only a difference of degree which divides parties; for those who hold, as a general rule, the binding force of apostolic practice, admit that some things which were sanctioned by them which are not now of obligation. But as to the latter question, the difference is of kind or principle, because we hold it as a great general truth, that it is unwarrantable and unlawful to introduce into the government and worship of the Christian Church any arrangements and ordinances which have not been positively sanctioned by Christ or his apostles; and because, when this general truth is denied, there is no limit that can be put to the introduction of the inventions of men into the government and worship of Christ's house.

Such is the ground taken by Dr. Cunningham on the question of the obligation of apostolic practice. The concluding sentence is in his own words. They set forth the serious question which divides even Protestants from one another; some holding, as the Church of England in her twentieth article, that "the Church has power to decree rites and ceremonies;" others maintaining that the government and the worship of God are, like his doctrine, of divine institution; that human inventions in either of these three departments are abominable and offensive; that will-worship is always sinful in man and hateful to God; that the worst errors of Popery began in the desire for improving upon God's revelation and institutes; and that the Church is never safe except as she stands upon the sanctions of the very word.

There is one more principle which our author derives from the Scripture history of this council, and that is the *jus divinum* of a

particular form of church-government. Like everything from Dr. C.'s pen, what he writes on this point is moderate and fair in the highest degree; yet he does not hesitate to declare: "From all this the conclusion manifestly follows, that a particular form of church-government has been laid down in Scripture as permanently binding upon the Church of Christ, that form being the Presbyterian one;" and again: "Presbyterianism, in its substance or fundamental principles, is binding *jure divino* as the form of government by which the Church of Christ ought permanently and every where to be regulated."

The apostolic fathers is the next topic to which, as treated by Dr. C., we would advert. Speaking of Clemens Romanus, whose first epistle to the Corinthians is universally admitted to be genuine, and, as is well known, is, as Dr. C. avers, "in its whole scope and spirit and several particular statements," "in so far as it throws any light upon the government which the apostles established," "unequivocally and decidedly Presbyterian, or at least anti-prelatic;" our author dwells upon the contrast between the writings of the apostles and their immediate successors as one never to be overlooked or forgotten. Neander had also noticed this contrast as a "singular phænomenon, which should lead to the acknowledgment of a special agency of the divine Spirit in the souls of the apostles." The transition, Neander describes as being not gradual, as transitions generally are wont to be, but "sudden and abrupt." Accordingly, Dr. C. remarks that, besides the testimony afforded by Clement as by the rest of the fathers to the leading facts and documents of Scripture, the only things for the knowledge of which we are indebted to this ancient writer, "are these two: First, that the scriptural and apostolic identity of bishops and presbyters continued in the Church after the apostles left the world; and, secondly, that pastors continued, as under the apostolic administration, to be settled only with the cordial consent of the church or congregation. These things have been made known to us through the instrumentality of Clement. We receive and value the information, but it is information which most of those who profess the greatest respect for the authority of the fathers, and who are in the habit of

charging Presbyterians with disregarding and despising them, seem but little disposed to welcome." So of Polycarp's epistle to the church at Philippi, (likewise universally acknowledged to be genuine,) our author says we learn from the inscription and the epistle itself, that other presbyters were associated with Polycarp in the government of the church at Smyrna; and that at this time the church at Philippi had presbyters and deacons, as bishops and deacons are seen there in Paul's epistle sixty years before; which may be regarded as a confirmation, if a thing so clear needs any confirmation, that in Scripture, bishop and presbyter are the same, and that this identity, established by apostles and sanctioned by Scripture, continued for some time after the inspired rulers of the Church were taken away. But, respecting Christ or the apostles, their actions or their doctrines, we learn from Polycarp nothing but what is at least as fully and plainly taught us in the canonical Scripture. With respect to Ignatius and the Ignatian epistles, Dr. C. has a section which is very interesting and very satisfactory, but our space forbids any further allusion to it.

So much for those fathers who, because they lived during the life-time of the apostles, have been called the apostolical fathers. But how is it with all the others? Dr. Cunningham lays down two positions which cannot be gainsaid: The first is, that we have no certain information of what the inspired apostles taught and ordained, except what is contained in the canonical Scripture. And the second is, that the inspired books of Scripture furnish all the guidance, in matters of religion, upon which we can implicitly rely. No other writers but these are safe guides for our feet. Justin Martyr, for example, wrote about the middle of the second century, and is justly one of the most revered of the fathers; but Justin Martyr "does not *profess* to communicate to us any information that had been derived from the apostles in addition to what has been conveyed to us through the channel of the sacred Scriptures." Irenæus, who lived till the close of the second century, "cannot be said to have conveyed to us any valuable information as to what the apostles taught or ordained, in addition to what is taught or ordained in the Scriptures," as

our author very fully evinces in a detailed account of his writings. Clement of Alexandria, in the end of the second and beginning of the third century, was the most eminent and influential of Christian teachers. "The general character and tendency of his writings impress us with the conviction that the Church has already greatly degenerated, both in doctrine and character." What has been said of Justin, of Irenæus, and of Clement, may be said also of Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian; so that the notion, so common amongst a class of Christians, that "the fathers had some inferior species of inspiration, entitling their views to more respect than those of ordinary men, is utterly baseless." "There is no very *material* assistance to be derived by us from the fathers, either of the earlier or of subsequent centuries." "A great deal too much importance has been attached to the testimony of the fathers." "We must draw a broad line betwixt any merely human authority and the testimony of Scripture. We are not bound to believe or practise anything as of divine authority unless the proof and warrant for it can be deduced from the word of God." "There are no men except the authors of the inspired books of Scripture to whom there is any plausible pretence for calling upon us to look up as guides or oracles."

Upon the subject of the constitution of the Church, our author remarks that Prelatists have been usually very loud and confident in appealing to the testimony of the primitive Church, and that if the primitive Church meant the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, they could no doubt produce a great body of testimony in their favor—testimony, however, which becomes feebler and feebler during every generation as we go backwards, until the truly primitive New Testament period, when it entirely disappears. He says: "The substance of what we are persuaded can be fully established upon this point, is this: that there was no Prelacy in the apostolic age; that there is no authentic evidence of its existence in the generation immediately succeeding that of the apostles; that the first faint traces of Prelacy, or rather of something like it, are to be seen about the middle of the second century; and that the power of prelates continued gradually to

increase and extend, until, by the end of the fourth century, it had attained a condition pretty similar to that which modern prelatic Churches exhibit. \* \* \* \* \* If there be anything approaching to accuracy in this general statement, it would seem very like as if Prelacy were a feature or part of the great apostasy from scriptural truth and order \* \* \* \* which was at length fully developed in the anti-Christian system of the Church of Rome; in other words, it might seem as if Prelacy were a branch or portion of Popery. \* \* \* \* At the same time, it is perhaps more proper and becoming that, out of regard to the valuable services which many prelates and Prelatists have rendered to the cause of Protestantism, we should abstain from the application of the term Popish to Prelacy, and content ourselves with asserting and proving that it has no warrant in Scripture or primitive antiquity, and therefore should not exist in the Church of Christ. But still, when Prelatists open their case, as they often do, by asserting that Prelacy prevailed over the whole Christian world for fifteen hundred years, and was found obtaining over the whole Church at the period of the Reformation, and adduce this as a presumption of its truth, it is neither unbecoming nor unreasonable to remind them that if it prevailed generally till the time of the Reformation, it was rejected by the great body of the Reformers as a popish corruption; that we can cut off two or three centuries from the commencement of their fifteen hundred years; and that then we can show that some other popish corruptions can be traced back, at least in their germs or rudiments, to as venerable an antiquity, and enjoyed thereafter as general a prevalence as Prelacy can claim." Vol. I., pp. 227-231.

We have entered at so great length into an account of our author's views upon the doctrine of the Church, that we must refer very briefly to his treatment of other topics. His discussion of the early controversies respecting the Trinity, occupies some fifty pages, followed by some thirty pages concerning the history of the Pelagian controversy. Then comes a historical statement and a doctrinal exposition of the worship of saints and of images, the germ of it being that excessive veneration for martyrs and

confessors, which began to show itself at a very early age, and which, constantly growing and enlarging through the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, culminated at the second Council of Nice, in 787. From this point, the author returns to the age of Constantine, to consider the relation then first established between the Church and the State. Discussing under this head briefly the topics, voluntarism, coördinate authorities, Erastianism, and the popish theory, he passes down to the twelfth century, and takes up the scholastic theology, and then the canon law. Afterwards he discusses the witnesses for the truth during the middle ages, and then comes down to the Church at the era of the Reformation. Dr. C. considers the state of Romish doctrine as affected by the councils of Fourth Lateran, of Florence, of Constance, and especially, at great length, of Trent. The doctrines of the fall of man and of the will, under many particulars, are both fully considered, which brings the work to the close of volume first. The second opens with the doctrine of justification. Then follows the sacramental principle. The Socinian controversy and the Arminian controversy are then presented at great length and in completeness, and the work closes with two chapters on church-government and the Erastian controversy.

Let us dwell for a moment on the delineation of Socinianism. Dr. C. adverts to the common, and certainly in some sense, the true saying, that it is "a mere negation." He says they have *positive* opinions. "They not only deny the doctrine of the Trinity, but they positively assert that the Godhead is one in person as well as in essence. They not only deny the proper divinity of Jesus Christ, but they positively assert that he was a mere man—that is, a man and nothing else or more than a man. They not only deny the vicarious atonement of Christ which most other professing Christians reckon the foundation of their hopes for eternity, but they assert that men, by their own repentance and good works, procure the forgiveness of their sins and the enjoyment of God's favor; and thus, while denying that, in any proper sense, Christ is their Saviour, they teach that men save themselves, that is, in so far as they need salvation. While they deny that the Spirit is a person who possesses the divine

nature, they teach that the Holy Ghost in Scripture describes or expresses merely a quality or attribute of God. They have their own positive doctrines upon all these points." Vol. II., p. 169. But, Dr. C. adds, "Socinianism, in its germs or radical principles, is the system of theology that is natural to fallen and depraved man. \* \* \* \* It has been often said that men are born Papists; and this is true. \* \* \* \* Still it does require *some* care and culture to make a natural man, who has not been subjected to the system from his infancy, a Papist, though the process, in ordinary cases, is not a very difficult or a very elaborate one. But it requires *no* care or culture whatever to make natural men Socinians. \* \* \* \* The more enlightened pagans and the followers of Mahomet agree in substance with the whole leading features of the Socinian theology; and if we could bring out and estimate the notions that float in the minds of the great body of irreligious and ungodly men among professing Christians who have never thought seriously upon religious subjects, we should find that they just constitute the germs or radical principles of Socinianism. Take any one of the mass of irreligious men who abound in professedly Christian society around us—a man, it may be, who has never entertained any doubts of the truth of Christianity; who has never thought seriously upon any religious subject, or attempted to form a clear and definite conception upon any theological topic—try to probe a little the vague notions which lie undeveloped in his mind about the divine character, the natural state and condition of man, and the way of attaining to ultimate happiness; and if you can get materials for forming any sort of estimate or conjecture as to the notions or impressions upon these points that may have spontaneously and without effort grown up in his mind, you will certainly find, that, without being aware of it, he is practically and substantially a Socinian." P. 186.

But we have sufficiently described this work, and given specimens enough of its discussions, to enable our readers to form a tolerably complete idea of its value. Dr. Archibald Alexander, three and thirty years ago, impressed upon our minds the idea that doctrine should be studied historically as well as

didactically. The history of opinions he held to be as important for their proper understanding as any possible exposition of them. We trust we have succeeded in recommending to the favor and confidence of some at least of our readers, the learned and candid and patient guide who proposes in these volumes to aid them in such researches.

Dr. Cunningham, frequently, as he proceeds in his historical disquisitions, allows himself to utter his definite opinion of men, of books, and of things in general, sometimes without stopping to argue the grounds of the opinion. A few of these utterances we propose to present to our readers, and so close this notice.

“I think it is very much to be regretted that so very inadequate and defective a summary of the leading principles of Christianity as the Apostles’ Creed—possessed of no authority and having no extrinsic claims to respect—should have been exalted to such a place of prominence and influence in the worship and services of the Church of Christ. \* \* \* \* It is, I believe, in some measure from \* \* \* \* having the Apostles’ Creed pressed upon men’s attention in the ordinary public services of the Church as a summary of Christian doctrine, entitled to great deference and respect, that we are to account for the ignorance and indifference respecting the great principles of evangelical truth by which so large a proportion of the ordinary attenders upon the services of the Church of England have been usually characterised.” Vol. I., p. 93.

“Blondell’s work, entitled, ‘*Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi*,’ is usually reckoned the most learned work ever written in defence of Presbytery.” P. 191.

“Calvin was moderator of the Presbytery of Geneva as long as he lived, probably just because no other man would take the chair while he was present.” P. 236.

“Take, for example, Turretine’s system; a book which is of inestimable value. In the perusal of this great work, occasionally some difficulty will be found, especially at first, in fully understanding its statements from ignorance of or imperfect acquaintance with scholastic distinctions and phraseology; but, as the reader becomes familiar with these, he will see more and more



clearly how useful they are, in the hands of a man like Turretine, in bringing out the exact truth upon difficult and intricate questions, and especially in solving the objections of adversaries. These considerations may perhaps be sufficient to show that it is worth while to give some degree of attention to the study of scholastic theology, so far at least as to acquire some acquaintance with the distinctions and the language of the schoolmen." P. 419.

"Grotius, whose inadequate sense of the importance of sound doctrine, and unscriptural and spurious love of peace, made him ever ready to sacrifice or compromise truth, whether it was to please Papists or Socinians." Vol. II., p. 83.

"Augustine, by far the greatest and most useful man whom God gave to the Church from the apostolic age till the Reformation." P. 42.

"It is true that even Augustine, notwithstanding all his profound knowledge of divine truth, and the invaluable services which he was made the instrument of rendering to the cause of sound doctrine and of pure Christian theology, does not seem to have ever attained to distinct apprehensions of the forensic meaning of justification, and usually speaks of it as including or comprehending regeneration; and this was probably owing, in some measure, to his want of familiarity with the Greek language, to his reading the New Testament in Latin, and being thus somewhat led astray by the etymological meaning of the word *justification*." P. 41.

"Augustine, indeed, eminently as he was furnished by the great Head of the Church both with gifts and graces for defending and promoting divine truth, is not by any means an infallible judge, to whom we can securely trust. God has never given to any uninspired man or body of men to rise thoroughly and in all respects above the reach of the circumstances in which they have been placed, and the influences to which they have been subjected; and Augustine was certainly involved to a considerable extent in some of the corrupt and erroneous views and practices which in his time were already prevailing widely in the Church. There are, it must be admitted, some of the

corruptions of Popery, the germs of which at least, though not fully developed, are to be found in his writings. But the great defect with which he is chargeable is, that he seems to have had no very clear or accurate views of the great doctrine of justification by faith. He did not accurately understand the meaning of justification as a forensic or judicial term, as distinguished from sanctification; and he seems to have, to some extent, confounded them together, as the Church of Rome still does. It could not be, indeed, that a man of Augustine's undoubted and eminent piety, and with so deep a sense as he had of human depravity and of God's sovereignty in determining man's character and condition, could have been resting upon any works or merits of his own for salvation, and therefore he must practically and in heart have been resting upon Christ alone; and this general statement must have been true of many others besides him in the early and middle ages, who had obscure or erroneous views upon this subject. But he had certainly not attained to any such knowledge of God's word in regard to this matter as would have enabled him to give a very accurate or consistent exposition of the reason or ground of his hope. I formerly had occasion to explain, that, at a very early period in the history of the Church, the scriptural doctrine of justification became obscured and lost sight of, and was never again revived in all its fulness and purity until the Lord raised up Luther as his instrument in effecting that important result. The early fathers soon began to talk in an unscriptural and mystical way about the objects and effects of the sacraments; and at length they came to talk of baptism as if it not only signified and represented, but actually conferred, and conferred invariably, both the forgiveness of sins and the renovation of men's moral natures. Augustine knew too much of the word of God, and of the scheme of divine truth, to go thoroughly into such views as these; but he certainly had such notions of the nature and effects of baptism, and of its connexion with the forgiveness of sins, as to lead him, to some extent, to overlook and throw into the background, if not to pervert, the scriptural doctrine of justification by faith alone. \* \* \* \* \* He showed very strikingly how much he was perverted by

erroneous and exaggerated views of the nature, objects, and importance of external ordinances, by broadly and unequivocally laying down the doctrine that all infants dying unbaptized are consigned to everlasting misery—a doctrine which is still generally taught in the Church of Rome." Vol. I., pp. 331–3.

*Studies in the Book of Psalms : Being a Critical and Expository Commentary, with Doctrinal and Practical Remarks on the entire Psalter.* By WILLIAM S. PLUMER, D. D., LL. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1866. Royal octavo, pp. 1211.

This work of Dr. Plumer is written in a spirit of reverential love of the Sacred Scriptures, and of deep and special interest in these ancient songs of Zion, so abounding in consolation to the people of God in all ages. It is well that he has devoted "a portion of the afternoon of his life to the study of this incomparable collection of sacred poems." And, in our judgment, he has done his work ably and well. The volume he has produced is of large proportions, but not greater than was due to these important and precious writings, in which David, Solomon, Moses, Heman, Jeduthun, Ethan, and the sons of Korah, gave forth the utterances of their hearts, in sorrow and joy, under the inspiration of the Most High; and in which the Church of old, with psaltery and harp and high-sounding cymbals, uttered his praise. It is a work which has filled up the intervals, not otherwise employed, of many years. In reply to the question why he undertook it, he gives these excellent answers: 1. That "the word of God is not bound; it is open to all." 2. That "he had a mind to it; he had never felt more disposed to any work." "He felt his own poverty, and wished to be enriched." And wisely did he occupy himself, for this end, with the words of David, the son of Jesse, the man who was raised on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, the sweet psalmist of Israel, by whom the Lord spake, who had his word on his tongue. 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, 2. Nor less rich in heavenly wisdom are the words of others, the associates of David, in those holy strains that have fired the souls of poets not inspired, have filled the solitary

chambers of God's children with the incense of devotion and praise, have soothed their spirits on their dying-beds, have imbued the literature of many lands—strains which are still vigorous and young, and are to be sung by countless myriads of other nations and times.

The Introduction to the Commentary is rich in instruction, dwelling, as it does, on the chief points of interest touching this wonderful book. In the Exposition itself, the practical predominates rather than the critical, though the variations of the ancient and modern versions, and the opinions of the best commentators are given. The necessity of this may be appreciated less by others, but this very profusion is welcome to the student to whom free access to authors and costly libraries is denied. Chrysostom, Augustine, and the Fathers, speak in it; Luther, Calvin, Beza, and the Reformers; Musculus, Amesius, Cocceius, Venema, and the divines of a subsequent age; Hooker, Lowth, Patrick, Michaelis, and the divines of the last century; and Hengstenberg, Tholuck, and Alexander of this; and a host of others pour their stores into this treasury. The doctrinal and critical remarks which follow the exposition are apt and suggestive, the utterances of a mind deeply imbued with divine truth, and taught in the school of religious experience by the Spirit of God. It is a book for the study and the closet, for the minister of the gospel and the people of his charge.

As a specimen of the more critical portion of the work, we quote from the Introduction what is said on that much disputed word, *Selah*, found in Habakkuk and the Psalms.

“The word, *Selah*, is found no where in Scripture but in thirty-nine of the Psalms and in the third chapter of Habakkuk; in the Psalms seventy-four times and in Habakkuk thrice. Our translators have left it as they found it. Bishop Jebb has devoted great attention to this word, and has reached the following safe conclusions, viz., that the word is an integral part of the sacred word; that it does not mean ‘*amen*,’ ‘*forever*,’ ‘*mark this well*,’ or ‘*nota bene*,’ that it never occurs in the alphabetical Psalms, nor in the Songs of degrees, nor in any Psalm composed after the Captivity; that the prayer of Habakkuk was composed at a time when the Temple service had been restored to great grandeur; that nothing can be confidently spoken respecting the

etymological meaning of this word; that the Septuagint renders the word invariably by *Diapsalma*, which marks a division of some kind; and that the word is put as a musical notation. Many will doubt whether this writer has fairly maintained another view which had been formerly given by Burkus in his *Gnomon Psalmorum*, that *Selah* is a mark of division, discriminating one moral portion of a Psalm from another. Without discussing at length this theory, which has been presented with some plausibility, it may be said that it does not seem to suit every case. The only ground yet taken and successfully maintained is that *Selah* is a simple direction to the musicians, the precise force of which is not known to us. The word is not found 'in the later editions of the Vulgate, nor in the Syriac, nor in the Arabic translations,' nor does the Church of England use it in her Psalter. Yet it is very properly retained in our authorised version of the Scriptures. And if any should feel disposed to pronounce it, let none be offended. It is undoubtedly a part of the holy writings given to us. Patrick: 'And here I must note, once for all, that it cannot be certainly known what is meant by the word SELAH, which we meet withal thrice in this (the third) short Psalm. The most probable opinion is that it was a note in musick. \* \* \* That musick being now lost, some interpreters have wholly omitted this word *Selah*, as I shall also do.' Calvin: 'As the word *Selal*, from which *Selah* is derived, signifies to lift up, we incline to the opinion of those who think it denotes the lifting up of the voice in harmony in the exercise of singing.' Venema thinks it calls for an elevation of the voice in singing the Psalm. Alting thinks it calls for a repetition of the words immediately preceding. The Chaldee renders it, *forever*. It should be stated, however, that it is designed to fix the minds of the godly on the matter, which has just been spoken of in any given case, as well as to regulate the singing in such a manner as to make the music correspond to the words and the sentiment. Alexander also says that *Selah* is 'properly a musical term, but generally indicates a pause in the sense as well as the performance.' A writer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, says:

"'Rabbi Kimchi regards it as a sign to elevate the voice. The authors of the Septuagint translation appear to have regarded it as a musical or rythmical note. Herder regarded it as indicating a change of note; Mathewson, as a musical note, equivalent, perhaps, to the word *repeat*. According to Luther and others, it means *silence*! Gesenius explains it to mean, 'Let the instruments play and the singers stop.' Wocher regards it as equivalent to *sursum corda*—up, my soul! Sommer,

after examining all the seventy-four passages in which the word occurs, recognises in every case 'an actual appeal or summons to Jehovah.' They are calls for aid and prayers to be heard, expressed either with entire directness, or if not in the imperative, 'Hear, Jehovah!' or, 'Awake Jehovah!' and the like, still earnest addresses to God that he would remember and hear, etc. The word itself he regards as indicating a blast of the trumpets by the priests. Selah, itself, he thinks an abridged expression, used for Higgsion Selah—Higgsion indicating the sound of the stringed instruments, and Selah a vigorous blast of trumpets.'"

In section 16 of the Introduction, the author's judgment is expressed respecting the assumption that the words Adam, Ish, and Enosh, the Hebrew equivalents for the English word man, are used emphatically, which was the opinion of Calvin, Piscator, Venema, Ainsworth, Patrick, Henry, Edwards, Pye Smith, and Hengstenberg.

"Patrick thinks that his theory gives us the key to the right understanding of the phrase, *the son of man*, so often found in the New Testament. But that title is sufficiently explained by simply saying that it declares the entire humanity of our Lord. No further meaning is required, or has been commonly accepted.

"It may seem almost presumption to express a doubt whether this theory is correct. Yet candor and truth are always worth more than they cost. The author has studied the matter with some care, and is not satisfied that any Psalmist ever used either of the words, Adam, Ish, or Enosh, in an emphatic sense, or as conveying the ideas contended for, or that the *primary* meaning of the words is ever to be insisted on in any part of these sacred songs.

"It is not at all here asserted that there is any impropriety in adverting at any time to the primary meaning of these or any other words of Scripture, if thereby the sense of any passage receives force. But it is simply denied that we have satisfactory evidence that these Hebrew words rendered *man* have an emphatic sense in the Psalms."

His opinion of the English version is thus given :

"Various translations of the Psalms are before the public. Many of them have much merit and preserve much of the heavenly savor of the original. All of them may occasionally afford a good hint. Of those made into English none can compare with the authorised version. Many devout persons have by long use become attached to the translation found in the prayer-book of

the Church of England. This version bears date from A. D. 1539. Their preference for this shows how precious God's word is in *any* translation, which is much used; but no competent scholar would agree that our authorised version has any successful rival. That just referred to is far more a translation of the Septuagint than of the Hebrew text. The Commentator Scott, who well deserves the epithet *Judicious*, says, 'The Prayer-book translation is in no respect comparable to the Bible translation.' Nearly all the translations now claiming public attention may be profitably consulted. The older English versions, from quaintness, if not from elegance, do often give the sense in a very striking way. The Polyglot Bibles may with great advantage be consulted by those whose scholarship is sufficient. The author thinks proper here to record his high estimate of the value of the English Bible now in common use. It seems to him that his brethren, who seek to bring it into disrepute, might be much better employed. He gives it as his deliberate judgment that he has never seen even one chapter done into English so well any where else. The learning of the men who made it, was vast, sound, and unquestionable. In this respect their little fingers were thicker than the loins of the men who decry their labors. The common people ought to be told that they have God's word in a better translation than that of the Septuagint, which was freely quoted by Christ and his apostles. Nothing is inspired but the original; yet those learned and modest men who have suggested improvements in the rendering of any text, should receive all due honor, and not be looked upon with suspicion."

As a specimen of the doctrinal and practical remarks, we quote the following on verses 1, 2, and 3, of the first Psalm:

"Though this is a wicked and suffering world, yet even here the righteous have real blessedness. It is not complete as it shall be after the resurrection, nor perfect as it shall be immediately after death; but it is solid, genuine, and enduring. It is from God. Their reliance is on him who knows how to give graces and comforts in right measure and in due season. The frames of the righteous vary, but their state is stable. The saving gifts of God are without repentance. With the saints something is settled. Their peace is secured by an everlasting covenant. Their principles are made strong by divine grace. They are like Mount Zion, which cannot be moved, but abideth forever. Clarke: 'The most momentous concern of man is the state he shall enter upon after this short and transitory life is

ended; and in proportion as eternity is of greater importance than time, so ought men to be solicitous upon what grounds their expectations with regard to that durable state are built, and on what assurances their hopes or their fears stand.' Even the wicked often admit that for the next world the righteous have chosen the good part, which shall not be taken from them. In this life things may often happen to the righteous hard to be borne. Cummings: 'The man who is born again, and seeks to be holy, as God is holy, is like the poor captive bird in the cage. The cage cannot kill the bird; the bird cannot free itself from the cage; it can only still wait, and persevere, and sing, and seek, and look, till the hour of its freedom. Its perfect emancipation into brighter realms and better days draws near.'

"But those who deny that piety affords delights, even in this life, are ignorant of its nature. It presents the most glorious themes, inspires the most blessed hopes, and affords the most elevated employments. Nothing in the service of God's people is degrading. It teaches the soul to lean on the bosom of God. South: 'The pleasure of the religious man is an easy and portable pleasure; such an one as he carries about in his bosom, without alarming either the eye or the envy of the world. A man putting all his pleasures into this one, is like a traveller's putting all his goods into one jewel; the value is the same, and the convenience greater.' If any ask, what are the foundations of the advantages of the righteous over the ungodly, it is easy to show some of them. First, the just man has *truth* on his side. His hopes and his cause are not based in falsehood, in error, in deception, in disguise, in fiction, in fancy. Truth will outlive all its opposites, though for a time it may fall in the streets. So that any wise man would accept a good title to an acre rather than a spurious title to leagues of land; would rather be charged with a murder of which he was innocent, than be guilty of a murder of which he was unsuspected. A truthful claim to a penny is really worth more than a fictitious claim to a pound. The reason is that in the end the truth, even in this life, does commonly appear. In the next world it cannot be concealed. 'For there is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested; neither was anything kept secret, but that it should come abroad.' Mark iv. 22. 'Some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment; and some men they follow after. Likewise also the good works of some are manifest beforehand; and they that are otherwise cannot be hid.' 1 Tim. v. 24, 25. Again, the righteous is on the side of *duty*. He honestly intends and endeavors to do what is right, because it is right and obligatory.



In the main even here it is found that fidelity brings the best rewards. Neglect of duty sometimes brings apparent ease and profit. But who would not prefer Joseph's dutifulness to Ahithophel's treachery? When the master is on a long journey, the lazy and disobedient servants may think their faithful brethren needlessly careful; but in the day of reckoning saints and sinners will alike see that a life spent in God's service ends happily, while a wicked life leads to misery alone. Besides, the people of God have *justice* on their side; and the impression is both general and well-founded that nothing forms a more ample shield to any one than having the right on his side. And the saints know that 'God is not unrighteous to forget their work and labor of love.' Moreover, God, with all his attributes, is on the side of the righteous. 'And, if God be for us, who can be against us?' That is inspired reasoning. It is also clear and level to the apprehension of the simple. Nor is this all. The righteous consults his best *interests*. He puts the soul above the body, eternity above time, and he is right. If his soul is refreshed, he remembers that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. If a blessed eternity is before him, he well judges that it matters little how much he may suffer in this world. Nothing is of such moment as an eternal well-being. Nor are the righteous at war with their own consciences, or best feelings. Jesus Christ has often called his friends to sacrifice ease, fame, earthly goods, old friendships, and even life itself. But, blessed be his name, he never asked any man to defile his conscience, nor to tarnish his honor by an act of meanness. If Eugene Beauharnais will retain the imperial favor of his step-father Napoleon, he must publicly unite in approving the dishonor put on his own mother. But the Almighty never called one of his servants to do a base thing. God always leaves the good conscience and good principles intact; yea, he greatly strengthens them. How then can the righteous but be blessed?"

The volume bears, on an appropriate page, the following dedication:

"TO MANY TRIED FRIENDS; TO MY SPIRITUAL CHILDREN; TO THE CHURCHES I HAVE SERVED; TO MY BELOVED STUDENTS; AND TO ALL WHO HOPE WITH ME TO SING THE SONG OF MOSES AND THE LAMB; THESE STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF PSALMS ARE AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED BY THEIR SERVANT IN CHRIST, WILLIAM S. PLUMER."

The work has met with favor from the religious public, and the VOL. XVII., NO. 3.—16.

first edition, we learn, is already exhausted. It fills a place not fully occupied by any other exposition of the Book of Psalms. It is written in a style vigorous and manly, simple yet dignified, enlivened, often, by a historic or biographic allusion, or by one of those condensed epigrammatic sentences, which, like goads, stimulate the otherwise torpid understanding and rouse conscience from its sleep.

*The Law of God, as contained in the Ten Commandments, explained and enforced.* By WM. S. PLUMER, D. D., LL. D. Philadelphia: Pres. Board of Publication. 12mo., pp. 644.

This is a volume of real and substantial value. We predict for it long life and wide popularity. If we are not mistaken as to its true value and worth, it will ere long take rank with such books as Baxter's *Saints' Rest* and Doddridge's *Rise and Progress*, and will be read and valued when the great mass of contemporaneous productions of similar aspirations shall have passed away and been forgotten. No one who is familiar with Dr. Plumer's peculiar style of dealing with such subjects can hesitate for a moment to identify the authorship of this particular volume. It bears on its face many and unmistakable marks of the warm heart and broad intellect from which it emanated. The theme of which it treats, though familiar and somewhat trite, assumes new power and peculiar freshness in his hands, and the perusal of it leaves impressions upon the heart and memory that can never be effaced. We feel thankful that Dr. Plumer was prompted to write this book, and we have no doubt that every serious-minded Christian who reads it will unite with us in this feeling.

One of the most remarkable excellences of the book is the exhaustive character of the discussion it undertakes. Nothing that ought to be said is left out, whilst everything is said in a happy and satisfactory manner. Every possible aspect of the subject is brought out clearly, methodically, and logically. The nature of the Law, the time and manner of its appointment, its design and uses, the obedience it exacts, the place it occupies in the great scheme of Redemption, the abuses and false teachings

that have found currency in connexion with it, are all discussed in the fullest and most satisfactory manner.

Nor is this volume less remarkable for the unction which pervades it. The reader is brought, as it were, face to face with a living, personal God, whose authority he is compelled to acknowledge, and whose commands he feels bound to obey. While the impression will be deepened on his mind that he can be saved only by grace, he will be thoroughly convinced that the Law of God is indispensable as a rule of conduct, and that he cannot be a true disciple of Christ, or an heir of everlasting glory, unless he habitually conform his life to it.

This volume too, though this was not its primary design, contains nevertheless an admirable code of ethics. So deeply are we impressed with its value in this particular respect, that we would be glad to see it introduced into our schools and seminaries of learning as a text-book. It is no objection, but a recommendation, that it treats of our duties and obligations to God, as well as to our fellow-men. These two things ought never to have been separated in the moral training of our youth, and we would be glad to see them reunited in all our literary institutions.

*Passages in the Life of the Faire Gospeller, Mistress Anne Askew.* Recounted by ye unworthy pen of Nicholas Moldwarp, B. A. And now first set forth by the author of "Mary Powell." "*Rather Death than false of Faith.*" New York: M. W. Dodd, 506 Broadway: 1866. 12mo; 237 pages.

Miss Manning is a true artist, rich in many gifts, but chiefly remarkable for the exquisite delicacy of her taste. She excels in that nice adjustment of situation, scenery, characters, language, and general tone, which painters, in their art, praise so highly, when they say of a picture that it is "in keeping." Add to this marked feature of her writings, if you would justly characterise them, English clear as crystal, and pure as close study of the older writers can make it; a grace of thought, matched only in its sweetness by the kindred grace of expression; a tender softness in the treatment of sorrow, that makes each touch of

pathos far more effective than passionate outbursts can; and, withal, a quaint, half-hidden humor that peeps out shyly from time to time, like a happy child with his face half buried in his mother's lap. These are her ways of charming; and her full sympathy with trust in God's overruling providence and faith in the Saviour of men, in all lands and all ages, infuses into her writings a life and beauty that draw their inspiration from a higher source than human genius.

This touching tale of faith strong unto death, the history of one of the earliest martyrs of the Reformation in England—a woman too, tender, delicate, and fair—is told with a chaste simplicity that makes it more true than sober annals, more thrilling than high-wrought tragedy.

The pretended manuscript of Master Nicholas Moldwarp is prefaced by a pleasant and humorous sketch, which some unknown friend of William Shakspeare gives to the great dramatist, of a visit paid to Mrs. Anne Askew's deserted house and the interview had there with Master Nicholas, the old librarian, and the house-porter, Jasper.

The good old scholar begins his tale by showing how he came to be so nearly connected with the Askew household, being sent by Sir William to Cambridge, because he early betrayed an ardent thirst for learning, and, as his house-steward's son, excited the kind old knight's interest. His disappointment in obtaining a fellowship induces Sir William to provide for him by appointing him to take charge of his library. This position puts him in intimate association with the young people of the family; and thus, from her very earliest years, Mistress Anne, his favorite, is his pupil and dear little lady. The quaint picture given of the growth and nurture of these young scions of the house of Askew, orphaned of their mother, and reared under the disadvantages occasioned by the father's straitened means after his expensive attendance on his sovereign at the Field of Cloth of Gold, is entertaining enough to warrant many quotations, had we space to insert them. It must suffice to say that Mistress Anne grows in grace and loveliness, while Master Nicholas busies himself with instructing and amusing the young folk, keeping up

all the time a steady intercourse with the student-world of Cambridge, and rendering into English Dr. Martin Luther's treatises, which were just beginning to make a stir in the world.

In the midst of this happy life, Sir William marries again, and a new order of things reigns in the household. Master Nicholas's own words best describe the change: "New brooms sweep clean. 'Tis a homely proverb to apply to a Lady. Ne'ertheless, our new Lady cleaned us up to that state of polish that we shone again." The new mother proves in truth a notable housekeeper, and keeps all things in exact discipline, from putting pretty Mistress Anne's golden locks under a coif to making a rich match for the eldest son. The domestic economy, which prevails under her *regime*, Master Nicholas gives us briefly thus:

"Now here ye shall see the perfect order and daily course of this honorable family. Mass, to begin with, at six o'clock; a certain portion of study; then Breakfast; then study again; afterwards exercise, in the open air, weather permitting; study again; Dinner; eleven o' the clock till twelve some open-air pastime; Even-song at three hours after noon; general talk in the hall, toward dusk, round the fire, during the short days; Study again; Supper, six o' the clock to seven; to bed at nine, after Complines."

While they live this quiet and retired life, great events are coming to pass around them; and King Henry's impartial persecutions of both faiths put in hazard the profession of any fixed creed. At this time, the news of Bilney's burning gives Mistress Anne her first glimpse of the faith and fortitude it takes to be a martyr. The discourse she has on this topic with her good Master Nicholas is affecting, and marks her early steadiness of soul and undaunted resolve. A short time after this incident, he is sent by Sir William to the continent as companion to Master Francis, his son. Well provided for their travels, and with the prayers of those they leave for their safety, they set out gaily for the seaport, and are soon landed at Flushing, with only a little sea-sickness on the way to damp their joy. Of his young charge he says:

"At that time, Master Francis was as handsome and engaging a Youth as you would be likely to meet in the course of the

longest day. His raiment and equipage were point-device, for he loved to go handsomely apparelled. We were on very pleasing terms together, for he was affable and I compliant; and, at first, my knowledge of the language gave me so much the advantage, and his want of it left him so much behindhand, that I continually took the Lead; but this was of no long continuance. He soon picked up a smattering of the Vernacular wherever we went, and with a better accent than mine."

Arrived in Paris, after visiting the most famous Dutch cities, Master Francis becomes a gay gallant, and does not submit so readily to the counsel of his governor. But, after some stay in that lively city, by the advice of the English ambassador they set out again on their travels, turning their faces toward Italy. On the voyage from Marseilles to Genoa a storm assails them; but they escape its dangers and safely reach their haven, "noting, with rapture, the charming Villas scattered over the Hills, and inhaling the odours of Orange, Citron, and Jasmine, that were wafted off shore." They visit Genoa in her period of greatest glory, when she had her Andrew Doria. At Ferrara, they see the poet Ariosto; at Arezzo, Michael Angelo. From Padua they go to Venice, sailing down the Adige into the Adriatic, and beholding that "beautiful City, contemplating herself as in a Mirrour in the tremulous waters." The following picture of the "Bride of the Adriatic" we cannot refrain from giving, so rich and brilliant is it:

"Most delightful was it to float over the liquid surface of those watery streets of gorgeous Palaces, with their flights of steps, terraces and balconies, and to catch glimpses of fair women and stately cavaliers leaning over the balustrades, or descending or ascending the marble stairs; to see other Gondolas, with their high steel beaks, and tasselled curtains, dart out from unseen coverts and glide by as silently as bats; while others gave forth silvery sounds of music and mirth. At sundry points, the Gondolas were so crowded together that they were like to sink one another, swaying fearfully to one side. All the nobility seemed out on the Canals, enjoying the pleasant freshness of the air after a hot summer day.

"Sometimes the Gondolier used his oar as a helm, and let the little vessel float idly at its will. We lingered on the water till long after the general concourse had dispersed, and till lights

began to glimmer through windows, and purple night set in, glorified by an infinity of stars, and till the moon arose and cast broad lights and deep black shadows. Now and then a solitary Gondola fleeted past like a swallow on the wing; and once a large one, closely curtained with black, and with muffled oars, passed noiselessly along in the deep shadow; and our Gondolier told us, when it had passed, that it belonged to the Inquisition, and was carrying forth a prisoner, or prisoners. to be drowned in the Laguna. A sorrowful death, I thought; and I strained my ears, though vainly, to hear the fatal splash."

The next paragraphs describe the chanting by the gondoliers of stanzas from Ariosto. But our space is limited, and we must pass on.

In Venice, Master Francis gets into trouble, and is only extricated from the toils by sudden news of his father's illness summoning him home in hot haste. They return, to find Sir William an invalid indeed, but not by any means a dying man, and sweet Mistress Anne grown up as beautiful as a May morning, and deeply versed in polemical studies from Master Nicholas's books. Then comes the wedding of Master Francis, and his being knighted by King Henry, after which Master Nicholas writes his famous "Treatyse on the Adornment of Gardens." Some time after, they are all saddened by the death of Mistress Patty, one of our heroine's sisters; and then Mistress Anne is still further afflicted by her father's requiring her to marry Master Kyme, the betrothed of her dead sister. To this match she will not consent; and, to win her over, she is invited to Kelsey Hall, her brother's place, where all sorts of blandishments are brought to bear upon her unwilling heart, to induce her to yield. When she returns home, she is persuaded by her cousin, Edmund Britain, to obey her father in this matter; and, accordingly, the marriage takes place. Master Nicholas does not see her again, until she rides over with her little daughter, to see her father die. Not long after this death, Master Nicholas learns from his niece, Lettice, her maid, how his dear lady is misused by her husband, and how she is rated by him, in particular, for what he calls her "Gospelling." A little later, Mistress Anne, with her two babes and the faithful Lettice, comes at dead

of night for refuge to the old home and the good and trusty friend of her youth, she having been turned out of doors by her harsh husband. In this time of trouble, her brother proves most unbrotherly; and she finally goes to London for shelter, attended by Master Nicholas and her maid. Here she soon suffers persecution from the party in power, for professing the Reformed Faith, and visiting in prison the lecturer Porter. Questioned as to her belief in the Real Presence, she gets the better in argument of her examiners, and is therefore sent to prison. Twelve days having elapsed, she is examined by Bishop Bonner, and admitted to bail. During the period of her liberty, she passes much of her time with the great ladies who favor the Reformed Faith, and enjoys from their support a temporary immunity from persecution. Her brother having provided for her a seemingly safe retreat away from the dangers threatening her in a residence so near the court, she withdraws from that perilous neighborhood. She is betrayed by this brother, once so fond a playmate, into the hands of her enemies. Brought before the Privy Council, she shows the same coolness and presence of mind when baited by Gardiner, as before Bonner on a previous occasion, and replies to his subtle questionings in such guarded terms as to elude his endeavors to entrap her. Refusing to give up the names of those who had contributed to her needs in prison, she is put to torture, but endures it with constancy, her brave soul unshaken by the racking of her delicate limbs. Repeatedly offered mercy, if she will recant, her constant reply is, "Rather death than false of faith." Refusing to recant, she is doomed to be burned to death at Smithfield. The closing scenes are best given in Master Nicholas's own words. First, his parting with her:

"I found Mistress Anne sewing a button to the collar of the long white garment she was to wear on the morrow, and biting off the Thread as I had oft seene her do in happier hours. She raised her Angel Face, which was as calm as if she were preparing for some Christian festival, and holding out her hand, sayd, 'O dear friend, how it joys me to see you! Do not go to Smithfield to-morrow; it will tax you too sorelie. My light affliction, which will be but for a moment, will lead to a far more exceeding and



eternal weight of glory.' I said, 'How can you call it light?' 'Because the Lord makes it so,' she replied. \* \* \* \* \* She took one of my hands in both her own, and though so wrenched by that vile Rack that she could not set foot on the ground, she looked in my face and smiled and sang till I almost wished to die hearing her so sing. Then she said, 'Let us pray.' And prayed for us all, and for her enemies, and last for herself. \* \* \* \* She kissed me, once and agayn, calling me her father, bade me give her love to Lettice, and Mistress Berry, and all inquiring friends; then waved me off, still smiling, with—'Now go: I have another to see: good-bye! good-bye! Have a care of your health, Nicholas! We shall meet agayn!'"

And thus they parted. But the old scholar could not obey her injunction not to go to her execution. He was there to see her happy end.

"A strange, confused moan or groan from many voices, arose as the Martyrs came in, with bare heads and feet, and in long white Garments. Inasmuch as, by reason of her previous racking, Mistress Anne could not stand, she was brought in a Cart, containing a Chair, in which she was supported by two Sergeants at Arms. My eyes grew misty as they lifted her out, and when I could look at her agayn, she was bound with a chain to the same stake with another of the four Martyrs; and Fagots were being heaped about them. Then there was a Pause. \* \* \* \* Clouds of white, eddyng Smoke, and darting forks of Flame, now concealed the Martyrs from our eyes; but those nearest to them heard them utter pious Ejaculations. The Smoke parting a little, I saw deare Mistress Anne's head fallen on her chest, and felt assured she was smothered. The next instant, a loud Report caused a general outcry; the powder had exploded. Their light Affliction, which was but for a Moment, had been exchanged for a far more exceeding and eternal Weight of Glory."

So end forever the sorrows of sweet Mistress Anne Askew.

*Discussions on Church Principles: Popish, Erastian, and Presbyterian.* By WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, D. D., Principal and Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh. Edited by his Literary Executors. 8vo., pp. 576.

This volume constitutes the fourth, and we suppose the last, volume, of the works of Principal Cunningham. We have already expressed our opinion of the first three volumes. As of the VOL. XVII., NO. 3.—17.

essays in volume first, written at considerable intervals and originally published in varying forms, it may still be said, that they constitute one complete discussion of the topic which gives name to the book; so, in like manner, these discussions are by no means a miscellaneous collection. Prepared at different times and with different objects in view, yet the editors have so selected them from amongst the writings, published and unpublished, of their author, that they embody a connected view, and a pretty thorough discussion, of the three leading theories of church-government referred to in the title.

The order in which these theories are discussed is that in which they there stand. The first five chapters discuss the leading principles of the Romish church system. The next three chapters bring up various questions of Church and State, and present us with a consideration of the church system of the Erastians. The remaining five chapters defend the great church principles which Presbyterians hold, against Prelatists and Papists on the one hand, and Erastians on the other. Dr. Cunningham brings to all these discussions extensive and profound learning, sound judgment, the utmost consideration, caution, and candor in the statement and defence of his opinions, and a patient zeal for the truth which makes him consider no pains too great for him to take in its elucidation and establishment.

One of the most interesting and instructive of these discussions is found in chapter V., on "The Liberties of the Gallican Church." Gallican independence of the Roman see began to assume a definite form in the quarrel of Philip the Fair with Pope Boniface VIII., at the end of the thirteenth century; but from a much earlier period there were indications that the French Church was indisposed to allow all the claims of the Roman bishops. At the period just now mentioned the papal power had culminated, and began to decline. The Sorbonne, that is, the theological faculty of the University of Paris, and the Parliament of Paris, generally were strenuous against the encroachments of Rome. Previous to 1682, it is Richer, Syndic of the Sorbonne, and Pithou, a celebrated jurist, whose writings maintain with chiefest power and influence, the liberties of the Gallican Church.

In 1682, the celebrated Bossuet procures the adoption of the famous "Declaration of the Gallican clergy." It asserted the civil power's independence of the spiritual; the Pope's having no authority in temporals; the superiority of councils over Popes; the obligation of the latter to regard the laws and customs of the French church; and that papal decisions, unless concurred in by the Church, were not "irreformable." This "Declaration" gave rise to much controversy, and able men attacked it, preeminent amongst whom was Charlas, President of a theological seminary at Pamiers; whose book Dr. Cunningham pronounces very valuable. Bossuet, Natalis Alexander, Fleury, and Dupin, were the principal defenders.

It is interesting to notice how these French divines, upon other topics not directly comprehended in the Gallican liberties, "approximated to sound and scriptural opinions in regard to the constitution and government of the Church, especially in regard to the relation that ought to subsist between bishops and presbyters, and between ecclesiastical office-bearers and the ordinary members of the Church. The causes of the comparative soundness of their opinions upon these points were that they were usually men of so much good sense and sound judgment as to perceive something of the unreasonableness and extravagance of the opposite doctrines—their inconsistency with the general scope and spirit of the New Testament; and that they sought to follow the practice of the early Church before its constitution and government were so extensively modified by papal corruptions." "They believed in the *jus divinum* of the papal supremacy, but they did not regard the Pope as the absolute monarch of the Church, as possessed of despotic authority over any other bishop, or as exempted from the control of the body of bishops. In like manner, they believed in the *jus divinum* of prelacy; but some of them attained to more reasonable and moderate views of the superiority of bishops over presbyters than have been put forth by some Prelatists who were not Romanists. The scriptural and primitive doctrine of the identity of bishops and presbyters has left traces of its influence through the whole history of the Church; traces which were not wholly obscured and suppressed

by the darkness and tyranny of popery." "We may refer, in illustration of this, to the declaration of Peter Lombard the Master of Sentences, that the primitive Church had but two orders of priesthood—the presbyterate and the diaconate; to the insertion, by Gratian, in the Canon Law, of the Presbyterian views of Jerome; and to the fact that some eminent Romish theologians, both before and since the Reformation, have maintained the position that the episcopate and the presbyterate are not two different *orders*, but two different *degrees* of one and the same order. The defenders of the Gallican Liberties \* \* \* \* have assigned a higher and more influential place to the presbyterate than many of the divines of the Church of England have done. \* \* \* \* Indeed, it was scarcely possible that with the sound judgment and the independent and candid examination of primitive antiquity, by which they were usually distinguished, they could fail to make some concessions to truth upon this point. Although they generally held that bishops were the successors of the apostles, and presbyters the successors of the seventy disciples, they saw and admitted that, even in apostolic times, the presbyters had a large share in the government of the Church; and they could not altogether resist the force of the evidence by which it has been shown, that, whatever may have been the precise stages and epochs in the gradual increase of prelatial authority, and whatever difficulty there may be in tracing them, it holds true, practically and substantially, that in primitive times the churches, to adopt Jerome's words, were governed by the common counsel of presbyters—*communi presbyterorum consilio Ecclesie gubernabantur.*" Pp. 157–160.

Our author points out some remarkable resemblances between the policy and arguments of Erastians on the one side, and Ultramontanists on the other; and how again Gallican Romanists and Presbyterians combine against them to establish the independence of Church and State as distinct societies. For example, Erastians assailed the independence of the Church, as maintained by Presbyterians, with the argument that there must be one supreme power to rule over all persons and all cases, or else the mischief of *imperium in imperio*. By the same argument

Ultramontanists assailed the independence of the State as maintained by the Gallicans. These parties of course apply this principle differently, the one vesting supremacy in the State, and the other in the Church. But it is curious and instructive that they should both make this principle the "mainstay of their argument." On the other hand, the fundamental principle of Presbyterians upon the relation of Church and State, our author describes as that of a *co-ordination of powers, and a mutual subordination of persons*; and then he quotes the great Gallican Dupin's unsurpassed statement of this fundamental Presbyterian principle thus: "It is to be observed that there is a great distinction between the power itself, and him who exercises the power; so that it may happen that he who exercises a power, may be subject to another power, although that power which he exercises is subject to no power. To apply this to the matter in hand, it is to be observed that the same man is at once a member both of civil and ecclesiastical society, and is therefore, in his person, subject both to the civil and the ecclesiastical power; but it does not by any means follow from this, that the civil power which he may possess is subject to the ecclesiastical, or the ecclesiastical to the civil; because he is subject to the civil power only in civil matters, and is subject to the ecclesiastical power in spiritual matters. Thus, bishops are subject to the regal power, but only in civil things: so that the power of bishops is not subject to the civil power, and hence the king cannot appoint or depose bishops by force or by civil authority. In like manner, kings are subject to bishops, to the Supreme Pontiff, and the spiritual power, but only in spiritual things; so that the temporal power which they have as kings, is in no way subject to the spiritual power; and hence kings cannot be appointed by ecclesiastical authority. On these grounds, though it is certain that kings are subject to the spiritual power, and bishops to the temporal power, we are not on this account warranted in saying that the ecclesiastical power is subject to the civil, or the civil to the ecclesiastical; for both these powers are entirely distinct and are dependent only on God by whom they were instituted; so that neither has any control or jurisdiction over the other,

although the spiritual is more noble than the temporal." (Pp. 153 and 154.) This paragraph is taken from a work published in 1691. The bearing of it is very strong upon a living issue in this country. This French Roman Catholic of near two hundred years ago, should teach a true and useful lesson to some American Presbyterians of this nineteenth century. The duty of loyalty belongs to individual office-bearers in the house of God; for the State has claims on them as well as the Church. But the idea of the Church, as such, being loyal to any government on the earth, is abhorrent to every rightly instructed Christian. At the same time, her being disloyal is equally abhorrent; for as the Church, she does not know any Cæsar, nor meddle with any of his concerns, except to teach her members to render faithfully to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.

Upon this whole subject of the relation of Church and State, the work before us is full of instruction, while, of course, no American can be expected to receive all of what the author would be likely to teach respecting it. This subject, as Dr. C. observes, has been the matter of controversy since the days of Constantine, and still divides men. Nor are these differences theoretical, but practical; so in all ages, so in our day. Now, more than ever, the subject is forced upon the attention of statesmen, says Dr. C.; and he might have added of churchmen likewise. All the errors still prevail, he says, which ever did obtain relative to this matter. In countries where the Church of Rome predominates, there still is persecution for conscience' sake; nor is it wholly banished from some other civilised lands, while, "in all Protestant countries, the civil powers have usurped, and the established Churches have consented to, an exercise of authoritative control by the State, inconsistent with scriptural views of the functions of the civil government, and with the rights and liberties of the Church of Christ." P. 196.

That the Church is by the ordination of its founder a society, a regulated union of many for the promotion of common interests, is clearly taught, says Dr. C., in Scripture, and plainly implied in all the representations there given of the kingdom of Christ and of its parts or sections. This, indeed, is generally admitted.

The Church is also represented in Scripture as a society differing essentially from the kingdoms of this world, both as to its origin and ends, its author and objects, its constitution and government, its officers and members, the standard by which its affairs are regulated, and the qualifications of those who should compose it. And this also is generally admitted. But differences of opinion have arisen as to the necessary permanence of this distinction in all circumstances, and as to some of the inferences deducible from it.

Now, Scripture sets before us the visible Catholic Church, consisting of all who profess the true religion and their children; but it also sets before us a number of churches, *each* an individual, but *all* parts or branches of the one Church. And the leading views of Scripture respecting the whole Church must needs apply equally, in substance, to every portion or section of the whole to which the designation of a Church can be legitimately given. Whatever is prescribed in Scripture to the visible Church as a whole, or as one organised society, in regard to its constitution, laws, and government, its relations to Christ, or to the kingdoms of this world, is equally binding upon every Church. The assumption of the character and designation of a Church by any organisation of professing Christians, larger or smaller, at once imposes upon it an obligation to conform to all that Scripture teaches respecting the kingdom of Christ. This, says Dr. C., is a principle of importance and of easy application. Every Church is bound to retain its distinctness from the kingdoms of this world. No change of circumstances can legitimately transmute a Church of Christ into a civil society. Some have contended that when the supreme civil power of a kingdom professes subjection to Christ's authority and a willingness to aid in carrying out the designs of the Church, especially if the chief part of the population should become members of the Church, then the distinctive character of the Church is virtually sunk in that of a Christian State. Something like this was Dr. Arnold's ground. The whole notion, however, is fundamentally erroneous. Christ has made his Church distinct and diverse from all the kingdoms of this world, and distinct and

diverse it must continue, if it would not abandon totally its relation to him. Thus it can easily be shown, says Dr. C., that the complete organisation of Church and State as distinct societies cannot be infringed upon without sin on the part of those concerned in it. So much for the permanence of the distinction.

One of the *inferences* from it which our author tells us has been disputed, and which our author himself disputes, is, that in no form or manner can there be any union or alliance between these distinct societies for mutual aid towards their common end. Here we must part company with Dr. Cunningham. His doctrine is that the general ends of the two societies, though different, are not opposite, but accordant, both being intended, in their respective spheres, to promote the glory of God and the welfare of man, and therefore they may enter into friendly union or alliance, provided that does not supersede their distinctness. The difficulty is that such an alliance does always destroy the distinctness of these two bodies. History, if we have not misunderstood its teachings, shows that whenever Church and State have been united, one of the two must dominate over the other, just as two distinct races of men never yet have dwelt together upon a perfectly equal footing. Let the Church and the State work for the common end which our author sets forth as belonging to the being of each, but let it be in their separate spheres. We can conceive of no gain from any kind of union between them; every such union is hurtful to both, but especially hurtful to the Church. Dr. C. proceeds to point out the limits of the respective spheres or provinces of the two powers, which he holds to be a very easy task. "Cæsar's things are the persons and the property of men, and God's things are the conscience of men and the Church of Christ." "Civil or temporal things are just the persons and the property of men, and ecclesiastical or spiritual things are just the ordinary, necessary business of the Church." "It is true that there are questions in which the civil and ecclesiastical elements are combined. Nay, it is true, as has been said, that there is no act so purely ecclesiastical, but that in some of its aspects and consequences it may come legitimately under the cognisance of the civil power; and no act so



civil that it may not, provided it be done by a member of the Church, come legitimately under the cognisance of the ecclesiastical authorities." But as concerns every admixture of these distinct elements which is proposed to be voluntarily made by man, Christ's prohibitory voice sounds aloud whilst he separates the one from the other, and commands, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

But whilst we decline to follow our author into a toleration of any union or alliance whatsoever of Church and State, we fully accord with him in the doctrine that the State not less than the Church is intended, by God who ordained it, to promote his glory and the welfare of the community (p. 205); and that Scripture plainly enough intimates civil government to be an ordinance of God, in some higher and more definite sense than merely this, that it is the natural appropriate result of the constitution which God has given to men, and of the ordinary providence which he exercises over them; so that it decidedly favors the idea that the State, acting through its organs, should recognise its responsibility to God and should coöperate with the Church in promoting his cause and advancing the welfare of religion (p. 198); only we would always insist that the State must do her own duty, whatever that may be, in her own proper sphere. We quote the following as a characteristically fair and candid statement of the truth respecting the question (now beginning to be considerably agitated,) whether the nations are not bound to acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord of all. "The Church is a supernatural institution, having direct relation exclusively to men's spiritual and eternal interests; and we can know nothing certainly about it except from the supernatural revelation which God has given us in his word. It is otherwise with the State or civil government. This is intended to bear, at least principally and most directly, upon the temporal welfare of men and ought to be regulated chiefly by a regard to the principles of natural reason. God has not prescribed his written word as the only rule to be followed by nations and their rulers in establishing and administering civil government; and he has not given them in his word sufficient materials to guide them author-

itatively in determining all the questions which, with reference to this matter, they may be called to entertain and dispose of. But it is not on this account the less true, that there are materials in the word of God which do bear upon the functions and duties of nations and their rulers, and that these relevant materials ought to be applied by them as authoritative in regulating their conduct. *Some* things, then, respecting the functions and duties of nations and their rulers, are to be learned from Scripture; and *every thing* that determines the obligations and procedure of Churches and of those who represent and regulate them is to be ascertained from that source." (Pp. 196, 197.) Dr. Thornwell in his Memorial said: Scripture is a constitution positively for the Church, negatively for the State. Dr. Cunningham makes the Scripture a complete constitution for the Church; an incomplete one for the State. Dr. Thornwell said, "The formula according to which the Scriptures are accepted by the State is: Nothing shall be done which they forbid. The formula according to which they are accepted by the Church is: Nothing shall be done but what they enjoin." Dr. Cunningham says *some* things rulers may learn respecting their duty from the word; the Church, *every thing*. The two statements help one another, and placed side by side we think they present the whole truth upon that point.

Our author points out (p. 199,) the true position of "Gillespie and the old Scotch and Dutch Presbyterian divines" respecting this matter, which we have always thought was somewhat misapprehended and so misrepresented by some who have our highest respect and regard. The right of the civil power "to interfere authoritatively in the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs" being urged by Erastians, those strong defenders of the truth were naturally led to the opposite extreme of denying that civil government had anything to do whatever in the sphere of religion. It was precisely thus, as we conceive, that our fathers of the Presbyterian Church in 1784 swung round, along with other leading minds in their age, from the extreme of a Church established by the State and in union with the State, to the opposite extreme of a divorce of the State altogether from religion. It is Gillespie's great name and high authority amongst Presbyterians to

which those chiefly appeal who oppose the doctrine advocated by Drs. Cunningham and Thornwell in common. But Gillespie was not absolutely and in every sense committed to this idea, if we may take Dr. Cunningham's testimony concerning the matter. He refers (p. 263) to the fact that Knox and the Confession of 1560 held that the word of God imposes on civil rulers certain duties in the interest of true religion; and then he adds, "In short the power which John Knox and the old Confession ascribed to the civil magistrate is also ascribed to him by the authors of our second Reformation and by the Westminster Confession. No one can deny that the Westminster Confession ascribes to the civil magistrate a right to a large measure of interference in regard to religious affairs and imposes upon him obligations with reference to all the matters which are comprehended within the ecclesiastical province; and every one acquainted with the writings of Gillespie and Rutherford must know that it is quite easy to produce from them statements about the power of the civil magistrate in regard to religion, as strong as any that ever proceeded from John Knox."

The chapters on "Church Power," and on the "Principles of the Free Church of Scotland," are of peculiar interest. Dr. Cunningham speaks very definitely upon a point disputed betwixt Princeton and ourselves, viz., the question of the Church's having any "discretionary power." He declares that "the great distinction between the views of the Romanists and the Reformers" as to the functions of ecclesiastical office-bearers is, that the former assigned to them "a magisterial or lordly," but the latter "only a ministerial authority;" that the former "assigned to them a large measure of power to be exercised very much according to their discretion," but "the Reformers, at least Calvin and his followers, deprived them of all real discretion in the administration of the affairs of the Church." He further states the two principles upon which this was done by Calvin, viz., First, that the written word is the only rule for the administration of Church affairs; and secondly, that the worship and government of the Church are settled and laid down in Scripture. Accordingly, this eminent Scotch Presbyterian authority

insists that it is not enough that what is proposed to be introduced into the worship or government of the Church "cannot be shown to be directly contrary to the written word, but that it ought not to be introduced unless it can be shown to be positively warranted or sanctioned by the word." Pp. 249, 250, 252.

Dr. Cunningham applies these principles to the matter of inventions in worship thus: "If God has given us a written revelation conveying to us information as to the way in which he is to be worshipped, the presumption is, that we must take that revelation as our only rule in discharging the duty of worshipping him, and abstain from exercising our own judgment and our own fancy in devising or inventing what may appear to us fitted to be acceptable to him. It is much more probable that the inventions of men in the worship of God will be displeasing to him than the reverse. God has not given to men individually, or to Churches, any power or authority to introduce rites or ceremonies into his worship; and what he has not given or sanctioned, the Church assuredly does not possess, and is not entitled to exercise. God has forbidden us to add to his word; and this may be fairly regarded as including a prohibition to derive, from any other source than his word, our principles and practices, in regard to any thing about which it was one of the leading objects of that word to give us information. Our Saviour has warned us of the vanity and danger of professing to worship God by following the traditions of the elders, or receiving as doctrines the commandments of men. And the apostle Paul has warned us against 'a show of wisdom in will-worship,'—a most exact description of the rites and ceremonies which the Church has introduced in the exercise of its power. They are *will-worship*, as being invented or devised by men themselves without any warrant or sanction from God, either directly in themselves, or in virtue of any general power or authority which he has conferred; and they have a show of wisdom, as some of them were originally introduced from an honest, though mistaken, intention to promote the right and acceptable worship of God; and all of them are professedly directed to that object." Pp. 253, 254.

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVII.—NO. 4.

---

DECEMBER, MDCCCLXVI.

---

## ARTICLE I.

*Discourses of Redemption: as Revealed at "sundry times and in divers manners," designed both as Biblical Expositions for the People and Hints to Theological Students of a Popular Method of exhibiting the "divers" Revelations through Patriarchs, Prophets, Jesus, and his Apostles.* BY REV. STUART ROBINSON, Pastor of the Second Church, Louisville, and late Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology at Danville, Ky. Louisville, Ky. A. Davidson: 1866. 8vo.: pp. 488.

Mr. Robinson informs us, in the Preface to this work, that it is "the result of an attempt to give permanent form, so far as oral instruction can be transferred to the printed page, to such outline specimens of the author's Biblical Expositions in the several sections of the inspired word as might be most suggestive to younger preachers in their attempts to develop the various parts of Scripture to the comprehension of the people; and, at the same time, be instructive to Christians and inquirers and other earnest persons troubled with doubts touching inspiration or the doctrines of the Bible." His idea of preaching is not that of theological disquisition, ethical essay, rhetorical, persuasive, or emotional

VOL. XVII., NO. 4.—1.

appeal, founded upon a shred of the sacred text chosen as a motto, or, at best, as suggesting simply the theological topic of the occasion; but that of giving the sense of Scripture, of showing the people how to read the word of God, and leading them to feel that "this day is the Scripture fulfilled in their ears," and that these are the words of a Jesus who not only *spake* by holy men of old, but *is now speaking* with living utterance to the men of this generation.

If any man is qualified to pronounce upon the best method of reaching the popular ear, that man is certainly the author of these "Discourses of Redemption." He has been preaching for twenty years, to congregations variously composed, in four different cities,—to professional and public men in the capital of Kentucky, to business men in Louisville and Baltimore, to Students and Professors of Law, Medicine, and the Arts, in Toronto, and everywhere with large crowds hanging upon his lips. Now what has been the secret of his popularity? He is not "a star preacher," to use the miserable slang of the day, a pulpit harlequin or buffoon, amusing his audience with jests upon things sacred and profane, making the Church and the ordinances of Christ the instruments of gain to himself, or prostituting the awful office of a preacher for the mere display of his own gifts and for the admiration and applause of the crowd. Nor is he a "political" preacher, trimming his sails to the breeze of popular passion and partisan excitement, accepting his doctrines from the caucus or the convention of the party to which he belongs, and preaching the preaching which *it* bids him, the poor slave of the majority of the hour. No! He is a preacher who stands before the people with the conviction that he is the anointed ambassador of the King of kings, commissioned to deal with his rebellious subjects upon questions no less awful than the majesty of his throne and their own eternal destiny; authoritatively setting forth the divine terms of reconciliation, and praying men, *in Christ's stead*, to be reconciled to God. Wonderfully gifted, indeed, and capable of interesting men in anything, yet, as a preacher and ambassador, confining himself to his *written instructions*, he has demonstrated that the people need no other attraction to draw them to the house of God

than a simple, rational, and practical exposition and illustration of the Bible. He has never needed advertisements in the Saturday newspapers of sermons on this or that sensational subject, or any other theatrical clap-trap, to get an audience. The secret of his popularity is his aiming to make the Bible a living message from God to men, by translating it into the current forms of thought and speech. And, we doubt not that men of far inferior natural gifts, if they would *study* to approve themselves unto God as workmen needing not to be ashamed, in the orthotomy of *the truth*, while they might not have such unbounded popularity as Mr. Robinson, would yet have a larger number of sinners to hear the glad tidings from their lips, than they now have.

The theme of these Discourses is Redemption, in the broad sense of that term, including not only the sacrifice of Christ, which is the centre and foundation of the whole scheme, but the whole work of Christ and the doctrine of the Church. These great topics are discussed with a perspicuity and an unction worthy of all praise. We had the pleasure of hearing many of these discussions from the pulpit; and now, after years of darkness and blood, we return our hearty thanks to the author for the high privilege of possessing them in a permanent form and of refreshing ourselves in the reading of them. It is a matter of wonder to many, that a man of war like Mr. Robinson, incessantly battling for the truth against overwhelming odds; an exile from his country and the object of a venomous and unrelenting persecution from men, who, having no conscience themselves, cannot conceive of a life governed by a high conviction of duty; should be able to write a book like this. To us there is no wonder in the case, any more than there is in Bunyan's writing the *Pilgrim's Progress* in Bedford jail, or in Luther's translating the Bible in the Wartburg, or in Rutherford's dictating his "Letters" in prison-bounds at Aberdeen. "Out of the eater comes forth the meat," and the fragrance of the "Saint's Rest" and "O mother dear Jerusalem" is due to the bruising of Baxter and David Dickson. Persecution and exile have been "Christ's Palace" to our friend; while we could not but be burdened with his afflictions, we now thank his Master and ours for this precious fruit. We hail this work as the first

fruits of a religious literature which will make our Southern Church a blessing to the world.

Taking it for granted that those of our readers who have not already bought this book, will do so as soon as possible, we propose, by way of whetting their appetites, to notice some of the leading views of Redemption it sets forth.

1. And first, as to the source of all our knowledge of redemption, the Bible: Mr. Robinson discusses the diversity in unity of Revelation, and utters an emphatic testimony for the plenary and absolute inspiration of the Scriptures, as the only rule of faith, the only source of saving knowledge, and the only effectual antidote to perilous error. If we were at liberty to quote as largely as our inclinations prompt us to quote, we should copy the whole of the first discourse on the unity in diversity of Revelation. We can only mention some of the points. In the author's view, the Bible is a thoroughly human as well as a thoroughly divine book, like the Great Revealer himself, the Incarnate Word, at once very God and very man. This is true not only in the sense that men were employed as the organs of revelation, and the writers of the books which compose the canon, and that too without violence done to the normal exercise of their individuality; but in the sense, that the history of man under the special providence of God is so connected with the revelation as to be the occasion and instrument of its development. Thus the first announcement of the fact, nature, and method of redemption in Gen. iii. 15, the germ of all that the Bible contains respecting salvation, was made in connexion with and in the form of a curse upon Satan, the author of the ruin of man. And thus during the whole period of the Theophanies, when God revealed his will to individuals chiefly for themselves, and not mainly as the repositories of his will for others, the occasion of the revelation, and we might add, the very vehicle of it, was something in the history of the individuals themselves. As in the first revelation, the serpent and the seed of the woman become pregnant historical symbols, so in the next great promise to Abraham, the "seed" is still the main thing, and, with it, a land of promise, the Paradise to be regained, set over against and illustrated by the Paradise lost. Again Abraham



saw, upon Mt. Moriah, the day of Christ; he saw it and was glad. How did he see it? In the sacrifice of his own son. His willingness to sacrifice his only son, rather than that the honor of God, and the majesty of his law should be reproached, was the symbolical language through which God revealed to him his determination to sacrifice *his* only Son, rather than that the glory and rigor of eternal righteousness should be, in the slightest degree, obscured or relaxed. And so in numberless other instances. Christ is not revealed as a Divine Legate and as a Founder of a new institute of worship, until Moses appears historically in both these characters, and can say, "a Prophet, *like unto me*, will God raise up." Christ is not revealed as a Priest, except by reference to an actually existing priest. He is not revealed as a King, until the natural development of the nation of Israel has led to the anointing and electing of a king. The revelation of the kingdom of Christ, of the seed of the woman as a body *organised* in opposition to the seed of the serpent as an organised kingdom of darkness, does not emerge until the outward kingdom of Israel emerges. The Bible is a human book, because its revelations proceed in accordance with the history of man. Hence the *diversity* of revelation.

Again: it is a thoroughly divine book, not only in the sense, that God is the real and only Author of it, but that it is the revelation of *his* plan and work of salvation. That very history of man, whose stages constitute the occasions and furnish the language of the revelation, is a history unfolding itself according to his eternal purpose and under the active operation of his providence. While, therefore, the form of the revelation changes according to the evolutions of the human history, we must expect it to be essentially the same throughout in its principles and aims. There must be *unity* as well as *diversity*. Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past by the prophets to the fathers, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son. Revelation is an organism, as history is an organism. The life, the power of the whole is in every part. The power of the whole gospel is in the promise, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall

bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." We find here clearly revealed these fundamental truths of redemption, entering into its very essence, and, in a manner, constituting the whole of it: 1. That there is to be a *work* of God for the restoration of his fallen creature to his favor, likeness, and fellowship: "I will PUT *enmity* between thee and the woman." 2. That this regeneration is to be brought about by means of the human nature: "the seed of the woman;" and that, too, a human nature which shall be the *woman's* seed and not the man's, and therefore involving a miraculous exercise of the power of God. 3. That the restoration shall be accomplished by the destruction of the serpent: "it shall bruise thy *head*." 4. That the work will involve the suffering of the woman's seed: "thou shalt bruise his *heel*." 5. That this work shall involve the gathering out of an elect seed, a "peculiar people," at enmity with the natural offspring of a race subject to Satan, and engaged in a perpetual conflict with it. 6. That this work involves the abolishing of death, which is the penalty of the law, and, therefore, the resurrection of the dead and the restoration of man, in his composite nature of spirit and body, to primeval blessedness. Are not these the fundamental elements of the gospel?

In like manner, the power of the whole gospel is in the promise to Abraham. We find there the "seed," the blessing and the curse, just as in the *protevangelium*, with a more distinct mention of the "land of promise," Paradise Regained. Again, we find the whole in the promise to Abraham's seed after it had grown into a nation, Ex. xix. 5, 6. "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then shall ye be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." Here we have the woman's seed, Abraham's seed, as an organised body of worshippers, segregated from the mass of the human race lying in the wicked one and constituting his seed. Once more, we find the whole in the promise to David, (2 Sam. vii. Ps. lxxii. lxxxix. Comp. Luke i. 32, Acts ii. 30,) in which the Church, the woman's seed, is presented to us in the form of the eternal kingdom of David's Son. The Church, then, is also an organism;

and the power of the whole is in every part. The whole oak is in the acorn. Isaac Newton, unfolding the mysteries of the universe, is the same as Isaac Newton in the cradle. The true religion is the same in all ages; and hence the Church, which professes the true religion, is the same in all ages. The revelation of the true religion varies in form and fulness in different ages; hence the Church varies in form and in the degree in which its organisation is developed. So that in the conception of an organic life, we have both the unity and diversity which characterise the word and the works of God.

This view also affords an explanation of the manifold meaning of prophecy, in the only sense in which prophecy can be said to have a manifold meaning. If all history is an organism, then it must be "typical;" the early stages of it must foreshadow the later and especially the last, just as the rudimentary forms of the plant or animal are prophecies of the mature forms. If there is any great fact or principle of the divine government which is to be fully and perfectly illustrated in the consummation of the scheme, we ought to expect that such fact or principle will cast its shadow back upon the whole process of evolution, or, ever and anon, flit across it. Thus the fact of a final judicial discrimination between the righteous and the wicked shows its shadow in the Deluge, the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, the destruction of Jerusalem, and, in a lower degree, in every judgment in which God has visibly made a difference between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. This is the basis of the argument of Peter in the second chapter of his second Epistle, against the Universalists and all other heretics who confound the immutable distinctions of truth and falsehood, right and wrong, and represent the Governor of the world as altogether such a one as they themselves. Now if such be the structure of history, such also must be the structure of prophecy. It must consist, mainly, of descriptions of characteristics and features of events, rather than of particular events themselves, and so be applicable to many events in different ages of the world. The prophecy of Enoch, for example, preserved in the Epistle of Jude, has had a manifold application, and is not yet exhausted. This is no doubt

the meaning of Bacon's famous aphorism, that "prophecy has a springing and germinant accomplishment throughout all ages, but reaches its height and fulness in some one age." It is an organism, in other words, like history, one part typical of another part, and all tending to a full development. The prophecy in Gen. iii. 15, has been undergoing a continuous fulfilment for nearly sixty centuries, and it was undergoing an organic development for more than forty. Regarded as a prophecy, we may say that the visions of Daniel constitute its advanced youth, and the Apocalypse its mature manhood. The same, yet different: the acorn, the sapling, and the oak.

This is a tempting subject, but we must forbear. To give the reader some idea of Mr. Robinson's felicitous manner of illustrating this subject, we extract the following:

"You find this revelation a record, not merely of the utterances of God speaking from heaven to men, but of the utterances, also, of the human soul answering back from earth to the voice of God. That answer is now in cries of mysterious terror, now in shouts of defiant impenitency, now in penitential wailings, now in the joyous cries of childlike faith and trust. The Bible is not a divine *monologue*; it is an amazing *dialogue* of the ages, between earth and heaven. The gospel which it reveals is not a mere melody of 'Peace on earth' sung by angel voices; it is the strain of a mighty orchestra rather. Notes from the stricken chords of the heart of God lead the strain, and notes from all the stricken chords of the human soul answer back in responsive chorus.

"As already suggested, the Bible method consists in the development more and more fully, through the successive 'sundry times' of humanity, of a scheme of salvation which was perfect from the first, though revealed only in germ. Men build their systems of knowledge as they build their houses; beam is laid upon beam; nor does the structure really exist, as a structure, until the last fragment has been adjusted to its place. Hence their proneness to regard a theology as imperfect, which is not thus artificially *systemized*. But when God constructs a theology, he builds, just he builds the oak of the forest, or the cedar of Lebanon, by the continual development of a germ, perfect from the first, through the successive 'sundry times' of the humanity with whose origin the development began.

"As the oak, perfect and entire, is in the acorn that buries itself in the soil, and expands and extends an ever perfect life till it

becomes the gigantic monarch of the forest; so the entire gospel of redemption was in that germinal promise concerning 'the seed of the woman' which, buried in the clods of a wasted Eden, shot forth its life parallel with the growth of humanity. Now it appears as the tender twig of promise to Enoch and Noah; now the vigorous sapling to the faith of Abraham; now the refreshing shade tree leafing out in the gorgeous ritual of Moses; now the well-known pilot's signal tree that guides the course of David and Isaiah; now putting forth its blossom of plenteous promise in the Gospel of John the Baptist; and now bearing the rich harvest of ripe fruit in the preaching of the apostles under 'the ministration of the Spirit.' Thus through all the ages, and in all the divers manners of its communication, it is one and the same gospel, embodying the same great truths in its various stages of development.

"To the cant of Rationalism concerning the narrower, less enlightened and legendary system of religion which *preceded* the Christian gospel, our response is, therefore, Christianity *had no predecessor*. In a sense that the English deist Tindal never conceived of, '*Christianity is old as Creation.*' The Bible is the history and development of Christianity, and nothing else. It is 'the Gospel according to' Moses and David, Isaiah and Daniel, just as truly as it is the Gospel according to Matthew and Mark and Luke and John. And this is manifest from the unity of idea that underlies all 'the divers manners' of the revelation. For of all the books in the world, the Bible is emphatically the 'book of one idea.' That idea is the grand enterprise of 'the seed of the woman' in conflict with the serpent and his seed, gathering his elect body, the Bride of the Lamb, out of all the successive ages." Pp. 19-21.

This unity in diversity of the Bible is a proof so strong of its divine origin, that no man, it appears to us, can reject it, who is not prepared to reject the proof of the same kind for the divine origin of the "constitution and course of nature," and to say with the fool, "No God." Indeed, the more thoroughly the Bible is studied, the more does its "self-evidencing" light beam into the soul, and the man who has his eyes open can no more doubt that it is a revelation from God, than he can doubt that the meridian sun shines, and shines by the command of One whose glory as far transcends the brightness of its beams, as the brightness of these beams transcends the brightness of a taper.

The infidel charges the believer with credulity; but the charge may be retorted with tenfold power by the believer upon the infidel, who believes greater and more marvellous mysteries. The difficulties which the faith of the believer removes are mere mole-hills, compared with those mountains which the infidel's faith tosses into the sea. To believe that such a collection of writings had a merely human origin, and *such* a human origin, is an enterprise of faith more heroic than any recorded in those writings themselves. O infidel, great is thy faith!

The transition, therefore, in Mr. Robinson's book from the illustration of the "diversity in unity" of the Scriptures to their inspiration of God, is easy and natural. And here we thank him for the emphatic testimony he utters for this fundamental truth. It cannot be denied that rationalism has made sad inroads upon the Church of the English-speaking nations, within the last few years. By rationalism we mean every "spirit" which refuses to recognise the *divine authority* of the Sacred Scriptures, or believe what the Bible testifies, *because* it testifies, and makes the reception of its teachings to depend on anything else than the simple testimony. It is not enough to believe that these ancient records *contain* the truth; we must believe that they *are* the truth. All Scripture must be received with a divine faith, because all Scripture is given by inspiration of God. We apprehend that this kind of faith in the word of God would excite a smile, either of derision or of pity, in some parts even of the Church of Scotland. In the high places of the Church of England, it is openly scouted. The ritualist and the rationalist, as of old the Pharisee and the Sadducee, the one denying the authority of the word by their additions to it, the other denying the authority of the word by their subtractions from it, are joining hands for an assault upon the true witnesses. The connexion between the revival of ritualism and the increase of infidelity is not accidental. They grow out of the same root of unbelief, of disbelief of the divine authority and the absolute fulness and sufficiency of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the rule of faith and duty. Francis Newman and John Newman were developed from the same germ. It is no unusual thing to find an ambitious young

man lamenting that arguments which satisfied Francis Bacon and Isaac Newton of the divine origin of the Bible, cannot impose upon *his* subtlety, and after a while, drivelling with the veriest old wives' fables and going through the mummeries of the silliest superstition. Thus does a righteous God expose the meanness and degradation of a soul which turns itself away from his light. Instead of a Christian, we have a cowering devotee; the deformity of an ape for the beauty of a man.

In opposition to rationalism, in all its forms, Mr. Robinson professes his faith, clearly, in the following propositions. 1. That the Scripture is "inspired of God" in the fullest and plainest sense which the words convey. It is "the word," "the law," "the testimonies," "the oracles of God." It is no more absurd to say that the infinite mind should have assumed the finite form of the human mind to utter its thought to man, than to say that the infinite nature should have assumed the finite form of the human body animated by a human soul. The inspiration of the Bible is no greater wonder than the incarnation. 2. That this plenary inspiration extends to "all Scripture" in the fullest sense of this last phrase. 3. That this inspiration extends to the language, the forms of speech. The *Scripture* is inspired of God. 4. That it is "profitable for doctrine;" containing *all* that a man is to believe for salvation. 5. That it is "profitable for reproof or refutation;" an antidote to every error contrary to the doctrine of salvation. 6. That it is the antidote for every "ethical error" contrary to the duty or principles of duty it inculcates. 7. That it is a complete institute for Christian nurture—"instruction in righteousness." All these propositions are illustrated with a force and beauty which can scarcely be surpassed. We regret that our limits will not permit us to give extracts from this part of the work.

Our author having thus clearly stated his view of Scripture in general, proceeds to notice the traces of the diversity in unity in the special covenant feature of the revelation in connexion with the existence of the *Church* as an essential part of the scheme of redemption. It is here, perhaps, that his chief merit as a theologian will be found, in unfolding the doctrine of the Church as an

essential part of the work of redemption. This redemption is not merely the redemption of a multitude of sinners, but of these sinners as a body, an organised kingdom of which the Redeemer is the head. The process of gathering this elect seed gives rise to the Church visible, which is begotten in the image of the Church invisible. This Church visible, under all stages of its development, like the invisible body of which it is the image, is based upon a *covenant*. This is a necessary feature of every transaction of God with men, outside the domain of pure natural justice. Hence we find it even in the religion of unfallen man in the garden of Eden. Man's position in this garden was not a position under mere law and natural justice, that is to say, the position of a servant; but the position of a servant who might become a son, and inherit the garden as a permanent possession. There was a promise of life, of "eternal" life, of a life which should not only be, in point of fact, endless in duration, but, in its own nature, indestructible and incapable of being forfeited. Of this promise of life, the "tree of life" was the sacramental sign and seal. We may observe, by the way, that we cannot agree with our author and others, who hold that this tree of life had the property of making man immortal. "Man liveth not by bread alone." God, and God alone, can impart or sustain life; the power of giving life cannot be communicated to any creature. It is evident to us that it was a mere sign or symbol of the promise, and therefore could sustain the eternal life of the promise only as the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper can sustain the same life. As these last have no power to nourish the life in themselves considered, but only operate through the Spirit on the part of God, and through faith on the part of man; so the tree of life in the garden only had a sacramental efficacy, the efficacy of a *sign and seal* addressed to faith. Hence, we interpret the language of Gen. iii. 22, not as the expression of God's solicitude that man might not accidentally or unwarily become immortal in a state of sin, but as a merciful declaration that he will put him beyond the reach of the tree, and so prevent, on man's part, any use of the tree which might confirm him in the hope of still obtaining life by the covenant which he had broken. In other words, God



mercifully protested against and warned man against the notion, apparently so natural to him, that a sacrament has an efficacy *ex opere operato*.

But to return: Our author, after having considered the "gospel covenant and worship of lost Eden," proceeds to consider the period of Abraham, when the Church visible was separately organised, that is, no longer identical with the family, but becoming a distinct community, corresponding, in the spiritual sphere, with the organisation of the State in the natural sphere. This topic is handled with great ability; but as there is less of the freshness of novelty, both in thought and illustration, in the discussion of it than in the discussion of the next, we will not longer dwell upon it. It contains a very fine specimen of the skill with which the popular preacher invests a topic, usually considered dry, with a lively interest. We allude to the argument, in the concluding part, for the safety of dead children.

The next topic is "Redemption as revealed in the laws and ordinances of the Theocratic Era," under two heads. 1. "The covenant of the Church's redemption; its seal and the significance thereof." 2. "The gospel of the Sinai covenant; its rule of life to convict of sin; its ritual to teach the taking away of sin; and its moulding of the social order as a type of Christ's spiritual commonwealth." We know of no finer example of popular *gospel* preaching than the discourse on "the Covenant of the Church's redemption," unless it be the discourse on "The Divine tragedy of earth, heaven, and hell," in another part of the volume. The only objection that an ordinary preacher can have to it, is, that it makes him feel "as if he could never preach again." But we pass it by in order to notice the valuable theology of the next discourse on the Siniatic covenant.

The key to the whole transaction on Sinai is to be found in the fact that it is another covenanting between Jehovah and his "children in the wilderness;" not indeed such a sacramental covenant as that of circumcision, organising the visible Church; nor that of the passover, covenanting for the redemption of the chosen body; but still a formal covenant providing for the spiritual nurture and growth in grace of the redeemed Church. The

law was *not* merely some vague moral precepts given to mankind at large, together with some semi-political laws organising a Church, or rather something half Church and half State, and an elaborate ritual, with all of which the Christian Church has no particular concern. The record, both in the nineteenth chapter of Exodus concerning the preparation for the delivery of the law, and in chapter twenty-fourth concerning what was done with it after it was received, expressly declares that it was delivered to the Church, as Church, already organised; that the preparation for it was through a council or synod of the "elders" of the congregation; and that, after the delivery, it was solemnly executed, as a covenant between Jehovah and the Church. And *after* thus solemnly adopting, by covenant act, the first revelation, consisting of the ten commandments, with an exposition of the application of their principles to the intercourse between God and man in worship, and man and man in ordinary affairs, *then* "went up Moses and Aaron and seventy of the elders," representing the Church, to a sacrificial feast in the presence of Jehovah in the mount, preparatory to the extended revelation concerning the establishing of the tabernacle of Jehovah their King among them, and the duties of the priests, his courtiers. *Then*, again, when the palace was prepared "according to the pattern shown in the mount," Jehovah descended and took possession of it; and thenceforth from that tabernacle, Moses received all the details of the Levitical law of worship; of ecclesiastical law to govern the Church; and of civil and constitutional laws for the government of the peculiar theocratic state established to be the type of Christ's spiritual and everlasting kingdom.

"Moses did *not* organise a Jewish church, as the popular conception hath it, but found the Church fully organised with its government of elders, at the time of his call. For to these elders he came with his credentials (Ex. iv. 29); to these elders he revealed the sacrament of the passover (Ex. xii. 21); and before these elders, in council or synod, he laid the message of Jehovah, and through them made preparation for the meeting of the congregation before the Lord at Sinai. Neither is it true that, by this revelation, given at Sinai, Moses organised the Jewish *civil* commonwealth, with its magistracy for secular affairs; for he found a civil government organised, before the giving of the law. And it

was not by suggestion of revelation, but on the suggestion of Jethro, his father-in-law, that the magistracy was appointed. This was done as a matter of common sense and natural reason, just as the magistracy of any other civil commonwealth is appointed. And, indeed, the careful student of Moses will discover throughout his system of ordinances for Israel, that, though in both the Jewish State and Jewish Church Jehovah ruled as Head, being served by its citizens as their King, as well as worshipped by them in their capacity of church-members as God, still the distinction between that which is political and that which is ecclesiastical is kept up far more carefully than in most modern Christian states, and in the conceptions of many modern Christian people. So that, even were there any apology for the modern blunder of citing, as precedents for a purely secular government, the ordinances of a theocratic commonwealth, established for the specific purpose of furnishing a type of the great spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ, still there could not be found, in the Mosaic ordinances, either precedent or apology for most of that confounding of powers secular and powers spiritual which has so often in modern ages brought both the Church and the State to the verge of ruin."

What, then, did Moses establish? What relation does his institute sustain to the gospel plan? Our author answers, 1. It was a covenant with this body of people *as a Church*, the body organised by the covenant with Abraham, and its redemption guaranteed in the passover covenant. 2. It was a covenant with this Church as a *representative* body, standing for the Church of all succeeding ages. See Acts vii. 35: "Our fathers received the lively oracles to give unto us;" that is, they stood there as representing us. 3. It was a covenant *wholly spiritual* in its significancy; as is evident from the extraordinary prominence given to the *moral* law. This law is a necessary element in every covenant of God with man; and here it is written by the finger of God himself, and placed in the ark under his throne, as its foundation and support. The sum of this law is nothing outward, but *love* to God and man, as well in Moses as in Christ. 4. As to the *end* and purpose of this covenant, considered as to its peculiar features, the Epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, and the Hebrews, are perfectly clear. "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." This covenant includes all that the previous covenants with Adam, Noah, Abraham, contained in reference to the "seed," with the

addition of ordinances designed to produce a conviction of the need of a vicarious atonement, as well as to prefigure the sacrifice by which it should be made; ordinances to set forth the method of applying the benefits of this atonement for the pardon of sin and the purification of the nature; and ordinances to set forth the relation of believers to their Redeemer, as King and Head of an organised commonwealth.

“With this general view of the nature and purpose of the Sinai gospel kept distinctly before you, these last four books of Moses—instead of presenting, as they may have done hitherto, a somewhat confused medley of precepts and promises, ethical, ritual, ecclesiastical, and civil; and all of uncertain application to Christianity—will be found to assume a simple and natural logical order, each portion in its proper place, and perfectly adapted to its special end. First, a general code of ethics covering the whole ground of man’s relation to God on the one hand, and to his fellows on the other (Ex. xx.) Second, a divine annotation on this general abstract code, illustrating its application to all the practical relations of man in life, as worshippers of Jehovah, as social beings in civil society, and as members of a peculiar spiritual society (Ex. xxi.–xxiii.) Third, this being received and formally adopted by covenant (Ex. xxiv.), then an extended revelation, expounding the construction of a typical palace in which Jehovah proposes to have “the tabernacle of God among men” (Ex. xxv., xl.) This constructed, then, fourth, an extended revelation, from his palace, of a ritual of worship which shall teach all the particulars of the application, by faith, of the vicarious atonement for the removal of guilt and the purification of the life; together with certain modifications of the social and civil law already existing, so as to mould the civil commonwealth itself into a prophetic testimony to the coming of a Redeemer and a type of his spiritual kingdom. (Leviticus.) To this is added, fifth, a brief historical account of the administration under this system in the wilderness (Numbers); and sixth, a summary rehearsal, after forty years, with certain additions and modifications needful to adapt it to the settled state upon which the people were then about to enter. (Deut.)”

“These people standing at the base of Mt. Sinai, are to be contemplated in three different relations, with reference to each of which these laws were given.

“1. They stood as men representative of all men of the Adam race, and, like Adam, creatures owing duty to God and to his other creatures.

“2. As the chosen, organised, spiritual body under the covenant with Abraham, constituting them Jehovah’s peculiar people, and him their God.

“3. As a social and civil organisation which is to possess a country guaranteed to them as an inheritance for this purpose.

“Contemplated in the second aspect, as the chosen and organised spiritual body under the covenant with Abraham, they needed—not an ecclesiastical constitution organising them, for that they already had; nor a theological creed and ritual of worship, for that also they already had—but a further development of their ecclesiastical constitution, adapting it to their new condition; and a fuller detail of their theology and ritual, in order to set forth more clearly, by its symbols, both the objective theology of redemption by atonement, and the subjective theology of that atonement, applied by the faith of the individual, to the renewing and purification of his nature. Contemplated in the third aspect of a social organisation, they needed not a political constitution, for that they already had. And had it been the purpose of Jehovah to leave them simply an ordinary civil community, with his Church established among them, there would have been no revelation of civil law, save by way of illustrating and applying the moral law as before mentioned. They would have modified and changed their civil polity as experience and the counsels of wise statesmen such as Jethro might suggest; just as any other people under the guidance of natural law and reason may modify their civil laws. But it being the purpose of Jehovah to dwell among them, by his visible presence, and to constitute this political commonwealth a type of the great spiritual commonwealth over which he specially rules, as his people, and to be a perpetual prophecy of the coming Messiah, it was needful to introduce various modifications of their civil code with reference to that purpose. Hence those peculiar laws forbidding the alienation of their lands by any family, or the alienation, permanently, of his liberty by any Israelite; hence the exceptional command to marry a brother’s widow, contrary to the general law forbidding marriage within that degree; with all the modifications of rights of property and person which grew out of these. Hence the various ordinances making idolatry, consultation of evil spirits, false prophecies, etc., treasonable. Hence, in short, the whole of those peculiar principles of civil law in the Mosaic code, and in the administration under it, which have so often been perverted by being applied as precedents in ordinary civil governments; as though Jehovah had covenanted with these civil governments to dwell among them as their theocratic king; or as though he proposed to make some one of these

model governments of modern times a type and a perpetual prophecy of his coming to the earth. It is manifestly from this confusion of ideas concerning the spiritual import of the Mosaic civil institutions that men get the precedents whereby they confound together the spiritual and the secular powers;—though even in the Mosaic institutes, these powers are carefully kept asunder, so far as they could be under that peculiar theocracy;—and by this confusion perpetually endanger both civil and religious liberty.”

“Our habit of conceiving of this ancient ritual as merely a dark and mysterious hinting at a salvation yet to be revealed, goes far beyond the Apostle’s meaning in describing the law as ‘having a shadow of good things to come.’ He says this with special reference to the error of those who insisted on clinging to the ancient prophetic mode of presenting Christ crucified to a faith which had yet to look forward to Christ’s first coming as we now look forward to Christ’s second coming; whereas, Christ having come, and faith having to look backward historically, the symbols designed as prophetic speech of him are not only needless, but the use of them, after their purpose is accomplished, can only tend to obscure the view of Christ; and the desire to use them can arise only from the dangerous error of resting in the external symbol without penetrating to its internal spiritual sense. This is the clue to the interpretation of all that Jesus first, and Paul after him, had to say on the subject of the Sinai law; viz., that they had need to contend, perpetually, with men who saw not the real meaning of the law which they extolled so; and who would feed the people, not upon the internal kernel of truth, but upon the husks containing it, out of which they had suffered the kernel to drop and disappear from view.

“It was not that the Sinai gospel was intended to veil the truths of salvation, as from men who might not be able to appreciate and feel their spiritual power, that Jehovah chose to write it in these symbols projecting all their shadows towards the great central Cross. It arose from the nature of the case, and out of a reason in the very nature of the human mind. The gospel that instructs a faith which must look forward, prophetically, to a future not yet actualized, must speak through symbols rather than in literal language, in order to be comprehensible to the human understanding, which can neither conceive nor utter its thoughts of the future save in symbols, types, and analogies. This you see even in the New Testament. All is literal enough so far as relates historically to Christ and salvation; but when it comes, as in the last book of the New Testament, to develope

the future of the gospel kingdom and the second coming of Christ, precisely as in the Old Testament, all become symbols and types. The believers of the Old Testament age had, of necessity, to be taught by symbols concerning the first coming of Christ, just as believers now can be taught only by symbols concerning the second coming of Christ. In ordaining that gospel ritual of shadowy symbols, Jehovah, in accordance with his usual method of revelation, accommodated himself to the habits of thought common among men. The saints guided by Moses were taught, in the prophetic language which they could best understand, precisely the same gospel truths which were taught the saints guided by Paul in the historical language which they could best understand. Having in literal terms, therefore, furnished a law of life to convict of sin, far more clear and in detail than any previous revelation, the Sinai covenant proceeds also, far more clearly and in detail than ever before, not only to hold up as heretofore the gospel provision for sin in atoning blood; but the gospel instructions for the application of that provision to the conscience of the sinner by faith—the cleansing of the heart to which such faith leads, and the consecration of the life to the Redeemer. Thus the gospel according to Moses differs neither in creed nor practical religion from the gospel according to Jesus and Paul, but only in the language in which, from the necessity of the case, it had to find utterance.

“The argument against the papal and semi-papal ritualism of modern times, which proposes by the authority of the Church merely to set up symbols in worship for teaching religious truth and assisting devotion, it will be perceived, runs much deeper than any mere reason of inexpediency or impolicy in matters of indifference. For the error of these modern symbols, as appendages to the ordinances of worship, is, in principle, exactly the error of the Judaizers against whom Jesus first, and after him Paul, contended so earnestly. It is the error of bringing back the cumbrous machinery absolutely necessary to meet the special difficulties of teaching a gospel whose great facts were yet prophetic, and of substituting this in place of that simple, direct, literal teaching which alone is necessary, and therefore alone is proper in exhibiting the great facts of the gospel now become historic. It is an attempt to force in symbols where there is no place for them, and therefore where the use of them can have no other effect than to encumber and hinder the communication of truth. Moreover, the very attempt itself, and the zeal with which it is prosecuted, evinces clearly that those who make it perceive not the grand internal truths of the symbol and their significancy

to the heart. That they are resting merely in the outward observance; admiring the outward shell, without penetrating to the kernel within; appealing to the imagination merely, and not to the conscience and spiritual nature of men. And besides this, the use concurrently of two methods so unlike in their nature of conveying truths cannot possibly result in any other effect than to blur, confuse, and obscure the view of truth to the minds of the people; and, as a necessary consequence, to make them lose sight at last of the real spiritual truth altogether, and perceive only the symbol itself as appealing to the imagination. The mind having the advantage of directly contemplating a historical 'Christ crucified' is, manifestly, not aided but hindered in its conceptions, by compelling it to use symbols, and thus look prophetically, and 'through a glass darkly' at Christ crucified.

"But far more conclusive than any considerations of philosophy and expediency, is the argument that there is no more authority in the Church for constituting a symbol, than for adding to the revealed truth of God. The true symbol must be divinely framed and constituted. It is no more left to the vagaries of human fancy, or to rest upon mere human authority, than the truths it was intended to teach. 'See,' said Jehovah to Moses, 'that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the Mount.' Even Moses was not left to his own taste and discretion, in fashioning a single cord, or loop, or tassel of the Tabernacle and its furniture—the symbolic palace of Jehovah, and typical at once of Christ the Prophet, Priest, and King, present and ruling in his spiritual kingdom. The authority of God alone can constitute a gospel symbol. And the claim to set up a symbol in gospel worship, which Jehovah has not set up in his word, is really a claim to speak as the messenger of Jehovah, and to come with authority to actualize a divine pattern revealed to him who sets it up. It is a claim analogous to that of Mohammed, Swedenborg, or of Joe Smith."

"No one who is familiar with the reasonings of that great Apostle, whose specialty it was to be the Jewish iconoclast, and dash in pieces the narrow perverted ritualism of his age, but must be filled with admiration at the heights and depths of his inspired logic, when planting his premises upon these old covenants with Adam, and Abraham, and Israel at Sinai, and David, as the great gospel bonds in which Jehovah hath bound himself to secure the sinner's salvation—he proceeds to reason out the title of all that believe, irrespective of blood, or nation, or age, to the benefit of those covenants as being represented in them. And with what majestic transcendental generalisation does he, in the



Epistle to the Hebrews, take the dead symbolism to which a contracted, unspiritual ritualism still clings, and re-animate with the new, fully developed gospel truths, until it swells out again to infinite proportions. As in that vision of Isaiah, the year King Uzziah died, he saw the temple and all its symbols expand infinitely, until the golden throne of Jehovah, on the ark of the covenant, was lifted up to infinite heights and breadths; and the temple expanded to the dimensions of the universe; and the visible symbol of Jehovah's presence on the mercy seat became the Jehovah actually filling immensity with his presence; and the mysterious emblematic creatures that with their wings overshadowed the mercy seat, rose and expanded, and floated apart, veiling their faces, as one shouted 'Holy!' and the other answered 'Holy!' and then both in chorus sing 'Holy is Jehovah, God of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory!' So these symbols of the ancient Sinai covenant, under the glowing logic of the inspired Apostle, again are re-animated for us, and rise and swell into proportions of infinite grandeur; till tabernacle and smoking altar and flowing blood, and floating clouds of incense, become so many infinite transparencies blazing with excess of light, exhibiting to us the actual scenes transpiring in the inner temple of the spiritual universe. No! No! To the soul that has ever caught the inspiration of Paul's New Testament logic, this cold and cautious criticism that so narrowly inspects, and so sweepingly lops off the repealed from the unrepealed, till but a sightless stump is left, seems irreverent and almost blasphemous!"

Mr. Robinson's next discourse considers the "Gospel Church typically set forth as the Eternal Kingdom of David's Son," in 2 Sam. vii.; 1 Chron. xvii. 17; Ps. lxxii. and lxxxix; Luke i. 32; Acts ii. 30. This view of the gospel Church is, in one respect, the most interesting of all, because it is the view of the New Testament. The great subject of the utterances of the Son, by whom God hath spoken to us in these last days, is the "kingdom of heaven," or "the kingdom of God." The parables were parables of the kingdom of God; the miracles were miracles of the kingdom of God. The incarnate Word is the King; and his sword goes out of his *mouth*. The prophetic and priestly offices of Jesus are subordinate to his kingly office, as the means are subordinate to the end. It is marvellous that the kingly office should have occupied so subordinate a place in the faith and feeling of the Church in recent times, and especially in

this country. And, doubtless, one great purpose of God in the troubles of this country, is to recall the Church to a consideration of the office of Christ as the King and Head of his people. We say it is marvellous that it should have been neglected, because, 1. The gospel is the "gospel of the kingdom." The burden of John Baptist's preaching was, "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The same was the burden of the preaching of Jesus himself and of his apostles, prior to the ascension of the King. It is made the second petition of the Lord's Prayer: "Thy kingdom come." Jesus was crucified upon the accusation of making himself a king. The superscription upon his cross, in the languages of the three elect and representative languages of the world, proclaimed the same great truth. And the apostles constantly contrasted, in their preaching, the treatment which Jesus received at the hands of men, with God's exaltation of him as King. 2. The very phrase "Son of man," which the Lord constantly uses of himself, denotes the same thing. It is taken from the prophecy of Daniel, in which "the kingdom of heaven" is contrasted with the "kingdoms of this world." That prophecy carries us back to the original promise of dominion which was given to *man* created in the image of God, and by that image united to God and brought into fellowship with him. That dominion was lost, when the image of God was lost; but was restored in the "seed of the *woman*," to whom the promise was given that it should bruise the *serpent's* head; that is, that the *human* should overcome the *beastly*; that the dominion of "the Son of man" should dash in pieces and survive the dominion of the "beast," the very subtlest beast of the field. In Daniel's vision, we find precisely the same elements and the same contrast, the "*beasts*" and the "*Son of man*." In the vision of Nebuchadnezzar, the representative of the beastly power, the world-kingdoms present themselves as a splendid *human* image, and the kingdom of God as a *stone*, naturally enough, as Nebuchadnezzar's psychological condition was the basis of the form of the vision; and he knew no better until he became a *beast*, and was driven from among *men*, and ate grass like an ox. Then he acknowledged that "the heavens do rule;" and that the dominion of man, whose

representative image he required the Hebrew children to bow down to and worship, was a beastly dominion, when separated from God, and refusing to acknowledge his supremacy as the God of heaven. Daniel sees these kingdoms in their true nature; the kingdoms of the world not as human, but beastly; the kingdom of the Son of man, Immanuel, God with man, as the true kingdom of humanity. The sceptre of the one is the *sword*; the sceptre of the other is the *word*. The one is a government of *force*; the other is a government of persuasion and of love. The one is a government of the outward man; the other, of the hidden man of the heart. So again, in the Apocalypse, which is the Daniel of the New Testament, we have the king, like unto a "*Son of man*," in the opening of the book; and, in the body of the book, his conflicts with the *beasts*; the "*seed of the woman*" in conflict with the "*Dragon*," "*that old serpent*" and his representatives on earth, to whom he gives his seat, and power, and just authority. There is but one beast in the vision of John which corresponds with the vision of Daniel; to indicate, perhaps, the unity of spirit which animates all the world-kingdoms, which is the spirit of the serpent, in whose image they are begotten; and, further, to indicate that it is not any one kingdom among men, exclusively, but *any* government which usurps the prerogative of God in Christ, by claiming the homage and loyalty of the heart, approbation and love as well as external obedience to its laws; any government which says, "all these things will I give you, if you will fall down and worship me." 3. Again, it is marvellous that Christ's kingly office is so much neglected, because the whole mystery of martyrdom revolves around it. So far as Jesus himself may be considered a martyr, he was a martyr for this *truth*; and the issue between all his martyrs and the world-powers has been precisely this and no other: "Is God or man supreme?" The test applied by the beast, in every age, has been very simple, something not at all hard to do, provided only there be a *heart* to do it. It is a test appealing to the *heart* or *will*. Only throw a little incense upon the censer, or salute the image upon the standard. That is all. Yes! well may it be said, that is *all*; for when that is given, the *whole man* is given, and the *whole*

man is lost. He has become a worshipper of the beast, and himself a beast. The martyr testifies for the royal supremacy of the "Son of man." Who but a believer in word, could have believed that this issue could ever be made in *this* land? That which is unjust, is unjust still. Our more human civilisation, more intellectual, more accomplished, more brilliant and imposing, still has a spirit that "goes downward to the earth." The worship of the majority is the worship of a majority. The voice of the people is the voice of God. The people worship themselves, and persecute those who will *not* worship the people. When Christ's people say that there is one Jesus, the King of *truth*, the scoffing question comes back to them from all sides, "What is truth?"

We have now given the reader some idea of the discussions of this work of Mr. Robinson. It is a book of principles, of *semina rerum*, which, if lodged in the mind, will germinate and bring forth fruit; a book which shows the author to be one of the leading thinkers, as well as one of the most popular preachers of the times; a book which none of our young men, who are in training for the Christian ministry, can afford to be without; which every plain Christian, who would have the word of God to dwell in him richly, can study with profit and delight.

We wish we had the space to quote, entire, the sermon on the "Official Authority, Nature, and Limits and Purposes of Gospel Preaching." It deserves to be written in letters of gold. We can only indicate the leading points. The text is Luke iv. 16-21. The qualifications of the gospel preacher are, 1. The unction of the Spirit: an unction which is not bestowed only at the time of his call into the ministry, but which continues with him always, in every true sermon, guiding his choice of what to say, taking the things of Christ and showing them to him, that he may show them unto the people. 2. He is anointed to *preach* with authority. The gospel ministry is not merely one form of doing good, like the agencies of the Sabbath-school, the conference and social meeting, the conversation of the colporteur, etc., but it is an office ordained of God. The minister speaks for God, in the place of God, to men in the word; he speaks for men to God in prayer; he stands as Christ's attorney in the sacraments,

presenting the covenant, and receiving the signature and seal of the people to it. Not only is this public official utterance of the minister different in kind from the similar utterance in the family, and in the private gatherings of Christians "speaking often one to another;" but it differs also from his own private utterances, as the utterance of the judge on the street, differs from that of the judge on the bench. 3. He is anointed to preach the *gospel*. By virtue of the anointing, this preaching differs in kind, from all merely human forms of thought and teaching, however it may resemble them. To preach may be eloquent utterance, but that is not all, nor the essential part of it. To preach may be profound reasoning; but that is not all, nor the essential part of it. To preach is to teach, but that is not all of it, though the primary end of it. To preach is to expound a book; yet not, as in the schools, the book of a Plato who *spoke*, but of a Jesus who *speaks*. It is to enforce our ethics; yet not, as in the school of a Socrates who moralized, but of a Jesus who *is* purifying the heart by faith. It is to develop a great system of thought concerning God and humanity; yet not as received merely from "holy men of old who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," but as revealed *now* by Jesus to the souls of his people. It is authoritatively setting forth the divine terms of reconciliation. The preacher is to "know nothing but Christ and him crucified." As the discourse of the ambassador, outside of his special official sphere, on politics, finances, literature, morals, is not to be taken as of any higher authority than the opinions of any other man equally intelligent; so when the ambassador of Christ discourses, outside of his commission, concerning science, physics, metaphysics, politics, ethics, national affairs, civil and military, his discourse is of no higher authority than that of other men equally intelligent. Nay, his opinions are even of less value than other men's, since he can know little of these matters, if true to his Master's work. 4. He is "to preach the gospel to the poor." The method of preaching must be adapted to the capacity of the uneducated; making the instruction of the wise and prudent incidental rather than primary. The gospel faith is precisely the same, whether existing in the heart of the poor unlettered

peasant, or of the mighty man of science. The poor and unlearned have little knowledge of the chemistries of philosophers, yet as readily as the philosophers, they understand how to appease their physical hunger with bread, and quench their physical thirst with water. Pp. 211-216.

But we must make an end. May the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, bless this work for his own glory and the gathering and perfecting of his saints!

NOTE.—It has occurred to the writer, since the foregoing article was written, that some reader might conclude from the warmth of the commendation bestowed upon Mr. Robinson's work as a whole, that *all* his views in these Discourses were endorsed. The writer, therefore, adds that he *cannot* endorse the views presented in the Discourse on 2 Tim. i. 10. 1. He is persuaded that Mr. Robinson has not done justice to the rational arguments for the immortality of the soul; and especially to the argument drawn from the moral constitution of the soul itself. To say that no rational arguments would have *produced a settled conviction* without revelation, is not the same as to say that no rational arguments are *valid* without revelation. 2. He objects to what seems to be implied in some of the author's statements, that the human race might have been annihilated, if it had not been God's purpose to send a Redeemer. This appears to the writer to be without any foundation either in Scripture or reason; and of dangerous tendency. It might be used, and doubtless will be, to support the views held by the "Thomasites" and others, concerning the annihilation of all the wicked. Besides, the Scriptures, so far from countenancing the idea that annihilation is a dreadful thing to the wicked, represent them as earnestly desiring and seeking it. We doubt whether there is any man, who has long been under pungent conviction of his guilt as a sinner, who has not longed *not to be at all*. What prompts suicide, but desire and hope of annihilation? 3. The opinion that the resurrection of the wicked is due to the resurrection of Christ is without any warrant from the word of God. The passage in 1 Cor. xv. 22, upon which our author relies, seems to us to have nothing to do with the matter. There is not the slightest allusion, in that whole chapter, to the resurrection of the wicked, from beginning to end: and if we had no other revelation touching the resurrection of the dead but this, the resurrection of the wicked, while it might be made exceedingly probable upon rational grounds, could not be proved from Scripture, and therefore could not be the object of *faith*. If our friend's interpretation of that twenty-second verse be the right one, it will prove a great deal more than he is willing to admit; it will prove the doctrine of *universal salvation*. The "death" must be commensurate with the "life." All that was lost in Adam must be restored in Christ. The true meaning of the text, then, is, "As all who are in Adam (are represented in the covenant by him) die, even so shall all who are in Christ, (represented in covenant by him) be made alive." The finally wicked and impenitent are not represented by Christ. He was obliged, indeed, to take their nature into unison with his divine person, because their nature was the same as the nature of the elect seed whom he came to redeem; but it was the nature of the elect seed (Abraham's seed, Heb. ii. 16,) that he designed to assume; and they alone are included in his federal representation. The text above explained, while it is used in a special application by the Apostle, is nevertheless a general statement covering the whole doctrine of the covenants, of the fall and of redemption.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE FUTURE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

Even to the coldest Thomas Didymus, not a bold and open infidel, the present question concerning the second coming of the Lord Jesus to this world, must possess some interest. All that reluctance may exist to believing any event on the faith of the prophecies which an infidel feels to believing any event on the faith of the Scriptures; intellectual pride may have peculiar possession of that part of our minds in which we delight to compare ourselves with weak and wild enthusiasts; the failure of past prophetic horoscopes may have led us to adopt an ultra Stoic calmness on all that class of subjects; yet if there is to be a second advent of Christ, and if that second advent is to be any thing more than a mere figure of speech, it cannot be unimportant or uninteresting to us. And there appears to be no way to get rid of the fact, hanging so boldly and visibly in the apostolic writings, that there is to be some sort of a second advent, but by bold and open infidelity. When Christ was ascending to heaven, in the presence of a great crowd of witnesses, there came two angels to them, as they stood with uplifted faces, gazing upon his form departing into the skies, and told them plainly, that in the same manner in which they had then seen him go away, *in that manner* he should come again to the world. That is itself enough. If that vivid scene stood alone on that point in the Scriptures, it would be sufficient authority for the awakening of the expectations of men. But that fact does not stand alone; corroborations crowd the writings of the apostles. One says he comes behind in no gift waiting for the coming of the Lord Jesus; and that his conversation is already in heaven from whence also he looks for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; and he beseeches his brethren by the coming of our Lord, as the most certain of events. Another beseeches his dear children to abide in Christ, that when

he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming. Another affectionately exhorts brethren to be patient in waiting for the coming of the Lord, in imitation of the long patience of the husbandman in waiting for the early and the latter rain, and the precious fruit of the earth. And a fourth argues at length, to prove that the Lord is not slack concerning this very promise of his coming in the last days, as some men count slackness. It is admitted that these certain assurances of a second coming of the Lord Jesus to this world, may be construed to suit either the premillenarian theory—that the history of this world will be far from its completion at the second coming of Christ—or the post-millenarian theory—that the second coming of Christ is to be at the day of judgment.

The advocates of these theories, respectively, are so, because each think their theory best explains and crystallizes these facts. But there is no diversity of opinion, known to us, among men who accept revelation as the ground of their religious tenets, about the fact that there is to be a second coming, of some kind or other, and at some time or other. The names by which these theories are called are long, scholastic, it may be pedantic. They express very important divergencies of opinion—being perhaps, the extremes, between which, somewhere, lie the opinions of most thinkers on prophecy; and, in all probability, that truth of which no one needs to be ashamed.

But in the nature of the case, the particular interest of the present times in prophecy, exists on the premillenarian theory. For if that sacred golden age, the happy thousand years of the millennium, is to come in gradually, and slowly, and by human and visible instrumentalities, to spread its wings of holiness and righteousness over the world before the second coming of Christ, then that event is surely yet a great way off. There is visible at this time, among the nations of the earth, nothing whatever like the reign of Christ, spiritual or temporal. The reverse is nearer true. As wave after wave of relentless persecution rolls over Christians, they may rather look with meek and patient eyes up to the throne of God, and hope that the days may be shortened, and that they shall come to their end by the appearance on



earth of such a power as shall forever put a stop to earthly persecutions. There is, at this day, an atheistic triumph of iniquity, a free course and glory of the three unclean spirits of the Apocalypse, a power exerted by fierce, levelling, and irreverent theories, which entirely takes away from the study of prophecy any special interest at this time, on the post-millennial theory. We firmly believe that the world is growing not better, but *worse*, every year, and that on that theory, each succeeding year postpones still farther and indefinitely, considered as a sign, the coming of the Lord. But if that event is to "come as a snare on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth," if it is to be "at midnight," if it is to be "at such an hour as men think not," if one object of the Divine Sovereign in this return to the world, is to show to the intelligent universe whereto the guilt of man will go, unrestrained by the fear of God; if another object is to display the disastrous and ludicrous failure of all human inventions, and to stain the pride of all human glory; and if that second coming is to introduce "the times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began;" to bring in that manifestation of the sons of God for which the earnest expectation of the creature at present waiteth; and if the Lord, by his coming and his presence, whatever those may be, is to prepare this world for that golden age, which lies in lines of orient light, alike in the poetry of the Greeks, and the prophecies of the Hebrews; *then* we can see and feel a deep interest in the prophecies and their interpretations at the present time.

For the firm belief that the coming of Christ is to be pre-millennial, and is now sufficiently near to be shrouded in that obscurity in which the dignity of the divine government clothes the near times and the seasons, we offer the following arguments and considerations. We do not forget that there are two sides to the question. We think the arguments on the one side are more weighty than those on the other, and better explain the word of God. But we try to feel that modesty which is becoming; and which is taught by the example of DR. GEORGE BAXTER, even in those days of the giants, who incessantly inquired of

thinkers and readers, concerning the *slaying of the witnesses*; saying that he did not know where we were in the prophetic current of events, until he could fix that event, which he had hitherto not been able to do to his own satisfaction; and also by the example of the elder ALEXANDER, who in a review, late in life, of some book on the Prophecies, declared himself to be "waiting for further light." But, after all, we are compelled to feel that the authority of inspiration, pronouncing the encouragement of a blessing from God, on those who *read* and *hear* and *keep* the things written in that darkest and grandest of prophetic books, is paramount to all the "dicta of abstinence" of master minds on the subject. Prophecy surely would never have been written at all, if there were not purposes for which the study of it is profitable. We have not, we think, the wish, either to be immodest ourselves, or to reprove others for not being so. But we boldly claim the full right of our spirits to be acted on by the word of God without human mediator. We claim the right to see what we see; to think we see what we think we see; and to say we think we see what we think we see. We must have theories. They are experimental limnings of thought for inspection, correction, erasure, or confirmation. Let us endeavor to hold our theories without dogmatism; always distinguishing between the prophecies and our theories of the prophecies, and always remembering that our theories are to be established only by being proved to be the true sense of the prophecies as intended by the divine Spirit, and the same arguments in general by which the meaning of other Scripture is discovered. No man can tell at what time the key of the prophecies which are now so universally engaging the attention of thoughtful minds, will appear in the world. It may have appeared since the giant Baxter and the sage Alexander watched and waited for its coming. It may be some event of no great significance in the outward and secular history of the world; significant only in that deep and splendid language of symbols, and in that deep thought of heaven, of which the prophecies give us glimpses. It may have appeared in the journals of the day, even while these pages have been passing under the eye. It may be five, ten, fifteen,

twenty years off still. It is not for us—and we shall have to learn the fact—to know the times and the seasons. We believe that no theory of prophecy is refuted by the failure of pragmatic ascertainments of dates; for no theory of prophecy can be the correct one which does not leave room for that glory of God which accrues in the concealment of a thing. The German Bengel, (by the way a great millenarian,) placed the second advent in 1836; many in the United States, in 1843; Faber and Cumming, in 1864–5; Drs. Scott and Cogswell, in 1866. What of that? Does the failure to fix the correct dates of events, which events are clearly foretold, but the dates expressly concealed, affect the clear revealing of the events? Certainly not. It is appointed to men once to die. But there is a concealment of the day and hour of our death. Does this uncertainty about the time, lead any reasonable man to discard the theory that he will die in the latter part of his life, and ought to expect and prepare for the event? Certainly not. This may not be an exact analogy, but it will serve the purpose of one. We admit no argument as valid against the premillennial theory, drawn from the failure of former horoscopes; because precise dates are not revealed; and because there is a difference between events and their dates; and because in the very act of attempting to ascertain dates lay the error, it may be the only one, of these theories; and because the things prophesied of, not having occurred in the past, cannot prove that they will not occur in the future; but only eliminates the past from the problem, and shuts us up to the future.

We shall assume for the present, that it is the habit and genius of prophecy to mingle every where certainty with uncertainty, just as in the book of the years of unfolding time, a white leaf alternates with a black one in every diurnal revolution. We claim that the uncertainty attending the hour of the expiration of a period, does not prove any uncertainty concerning the *length* of that period.

We therefore take the well-known expression—“a time, times, and the dividing of time,” “forty and two months,” “a thousand two hundred and three score days,”—frequently occurring in

both Daniel and Revelation, and indicating by its occurrence in those two books alone, that the periods of time in them are to be interpreted by the application of the same symbols—to mean twelve hundred and sixty years. This is on what is called the *year-day* principle. We cannot but accept this principle as one as well established as anything in the language of symbols has often been, or is likely to be.

The second chapter of Daniel, containing that great symbolical and historical image, with its different parts of gold, silver, brass, and iron and clay, and the stone cut out of the mountains which broke them in peices, is one map of earthly history, grouped under different periods of successive universal empires.

The seventh chapter of Daniel, containing the rise of the symbolical beasts from the sea, and the throne of the divine Son of man ultimately reigning over them; is another and parallel map of the same history, similarly grouped under universal empires. These two chapters appear to relate to the fortunes of the WEST. The eighth and the eleventh chapters of Daniel have probably the same species of parallelism with each other; and we understand them, together with the sequel of the great prophecy in the latter chapter, which extends through the twelfth chapter, to relate in like manner to the history and destinies of the EAST.

As there are four principle chapters of unfulfilled prophecies in the book of Daniel, so there are four principal chapters of unfulfilled prophecies in the book of Revelation. And the idea is advanced, and seems eminently like truth, and probably is such, that there is the same kind of parallelism between the two couplets of prophetic chapters in the Apocalypse, the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth, that there is in Daniel.

There may not be sufficient evidence at this time to establish this parallel in the Revelation. It seems difficult to distinguish the history of the East from the West in the gorgeous symbols of that sublime book. Yet it would not be surprising if the light of advancing years should establish this theory of parallelism as truth; that not only does each chapter repeat the foregoing one on the same department of history, but that the one book of

prophecy repeats the other book; and that the visions of the seer of Patmos are rehearsals of those of the sage and prophet of the Ulai, five hundred years before, with an ever increasing number of bright and significant points in the picture, as an ever increasing number of stars appear, in strange and awful glory, in the skies, as the hours of the evening advance.

We approve those interpretations which find the PAPACY in the LITTLE HORN which rises among the kingdoms of the Roman Empire, Dan. vii. 24; which is diverse from the first set; which subdues and supplants three kingdoms; which speaks great words against the Most High; which wears out the saints; and thinks to change times and laws; and we firmly believe that that symbol describes that thing with a sublime and startling accuracy. In that prophecy we first meet with the great prophetic period: "and they (the saints and the times and the laws) shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." Dan. vii. 25. We have this same period mentioned in the twelfth of Daniel, in a prophecy which, if our theory of classification holds good, relates to the affairs of the East, as this in the seventh chapter does to those of the West. The great periods of the depression of true religion are of the same length in both. Their being of the same length does not prove, it is admitted, that they cover the same date and have their beginnings and ends at the same time. One may begin twenty years before the other, or any other number of years. That only proves that it will end the same length of time before the other that it began. And yet the repeated parallelism of the East and the West, in the mind of the Spirit, both in the book of Daniel and in the Apocalypse, their being woven together as alternate scenes in both these sublime books, and the same period being the duration of the great oppressors in both regions, does raise the probability, that the periods, East and West, begin together, and end together. There are also interpreters who think that it is requisite to the vast importance of the particular occasion, that the crash of the downfall of the great enemy of Christendom in the East, and the crash of the downfall of the great enemy of Christendom in the West, should occur at the same moment.

We frequently meet the same period in the Revelation. The time of the treading of the court of the temple under foot by the Gentiles, in the eleventh chapter of Revelation, is "forty and two months." The time during which the two witnesses prophesy in sackcloth, in the same chapter, is "a thousand two hundred and three score days." The time during which the woman is nourished in the wilderness from the face of the serpent, in the twelfth chapter, is "a time, and times, and half a time." And the time during which the fearful beast with seven heads and ten horns and ten crowns, was to continue in power, was "forty and two months." These are obviously the same period of time variously stated, in days, or months, or years, to confirm, to illustrate, to explain each other. A thousand two hundred and three score days is just what forty two months would make, reduced to days. And forty and two months are three years and a half, reduced to months. Now, as has already been hinted, it is not so much the duration of those great periods in which the history of the world is grasped by the mind of the Spirit, which is to be concealed by the wise reserve of prophecy, as their precise terminations. It is the "times and the seasons." So that it is but reasonable to suppose that some means have been employed by which to let fall on the earth a measuring line for this period so often used in the Scriptures. Is there not commonly some clue given to dark prophecies? Is not the number given as that of the name of the apocalyptic beast, Rev. xiii. 18, such a clue? Is any reason to be found in "the glory of God to conceal a thing," in the wise reserve and dignity of the inspiring Spirit, against the probability of such a clue? Is not the hiding of the beginnings and endings of these periods a sufficient darkness on them, to answer all the purposes of darkness? And does not the concealment not only of the times and seasons of the beginnings and endings of great periods, but also of the very length of those periods themselves, amount to a denial of all revelation in the prophecies, and thus prove suicidal? We therefore think it rational to suppose that a measure of the great prophetic period should have been given us in the Scriptures. We find that measure in the seventy weeks of Daniel. They are the time

between the giving of the prophecy and the crucifixion of Christ. That time was four hundred and ninety years. That proves that one of those weeks was seven years; that a day is the prophetic symbol for a year; and the accomplishment of one of those Old Testament prophecies, which stands fully and fairly in the midst of the others, shows the rule by which they are all to be interpreted, gives the clue of the dates, and is the voice of the Holy Spirit saying in terms as plain as ought to be expected to be employed: the days in some prophecies are the same kind of symbols as the days in others; they are all days for years; and just so certainly as the event has proven that it was four hundred and ninety years till the cutting off of Messiah, just so certainly has the establishing of that measure fixed the great prophetic period at twelve hundred and sixty years. We confess that we have never been able to see a defect in this reasoning. We therefore hold it to be conclusive. We embrace therefore the *year-day* principle. We apply it to both couplets of prophecies, in both books; conceiving that the event has established the fact, beyond dispute, in other days; and that that event was of so centrally momentous a character, the bringing in of everlasting and vicarious righteousness, that it was most suitable and becoming to be used as a standard measure of time, during which other great events would happen on earth, marking the steps of the progress of that everlasting and vicarious righteousness, to its rightful triumph over the race of fallen man.

Without presuming to shut out future light, and without assuming a positive tone, which is wholly unbecoming on the subject, we confess that we are inclined to think it an entirely settled point of interpretation, in reference to the couplets of prophecies in both books, and in reference to the temporary triumph of the foes of Christ in both quarters of the world, that the great prophetic period is as certainly twelve hundred and sixty years, as the time from Daniel to Christ was four hundred and ninety years; that a day means a year in all these prophecies, if it means a year in any of them; and that the event has already proved that it means a year in that one of them which was first fulfilled, and which was therefore best adapted to be made a standard of measurement for the others.

Of course, then, the question when this period of twelve hundred and sixty years commenced, has fallen to be much discussed. Certain interpreters have fixed the foot of the ladder of time at the decree of the emperor Phocas, in the year 606, constituting the Pope of Rome universal bishop. They claim that that decree gave the saints, and the times, and the laws, into the Pope's hand, according to the prophecy. With this decree they claim that the retirement of Mahomet to the cave of Hera, to compose the Koran, coincided; and that that was the era of beginning of Islamism, the great enemy of Christianity in the East. Yet there is far too much "easy facility" about this coincidence; and not that darkness of birth which attends realities from the hand of God. We have never seen either satisfactory proof that the retirement of Mahomet to the cave was the great era of the commencement of the Eastern imposture; or so much as good reason to think it was an era at all in his public life. Probably it was the beginning of a serious purpose of imposture on his part, but hardly his entrance on such career; or if so, hardly a step in such career of sufficient importance to be the era of its commencement. As to this decree of the emperor Phocas, there is not wanting an amount of uncertainty about it. Mosheim tells us that it is stated "solely on the authority of Baronius, for no ancient writer has given such testimony." But he quotes Anastasius and Paul Diaconus for statements nearly equivalent; that Phocas, disliking the bishop of Constantinople, decreed that primacy to the bishop of Rome which had hitherto been claimed by him of the Byzantine capital. And what "was intended as a compliment, was *artfully construed* into a grant of unlimited power," as is keenly remarked by the translator, touching the matter.

There is a part of the great chronological series of seals, trumpets, and vials, generally admitted to refer to Mahomet and the Saracens. It is in the ninth chapter of Revelation; and begins with the falling of a star from heaven to earth. In that place, it is said that men should be tormented by that power for "five months." It is concerning this latter prophecy of the Saracens, that the elder Alexander, not a follower of either opinion, in an article in the *Princeton Review* for April, 1847, says:



“There is nothing more remarkable in this prophecy than the precise agreement between the time specified and the actual progress of the Saracens upon the *year-day* principle. For commencing the calculation from 612, when Mahomet first published his pretended revelations, to the year 762, when they received the first effectual check in the south of France, is a period of exactly 150 years. And then occurred another event, which had a greater effect in putting a stop to the career of the Saracens than the victories of Charles Martel; which was a division in the caliphate. In the year 750, the family of the Abassides were supplanted by that of the Ommiades. The deposed caliph fled to Spain, and *there* was acknowledged as the true caliph, while Almanzor kept possession of the East; and in this very year, 762, laid the foundation of a city on the banks of the Tigris, which became the capital of the East. From this time the conquest of the Saracens ceased. ‘The locusts,’ as Daubuz remarks, ‘took their flight from Christendom.’” This is the calm thought of a wise man, with hardly sufficient partisan inclination to any school of interpreters, to admit that there is a certain and ascertainable sense in the prophecies at all. He gives us a wonderful confirmation of the time which has been agreed upon for the rise of the Mahometan imposture in the minute prophecy. We see no reason for pitching upon one period in the minute prophecy, and a different period in the larger prophecy, for the same event. Probably the fulfilment of the one in the past is intended to guide us in understanding the other.

Many students of prophecy have been struck by the exact fulfilment of the minute prophecy. The power which was to last “five months” lasted exactly one hundred and fifty years, or five times thirty days, putting a day for a year. We pretend not to fix dates; for, as has been said, we believe that God has cast particular shadows over their edges. We think the passing by of 1866 without witnessing the absolute fall of the Pope and the great Mahometan power of the East, proves that the era of their origin was not 606. We see not that it proves anything else. We believe that the shadows of divine reserve have already gathered around both these powers. We are unquestionably

near their fall as a prophetic question. The attentive observer will, we think, agree that the shadows of doubt have almost departed from them considered as questions among the great powers of Europe. Admitting that the precise lapse of the times is reserved in the hands of God to check human presumption, we yet make no doubt, on the other hand, of the presence of the element of time and date in the prophecies. We yield to post-millenarians that the inspiring Spirit does not mean to make us *mad prophets*, but meek interpreters, and we claim that he does not mean to make us blind neglecters. If we were going to fix—as we are not—any time for the placing of the foot of the great period of twelve hundred and sixty years, it would not be 606. It would be 612; because that was the period of the commencement of the Mahometan power, in one prophecy which has already run its course, and proved the date to be correct. *Further than this*, we have no sympathy whatever with the post-millenarians, for which the reasons will be given further on. Good men there have been, but mistaken ones, who fixed the second advent at 1843, others at 1866. Their dates were erroneous, and they were mistaken in supposing that they had any vocation to fix precise dates at all. We go no further than this in making sport of them. That we have never yet died, does not prove that we shall never die. The delay of the Flood and the mistakes which good and believing men might have made concerning the time of its coming, did not prove, save to the prone sensualist, that it never would come. The taunting question spoken of by the apostle Peter, “Where is the promise of his coming?” does not disprove his coming. There is nothing like implied censure upon the prophet Daniel that he knew “*by books*” the time of the lapse of the captivity.

When it is affirmed to be the glory of God to conceal a thing, we understand it to refer to the knowledge of those minute circumstances which would make men enthusiasts or fanatics. Such confident familiarity must be offensive to the awful dignity, the intellectual reserve, the dislike of impertinent gaze and inspection, and the preference to work out his own eternal counsels, concealed from shallow and short-sighted mortals, which we

must ascribe to the Holy Spirit of God. It is not for us to know the "times and the seasons;" those minute periods of events, and their happenings, which would if known remove the restraints, the boundings, and the governings, which ignorance of the future imposes on men's spirits; and cause bewildering lunacies of prophetic interpretation to spring up, of which the world has had examples in many lands and in many ages. Judging from the dealings of divine Providence with every individual man, in concealing from him his own future, the cloud which now hangs over the future of the world, together with the wide spread expectation and inquiry excited in thinking minds, is best for the mind of man, and most in accordance with the divine reserve. But that there will be great and sore trials of the faith of his saints, by the long delay of his second coming, we gather from several places, especially from his significant question in the parable on perseverance in prayer, where he says: "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" That neither this delay, for the trial of his people's faith, nor the reserve of the day and hour and minute circumstances, for his own secret knowledge, nor the failure of all attempts at fixing dates exactly, disproves his second coming itself and does not disprove any theory of it; but does merely fulfil those Scriptures, which speak of its coming at an unlooked-for hour at last, we do fully and firmly believe. The divine shadow has already touched us. At least we are in its penumbra. Whatever may happen now, on any month and year, with regard to those powers, and realms, and empires which constitute the subjects of prophecies, will in all probability be in the direct course to the consummation. It may not be intelligible to the slumbering world. It will be a part of the progress of the doomed powers to their doom, and of the progress of events to their long forespoken ends, and of the purposes of God to their accomplishment.

The overthrow of the Papacy and Mohammedanism—and **WHAT THEN?** We shall attempt to answer as the Scriptures appear to us to teach, irrespective of the sneers of men, irrespective of all questions of power, or of the mode, or of the practical road from the present to that prophesied of; being confident that what God

has said he will do, that he can do, and has known forever that he can do; and that his resources are as much above man's conceptions as is his omnipresence, or any other of his natural attributes.

In the great image in the second of Daniel, gold, silver, brass, iron, are symbols respectively of the four universal empires of ancient history, from early Assyria to the latest Roman ages. These symbols are solid material substances. Then a stone cut out of the mountain without hands smites and destroys this image. And the stone miraculously increases, and fills the whole earth. This smiting of the upper parts of the image by the stone, is interpreted to mean that "in the days of those kings, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."

In the old spiritualizing modes of interpretation, this kingdom of the stone was the *Church*. We believe this interpretation to be contradictory to the fundamental laws of symbolical language. That is a language in which one thing is expressed by another analogous to it. There seems to us to be no analogy whatever between the grace of God in the hearts of men which constitutes the Church, and a stone which crushes the civil and political kingdoms of the world. We believe there are already signs clearly visible, that that interpretation does not satisfy inquiring spirits. The Church is the most spiritual of things. This symbol, the stone, in which the old spiritualizers profess to find a prophecy of the Church, is the most material of things. The very declarations of the Lord Jesus himself—one before Pilate, that his "kingdom is not of this world," and one that the kingdom of God "cometh not with observation," but is "within you"—do themselves plainly show that the kingdom of God of the Gospels, and the kingdom of God of the Prophecies, are *not* identical. The kingdom of the prophecies *is* of this world. It appears in the series of the kingdoms of this world. It is their successor. It is their successful rival. The weapons of the warfare of the Church are not carnal. Those of this kingdom are so. It breaks in pieces and consumes other temporal kingdoms.

We are led to the same results by the parallel prophecy in the seventh chapter of Daniel, where a series of wild beasts arise amid the striving winds upon the sea, as a new set of emblems of the four great ancient monarchies. After the terrible Roman beast, and the little horn upon his head, representing the papacy with ghastly accuracy "with eyes like the eyes a man and a mouth speaking great things," "thinking to change times and laws," and "wearing out the saints of the Most High," and having them given into his hand during the oft repeated prophetic period of a "time, times, and half a time," the vision still looks to the future to see the kingdom of God of the prophecies. The kingdom of God of the Gospels, the Church, was then six or seven hundred years old. But the kingdom of God of the prophecies was to be erected upon the ruins of the papal apostasy and usurpation, and after that had had its long career. Unless, then, that prophetic interpretation which sees the papacy in this little horn, and which has the consent of a greater number of scholars than perhaps any other in the whole circle of prophecy, is itself a mistake, the kingdom of God of the prophecies comes after the papacy; and cannot therefore be the Church, which was long before. In those late days, the political judgment throne is erected. Upon it sits one whose right to occupy it grows out of his eternal years, "the Ancient of days." Righteousness, under the symbol of "a garment white as snow," clothes Him. His justice shines from a "a throne like fiery flame"—"wheels as burning fire," and "a fiery stream issuing and coming forth from before him." His power is seen in the thousand thousands that minister to him, and the "ten thousand times ten thousand" who stand before him. A sentence of fearful justice is executed. The beast which bears the papal horn is given to the burning flame. The power of persecution, that power so contradictory to Christianity, is crushed. Then the Son of man comes in the clouds of heaven, in which manner his coming is so often spoken of; he appears before the Ancient of days, and there, by a just decree of that political judgment, HE receives "dominion, glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." "His dominion is an everlasting

dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." We of course have no disbelief that the Church is a kingdom of Christ; its crown one of the most glorious of the many crowns he wears. But to make this late kingdom the Church, is to confound all sober distinctions of character, quality, and date, among the things in the prophecies. The grand old word of the seventeenth century, whatever they meant by it, FIFTH MONARCHY, is the correct one; a fifth universal monarchy, successor of Roman, Greek, Persian, and Assyrian; in which political crimes shall be judged and punished, political justice done, the wild political intoxications of men sobered; in which he will be King on earth who has long been King in Zion; who then first, in the full sense of the grand words, "shall sit upon the throne of his father David."

There are other prophecies in the Old Testament which show the real nature of the kingdom of Christ, which we have not space here to bring together. We mention the second Psalm as a specimen. The old interpretation which spiritualizes the *breaking of God's enemies with a rod of iron, the dashing them in pieces like a potter's vessel, and their perishing from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little*; and makes them describe the operations of that truth and grace which come down like the dew upon the mown grass and as showers that water the earth, is so utterly unsatisfactory to any spirit of faithful interpretation that it cannot be necessary to argue it. *How could a real and literal kingdom be affirmed, if it is not by such images?* Of course great splendor of the Church is bound up with this kingdom of political justice. In the Old Testament prophecies, the two combine in the images to a great extent. In the book of Revelation, we have symbols of purely civil power; as "the man child who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron," Rev. xii. 5; "one like the Son of man seated upon a white cloud, with a crown of gold, and in his hand a SHARP SICKLE," Rev. xiv. 14; and the WORD OF GOD with vesture dipped in blood, followed by armies in white, going to rule with a rod of iron, treading the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God, with KING OF KINGS and LORD of LORDS written upon his thigh. Rev. xix. 13.

And then we have purely religious symbols; as the temple of God, Rev. xi. 1; the woman in the wilderness, Rev. xii. 14; the Lamb on Mount Zion with his elect, Rev. xiv. 1; the temple filled with smoke from the glory of God, Rev. xv. 8; the censer cast into the earth, Rev. viii. 5.

Amid these two kinds of symbols, civil and religious, in the four chapters of parallel prophecies, we have frequently the same period, "a time, and times, and half a time," or its equivalent in days or months, given as the time of the duration of the enemies both of a pure Church or a just State. There are many probabilities that these prophecies are parallel to those in Daniel, which need not be given now. We have glanced at what is to follow the overthrow of the Church's enemies, in those prophecies. Let us now go to the Apocalypse to find what is its response to the same question.

We could never see any adequate reason for Dr. Henry More's celebrated scheme, that the messages to the seven churches of Asia Minor are descriptive of seven consecutive periods of time, or different ages of Christianity. There is also a learned note in Stier's Words of Jesus upon the same principle. We see nothing whatever to prove these messages to be chronological. The contrary appears clearly stated. The apostle was directed to write "the things which are," and the "things which shall be hereafter." The "things which are," extend through the third chapter. Then he is called at the commencement of the fourth, to go through an open door into heaven to see the "things which must be hereafter." These marks of time appear in the text itself, and seem entirely decisive that the seven messages are present things, and what are beheld after the seer goes through the open door in heaven are future things.

With the latter division, the future things, our present concern is. The scheme of the whole book is very grand. There is one rolling series of sevens; these seven messages to the churches, with their seven golden promises to him that "overcometh," embracing the things that are. There are three rolling series of sevens, only every seventh till the last, unfolds itself into the next series. The seals are opened one after another, to

the seventh, which contains the seven trumpets. Then the trumpets are sounded one after another, till the seventh, which contains the seven vials. Each seventh is expanded, for more distinct illumination, into seven subdivisions. All the trumpets spring out of the seventh seal. All the vials are poured out in the time of the seventh trumpet. According to this plan, every seventh goes to the end. The seventh seal embraces trumpets and vials to the end. The seventh trumpet embraces all the vials to the last. The seventh vial is the last subsection of trumpet and seal. So the last yard of a mile, and the last foot of that yard, and the last inch of that foot, all go to the end of the mile.

The contents of the little book are probably complete sections of the great period, cut through and through longitudinally, for clearer and better light, from different points of view, and in connexion with the different matters of interest comprised in it. But the general plan is that of rolling sevens, each seven rolling out into subdivisions. When the seventh seal is opened, the first seventh of future things, there are "voices and thunders, and lightnings, and an earthquake," to denote those tremendous civil and social convulsions, perhaps also natural ones, which all prophecy teaches to precede the consummation of God's patience with the crimes of the world. The series of trumpets then begins, giving a more minute map of the period of the seventh seal. It rolls on to its seventh in turn. And when the spirit of prophecy arrives at a point at which the consummation may be made visible to human eyes and audible to human ears, then "there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever." Rev. xi. 15. This is the same thing of which Daniel speaks. The remarks there apply here also. Here is a definite answer to the question, after the overthrow of Christ's enemies, WHAT THEN? We answer that then the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ. We are under no obligation to explain what or how it is all to be, as if we were God's counsellors. We are often amazed at the easy triumphs of the post-millenarian



writers, because others cannot explain all the *minutiae*, and solve all the difficulties their fruitful imaginations can invent, in connexion with the sublime cosmogonies of the prophecies. They require that we should have the wisdom of the Creator ourselves. But He can solve them, if we cannot; and so will he do beyond all controversy, if he has so said, even though it may involve the calling down of the twelve legions of angels who were not called down at the crucifixion of Christ. We pause not now to argue with schemes which make the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ, a figure of speech to be explained and attenuated away, or spiritualized into certain ecclesiastical happenings, which will still leave the world a prey to tyranny, to injustice, to fanatic phrensy, and to atheistic falsehood. We say emphatically that we trust not such interpretations.

The seven vials spring out of the seventh trumpet, in turn, to furnish a map of the last spaces of the prophetic period, on a more distinct and minute scale. When the seventh vial was poured out, there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven from the throne, saying, *IT IS DONE!* The trials of the faith of the saints; the tolerated triumphs of the persecuting, the ungodly, and the atheistic; the dark, deep, wise delays of the coming of his power, are *DONE*, for that time at least, and for a long and blessed season after that. There is then another account, parallel of course, but, like other prophecies, filling out the matter more thoroughly by each succeeding repetition, to that which occurred at the seventh trumpet: "There were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon earth, so mighty an earthquake and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell: and great Babylon came into remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath. And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found. And there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent; and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great." Rev. xvi. 18-21. This is a still fuller

and more minute description of the scenes and events at the end of the period. Then follow three gorgeous chapters, containing the drama of the destruction of the great enemy of the saints, here called Bablyon: the seventeenth, the eighteenth, and the nineteenth. The saints of God come out of her, as from a great edifice on fire. The kings of the earth witness the ascent to the skies of the smoke of her burning. The merchants and ship-masters sit on shore, and lament her fate; but in terror, lest the devouring flames should seize them also. God's holy prophets and apostles rejoice over the long delayed, but now fully, thoroughly, signally paid retribution. The *blood of the saints* was found in her. (Let all persecutors beware, and pause, and repent.) There is a great song in heaven in praise of the righteous and omnipotent dominion of the long insulted and defied, but faithful and true Lord God. Dark crimes covered over with the adorning robes of success, now assume their true and real shape.

Then goes forth, with vesture dipped in blood, that splendid and terrible personage, the Word of God, THE KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS; to smite the nations with the rod that goeth out of his mouth; to rule them with a rod of iron; to tread the wine-press of the fierce wrath of God; to spread a supper on the flesh of kings, captains, and mighty men, for all the ravenous birds under heaven; to take and to destroy the beast and the false prophet, and cast them into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. Then follow the binding of Satan, the enthroning of the saints, the first resurrection, the millennium or golden age of Revelation; and then the judgment; the new heavens and earth; the golden city, the New Jerusalem; and the other unspeakable splendors of a blessed and holy eternal state.

These things furnish a more complete picture of the taking of the kingdom by the divine Son of man than that in Daniel. They are placed under the same limitations of time. The same period is constantly referred to in both. We have not a word to say on the questions on the mode and circumstances of the expected coming of Christ, whether it is to be visible or invisible; or about the first resurrection, whether it is to be literal,

figurative, or spiritual; or about the reign of the saints, whether temporal or ecclesiastical; or about the thousand years, whether to be taken on the *natural day* principle, or on the *year-day* principle. All we have to say is that these are to be interpreted so as to be SOMETHING, and not so as to be NOTHING.

This is a fair occasion to state our objections to what are called post-millenarian views of prophecy: 1. They seem to us to strip the prophecies almost entirely of the deep moment and joyous importance which holy beings on earth and in heaven attach to them. One writer does not know, in shameful discredit of God's word, but that the Millennium has been long going on!! 2. These views seem to have their roots in an unwillingness to be caught too implicitly relying on the word of God; for fear that doing so will expose them to ridicule for the failure of their trust in God, as it is evidently believed that many good but misguided men have been caught heretofore; forgetting that men's horoscopes have failed, because they intruded into "the times and seasons" which belonged not to them; and that there is less intellectual pride, and probably less sin, in a mistaken horoscope, than a cold disdain of God's voice in prophecy. 3. Post-millenarianism subsists upon ingenious difficulties stated in the way of our being able fully to conceive the *manner* in which the Almighty will reconstruct the moral universe in the millennium. Such difficulties may be set on foot in relation to the work of the Holy Spirit on the hearts of men; in reference to the concurrence of the divine will and the human will in the divine decrees; in reference to the union of two distinct natures in the one Person of our divine Redeemer, and many other points. They are not really of a great deal of weight. 4. We object to that attenuating process by which the prophecies are made mere figures of speech, spiritualized, or converted into oracles more slippery and illusory than the Delphic; so that they may mean that which would not be recognised, if beheld in fulfilment before our eyes on earth around us. The prophetic language is the language of symbols, but not of jugglery. To check human presumption, the symbolic veil is employed; it is not intended to conceal the uncertainties of the divine plan, as

many seem to suppose, but to repress profane curiosity. There are inspired interpretations of many symbols: the four metals of the great image, in one chapter of Daniel, and the four beasts in another, are explained to mean the four universal empires. They are not spiritualized away. The meretricious woman in scarlet and purple, in the Revelation, is explained to mean "that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth." Rev. xvii. In these and many other inspired specimens of the solution of prophetic symbols, we do not discover the attenuations of the spiritualizing process. States as well as Churches, we believe more frequently than Churches, are the subjects of prophecy. Some of the most fearful of the retributions of the reigning Son of God, when he shall come into this world for purposes of retribution, are to be upon apostate and persecuting States, as the companions of apostate and persecuting Churches. It will be a most instructive chapter to the student of the history of prophetic interpretation, which records those theories in which men argue from the uncertainty of *times* and *seasons*, to the uncertainty of the symbols and the things themselves; and from the cloud around about the *edges* of events, to a cloud of uncertainty around the *great principle* of the divine fidelity in fulfilments itself. We may derive light upon the fulfilment of prophecy in future from the fulfilment of prophecy in the past. Prophecies, symbolical and literal, by Old Testament prophets, and New Testament prophets, have been fulfilled in the past. A virgin has conceived and borne a son. Babylon has been judged for her conduct to God's people. Egypt, Tyre, Dumah, have received dooms prophesied. A coming of Christ has occurred at the destruction of Jerusalem. Stars symbolical have fallen from heaven. Locusts have gone forth. White horses with crowned riders conquering and to conquer, black horses with riders bearing scales, and pale horses with Death as their riders, have gone forth on the earth. We make bold to affirm, that so far as clear interpretations have been given to the prophecies of the past, we do not, on any theory, find any confirmation of the modern post-millenarian theory of attenuation, of spiritualization, and of the annihilation of the clear sense of words and

symbols. We call in as a witness to this fact, that whole excellent and readable volume, Keith on the Prophecies. On one single point does this retrospect appear to diminish the meaning of the unfulfilled prophecies: A coming of Christ is prophesied of in connexion with the Roman and New Testament destruction of Jerusalem. There was at that time, that has been recorded, no visible appearance of the awful Judge to that people. But it is a question by no means settled, whether that is, or is not, one of those perpetual prophecies which repeat themselves time after time, after the manner of the foretellings of common principles in the moral government of God; and whether or not the first of its fulfilments did not leave some circumstances untouched, which will yet appear with more and more perfect accuracy, every time it repeats itself, till every jot and tittle is made good. And even if this be not conceded, the tremendous wrath upon that people at the time of that prophecy and that generation, including the deep and tremendous subversion of their state, does not seem, by any means, to make nothing of the coming of Christ to the world hereafter, "to judge and make war."

The fall of the power of the Pope, and the fall of the power of Turkey, the representative of Mahomet on the field of the old Roman empires, are the signs in every prophecy of the coming of God's justice to the world. Since the recent departure of the French bayonets from Rome, there has been strong temptation to a thoughtful mind to remember the forespoken and infallible doom of that hoary iniquity. And whatever the powers of Europe may combine to do, in the way of support to him, their so-called "Holy Father," when the time of God comes, their resolvings and their doings will be as the chaff of the summer-threshing floor which the wind driveth away. And he who looks back to the times of Gregory, and Hildebrand, and Borgia, when Europe trembled at bulls, interdicts, excommunications, when popes dethroned kings, set their feet upon the necks of princes, kept emperors waiting for days for audience at their doors, or made them hold their stirrups as they mounted their steeds of hypocritical pride, will probably feel that the pope is already little better than fallen. And he who remembers how Europe trembled when

the countless hordes of the Grand Vizier Kara Mustapha besieged Vienna in the *latter part of the seventeenth century*, just before the coming of William of Orange to the throne of England; and would have taken it, but for John Sobieski and his Poles; and then remembers how foreign bayonets propped the Moslem throne in the late Crimean war; and how soon the Russian Czar *would*, and how easily he *could*, make Constantinople once more the capital of a Greek Empire, but for the jealousy of Western Europe; will be apt to think the same thing in relation to the power of the Turk. "From the barren plains of the North"—they are the words of a public journal since our article was begun, commenting on the New Year's speech of the French emperor—"the bearers of the Cross are nearing those confines which shall bring them face to face with the glitter of the Crescent, and the purple waves of the Golden Horn. The fateful problem of that supremacy against which England and France have so sedulously fought through the agencies of war and diplomacy for many decades, will, if the omens be true, be decided ere long in the advance of Russia upon Turkey. Even now, as in a prologue to a coming tragedy, the issue is made with the Ottoman power by a band of hardy Greeks. And when the long deferred fall of Islam shall be at hand, and the Russian Cossacks shall swarm to the work that ceased for a while at Sebastopol, there will be time for his imperial majesty (of France) to declare in another prophetic enunciation from the Tuileries, that the hopes with which he entered the year 1867 have been baffled and destroyed, and that the revenges that come from battle and its results must again compass the ends of empire and nationalities." *New York News, January 12.*

We learn from the Holy Scriptures that when our Lord Jesus Christ last left this world in the body, he was then received by the heavens, "until the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts iii. 21. There are, then, RESTITUTIONS to be expected at his coming. The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. The creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption

into the glorious liberty of the children of God. The material world implores the coming of its divine Restorer, to deliver it from many an evil spell and charm of miasm, infection, contagion; and from many an evil spell and charm of sterility, barrenness, thorns, weeds, and briers; and from poisonous insect, and venomous reptile, and fanged serpent.

The social world implores his coming whose right it is to rule, that persecution may at length have a law imposed upon it: Hitherto shalt thou go, and no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed; that the power of tyranny may be broken, and the teeth of malice be extracted; that the voices of depraved numbers, whose passions have been artfully inflamed, may not be erected into a standard of eternal right; that men may recognise the chalice haunting their own lips, in the hand of Nemesis, which they have spent a life-time in preparing for the lips of others; that a set of principles may not be exalted to the skies, as the principles of the brave, the good, and the wise, in one century, if they succeed, and the same set of principles be condemned to the abyss, as the principles of the base, the evil, and the fools, in the next century, if they fail; that one man may not waste and pine in captivity, in one place, for the same acts, the same principles, and the same spirit and intentions, for which another sleeps in unrivalled earthly glory in another place; that it may be clearly seen, to the conviction of all intelligencies, that the end does *not* justify and sanctify the means, and change them from crimes to good deeds, even though the end were a real good, and not selfish and in contravention of the good of others; that there may at length be some other standard of social justice exhibited to the eyes of the nations than that power founded upon mental darkness and passion; that the Moral Law of God may have full leave to throw its cords over kings, realms, states, conclaves, armies, populaces, as well as individuals; that the voice of truth may at length find instant response in heaven; that the prayers, and the tears, and the blood of down-trodden innocence, with whom there is no other helper, may come up to the ears of the Lord God of Sabaoth.

The religious world implores his coming, that he may, with

unerring judgment, discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that blinds himself with the delusion that the indulgence of unbridled malevolence, is the service of God; that he may depose those who "say they are apostles and are not; that he may apply a faithful test to that which says it is gospel but is not; that he may know and acknowledge his own people, and his own truth, and his own grace, to the reprobation of all counterfeits; that he may apply to the touch of the Ithuriel spear to Satan even under the transformation of an angel of light; that he may try the spirits, whether they are of God, or are of the many false prophets that have gone out into the world; that he may convict of apostasy all sects, sections, churches, theologies, associations, synagogues, parties, and partisans whatsoever, who have disobeyed the authority of pure and simple revelation, and have followed the contrary humanities, or the contrary ferocities, prompted by the unclean spirits which come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet; and judge them, as may become his kingly dignity and authority, for disloyalty to the King in Zion, while he was *but* King in Zion, and before he had taken unto him his great power to be King of the kingdoms of this world. We join our humble voice with the voices of the material, the social, and the religious world: Even so: Come Lord Jesus; and come quickly.

---

ARTICLE III.

THE CHRISTIAN'S DUTY TOWARDS HIS ENEMIES:

It may be surmised that this is a duty whose "metes and bounds" are ill understood by many of the people of God; and that, consequently, the minds of many of them are harassed with doubts and temptations concerning it. On the one hand, many, perhaps, excuse to themselves criminal emotions under the name of virtuous indignation; and on the other, some of them afflict themselves



with compunctions for, and vain endeavors against feelings which are both proper and natural to us as rational beings.

The embarrassment is increased by the current opinion, that there is inconsistency between the teachings and examples of the Old Testament and the New, upon this subject. Men read in the former the stern language of the imprecatory Psalms, for instance, of the thirty-fifth, the fifty-ninth, the one hundred and ninth, the one hundred and thirty-seventh, and the one hundred and thirty-ninth, where the inspired man prays: "Let them be confounded and put to shame that seek after my soul. . . . Let them be as chaff before the wind; and let the angel of the Lord chase them;" or describes the persecuted Church as crying to her oppressors: "Happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us;" or protests, "Do I not hate them, O Lord that hate thee? Am I not grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred." They then turn to the Sermon on the Mount, and read the words of our Lord; "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." They thereupon imagine a discrepancy, if not a contradiction, between them; and adopt the mischievous conclusion, that the two Testaments contain different codes of Christian ethics. This notion, it is to be feared, has a general prevalency. What is more common than to hear Christians, who should be well-informed, and who profess full reverence for the inspiration of the whole Scriptures, speak of the morality of the Old Testament, of the Hebrew saint, of the prophet, as harsh, austere, and forbidding; while that of the New Testament, of Jesus, and of the Christian, is sweet and forgiving?

All these notions are of Socinian or rationalistic origin, and are incompatible with an honest belief in the actual inspiration of the Scriptures. If inspiration is but an "elevation of the consciousness," a quickening of the intuitions of the transcendental reason, an exaltation of the soul, of the same generic kind with the other impulses of genius, only of a higher grade; then it can be understood how prophets and apostles may contradict each other; although yet they may teach us noble lessons, and

such as common men would never have found out of themselves. But if "all Scripture (the apostle means the Old Testament) is theopneustic," if "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and the apostles, in their turn, had the promise of the Holy Ghost to "lead them into all truth," then a real discrepancy between them is impossible. For all truths must be harmonious among themselves. The honest believer can admit, of course, that the partial revelation of the Old Testament, although absolute truth as far as it goes, and as perfect in its principles as the God who gave it, stops short of that fulness of detail to which the New Testament afterwards proceeded. But while there is a difference in degrees of fulness, there can be no contrariety.

The same view commends itself irresistibly to the plain mind from this fact: that Jesus Christ (not to add the apostles,) suspended the truth of his mission and doctrines, on the infallibility and holiness of the Old Testament. His appeal is ever to them. He cites Moses and the prophets, as though he thought their testimony must be the end of strife. Now, if they are not inspired and true, it follows irresistibly that Jesus Christ was either mistaken, or he was dishonest. (*Absit impietas.*) In either case, he is no Redeemer for us. And indeed the former alternative of this dilemma is inadmissible for one who claimed, as he did, an infallible knowledge for himself, a præexistence of the era of Abraham and the prophets, and the authority of the Messiah by whose Spirit those prophets spoke. So that if the Old Testament were imperfect, Jesus of Nazareth would stand convicted of criminal attempts of imposture!

There is a second reason why such an explanation cannot be applied to the supposed vindictiveness of Old Testament morals: that the same sentiments are expressed in the New Testament, and the same maxims of forbearance which are cited as so lovely in the latter, are set forth, both by precept and example, in the former. So that, if a discrepancy is asserted, it must not be between David and Christ, Hebrew and Christian; but both Testaments must be charged with contradicting themselves, as well as each other. Thus, in Acts viii. 20, Peter exclaims to Simon Magus: "Thy money perish with thee!" Acts xxiii. 3,

Paul sternly denounces the persecuting chief-priest: "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall!" and (2 Tim. iv. 14) distinctly expresses a prayer for retribution upon Alexander the copper-smith of Ephesus: he "did me much evil; the Lord reward him according to his works." 2 Thess. i. 7-10, Christ's coming "in flaming fire to take vengeance on them that know not God," is subject of admiration in all them that believe. Apocalypse vi. 10, the souls of the martyrs under the altar are heard crying with a loud voice: "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" And Matt. xi. 20, and xxiii. 13, Jesus of Nazareth is heard denouncing awful woes upon the enemies of truth.

On the other hand, the Old Testament contains substantially the same precepts of forgiveness, and examples of forbearance, which are so much admired in the New. First, the great truth, which lies at the root of all this subject, that retribution is the exclusive function of the Lord, was first published in the Old Testament, and it is thence St. Paul quotes it, in Rom. xii. 19, "It is written, Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord," It is written a thousand years before, Deut. xxxii. 35, Lev. xix. 18, "To me belongeth vengeance and recompense;" recognised by David as a rule for him, 1 Sam. xxiv. 12, towards his deadly enemy Saul—"the Lord judge between me and thee, and the Lord avenge me of thee; but my hand shall not be upon thee;" repeated in Psalm xciv. 1: "O Lord God, to whom vengeance belongeth;" and cited against evil men, as a rule which they had violated, twice in Ezek. xxv. 12, 15: "Edom and the Philistines have taken vengeance, and have greatly offended." The lovely precept for rendering good for evil is enjoined upon the Israelites in a form most perspicuous and impressive to a pastoral people: "If thou meet thine enemy's ass or his ox going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again." Ex. xxiii. 4. Israel was enjoined to practise tenderness towards foreigners, (a duty ignored then by the pagan world,) and especially towards Egyptians, their late ruthless oppressors. Ex. xxii. 21; Deut. xxiii. 7. Job, the oldest of the patriarchs whose creed has been handed down to us, recognises malice, even when limited to the secret wishes, as an

iniquity: "If I rejoiced at the destruction of him that hated me, or lifted up myself when evil found him; neither have I suffered my mouth to sin by wishing a curse to his soul." Job xxxi. 29. David, the author of nearly all the imprecatory Psalms, repudiates malice with holy abhorrence. "If I have rewarded evil to him that was at peace with me; (yea, I have delivered him that without cause is mine enemy,) let the enemy persecute my soul and take it, etc." Ps. vii. 4. And in Ps. xxxv. 13, he describes his deportment towards his enemies, as in contrast with theirs towards him, and in strict accordance with Christ's command: "But as for me, when they were sick, my clothing was sackcloth; I humbled my soul with fasting, etc." That all this was not mere profession, we have splendid evidence in the sacred history, where he displayed such astonishing forbearance and magnanimity towards Saul, after the most vehement provocation; twice delivering his life from the indignation of his followers, and singing his dirge with the honorable affection of a loyal follower.

This age has witnessed a whole spawn of religionists, very rife and rampant in some sections of the Church, who pretentiously declared themselves the apostles of a lovelier Christianity than that of the sweet Psalmist of Israel. His ethics were entirely too vindictive and barbarous for them, forsooth; and they, with their Peace Societies, and new-lights, would teach the world a milder and more beneficent code! How impertinent does this folly appear, coming from the petted favorites of fortune, whose wilfulness and conceit had hitherto been pampered by a rare concurrence of privileges, so that they had hardly experienced the call for the Christian virtue of forgiveness; and who, as soon as they are crossed (not in their rights, but) in their most arrogant caprices, show themselves incapable of one throb of David's magnanimity, and break out into a vindictiveness set on fire of hell! He who knows his own heart and human nature, will humbly avow, instead of accusing the Psalms of unchristian malice, that he will do well if he never goes beyond their temper, under bitter wrong; and if, while swelling with righteous sense of injury, he can always remit the retribution, in wish, as in act, to God alone.

The consequence of this erroneous admission of actual

discrepancy between the morality of the Old Testament and the New, is, that expositors have fatigued themselves with many vain inventions to explain away the imprecatory language of the Psalms. The generality of this feeling is betrayed by the frequency of these attempts. A curious betrayal of this sceptical impression exists to this day, in the book of Psalms, in the hands of our own Presbyterian people. Instead of a metrical version of Psalm cix., as it stands in the inspired lyrics, there is a human composition upon the beauty of forgiveness. In the psalm books in use for a whole age among the Presbyterians of England and this country, this hymn was formerly prefaced with the words, "(Psalm cix.) Christian forgiveness after the example of Christ." (This title the last editors of our psalm-book bethought themselves to omit.) Any one who compared the human poem with the actual hundred and ninth Psalm, could hardly fail to overlook the suggestion of a contrast: that while the uninspired psalmist of our modern Israel gave utterance to Christian forgiveness after the example of Christ, the actual ode of inspiration expressed unchristian revenge after the example of David. How could the feeling be more clearly betrayed, that the sentiments of the Psalmist were indefensible?

Hence ingenious expedients have been sought to explain them away. Of these, the most current is the following: that where our version says, for instance, "Let his days be few, and let another take his office," the verbs are improperly rendered as imperatives. It is asserted that they may as fairly be rendered as simple futures, "His days will be few," etc.; and then all these passages are converted from imprecations to predictions. The Psalmist only foretells the divine retributions. Waiving the insuperable difficulty, that it is only to a part of these texts the explanation even plausibly applies, we perceive this general objection: That if they be all understood as predictions only, yet they are predictions to the accomplishment of which the inspired men evidently looked forward with moral satisfaction. Thus, they reveal precisely the same sentiments towards evil-doers, as though we understood them as appealing to God with requests for their righteous retribution, while they at the same time

recognise his sole title to avenge, and the sinfulness of their taking their retaliation into their own hands.

All these inventions, then, must be relinquished; the admission must be squarely and honestly made, that the inspired men of both Testaments felt and expressed moral indignation against wrong-doers, and a desire for their proper retribution at the hand of God. This admission must also be successfully defended; which, it is believed, can be done in perfect consistency with that spirit of merciful forbearance and love for the persons of enemies, which both Testaments alike inculcate.

Simple resentment is an instinctive emotion, immediately arising from the experience of personal injury. It can scarcely be called a rational sentiment; for it is felt by men and animals in common, and in human breasts is often aimed against irrational assailants. It does not arise in view of the moral quality of the act, but immediately in view of the injuriousness of the act to the person who feels the resentment. Its final cause is, to energize man for his needful self-defence. Hence resentment obviously has no necessary moral character, more than hunger, thirst, or pain; its moral character only arises when it is regulated or directed amiss. Resentment may be innocently felt, or may be criminal, according as it is properly limited, or is permitted to become inordinate. This is the sentiment concerning which St. Paul says: "Be ye angry, and sin not: Let not the sun go down upon your wrath." Last, the emotion is strictly personal: its immediate cause is injury aimed at one's self.

Moral indignation, or moral disapprobation, in its warmer and more emotional type, is an affection often coëxisting with simple resentment, and often confounded with it. But the two feelings are essentially distinct. The moral sentiment is impersonal; it is not directed merely to self-defence, but disapproves of our neighbor's unrighteous injury, as of our own. It is awakened, not by mere injury, but by injustice; that is, it arises in view of the moral wrong of the injurious act. It is strictly a rational emotion, taking its rise in that highest and noblest form of the intuitions of the reason, the judgment of moral distinctions, and being thus, the function only of rational spirits. Hence this sentiment can

never be indifferent or negative as to its moral quality, as simple resentment may be; but wherever it is not righteous, it must be wicked. And whereas the final cause of resentment (the subject's self-defence) requires it to be temporary, the final cause of moral disapprobation requires it to be permanent, up to certain limits which will be defined. No inspired man has said of this sentiment, as a general rule: "Let not the sun go down upon it."

This moral sentiment, as was remarked, often coexists with resentment. When we are ourselves made the objects of assaults which include both injury and injustice, the mixture of the two feelings is unavoidable. When we behold such an attack upon a fellow creature, the impersonal sentiment of moral reprobation may be mixed with a reflex resentment received by the law of sympathy. In both cases, the effect is to give a warmer and more passionate aspect to the moral sentiment.

The next truth to be considered is, that the judgment of demerit intuitively accompanies every act of moral disapprobation. The wisest Christian philosophers teach that the idea of obligation is inseparable from the idea of moral rightness in acts. In other words, to say that an act is obligatory, is the same thing with saying it is right. Now, obligation implies an obligator. This judgment of the conscience is but an intuitive recognition of a relation between the personal moral agent and a personal moral ruler, God; whose will is the rule of the obligation to him. The judgment of moral disapprobation is, therefore, in its very nature, a judgment of wrong relation between the sinning agent and the personal will of the divine Ruler; it recognises that holy will as outraged by the sin. Hence, by a necessary law of the human reason, our judgment of the sinfulness of every wrong act includes the decision, that the agent has therein demerit; that is to say, it is now right that he should receive suffering for his sin, physical evil for his moral wrong, in a just ratio, as its proper moral equivalent. This judgment, we repeat, is unavoidably included in our judgment of the wrongness of his act. And this relation between sin and deserved penal suffering, the reason apprehends as morally obligatory. Its preservation is necessary to satisfy righteousness; its rupture is necessarily wrong.

It appears therefore evident that if the reason is impelled to this judgment of demerit by the very law of its moral action, and this demand for penal equivalent to sin is a valid part of its moral verdict, the mere entertaining of it as a sentiment cannot be morally wrong. To assert that it can be, would be to assert that the soul may act immorally in the very acts which are immediately directed by the law of its nature as a moral agent. Moreover, as the judgment of moral disapprobation involves a judgment of demerit, affirming the righteousness of the requital of suffering for the sin, it is inevitable that the soul should find a pleasure in the satisfaction of this sentiment; and if the sentiment is moral, the pleasure cannot be immoral. For it is absurd to say that a rational creature is criminal for its satisfaction in the rightful actings of the laws of its own reason. How can the lawful happiness of the creature be more justly defined than as that pleasure which is found in satisfying the righteous and reasonable promptings of its own native powers? "*Happiness*," said the most profound of the Greeks, "*is virtuous energy*."

It thus appears that the impersonal sentiment of moral reprobation is lawful, yea more, that it is positively virtuous; and that the rational desire for the satisfaction of it cannot be sinful *per se*. But lest some mistrust of this conclusion should be felt, from the abstract nature of the analysis, it will be confirmed by these further considerations.

1. Every one easily recognises this sentiment of moral reprobation as the counterpart to that of moral approbation. In the latter, the mind has, as its root, a similar judgment, in the reason, of the virtuousness of the act; it thereby recognises the agent as meritorious for the act, that is, as righteously entitled to his suitable well-being as its moral equivalent; and the mind finds virtuous pleasure in the satisfaction of this its verdict, by the actual enjoyment which the meritorious agent has of his reward. That a soul should be capable of witnessing a virtuous act and its reward, and remain wholly devoid of this sentiment and this satisfaction, would of itself argue a criminal defect. The man who is capable of being spectator of some splendid and lovely instance of filial gratitude and fidelity, and of its reward in the benediction of the



happy father, and the well earned honor and prosperity of the pious son, and who can feel no pleasing judgment of approval in his own soul, and no virtuous satisfaction in witnessing the reward of merit, is thereby shown to be a cold villain, capable, himself, of any ingratitude or treachery to his parents.

But add to this, that in morals, wrong is the necessary counterpart of right, as every moralist admits. As absence of caloric is cold, or absence of light is itself darkness, so in moral actions, lack of right is wrong. There is, hence, no such thing as a moral neutrality in a case involving positive moral elements. It appears therefore very plain, that the susceptibility of moral approbation implies necessarily that of moral reprobation; that to be insensible to the latter, would involve insensibility to the former. But this, as all admit, would characterise the man as positively evil. Hence it appears that these active sentiments of moral reprobation for wrong doing are positively necessary to right character; so far are they from being unholy. The reader may find this conclusion confirmed by numerous scriptural testimonies, among which these two, from the New and Old Testaments respectively, may be cited: Prov. xvii. 15: "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord;" Rom i. 32: St. Paul condemns sinners as those who "not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

2. When flagrant crimes are committed against the law of the land, and the "gallows is cheated," the most virtuous citizens feel the craving of their moral nature for the retribution of justice upon the criminal, and the grief of its disappointment. This feeling cannot be accused of selfishness, but is wholly impersonal, for it is vividly felt by virtuous persons who have no connexion with the object of the outrage, and who suffer no special wrong by it. It is found most often in the most disinterested and noble natures. It is impossible for the subject of it to rebuke himself for entertaining it; for he feels that to lack this feeling, would be to lack virtuous regard for the law which has been dishonored, and the innocent victim who has been wronged. Sympathy with the right implies reprobation of the wrong.

3. The Scriptures beyond a doubt describe the saints in glory as participating in the judicial triumphs of the Redeemer, when he shall pour out his final retributions on the wicked; and the satisfaction of this intuitive sentiment which craves just penalty for demerit, is one of the elements of the bliss of the redeemed. Ps. cxlix. 5-9, says; "Let the saints be joyful in glory. . . Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand, to execute vengeance upon the heathen," etc. The yearning of the martyrs in heaven for a righteous vindication has been already seen in Rev. vi. 10. And in Rev. xix. 1-3, heaven is heard in jubilee over the judgment of the persecuting Babylon of the Apocalypse. Now, it will scarcely be doubted, that it is right for Christians to feel here, as they will feel when perfectly sanctified in heaven.

Lastly. Righteous retribution is one of the glories of the divine character. If it is right that God should desire to exercise it, then it cannot be wrong for his people to desire him to exercise it. It may be objected, that while he claims retribution for himself, he forbids it to them; and that he has thereby forbidden all satisfaction in it to them. The fact is true; the inference does not follow. Inasmuch as retribution inflicted by a creature is forbidden, the desire for its infliction by a creature, or pleasure therein, is also forbidden. But inasmuch as it is righteously inflicted by God, it must be right in him, and must therefore be, when in his hand, a proper subject of satisfaction to the godly.

Now, if the feeling of moral reprobation, when thus impersonal or disinterested, is righteous, its propriety cannot be wholly destroyed by the circumstance, that he who feels it was object of and suffered by the crime reprobated. The crime is still the same in principle, and is properly the object of the same moral emotions. The only difference is, that the temptation of the sufferer to inordinate and sinful resentment is thereby rendered much greater; and he is thereby called to strict watchfulness and self-control, lest the personal feeling, which is mixed with the impersonal, assume the ascendancy, and thus malice usurp the place of righteous zeal. But otherwise, no reason appears why it is not as righteous to approve and desire the just penal

recompence of the enemy who has assailed the right in attacking one's self, as of the party who has injured our neighbor.

But, it cannot be too often repeated, the righteous desire for recompence never craves to take its vindication into its own hands. The godly man always prefers to remit the penal settlement to a perfect God; and arrests his own forcible agency, as soon as the purposes of mere self-defence are secured. It is the declared principle of both Testaments, that God reserves retribution to himself as his exclusive function. He has indeed delegated a limited portion of this authority to the civil magistrate, to wield it, as his representative, for a specific purpose. But this is no exception; for when civil society punishes crimes, it is as much a part of God's providential ordering, and of his providential act, as when he punishes them by sickness or dearth. The principle stands absolute: a limited resentment, purely defensive and temporary, may be man's; but vengeance is God's. This is proper, because the injured man is himself a sinner, as well as the injurer; and so rigorous a function is not appropriately wielded by one who is himself exposed to it, and who is seeking to escape it by the door of mercy. It is proper, because man is ignorant of those spiritual conditions of crimes, on which the aggravation or palliation of their demerit so much depends. It is proper, because the impersonal moral sentiment demanding retribution is, in man's breast, so seldom unmixed with the personal passion of direct or sympathetic resentment; so that it is doubtful whether a human being is ever in a condition to judge a wrong act with perfect equity. It is proper, because God is not only an omniscient and perfect being, devoid of all passion, but is the supreme proprietor and ruler of men, and his will is the source of the obligation which they violate, as well as its infallible rule. Hence, the state of feeling to which the Christian should strive, is, not insensibility to wrong, not indifference to the craving of our moral nature for its just penal recompence, but a hearty willingness to leave that retribution in God's righteous and unerring hand.

A stage has now been reached in this discussion, at which it is necessary to introduce a few plain distinctions. One is the well

known distinction of divines between the love of complacency and the love of benevolence. The former is founded on moral approbation for the character of its object, and implies moral excellence in it. The other does not, and may exist notwithstanding moral disapprobation of its object. Of the former kind is the love of God the Father for God the Son. Of the latter kind is the love of the Trinity for sinners. Obviously the love of complacency is directed towards its object's character, while the love of benevolence is directed to the person of its object, and exists in spite of his obnoxious character. And it is thus possible that love may hate the character, and compassionate the person, of the same man. Such, in fact, was Christ's love to us "while we were yet sinners." The adjustment between the New Testament and the Old is partly to be found in this distinction. When Jesus Christ commands us to love our enemies, it is with the love of benevolence and compassion. When David declared that he hated God's enemies with a perfect hatred, he meant that he did not entertain for them the love of moral complacency, but as was proper, the reverse. This love of benevolence for the person of a bad man ought to be, in the Christian, the finite reflexion of what it is in God, limited only by the higher attribute of righteousness.

Next: To understand the relations of godliness between us and enemies, the elements involved in their injurious acts must also be distinguished. The sin of a wrong-doer against his fellow involves three elements of offence. One is the personal loss and natural evil inflicted, and is expressed by the Latin divines by the word *damnum*. The second is the guilt (*reatus*) or relation of debt to the law, by which the wrong-doer is bound to pay for his act in punishment. The third is the moral defilement or depravity of character, (*pravitas vel macula*.) which is both expressed and increased by specific acts of sin. Now, when the Christian is made the object of an unrighteous act, the element of loss, or *damnum*, is the only one which is personal to him, and therefore the only one which it is competent to him to remit. And since nothing but self-interest is concerned in this element, the great law of love requires the Christian to remit it without price or compensation, provided the moral conditions of the case

do not forbid it. And to pursue the aggressor with evil, directly for the sake of this element of his offence, is sinful malice. The second element, that of guilt, is not personal to the injured Christian. It is not his business to pursue the satisfaction for guilt, but God's. He is to leave this element wholly to God, only taking care that his moral sentiments touching it are conformed to those of the divine Judge. But practically, he has no outward duty to perform with reference to it, in any circumstances whatever; unless he is providentially called to fill the office of magistrate in the commonwealth; and then he is bound to execute upon the guilty that portion of the retributive penalty committed to his charge by the laws of God and his country, without either favor or malice: feeling that where guilt is duly affixed, he has no more option to remit any of its penalty, than he has to give away another man's property intrusted to his charge.

The third element, that of the inward defilement represented and fostered in the wrong act, is also impersonal to the injured party. He has no option or license to disregard it; and the love of complacency has no relevancy to a prompting to overlook it. By the very reason that it is his bounden duty to love holiness, it is his duty to be opposed to impurity. He who should argue that his compassion and Christian kindness ought to, or could, lawfully prompt him to overlook this defilement, and restore his approbation and fellowship to the transgressor while still defiled in character, would be as preposterous as he who should say that his compassion justified him in agreeing with the liar, that falsehood is truth, and truth is falsehood. Kindness and compassion have no application to the case; but our judgment and treatment of the evil must be according to the eternal principles of truth and right. Now, for this third element of moral impurity, the only remedy is true repentance, prompted by the renewing and sanctifying agency of the Holy Spirit, and manifesting and fostering itself in outward reform. For the second element, that of guilt, the appointed remedy is the atonement of Calvary, embraced by faith. For the first element, that of *damnum*, the remedy is reparation.

The light which these distinctions throw upon the Christian  
VOL. XVII., NO. 5.

treatment of enemies, may be displayed by applying them to a concrete instance. Let it be supposed that the crime is a robbery committed upon the goods of a private Christian. There is an element of *damnum*, which consists in the privation of the use and value of the property taken. There is an element of guilt, by which the robber is made debtor to the laws of the commonwealth and of God, in certain penalties. And there is an element of moral defilement or taint, attaching, through the theft, to the robber's character. Let it be supposed, first, that the offender provides no appropriate remedy for either: that he neither makes reparation of the stolen property, nor makes satisfaction to human and divine law, nor exhibits any purification of character by repentance. How ought the injured Christian to treat him? The answer is, that the law of love does not bind him to extend moral fellowship and approbation to a defiled character, nor to intervene between the guilty party and the penal claims of law; for these consequences of the sin are not personal to the injured party. But the law of love may bind him to remit the claim for restoration of the value stolen, "without money and without price;" as, for instance, if the thief have become unable to repay; and in any case, it binds him to succor the thief when suffering, if he is able; and to perform to him any other duty of humanity, as though he were no aggressor.

Let us suppose again, that the thief has, from some motive implying no virtue, made exact reparation, but that his guilt is not atoned for, and there is no purification of character by repentance. How ought the injured party now to treat him? The answer is, precisely as in the first case. The *damnum* is repaired indeed, but that element of offence was personal to the injured party; and it was right that he should waive it without reparation, at the prompting of Christian kindness.

Let us suppose again, that the thief has made no reparation of property, because he is really unable; but that having made full atonement to human law, he has by faith embraced the righteousness of Christ for the remission of his guilt towards God, and has evinced by a true repentance the cleansing of his soul from depravity. How shall he be treated by the Christian

whom he has injured? The answer is, precisely as though he had never injured him. The guilt and defilement of the sin have now received their appropriate remedy. The element which remains uncompensated is the *damnum*; and it is the Christian's duty to remit this, freely and joyfully, seeing it is personal to himself, at the prompting of love.

Now, it is asserted that if the imprecatory passages in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments be compared with these conclusions, they will be found to contain nothing inconsistent with them. And if the Christian precept of forgiveness, Eph. iv. 32, "Forgive one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you," be examined, it will be found to express the same thing. God is "kind to the unthankful and to the evil," so long as the claims of his justice are suspended. But he does not remit their guilt, nor relax his righteous disapprobation and fixed purpose to punish, without satisfaction to law. Nor does he compromise his purity by adopting the sinner who remains impenitent and depraved. What he does is this: he extends to them, in the midst of their sin, all the compassion which his wisdom, justice, and holiness permit. And as soon as guilt is satisfied by an interest in Christ, and personal defilement purged by regeneration, he graciously overlooks every outrage of his honor and person, and adopts them into his favor as fully as though they had never sinned.

The sum of the matter, then, appears to be this. The law of love does not require the injured Christian to approve or countenance the evil character manifested in the wrong done him, or to withhold the verdict of truth and justice against it, when righteous ends are gained by pronouncing it. The law of love does not require him to intervene for delivering the aggressor from the just claims of either human or divine law, for penal retribution; nor does it forbid his feeling a righteous satisfaction when that retribution is executed by the appropriate authorities. But the law of love does forbid his taking retribution into his own hands; and it requires him still to extend the sentiments of humanity and the love of compassion to the enemy's person, so long as he continues to partake the forbearance of God;

which love of compassion will prompt the injured party to stand ready to forgive the element of personal *damnum* to his enemy, and to perform the offices of benevolence to his person, in spite of his obnoxious character.

Such a discussion should not be closed without repeating the wholesome caution against the confusion of personal resentment with moral reprobation. The intermixture of the two in the breast of the injured Christian is perhaps unavoidable for imperfect man. The temptation to sanctify the inordinate indulgence of the one under the holy name of the other, is dangerous. Hence every child of God under wrong is called to watchfulness, prayer, and jealousy of himself.

But it should not be concealed, that there is also a subtle danger in the opposite direction. The sentiments of righteous resentment, and moral reprobation, are the great supports intended by God for the rectitude, nobleness, and independence of the soul. But when injuries are enormous and often repeated, there is a terrible danger lest the very frequency and violence of the impressions made upon this moral susceptibility, shall blunt it. Familiarity with wickedness, even when it is wickedness aimed against ourselves, ever tends to stain the purity of the soul. When the capacity of virtuous indignation is thus depraved by violent and frequent frictions, aggression comes gradually to excite the mere emotion of abject fear, instead of the nobler moral emotions; and the wretched victim gradually grows as base and servile and unprincipled as he is miserable. Both domestic and public history teems with fearful examples of this degradation by submission to wrong. And there can be no more supreme and sacred duty which is owed to God and to himself by the good man, than that of protecting his own moral sentiments from this corruption. To resist wrong within the lawful limits, or to evade the power of the oppressor when resistance is no longer feasible, may be the first obligation which man owes to his own virtue.



## ARTICLE IV.

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE SECOND  
ADVENT.

The term ADVENT has been commonly used in ecclesiastical language in reference to the incarnation; and also to the visible, real, and personal appearance of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, at the end of the world, to judge all men, the righteous and the wicked, both quick and dead. The one is called the first, and the other the second advent. We have said commonly used; for the term advent, and its synonyms, appearing, manifestation, etc., are employed frequently in the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testaments to denote any instrumental, figurative coming or interposition of the Lord, either to impart blessing or to inflict judgment.

This doctrine of the second advent has been held always, every where, and by all, in all churches, ancient and modern, oriental and western, primitive, mediæval and protestant, as one of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Church, one of the first principles of the oracles of God, concerning which there ought not to be, and never has been any doubt. Thus the Apostle's Creed, which certainly contains the germ of the earliest Christian creeds, after declaring that Christ ascended up to heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, adds: "from thence," that is from heaven, where he is regarded as having continued to sit as our Mediator, Intercessor, and King, "he shall come to judge the quick and the dead," that is the whole world of mankind, good and bad, and at the same time. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, disciple of the apostle John, enlarges this article so as to express belief in the "ascension of our beloved Lord Jesus Christ in the flesh, and his coming again from heaven in the glory of his Father, to gather together, in one, all things; and to raise from the dead the flesh of all man-

kind . . . . and that he may exercise righteous judgment on all, consigning to everlasting fire all . . . . both the angels who transgressed and became apostates, and ungodly, lawless, and blasphemous men; and to bestow life upon them that are just and holy . . . . and investing them with immortality and everlasting glory." Irenæus, who is made the father of the premillennial theory of the advent, believed that the Lord Jesus Christ would establish a kingdom on this glorified earth—not before, but after the resurrection. The creeds of Tertullian, Lucian of Antioch, and Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, and the Nicene Creed on this subject, are perfectly synonymous with the above. In the creed of Pelagius the article is, "He will come to judge the living and the dead, that he may reward the just and punish sinners." The Athanasian Creed, which is one of the three embodied in the Thirty-nine Articles, says, "At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire. This is the catholic faith, etc.," against the rejection of which is pronounced anathema. The Liturgy of St. James, one of the oldest and most important, in the prayer of consecration says: "We sinners, remembering his life-giving passion, his saving cross, his death and resurrection from the dead on the third day, his ascension into heaven, and sitting at the right hand of thee, his God and Father, and his glorious and terrible second appearing when he shall come in glory to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works, etc." It is unnecessary to quote from any later creeds, either anterior or subsequent to the Reformation, as their tenor will be found uniform. In our own standards, the doctrine of Christ's second advent is introduced under a variety of relations. Thus in the Confession of Faith, (Ch. 8. § 4,) it is said of Christ that "on the third day he arose from the dead with the same body in which he suffered; with which he also ascended into heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of his Father, making intercession; and shall return to judge men and angels at the last day." In Chap. 32, the souls of the righteous are

represented as being "received into the highest heavens, where they wait for the redemption of their bodies, and at the last day all the dead shall be raised up, etc." In Ch. 33, it is declared that "God has appointed a day wherein he will judge the world, etc.; in which day not only the apostate angels shall be judged, but likewise all persons, etc. For then shall the righteous go into everlasting life, but the wicked, etc." "As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, so would he have that day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security and be always watchful, because they know not at what hour the Lord may come; and may be prepared to say, Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly." The proof texts added to these and other passages of a similar purport will be found to include those adduced in proof of a premillennial advent, and are, like all the Scripture proof texts of the Westminster standards, of equal authority with the text itself.\* In the Larger Catechism, Q. 53, it is said that Christ "shall continue (in the highest heavens) till his second coming at the end of the world." For teaching of precisely similar import, see Q. 52, 53, 56, 63, 64, 66, 68, 74, 75, 77, 78, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87. See also Shorter Catechism, Q. 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 37, 38.

Such is the doctrine of the second advent of Christ as set forth in all the symbolic confessions of faith in Christendom, and as declared by them to be taught in the Holy Scriptures;—simple and sublime; the logical sequence of the science of redemption; the last act in the divine tragedy of an Incarnate Deity; the top-stone of the living temple of God's glorious grace; the final step in the progression of that coming of God's eternal Son whose initiation in the everlasting covenant was revealed in the foreshadowing promises of the prophetic dispensation, manifested in the Word made flesh and dwelling among us, is perfected in the appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ when he shall come to be glorified in his saints; the consummated triumph of that victorious conflict of salvation which crowns the Redeemer with a diadem gemmed with souls trans-

---

\* See Ch. 25. § 1, Ch. 29. § 4, Ch. 12, Ch. 13. § 2, Ch. 19. § 3.

lated out of the kingdom of darkness, and shining resplendent as the stars for ever and ever;—and the hallelujah doxology of that heavenly song whose first strains were sung melodious by the angel choir over the silver mantled plains of Bethlehem, when

“The joyous hills of Palestine  
Sent back their glad reply,  
To greet from all their holy heights  
The day spring from on high.”

Of this advent, Scripture is full. It is spoken of or implied in all its teachings. Without it, no doctrine is complete. It constitutes the key-note in all its strains, whether plaintive or seraphic. This is the thunderbolt in every tempest of vengeful wrath and fiery indignation; this is the still small voice of tender merciful compassion and sustaining hope, fortitude and self-sacrifice in the Church's heart as she comes up from the wilderness leaning upon her Beloved; this the anchor which holds her fast amidst every swelling tide of adversity

“When cares like a wild deluge come  
And storms of sorrow fall.”

This also is the death-song of every weary pilgrim as he treads the verge of Jordan and plunges into its icy stream; and with this shall be commenced the universal, unending song of the innumerable ransomed hosts, which, loud as the sound of many waters, shall fill the courts of heaven and resound throughout the universe of God.

Our Lord as the great teacher, and his apostles as taught by him all things, and guided by his Holy Spirit into all truth, have frequently and in most explicit terms spoken of this great consummating event. They speak of it in various relations, applications, and aspects. They represent it in all its solemn pomp and infinitely momentous issues as foreshadowed and assured in the destruction of Jerusalem, the destruction of the Roman Empire, the overthrow of the antichrist, the overturning of the nations, the fulness of the Gentiles, the spiritual ingathering of all Israel which shall be saved, and in all the glorious

things spoken of the progress, perpetuation, and perfection of the Church of God till all her regenerated and redeemed saints shall be presented by him at his coming, without spot and blameless, unto God. Throughout these numerous passages, of which twenty-seven are contained in the Pauline epistles, this advent of Christ is spoken of as one and only one. Various terms, like rays of light, are employed to define and describe that day as one and only one, and throw upon this event their convergent lustre, such as "revelation," that is, the making to appear that which previously had not appeared; "presence" or "advent;" "appearance" or "manifestation;" the "day of God;" the "day of the Lord;" the "day of the Lord Jesus;" "the day of the Lord Jesus Christ;" "the last day;" "the great day;" "the day of wrath," and "the day of judgment," and of the "revelation of the righteous judgment of God." It is important also to remember that the Scriptures speak only of one literal and general resurrection of the dead, though it admits a priority in order for the righteous; of one literal and general judgment, including the righteous, the wicked, and the devils; one conflagration of the earth, as there was one deluge; and that they distinctly affirm that the heavens and the earth that now exist are reserved for that destruction by fire; and that the coming of Christ at that day is represented to be his coming again and the second time; and that they never speak of any third or other advent of Christ.

There are four ways in which this question of the second coming of Christ may be brought to a clear and positive determination.

I. Do the Scriptures teach that Christ's second advent is to occur in connexion with the general and simultaneous resurrection of the dead, the general judgment, the conflagration of the world, and the generation of new heavens and new earth? For if they do, then it is impossible that that advent should take place previously.

And *first*, as to the resurrection of the dead, it would be admitted by all persons, (did not the premillennial theory upon the strength of a single figurative expression in the book of

Revelation question it,)\* that it will be *universal* and at the last day. Thus it is written: "Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." "And this is the Father's will that hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day." "And this is the will of him who sent me, that every one who seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day." "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." "Of the resurrection of the dead I am called in question." . . . "I hope toward God that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." "Since by man came death, by man also came the resurrection of the dead;"—"so also is the resurrection of the dead." Scripture therefore indubitably teaches, 1. That there will be a universal resurrection of the dead. 2. That this resurrection will include the righteous and the wicked. 3. That this resurrection of both classes will take place on the same occasion. 4. That, excepting Enoch and Elijah and perhaps Moses, it will be a universal resurrection of the dead, as of this even Job was distinctly informed; for he says, "Man dieth, and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep."

The Scriptures are equally explicit upon the subject of the judgment; teaching, 1. That there will be a day of judgment. 2. That Jesus Christ will be the Judge. 3. That the judgment

---

\* See Rev. xx. 6; on which see Fairbairn's *Typology and Prophecy*, and Brown on the *Second Advent*.

will comprise the whole of the human race without exception. 4. That the judgment will comprise also the angels that kept not their first estate, and thus will be universal as to man, and general as including men and devils. 5. That there is a day or one season or time appointed by God. 6. That this judgment shall take place at the last day or close of time. Thus it is written: "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ." "Because he hath appointed a day wherein he shall judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ." "Every idle word that men shall speak they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead." "It is he who was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead." "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." Since, therefore, it is the indubitable teaching of Scripture that the personal coming of Christ again or the second time, will be at the end of the world, and simultaneous with the universal and general resurrection and judgment of all men, righteous and wicked, and of devils, it is impossible that that advent should be at any previous period.

II. Do the Scriptures teach that the Church, the Bible, the ministry, and the sacraments are to continue as God's appointed instrumentality for the conversion of the world, and the ingathering of his elect people, to the end of the world? For if they do, then of course Christ cannot come personally before the end of the world, as the premillennial theory affirms, to abrogate this

present dispensation, abolish the Church, and do utterly away with the Bible, the ministry, and the sacraments, and introduce an altogether new and different dispensation. Now, as to the *Church*, it is sufficient to remind our readers of our Saviour's declaration in the very institution and commission of the Church, (Matt. xxvii. 18-20,) "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them, etc., . . . and, lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world;" and of the declaration of the apostle, (Eph. iv. 8-14,) "When he, that is Christ, ascended up on high . . . far above all heavens, that he might fill all things, he gave apostles, and prophets, and evangelists, and pastors, and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of faith unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." See also Eph. i. 22, 23. As to the *Bible*, our Saviour declares, in Matt. v. 17, 18, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets . . . for verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." The apostle Peter also declares that all men shall die and pass away, "but the word of the law endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." As to the *sacraments*, the words of Christ's institution require the administration of baptism, with preaching, to "the end of the world." And as to the *Lord's Supper*, it is positively declared that "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." And as our Saviour declared to his disciples that he would not again in the flesh personally partake with them of the bread and wine till he "ate with them in his Father's kingdom," he teaches us that he will not come again until he shall have delivered up his present mediatorial kingdom unto the Father at the last day in heaven, after which event the Marriage Supper of the Lamb will be celebrated.\* As to the *ministry*, it is unnecessary to add anything to the passages already quoted. See Matt. xvi. 18, 19, and xiii. 19-30, and 38-42, where Christ declares as the result of

---

\* See Conf. of Faith on the Sacraments.



the work of the ministry, that at the end of the world the tares and the wheat shall both be gathered together and the tares burned in the fire. "So shall it be at the end of the world." So also in Matt. xxv. 41, our Saviour describes himself as pronouncing final sentence upon the wicked as well as the righteous. Thus again it is demonstrated that the Church and its present dispensation are to abide until the end of the world and the day of universal and general judgment.

But this conclusion, although indubitable, will be made more incontrovertibly clear by some passages which in this controversy have been strangely overlooked. In John xiv. 18-20, our Saviour, in his consolatory address to his disciples, after having declared to them that in his Father's house there were many mansions, that he was going to prepare a place for them, and that he would come again to receive them unto himself, that where he is, there they might be also, in these verses adds this declaration, "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you; yet a little while and the world seeth me no more, but ye see me; because I live ye shall live also." Now, it is perfectly clear that if Christ were personally to come again and dwell on the earth, then "the world" would see him again, and our Lord could not have said, as he does say, that *the world would see him no more*, that is, in other words, that he would not again personally dwell on the earth. But he told them further, that while the world, which, because of its carnal blindness that cannot discern spiritual things, would not see him in his spiritual comings or manifestations to believing hearts, on the contrary his believing disciples in all ages of the Church, in an evangelical, real, and spiritual presence—the dwelling in their hearts by faith, and being seen, felt, and enjoyed in sacrament, prayer, and worship—*would see him*. Christ therefore wished his disciples to understand that there would be no necessity for his personal presence, since his spiritual presence would be immeasurably more to their benefit and comfort. But as this perpetual presence of Christ spiritually, implies necessarily Christ's personal and real presence perpetually in heaven, in his capacity of High Priest, Mediator, Intercessor, and King, the premillennial

theory, which implies that at any moment Christ may cease his celestial mediation and rule, abdicate the seat of his intercession and the throne of his power, and personally absent himself from heaven for a thousand years, is in manifest contradiction to Christ's own most comfortable declaration. See also vs. 25-30, where Christ enlarges this thought as a ground of unspeakable benefit and consolation to them, inasmuch as while he returned to the Father to carry on the work of their salvation in heaven, the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, would supply his place, teach them all things, and fill their hearts with divine peace. .

In the continuation of this parting discourse, in chap. xvi. 6-16, our blessed Lord and Saviour, with a heart overflowing with infinite and pitiful compassion, recapitulates with pointed emphasis these pregnant thoughts. Referring to the coming of the Comforter, whom he said he would send unto them, he declares, "And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. Of sin, because they believe not on me, (that is, will not see me.) Of righteousness—mark these two reasons which Christ gives—because (1) I go to my Father, and because (2) ye see me no more." Christ here most authoritatively teaches that while the propitiatory part of his mediatorial work would be finished upon earth by his sufferings, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension, that mediatorial work would be resumed and continued perpetually in heaven; that as on earth he had provided a way of justifying, or constituting righteous in the sight of his Father, all those who truly believe in his name, the remaining part of the work of righteousness, our Lord was to perform in heaven in the execution of his intercessory office as our Mediator and High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary, by incessantly presenting the merits of his all-sufficient sacrifice, and to bestow upon his people, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, all necessary supplies of spiritual life, health, and succor; and by supporting, governing, and superintending all their interests, and defending them against all his and their enemies, in his character of King of Zion. Christ's exaltation and investment with his sacerdotal and regal authority as Mediator, and the perpetual continuance of his real presence,

so that it would be impossible that he should absent himself from heaven and any more dwell corporeally upon earth, are here made by Christ the very foundation upon which the salvation, hope, and glory of the Church rest. It thus appears that it is absolutely necessary for the full and perfect accomplishment of the work of righteousness that the heavens should retain Christ personally until the day of final judgment, and that until that solemn period, the consummation of all things, the Church on earth should see him no more.

It will also be particularly observed on this testimony of Christ, that *because* he himself was about to return to heaven, the Holy Spirit would be sent in his stead to instruct, etc. Had it been his design, Christ would have said, "As I go to my Father and the world seeth me no more, I will send the Holy Spirit that he may convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." But this our Lord has not said. Each of the three subjects to which our Lord distinctly adverts has *its own separate exposition* annexed to it, and the words, "ye see me no more," must have a meaning peculiar to the particular subject which they explain, and a meaning not appropriate to the other subjects. These words therefore are most definite and unassailable proof that his disciples should not see him again, in the flesh, till he comes to judge the world, and that he could not by possibility be absent till then from his great mediatorial work in heaven. It cannot be thought that Christ can come to judge the world or to raise the dead before the millennium and the last day, because the perpetuity of Christ's mediatorial work, which is emphatically the work of righteousness, is repeatedly and absolutely asserted in the Scriptures. The meaning of our Lord's words is therefore most distinct and unpervertible—like something fixed by a wedge, immovable and bidding defiance to all efforts of criticism to take it away. And the argument from this passage is just as strong against the premillennial advent now, as it was against such a Jewishly believed advent as addressed to his disciples.

In corroboration, however, of this argument, it is declared by the apostle Peter in Acts iii. 21, "whom, *i. e.* Jesus Christ, the

heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things, etc.." "Therefore (ii. 33,) being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." (See also ch. v. 31.)

Nothing can be made more plain by Scripture than its declarations concerning our Lord's sacerdotal office in relation to the appointed place of its execution, its immutability, its continuity, its perpetuity, and as to its nature and design. As to the *place* appointed to our Lord's execution of his office as High Priest, it is, among other passages, declared that Christ "is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." "We have such an High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens." "Christ is not entered into the holy place made with hands, etc., but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Christ, therefore, can never exercise his intercessory work in a kingdom upon the earth; "for if he were on earth, he would not be a priest," (Heb. viii. 4,) and "no man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." As to the *immutability* of our Lord's office of High Priest, it is declared, "But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." As to the *continuity* of our Lord's office of High Priest, we have the declaration of the last verse quoted, and these following: "Wherefore he is able to save to the uttermost, etc., seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." And Melchisedec is said typically to resemble Christ, because he, the Son of God, "abideth a priest continually." As to the *perpetuity* of our Lord's high priesthood, it is written, "Jesus is made a high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec;" "but this man because he continueth forever;" "but this man forever sat down at the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Heb. x. 13. As to the *general nature and design* of our Lord's sacerdotal office, the

Scriptures delineate its mediatorial and antitypical character: "Seeing we have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast, etc." "We have not a High Priest who cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but one, etc." See also Heb. vii. 26; ii. 17, and vi. 20, from which passages we are taught that it was by the blood of his atonement Christ entered into the true tabernacle for us, where alone he can efficaciously plead the expiatory virtue of that blood; that there access by prayer with holy boldness to the throne of grace is only in the name of Christ as interceding for them at his Father's right hand; that his intercession therefore is an essential part of his work of salvation, and a fixed and indispensable ordinance of the mediatorial economy, requiring Christ's perpetual presence in the heavenly sanctuary; that if Christ were personally to quit that sanctuary to dwell on the earth, no covenant blessing could thenceforth be imparted to the Church; that it is indispensable therefore that Christ should conform and adhere to this appointed place and order of his intercessory work; and that it is absolutely necessary for believers that they should have a high priest at the right hand of God, constituted after the power of an endless life and made higher than the heavens. Finally, as to the antitypical character of our Lord's high priesthood, there is according to the previous and other passages a plain contrast pointed out between the typical and antitypical priesthood, as pertaining to the conscience, and it is made therefore utterly inconceivable that an economy thus comparatively defective, after having answered its typical and temporary purpose, should again be revived, as the premillennial theory asserts it will, especially when it is considered that that economy possessed no value or efficacy in itself, but derived all its importance from that superior and final economy which it merely typified, and by which it was ultimately superseded as a "shadow" of the good things to come. (See Heb. vii. 11, 18, and ix. 23.)

This teaching of Scripture as to the impossibility of Christ again personally appearing on earth previous to the final consummation of his mediatorial economy, when he shall deliver up

that kingdom to the Father, receives striking confirmation from those declarations of the apostles, in which, as in 2 Cor. v. 16, it is said, "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now know we him no more." And still further, the apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. ix. 26-28, appears to us to state the whole doctrine of the second advent in terms so clear and positive that it can admit of no question among those who are willing to abide by the testimony of the Holy Ghost as given to the holy men inspired by him. The apostle declares in verse twenty-fourth that Christ as our High Priest has entered "into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us," "not that he should offer himself oft, etc., . . . but now, once in the end of the world," that is, as Doddridge and other critics think to be the best interpretation that can be given, "*now in this the last dispensation which God will ever give to man,*"—"hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Here it is positively said that Christ made his first advent under the last dispensation which God will ever give to men, and consequently he cannot make a second advent under the same dispensation. It is to be observed also, that the term translated "world" is in the original, "ages," in the *plural*, and not as in Matt. xvi. 28, where it is in the *singular*, in which form it is employed to denote literally the end or last of this mundane system. So much for the first advent as here revealed. And now as to the second advent of Christ, the apostle goes on in verses twenty-seven and twenty-eight to say, "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin (*i. e.* not as a sin offering) unto salvation." Now here we have asserted, 1. The universal law of mortality as the penal curse of God's violated covenant—"it is appointed unto men (that is the whole race of men, good and bad,) once to die." 2. Here is the universal judgment of the same entire race of men after death—"the judgment of all men," that is, of course, of all who shall have become subject to the universal law, which consequently implies the previous universal resurrection of the dead. 3. We have here the judge

whose advent is afterwards foretold—"Christ was once offered, etc., and unto them that look for him, shall he appear the second time, etc." 4. This appearance is explicitly declared to be the second personal advent of Christ. And thus as Christ's first advent is already past and there cannot possibly be an intermediate advent, it inevitably follows that the premillenary hypothesis is not true. That these words refer to the universal judgment, comprehending both the righteous and the wicked, will be still further evident in the contrast implied in the words "them who look for him" with those who do not look for him.

The argument of the apostle is this: the future judgment will be universal, and there cannot, therefore, so far as the human race only is concerned, be more than one day of judgment. The resurrection which must precede this judgment will be universal, and there cannot, therefore, be more than one resurrection. And as both the universal resurrection and the universal judgment will, as we have seen, take place at the last day, our Lord will not make his second personal advent to the earth till he comes to raise the dead and judge the world at the last day. And therefore, since Christ will not make his second personal advent to the earth until he comes to the universal resurrection and judgment at the last day, he cannot, as this hypothesis demands, make his second personal advent at any intermediate period. Observe well the apostle's analogical reasoning: 1. As the race of man dies once and only once as the penal curse for sin, so Christ could only die once to bear that penal curse. 2. That which awakes each man of the whole race of men after death is *judicari*—the judgment, the one and only judgment of the quick and the dead, good and evil, at the last day, which is the final fulfilment. So Christ's second coming is *judicare*, not to bear or atone for sin, but to judge sin and sinners, and pronounce on all the sentence of salvation or of perdition. 3. This death and judgment are by the appointment of God, his constitution or covenant or law, and are penal and final in their nature, and as such everlasting, and *actually* everlasting to all who die impenitent, "the wrath of God abiding on them." Christ's *second* coming, therefore, will be to pronounce judicially

the final and full salvation of the penitent and perdition of the impenitent.\* 4. The next event in the great scheme of man's redemption,—next to death, there being no intermediate dispensation admitting of a possible change after death—is the judgment and the second coming of Christ as judge; and since Scripture no where makes mention of any third personal coming of Christ, the millenary hypothesis must be untrue. Let it be added and duly considered that in the above interpretation of passage, there is, as far as our examination of commentators has gone, a universal concurrence, the word "salvation" being substituted for the word "judgment," as the analogy would require, because, as elsewhere, the apostles, when speaking of the judgment in relation to believers, speak of it as it really shall be, and as the song of the redeemed (see Rev. v., vii.,) declares it shall be—their consummated salvation. We shall only give the opinion of the great Dr. Owen on this passage: "Any other coming, Scripture knows not, and this place expressly excludes any imagination of it. His first appearing is past, and appear the second time he will not until the judgment comes and the salvation of the Church be completed." There are several other passages which, correctly interpreted, must confirm the conclusions to which we have arrived. Let us, however, only advert to two, one from the apostle Paul, and the other from the apostle John. In Col. iii. 4, the apostle Paul gives us his testimony positively: "When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." Here the second advent or appearance of Christ is of necessity to be interpreted in accordance with the explicit statement commented upon in Heb. ix. 26–28, at the time of the general and universal judgment; and the place is also determined by the established use of the term glory as applied to heaven and the ultimate consummated blessedness of the righteous. The apostle John in like manner gives us a negative testimony (which is the more important as this

---

\* In proof of the use of the term salvation, here employed, see Is. xxv. 28, 29; Rom. viii. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 51; Phil. iii. 22, 23; 2 Th. i. 7–10; Rev. vii. 10.



whole theory in its traditional form is traced up to him) in John iii. 1, 2, in which there is an evident allusion to what he had recorded in his Gospel (see John xiv. 16, and above). "Beloved," says John, "now we are the sons of God, (that is the loftiest earthly condition possible for us,) and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is," that is, in heaven. Here the apostle declares, first, that he had no knowledge of this premillennial earthly glorious advent; secondly, that he did know that at Christ's second advent—as in the same passages referred to he had taught in his Gospel, and also in Christ's intercessory prayer recorded in c. xvii., where Christ says, "I will that these may also be with me,"—that is, with the Father in heaven where he was going—"that they may behold the glory which thou hast given me")—Christ's glory and kingdom would be in heaven as taught by the apostles.

III. The doctrine of Scripture on the second advent may be determined by asking, Does the Scripture teach that the kingdom of Christ—as foretold in some hundred passages, many of them literal and some symbolical, prophetic, and figurative, under analogies drawn from the kingdom of David, the tabernacle, the temple, and the Jewish ritual—has actually come? For if they do, then we have a divinely authorised rule of interpretation by which all the other prophecies relating to that kingdom are to be understood. The apostle James, in the council held at Jerusalem, after hearing the declaration of the apostle Peter, "how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name," immediately afterwards recites a passage from the prophet Amos which is entirely subsversive of the millenary theory. "Simeon," said James, "hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name; and to this agree the words of the prophet; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up, that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." The

preaching of the gospel is here represented by the building again the tabernacle of David and teaches that it was not to be restricted, but was designed for all nations without exception. We have here, therefore, the apostolic and inspired rule for explaining the rest of the typical and figurative predictions of the prophets, relative to the gospel dispensation, in which they use symbolic language drawn from the ancient history and institutions of the Jewish people. And as the tabernacle was employed by the prophet Amos to represent the Gospel Church in its migratory and unsettled state in the wilderness of this world, so the temple is employed by Ezekiel to prefigure that same Church in its most enlarged and exalted state, to signify its greatest external stability, grace, sanctity, and glory. Such is the character of the only temple which Christianity recognises and to which alone it directs attention—a spiritual, not a temporal, an eternal, and not a perishable edifice, a temple “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth up into an holy temple of the Lord.” “Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.” Such is the noble temple, such the innumerable priests, such the rare sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ, which Christianity exhibits; but as to a material temple erected at Jerusalem, the restoration of the Jews and the reconstruction of the Mosaic institutions, Christianity in her record says not one word. It is of this temple the prophets symbolically declare “the stone which was cut without hands became a great mountain and filled the whole earth.” “The mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all the nations shall flow unto it.” “The kingdom of heaven is like a grain of mustard seed, . . . but when it is grown . . . and becometh a tree, etc.” “The kingdom of heaven is like unto the leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal (the first disciples) till the whole (the whole generations of men) was leavened. This interpretation of the symbolic pro-

~~phenix~~ drawn from the tabernacle, the temple, the Jewish ritual, the kingdom of David, the restoration of the Jews, the throne, royalty, and dominion of the Messiah, were all fulfilled in Christ ever since his ascension. This is explicitly and most abundantly testified to (see Luke 2,) by the angel Gabriel in his annunciation to Zacharias and to Mary, and by Zacharias, Elizabeth, Mary, John, and the angelic choir, as also by apostles Peter, Paul, and John, and by Stephen. See Acts ii. 29-36; iii. 13-15; iv. 26-28; v. 29-31; Heb. x. 12, 13; Rev. iii. 7-12. Hence it appears that the kingdom of Christ of the theocratic kingdom, temple, and institutions, and especially the great typical kingdom of David with its temple, were prophetic figures, is destined gradually to spread till it pervades all mankind, and will "occupy the entire course of time and cover all the space in the world, restoring and transforming the world into the kingdom of God." This our Saviour absolutely declares in his final authoritative commission and promise to be with this Church and kingdom always, every day, all the appointed days, never being absent from her a single day, never being absent in any of the days of her greatest trial and affliction, but remaining with her till the last day, when she will see him again in bodily presence—that is, until the consummation of this secular *αἰών*, or the period of time which comes to an end, with the *παρουσία* and involves the end of the present world itself. "Lo, I am with you:" that is, "he is not coming, he is here; he is with weak and strong, in battle as in victory, in life and in death; here Jesus is with his word and his ordinances as our royal Brother, eternal Priest, almighty Protector, unfailing accomplishment of our protection, as our almighty King, omniscient Witness, patient Forbearer, and righteous Judge. The whole duty of the Church, therefore, is to believe on the Risen One, extend the Church, and console herself with the Lord's gracious assistance till he come for each of us at death, and for his whole Church in glory. Christ never absenteth himself, but while sometime in the dark is never at a distance." (See Alford, Wordsworth, Lange, etc.) Of this Church and kingdom of Christ, glorious things are still spoken; prophecy is full; sun, moon, and stars in their courses

testify; a groaning earth and fettered Church longing for universal extension, exaltation, and glory, give unutterable testimony; while the Apocalyptic angel having the everlasting gospel to proclaim to every nation and kindred and tribe and tongue and people, and laden with all Scriptural blessedness in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, is preparing the way for the overthrow of the antichrist, the moral subjugation of thrones and empires, and the full ingathering of earth's spiritual harvest.\*

Away then with the treasonable and blasphemous allegation that "the gospel has proved a failure."† Sustained by our Lord's promised presence, power, and spirit, the active obedience of the apostles and their uninspired successors within a period of thirty years accomplished the dissemination of the gospel throughout almost every part of the then known world, and rendered doubt respecting its future predicted universal prevalence altogether inexcusable, and inspires with continual reanimating hope the present zeal and hope of the Church. As the seed which lies long concealed in the earth before it springs forth in verdure, and at length displays itself in the golden ear; and as the leaven which lies hid in the meal till the whole lump is leavened; so the gospel, divinely represented by these similitudes, though for a long season it fails to attain to the maturity and

---

\* See Matt. xiii. 31, 32; xxviii. 19, 20; Ps. ii. 7, 8; xxii. 27-29; lxxii. 8-11; Is. ii. 2, 3; xi. 69; lx. 12; lxvi. 23; Dan. ii. 35-44; Zech. ix. 10; xiv. 9; Rev. xi. 15.

† "If the gospel was to convert the world, then if it is *not* done, it will prove a failure." See Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, or *History of the Doctrine of the Reign of Christ on Earth*: 1856. Of this stereotyped work, purporting to be an index, with quotations, to the opinions of authors in all ages of the Church, we feel bound to say that it is the most unscrupulously dishonest and untruthful publication with which we have ever met, and is unreliable as to the real sentiments of any one author quoted in it. It is simply a man-trap to catch the souls of the ignorant and unwary. We can only give, out of many, one instance. Buck's *Theological Dictionary and the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* are quoted as favorable to the doctrine; while both have articles decidedly opposed, Buck stating that the premillennial theory is "grounded on some doubtful texts in the Apocalypse and other Scriptures."

strength of its predicted influence, is nevertheless gradually pervading the mass, and will at length rise and spread itself into that world-shadowing tree of life whose fruit will be for the healing of the nations. It is no idle dream, nor is it any pre-millennial and ever-shifting, never-fulfilling prophecy, but the sure word of him who is the faithful witness and the omnipotent Head of the Church, that he will continue to draw all men unto him until the "fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in." Then also shall "the Jews be grafted in; for God is able to graff them in again." "Even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart; but when they shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away." "Blindness in part is happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." When Christianity shall have triumphed over infidelity, popery, Mahometanism, and every modification of false religion and corruption of the true faith, and shall have extended itself throughout every region of the globe, then will the conversion of the Jews as a nation commence. And when the Jews as a nation shall have embraced the gospel, a still more glorious display of divine grace and power will awake the Gentiles. The conversion of the Jews, the depth of their predicted penitence, the rapidity with which the gospel will spread among them, the numbers who will contemporaneously embrace it, the wonderful verification of Scripture prophecy which these events will exhibit, will diffuse the spirit of vital godliness, the heroic, self-sacrificing zeal of the blessed martyrs among the hitherto formal Gentile professors of Christianity. "For," says the apostle, "if the casting away of them (the Jews) be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" "If the fall of them be the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness?" The fulness of the Gentiles will inaugurate the conversion of the Jews, and the full conversion of the Jews will crown the Gentiles with a glorious effusion of all the spiritual blessings of the gospel in heavenly places in Christ Jesus—and then "there shall be one Lord and one Shepherd." These glorious and happy changes, this predicted unity and spirituality of the Church, this matured and exalted personal

piety, this delightful sanctification of all the families of the earth, shall usher in that glorious and happy era when the gifts and graces of the Spirit shall be poured forth in their utmost richness and abundance, as the fruit of the intercession of our great High Priest, who is, and will then still be, at the right hand of God, the Mediator of the new covenant, the great Apostle and High Priest of our profession, the King of his spiritual and enthroned Israel, sitting as King and Priest upon his throne in the heavens, administering all the ordinances of each of his exalted offices for the benefit of a regenerated, enlightened, sanctified, and happy world. Christ will then reign as King over all the earth, and his saints, who shall then be upon the earth, as they will fill all places of authority, both supreme and subordinate, will, in a correctly scriptural sense, reign with Christ—not he *with them* on the earth, but over all of them while he sits on his perpetual throne in the heavens.

The present dispensation we have seen is the last which God will ever give to man upon the earth. The gospel, as the revelation of the way of salvation and sanctification, is *perfect*, converting the soul, making wise unto salvation, and is and will be the power of God and the wisdom of God unto the salvation of every one who has believed, does now believe, or ever shall believe. And the Church is already Christ's consummated earthly kingdom in which he rules with all power in heaven and upon earth, and is his final and complete instrumentality for the calling and redemption of all his chosen people. It carries the witness within itself of its intended universality. It is as powerful in its efficacy as it is perfect in its constitution, and in the doctrines and precepts, the promises and threatenings of the written word; in the ministration of the gospel; in the celestial advocacy of our great High Priest and in the efficacious agency of the Holy Spirit; and it is provided with every requisite for fulfilling the predictions of Scripture and effectuating the transcendently benevolent purposes of the Almighty, both in regard to this world and to the purer and sublimer blessedness of the next. Why then should another dispensation be expected? For what purpose can it be needed? What specific purpose is

there, glorifying to God and beneficial to man, that the present dispensation cannot effect, and that another dispensation can or would secure? Where is that country in which this divine seed will not grow? Under what clime will it not flourish? It has proved itself the gospel for man of every language and nation, and why should it not extend its dominion to the ends of the earth? Has it not effectually resisted or vanquished every form of hostility? Has it not corrected every species of iniquitous rule until they have eventually been subverted and overthrown—as when the river of pure water, flowing out from the fountain of divine grace, gathering strength in its course, forced back the all-powerful ocean of earth's greatest dominion, until commingling with it, it brought it into harmonious subjection to itself? Has it not moulded fierce and terrific war by its mild and gentle influence? Where is the heart which it cannot sanctify? Where is the will which it cannot subdue? Where are the passions which it cannot control? Where is the conduct which it cannot reform and regulate? Where is the person, family, community, or nation which it cannot purify, felicitate, and exalt? Away then, we say again, with that millenary theory—vain figment and tradition of those rabbinical fathers who made void the word of God—which casts dishonor upon the Church of God, and upon the wisdom, power, and grace of its glorious Head, who is always with it, the same yesterday, today, and forever. Away with that Church and dispensation which it would give us as a substitute—a Church without a High Priest and Advocate at the right hand of God; without any intercession there for the saints; and consequently without answers to prayer, without communications of the Spirit as the fruit our blessed Lord's intercession at the right hand of God.

Finally, let us advert to another method by which the doctrine of Scripture, on this article of the Church's universal faith, may be brought to a test, but to which our time will only permit a general allusion. If Scripture teaches that there are many events yet to occur in the course of that divine providence by which the history of redemption shall be brought to its glorious consummation by the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, then of

necessity such advent cannot be anticipated while these events are still future. The gospel, we have seen, is yet to attain to universal prevalency and power;—Christ shall receive the heathen for his inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession;—the Jews shall be converted to Christianity and united in Christ's one fold with the fulness of the Gentiles, and with such an awakened revival of spirituality, zeal, and divine power, as to realise all that is implied in the prophecy of the first resurrection, as foretold by the apostolic seer, and by the valley of dry bones of the prophetic Ezekiel;—a short season of apostasy and violent conflict between the kingdoms of light and darkness is also prefigured. (See Luke xvii. 26–30; 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4; Rev. xx. 7–9.) It is also, further, clearly and distinctly made known that the present earth and its mundane system are reserved by God for destruction by fire at the time when this second advent of our Lord shall take place. This is taught in 2 Peter iii., see from v. 4–13, with Rev. xx. 11; xxi. 1–3, etc.; Ps. cii. 26; Ps. l. 3; Is. xxxiv. 4; lxxv. 17.

This whole passage of the apostle Peter is in itself destructive of the premillennial theory, a milstone tied about its neck, whether it is interpreted, as some of these theorists do, by a bold denial of the universality of this predicted conflagration, or by a denial of its literal meaning. Let it be remembered, 1. That this Second Epistle of Peter, like the Second Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, was written for the very purpose of condemning this very theory in its original Jewish-Christian form, as leading to the expectation of a speedy personal advent of Christ. 2. The passage in Is. lxxv. 17, to which the apostle is believed to have special reference, when it speaks of the new heavens and the new earth to be created, must intend to represent figuratively the happy condition of the Christian Church when the gospel shall have attained its most extensive and glorious triumphs, as it will then, in comparison, appear as a new creation—a resurrection from the dead; for in that prophecy the world is to be tenanted by inhabitants not only having offspring, but over whom death will reign, and in which all flesh will worship the Lord, in which state the Church will be a typical prefigurement and preparation



for heaven. 3. In passages of the Bible too numerous to quote, heaven is revealed as the final and everlasting residence of the righteous—"an inheritance incorruptible . . . reserved in heaven."

4. This being so, the common interpretation which places heaven and the "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" upon this earth, cannot consist with such general and otherwise invariable teaching of Holy Writ; and the interpretation given by Edwards in his *History of Redemption*, (see page 372,) may *possibly* be the true one, that this world which formerly was used by Satan as the place of his kingdom where he set himself up as God, shall be the place of his full and everlasting punishment, where he and his angels and wicked men shall be tormented in everlasting fire. (See Deut. xxxii. 22.) In this passage, therefore, we are taught that the old world perished so far as water could produce that effect. This is the express analogy drawn by the apostle, that is, that so far as the world was inhabited by men, the deluge was universal to the destruction of all the ungodly, and that as only the Noachic family were saved from that destruction by the ark as a type of Christ, so at Christ's second coming, only those saints who are found alive will be caught up far above the fearful conflagration which rages below, to meet the Lord in the air, while all the wicked shall be left to be consumed by the flames, which shall rage fearfully over every portion of the globe.

5. The apostle further plainly affirms that, although God at that time spared the old world itself, it was not with a view to its *ultimate preservation*, but in reference to a final destruction, for which it is kept in store.

6. The apostle then predicts the particular element by which this utter destruction will be eventually effected, viz. fire. He repeats this idea afterwards, saying that this mundane system is "reserved unto fire;" that is, destruction by fire is the ultimate end for which at the time of the deluge it was spared.

7. The apostle therefore teaches that these heavens and earth are kept in store, not for a glorious renovation, but for a total destruction analogous to that of the deluge.

8. It may be further observed that in speaking of the "old world," the apostle says nothing of the "heavens," the reason obviously

being that the former destruction was superficial and temporal, while the latter destruction involves the entire dissolution of the globe with the atmosphere and all circumambient appendages. 9. To make it still more evident that the destruction of the earth by fire will not be superficial as by the deluge, the apostle proceeds to say that not only the ungodly inhabitants together with all their works will be destroyed, but that the earth itself, and all that appertains to it, will be so utterly consumed as "like the baseless fabric of a vision, to leave not a wreck behind;"—"the heavens shall *pass away* with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." This idea the apostle expresses no less than five times in about as many verses, thus peremptorily excluding the idea that the earth would undergo only a superficial ignition, and be only singed or scorched along its surface. This assertion of the apostle, which he implies to be in accordance with the teaching of the apostle Paul, (see verse sixteen,) is taught as distinctly as human language can import by the apostle John in Rev. xx. ii; xxi. 1-5: "And I saw a great white throne and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them." "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away." Also in the remarkable prophetic language of Job: "As the waters fail from the sea and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not till the heavens be no more: they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep."

"Then cometh the end," and not till then. As Isaiah says, "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation (or scheme of redemption) shall be for ever, and my righteousness (or means of securing that redemption) shall not be abolished. Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law; fear ye not the reproach of men . . . for the moth shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm shall eat them

like wool; but my righteousness shall be forever, and my salvation from generation to generation. Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord; awake, as in ancient days, in the generations of old." Is. li. 6-8. Thus certain is it, that till the utter end of the world God will go on to accomplish deliverance and salvation for and by his Church. "From generation to generation," that is, throughout all generations, beginning with the first generation of men upon the earth, and not ending till these generations shall end with the world itself, God shall carry on his work of redemption. And why should any wish to abridge this time of God's merciful visitation and these glorious hopes of a coming period when the earth's population shall be multiplied a hundred fold; when the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdoms of our God and his Christ; when the Church shall shine forth fair as the moon, glorious as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners, conquering and to conquer; when converts shall be multiplied as the stars in heaven above, as the drops of morning dew, and as the sand that lies heaped upon the earth; and when these innumerable multitudes shall be continually translated from the Church militant to the Church triumphant to swell that countless assemblage, from whom shall go up, with ever increasing volume and ecstasy, the song of the redemption?

We have thus presented in outline to our readers the doctrine of the second final and glorious advent of our blessed and ever adorable Redeemer, as it has been held by the Church of God *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, as one of the first principles of the oracles of God (see Heb. vi. 1,) to be believed as one of the few essential articles of her earliest creeds, to be taught her children, catechetically enforced upon her youth, to be contended for as the faith given to the fathers, even unto blood, and for the maintenance of which millions have not counted life itself dear that they might bear a faithful witness to it; a banner of the truth taken up by the Church from generation to generation amid falling thousands in her fierce conflicts with her enemies, which, like a Rock of Ages whose foundations are in the depths of eternity, and whose top, piercing the clouds and pointing heavenwards,

has beaten back every tempestuous storm of opposition; and from whose summit shall be descried the first gleaming ray of that glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, when he shall come in the brightness of his Father's glory, with his eyes as it were a flame of fire, and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace, and his voice as the sound of many waters, having in his right hand seven stars, and out of his mouth going a sharp two-edged sword, and his countenance as the sun shining in his strength.

The premillennial theory of Christ's second advent is that the Lord Jesus Christ will come again from heaven, really and in person, before any general revival or universal extension of the Church, and in order to such a millennial dispensation; that this appearance of Christ is to be looked for now as it has been for days, months, years, generations, and centuries past; that the Church, as she now exists, with the ministry, the oracles of God, the sacraments, and the means of grace, were only designed to be temporary and introductory, and could never accomplish what prophecy foretells; that the office of the Church now, is therefore not for the conversion of the world, but as a witness-bearer for Christ, while he gathers his elect and prepares them for his coming; that when Christ shall come, the saints that are alive upon the earth and the saints now in glory shall dwell with the descended Saviour upon the earth for a period variously estimated at one thousand years, thirty thousand, three hundred thousand, or forever; that the world is then to be subjected to partial destruction in order to a complete renovation; that Christ ceasing to be mediator between God and man in heaven, will establish an earthly throne and kingdom, having Jerusalem for its metropolis; that the Jews (who have nearly all hitherto remained anti-Christians) are nevertheless to be restored to Palestine and acquire a preëminency; that the Jewish temple is to be rebuilt and adorned for the Saviour's residence; that the Jewish ritual, including animal sacrifices, is to be restored, while, strange to say, all the lower animals are to be brought back to the liberty and happiness enjoyed before the fall; that the nations of the world are to come up from Sabbath to Sabbath and

month to month, bearing gifts and doing homage, at Jerusalem; that at some closing period of this dispensation, the world shall again be filled with wicked men, (how and whence is not known,) who shall, like the fallen angels, or under their guidance, come up to wage war against Christ and his saints, to destroy them; that by fire from heaven Christ shall utterly destroy them, and that then, and not till then, shall come the final resurrection of the dead and the judgment of the great day. This millennial period is to be one of as great earthly and temporal prosperity as of spiritual, according to Papias, to whom the earliest Jewish-Christian form of this tradition is traced by Eusebius: "The day shall come in which there shall be vines which shall severally have ten thousand branches; each branch ten thousand smaller branches; each smaller branch ten thousand twigs; each twig ten thousand clusters of grapes; each cluster ten thousand grapes; each grape, being pressed, yielding two hundred and eighty gallons of wine; and that when one shall take hold of one of these sacred bunches, another shall cry out, Take me, and by me bless the Lord." A flood of the most extravagant errors came in with this theory wherever it prevailed. Among these were the fancies of those called Chiliasts, (*i. e.* Millenarians,) of whom Cerinthus, contemporary with the apostle John, was one, who maintained that the millennium would be employed in nuptial entertainments and carnal delights. Similar opinions were held by all the heretical sects of that period, by the Montanists, by Proclus at Rome, and by Nepos, an Egyptian bishop.

It will be found that the premillennial theory is not only as old as Christianity, but that it was one of those traditions of the Jewish Rabbis by which they made void the word of God, which our Saviour constantly denounced, and upon the basis of which was grounded the general unbelief, apostasy, and rejection by the Jews of Christ as the true Messiah. Time will not permit us to show at length—what is not questioned by any\*—that the above millenary theory of Christ as a great temporal prince and saviour, in all its essential features, was prevalent among the

---

\* One chapter is devoted to Jewish extracts containing these views, in Taylor's History of this doctrine, alluded to above.

Jews at the time of our Saviour's incarnation. This was made evident by the frequent questions addressed to our Saviour by the scribes, Pharisees, the high priest, Pilate, and by his own disciples, as when they had controversy among themselves which should be greatest, when the mother of two of his apostles asked that they should have places at his right and left hand in his kingdom, and as when, even after his resurrection, all his disciples inquired, "Wilt thou not at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" and as when repeated efforts were made to make him a king and to urge him to assume the insignia of royalty. The Jews, therefore, to this day continue to believe that the Messiah, when he does come, will fulfil all the expectations which this theory maintains, and they do this, on the very same ground upon which this theory rests its assumed scriptural claims; that is, upon several unfulfilled prophecies drawn from the analogies of the Jewish dispensation, temple rites, and kingdom, *literally* interpreted, and of which a *literal* fulfilment is anticipated. The question, therefore, involved in the truth or falsity of this theory is, to a very important extent, that of the truth of Christianity, the claims of Jesus Christ to be the true Messiah, the whole doctrine and system of the gospel, and the foundation of our hope and faith towards God and our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom life and immortality are brought to light.

It is impossible in this article to enter into a full refutation. Did time permit, our arguments against it would be, 1. It is condemned by its history; 2. By Scripture; 3. Because it is merely of a theoretical, speculative, impracticable, and delusive character; 4. That it is injurious and dangerous, divisive, distracting, anti-missionary and anti-revival, ever shifting and variable, leading to enthusiasm, fanaticism, irreligion, absurdities, and the most wild and dangerous heresies, as in the case recently of the Irvingites and some bodies in this country calling themselves believers; of the Fifth Monarchy men, and the Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation; and thus, as the Rev. Dr. Hugh White says, (see *Practical Reflections on the Second Advent*,) having "at various times, and never perhaps more remarkably than in our own day, been so mixed up with start-

ling heresies and wild schemes of millenarian prophecy and reveries of enthusiasm, that many sober-minded Christians have been led to extend to the doctrine itself, (I mean the scriptural doctrine of the second advent,) the feelings of suspicious alarm justly excited by the extravagant theories of those who have grafted upon it heretical opinions or speculative dreams."

And first, this theory is historically condemned. It is, as we have seen, Jewish and ante-Christian, originating altogether from ignorance of the spiritual character of the Scriptures and of the Messiah and his kingdom, and of the end and object of his appearance. This Jewish theory was brought into the Christian Church by Jewish converts and attached to the Christian prophecy of a millennial period of the Church. It constituted a leading doctrine with all the early heresies and sects,\* and led probably to the writings of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians and the Second Epistle of Peter. Papias, to whom this opinion is traced by Eusebius, is represented by him to be a man very credulous, of slender judgment and not capable of understanding the prophetic symbols. There is nothing found to favor the theory in the epistles and genuine works of the earliest Christian writers, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp; nor in the apologetic writings of Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch. Justin Martyr, who attributes his holding it to the tradition of Papias, acknowledges that others did not hold it. Tertullian brought it with him from the fanatical sect of the Montanists. The Roman Presbyter Caius, about the middle of the second century, opposed the doctrine as the invention of an arch-heretic who forged writings in its support. The great leaders of the Alexandrian school, Clement, Origen, Dionysius, etc., regarded the theory as a fable of man, and only capable of plausible defence by interpreting Scripture in a literal and Judaizing sense, and made formidable opposition to it. Fifty years later, a body of Christians, headed by Nepos, seceded on account of this theory from the Alexandrian church, but after a

\* See Kitto's Cycl. of Bib. Lit., Art. Millennium; also Herzog's Theological Encycl., Art. Chiliasm; Watson's Theol. Diet.; Schaff's Hist. of the Church, page 299.

discussion of three days by Dionysius, the successor of Origen, A. D. 263, this party made an open confession of their error and returned to the Church. Dionysius wrote a book against the theory, and its last echo in the Greek Church died away with Apollinaris of Laodicea. In the West, the theory, in its most gross and sensual form,\* continued to have its advocates, but was powerfully opposed by Augustine, who established the true spiritual conception of the Church. Augustine and Philostorgus placed it in their list of heresies. Appearing again at the time of the Reformation, Luther and Melancthon set themselves with earnestness to oppose the theory, which is condemning in the two leading reformed Confessions, the Augsburg and the Helvetic. Dr. Whitby, in his learned treatise on the subject, proves that it was never generally received in the Church of Christ and that there is no ground to believe that it was derived from apostolic authority, and, as we have seen, was never admitted as an article of belief in any creed of any Church in the world. Nor was the theory as held by many who are quoted in support of it, that which is now maintained, but directly the contrary. Irænaeus, the disciple of Polycarp, held that the earthly advent and kingdom of Christ would take place not before, but after the general resurrection. Joseph Mede, (born A. D. 1550) who may be regarded as the father of the modern millenarians, distinctly rejected the idea of the personal appearance of Christ before the millennium. His words are: "The presence of Christ in his kingdom shall no doubt be glorious and manifest, yet I dare not so much as imagine that it should be a visible converse upon earth. For the kingdom of Christ ever hath been and shall be a kingdom whose throne and kingly residence is in heaven. There he was installed when he sat down, etc., . . . and there, as in his proper temple, is continually to appear in the presence of his father to make intercession for us." Bishop Newton, who is also falsely quoted in favor of this doctrine, supposes that the martyrs only shall rise from the dead at the commencement of the

---

\* Munzer and his followers wished to establish the earthly kingdom of Christ by fire and sword, as did the Anabaptists and Fifth Monarchy men. See Schaff's Hist. Page 301.



millennium, and that Christ shall not dwell personally upon earth. Bishop Burnet, in his visionary theory of the earth, supposes that the millennium will follow the general judgment and destruction of all the wicked, and accounts for the existence of apostates and persecutors who shall afterwards make war upon the saints by supposing them to be "generated from the mud or slime of the new earth." Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, by a theory, to say the most of it, as visionary and groundless, supposes that all the wicked, not existing upon the earth when Christ makes his advent, shall at the end of the millennium be raised from their graves, with opportunity to rise for an open onslaught upon Christ and the saints.

This theory carries with it its own condemnation historically, because it has never been capable of being stated in a fixed and definite form. Truth is one and the same; and as the Scriptures are now complete, that doctrine which is clearly deducible from them must be capable of clear and perfect statement. This theory, therefore, which has assumed such various and contradictory forms, is utterly destitute of that unity, consistency, constancy, and universality, and, in a word, catholicity, which are the essential marks of true doctrine. Like all other errors, this fluctuating heresy has only served to test, determine, define, and limit the doctrine of Christ's second advent, and so clearly to fix the sense of Scripture that there has been no variance or change in the expression of it in the creeds of the universal Church.

Why then, it will be objected, has this theory continued, with more or less prevalency, to exist, and even now to be adopted by many of our most earnest, zealous, and faithful evangelical Christians? To this it is sufficient to answer that the same is true of many other opinions which are held beyond the established form of sound doctrine; and that it has been held, (although, as we have seen, plainly condemned in the Athanasian and other creeds,) because it can be held by those who still hold to the essential doctrines relating to the divinity, atonement, and mediatorial work of Christ, but who are too sentimentally and impatiently desirous of some more personal and glorious earthly manifestation of Christ and his Spirit.

This theory, we have seen, is also condemned by the clear, constant and frequent testimony of Scripture in passages which are not prophetic, symbolical, or of doubtful interpretation, but dogmatical and positive.

This theory is erroneous in the fundamental rule of interpretation, that is, what is called the literal. In a proper sense, this canon of interpretation is of primary importance. It is essential, first, to attain the true text or words of Scripture, and then to ascertain the proper meaning of the words in relation to each other. But it is a gross perversion and abuse of this canon to interpret figurative, symbolical, typical, and prophetic language as if it was to be understood in the true literal meaning of these figures, symbols, types, and prophecies, because what the Holy Ghost teaches is not what is said in figure, but what these figures analogically convey;—and because the Scriptures are to be interpreted, not as a book of human composition, but of divine inspiration and full of the manifold wisdom and teaching of God, the mere literal understanding of which killeth, while its spiritual meaning giveth life, converteth the soul, and is, both in the Old and New Testaments, a testimony to Jesus Christ. This rule of merely literal interpretation is heretically that of the Jews, who while students of the letter and overlooking the spirit, did not see Christ in Scripture, although he is the sum and substance of it. On this very ground they rejected him of whom Moses and the prophets did write. They thus incurred the punishment denounced by Scripture, as the apostle says, “because they knew him not nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him.” (See Rom. iii. 2, and Wordsworth *in loco*; also Acts xiv. 21; John i. 45; Acts xiii. 27–40; 2 Cor. iii. 6.) This rule of baldly literal interpretation ignores the apostolic canon which is the analogy of faith and the spirit that giveth life. It dethrones Scripture and reduces it to the level of a human record, and is in its nature essentially sceptical and rationalistic, and is the false light which has lured Colenso and multitudes at this present time in Germany, in England, and in this country, to teach for doctrines the wildest theories of men, and to destroy the claims

of Scripture as in all its teachings divine and authoritative; and is most explicitly condemned, both positively and negatively by Christ in his rebukes of the Pharisees; by Gabriel in his annunciations to Zacharias and Mary; by Zacharias, Mary, and Elizabeth, in their inspired songs; by the evangelists; by Peter, (see Acts ii. 3-5, etc.); by Paul (Rom. Heb. and Gal.); and by the apostle James, as above quoted in the council of Jerusalem; by the early Fathers as an entire body; and by the wisest and best interpreters of all churches and countries.

The reception of Christ as the Messiah; the miraculous establishment, progress, and permanency of Christianity; the predicted rejection of Christ by the Jewish people; the interpretation of prophecy given by Christ and his inspired apostles, and the fulfilment in Christ of innumerable passages, and the whole spirit and typical character of the Old Testament, including many of those typically figurative passages, upon the literal words of which this theory bases itself, and the invariable rejection from the creeds of the Church of this theory, though existing; are demonstratively conclusive against both this theory and its rule of interpretation. (See Matthew xiii. 11-44; John xviii. 36; Rom. xiv. and xvii.) The whole teachings of Christ and his disciples are to the effect that his kingdom is not of this world, not earthly, not an earthly dominion; that in it there should be no distinction between Jew and Gentile, no earthly temple, sacrifice, or priest. They declared that its qualification for membership, its promises, privileges, profession, practice, experience, responsibilities, and rewards, are all spiritual. (See, further, Luke i. 32, 33, 55, 67-70; Acts iii. 13-15, and v. 29-31; Rev. iii. 7-12, etc.) The whole spirit of apostolic instruction requires, therefore, that Christians, as risen with Christ above all earthly expectations, should set their affections, aims, and hopes upon things above, upon the hope laid up for us in heaven. This theory, therefore, which bases itself upon a literal, self-contradictory, and impracticable interpretation of one passage of Scripture (Rev. xx. 6,) which is in itself difficult; which occurs in the most highly figurative book of the Bible; of which a figurative, spiritual interpretation is consistent with all the

explicit teachings of Scripture on all the points involved, and the assumed literal interpretation of which would involve a fundamental doctrine (that is, two or more resurrections from the dead,) which is no where else authorised, but contrariwise, most undoubtedly excluded,—must be regarded as contradictory to the clear and uniform teaching of Scripture as interpreted by the clear and uniform interpretation of the Church of Christ.

The following articles have been universally received by the Church of Christ as the common-law interpretation of God's inspired testimony upon the subject now under consideration :

1. That the earth was created to be inhabited only by the human race, and that external nature is strictly adapted only to such a race of intelligent beings—"God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth." "The earth hath he given to the children of men." (See also Gen. ii; Ps. viii.)
2. That all the plans of the Divine Being, revealed in Scripture, so far as the earth is concerned, have relation to a race so constituted, and to no intelligent beings differently constructed.
3. That God, in the dispensation of redemption, has provided a perfect scheme of moral agency for the spiritual benefit of this race, and that this has been in a gradually developing form in operation since its origin, and will continue to be so until the end of time,—that is, until the world itself shall cease, with whose origin and motion time began.
4. That this scheme of redemption or salvation (which are synonymous terms) is one, beginning with God's purpose in the covenant of grace, first revealed to our fallen parents in Eden in the prophetic promise of Him who was to come as a Saviour or Redeemer; which coming was manifested and set before the faith of men in the sacrificial and typical dispensations of the antediluvian, patriarchal, and Jewish covenants; fulfilled in Christ's first personal advent as the Saviour of the world, to make reconciliation and propitiation through his obedience and death; and now, under "this last dispensation which God will ever give to man," (Heb. ix. 26,) set before us in the Scriptures in the present exaltation and never-ceasing mediatorial, intercessory work of our Emmanuel in heaven, and the presence and operations of the

Holy Ghost on earth, and in the constant prophetic assurance of Christ's second coming as our Emmanuel, for the consummated perfection of redemption or salvation, when the mediatorial kingdom will be closed and merged into the kingdom of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for ever, in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. 5. That an essential and most important part of this scheme consists in the intercessory work of Christ as our High Priest and Mediator at the right hand of the Majesty on high, where he ever liveth as a Priest upon his throne, at the right hand of God, whom the heavens must retain until the time of the restitution of all things. 6. That the gospel, with the ministry and other instrumentalities of the Church, through the intercession, and under the rule of Christ, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, and the divine blessing on these agencies, will be the only means of spreading among the inhabitants of the earth that knowledge, holiness, felicity, and glory, which will alone constitute—not another millenary church—but the millenary state of the Church. 7. That there will be only one resurrection of the dead, and that this resurrection will comprehend all the righteous and wicked dead who shall have died from the beginning of the world until the day of final judgment. 8. That at the day of final—that is, universal and general—judgment, every human being who has ever lived, or may be then living on the earth, will appear before the judgment seat of Christ, to be judged according to that which he hath done in the body. (See Rom. ii. and xvii.) 9. That at, or immediately after, the final judgment, the earth, having been defiled by sin, and dishonored by universal rebellion against the authority of its Creator and Governor, will be literally destroyed by fire; and the two classes which had constituted the great mass of its inhabitants, including all nations and ages, will “*go away*” to their appointed places of happiness or misery, viz., the righteous to heaven, the wicked to hell.

Such is the simple, accurately defined, unvaried, and unalterable creed of the Holy Catholic Church, throughout all ages, and in all the world.

In concluding this condensed outline of the doctrine of the

second personal advent of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, we will notice the only plausible objection by which many general readers of Scripture are "ignorantly"—that is, without due consideration—perplexed and led to "wrest to the destruction" or weakening of their faith, that is, the constant reference to our Lord's second coming, as if imminent or at any moment likely to come to pass. Now, it is undoubtedly true that the solemnities and glories of our Lord's promised second appearing, are made to bear with all the pressure of the powers of the world to come, as the great practical motive by which every Christian is required to identify this glorious hope with his daily devotions and meditations, and by which sinners are awakened by the terrors of the Lord at once to repent and be converted, while the day of their merciful visitation holds out. To understand this admitted and most important character of Scripture reference to our Lord's second advent, let it be observed, 1. That in many passages of Scripture the time of this second advent is declared to be purposely concealed from the knowledge of men, as one of the secret things that belong only to God, and one of the great component parts of our present moral and spiritual probation and trial of faith. (See Matt. xxiv. 36; Mark xiii. 32; Luke xii. 40; Acts i. 6, 7; 1 Thes. v. 1-3; 2 Thes.; 2 Peter iii. 3, 4, 10; Rev. xvi. 15.) 2. That it has been shown that many events, not yet consummated, occupying an indefinite period of time, are distinctly revealed as to occur before that advent can take place. 3. The form of language referred to was used by our Saviour and his apostles nearly two thousand years ago, when all the intervening events by which its occurrence was necessarily postponed were fully known, so that it must be explained on other principles than the actual proximity, according to our notions of time, of our Saviour's advent, and must, under any interpretation, be more forcible now, since, with whatever delay, the judgment day must be nearer to us by at least two thousand years. 4. But this is not all, for Enoch the seventh from Adam (see Jude, verse fourteen,) based his prophetic preaching of the gospel upon the certainty of this last advent of our Saviour, saying, "Behold, the Lord cometh with

ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all." Such language was, therefore, practically appropriate, even six thousand years ago. 5. The apostle Paul, to whom, by inspiration and special visions, the whole future of the Church was clearly known, and who wrote his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians to correct the opinion they had taken up of an immediate advent of Christ, by foretelling future epochs; and the apostle Peter, who wrote his Second Epistle with the same object in view, and who meets this precise difficulty by declaring that, although Christ had not yet come, he would certainly appear at the appointed time, and that with the Lord a thousand years were as one day; and the apostle John, (after all the other apostles were dead, say A. D. 90,) who has given in Revelation a chart of the whole lengthened future course of the Church militant;—used frequently and closed the inspired record with the startling announcement, "Behold, I come quickly." 6. The same form of urgent warning and appeal has been employed by the Church universal from the very beginning under "the sons of God," who were the sons of Adam, during all the period of the ante-Christian era, and since Christ's incarnation until now. 7. Bishop Horsley, so eminent for his biblical, critical, and historical knowledge, gives it as his opinion, after full examination, that the "coming of our Lord, always refers to his final advent." (See Sermons 1, 2, 3, and 12). 8. The rule for interpreting the order of events in the vast scheme of redemption is given by the apostle Peter, "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men (premillenarians) count slackness. One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." "*Soon* and *late* are words," says Bishop Horsley, "whereby a comparison is intended of the mutual proportions of different intervals of time, rather than of the magnitude of any one by itself defined. . . . Thus, although the day of judgment was removed undoubtedly by an interval of many ages from the age of the apostles, yet it might in their day be said to be at hand, if its distance from them was but a small part of its original distance from the Creator of the world. . . . There is, again, another use of the words *soon* and *late*, whereby any one portion of time, taken

singly, is understood to be compared, not with any other, but with the number of events that are to come to pass in it in natural consequence and succession. If the events are few in proportion to the time, the succession must be slow, and the time may be called long. If they are many, the succession must be quick, and the time may be called short, in respect to the number of events, whatever may be the absolute extent of it. In this last sense, the expressions denoting speediness of event are applied by the sacred writers to our Lord's coming. . . . In the interval between our Lord's ascension and his coming again to judgment, the world was to be gradually prepared and ripened for its end. . . . And when the apostles speak of that event as at hand, which is to close this great scheme of providence—a scheme in its parts so extensive and so various—they mean to intimate how busily the great work is going on, and with what confidence, from what they saw accomplished in their own days, the first Christians might expect in due time the promised consummation. . . . And thus I have shown that our Lord's coming, whenever it is mentioned by the apostles in their epistles as a motive to a holy life, is always to be taken literally for his personal coming at the last day." (See Dis. pp. 8-10.) 9. Let it be further borne in mind that the great scheme of redemption or salvation—which in the abstract mean the same thing—is ONE, of which redemption or salvation through the coming of Christ as Jesus—that is, Jehovah the Saviour—to save the lost, is the beginning, middle, and the end. God gave Christ and Christ gave himself in the covenant of grace to be the Saviour of the world. As such, Christ was promised and prefigured, until, by the incarnation, he finished the work of atonement and ascended to heaven to perfect personal salvation in every believer, and will come the second time for the full and final salvation of all his completed Church. This second coming is, therefore, the next event to all living, so that no other coming or dispensation can intervene or obstruct our view in looking for it. 10. This leads to the remark that in God's view—to whom there is no past, present, or future, but one eternal now—the second coming of Christ stands in immediate and



inseparable relation to his first. 11. In like manner to the enwrought vision of the prophets, this entire scheme appeared before them in its unity and continuity, so that their spiritually enlightened eye looked at once from its beginning in grace to its consummation in glory. 12. Such also is the aspect in which this scheme of redemption presents itself to the eye of enlightened faith, hope, and expectant, jubilant anticipation, and longing desire. 13. And let it not be forgotten by any that this Lord and Saviour, for whose glorious appearing we now joyfully look, though now we see him not bodily—as he himself forewarned us, and as the apostle Paul rejoicingly declares, it was “needful” and “better” for us, and alone consistent with his necessary presence and mediation, that we should not—yet believing in and realising his assured, actual, and spiritual presence with us, both personally, in his ubiquitous manifestation, and by his Spirit, we rejoice in him with a joy unspeakable and full of his anticipated glory. This faith and hope constitute the very essence of our Saviour’s farewell comforting discourse with his disciples, and, through them, with his people always, in which he now says, as it were, “I have now finished the work of salvation so far as it can be done upon earth, and now, therefore, I go to my Father’s house in heaven, there to continue and perfect it by my mediatorial and intercessory work, so that ye shall see me no more in the flesh, until I appear the second time unto all that look for me, to consummate the great work of salvation in your heavenly and everlasting glory. Nevertheless, I shall be always with you to the end of the world, in my spiritual presence and by my Holy Spirit to inspire your hearts, indite your prayers, exalt your praises, fill you with peace and joy in believing, and with all the fulness of the blessings of the gospel of Christ.” O that Christians would meditate more on the priestly office and intercession of our exalted Lord and Saviour, in his glorious character of High Priest of our profession, so as to be more identified with him, in all our reflections and in all our reading and meditations, and especially in our prayers, whether in the closet, in the family, or in the house of God; so that, on these solemn and interesting occasions, filled with all the fulness of his

gracious presence, we might be able to approach the throne of grace, not only with more pious confidence and boldness, but with more fervent, tender, and affectionate sympathy and confidence. 14. Finally, let us triumphantly say that our divine Lord—our life, our love, besides whom there is none in heaven and none upon earth that we desire—comes virtually with that glorious grace with which he shall appear the second time unto salvation, to every believer at the hour of his departure. The unmistakable promise, so miserably perverted by the fictitious and unwarranted expectation of a mere Jewish, earthly, typical, and preparatory kingdom here upon the earth, has been hitherto, is now, and shall be fulfilled, in all its comforting and happy experience to every true believing heart. “I am with you to the end—this day shall thou be with me in Paradise—I will guide thee by my counsel and afterwards receive thee into glory—I have prepared a place for you, and at the hour of death I will open for you the kingdom of heaven, and will receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also. And when thou passest through the valley of the shadow of death, thou shalt fear no evil, for I am with thee, and my rod and staff they comfort thee. To depart is to be with Christ.” (See James v. 7, 8; Heb. ix. 24, 26–28; x. 36, 37; Rev. ii. and iii.; 2 Cor. v. 8–10; Acts vii. 55–60; Luke xvi. 22, 23; Ps. xxiii. 46.) And as it regards the unhappy, miserable, infatuated, and ever to be lamented man, who dies in his sins, unpardoned and unrenewed, let it be solemnly remembered, that Christ will in the hour of death virtually come to him as the great and terrible judge—“Behold, the judge standeth at the door—behold, I come quickly—and the door was shut—and he stood speechless—for after death is the judgment, when we must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ to receive according to our deeds done in the body, whether they be good or evil.” And so short will the time intervening between the sinner’s death and the sinner’s final actual judgment and destruction appear, that when that last day, the day of wrath, shall come, as Luther says, “Every one will say, ‘Lo, I have but just now died.’” O yes, it will be as the interval between conviction and sentence and execution to

the guilty culprit,—while to the righteous it will be like the seven years of Jacob's loving and hopeful toil for Rachel. "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me."

NOTE.—Since closing the article, we have met with a beautiful confirmation of the closing point, in Stier's Words of Jesus, vol. ix. pages 447-8, on the Epistle of James, v. 7-9: "St. James could in his day predict the coming of the Lord as at hand, and his word was soon confirmed. But after this *first typical* coming of the Lord to judgment upon Israel, the faithful always regarded the reserved and proper day of judgment and redemption, the *last* coming of their Lord, as near. When he shall come the second time. (See page 448.) . . . . It is the will of God that there should be a reality in the continual presentation of the coming of the Lord as near. Every generation should wait for his day, for to every generation and to every mortal, the Lord already comes in death. . . . Because, for wise reasons, the interval between death and the last day is concealed from us, and the day of our death is dark. The Scripture sets before us instead, the day of Christ's revelation as the bright goal of our expectations, and believers are generally, in the New Testament, (since the Lord's Parables,) those who wait for the Lord."

---

ARTICLE V.

*Histoire de Jules Cæsar.* Par Sa Majesté Imperiale NAPOLEON III. Tomes premier et second. New York: D. Appleton et Cie., Libraires-Editeurs. 443 et 445 Broadway. 1865, 1866.  
*History of Julius Cæsar.* Vols. I & II. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square: 1865, 1866: pp. 463, 659, 8 vo.

The History of Julius Cæsar is but another name for the history of the change of the great Republic of Rome into that renowned Empire which embraced in its circumference the civilised world. Whether, at that particular juncture, there was a political necessity for such a change, is a question whose decision will not materially alter our estimation of the means by which it

was effected. Cæsar represents that change. Through a lifetime of plotting, and with consummate genius, he made himself in all but name a monarch, annulling by the sword the antagonism of rival factions, concentrating in himself the authority of the senatorial or constitutional party, crushing out the liberties of the democratic populace who had elevated him at first to power, and consolidating under a more efficient, because a less complicated system of government, the Republic's vast conquests from the Thames to the Nile, from the Caspian Sea to the waters of the Atlantic. In England, his character and achievements have of late been set forth, though with different views, by Dr. Arnold of Rugby, and in Merivale's "History of the Romans under the Empire." This careful, elaborate, and comprehensive treatise on the same subject by Napoleon, reflects honor upon the learning and industry of his majesty, engrossed as he is with the cares of his own large empire, and confers, coming from such a source, honor upon the memory of the illustrious hero to whose life and actions he has devoted for many years his studious attention. If ambition for scholarly distinction had chiefly influenced Napoleon in editing this work, perhaps he would have addressed it in a different form to the little world of students who are especially learned in classical criticism, instead of publishing it, as he has done, in a popular form for general reading. But he has done wisely; for it is the duty of a prince, when he would instruct his people, to do so in their own language, and without the pedantry of a Basilicon Doron. There is a significance in the selection of such a theme by such a writer at the present time, more than is the case ordinarily in the reproduction of classical subjects. If it shall be in our power to make manifest the design of this "*Histoire de Jules Cæsar*," much will have been accomplished towards its criticism, by establishing the true point of view from which we should regard it.

The classics, besides the interesting knowledge they contain, and the intellectual enjoyment they afford by exquisite masterpieces in almost every variety of composition, are a great storehouse of literary models and of subjects for the meditation of philosophers and statesmen. Useful as they have been through

many generations and throughout Christendom for the mental training and instruction of the young, they have been found worthy also of the study of monarchs in the plenitude of their power. There is a suitableness in King Alfred's translating Boethius *De Consolatione Philosophiæ*, as there is in Napoleon's editing a history of Cæsar; and it will be still more in keeping with his position, (though he is too far superior for any personal comparison with Cæsar's successor,) if he shall next engage in a history of the reign of Augustus. His uncle, styled by Michelet "our own Cæsar," occupied a portion of his time at St. Helena, in dictating strictures on the military achievements of the founder of the Roman Empire. It is said that Charlemagne spoke Latin and read Greek. We know from Walpole's "Royal Authors" that the classics were familiar to many of England's sovereigns. Queen Elizabeth, inheriting her father's title of *Defensor Fidei*, gained by his Latin essay, was herself skilled in the classics, and during the anxious period that preceded her elevation to the throne, turned suitably to translating the same work which had engaged the pen of Alfred. In our day, it would be an exception if a monarch in Europe were unacquainted with the literature of Greece and Rome; though the avocation of princes seldom affords such leisure as Frederick of Prussia enjoyed for the cultivation of letters and for authorship.

Books become our favorites as they suit our mental growth, opinions, experience in life, or even our transient moods of feeling. And if we have been early associated with classic authors, it is natural that we should recur to them for reading adapted to our dispositions. We choose among them, as we make choice of our friends among the long known companions of our youth. But in a wider view we may notice among nations likewise—for they too have their intellectual phases, changes of taste and opinion, capricious fancies and fickle moods—that the classics recur from time to time in greater or less prominence of appreciation. It is not irrelevant to the subject before us to dwell for a moment on this point. It may show whether it is simply in consequence of some popular recurrence of the topic, that these volumes are introduced to our attention, or whether apart from

or in addition to this, some particular lesson is meant to be taught in this History of Julius Cæsar.

As all Christian nations study the classics, and have, as it were, a common library of them, the authors in most esteem at any time may be indicative, within the range of classic subjects, of the prevailing objects of study, and to some extent of the taste and even of the moral tone of the educated classes. We say *may be*, for it would require some research to establish the truth of this opinion. In support of it, we may notice that the *Carmina* of Horace, dedicated to the Prince of Wales, have recently appeared in England in the polished version of Lord Ravensworth and Lord Derby, almost simultaneously with three other translations of high literary merit. At this distance we would not venture to infer from such renewed devotion to this poet that there is to any considerable degree a tone prevailing, under the protection of which Swinburne, emulating the looser effusions of the Venusian bard, has dared to put forth his amatory lyrics, and his defensive Canidian explanation. We would rather infer, and think we might make the inference with certainty, that the increased melody of poetic English exhibited in artistic excellence by Tennyson has furnished a higher standard of mere versification, which, leading to a comparison between our present English poetry and the poetry of the Augustan age, has suggested our capability of translating with more success now than Pope or Dryden could have achieved, those Odes whose greatest charm consists in the mellifluous perfection of their style. We may take another view of the popular reintroduction of the *Carmina*, and refer it to the influence of Moore's Melodies, Burns's Songs, Campbell's National Odes, and other excellent productions of this kind, which have occasioned an outpouring of lyrics so abundant and wide-spread as to characterise this period of English poetic literature, and may indeed give to it hereafter the denomination of the lyric period. In addition to recent themes, the reliques of old native songs and ballads have been searched for throughout the realm, and the muse has not disdained excursions to other climes. By the side of Percy and Ellis, we find Lockhart with his Ballads of Spain,

and Macaulay with his *Lays of Ancient Rome*; and with them what more worthy minstrel could be placed than the favorite "*Romanæ fidicen lyræ*," who for so many centuries has delighted the hearts of men? With respect to this poet we may make another observation. The love of satire has never been characteristically prevalent in England. But a little of it has always been acceptable, and it may be remarked, that the general spirit of it has been that of the later Greek comedy, and of the sportive Horatian satire, rather than of personal invective or the bitter truculence of Juvenal. This preference of Horace to Juvenal, while it occasions again the more frequent recurrence of the former, truly indicates the humane and generous culture of English society.

We might strengthen our opinion by turning to the period when Pastorals were fashionable, and Virgil and Theocritus brought forth their shepherds and shepherdesses, till all were wearied with Corydon and Phillis. We believe that Martial and the anthology come in vogue when epigram follows epigram in city and in court; that when a taste for biography prevails, Plutarch revives; that Herodotus reappears when public curiosity delights in strange adventures and tales of distant lands; that Suetonius hands his Court Memoirs to those who are pleased with Grammont and DuBarry; and that the Greek tragedians walk arm in arm with French dramatists. What shall we say of Plato and Aristotle, who have held from time to time intimate communion with theologians, metaphysicians, and explorers in physical science, and have distinguished by their influence long periods in the struggling course of philosophy? In their lifetime they had not greater sway over the minds of the Athenians, than they had in Europe in the sixteenth century.

This adaptability to supply in ways so various our mental appetencies, individual and national, has identified the literature of Greece and Rome with modern education. Arabia may furnish her spices, and China her teas; but their books—and all books not associated with European civilisation—will never be much more to us than foreign curiosities. In every upheaval with us of the mass of minds which make up a thinking people,

one or more of the classic authors crop out, as it were, alongside of new aspirants for enduring favor, but who are destined soon to disintegrate and disappear, except when such a spirit as Diodati or Galileo catches with the intuition of genius the vigor of an approaching era of untrammelled thought, or a Cervantes perpetuates the recollection of a great institution waning into a dream of the past, or a LeSage with delightful skill portrays the manners of an age affected by peculiar influences, or a Gibbon unfolds before us the grand panorama of an Empire's decline and fall, or other gifted minds appear to leave their impress on the world and receive its award of immortality.

The immortality of a book seems to partake of the nature of the earthly lives by which it exists, and to have a kind of sleeping and waking alternation. Perhaps we do not use the proper word in calling a literary work immortal. We lack a word for the idea of an existence continued by resuscitation or reinvigoration of powers not dormant but ceased—having in themselves no principle of life, but a capacity for life through the vivifying touch of an exterior power. We may be permitted to descend lower than this, and leaving out of view the qualities of thought which give to a book the idea of a living power, look upon literary works as pieces of mechanism capable of being set in action, and which, if it were possible to make them permanent, might be called immortal in the sense, nearly, in which we speak of a poem or history as immortal. It was but a slight similitude of endurance that justified Horace in calling a literary work a "*monumentum*." Father Ennius had come nearer the truth: "*Volito vivu' per ora virûm*." Yet the alternation of darkness and of cessation of functions came upon his immortality when his countrymen were no longer interested in what he had pictured, or when an improved intelligence, using a less defective language, reproduced the same materials in a more charming form; and the *volito vivus* folded his wings and drooped to his destined obscurity. But could we now recover the works that bear his name, triumphant would he revive, resplendent with commentaries and emendations, to become for a period the favorite of scholars to whose wonderful acquirements in criticism he would be more



indebted than to his own merits for the repluming of his immortal wings. His recurrence would be due to the adaptability of the material furnished to the intellectual appetency of the age. We would relinquish him for a while to Germany, and name him as indicative of the philological erudition of the celebrated universities of that nation of scholars.

We presume that in every country in Europe the same causes of the recurrence of classic authors and subjects may be traced. It appears, from notices we have seen, that considerable attention has been directed to the history of the Romans under the Empire. Merivale observes, (in 1860,) "The scanty illustration of these times by English writers has been amply compensated by the abundance and copiousness of the contributions of continental scholars. The volumes of Michelet, Amedée Thierry, Duruy, Hoeck, Abeken, and others, have lain open before me throughout the course of my own studies; and the elaborate work of Drumann, in which he has amassed every notice of antiquity," etc. In the notes to the Emperor's History of Cæsar, references are made, almost without exception, to the Greek and Latin authorities connected directly or incidentally with his subject. Scarcely a statement is made without reference to authorities, and the whole body of these (with the strange exception of the poets) seem to have been made tributary to his plan of an independent historical investigation. We may conclude, then, that the subject of Cæsar is in accordance with the spirit of historical inquiry which marks the times—in accordance with the special recurrence of the theme of Cæsar, his character, and achievements. What views have been presented to the public in the treatises above mentioned, we are unable to say, except in the case of Michelet. The Emperor's work, though it may have been suggested by the publications of other writers, does not profess to discuss the conclusions at which they have arrived. His object appears to be as follows: From the imperial throne, with hand uplifted, and depending on no modern writer's assistance, he teaches the people a lesson for the present by an example of the past, and he brings to his side for its enforcement the august presence of the founder of the empire of the Romans.

He would say, (we think,) and say truly, "By this witness, I conjure you, my people, struggle not madly against the decrees of Providence! When the spirit of old institutions hath perished, a new system begins, and happy are they who have wisdom to recognise as a harbinger of blessings the dawning era of improvement, of prosperity, of peace, of security and a higher civilisation!" We believe this to be the principal design of the History of Cæsar.

We have already paused so long on the threshold of our subject in speaking of the ancient authors, that now when a hero is to be reproduced we may be indulged, before we look upon him, in one thought more to express the difference which, no doubt, we all feel between welcoming back the authors themselves and the heroes they describe, were it in our power to recall them to earth. It seems to ourselves that many a weary mile would be trod, to take cordially by the hand those whose æsthetic taste, refined philosophy, search after knowledge, and eager longing for the full light of truth, breathed in glowing words, and all the fascinating beauty of language, made us admire them and sympathise with them when we were young, and as we grew older almost love them; these we would go forth to welcome to our homes, and feel honored to be permitted to take off their dusty sandals and refresh the long wished for friends with good cheer, and hear them speak. But as for very many of the heroes of their books, if these were reported coming, we would raise the neighborhood, and bind them with chains, and imprison them in the penitentiary for life. Keats, in his *Hyperion*, describes a vast, dim cavern, wherein lay the Titans, fate-bound, beings of an epoch forever past; there, we can imagine, have come to join the giant race, at intervals of centuries, which to them may have seemed but passing days, the potent spirits of mortals born, who with Titanic power have swayed the realms of earth. Their epochs, too, are forever past. The advancing spirals of human destiny sweep upwards in unceasing rounds, and the mighty of the olden time, could they be recalled, would have to be suited to our day by a reconstruction on the Pythagorean process, and reappear as mere germs. For what could we do with a destruc-

tive Dinotherium or Mastodon roaming at large? What use would there be in living Megalosauri or political monsters setting at nought all precedents, like Mirabeau "swallowing all formulæ," trampling down institutions, and overturning the harmonious arrangements of modern international equilibrium! Though we draw lessons of instruction from the history of his deeds, let the oriental Timour lie in the Titans' cave with Ceus, and Cottus, and Enceladus, "and many else whose names may not be told;" there, too, let Alexander of Macedon take his long rest, and Julius Cæsar, under whose statue was written, *He is a demi-god!* But lo! he comes, at the call of an emperor—perhaps no other summons would have brought him forth from the dim cavern—and with him appears, somewhat reluctantly, another, with thoughtful look and folded arms, crowned with majesty, at whose name Europe was wont to tremble, the latest admitted among the Titans; by his side stalks the Divus Julius who eighteen centuries ago plunged his Gallic legions over the Rubicon—tall in stature, with pale and care-worn features, and dark and piercing eyes; negligently around him falls his triumphal robe; and to conceal the baldness of his forehead, he wears a perpetual laurel wreath. Twice in his short Preface, has the Emperor coupled their names together. "En effet, ni le meurtre de César, ni la captivité de Sainte-Hélène, n'ont pu détruire sans retour deux causes populaires renversées par une ligue se couvrant du masque de la liberté. Brutus, en tuant César, a plongé Rome dans les horreurs de la guerre civile; il n'a pas empêché le règne d'Auguste, mais il a rendu possibles ceux de Néron et de Caligula. L'ostracisme de Napoléon par l'Europe conjurée n'a pas non plus empêché l'Empire de ressusciter." "Lorsque la Providence suscite des hommes tels que César, Charlemagne, Napoléon, c'est pour tracer aux peuples la voie qu'ils doivent suivre, marquer du sceau de leur génie une ère nouvelle, et accomplir en quelques années le travail de plusieurs siècles."

Passing by the lesson inculcated in this parallelism, and turning from Napoleon the Great, whom we admire more than Cæsar, it is our privilege to gaze upon the latter with the feelings with which we have been accustomed from youth to regard him. We

have traced him in Suetonius, stained with gross immoralities and adulteries, a votary of the goddess from whom he proclaimed himself lineally descended; recklessly contracting enormous debts for the means of bribery, and by means of the indebtedness itself securing the interest of his creditors in his elevation to power as the only source of payment; unscrupulous in the means of accomplishing his purposes; patient and persevering in his steady career of self-aggrandizement, from the time of the prophetic remark of the aristocrat Sulla, "*Cæsari multos Marios inesse,*" to his ædileship, which disclosed the dangerous nature of his ambition, to his consulship in which he unconstitutionally thrust aside his colleague, and it became "*Julio et Cæsare consulibus,*" confirming his imperious disposition for that sole domination "*quam aetate prima concupisset,*" to the final possession of unlimited power by military usurpation, when he said "*Nihil esse Rempublicam, appellationem modo,*" and Cato comparing with the course of others his deliberate persistence in undermining the liberties of the State, uttered the crowning denunciation "*Unum ex omnibus Cæsarem ad evertendum Rempublicam sobrium accessisse.*" Criminality is not lessened by the successful consummation of bold schemes; though we are too prone to admire the courage, shrewdness, and intellectual force, which accomplish the result.

This brief outline of Cæsar's character from Suetonius, might easily be corroborated by quotations from Plutarch,\* and from the more minute treatise of Dion Cassius, and from the spirited narrative of Appian, who tells us that when Cæsar wished to retain military command, until clothed again with consular power, and opposition was made by the Senate to his request, he clapped his hand upon his sword and said, "This will gain it for me." But particularly would we rest on the authority of the letters of Cicero, whose intimate association through a long public life with the leaders of the State, and whose friendly

---

\* Plut. Vit. Cæs. Chaps. 6, 8, 11, and 28.—See also Appian, Book ii. Chaps. 6, 9, 28, and 30.—We need not accumulate references. Those who wish can readily find what is said by those authors, and by Aul. Gellius, Paterculus, and others.

relations with Pompey and Cæsar, gave him most reliable knowledge of their character and designs, while his opinions come from a sagacious and reflecting mind, imbued with a patriotism that then actuated but few others, such as Catullus and Cato; for Pompey's principles of patriotism were so much like Cæsar's, that they may be said to have been for years counterpoised in opposite scales of the balance, till the fortunes of the latter prevailed with a Brennus-like "*vae victis*," and the "*gladius ponderi additus*."\*

We append a few extracts from Cicero's letters to Atticus, beginning at the time when Cæsar had not yet set out from Gaul: "The power of Cæsar renders our situation too serious for trifling. Nay, I am one of those who think it better to yield to his terms than to decide by the sword. It is too late now to oppose him, having for ten years fostered his power against ourselves." "When the stream of his power was weak, it might have easily been stopped. But now he is master of eleven legions, and as much cavalry as he pleases to draw into the field. Think of the towns beyond the Po, upon the mob at Rome, upon so great a majority of the tribunes, upon a profligate rising generation, upon a general with such sagacity to contrive, and such boldness to execute." "Mistaken, wretched man! insensible to every idea of true glory! He pretends that all he does is to maintain his dignity. But can dignity exist without virtue? Is it compatible with virtue to continue at the head of his army, without the voice of the people to authorise him, and to seize cities inhabited by Romans, that he may open a more easy passage to the heart of his country? Not to mention the cancelling of the national debts, the recall of the banished, and a thousand crimes that are yet to be perpetrated before he can rear the temple of tyrannic power, the only deity he worships. I do not envy his greatness. I had rather spend one day with you in the sunny walks of Lucretum than be a monarch over innumerable kingdoms by guilt like his." "It is certain that Cæsar, even upon despatching Lucius Cæsar with his proposals

---

\* Livy v. 48.

for an accommodation, has carried on his operations with greater vigor than ever, by seizing posts, and forming a strong line of garrisons. What a ruffian!—what a robber he is!" "But will you then be able to look upon a usurper? I answer, there is little difference in looking upon his person and hearing of his actions." "Now, you are not to imagine that there is in all Italy one unprincipled man who has not joined Cæsar. I saw the general rendezvous of them at Formiæ. I was well acquainted with them beforehand, (nor indeed did I ever look upon them as any other than beasts of prey,) but I never before saw them in one group." "Should he be victorious, I foresee a general massacre, the plunder of private property, the return of exiles, a general bankruptcy, the advancement of the most profligate to the highest places of government, and a tyranny insupportable, not only to Roman citizens, but to eastern slaves." Indeed, if we had no histories or biographies of Cæsar, we might, from Cicero's Letters alone, form a consecutive view of the steps by which the usurper rose to power, from the audacious triumvirate, as it is called, and his first consulship, when, though in the incipency of his career, he was "too powerful for the constitution," till he had reduced the State to subordination to his will, and could say, "I will be the source of public honors."

The translations we have adopted from Guthrie, though not always accurate, sufficiently exhibit Cicero's private opinion of Cæsar. The politic flatteries in his orations may be read in *Napoleon's History*. On this subject, the world, it may be said, has been, from the time of the events, settled in its convictions. We have been taught how to regard Cæsar by his own contemporaries. The honest though impracticable Cato warned the people that "it was neither the Germans nor Gauls they had to fear, but this ambitious man, whose designs were apparent to everybody." If there have been hitherto apologists for Cæsar, it has been, we believe, not to gainsay the established estimate of his character, but to advance extenuating circumstances to justify his usurpation. The Emperor Napoleon enters more particularly than others have done into a vindication of the character of his hero. To this vindication we will return after

we shall have considered a few points in further illustration of the view generally entertained on this subject.

The condition of the republic, and the means and opportunities which rendered possible such a career as Cæsar's, or, in other words, the causes which produced the political necessity (we will admit that such necessity existed) for a change from a republican to a monarchical form of government, could scarcely be appreciated in an epitome of events, but would require an exposition of changes in the laws, customs, and character of the commonwealth through many generations. But the success of Cæsar may more especially be attributed to three causes which can be briefly set forth.

1. The abolition of kings seemed, says Livy, to give origin to Roman liberty, because there followed an annual election of rulers; but there was no diminution of kingly power. All the rights and insignia of royalty were held by the first consuls. The administration of the government belonged exclusively to the patrician order. The commonalty or *plebs*, however, on whom fell the burdens of the State, were naturally increasing in numbers, wealth, and intelligence, and soon began to claim a share in the government. Thus an antagonism sprang up which marks the whole history of the republic. The more important stages in the progress of plebeian power may be exhibited as follows, extending through about four centuries. The Senate was augmented from the *plebs*; the secession to the Mons Sacer led to the election of popular inviolable tribunes with a veto power; an agrarian law was proposed, giving the *plebs* a share of the *ager publicus*; the Valerian law established an appeal from all magistrates to the people; they gained the right of electing one patrician consul; the plebeian magistrates were no longer elected in the *comitia centuriata*, but *tributim*; what the people ordained *tributim* was binding upon the whole *populus*; the law of Canuleius *de connubio patrum et plebis* was confirmed; the demand for the right of the *plebs* to the consulship was temporarily avoided by the Senate by the appointment of six military tribunes from both classes with consular power; demands were renewed for a share of the public conquered lands in Italy;

though the efforts to elevate the plebeian order to political equality with the Patricians were again and again baffled or eluded, yet the popular cause, supported socially by the Canuleian law, was constantly gaining strength; at length one plebeian consul could be elected, but the judicial power of the office was transferred to a patrician prætor; the dictatorship and censorship followed, and by the *lex Ogulnia* plebeians were eligible to the priestly office, and any of their class who were worthy had opened to them (nominally at least) a participation in all the honors of the republic. But with the temporary close of political strifes began others springing from social causes; conflicts between wealth and poverty, propositions for cancelling debts, agrarianism resulting in fierce party spirit, in popular tumults and civil slaughter; distress, oppression, corruption of morals; and soon there set in—away from the democratic form of rule towards which the constitution seemed tending—a strong divergence towards an absolutism of wealth and of senatorial power, made stronger by the expanding military operations entered upon with avidity when Italy had yielded to Rome, and stronger still by the prestige of patrician imperators, who year by year returned with dazzling triumphs, and bestowed upon the eager *plebs* circus-shows and holiday-profusion of gifts in money and food. The decay of Roman virtue became steady and rapid. Each generation could say—

Damnosa quid non imminuit dies!  
 Ætas parentum, pejor avis, tulit  
 Nos nequiores, mox daturos  
 Progeniem vitiosiore.

In the civil wars, the bloody struggle of Marius (the champion of the *plebs*), and Cinna against Sulla, left the aristocratic party triumphant, and the *plebs* lay quelled till Julius Cæsar, of patrician extraction, yet the nephew of Marius, and son-in-law of Cinna, revived their party, and was borne on its billows against the patched and crumbling walls of the old *imperium* of the patricians. At this time, neither the *plebs* nor the *patres* were what they had been; the latter, though bolstered up by accessions of new nobles, had become degenerate and corrupt; the



former, in their way, were equally corrupt, but powerful for evil, wild in their strength, and reckless of their old and honorable freedom. We have left out of view who they were originally in contradistinction to the *patres*; how they were diminished by the continual warfare of the city against the Italians, and in foreign conquests, and replenished, to the detriment of the whole class, by the admission of freedmen and conquered aliens to citizenship. The vagabonds of Italy tramped to Rome, and mingled with the freedmen, and sons of freedmen; who now largely represented the ancient plebs, lived on largesses and by selling their votes, and might rise by baseness, as some had already risen, to riches and public honor. Here is one of them :

Sectus flagellis hic triumphalibus,  
 Præconis ad fastidium,  
 Arat Falerni mille fundi jugera,  
 Et Appiam mannis terit;  
 Sedilibusque magnus in primis eques,  
 Othone contempto, sedet !

An extreme specimen of the proletaries were the gang of cut-throats Marius brought to Rome when last he came to the city in company with Cinna. Their ferocity caused them to be put to the sword. Such was the "mob" Cicero feared, the wolves whom he had well known, and upon whom he looked with dread, when assembled in one pack at that rendezvous at Formiæ. At the time\* "when all the kings of the earth paid homage to the Roman people, represented by the Senate, this people was rapidly becoming extinguished; consumed by the double action of eternal war, and of a devouring system of legislation, it was disappearing from Italy. The Roman passing his life in camps, beyond the seas, rarely returned to visit his little field. He had in most cases, indeed, no land or shelter at all, nor any other domestic gods than the eagles of his legions. An exchange was becoming established between Italy and the provinces. Italy sent her children to die in distant lands, and received in compensation millions of slaves. Of these, some attached to the soil, cultivated it, and soon enriched it with their ashes. Others, crowded in the

---

\* Michelet's Roman Republic, translated by Hazlitt. Book iii. Ch. 1.

city, devoted to the vices of a master, were often enfranchised by him, and became citizens." In the time of the Gracchi, they almost exclusively filled the Forum. One day, when by their clamors they were interrupting Scipio Æmilianus, he could not endure their insolence, and ventured to say to them, "Silence, spurious sons of Italy," and again, "Ay, clamor as ye will, ye whom I brought bound to Rome will never make me fear, unbound though ye be." "It was no longer a question, where were the plebeians of Rome. They had left their bones on every shore." In a great measure a new people had taken their place; and of these, and of all the Romans after Carthage was destroyed, the descent into vice had been "*Non gradu, sed præcipiti cursu.*"\* Though courted, feasted, and patronized by Cæsar for many years, they were at last like an untamable beast even in his powerful hand. Their portraiture, if we have not sufficiently given it, may be completed from Sallust—uniting the *grex Catilinæ* with the levies raised by Marius for the Jugurthine war. Cæsar used them for his purposes by skilful management, but we think he never completely moulded them to his will, or fully trusted in their attachment. They had nothing to lose and much to gain in *emeutes* and civil commotion, and were the ready instruments for bloodshed, pillage, and revolution. At the same time, the respectable citizens, the industrious tradesmen, farmers, landlords, and money-lenders, from their sad experience, preferred a settled government, whatever its character might be, to a repetition of domestic war. They shouted for Pompey while he was nigh, and shouted for his conqueror as soon as he appeared.

2. At this period the venality of the Romans of all ranks was frightful; the "*sacra fames auri,*" or as another contemporary poet hath it, "*ducentis ads e cuncta pecuniæ,*" became characteristic of the whole nation. In the muddy sewer of corruption

---

\* Vell. Paterc. Book ii. Ch. 1. The whole passage should be read: "*Quippe remoto Carthaginis metu, sublataque imperii æmula, non gradu, sed præcipiti cursu, a virtute descitum, ad vitia transcursum; vetus disciplina deserta, nova inducta; in somnum a vigiliis, ab armis in voluptates, a negotiis in otium conversa civitas.*"

by bribery, (if we may be pardoned for the simile,) Cæsar did not disdain to paddle. He knew where its tortuous windings penetrated, and he could rise in his canoe, and touch in the dark with his hands, the foundation stones of every temple of liberty in Rome. When Jugurtha was driven from the city, it is related that he frequently looked back upon it in silence, and at last said, "Urbem venalem, et mature perituram, si emptorem inven-  
crit."\* The opinion was the result of his own experience. His historian entertained the same opinion: "Namque avaritia fidem, probitatem, caeterasque artes bonas subvertit; pro his, superbiam, crudelitatem, deos negligere, omnia venalia habere, edocuit."† This demoralisation resulted from the luxury and extravagance produced by the sudden wealth obtained from plundered countries, and is admirably traced by Sallust; the love of riches and the lust for power spreading like an infection, until corruption had changed the government itself into a rapacious tyranny. But we have been tedious already, and will refer the reader to Sallust, Cæsar's contemporary and friend. His description of the moral condition of his times is no doubt correct; though his expulsion from the Senate for vice, when all were more or less vicious, may have inclined him to darken the picture of the general corruption. The abandoned characters in Rome were not all plebeians; knights and senators in large numbers were mingled in the maelstrom of depravity and extravagance. In such a city, money was all-powerful. The wealth of the provinces did not enhance the power of the government; it enriched the citizen to debauch him. In his cravings for vicious indulgences, he loathed even the recollection of Sabine simplicity and the austerity of the old republican virtue. Having wasted his patrimony, and squandered what he could borrow, his most urgent need was money—always, money. It was useless, when the judiciary were engaged in farming the revenue, to try cases of spoliation. An attempt to bring an extortionate Verres to judgment, or a spasmodic effort to purify the Senate, but showed the futility of endeavoring to obstruct the torrent of demoralisa-

\* Sall. Jug., Ch. xxxv.

† Id. Catil., Ch. x.

tion. By means of the wide-spread venality at Rome, and by the riches acquired in his provinces, Cæsar was enabled, as he pleased, to pave with gold his glittering path to power. Cicero wrote "there was no man so low but he thought him worth the trouble of gaining." Suetonius informs us that "every person about him, and a great part likewise of the Senate, he obliged by the loan of money at low interest or none at all; and to all others who came to wait upon him, either from invitation or of their own accord, he made liberal presents; not neglecting even freedmen and slaves who were favorites with their masters and patrons. He was, besides, the signal protector and support of all persons under prosecution or in debt, or prodigal young gentlemen; excluding from his beneficence only those who were so deeply immersed in guilt, poverty, or luxury, that it was impossible effectually to relieve them. These, he openly declared, could derive no benefit from any other means than a civil war." Whether in earnest or in jest, he knew such men were already his without the necessity of purchase. Before he held any office, he is said by Plutarch to have been 1,300 talents, or about \$1,372,000, in debt. When he set out for Spain, his first provincial government, this debt had accumulated\* so much that he was embarrassed to satisfy some of his creditors. In a short time his obligations were met, his army and himself enriched, and a large revenue sent to the treasury. His liberality was princely. If we can believe reports, he secured the partisanship of Curio by a gift of \$400,000. He bought (*ἐπιπράο* is Appian's word) the neutrality of the consul Paulus for 1,500 talents, over

---

\* Merivale says 250,000 sestertia, referring to Appian's *δισχιλίῳν καὶ πεντακοσίων μυριάδων*, and which Schweighæuser gives "Opus esse sestertio millies." Reading Appian, two thousand five hundred myriads of drachmas, the drachma being 17.6 cts., makes Cæsar's indebtedness \$4,400,000; or taking the drachma as low as a denarius, by which it was often rendered (Boeckh), the sum is over \$3,800,000, with which the Sestertium millies nearly agrees. Merivale is in error, making it nine and a half million. A note in Thomson's Suetonius still more extravagantly represents Cæsar to have said "he was two million and near twenty thousand pounds worse than nothing." If Cæsar could be consulted about it, we suppose he would not care how high we swelled the amount. He paid it.

a million and a half of dollars. He gave to one of his mistresses, Servilia, a pearl worth a quarter of a million. From the produce of the booty of Gaul, he began to adorn the city with a magnificent public structure, paying for the site in the Forum on which to build it nearly \$4,000,000. The Emperor Napoleon in explaining the resources of such immense means estimates among other items that "500,000 Gauls, Germans, or Britons, were sold as slaves during the eight years of the war in Gaul, which must have produced a sum of about 500,000,000 sesterterii or about 95,000,000 francs."\* After a life of enormous expenditure, he left in his will a sum of about \$15, as a gift to each of the citizens, the number of whom was probably more than 170,000. "The pearls of Britain," says his admirer Merivale, "the statues and gems of Asia, the hoarded gold of Gades and Antioch, the slaves of exquisite figure and curious accomplishments, were, in his hands, the instruments of a lofty ambition, not objects of sordid avarice." We quote again, "Urbem venalem, et mature perituram, si emptorem invenerit."

3. Of the many causes of Cæsar's success, the third which we shall briefly notice, is the most important. In early times the soldier served without pay, near home, and was not kept long in the field. He was a free-born citizen, possessed of property, and his dearest interests were pledges of his patriotism and courage. But in the course of time, in protracted foreign wars, a standing army became necessary, and the legions were filled with professional soldiers, but trusty citizens still, on whom rested the safety and stability of the government. To them the honor of the nation was symbolised in the victorious standard, with its emblazoned *Senatus Populusque Romanus*, that like a mystic charm of invincibility was dipping into valleys and rising over hill-tops, still onward, among quailing nations, northward and southward, eastward and westward. We can appreciate the dream of the English opium-eater who had been reading Livy, and to whom, among the grand pageants that flitted before him in his perturbed hallucination, the grandest was when "at the clapping of hands,

---

\* Hist. J. C., Vol. ii. p. 557. See also p. 478.

would be heard the heart-quaking sound of *Consul Romanus!* and immediately came sweeping by in gorgeous paludaments, Paulus or Marius, girt around by a company of centurions, with the crimson tunic hoisted on a spear, and followed by the *alalagmos* of the Roman legions." Protracted warfare, in rendering necessary the continuous service of the legions, made it necessary also that the services of experienced and skilful commanders should not be limited to a consular term. Innovations followed. By the Gabinian law, Pompey was intrusted with extraordinary powers by land and sea for three years, if necessary, to destroy the pirates; and by the Manilian law—the death-blow of the Constitution—he was made chief general against Mithridates, holding under his orders all the forces in the eastern provinces, and all the navy of Rome. Cæsar of course supported these measures; and to himself, by the help of Pompey, fell a military command in Gaul for ten years. He is said to have boasted in the Senate, when this province was first allotted to him by the people, that he had, in spite of his enemies, obtained all he desired, and could fling defiance in their face.

Sylla debased the discipline of his legions, permitting them to become corrupted by pillage and intemperance. But Marius did worse in departing from the old custom of enlisting recruits, and enrolling as Roman soldiers the proletaries and abandoned rabble, to whom "*omnia cum pretio honesta videntur.*" With such changes in the army, what more was now needed for military usurpation, but a daring general? The political rivals of Cæsar had gained renown in war, and could rely upon the affections of their hardy troops. Pompey proudly said he had but to stamp on the ground to raise armed legions. Where was Cæsar's host? He had none. He turned his face towards Gaul, and entered upon a career in which there was no dalliance with warfare. We can understand the stimulus of his activity. Year after year, and many times a year, came marching into Rome his lictors with their *fascæ* bound with laurels, bearing bulletins of victory, comparable only with those Napoleon kept sending to Paris. The atmosphere of the city undulated with the people's wild shouts of joy; the reluctant Senate caught the

enthusiasm of the hour, and joined in votes of praises, triumphs, and thanksgiving days; while Cato bit his lip and uttered truthful prophecies. "He certainly was a great man," says Michelet, "who, casting on one side all petty considerations, went into exile, that he might return master. Italy was exhausted, and Spain unruly. Gaul alone could subdue Rome. I should have liked to see that white and pale countenance withered before its time by the debauches of Rome; that delicate and epileptic man walking at the head of his legions, under the rains of Gaul, swimming across our rivers, or riding on horseback among litters in which his secretaries were borne, and dictating four or six letters at a time, agitating Rome from the remotest parts of Belgium, sweeping away two millions of men on his path, and in the space of ten years subduing Gaul, the Rhine, and the northern ocean." In preparing a host of veterans peculiarly his own, Cæsar went further than Marius in innovations. He formed a legion of Gauls, paid from his own purse, and devoted to his interests. He added to his command more legions than he had been allowed by the government. He doubled their wages, permanently. When food was abundant, their rations were whatever they chose to take, and sometimes each soldier received a valuable portion of the booty. But they were kept well under discipline. At the same time, by couriers, constantly in motion, he was apprised of all that transpired at Rome, and by the watchful shrewdness of his policy, by princely largesses and munificent bribes, he retained his command, and consolidated the attachment of his veterans to his person and fortunes. The troops of Sylla, Marius, or Pompey, in their fondness for their leaders, and pride in their achievements, may have forgotten for a while the sovereign authority at home, to which their true allegiance was due. But never before had there been a Roman army like Cæsar's. Others may have been, like his, powerful in discipline, and *esprit de corps*, or trained, like his, to move with remarkable rapidity; but no other was ever so wielded by the instant will of its general, regardless of all else and ready to strike, if he ordered it, at the very eagles whose silver wings glittered in their van. So accustomed were they to his generos-

ity, that at the Rubicon, showing the ring upon his finger, with which, he said, he would sooner part, than that they should be unrecompensed for their fidelity, they readily understood him to promise every man knightly rank and knightly fortune at Rome. When his too great power had alarmed the Senate, they withdrew from him, under a pretext, two of his legions, one of which had been Pompey's. On parting with them, he gave each soldier a present in money.

Lucan has described the consternation produced by Cæsar's rapid and unexpected march upon the city with his Gallic legions and "barbaric horsemen." His army "was composed for the most part of barbarians; of heavy infantry from Belgica; light infantry from Arvernia and Aquitania; of Ruterian archers, and German, Gallic, and Spanish cavalry; the personal guard of the general, his praetorian cohort, was Spanish."\* We know not what proportion of his army was made up of such troops; but the panic in Italy caused all to feel and act as though a barbarian host, composed of the ferocious races whom he had subdued, and whom they had so long dreaded, were upon them to plunder, to burn, and to slay. They were soon reassured by the remarkable clemency of the conqueror. Knowing that Pompey's strength lay in Spain, Cæsar guarded against any movement from that quarter, and with a few legions precipitated himself upon the surprised champion of the Senate. The latter has been represented as an ancient oak, and his fearless rival as the swift lightning that rends it asunder. The senatorial party were paralysed and could do no more than turn to immediate flight, or remain and submit to the conqueror. We need follow his career no further.

This is the successful usurper, who, after a brief enjoyment of unlimited power—about five months—was pierced by the daggers

---

\* Michelet, p. 353.—Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Bk. 1.—Merivale, vol. ii. p. 3. Some slight allusion is made to this important matter in Napoleon's 2d. vol. p. 533, of the English translation. Perhaps it will be spoken of in the next volume. We must be permitted to say, however, that there are several other matters not favorable to Cæsar that are hard to find amidst the praises accumulated in these volumes.



of Brutus and Cassius, and muffling himself in his bloody *toga*, fell at the base of Pompey's statue, on the dismal ides of March.

But is this the Cæsar whom the Emperor Napoleon would have us gaze upon? Not at all. The genius which won success in every effort, social, literary, oratorical, political, and military, at last led the dictator to the realisation of the highest glory of his ambitious dreams. The fascination of his renown as the master-spirit of the world, prompts us, even at this late day, to wish that his manhood, view it as we may, were such a manhood as would justify the extreme admiration which, by our nature, we are forever seeking to bestow, not only in homage, but to satisfy our own souls. Hero-worship, as Cicero suggests in his *Tusculan Disputations*, filled Olympus with its divinities. The Emperor's admiration for Cæsar as a conqueror, a statesman, the founder of the empire, has, we think, unconsciously effected in his mind a softening of every harsh feature of his hero. It is noble to remove—it is noble to try to remove—unmerited obloquy, or even unjust censure from the name of the living or the dead. But the vindication of Cæsar is, in some respects, contrary to what we have been accustomed to regard as historic truth. We extract from the Emperor's two volumes, the following sentences. In the admirable and philosophical Preface we read: "Too many historians find it easier to lower men of genius, than, with a generous inspiration, to raise them to their due height by penetrating their vast designs." Instead of tracing the causes of the decay of republican institutions, rendering Rome "incapable of sustaining herself without a central power stronger, more stable, and more just; instead, I say, of tracing this faithful picture, Cæsar is represented, from an early age, as already aspiring to the supreme power. If he opposes Sylla, if he disagrees with Cicero, if he allies himself with Pompey, it is the result of that far-sighted astuteness which divined everything with a view to bring everything under subjection." . . . "If, lastly, he is assassinated by those whom he had loaded with benefits, it is because he sought to make himself king, as though

he were not\* to his contemporaries, as well as for posterity, the greatest of all kings. Since Suetonius and Plutarch, such are the paltry interpretations which it has pleased people to give to the noblest actions." At the conclusion of the first volume, the Emperor takes up again this subject: "Strange inconsistency, to impute to great men at the same time mean motives and superhuman forethought!" "Is it truer to say that Cæsar, having become proconsul, aspired to sovereign power? No; in departing for Gaul, he could no more have thought of reigning over Rome, than could General Buonaparte, starting for Italy in 1796, have dreamed of the Empire."

At what time dreams of empire first visited the souls of these great men, we cannot say; but it is surely legitimate reasoning to interpret a man's motives by his conduct; and the Emperor himself follows this rule of interpretation, only leaving out of his set of motives all that is paltry and mean. In his conception of Cæsar's character, the ruling principles are humanity and the public welfare, which throughout life guided him to protect the oppressed, to redress wrongs and grievances, to give prosperity to the poor, to defend the rights of the people, to establish justice in the colonies, to maintain domestic peace and to ensure the stability of the Republic! His ambition was lofty, unselfish, patriotic, aiming ever at the good of his country, even in the *coup d'état*, which was unanticipated by himself, and forced upon him by the machinations of his enemies!† But did not Cæsar

---

\* The English translation omits this word, converting this fine sentence into nonsense.

† We think this summary is correct. But the Emperor's conclusions are perhaps so different from the opinions, on this subject, of many of our readers, that it may be well to give the following passages: "Cæsar, while spending millions to amuse the multitude, did not make this fleeting enthusiasm the sole basis of his popularity; he established this on more solid grounds, by reawakening in the people the memories of glory and liberty." Vol. i. p. 336. "From the age of eighteen, he has faced the anger of Sylla and the hostility of the aristocracy, in order to plead unceasingly the grievances of the oppressed and the rights of the provinces." Ib. p. 421. "During his first consulship, Cæsar was animated by a single motive, the

know, at the passage of the Manilian law, to use Napoleon's words, "La peuple s'habituaît de plus en plus à considérer la concentration des pouvoirs dans une seule main comme l'unique moyen de salut;" and had he not penetration enough to be aware of the "marche fatale des événements" which the Emperor depicts in the third chapter of Book the second?

But it is not our intention to criticise this elaborate and extensive history. Our more humble object has been to notice its spirit and design, and we have restricted ourselves to the character of Cæsar. Even on this point, perhaps, we should have waited for the appearance of the next volume, in which, no doubt, will be summed up the qualities which constitute the greatness of the hero, and we shall see unveiled the perfect statue draped in all the charms of a grand conception. We have endeavored to show that in the popular recurrence of classical subjects, this History of Julius Cæsar may have been suggested; but that higher designs than of a mere literary work must have induced its laborious preparation; and that among the motives for its opportune publication, may be a delineation of the historical parallelism between the founding of the Roman and of the French Empire, and the important lesson which such a review of past events should impress upon the minds of the people—that people who are already looking forward with solici-

---

public interest." *Ib.* p. 444. "He marched in the track of the Scipios and of Paulus Æmilius; the hatred of his enemies forced him, like Sylla, to seize upon the dictatorship, but for a more noble cause, and by a course of proceeding exempt from vengeance and cruelty." *Ib.* p. 463. "Cæsar, the head of the popular party, aspired to power, in order, above all other considerations, to ensure the triumph of his cause. The way which would offer itself to his mind was not to excite civil war, but to obtain his own nomination several times to the consulship." (We must add, as the sentence meets our eye, that it is said, as a matter of course, one of the ways to reach the consulship was, "as everything was venal, to buy, with the produce of the booty made by war, the consciences which were for sale"!)

*Vol. ii.* p. 454. Ought Cæsar to have obeyed the Senate, and disbanded his army? "No, if this abnegation would endanger what he had most at heart, the regeneration of the Republic." *Ib.* p. 590. See also *vol. i.* of the Translation, pp. 326, 414, 560; *vol. ii.* pp. 408, 454, 533, 568.

tude to the demise of their present able ruler. We are tempted, if the limited space of this article would permit it, to speak of the spirited narration of Cæsar's campaigns in Gaul; which, from the master hand of Napoleon on such a theme, reminds us of Homer describing the achievements of Achilles. No treatise has ever before furnished so lucid an exposition of the Commentaries, based, as it is, upon recent and thorough topographical, antiquarian, and military researches. Topic after topic of enchanting interest bears us on through every chapter of the work. Like the Prolegomena of Wolfius or the Letters of Phalaris, it will, in all likelihood, excite the prolonged attention of European scholars. In conclusion, we again quote from the Preface, and wish we could quote it all: "The preceding remarks sufficiently explain the aim I have in view in writing this history. This aim is to prove that, when Providence raises up such men as Cæsar, Charlemagne, and Napoleon, it is to trace out to peoples the path they ought to follow; to stamp with the seal of their genius a new era; and to accomplish in a few years the labor of many centuries. Happy the peoples who comprehend and follow them! Woe to those who misunderstand and combat them! They do as the Jews did, they crucify their Messiah; they are blind and culpable; blind, for they do not see the impotence of their efforts to suspend the definitive triumph of good; culpable, for they only retard progress, by impeding its prompt and fruitful application."