

THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, S. C.

VOL. VI. No. 4.

APRIL, MDCCCLIII.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED BY I. C. MORGAN.

1853.

Y700 INT
TO 0000
YRABELL 000000

~~000~~
~~57~~

BX2760
.57

CONTENTS.

NO. I.

Article.	Page.
I. Spiritual Beneficence,-----	1
1. The Divine Law of Beneficence. By Rev. PARSONS COOKE, Lynn, Mass.	
2. Zaccheus; or Scriptural Plan of Benevolence. By Rev. SAMUEL HARRIS, Conway, Mass.	
3. The Mission of the Church; or Systematic Beneficence. By Rev. EDWARD A. LAWRENCE, Marblehead, Mass.	
4. The Faithful Steward; or Systematic Beneficence an essential of Christian Character. By Rev. S. D. CLARK, Ashfield, Mass.	
II. Unconditional Decrees,-----	22
III. The Ceaseless Activity of Matter,-----	37
IV. An Inquiry; Are the Wicked Immortal?—Six Sermons. By GEORGE STORRS,-----	61
V. An Address delivered before the Society of Missionary Inquiry, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., May 10th, 1852,-----	73
VI. Necrology.—Rev. JAMES WHITE STEPHENSON, D. D. 102	
“ Memoir of the late Rev. THOMAS REESE, D. D., of South Carolina.	
VII. Reason and Future Punishment,-----	120
VIII. Critical Notices,-----	138
1. The Testimony and Practice of the Presbyterian Church in reference to American Slavery: with an Appendix, containing the Position of the General Assembly (New School) Presbyterian Church, Reformed Presbyterian, Associate, Associate Reformed, Baptist, Protestant Episcopal, and Methodist Episcopal Churches. By Rev. JOHN ROBINSON, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Ashland, Ohio. Cincinnati: 1852. pp. 256. 12 mo.	

Article.	Page.
2. Wesley, and Methodism. By ISAAC TAYLOR. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852.	
3. Salander and the Dragon: A Romance of the Hartz Prison. By FREDERIC WILLIAM SHELTON, M. A. New York: John S. Taylor: pp. 250.	
4. Romanism at Home. Letters to the Hon. Roger B. Taney, Chief Justice of the United States. By KIRWAN. New York: Harper & Brothers: pp. 272. 12 mo.	
5. The Ruling Eldership of the Christian Church. By Rev. DAVID KING, L. L. D. Glasgow. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers: 1852: pp. 165: 16 mo.	
6. Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity, delivered at the University of Virginia, during the session of 1850-'1: pp. 606: 8 vo. New York: Carters: 1852.	
7. The Bible in the Family, or Hints on Domestic Happiness. Philadelphia: pp. 343: 12 mo.	
8. Daily Bible Illustrations. By JOHN KITTO, D. D. F. S. A. Evening Series. Job and the Poetical Books: pp. 410: 12 mo.	
9. The Lost Senses. Deafness and Blindness. pp. 379. 12 mo. New York: Carter & Brothers.	
10. Wheat or Chaff? By the Rev. J. C. RYLE, B. A. New York: Carter & Brothers: pp. 382: 16 mo.	
11. An Analysis and Summary of Thucydides, with a chronological table of the principal events; money, distances, &c. reduced to English terms; a skeleton outline of the geography, abstracts of all the speeches, &c. By the author of "An Analysis and Summary of Herodotus," &c. Oxford: England: pp. 376: 12 mo.	
12. An Analysis and Summary of Old Testament History and the laws of Moses. With an introductory outline of the geography, political history, &c; the prophecies, types and intimations of the Messiah; Jewish history from Nehemiah to A. D. 70; Chronology added throughout; examination questions. By the author of "An Analysis and Summary of Herodotus. Oxford, England: pp. 285. 12 mo.	
13. The Heavenly Recognition; or an earnest and Scriptural discussion of the question, Will we know our friends in Heaven? By Rev. H. HARBAUGH, A. M. Second edition. Philad: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1852. pp. 288: 12 mo.	
14. The Mystery Solved, or Ireland's Miseries. The Grand Cause and Cure. By the Rev. EDWARD MARCUS DILL,	

Contents.

v.

Article.

Page.

- A. M. M. D. Missionary Agent to the Irish Presbyterian Church. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers: 1852: pp. 346: 16 mo.
15. The Indian Tribes of Guiana. By the Rev. W. H. BRETT. New York: Carters: pp. 352: 16 mo.
16. God in Disease, or the Manifestations of Design in Morbid Phenomena. By JAMES F. DUNCAN, M. D., Physician to Sir P. Dun's Hospital, Dublin. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blackiston: 1852: pp. 232: 16 mo.
17. The Friend of Moses; or A Defence of the Pentateuch as the Production of Moses and an inspired document, against the objections of Modern Skepticism. By WM. T. HAMILTON, D. D., Pastor of the Government-street Church, Mobile, Alabama. New York: M. W. Dodd: 1852: pp. 547: 8 vo.
18. Christ our Example. By CAROLINE FRY. To which is prefixed an Autobiography of the author. New York: Carters: 1852: pp. 385: 12 mo.
19. The Holy Testament, or the Book of the Holy Gospel of our Lord and our God, Jesus the Messiah. A literal translation from the Syriac Peshito version. By JAMES MURDOCH, D. D. New York: Stanford & Swords: 1851: pp. 515: 8 vo.
20. Historical Commentaries on the state of Christianity during the first three hundred and twenty-five years from the Christian era, being a translation of the Commentaries on the affairs of the Christians before the time of Constantine the Great. By JOHN LAWRENCE MOSHEIM, D. D., late Chancellor of the University of Gottingen. In two volumes. Volume I, translated by R. S. Videl, Esq; Vol. II. translated and both volumes edited by JAMES MURDOCH, D. D. New York: S. Converse: 1851.
21. Die Offenbarung des heiligen Johannes für solche die in der Schrift forschen erläutern von E. W. HENGSTENBERG, Dr. und Professor der Theologie in Berlin. Erster Band. Berlin: 1849: pp. 632: 8 vo. ●
The Revelation of St. John. Expounded for those who search the Scriptures. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, Doctor and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated from the original by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, author of Typology of Scripture, &c. Volume I. New York: Robt. Carter & Brother: 1852: pp. 581: 8 vo.

NO. II.

Article.	Page.
I. Principles of Christian Economy,-----	157
II. The Consolations of Survivors in the Death of the Pious,-----	186
III. The Doctrine of Future Punishment—No. 1,-----	203
IV. Rev. ROBERT HALL,-----	219
V. Baconianism and the Bible,-----	226
VI. The Phenomena of Freezing Water in the Book of Job,-----	254
VII. The Holy Scriptures,-----	259
VIII. The <i>dyatón</i> of Scripture; or, the Rule, Basis and Effects of Spiritual Virtue,-----	271
IX. Critical Notices,-----	289
1. Exploration and Survey of the Valley of the Great Salt Lake of Utah, including a reconnoissance of a new route through the Rocky Mountains. By HOWARD STANSBURY, Captain Corps Topographical Engineers, U. S. Army. Printed by order of the Senate of the United States. 8vo. pp. 487. 1852.	
2. The Constitution of the United States of America, with an alphabetical analysis, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the prominent political acts of George Washington, Electoral Votes for all the Presidents and Vice Presidents, the High Authorities and Civil Officers of Government, from March 4, 1789, to March 3, 1847, Chronological Narrative of the several States, and other interesting matter, with a descriptive account of the State Papers, Public Documents, and other sources of political and Statistical information at the seat of Government. By W. HICKEY. Fifth edition: 12 mo., pp. 521. 1852.	
3. Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform: chiefly from the Edinburgh Review; corrected vindicated and enlarged, in notes and appendixes. By Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON, Bart. 8vo., pp. 758. Edinburgh: 1852.	
4. The Epistle of James, practically explained by Dr. AUGUS-	

Contents.

vii.

Article.	Page.
TUS NEANDER. Translated from the German by Mrs. H. C. CONANT. 12 mo. pp., 115. New York: Lewis Colby. 1852.	
5. The Works of JOHN OWEN, D. D. Edited by Rev. W. H. GOULD, Edinburgh. Volumes 4th, 5th, 14th and 15th. 8vo. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1852.	
6. A Digest of the Acts of the Supreme Judiciary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Board of Publication. By order of the General Assembly. 12 mo., pp. 296.	
7. Counsels of the Aged to the Young. By the Rev. A. ALEXANDER, D. D. 18 mo., pp. 67.	
8. Early Religious History of JOHN BARR, written by himself and left as a legacy to his grand-children: to which is added a sketch of his character. 18 mo., pp. 80.	
9. An Affectionate Address to Fathers. By the Rev. D. BAKER, D. D., of Texas.	
10. The Flower Transplanted and the Blind Boy. 12 mo.	
11. Polyglotten-Bibel zum praktischen Handgebrauch. Die ganze heilige Schrift Alten und Neuern Testaments in uebersichtlicher Neibneinander-stellung des urtextes, der Septuaginta, Vulgata und Luther-Uebersetzung, so wie der wichtigsten Varianten der vornehmsten deutschen Uebersetzungen. Bearbeitet von Dr. R. STIER und Dr. K. G. W. THIELE. Bielefeld, 1848, 1851.	
12. The Presbyterian Psalmodist, a collection of Tunes adapted to the Psalms and Hymns of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Approved by the General Assembly. Edited by THOMAS HASTINGS. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.	
13. Catechism of Scripture Doctrine and Practice for Families and Sabbath Schools, designed also for the oral instruction of Colored persons. By CHARLES C. JONES. Board of Publication. 18 mo., pp. 154.	
14. On the Study of Words. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, B. D., Vicar of Ichenstoke, Hants; examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford, and Professor of Divinity, King's College, London: From the second London edition, revised and enlarged. New York: Redfield. 12 mo., pp. 236. 1852.	
15. Experience of the past should inspire confidence in the Fu-	

Article.	Page.
ture; A Discourse on Domestic Missions, delivered during the Annual Sessions of Flint River Presbytery, in the Presbyterian Church, Americus, Georgia, April 3, 1852. By JOHN L. WILSON, Pastor of the Decatur (Geo.) Presbyterian Church: Published by the Presbytery. Atlanta, Georgia. 1852.	

NO. III.

I. The Claims of the English Language,.....	301
II. Unregeneracy in the Ministry.—The Fact,.....	332
III. The Doctrine of Future Punishment—No. 2,.....	349
IV. Inspiration <i>versus</i> Morell's Theory,.....	378
V. The Presbyterian Church and Foreign Missions,....	395
"The Fifteenth Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. Presented to the General Assembly in May, 1852."	
VI. Our Ecclesiastical Literature,.....	410
Plans and Operations of the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia: Published by the Board. 1847.	
Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth—Annual Reports of the Board of Publication: To 1851.	
VII. Necrology—Rev. WM. H. BARR, D. D.,.....	428
VIII. Critical Notices,.....	442
1. The Scots Worthies; containing a brief historical account of the most eminent Noblemen, Gentlemen, Ministers, and others, who testified or suffered for the cause of Reformation in Scotland, from the beginning of the sixteenth century to the year 1688. By JOHN HOWIE, of Lochgoin. Illustrated. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 632.	
2. Daughters of China; or Sketches of Domestic Life in the Celestial Empire. By ELIZA J. GILLET BRIDGMAN. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 235 Broadway. 1853. pp. 234.	

Article.

Page.

3. *The Spring Time of Life; or Advice to Youth.* By Rev. DAVID MAGIE, D. D., Elizabethtown, N. J. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 285 Broadway. 1853. pp. 328.
4. *Daily Commentary; a Practical Exposition of Select portions of Scripture, for every morning and evening throughout the year. Being a compendium to Family Worship.* By one hundred and eighty Clergymen of the Church of Scotland. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853. 8vo., pp. 968.
5. *Ancient Christianity Exemplified in the private, domestic, social, and civic life of the primitive Christians, and in the original institutions, offices, ordinances, and rites of the Church.* By LYMAN COLEMAN. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1852. pp. 645. 8vo.
6. *The Bible the Book of the Lord, or the Divine Authority of the Sacred Scriptures; Addressed especially to the Young.* Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 48.
7. *Daily Readings. Passages of Scripture selected for Social Reading, with applications.* By CAROLINE FRY. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 288.
8. *A Manual on the Christian Sabbath.* By JOHN HOLMES AGNEW. With an Introductory Essay, by the Rev. S. MILLER, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 198.
9. *Evidences for Heaven. Written in the year 1650.* By Mrs. THOMASEN HEAD, for the benefit of her children. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 101.
10. *Memoirs of the Lives of Robert Haldane, of Airthrey, and of his brother, James Alexander Haldane.* By ALEXANDER HALDANE, Esq., of the Lunar Temple. Barrister at Law. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853. 8vo., pp. 604.
11. *The Well-Watered Plains, or Instructive Lessons from the History of Lot.* By H. N. BRINSMADE, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 93.
12. *Romanism as it is. An Oration, delivered by the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, D. D., of London, with an Appendix, by the Editor.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 70.
13. *The True Source of National Happiness: a Sermon, by*

Article.	Page.
Rev. H. B. CUNNINGHAM, of North Carolina. Delivered on Sabbath, July 4th, 1852, and published by request.	
14. Robert and Harold, or the Young Marooners on the Florida Coast. By F. R. GOULDING. Philadelphia: William S. Martin. 1852: pp. 422, 18 mo.	
From the Presbyterian Board of Publication:	
1. Pictorial Scenes, illustrative of Christian Missions.	
2. My Own Hymn Book.	
3. Grandmother's Parable: or the Young Pilgrims.	
4. A Forest Flower, or a Memorial of Daniel McKillican, who died in the fourteenth year of his age. By Rev. JAMES DRUMMOND, Missionary of the Free Church of Scotland, Madrad.	
5. The Youth's Gleaner, or Ripe Fruits of Piety.	

NO. IV.

I. Conscience—Its Nature, Office and Authority,.....	453
1. Moral Science. By A. ALEXANDER, D. D.	
2. Dick's Theology. Lectur: LXXXVII.	
3. McCosh on Divine Government. Book III: Chapters 1 and 2.	
4. Paley's Moral Philosophy.	
5. Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind. By THOMAS BROWN, M. D. Lectures LXXXIII and LXXXII.	
II. Uniqueness and Superiority of our Lord's Teaching,	476
III. On the Nature and Importance of a Christian Profession, and its Connexion with Membership in the Visible Church,.....	484
IV. The Unpardonable Sin,.....	507
V. Mercantile Morals; or Thoughts for Young Men entering Mercantile Life. By WILLIAM HOWARD VAN DOREN, Pastor of the Second Reformed Dutch Church of Piermont, N. J. New York: Charles Scribner, 145 Nassau Street. 1852.	

Contents.

xi

Article.	Page.
VI. Necrology. —Rev. JOHN SIMPSON,-----	546
VII. Mormonism, -----	559
1. Exploration and Survey of the Valley of the Great Salt Lake of Utah; By HOWARD STANSBURY, &c. Chapter VII: 8vo. pp. 487. Lippincott & Grambo. Philadelphia. 1852.	
2. History of the Mormons, or Latter-day Saints; with Memoirs of the Life and Death of Joseph Smith, the American Mahomet. Illustrated. 12 mo., pp. 399. Derby and Miller, Auburn, N. Y., 1852.	
3. The Mormons, or Latter-day Saints, in the Valley of the Great Salt Lake; a history of their rise and progress, peculiar doctrines, present condition and prospects, derived from personal observation, during a residence among them; by Lieut. J. W. GUNNISON, of the Topographical Engineers. 12 mo., pp. 168. Lippincott & Grambo, Philadelphia: 1852.	
VIII. Critical Notices, -----	590
1. Pastoral Theology: or the Theory of the Evangelical Ministry: By A. VINET. Translated and Edited by THOMAS H. SKINNER. D. D., Professor of Pastoral Theology in the Theological Seminary of New York; with Notes and an additional chapter by the Translator. 12 mo., pp. 387. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.	
2. Female Piety: or the Young Woman's Friend and Guide through life to immortality. By JOHN ANGELL JAMES, author of "the Anxious inquirer," "Christian Professor," "Young Man's Friend," &c. 16 mo., pp. 450. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1853.	
3. The Diplomacy of the Revolution: an Historical Study: By WILLIAM HENRY TRESCOTT. 12 mo., pp. 169. New York: Appleton & Co. 1853.	
4. The complete works of SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE: With an Introductory Essay upon his Theological and Philosophical opinions, Edited by Professor SHEDD; In seven volumes: 12 mo., vols. 1 and 2, pp. 484 and 551. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.	
5. On the Lessons in Proverbs; being the substance of Lectures delivered to Young Men's Societies at Portsmouth and elsewhere: By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, B. D.,	

Article.	Page.
author of "the Study of Words," etc. 12 mo., pp. 140. New York: Redfield. 1853.	
6. A Stranger Here; the Memorial of one to whom to live was Christ, and to die gain. By the Rev. HORATIUS BONAR, Kelso: 18 mo., pp. 411. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1853.	
7. Letters on Clerical Manners and Habits; addressed to a Student in the Theological Seminary, at Princeton, N. J. By SAMUEL MILLER, D. D. A new edition revised. 12 mo., pp. 384.	
8. Letters from a Father to his Sons in College. By SAMUEL MILLER, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. 12 mo., pp. 240. Presbyterian Board of Publication.	
. Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Buonaparte, and His- toric Certainties respecting the Early History of America. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 18 mo. pp. 184. 1853.	

Article I.	Rev. Enoch Pond, D. D.,	- - -	page 1
" II.	" Samuel J. Cassels,	- - -	" 22
" III.	Prof. R. J. Brumby,	- - -	" 37
" IV.	Rev. S. C. Pharr,	- - -	" 61
" V.	Anonymous,	- - -	" 73
" VI.	Rev. James A. Wallace,	- - -	" 102
" "	J. R. Witherspoon, M. D.,	- - -	" 116
" VII.	Rev. John M. Lowrie,	- - -	" 120



46-41

CONTENTS.

Article.	Page.
I. Spiritual Beneficence,-----	1
II. Unconditional Decrees,-----	22
III. The Ceaseless Activity of Matter,-----	37
IV. An Inquiry;—Are the Wicked Immortal?-----	61
V. An Address before the Society of Missionary Inquiry,	73
VI. Necrology.—Memoir of the Rev'd. James White Ste-	
phenson, D. D.,-----	102
“ Memoir of the late Rev'd. Thomas Reese, D. D., of So.	
Carolina, -----	116
VII. Reason and Future Punishment,-----	120
VIII. Critical Notices,-----	138

16-41

CONTENTS.

Article.	Page.
I. Spiritual Beneficence,-----	1
II. Unconditional Decrees,-----	22
III. The Ceaseless Activity of Matter,-----	37
IV. An Inquiry;—Are the Wicked Immortal?-----	61
V. An Address before the Society of Missionary Inquiry,	73
VI. Necrology.—Memoir of the Rev'd. James White Ste-	
phenson, D. D.,-----	102
“ Memoir of the late Rev'd. Thomas Reese, D. D., of So.	
Carolina, -----	116
VII. Reason and Future Punishment,-----	120
VIII. Critical Notices,-----	138

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER I.

JULY, 1852.

ARTICLE I.

SPIRITUAL BENEFICENCE.

The Divine Law of Beneficence. By Rev. PARSONS
COOKE, *Lynn, Mass.*

Zaccheus; or Scriptural Plan of Benevolence. By Rev.
SAMUEL HARRIS, *Conway, Mass.*

The Mission of the Church; or Systematic Beneficence.
By Rev. EDWARD A. LAWRENCE, *Marblehead, Mass.*

*The Faithful Steward; or Systematic Beneficence an Es-
sential of Christian Character.* By Rev. S. D. CLARK,
Ashfield, Mass.

Several years ago, a benevolent individual, unknown to us, offered a premium of two hundred and fifty dollars for "the best approved treatise on the importance of *Systematic Beneficence*, and of statedly appropriating certain

* The following article was written by a New England man, and its phraseology conforms, in some places, to the systems of charity in operation in that section of our country, viz. the *voluntary associations*. But its principles are equally applicable here as there. Perhaps they are more so, since no general system of beneficence can be more perfect than that of the Presbyterian Church. What we need is, not to perfect our system as a whole, but to carry it out more generally and perfectly in its bearing upon particular parts, and upon individuals. This result it is hoped the article before us will have a tendency to produce.—[Eds. S. P. Rev.]

VOL. VI.—No. 1.

1

portions of income for benevolent objects. This offer set in motion no less than one hundred and seventy-two heads, and hearts, and pens; the result of which was as many manuscripts, some of them "large treatises," and quite a number of them marked by distinguished merit. From this mass of material, the Committee of award "selected *four*, as in their judgment superior to the rest." Of these four, the committee were unable to determine which was the best, and the donor having increased his premium to four hundred dollars, it was resolved to divide it equally among the several writers. These four treatises are now before us, and the titles of them are given above, three of them from the press of the American Tract Society, and the fourth from that of M. W. Dodd, of New York. It is remarkable that the writers of these treatises are all of them pastors in Massachusetts, two of them in adjoining towns in the county of Essex, and the other two in adjoining towns in the county of Franklin.

We wonder not that the committee were unable to give a decided preference to either one of the premium tracts. There is not, indeed, any marked similarity among them, except in relation to their subjects; but they are all so good, and of so nearly equal merit, each in its own way, that it would be difficult to determine which was, on the whole, the best. That of Mr. Cooke is, perhaps, the most closely logical and consecutive; those of Messrs. Harris and Lawrence are more easy and flowing, and in a higher style of rhetorical composition; while that of Mr. Clark deals rather more closely with the individual man, and traces all truly beneficent action to the promptings of an enlightened and growing piety.

It is not our purpose to go into a critical examination of these several treatises. They will be widely circulated, and we trust that both the kind individual whose bounty originated them, and the several writers who produced them, will find themselves amply compensated in witnessing their happy results.

The subject of Systematic Beneficence is one of transcendent importance. It is not exhausted in the treatises before us, nor is it likely to be in any subsequent efforts. We propose to offer a few thoughts upon it, with a view

still further to commend it to the notice and the practice of Christians.

In all the common pursuits of life, the necessity of system is universally acknowledged. To the husbandman in his fields, to the mechanic in his shop, to the minister of the Gospel in his study and in his parish, to the commander-in-chief at the head of armies, to the chief-magistrate of a nation in the chair of state—to all, indeed, who would look for success in any of the stations and occupations of life, whether high or low, small or great, *method, system*, is alike indispensable. Without it, there must be irregularity, confusion, and speedy ruin; but with it, every thing has its time and its place, and the affairs of an empire may be conducted with as much definiteness and precision as those of a household.

Of system, in its higher developements, we have the only perfect example in the works of God. The remark is as true as it is trite, that “order is *heaven’s* first law.” In the divine operations, wherever displayed, whether in the kingdoms of nature, providence, or grace, the most admirable connexion and design are manifested. Means are adapted to ends, and these again to other ends, and so upward and onward, till the last end of all is attained, viz. the highest glory of God, and the utmost good of that universe over which he reigns.

But on the importance of system in the general, we need not now enlarge. In terms, this is universally admitted, though not always exemplified, as it should be, in practice.

But if system is so necessary in other things, why should it not be in the various enterprises of benevolence? Why should we be so strenuous about order and method in our worldly affairs, and leave the most important of all our concerns, viz. those of *beneficence*, of *doing good*, to the promptings of mere impulse, to the force of circumstances, to the chance of being performed, or (what is more likely) of being almost wholly neglected?

Acts of beneficence and charity, in the widest sense of the terms, are not to be restricted to the *mere giving of money for benevolent purposes*. They include a variety of other things, such as instructing the ignorant, reclaiming the vicious, ministering to the sick, comforting the afflicted, seeking out and relieving objects of distress and want—

in short, *doing good unto all men*, in respect both to body and soul, to this world and the next, as opportunity shall present. Beneficence, in this larger sense, is often a higher virtue, and involves much greater self-denial than the mere contributing of our substance for charitable uses. Thousands of persons may be found, all over the land, who would not withhold their money in a case of need, who could hardly be persuaded to go out *personally* into the abodes of ignorance, infamy, disease and want, and minister instruction, consolation, and needed help, with their own hands.

Beneficence, in this larger, higher sense of the term, is capable of being systematized, and often has been. Benevolent individuals have not trusted to mere accident and impulse to guide them in this matter, but have entered upon it *regularly, systematically*, as a part of the appropriate labor of life. Some have set apart a particular day of the week, or a certain portion of the day, in which to engage in works of this nature. Others have taken the responsibility of looking after the poor and the distressed, in a particular street, or district, or neighbourhood, leaving like portions of a city or town to be visited by others.

One of the most devoted and consistent *good-doers* that ever lived in this country, was the celebrated Cotton Mather. To aid and direct him in this matter, he proposed to himself the following questions for every day of the week:

"Sabbath Morning.—What shall I do to-day, as *pastor of a Church*, for the good of the people under my charge?

Monday.—What shall I do in my own *family*, and for the good of it?

Tuesday.—What shall I do for the good of my *relatives* and *connexions* in life?

Wednesday.—What shall I do for the *Churches* of the Lord, and the more general interests of religion in the world?

Thursday.—What good may I do in the several moral and benevolent *societies* to which I belong?

Friday.—What special subjects of affliction and objects of compassion, may I take under my particular care; and what shall I do for them?

Saturday.—What more have I to do for the interest of religion in my own heart and life?"

These questions, it will be understood, came up for con-

sideration in regular order, day after day and year after year. Nor were they dismissed with only a transient thought. Mr. Mather was accustomed to go into them methodically and and fully, to dwell upon them, and to *perform* the good, or at least to attempt it, which he regarded as within his power. Thus did Cotton Mather, as an individual, continually.

But this great proficient in the art of doing good did not confine himself to individual beneficence. He knew the power of *associated* action and aimed at a still higher system, through the agency of benevolent societies. This plan was to have such societies formed in every considerable village and neighbourhood. And where several societies existed in a town, they were expected to have a general meeting, once in the year, to be spent chiefly in prayer, and in devising further means of usefulness. To aid them in their good devices, he drew up the following list of questions, to be separately and fully considered at each annual meeting :

"1. Is there any particular *disorder* in the place which requires our endeavours for its suppression ?

2. Is there any person so scandalously *immoral* that it may be proper for us to send him an admonition ? Or are there any *contentions* which we should strive to quench ?

3. Is there any particular service to the interests of religion to which we may direct the attention of our *ministers* ?

4. Is there any thing which we may well recommend to the *magistrates* for the further promotion of good order ?

5. Are there any magistrates among us so neglectful of their duty that we may properly remind them of it ?

6. Can any further methods be devised for the removal of ignorance and wickedness, and for the promotion of domestic piety ?

7. Are there any instances of *fraud* or *oppression* which may require our interposition ?

8. Are any additional *laws* needed for the public benefit ?

9. Are there any persons languishing under heavy *afflictions* who require our help ?

10. Has any one a proposal to make for the further advantage and usefulness of this society ?"

We adduce these instances from Cotton Mather, not that they may be literally imitated, but to show how possible it is to systematize our more *general* efforts of benevolence,

and how much more effective such efforts will thereby become. If Mather's "essays to good" are not all of them adapted to the present times, they certainly are adapted to awaken thought, to excite interest, and lead Christians now, if not to do the same things, at least to do with their might what their hands find to do.

But though acts of beneficence are not to be confined to the mere contributing of our substance for charitable purposes, still such contributions have ever constituted, and ever will, a very important part of the charities of Christians; a part, too, requiring—perhaps beyond any other—to be *methodically, systematically*, pursued. Our subsequent remarks will relate chiefly to charitable efforts of this nature.

One of the most simple, unexceptionable systems of religious charity ever thought of, was that proposed by the Apostle Paul to the Churches which he had planted,—“Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye. *Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him*, that there be no gatherings when I come.” 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2. We shall have occasion to refer to this passage again. Suffice it to say now, that we have here the outline of a *system* of religious charity; a system prepared for the early Churches, and enjoined upon them by apostolical authority. The individual members were directed to contribute *something*, every Lord's day, according as they had been prospered through the week. It is not certain that this plan, in the details of it, was intended to be perfectly binding. Where other methods are likely to be more efficient and satisfactory, we are at liberty to adopt them.

A system of charity may be pursued by *individuals*, operating singly and alone, or by individuals connected in a *society*; or by *several such societies*, connected in one larger body; or in *all these several ways combined*.

Individuals may establish a system of charity for themselves, by resolving to bestow a particular sum *daily, weekly, monthly, or annually*; or by resolving to bestow, as occasion presents, a particular *proportion* of their regular income. This latter method has many things to recommend it. It is, in principle, very like to the plan of the

Apostles. The persons adopting it do "lay by in store, *as God hath prospered them.*" The proportion to be contributed must be determined by circumstances. Cotton Mather insists, that the *least* that any Christian should think of bestowing, is a *tenth*. He argues, that as the practice of tithing for religious purposes was in use long before the institutions of Moses, the same practice may be expected to continue, when these institutions have passed away.— Abraham gave to Melchisedek, "a tenth of all." It was a part of Jacob's covenant with God at Bethel: "Of all that thou shalt give me, I will surely give the tenth unto thee." Indeed, as Mr. Mather says, "the ancient heathen used to decimate their substance for sacred uses. And shall Christians do less for *their* God, than the poor perishing Pagans did for *their's*?"

The proportion of a tenth, Mr. Mather was himself accustomed, during his whole life, to bestow in charity; at least, he never fell below a tenth. The same was the practice of his venerable father, Dr. Increase Mather; and of many of the early ministers and settlers of this country.

Individuals proposing to establish a system of charity for themselves, may associate with others who are willing to do the same; and thus a regular charitable *society* is constituted. Formerly, a vast number of females in this country were associated together, in what were called *cent societies*. Their practice was to bestow, each of them a cent a week, or fifty-two cents a year, for some charitable object. This cheap and simple method of doing good was vastly better than nothing. Perhaps, in some parts of the country, and among a certain class of people, it was the best method that could be devised. Most sincerely do we hope that it has in no instance been laid aside, but with the view of substituting some more effective system in its place.

Very similar to the plan here adverted to, is the *penny-a-week system*, so extensively adopted among the middling and lower classes in England. From these humble societies, some of the noblest missionary institutions in our fatherland derive no small proportion of their incomes.

The contributions at the Monthly Concert, or the monthly *collections*, as practised in some churches, furnish a favorable opportunity for those whose plan it is to make

their donations *monthly*. A society formed on this plan, and carrying out vigorously the purposes of its organization, can hardly fail to be efficient.

Societies claiming an *annual* contribution are very common. It is a recommendation of such societies that, on account of the infrequency of payments, they may exist in common with other charitable organizations, without interference.

We have spoken, thus far, only of *individual* associations. Where several societies exist in the same vicinity, and for the same object, they may connect themselves together by a common agreement, and thus pour their united charities into the treasury of the Lord. And when an object of great and common interest is presented, sufficient to excite an entire community, the whole may be districted into associations of this nature, and thus a great and universal system of religious charity may be organized.— A system like this was proposed several years ago, and to some extent executed, in behalf of the work of foreign missions. Associations were to be formed in every church; these were to be united in larger auxiliaries; and the proceeds of all were to go into the treasury of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. A system like this presents a striking analogy to some of the great processes of nature. Individual drops unite and form little rivulets; these constitute the larger streams; these the mighty rivers; and these pour themselves into the great ocean. Could the system be made as perfect as these processes of nature, and work as regularly and efficiently, the results accomplished would far transcend all our present calculations and conceptions. The ocean of charity would not indeed, (more than the literal ocean,) be surfeited, but would be constantly pouring out what was poured in, and fertilizing the dry and desert places of the earth.

We need not say more in showing what is meant by *systematic* charitable operations; or in pointing out ways in which our acts of beneficence and charity may be *systematized*. The remarks which have been made are to be regarded only as *suggestions*. The same form of organization may not be required in every place. The system must be modified according to circumstances; and “wisdom is profitable to direct.” But obviously, *there should*

be system of some kind. We should not be satisfied with doing good and bestowing our charities irregularly and occasionally, but should avail ourselves, so far as possible, of the advantages of *system*, and proceed according to some digested and established rules. The reasons for this are numerous and obvious, as

1. *The Divine Command.* There are many commands in the Bible enjoining *beneficence* in the general, or the work of *doing good*. We are to "do good unto all men, as we have opportunity." "To do good and to communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices, God is well pleased." But in addition to these, there are commands enjoining a *systematic* benevolence or charity. Such were many of the injunctions under the former dispensation, requiring that, from one festival to another, and from year to year, *regular systematic* contributions were to be made, in honor of God, and for the support of his institutions.—Such were the tithes, the first fruits, and most of the offerings at the tabernacle and temple. With the ancient Israelites, contributing for religious purposes was a *regular business*, which they were no more at liberty to neglect, than they were to violate any other of the commands of God.

And we find the same general feature introduced, though with less of minuteness and formality, into the Christian church. No sooner had churches been planted among the Gentiles, than they were required to make contributions for the relief of the poor, and for the general purposes of religion. And the Apostle Paul, acting by the direction of the Holy Ghost, drew up for these churches, and enjoined upon them a *system of benevolence*. The passage referred to has been already quoted, but must be introduced again: "Now, concerning the collection for the Saints, as I have given order to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye.—Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him," &c. The apostle, it seems, had previously "*given order* to the Churches of *Galatia*" concerning the matter; and now he authoritatively enjoins the same upon the Corinthians.—"*So do ye. Let every one of you lay by in store,*" &c. There was no room left here for any one to hold back.—There was no liberty given to a single individual to be ir-

regular and inconstant. The matter of contributing for religious purposes must henceforth be a steady business. From one Lord's day to another, it must move on as regularly as any of the concerns of life.

It is not necessary to suppose, as before remarked, that christians, in all ages, and under all circumstances, are shut up to this precise method of doing good ; though it cannot be doubted that vastly more has been lost than gained, by the liberty which has been taken to vary from it, or to drop it altogether. But I do suppose that the passage enjoins as much as this : *Systematic benevolence*. "If you do not like this method, adopt some other ; but at least, *have a method*. Have a system of benevolence, and pursue it. Carry it out, consistently and regularly, to its appropriate results." Less than this, no christian can consistently make of the passage ; and with this interpretation, systematic benevolence becomes a matter of positively enjoined duty.

2. A second reason for adopting system in our charities grows out of its benefits, in a spiritual view, to *the giver*. All charitable effort is a benefit to him who makes it—often a much greater benefit to him than any one else. "It is more blessed to give, than to receive." But more than half the blessing is lost to the giver, if his benefactions are but casual and irregular. The very fact of their irregularity indicates that they are not made upon *principle* ; that they are prompted rather by impulse and the force of circumstances, than by an abiding sense of obligation, and the overflowings of a benevolent heart.

The selfishness of the human heart is very strong. In the unrenewed heart, it reigns without control ; and in the regenerate heart, it is but partially subdued, and is ever striving for the mastery. Now there is no better antidote to the power of selfishness, than *charitable giving* ; more especially when this comes to be habitual and methodical. Every act of true charity is a conquest, for the time, over the power of selfishness ; and when such acts are reduced to a system, and become habitual, this terrible power must yield, and ultimately be subdued.

It might be supposed, had we no facts to correct our reasonings, that selfishness would at length be satiated by mere accumulation ; that as riches increased, the craving spirit would come, at last, to say : *it is enough*. But it has

been proved, a thousand times over, that such a supposition has no foundation in truth. It is a mere fancy. So far from becoming less selfish, and less attached to the world, in consequence of increased acquisition, the opposite of this is dreadfully true. In the exercise of our natural selfishness, the more we have, the more we want. Our desires more than keep pace with our acquisitions. When Alexander had gained Persia, he wanted India ; and when, as he had supposed, he had conquered one world, he wept for another world to conquer. The tendency of increasing wealth is, not to render the heart more benevolent, but more selfish ; not to open it to generous impulses, but to close it up in miserly niggardliness, and render it insensible to every call of benevolence. We see this terribly exemplified, at times, in the case of covetous and long prospered individuals. And now what shall be done to counteract and overcome this sordid tendency ? What shall be done to keep the heart open and alive to benevolent impulses, under the naturally debasing influence of increasing wealth ? There is no antidote to the evil spoken of so sure, and so effectual, as *regular, systematic giving*. Let a man adopt and adhere to some wise system of charity ; let him consecrate, for example, a tenth part of all his gains to benevolent purposes, so that the more he acquires, the more he gives ; and increasing wealth will no longer injure him. It will be a rich blessing to him personally ; while it puts into his hands the means of conferring abundant blessings upon others.

3. It may be mentioned as a third reason for system in our charities, that *more will in this way be given*, and with *less embarrassment*, than would otherwise be possible. Small sums, regularly laid by in store, accumulate almost insensibly, and soon swell to a large amount. A few cents only every week, amount to dollars in the course of a year. The large sums collected by the penny-a-week societies in England, are accumulated so regularly and gradually, as not to be at all oppressive ; whereas to collect the same amount from the same sources in any other way, would be impossible. We are acquainted with a town in which a number of individuals, a few years ago, agreed to pay each of them a dollar for foreign missions, at every monthly concert. They have fulfilled their engagement to the pre-

sent time; and there is, probably, no town in the United States where the monthly concert has been so uniformly productive.

A gentleman of our acquaintance commenced business in early life, with moderate prospects, still he was determined to be charitable, and so he set apart a certain portion of every gain, to be devoted to the service of God, and by this means he was enabled to assist constantly, and for some part of the time wholly, in the support of an aged disciple of Christ; to contribute a weekly stipend for a poor and wretched family; and in the course of the first six months to contribute fifteen dollars for objects more strictly and appropriately religious. Such was the beginning of the experiment. The gentleman is still living and pursuing the same course of life; and we know that the experiment, year by year, has been equally satisfactory, though with the details of it we have not recently been made acquainted.

These instances, out of the many which might be mentioned, show how greatly, and yet almost insensibly, little sums laid by for charitable purposes increase; and make it evident that by bestowing our charities according to system, more will be given, (and with less embarrassment) than could be obtained in any other way.

4. At the same time—and this is another benefit of system—more will probably *be saved* than is given. This assertion may seem, at first view, paradoxical and impossible, and yet we are confident it is strictly true. The gentleman just referred to, who by regularly devoting a portion of his gains to charitable purposes, was enabled to accomplish so much good, says: "I have no doubt that the deductions made on every gain have been saved in carefulness and economy." We have no doubt that they were; nor do we doubt that any other person who should make the same experiment, would find that it was the means of saving him even more than he gave away. There are good reasons why it should be so.

In the first place, he would secure for himself the *blessing of God*, that blessing which maketh rich, and which God has promised to bestow upon the consistently liberal. "Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of thine increase; *So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine.*"

"*The liberal soul shall be made fat, and he that watereth shall be watered also himself.*" "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom." These divine promises, with many others like them, *have a meaning*; and their import is so obvious that it cannot be mistaken. They are promises not so directly of spiritual as of *temporal good* to those who hold their substance as stewards of the Lord, and are ready to part with any portion of it, when he, in his providence, shall call. And the infinite author of these promises is abundantly able to fulfil them. He holds the life and health, the powers and faculties, and the various circumstances of all his creatures completely in his hands. The winds, the waves, the elements, the seasons—all the sources of temporal as well as spiritual good, are entirely at his control. In any way, and at any time, he can bless those whom he is pleased to bless, and curse those whom he is pleased to curse. His promise, therefore, is of all securities the greatest, that the consistently liberal shall be *enriched*, and not impoverished by his liberality.

But waiving this consideration, which is tantamount to all others, there are sufficient reasons growing out of the very nature of the case, why those who pursue a consistent course of religious charity will be likely to save even more than they bestow. For whoever adopts a system with respect to his charities, will be likely to do his other business systematically. Whoever is conscientious and exact in complying with charitable claims upon him, will be so in his other concerns; and this will lead to the truest and best economy. He who spends one part of every gain to promote the cause of God in the world, will not be inclined to spend the other part thoughtlessly, extravagantly or wickedly. The bare fact of bestowing charity, provided it result from a proper motive, must have a moral influence upon the heart, which will be felt and exhibited in the whole manner of living; and if these acts of christian charity are carried into the common business of life, and are multiplied to the number of any person's gains, they must so bring into view and hold up before the mind, the gospel motives and rules of purity, and honesty, and active diligence, as greatly to prevent poverty and the numberless dis-

appointments in pecuniary concerns, to which all men are liable.

For these reasons, among others which might be mentioned, we are persuaded that those who form and pursue a wise and proper system of religious charity, do actually save more than they are called to give away. Their system of charity is, on the whole, a gain to them.

And this view of the case is confirmed,—and *has been* all along down the track of time—by *facts*. In instances innumerable, the truly charitable have found the divine promises which have been referred to verified, in their own experience. So it was with Job. He “delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had no helper.” He “was eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame, and a father to the poor.” But his extensive charities did not impoverish him. He had immense wealth, previous to his distressing bereavement and trials; and when these were ended, the Lord “gave him *twice as much as he had before, and blessed his latter end more than his beginning.*” The poor widow of Zarephath was wonderfully charitable to the distressed prophet Elijah. She received him into her house and divided with him the last morsel which she had reserved for herself and son. Her stock of provisions was miraculously continued and increased, during the season of famine, and afterwards, her beloved child, when breathless, was raised to life, and restored to her bosom. In like manner, the Shunamite was blessed, because of her kindness to the prophet Elisha. She had a son given her in the first instance, and afterwards restored to her from the dead, in answer to the prophet’s prayer. She was also put in possession of her house and her land, which had been taken from her during her absence in the country of the Philistines. (See 2 Kings, chap. iv. and viii.)

Numerous instances of a like nature have occurred in all periods of the church. Eusebius says of Constantine the great: “God gave that merciful prince more wealth than heart could wish, because of his bounties to the poor.” Tiberius II, a succeeding emperor, was so bountiful in his charities, as to incur the censure of his friends. His reply was: “I shall never want money, so long as, in obedience to Christ’s commands, I supply the necessities to the poor.” On one occasion, after he had given much away, a marble

slab was accidentally removed, under which he found a very great treasure. News was also brought him of the death of a rich man, who had left him his whole estate.

One of the bishops of Alexandria, in the sixth century, was surnamed *the almoner*, on account of the extent of his charities. In a time of distress and famine, he continued to bestow his largesses, till he was on the point of being reduced to want. But just at this crisis, when his money and credit were about to fail, he heard of the arrival of two large ships richly laden with corn, which had been sent to him from the island of Sicily.

As the charitable bishop of Milan was one day travelling with his servant, they were overtaken by some poor people, who asked alms. The bishop directed the servant to give them what money he had, which, as it happened, was only three crowns. The servant, however, thought it not prudent to part with all, and so gave them but two. Shortly after the bishop received a present of two hundred crowns; upon which he said to his disobedient servant, "See how, in wronging the poor, thou hast also wronged me. If thou hadst given those three crowns, as I directed, I had received *three* hundred crowns; whereas now I have only *two*."

Mr. John Walter, a citizen and draper of London, many years ago, was remarkable for his charities, even from his youth. But notwithstanding these, his estate so rapidly and constantly increased, that he at length became satisfied with it; and many years before his death he entered into covenant with God, that all future additions to his wealth should be sacredly devoted to charitable uses. After this, as riches continued to pour in upon him from various quarters, he commenced building alms houses and chapels for the poor, investing property for their support when he was dead, and in every way possible ministering to their necessities, and yet he left to his family, who survived him, a very large estate.

It would be easy to multiply instances of this nature, but it cannot be necessary. Mr. Thomas Gouge, an excellent London minister of the last century, published a treatise, with the following title, "*To be truly charitable, is the surest and best way of thriving.*" In this work we have the following strong expressions:

"I dare challenge all the world to give one instance, or at most

any considerable number of instances, of truly merciful men whose charities have undone them. But as living wells which, the more they are drawn, the more freely do they spring and flow, so the substance of the charitable doth ordinarily multiply, in the very distribution."

5. I mention as another reason for system in our charities, that when bestowed after this manner, they can be *expended to much better advantage*. Those to whom they are entrusted, knowing very nearly what they are to expect, and at what times, will be able to form their plans and enter into engagements accordingly. They will be able to dispose of the sums committed to them to much better purpose for the general cause, than would otherwise be possible. This is too obvious to need illustration. Every one at all acquainted with business understands the matter perfectly. He knows the benefit of having his means in his own hands, or of his having some reasonable assurance as to the amount he is to expect, and the time when it is realized. Hence, every such person will see, at once, the importance of *system* (and the more regular the operation of the system the better) in the charities of the christian public. Those to whom they are entrusted will be able in this case, to form their plans with foresight and wisdom. They will be able to take the advantage of circumstances, to make favorable contracts, and to turn the means entrusted to them to the best account.

6. Another advantage of system in any great charitable undertaking is, that the promoters of it, by being organized in one body, and moving unitedly and steadily onwards, will impart *courage* and *confidence* to each other. We are all so much under the influence of our fellow-men, as to feel encouraged and strengthened by their countenance and co-operation. The work of missions, for example, is a noble work; but almost any christian engaged in it alone, or with only a few to aid him, would be likely to be soon discouraged, or if there were numbers engaged in it, but all operating in a disjointed and irregular way, the strength and confidence which they ought mutually to impart would be much diminished. But when all that *system* is given to the work of missions of which it is susceptible; when its friends and promoters shall become organized in one vast body, each moving in his own proper sphere, and do-

ing his appropriate work ; they will then appear and will feel like an army with banners ; they will inspire mutual confidence and strength ; and the noble work in which they are engaged will go forward with a steady and resistless progress.

7. Still another benefit of system among the friends of missions is, it will give courage and confidence to *missionaries*. Those beloved brethren and sisters, who have left their country and homes for the purpose of spreading the gospel among the heathen, are, under God, entirely dependent on the churches, or the *christian community*, which they have left behind, and this dependence they must deeply feel. They know that they are but the messengers of the churches, sent forth at their expense, and restricted as to the extent of their operations to the means which are furnished them. With what interest, therefore, must they look to the contributions at home ? And with what confidence must it inspire them in their arduous labors to see the brethren whom they have left behind, not only pledging themselves for their support, but actually forming themselves into *one great, connected body*, from which the means of their usefulness are to be supplied, and from which the charities of christians are to flow out, in a constant and unbroken stream ? Missionaries will see that in this way, their earthly foundation is greatly strengthened, and their prospects of permanent usefulness proportionally increased. They will be encouraged to enlarge the sphere of their labors ; to form and to execute new plans of benevolence ; and to make greater inroads upon those "dark places of the earth which are full of the habitations of cruelty."

8. It may be mentioned as another advantage of organization and system among the friends of missions, that they can thereby be more readily addressed ; can be made more minutely acquainted with circumstances ; and their united energies can be more directly called forth when special exigencies occur. If insulated or disunited in their exertions, they will have no common head, no common organ of communication with the public, no means of imparting or receiving intelligence, or of becoming acquainted with the state of affairs, and no individual among them will be able to make his voice heard beyond his own private sphere, or beyond the little circle in which he separately moves.

But when their operations are digested into a regular system, and they come to be united in one great body, with its appropriate organs of communication and action, the case now is very different. They can all be directly and quickly addressed on any subject or occasion which shall be thought necessary. They can be made acquainted with the same facts, the same encouragements, trials, and wants. The same calls can be issued, and the same motives be made to bear on all at once. The supporters of missions would resemble, in this case, a well regulated army, moving on to their purpose, and directing their energies against the strongholds of sin, in sure prospect of a speedy and decisive victory.

9. But this suggests another reason for system among the friends of missions and other charitable operations: They have to contend against a *powerfully organized opposition*. The designs formed against the kingdom of Christ in this world are not the result of mere accident, or of circumstances. They betray the hand of a great master spirit, invincible indeed to us, secluded behind the scenes, but powerfully working in the cause of evil. They betray an organized system of wickedness, vast and mighty, present wherever mischief is to be done, and prepared at all points for the conflict with truth and holiness. Here are the principalities and powers of hell—the spirits of wickedness in high places. Here are the devil and his angels, whose name is legion, for they are many. Here, too, are their subalterns and agents among men; not a few of whom are in situations to do their master's work more effectually than he could do it for himself. Such, then, are the hosts of evil against which the people of God are to contend, and in face of which the cause of Christ is to go forward to its predicted triumphs. And what an argument is here for unity, harmony and *system*, as well as faithfulness and zeal, among the promoters of this holy cause? What can insulated, irregular, fitful, impulsive action do against such an opposition? With the great "captain of salvation" for our leader, and the armies of heaven for his ministering servants, and "the sacramental host of God's elect" on earth, all marshalled and trained, each moving in his appointed sphere, and faithfully executing the behests of his Lord, we have nothing to fear. Those that be for

us are more and stronger than those that be against us. But insulated, separated, and in some instances alienated, acting without system or concert, one trying to do one thing, and another another; we are in no situation, certainly, to meet the opposition arrayed against us, and can expect only defeat and shame.

10. We will mention but another reason for system in our religious charities, and this is, they will be more likely to be *permanent*. Those persons are much mistaken (if any such there be) who fancy that the world's conversion is to be a short work. It is obviously one of surpassing magnitude and difficulty. Obstacles appalling, overwhelming, to mere unaided human wisdom and strength, stand in the way. To be sure, we have confidence that, in the end, these will all be overcome. They will be overcome, too, by human means and instrumentalities, guided, energised by an influence from on high. But there is no reason to suppose that this work will be done suddenly. It will be, *must be*, a work of time; and Christians must form their plans and direct their efforts with a view to permanency.

And here we see the necessity of system. Without some regularly digested system, even the best friends of missions are liable to become negligent. Other calls are made, and the claims of the Lord's treasury are unheeded. This accounts for it, that where there is no system in operation, the charities of Christians are so fluctuating and so little to be relied upon. But where there *is* system in this important matter—system wisely adapted and vigorously pursued—there, it may be reasonably hoped, will be permanency. The system, entered into with spirit and with prayer, may be expected to move on in its appointed course. The stream of charity may be expected to run—the contributions of Christians will be continued and increased—the noble work of spreading the Gospel will not cease, till the necessity for it ceases. It will *go on*—it may be confidently hoped it will—and that, too, with increased energy and success, till the knowledge of the Lord shall have covered the earth as the waters do the seas.

Such are some of the reasons which have occurred to us for pursuing the great work of Christian charity systematically. Such are some of the advantages which such a

mode of operation may be expected to have over every other. These are, in the general, *obvious* advantages, such as can scarcely fail to be realised. The necessity of system, in other things, is *universally* admitted. But there is, perhaps, nothing to which it can be better applied, and with greater benefit, than to the religious charitable operations of the present day.

It is matter of rejoicing, therefore, to all who love the cause of truth, that these various operations have, from the first, been gradually resolving themselves into a more regular and systematic form. Individuals are coming to act, less from impulse, and more from principle, in their contributions, putting them into a shape for permanency, and regarding them as a part of the regular business of life. The *associations* which exist, too, have been assuming a more regular, systematic form; the smaller connecting with the larger, and these with others larger still, constituting, at the last, great reservoirs of charity, from which streams are flowing out to bless the world. In this way, increased *concert* of Christian action is attained, and a proportionally increased *efficiency*, for the accomplishment of some of the noblest objects that ever were presented to the mind of man.

It is devoutly to be hoped that the *methodizing* process thus commenced may go on till the system has assumed all that perfection of which it is capable. Its progress hitherto has been the result, not so much of contrivance as of experience. Changes and improvements have been made only as they were found, on trial, to be necessary; and obviously this is the only safe course of procedure for the time to come. The actual working of the system (so far as it has come to be a system) must be watched, and the lessons of experience heeded, while vast innovations and untried experiments are to be shunned.

In further improving our systems of charitable operation, the work should commence with *the individual*. Let individual Christians become more *methodical*, as well as more liberal, in their contributions. Let each one—even the poorest, the humblest—adopt some system of charity for himself; that which to him will be most convenient; that to which he can best adhere; and let him pursue it. Let it become a settled *habit* with him—a part of his life. Changes may indeed be necessary in a change of circum-

stances, but the principle, the habit, must never be given up.

The particular plan which the individual finds convenient to himself he will of course explain and recommend to others; and when a sufficient number have become united in the like methods of doing good, a society may be organized, to connect with some more general society; and thus these individuals, however few and feeble by themselves, come to take a place, and bear a part, in that grand system of effort which is to renovate the world.

Much remains to be done, not only to perfect our systems of charity, but to *extend* them. The utmost boundaries of our Zion have not yet been reached. Vast numbers of professing Christians in this land, and I fear a great many evangelical *Churches*, have done almost nothing, as yet, in a way of religious charity. And what they have done has been contributed irregularly, in consequence of some special call or peculiar emergency, and not in pursuance of any established system or principle on the subject. Now, such Churches and such individuals should be looked up and stirred up. They should be informed as to the moral condition of the world, and what is doing in it, and what it devolves on them to do, for its recovery and salvation. If Christians indeed, they *can* be interested—or rather, they *can but be interested*, in the advancement of Christ's kingdom, and can be induced to stand in their lot, in urging forward that system of means by which this kingdom is to be promoted.

The *motives* to effort—to persevering and united effort—in this great cause, are numerous and powerful. The command of Christ—the precious interests of His kingdom—the best good of our souls, and the salvation of a world lying in wickedness—all are urging us, pressing us, to do what we can, and to do it *now*. Satan has vaunted himself the god of this world long enough. It is high time that he was dispossessed and cast out of it. The last injunction of the Saviour has lain neglected long enough. It is more than time that all His professed followers should listen to his words and combine their efforts to fulfil them.

We are to remember, also, that to each one of us the season for labour in this world is *very short*. Whatever we do must be done quickly. "The night cometh when

no man can work." And as we lie on the bed of death, will it not be a comfort to us to reflect that, so far as the cause of Christ is concerned, we have not lived in vain? And when millennial scenes shall have been ushered in, will it not be an honour to us to be remembered as in the number of those who prayed and laboured to advance them? In the shining of that bright day, our children will love to say one to another, "These are the glorious things on which the eyes and the hearts of our fathers and mothers were fixed—the things for which they anxiously and patiently toiled, for which they prayed with many tears, and for which they cheerfully contributed of their store." O! such a reflection will then be worth vastly more to our children than an estate. They will *choose* to be known as the descendants of those who devoted themselves to the cause of Christ, rather than of those who bequeathed to them a worldly treasure.

Every consideration which ought to have weight with a rational mind is urging us, Christian reader, to continued and increased exertion. Let us, then, not be weary in well doing, but by faithful labours, and cheerful sacrifices, and patient sufferings in the cause of Christ, let us prepare to stand before Him, and to hear Him say, "*Well done good and faithful servants, enter ye into the joy of your Lord.*"

ARTICLE II.

UNCONDITIONAL DECREES.

It is with words as with men, they are often the objects of the most blind and inveterate prejudices. What horrible ideas, for instance, have been associated by those of the opposite party, with such terms as whig and tory, republican and royalist, catholic and protestant, unitarian and trinitarian, believer and infidel! And when one, who has been long duped by such prejudices, becomes personally intimate with his neighbor of the opposite party, he is often greatly astonished to find that he is not only a man and a gentleman, but possibly a devout and exemplary christian!

Few words in modern times have been more perverted by such prejudices than the words decree, election, reprobation, and all that vocabulary of terms peculiar to Calvinism. A very large class, of not only intelligent but pious persons, can never hear such words uttered, without either secret or open disgust. And yet, these are all scriptural phrases, and represent ideas and truths held by the great body of the church from the days of the Apostles to the present time.

Among the other obnoxious terms to such persons is the word *decree*. Instead of attaching to this term the sense which belongs to it, and which has come down with it from the remotest antiquity, they give it a meaning entirely novel, and which neither lexicographers nor common usage tolerates. According to them, the term *decree* signifies a rash and arbitrary determination whereby a ruler seeks to accomplish certain measures, irrespective of either their character or the methods by which they are accomplished. (a) Now to associate the term *decree*, in this distorted view of its meaning, with the character of even an earthly prince, would be to represent him as the basest and most tyrannical of men. How awful then must be that presumption, which can affirm a decree of this sort of the infinitely wise and perfect Ruler of the universe! To represent God as supremely selfish and also blind and capricious—who does not shudder at the thought?

In distinction from these perverters of language and maligners of christian doctrine, we hold that the word *decree* has a good signification; and that in theology, at least, it can be associated with no other ideas than those of wisdom, justice and benevolence. Indeed, so excellent is this term,

(a) "The opinion, says Knapp, has long existed in the church, that the decrees of election and reprobation were absolute; that is, without respect to their moral character, God selected from the human race a certain number and destined them to eternal happiness; and on the other hand rejected others in the same arbitrary manner and destined them to eternal condemnation." [The. vol i, 248.] It is wonderful that this learned divine should thus represent the Calvinistic system. According to Calvinistic theology, all men are by nature totally corrupt and worthy of death. Their native characters are essentially equal. From this general mass of fallen humanity, God has been pleased, for reasons known fully to himself alone, to elect, redeem and *sanctify*, not the whole, but a part of the race. These positions Calvinists hold to be fundamentally true. They certainly do not harmonize, however, with the statement given above.

that in the second Psalm, we hear even of the Eternal Son of the Father boasting of it: "I will declare the decree; Jehovah hath said unto me, thou art my Son, this day I have begotten thee." The Hebrew word *hok*, here translated decree, is equivalent, according to Gesenius, to the terms "statute, ordinance, law." Now, when we consider that "the statute, ordinance or law" here spoken of, originated with the Eternal Son, and constitutes the substratum of human salvation, we cannot wonder surely, that He who dwelt from everlasting ages in the bosom of the Father delighted to make it known. And what is true of this primary decree concerning man's redemption, is also true of all those other decrees of God, by which that redemption is communicated. They all originate not only in wisdom, but in infinite wisdom; and they are all directed, not only to good ends, but to the best ends conceivable. No decree of God is, or can be, either arbitrary, capricious, or malignant. Why then, we ask, do men find fault with them? Wholly, we apprehend, from either their own malignity and insubordination, or their ignorance of the true nature of the divine decrees.

But let us enquire more particularly, what are the decrees of God. Webster defines the term decree in its theological sense, as "a predetermined purpose of God." The latter term again he defines as "that which a person sets before himself as an object to be reached or accomplished." Now, placing the two definitions together, a decree of God, according to this lexicographer is, a predetermination of God to accomplish a certain object, or end.

In the human mind a resolution or purpose is usually formed before we proceed to the accomplishment of any object whatever. Indeed, such predetermination of the will is absolutely necessary to render any human action a matter either of intelligence or morality. What is done without such a purpose is the result of accident or mere muscular motion—it is in no sense the deed of the human spirit. Now, the only method by which we can conceive of the operations of the divine mind, is, through analogies drawn from our own. How can we form any conception of God's love or anger, save as we ourselves are the subjects of these emotions? The same is true in reference to the operations of the divine intelligence—we know nothing of them, save

as we make our own modes of reasoning and thought the guides to our conclusions. And if there be in Deity, as there may be, attributes and qualities, none of which we possess, there is a strong probability that such perfections of the Infinite God will ever remain unintelligible to us. Judging thus of the operations of the divine mind from the operations of our own, we can come to no other conclusion but that a fixed purpose or decree must necessarily precede every divine action. We see around us in space a vast system of worlds, all performing various revolutions, and all controlled by some mighty, but invisible power. Now, we can no more conceive that this great universe of nature was brought into being for no definite and fixed purposes, than we can conceive that the whole of it is the product of mere chance. Indeed, it is upon the latter supposition alone, that we can arrive at the conclusion, that the work of creation subserves no ultimate and predetermined ends. If in its origin, the universe is accidental, then in its results it may also subserve accidental purposes. But if an infinitely wise and powerful Creator originated these mighty fabrics of nature, then must there have been ends and objects contemplated by the mind of that Creator, to the fixed accomplishment of which all the agencies in the universe are directed. Nor can we conceive it possible, that by any seeming mishaps by the way, by any false calculations at the outset, or by any errors, oppositions or casualties whatever, these ultimate ends of the Godhead can be defeated. True, it may appear to a being of such limited capacities as man, occupying as he does but a spot in the infinite succession of causes and effects—it may appear to such a being, that both moral and physical evils are intrusions upon God's plan, and that they must, more or less, affect the ultimate objects of creation. But conclusions of this sort arise wholly from the utter incompetency of the human observer to cast his eyes over the whole area of the divine plan. Now, that navigators have often sailed around our globe, it is easy to speculate and argue concerning both its size and shape. But to the first tenants of our planet, to those who occupied but one seemingly flat spot of its surface, how utterly unknown were all the facts of our present geographical knowledge? So with us, who fill but a moment in eternal duration—who encompass but a point in

infinite extension, and whose utmost capacity can comprehend but a drop in universal knowledge—to us the adaptations of seemingly counterworking agencies to those ends which we *infer* an infinitely wise and benevolent God must have had in view in creation, appear not only mysterious, but impracticable. We see not how sin and misery, and “all our wo” can subserve the benevolent purposes of the Supreme Ruler of the universe; or how greater and higher results of good can accrue from causes so malignant and afflictive. To a mind, however, like that of Jehovah, that “sees the end from the beginning,” that encompasses at once the results contemplated and the whole succession of agencies by which those results are to be reached—to a mind of this sort, there is and can be no incongruity whatever between the agencies that precede and the ends that complete the purposes of God.

To enlighten our ignorance on this subject, and also to dissipate our incredulity, God has given us many and powerful analogies. Does the acorn perish in the earth? It is only to yield the oak, whose branches and shade are to delight and protect the traveller. How strange the process, when every Spring, the husbandman covers the fruitful grain beneath the soil, in order that the barns of Autumn and of Winter may overflow with the products of the earth! How ruinous, seemingly, are storms and hurricanes? And yet were it not for these powerful agents, our atmosphere would be in a condition productive only of disease and death. In providence too the same lessons are taught us. Who that holds in his hands the complete biography of one human life, has not there read the truth, that apparent evils in such a life, resulted ultimately in positive and superabounding good? There he sees that poverty produced great wealth; that an ignoble birth reached the palm of immortal honour, and that afflictions and crosses formed a character that nothing else could have created. The hatred of his brethren led Joseph to the premiership of Egypt, and the persecutions of Saul exalted David to the throne of Israel! Daniel’s supremacy over the counsellors of Persia, was brought about by his exposure in a den of lions, and the apostleship of Paul succeeded to his persecution of the christians! Even our blessed Savior’s exaltation to his Father’s right hand, is ascribed in scripture, to “his endur-

ing the cross and despising of its shame." Thus in all nature, and in the histories of both men and nations, is God continually forcing and constraining that hated agent *evil*, to subserve great and good results. These lessons are taught us in all things, and they are taught to us daily. Can we believe then, that those mightier evils that extend, not only over a generation, but over a race; that cover, not simply our zenith but our horizon; that pursue us not only in time, but in eternity; can we believe that evils of even these enlarged dimensions are not subject to the same laws that regulate the lesser trials of our short pilgrimage, and that constrain our bitterest earthly gall to yield us a sweet and heavenly nectar? If God sees to it, that all the shorter roads of evil shall lead to manifest good, will he not also care, that in its mighty pathway through his kingdom—in its highway career to the eternal future—sin shall be so overruled as to promote and enlarge the boundaries of universal bliss? Of this, to our minds, whether we consider the character of God, the lessons He daily sets to us in his works and providence, or the yet clearer elucidations of his will in scripture; there is and can be no doubt. We cannot believe that evil is an accident, or that it is a thing of such inveterate nature, that even omnipotence cannot make it co-operate with other and even antagonistical agencies in the completion of his pre-chosen and infinitely complete plan.

Some may suppose that these views lead to Universalism. We differ from them. Universalism assumes it as a datum, that the highest and best good of the universe consists in the personal felicity of every individual member of that universe. But we do not concede this point. Even in its most exalted and perfect condition, the empire of the Great God may admit, for aught we know, not only of suffering, but of a great amount of suffering. We believe that so far as God himself is concerned, and that countless number of individual beings that constitute His loyal creation, all the moral and physical evils that exist will work out ultimate and real good; but that every rebel in the universe will be a participant of that good, is what we dare not affirm in the face of so many express texts of Scripture to the contrary. (b.)

(b) Ignorant as we now are of all the motives which led the mind of Deity

The decrees of God, so far as they relate to the salvation of men, are divided by Theologians into two classes; conditional and unconditional; or, contingent and arbitrary. The Arminians hold the former, the Calvinists maintain the latter. The difference, however, between these two classes of divines does not refer to the question, whether or not, means precede ends and antecedents consequents. Both admit the validity of the tie between cause and effect, condition and result. Without planting, according to each, there can be no reaping, and without repentance no forgiveness. The real question of dispute here is, *in whose hands are the conditions, or antecedents, of salvation—those of man or those of God?* The Arminian defends the former, the Calvinist the latter.

“Conditional decrees,” says Knapp, “are those in making which God has respect to the free actions of moral beings. These conditional decrees are founded upon that fore-knowledge of the free actions of men, which we are compelled to ascribe to God. God foresaw from eternity how every man would act, and whether

to permit sin, we can yet perceive that good has resulted from that event which otherwise would never have existed. The highest bliss of the universe must ever consist in the enjoyment, directly or indirectly, of the first originating mind. Before, however, God can be enjoyed he must be revealed. Now, whatever may be said of the origin of sin, it is certain that it has given occasion to the manifestation in the Godhead of attributes and exercises that otherwise had never been known. The holiness and justice of God are never so clearly seen as when brought into contact with sin. Yet more plain is it, that mercy had never been exercised but for the misery into which sin has plunged a part of God's creation. The Incarnation certainly, and the Trinity possibly, had never otherwise been realized. Nor can we conceive that even the power and wisdom of God are revealed so impressively in nature as in the dispensations of Divine Providence with our fallen race. The permission of moral evil, as overruled by God, has also impressed many salutary lessons upon the minds of his intelligent creatures. How has it taught them their frailty, their responsibility, their danger. How has it implanted in them the true principles of moral government; and especially, how has it developed in them, as in God, attributes and exercises that otherwise had never existed! Nor have we completed the picture yet. Our race, like our planet, is evidently connected with a vast creation of intelligent beings existing elsewhere. If not in our present crystal state, no doubt in the immortality of our being closer connexions will be formed between us and them than now exist. The history of our race, therefore, will become hereafter a book of instruction to myriads of beings whose very existence may now seem as merely problematical. Now, how far these and other consequential blessings of sin exceed the positive evils it produces, or whether they are even equal to them, it is for the mind of God alone to determine. That determination we think pretty clearly expressed in his permission of moral evil.

he would comply with the conditions under which the designs of God concerning him would take effect, or would reject them; and upon this fore-knowledge He founded His decree. Of this class are the decrees of God respecting the spiritual and eternal welfare of men. They are always founded upon the free conduct of men, and are never absolute, but always conditional."

In perfect harmony with these sentiments is the following statement of Watson in his Institutes:

"We see, then, the order of Divine operation in individual experience; conviction of sin, faith, justification and regeneration."

The condition of salvation in this category is faith, which, though it be ascribed to a divine operation, is nevertheless located anterior to regeneration. It must be, therefore, at last only such a faith as man is competent to without the renewing of the Holy Ghost. All that the Spirit does in this case is to impart an inclination or desire; the *power* to exercise saving faith being wholly in the hands of the sinner himself.

The Calvinistic view may thus be given, in the language of Dr. Hill:

"The Calvinists say that the faith and good works of the elect are the consequences of their election, and are foreseen by God, because he determined to produce them; that being the fruits of his determination, they cannot be regarded as the cause of it, and therefore that the election of some and the reprobation of others, are to be resolved into the good pleasure of God, acting indeed upon the wisest reasons, but not originally moved by the foresight of any circumstance in the former rendering them more worthy of being elected than the latter." (Div. Bk. iv. ch. 7.)

These quotations are sufficient to show the point at which the Calvinistic and Arminian systems diverge from each other; that point is, *Is saving faith the product of Divine grace; or, is it the exercise of an unrenewed heart?* There are two kinds of faith spoken of in the Scriptures—natural and supernatural, dead and living. The former is that which is exercised by man in the truths of Revelation previously to the new birth; the latter is that which he exercises after that event. The former is represented as the faith of hypocrites and devils; the latter as belonging only to "God's elect." The former results from the unassisted powers of the human mind in the contemplation

of evidence; the latter is the "fruit of the Spirit," "the gift of God," and the result of "His operation." The former is inactive and powerless; the latter "overcomes the world, works by love and purifies the heart." Now, the question is upon the exercise of which of these two kinds of faith is it that "God justifies the ungodly?" Is it upon the exercise of the former, then is the whole world of nominal believers in a state of justification! Why, the veriest drunkard that lies in the ditch; the most profane swearer that visits a bar-room; the whole class of the ungodly around us, admit implicitly the great truths of the gospel, and some of them are often much affected by them. But is it through a faith such as this that God pardons, adopts and saves men? The very question carries in it its own refutation.

The prominent idea in justifying or saving faith, and that which wholly distinguishes it from the ordinary belief of the unconverted, is, trust or confidence in Christ as a Saviour. Hence it is said "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." Nor is this trust merely such confidence as a man has in the stability of his government, or the regularity of the laws of nature. It is rather the confiding spirit of a wife in her husband, of a child in his parent. The soul perceives in Christ not only dignity and excellence, but love and friendship. It is attracted to him, and is enabled to rely on him wholly and forever, for all the blessings of salvation. Now, it is evident that a state of mind of this sort does not show a man to be in a state of nature, but of grace. No internal evidence of regeneration can possibly be stronger than the exercise of such confidence in the all-sufficiency of Christ to save from sin and hell. Even the highest rapture, or the most extatic joys, would not indicate as surely that a soul was born of God. Indeed, an unrenewed heart is wholly incompetent to exercise that trust in Christ which is the very essence of justifying faith. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Now, the great fact in "things of the Spirit" here spoken of, is Jesus Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice for sin. It is the chief office of the Holy Ghost, in the work of conversion, to reveal Christ to the soul, and so enable the soul to rely on Him for salva-

tion. But until the soul perceives the loveliness of Christ, and has some suitable notions of the design and import of His death upon the cross, it cannot confide in Him. These perceptions, however, of Christ and His work, the Apostle assures us no man has in his natural state. Never, till the soul is renewed, does it, or can it, properly appreciate the Lord Jesus Christ. Up to that moment, even in the depth of his conviction, does every awakened sinner reject Him as a Saviour. There may be in such a state of mind desires for pardon ; there may be strong crying and striving after salvation ; there may be, under the teachings of the ministry, a seeming concentration of all the powers of the soul to find an unknown Christ ; but there is in it no true faith, because the soul, at this period of its exercises, really has no true knowledge of the son of God as a Saviour. Hence it uniformly happens, that persons in this state of mind seem to be little profited by the counsels or exhortations of friends. You may demonstrate to them that all that is required is faith ; you may explain and illustrate the nature of that faith so clearly, that one would think they could not remain a moment longer in darkness, and yet all your efforts and explanations are powerless until the Spirit accomplishes his work of renewal. The moment this work takes place, not only faith, but peace and joy, ensue. The soul now sees the excellency of Christ and feels no difficulty whatever in resting upon Him for salvation. Thus is faith not the operation of a natural heart—not the product simply of human endeavour and agency, but the “fruit of the Spirit,” and “the gift of God.”

Again : to place justifying faith anterior to regeneration, is to invert the order of things in the Gospel, and instead of representing God as anticipating man in all the various parts of the work of redemption, it exhibits man in the foreground, and as leading after him the mercy and goodness of the Creator. Expiation was conceived and executed, not by consultation of man, but wholly in the counsels of the Godhead. All the institutions, too, of the true religion, whether Mosaic or Christian, were not ordained of man, but appointed by God. The call, too, of the Prophets and Apostles was not by human authority, but by that of God. So, too, in the conversion of the soul, the work of God is not second but first ; not resultant, but

causal; not subsidiary, but effectual. Christ said to his disciples, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." The Apostle John also declares, "We love Him because He first loved us." Now, if we put faith anterior to regeneration, we invert this order of things in the divine economy, making man, not only an agent, but the chief agent in the work of his conversion. Faith, according to this theory, is the antecedent or condition of regeneration; and inasmuch as such faith is exercised antecedently to regeneration, it is of course but a natural faith, and one which man exercises by means of his own native powers. Now, if regeneration is the result of such faith, and not its source, then do we place man and his work in a state of priority to God and the gifts of His grace. We represent not God as seeking man, but man as seeking God—not grace as subduing and sanctifying nature, but nature as stimulating and urging forward the grace of God.

But it may here be asked, why is the exercise of faith in Christ the first duty enjoined by the Gospel upon a sinner, if, in an unrenewed state, he is wholly incompetent to such exercise? The answer to this, so far as it relates to the subject under discussion, is easy. God commands faith in order to *impart it*. There is a strong analogy between these moral operations of the Spirit and those physical changes wrought by the same agent upon the first chaos. Over that chaos the Almighty Speaker issued his commands to "things that were not, as though they were." Nor were those commands ineffective, but under their influence light was developed; a firmament was spread abroad; plants and animals sprang into being; the heavens were peopled with winged songsters; the seas became alive with fish; and man, God's image, though last work, stood up in beauty and grandeur. If not the physical, our moral world, from its original glory, has been reduced to a universal and calamitous chaos. The Spirit, however, has not been withdrawn, but through Christ is still "moving upon the face of the waters," and the voice of the same Almighty Speaker is still heard amid all the chasms and depths of spiritual death, saying, "Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." God, as truly now as in the first arrangement of elementary matter, calls those "things that

are not as though they were." He commands repentance, but gives it ; He requires faith, but bestows it.

The miracles of our Saviour afford beautiful illustrations of these facts. When the blind, the lame, and the diseased, were brought to Christ, he commanded them respectively to see, to walk, to be whole. In themselves they were competent to do none of those things commanded. True, the blind could walk, the lame could see, and the diseased, in many cases, do both. But the wonder-working Saviour, to show forth his power and grace, addressed his commands to those things which each respectively could not do. It was their impotence that he would convert into strength, their weakness that he would change into power, their deadness that he would reanimate with life. It is just so here. Christ does not call men to salvation because they are able to save themselves ; He does not call them to repentance because they are able to repent of themselves ; nor does He call them to faith because they are able, even before regeneration, to believe. The reason of the command is just the opposite of all this. He calls men to salvation because they are lost ; he calls them to repentance because they are helplessly impenitent ; and He calls them to faith because in themselves they would remain forever in unbelief.

The foregoing observations are sufficient, we trust, to prove that the exercise of justifying faith is not anterior to regeneration, but its effect. True, it is a human exercise—it is man that believes. But, then, it is man made alive by the Spirit, and not man "dead in trespass and sins." It is said of Lazarus, "And he that was dead came forth." But this coming forth was not anterior to his quickening, but subsequent to that event. So with every one truly converted—he believes—but then it is only after Christ has given him life. All the exercises of a dead heart are like itself dead—its repentance is dead, its faith is dead, its desires and hopes are dead. But when the grace of God quickens that heart, then all its exercises are vital—its repentance is genuine—its faith is lively and justifying—its hopes and joys are spiritual and heavenly.

Now, if we have proved, as we hope we have, that the condition of salvation, *faith*, is in the hands of God, and not of man, then, even according to the admission of Ar-

minians themselves, it is the fit object of a divine decree. The difficulty with the Arminian system here is, that by subjecting the exercise of faith to mere carnal volition, it places the decree of God upon a contingency. True, that contingency is foreknown to God; but it is foreknown to God only as an Omniscient Being, and not as the product of His own will. He foresees how many men will, by their own choice and power, believe; and these he elects to everlasting life. But to arrive at this conclusion we must previously admit a most fearful error—that faith, the prime condition of salvation, has its origin in man, not in God; in the sinner, not in the Holy Spirit. This error, we trust, we have refuted, demonstrating, both from Scripture and reason, that justifying faith is the result, not the cause or means of regeneration; and that therefore it is the work and gift of God, and not the endeavour or virtue of man.

Now, if regeneration be a work of God, and faith be its consequent, not its antecedent, then is regeneration *decreed* and not contingent. It results from the will of God; that will never acts save from predetermination, and that predetermination is what we mean by a decree. We hold it then as a great truth, that if man does not save himself, or is not unintentionally saved by God, that he is saved by virtue of a divine decree or purpose. God saves him, and he previously determined to do so.

But it is the *eternity* of such a decree that is peculiarly offensive to some minds. This eternity of the decree, however, has not so much to do with the *doctrine* of predestination as it has with the *nature* of God. God is eternal, and his purposes are said to be eternal from that fact. They, therefore, who war against the doctrine of decrees on this score, must either attempt to prove that God acts without any definite intention, or that eternity is not a proper element of his nature.

The controversy then, between Arminians and Calvinists on this subject, is reduced down to *the authorship of faith*. If faith be, as the Arminians allege, the product of unregenerated human nature, and if its exercise be so much a matter of man's volition as to lie beyond the control of Deity, then is its exercise contingent; and, of course, the salvation that follows that exercise is contingent also. But if faith is the product of the Spirit in regeneration, and if

God be truly its author and source, then is it as much a matter of the divine decree as any event that occurs in the kingdom of nature. It is a work of God, and therefore pre-determined. This fact, we presume, few would deny, were it not for the fearful consequences that must ensue. But what are these fearful consequences? Why, simply that a part of mankind are saved; and that God saves that part by an act of free grace! Is this a suitable matter for complaint? But says the caviller, why did he not save all? Ah, this is the rub at last. Men see no good reason why that grace which selects a portion of the race should not have chosen the whole. "Is not God a just Sovereign, they are ready to say, and is not his power infinite? Why then, if salvation be his work, is it not universal?" To defend the character of God in the case, they betake themselves to numerous devices and subterfuges. Thus it happens, that under the pretext of apologizing for the divine conduct, salvation is wrested entirely out of the hands of Jehovah, and placed in those of the creature! But is the evil remedied by this device? Not at all; but greatly increased; for besides the original difficulty, there is introduced for our settlement another and a greater one. True, in our disputes about the latter, the former may be overlooked. But it still exists; and despite the benevolent creed and efforts of Arminians, a large portion of mankind live and die under guilt and condemnation. Account for it as we may, apologize for it as we can, it still remains a truth, that but a *part* of mankind are saved. The Calvinist maintains that this part are saved, not by themselves or by mere human agency, but by God. He is also firmly persuaded that were it not for God's special intervention in behalf of these, even they would share the fate of the rest, a just and merited perdition.

In conclusion we would say, that the limitation of the remedy provided for sin to a part of our race, is to be solved upon the same ground that we account for the existence of moral evil. To allege that moral evil exists through an abuse of human freedom, is precisely equivalent to saying that the reprobate of our race are sent to perdition on account of their sins. We simply assign in each case the proximate cause of sin and punishment. Now, it is true, that were man not free he could not sin; and it is also true, that his sinning is the abuse of his freedom. It is true

also, that the rejecters of Christ and all the wicked who perish, deserve that perdition. *entirely* for their sin's sake. They have natures and characters that by a sort of moral necessity must precipitate them into hell. But solutions of this kind reach only to the *human part* of these great mysteries. Beyond human agency, however, in these mighty events, there lies a back-ground of divinity—God's plans, and purposes and decrees, are at the base of these things. The fall of man was surely no accident; nor is the partial redemption of our race a matter of chance. The finger of God was in both; and the purpose of God was in both.—Now, if it still be asked, why God permitted moral evil to exist, or why he did not extend the remedy to the limits of that evil, our reply is, that it is not for man, the creature of a day, the proprietor of but a spark of intelligence, to interrogate his Maker on these points. (c) God is infinitely wise, benevolent, and just. This we know, and hence infer, that even these mysterious dispensations of his providence are essentially good, and must be followed by good results. Here, if anywhere, we must take our stand till all this darkness shall pass away. The future is for the most part a fast sealed-up book; but when its mysteries shall be disclosed, we will clearly see, that both in the permission of moral evil and in the limitation of redemption, God was actuated by good and wise motives, and that even here, in these deep shades of humanity, "He is light, and in Him is no darkness at all."

(c) Besides the fact, that the partial application of the remedy for sin, demonstrates God's absolute sovereignty over his creatures, (and this is Paul's solution of the matter) it appears to us, that a universal redemption would have been, as a governmental measure, nearly as bad as a universal pardon. The difference in the case is chiefly in this, that the one rests solely upon the divine clemency, and the other upon a satisfaction rendered to government.—But when it is considered that this satisfaction has been provided by the government itself, the practical result in each case must be substantially alike. The authority of the throne would be lessened; the transgression would be viewed as a trifle; and the whole influence of example would be turned to ill account. Let us illustrate. Suppose the inhabitants of a province to rebel against their sovereign, and that they are all accounted worthy of death. Would not the restoration of that Province to royal favor, by some method of substitution on the part of the government be all one, as a general amnesty pronounced by the King? But if the government should discriminate; and on the one hand deliver up a part to the law, but rescue the balance from death, no pernicious consequences could follow. On the contrary, by the combined exhibition of rigid justice and of a prudent clemency, the Province would be restored and the authority of the sovereign exalted.

ARTICLE III.

THE CEASELESS ACTIVITY OF MATTER.

It is our purpose to show, in this article, that every particle of matter is ceaselessly in motion,—that not an atom is ever at rest.

To our senses the universe seems still ; and close observation, during an appreciable interval, is necessary to discover motion in the heavenly bodies ; yet Astronomy demonstrates that planets, suns, and systems, are performing various complicated revolutions with fearful velocity. The Earth, for example, moves in its orbit 68,000 miles per hour. Absolute stillness of matter is therefore impossible.

An uneducated man regards the earth as the emblem of stability ; though the Bible tells us of its creation, its chaotic state, its re-adjustment with continents and oceans, its deluge, and its future destruction by fire, followed by new heavens and a new earth ; and, in accordance with this character of mutation, geology demonstrates that the planet, during the countless ages of its progress to the recent period of man's creation, was the scene of inconceivably great, numerous and protracted changes, in continents, oceans, and organic beings. To the geologist, the earth is the emblem of change.

So, most persons habitually regard a rock or a grain of sand as an inactive, motionless thing. The chemist views either in a very different light. His mind's eye sees in it atoms as numerous as are the stars in the vault of heaven, and performing motions relatively as regular, ceaseless and great, as those of the planetary bodies. He knows the grain of sand to exceed in size 1,000,000,000 of animalcules, of which 500,000,000 swim freely in a drop of water, and each of which contains thousands of compound atoms ; and he can, with a good microscope, see the visible motions of the animalcules ; so, science teaches him, with equal certainty, that myriads of atoms move, incessantly, in a grain of sand or a particle of gold. "Accordingly," says the learned and pious Harris, "even the repose of nature is only apparent. Not an atom, not a world is at rest. The

simplest and minutest body is the subject of *internal* movement among the particles composing it."

Subjects closely allied to this were much discussed by the philosophers of antiquity and by the schoolmen; but ignorance of science caused these discussions to end in wild conjectures or false theories. And though incidental allusions are often made to the constant motion of all material atoms as probably true, we are not aware that any one has attempted a demonstration of its truth, since the atomic constitution of matter was rendered almost certain by chemical laws, and especially by the phenomena of isomorphism. The subject has often forced itself on our attention; but as the aspect in which we aim to present it is certainly new, we rigidly limit our arguments to admitted facts and established scientific principles, sternly rejecting, with a single exception, all assumptions, and excluding all theoretical considerations. And that single assumption is the material, atomic constitution of matter, on which chemistry and all the physical sciences rest. Hence, all philosophers now reject the metaphysical hypothesis, which resolves all matter into properties, and regards all things as ideas; because it saps the foundation of human belief, and leaves the mind in a hopeless state of bewilderment.

Assuming, then, the existence of matter, chemistry has proved that its particles are not, as Epicurus taught, uncreated and eternal, but that they are, as he believed, indivisible, inert atoms, inconceivably minute. By their union, not in consequence of inherent, self-originated motion, but in obedience to definite physical forces, impressed upon them by Creative power, they form inorganic masses; and, when the vital are added to and control the physical forces, organic, living beings result.

Atoms are never in absolute contact. Even in gold the solid material particles must be as much less than the interstices between them, as are the planets than the intervening celestial spaces. And as the planetary orbs can move freely, incessantly, and simultaneously on their axes, in their orbits around the sun, and with that luminary towards a central point in the celestial vault; so, the atoms of even the most compact mass can move freely in their inter-atomic spaces, in obedience to the impulses of the ever antagonistic forces, which, struggling for the ascendancy, prevent the possibility of equilibrium or *rest*.

As already stated, our purpose is to show that in matter there is no *rest*; that absolute cessation of motion, in even a single atom, has never occurred; and that ceaseless activity is characteristic of each particle, as well as of each celestial orb of God's material creation. Solemn thought—instructive truth! How impressively does it admonish us, as immortal spirits, to obey the injunction, “whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might;” not simply because “the hand of the diligent maketh rich,” and “shall bear rule;” but because “the soul of the diligent is made fat,” if “fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.” The activity of nature is a grand illustration of the sin of slothfulness; and we cannot conceive of a more dismal doom,—a blacker hell,—than the confinement, as Dr. John Breckenridge once described it, of a conscious being, in some remote point of space, in a state of absolute, hopeless, eternal stillness!

That not a particle of matter has ever ceased to be is obvious. Matter is inert, passive. Infinite power called it into being, and the same power only can annihilate it.—Besides, created by infinite wisdom, it was designed for purposes commensurate with time; for its annihilation, at any period, however remote, would imply a failure in ability or wisdom to employ it for the accomplishment of a benevolent purpose.

Nor, for the same reasons, can any material atom, however minute, be inactive, useless for an instant. Ceaselessly it must obey its Creator's will. The instant one purpose of its being is accomplished, it enters on the discharge of another. But it is not our purpose to dwell on the metaphysical and moral arguments, which bear directly on this subject. Our arguments must be deduced from physical science; and enough has been said to evince the consistency of the proposition, that not an atom is ever still, with the sublime motions of creation, the ever changing condition of the earth, and, above all, with the attributes of the Creator.

It is important to remember that, in matter, there is never any tardiness. Of this truth every experiment in a Laboratory, as well as every process in the nutrition of animals, is an illustration. In a mixture of oxygen and hydrogen gases, consisting of myriads of atoms, each is ready;

and, yielding to the first impulse of flame or the electric spark, all unite with explosive violence, and water results. So, in the circulation of the blood through the countless ramifications of the capillary vessels, each atom that has performed its function, in any one of the numerous organs of the body, even in solid bone, obeys promptly the impulse to depart, and another from the blood takes its place.

✱ All masses, then, how large or small soever they may be, whether planets or particles of dust, oceans or drops of water, quadrupeds or animalcules, are made up of ultimate atoms, few in kind, definite in size, indivisible, not in contact, indestructible, passive or ready to obey any impulse; and each is enveloped in an atmosphere of opposing, antagonistic forces acting upon it. Such is the constitution of matter. Some of the forces acting ceaselessly on its particles are known. Such are gravitation, cohesion, chemical affinity, heat, light, electricity, and sometimes vitality. Matter can be released from the influence of vital force; but though human genius delights in wrestling with difficulties, it has failed signally in all efforts to wrest even one atom from the grasp of any one of the physical forces. And numerous phenomena, not referable to any known power, indicate the existence of others, which produce effects in ways still mysterious and inexplicable, though the progress of discovery has been so rapid, that we may hope they, too, will be ultimately ascertained. This, however, is not necessary to the complete elucidation of the proposition in hand. Nor is it of any consequence whether the enumerated known forces differ merely in modes of action, and are, as some maintain, the same subtle principle—the same power—modified by different circumstances. The effects are, on either supposition, the same; and to produce *rest*, these different forces, or modes of action of the same force, must equilibrate each other; for it is obvious that any, even the slightest disturbance of equilibrium, in the various opposing impulses acting on an atom, must cause in it a corresponding oscillation or departure from a state of *rest*.

Is such a state of equilibrium compatible with the incessant action of so many inconceivably great antagonistic forces, each ever present, and each struggling for the ascendancy? This is not speculation. All science demonstrates that not each mass merely, but each atom, also, is

ceaselessly under the influence of all the physical forces,—gravitation, cohesion, affinity, electricity, heat, and others—that these forces are antagonistic, heat, for example, contending against cohesion, and electricity against affinity; and that all the diversities in form and other properties of matter, result from the effects of these forces, one ever and anon gaining and another losing the ascendancy, though neither is destroyed. Every school-boy knows heat enough may be squeezed out of a pint of cold air to make a pound of iron red hot; yet so much is left to contend with cohesion, that the air is not rendered either liquid or solid. When, however, a similar quantity of heat is extracted from carbonic acid and other gases, they are liquified, and, in some cases, solidified, showing that cohesion is active in gaseous particles. The same is true of all the other forces. They are ever present and active, though they may seem to be dormant.

Nor must we forget, that when seemingly dormant, they may be freely developed, by an apparently slight external excitement. A certain mineral, brushed gently with a feather, manifests electric excitement, and emits phosphorescent light. A compound of nitrogen explodes violently when touched with phosphorus; and an iodide of mercury, when merely scratched with a pin point, changes in color from yellow to rich vermilion. And any cause that affects one of these forces invariably augments or diminishes one or more of the others. It would be easy to multiply examples; but enough has been said to evince the truth, that the relative strength of numerous forces, constantly acting on each atom, may be changed by conditions so various and slight, as to preclude the idea of such a balance of power, as is necessary to bring to a state of *rest*, particles having, in all cases, ample space to move in.

And, by *rest*, we mean absolute cessation of motion; for motion often eludes and cannot be measured by vision. Can we see the motions of the particles which unite an external wound? The result we see; but the motions of the myriads of particles, which marshall themselves in symmetrical order, according to fixed vital laws, in the filaments of the nerves, blood-vessels, muscle and skin, of the renewed flesh, defy the highest power of the best microscope.

We will illustrate a little more fully the reality of invisible motions; and, to do it, attention will be directed to a substance in which all the agencies—gravitation, cohesion, chemical affinity, electricity, heat, light and vitality—are in full activity. We know no experiment that has interested us more, or that has excited a profounder sense of awe than this. Examine, in a glass of water, a large animalcule barely visible to the naked eye. It seems to be a white speck, moving in the water. Catch it in the end of a small glass tube, transfer it to the crushing box of a good microscope, and confine it on its side in a drop of water. In a clear light, though its body is confined, the motions of its parts—as the head, eyes and organs of motion—are distinctly seen through the instrument. These voluntary motions are what we expect. They are of a kind to which we are accustomed. So of the involuntary motions of its lungs and other internal organs. In addition to this, however, a far more instructive scene presents itself. In the whole of the illuminated body of the little transparent creature, every particle is seen to be in motion. Nor is this pervading motion a mere momentary shudder. It may be seen for hours; and if the animal be then released from confinement, it swims as joyously as ever.—Watch it when it pauses on its career, and the same tremulous motions of the particles of its body will be seen to pervade its whole frame. These motions are visible, but can we believe we see all that occur in its body? And what is the cause of this natural tremor of organic particles? To answer this question, we must remember that no animal can live an instant without the conjoint stimuli of vitality, heat, electricity, chemical affinity and gravitation. Is not the tremor, in the entire substance of the animalcule, the result of the struggle between these agencies? The same elementary motion, doubtless, pervades the system of every living being. Truly “in the midst of life we are in death.” Death is but the cessation of vital motion in an organism. And can we suppose the overthrow of vitality, in any case, causes harmony between the other forces? All science is opposed to the thought.

Let us, now, examine briefly some of the laws or modes of action of the known forces, which must prevent such a balance of power, as is essential to rest, from being perfect-

ly attained, for an instant,—which must indeed render it impossible. And, in prosecuting this investigation, we must bear in mind the truth, that to preserve any one atom of a mass in a state of even relative rest, each and every atom of that mass must be perfectly suspended between balanced forces: for a disturbance of any one point must propagate itself through all others, momentarily at least, precisely as when a voltaic circuit is brought in contact with one end of a telegraphic wire, the effect is propagated through the wire, quite to the other end.

We will begin with gravitation. We are apt to regard it as a force that attracts and influences masses only. We are wont to view it in reference to the vast area of its action; and to see in it a power spanning all space; holding our revolving, wheeling, rocking earth by a cord that cannot be sundered; binding planet to planet; chaining system to system; and linking together, in their motions, the myriads of worlds, that adorn the robe of the Infinite. Yet, it influences each mass in direct proportion to the number and weight of its atoms. It guides and controls masses not as such, but as congeries of atoms. True, by its laws, the astronomer not only proves that suns and stars are solid bodies; poises one against another; and calculates accurately the weight of each; but ascertains the cause of the slightest disturbance of the general balance of the gravitating force. Thus, a slight trembling was observed in Uranus in a particular part of its orbit; and this led Adams in England, and Le Verrier in France, to determine the exact place of an unknown planet; and, to the honor of these far searching minds, and to the glory of science, the planet Neptune has since been discovered in the very place, which had been designated by rigorous calculation. Hence, say astronomers, “if one of the most remote of those gems of light, which flicker at midnight, in the dark distance of the starry vault, were, by any power, removed from its place, the disturbance of these delicately balanced mysteries, would be felt through all the created systems of worlds.” Yea, astronomers assure us, that so completely is all nature locked in the bonds of this infinite power, (gravitation,) that it is “no poetic exaggeration to declare that the blow, which rends *any earthly mass*, is conveyed, by successive impulses, to every one of the myriads

of orbs, which are even too remote for the reach of telescopic vision."

Now, in these statements, all astronomers cannot possibly be mistaken. Yet, if what they tell us is true, and if, as they demonstrate, gravitation links together, not masses as such, but atoms into masses, masses into planets, planets into systems, and these into the harmonious universe, what must be the effect of the myriads of disturbances or oscillations, like that to which we have alluded in Uranus? Must not all atoms be kept in a state of extreme tension, and of consequent tremulous motion? Yea more! if the blow which rends any *earthly* mass, is conveyed by successive impulses to every one of the most distant orbs, what must be the effect, on the universe, of even the exertions of force in this little planet? Think not merely of volcanic eruptions, rocking earthquakes, heaving subterraneous forces, exploding meteors, falling mountains and desolating avalanches; but of rocky masses rent asunder by ice, bursts of electric fluid in thunder storms, discharges of artillery, and the thousand ways by which at least a limited portion of the earth's solid surface is made to vibrate perceptibly; and you may form a conception of the myriads of impulses, momentarily conveyed from particle to particle, through the solid interior of this planet, and from it to other worlds.—Yet, to prove that not a world, not an atom is at rest, we might safely limit our view to earthquakes alone; for Humboldt tells us, in his *Cosmos*, that "could we obtain daily news of the state of the earth's crust, we should, in all probability, become convinced, that some point or other of its surface is ceaselessly shaken by earthquakes."

And what are such exertions of power—such departures from a state of quiescence—but overthrows, temporarily, but on a grand scale, of the balance of forces? And can we suppose such disturbances as volcanoes and earthquakes are peculiar to this planet? The surface of the moon exhibits distinctly, under a telescope, more than 1,000 volcanic craters, and some are 25,000 feet in height, as many feet in depth, and 150 miles in circumference. And can we believe all the other planetary bodies are in profound repose? Suppose them all, numerous as they are seen to be in the blue vault of heaven, and especially in the milky way, to be rent by disturbances like those which

shake our earth ; and what must be the effect, through the mysterious, ever struggling, ever recuperative force of gravitation, on the atoms of each revolving, pendulating orb ?

We have an apt illustration of this part of the subject in our atmosphere. It is an immense ærial ocean, at the bottom of which we move, and breathe, and hear. So obvious are the effects of moving bodies, breathing animals, winds, heat, electricity, and other forces that constantly stir its elastic particles, that no one can believe its atoms are ever still. Leaving out of view all these forces, let us confine our attention to the phenomena of sound. And what is sound but the effect of vibratory motion, transmitted from particle to particle through air ? And were the air subject to no other cause of motion, would not the myriads of sounds, ever rolling from earth's surface, keep each ærial particle ceaselessly pulsating ? If so, must not all the causes of motion united, have a similar effect on the atoms of all ærial oceans of matter in the universe, including comets and nebulæ ?

But some may object to this illustration by saying ærial masses are elastic, while the great bulk of the earth and other planets consists of solids and fluids. And are not liquids and solids, metals especially, better conductors of sound than air ? Franklin first proved, by numerous experiments, that water transmits sound more rapidly and distinctly than air ; and hence marine animals, that hear well under water, are deaf and appear stupid when their ears are in air. Biot proved the same, though in a much greater degree, of metals. When one end of a long series of united metallic pipes was struck, an ear placed at the other end heard two sounds, the first and loudest being transmitted through the metal, and the second through the air. Do, then, the causes of sound shake the particles of the solid earth to a greater extent than those of air ? Certainly they do ; and hence animals, as the mole, which burrow in the earth, have no external ear, yet hear the slightest sound. And do the vibrations of each sound pulsate through the whole ærial ocean ? What can prevent it ? The balance of forces being disturbed in one part, must not every atom, however remote, change its position ? The explosions of a volcanic eruption have been heard, distinctly, 970 miles, showing that the particles of air were

so convulsed, throughout a space near 2000 miles in diameter, as to affect the human nerve of sound. Had it been possible to place a sound human organ of hearing at the centre of the earth, would not the awful explosions of that volcano have been heard even there?

In illustration of the propagation of motion from particle to particle, through immense masses, let us take another familiar instance. Shakspeare says, somewhere, a pebble dropped into a lake shakes all the water in it. And who can doubt, that the launch of a war-steamer, or the plunge of each porpoise, moves every atom in the Atlantic? The force of gravitation being disturbed in one part, where can the necessity for readjustment cease?

In considering the effects of disturbances of gravity by volcanos and earthquakes, we must remember what Daubeny and Humboldt tell us, that, in such convulsions, there are generally three simultaneous motions—one upwards, another horizontal, and a third rotary. Hence the curious fact mentioned by Humboldt, in his description of the overthrow of the town of Riobamba, in 1797, when the bodies of many of the inhabitants were found to have been hurled several hundred feet upwards, but not vertically upwards, for the horizontal force carried them to the top of the high hill, Cullca, between which and the town flowed the river Lican; and the furniture of one house was, in many cases, found under the ruins of another.

But gravitation is not the only force acting on the planetary bodies. Were it, for a moment, unrestrained by antagonistic powers, all the planets of the solar system would rush to their centre, the sun, and with it towards some other greater centre or centres of attraction. In the consequent wreck of worlds, whether there would be one or several centres; in what directions those centres lie; and how remote they are, are problems which finite intelligence can never solve.

One of the antagonistic powers is the centrifugal force, which causes the planets to revolve in their orbits around the sun, with different degrees of velocity. The earth travels in its orbit 68,000 miles in an hour, or 630,000,000 miles in a year—a velocity sufficient of itself to rend the hardest rocks; and were the impulse to separation imparted by it to the portions of the revolving mass unrestrained,

for an instant, by gravitation and other forces, our planet would be shivered and scattered through space, in heated, glowing fragments, like a shower of shooting stars. There is, then, an incessant struggle between gravitation and the centrifugal force, each spanning the universe, one inducing a tendency in all material atoms to fly asunder, the other chaining them together in masses. In the grasp of such contending forces, worlds oscillate continually; and must not the atoms of those worlds tumble incessantly?

In addition to that in its orbit, the earth has at least three other kinds of motion, viz: a diurnal revolution on its axis, at the rate of 1000 miles an hour; the precession of the equinoxes; and the nutation of its axis. The diurnal revolution was ascribed by Laplace to the centrifugal force; and he calculated the exact angle or degree of obliquity at which the force struck the planet, in order to produce both the orbital and axial motions. The precession of the equinoxes may also result from the same force, counteracted by the sun and moon, acting obliquely on that accumulation of matter under the equator, which gives the earth its oblate spheroidal form. These motions, however, and the nutation of its axis, may be produced by other unknown forces. However this may be, all the planetary bodies, that are within the sphere of telescopic vision and rigid mathematical calculation, exhibit the same kinds of motion, and are, therefore, subject to the same forces, known and unknown; and hence, the effects of these forces on the matter of the earth may be safely predicated of all the heavenly bodies. And we know that the earth, "rocking regularly upon a point, round which it performs its diurnal revolution, progresses onward with incredible speed in its orbit, and also accompanies the sun in its motion towards a point in the starry vault, at the rate of 33,500,000 miles in a year. "Like some huge wheeling top, in tremulous gyration upon the deck of some vast ærial ship, itself gliding rapidly through space," is the earth performing its part in the great law of motion. And how can such motions fail to influence materially the condition of each atom? Constantly impelled in opposite directions, each atom, like the orb of which it forms a part, must oscillate, rock, gyrate and revolve, for we must remember that atoms are never in absolute contact, that the interstices between them

are proportionally as large as the inter-planetary spaces, and, therefore, that all have ample inter-atomic space, in which to perform their motions. Thus free to move, all are subjected to the influence of opposing forces. These are, in the aggregate, delicately and securely balanced; but, ever and anon, one temporarily, slightly gains the ascendancy, as when the earth is at different distances from the sun, or is suddenly approached by a comet. In this way must not all atoms be kept vibrating? "The spring is brought to the highest state of tension—one tremor more, and the balance would be destroyed." It is a wonderful display of omnipotent power and infinite wisdom, ever active in every part of the universe.

Let us now consider, briefly, the action of other antagonistic forces; and, for the sake of clearness, we will limit our view as much as possible to this planet; for what is true of its particles may, we have seen, be safely predicated of the whole great machine—the stellar system of the universe. And we will first examine cohesion and crystallographic attraction.

Cohesion is so similar in many respects to gravitation, that some philosophers are inclined to regard them as modifications of the same force. Many phenomena are, however, irreconcilable with this view, and the experiments of Prof. Plateau serve to prove, that they are independent forces, for drops of oil, wholly withdrawn, in a most ingenious way, from the influence of gravity, assumed, not the spheroidal flattened form of masses under the conjoint effects of gravitation and cohesion, considered as modifications of the same force, but perfectly spherical shapes, which could only have resulted from some distinct power, acting equally in all directions from the centre of particles possessed of perfect freedom of motion. There is, then, a peculiar, distinct force, that unites atoms, simple or compound, into masses. It acts at insensible distances only; for if a pipe stem be snapped, or a tumbler fractured, we cannot reunite the parts by bringing them into apparent contact. The fragments weigh, however, as much as did the pipe or tumbler; and hence, a cause that subverts cohesion does not diminish gravitation. This force resists alike the tendency of gravitation to unite all matter into one mass around a common centre, and that of the centri-

fugal force to shatter masses into scattered fragments. Like both, it acts on all kinds and forms of matter; for as soon as its special antagonist, heat, is subdued, in any way, in gases, it collects their atoms into liquid drops, and finally, if unresisted, into solid globules. Its sole office seems to be the aggregation of atoms into spherules, without regard to number, relative position, or permanent arrangement. It is ever busy, gathering atoms of every kind into plastic aggregates, to be moulded into other forms by those active forces, crystallogeny, chemical affinity, and vitality. Nor is cohesion an inconsiderable force. Its sphere of action is limited, but within that sphere it often attains great power. Though it may be so modified by other agencies as to permit matter to assume various degrees of either the solid, liquid, or gaseous state, it sometimes acquires such intense energy, as seemingly to defy all exertions of other forces. Thus, titanium resists, successfully, under all ordinary conditions, the efforts of heat, electricity and chemical affinity, to reduce it to the liquid state; and an iron wire, 1-36 of an inch in diameter, sustains a weight of 60 pounds. We feel its power, not merely when we attempt to rend rocks or snap metals, but when we break threads of cotton, flax or silk.

In its activity, it strives ceaselessly to bring all atoms under its domain, and to lock them up in unyielding globules. Were atoms to escape, momentarily, from the grasp and influence of other forces, cohesion would bind them fast in amorphous, motionless solids.

This tendency of cohesion is curiously modified, though not absolutely resisted, by crystallographic attraction. In this force, Nature reveals many of her most wonderful secrets, and permits us to behold, not merely the results of her operations, but the processes themselves. In studying these processes in our laboratories, we can examine multitudes of substances in the act of passing from the liquid or gaseous to the solid state; and, in all cases, the instant before they congeal or come fully within the sphere of the cohesive grasp, their atoms evidently obey a new impulse; and, arranging themselves according to certain laws of symmetry, their aggregation gives rise, not to amorphous solids, but to regular geometric forms. These forms of crystals are almost as characteristic of mineral species, as

the forms that occur in the world of organization are of the species of living beings. Yet, in these beautiful crystalline solids, atoms are not in contact; and the symmetry of their figures indicates clearly, that the force impresses on each atom a directive tendency, like the polarity of a magnet. The polar points of attraction and repulsion cannot cease to act as long as cohesion keeps them in close proximity. Indeed, these attractive and repulsive points must keep the atoms suspended in the interstitial spaces, trembling under the influence of gravitation impelling them towards a centre; of the centrifugal force, tending to scatter them; of cohesion, laboring to bind them down in irregular solids; of chemical affinity, drawing them into other combinations; of heat, exerting its repulsive energy to dissipate them in vapor; of magnetism and electricity, according to the refined observations of Plucker and Faraday, impelling them, sometimes in the direction of the magnetic meridian, and at other times at right angles to that line; of light, wooing them into certain optic axes for the display of the marvellous phenomena of polarization; and perhaps of other forces equally potent, such as those which give rise to isomerism, dimorphism, isomorphism, allotropism, eremacausis, actinism, and other less marked phenomena.

The vital principle adorns the surface of the earth with endlessly diversified forms of animal and vegetable life, causing changes in matter on a scale of magnitude that defies conception. In the deep rocky recesses of the earth vitality ceases; yet, even there, the crystallogenic force, like a creative spirit, pursues its never ending task of effecting changes in the forms of matter, and of modelling sparkling gems or treasuring up useful substances, in dark caverns, damp crevices, and even in solid rock.

To form any idea of the grandeur of the scale on which this agency has acted, in all the inconceivably protracted geologic periods in the earth's eventful existence as a planet, you must examine attentively the rocky basement of the everlasting hills. Begin with the unstratified masses, that form the unstable foundation, (for it is constantly shattered by earthquakes or melted by volcanic fires.) In that changing foundation, you will find granite and its associates—once melted, perhaps gaseous matter—now made up

of crystals and crystalline grains. On these lie gneiss and other stratified rocks, sometimes at least twenty miles in thickness, and which were deposited in ancient oceans as comminuted fragments torn or worn from granitic shores. These, too, have been remodelled by this active force, and the sand, mud and pebbles of which they consisted, when first deposited, have been thoroughly changed, and they are now richly laden with light refracting crystals, except at their upturned edges near the surface, where, by the chemical effects of air, and moisture, and other substances, they have rotted into beds of clay, often more than 100 feet thick. On these non-fossiliferous rocks lie the fossiliferous strata, ten miles thick, and more wonderful than all below them. In these, too, is found abundant evidence of the activity of this plastic force, in restoring to form and comeliness the debris of dilapidated continents. But this is not all. Mountain chains, in all countries, composed in a great degree of the remains of animals and plants, have been moulded into crystalline, stoney catacombs, without effacing the most delicate lines of organic structure. Even in the southern part of our own State are enormous beds of rock, filled throughout with marine shells. These shells, when deposited on ocean's bed by races now extinct, must have consisted chiefly of carbonate of lime; but this substance has been, in most cases, removed by chemical processes, and its place supplied by crystalline siliceous matter. The changes, that have occurred in the organic structures of such rocks, may be familiarly illustrated by supposing a piece of jewelry "to be taken to pieces, atom by atom, the expert mechanist so skilfully substituting a particle of brass for each one of gold displaced, that the removal of the precious metal could not be detected by mere inspection of the external form." The fossil shells, in such cases, are unchanged in shape, but their original substance has been completely removed and replaced. Indeed, in some instances, the work was arrested before the process of chemical and crystalline substitution was completed; for though a part of some shells is siliceous, other parts retain the carbonate of lime which the animal secreted; but even that, when broken, shows that the atoms have been in motion, for it exhibits within a crystalline arrangement. Nor is this all. We frequently find in rocks pleasing evi-

dence of curious changes of another kind. As animals and plants grow, generate, die, and decay, thereby displaying Divine wisdom and goodness, while they beautify the surface of the earth, and keep up endless motions and changes in matter; so, in the dark recesses below, crystals are formed by accretion. They increase in size till they attain what may be regarded as their maturity, and then, owing to some change of the conditions in which they were formed, they are decomposed and removed by chemical solution, and their place is taken by other crystalized matter, without a change in form. In this way one mineral is made to imitate the crystalline form of another; and so numerous are the evidences of these curious changes in the solid crystals of solid rocks, that every cabinet of minerals contains these skeleton crystals of quartz, oxide of iron, oxide of tin, copper pyrites, and other minerals, called *pseudomorphs*.

Liquid and gaseous bodies cannot be modeled into symmetrical forms by this potent architect, because, probably, their atoms are too restlessly in motion, performing other functions; but as soon as solid matter is precipitated on the beds of oceans, resulting from the spoils of disintegrated crystalline rocks, or is poured out through volcanic vents from deep seated masses of melted granite, so as to be once more in danger of being chained down by cohesion, its atoms are seized by this resistless agency, and are made to labor in the reproduction of forms of utility and beauty.

But persons who are unaccustomed to the close and scrutinizing examination of nature's processes, may be skeptical when told of motions, attended with a total change of form, in matter apparently solid, unyielding, and still. They may be incredulous when informed, that molecular forces often effect re-arrangements of particles in the most compact inorganic bodies—re-arrangements which are proved by sensible changes in properties. They will admit that the particles of the most compact parts of the bones of animals and of the woody fibre of plants, are ever changing, because they know the body of each living being is a vortex, into the current of which particles are continually entering, and from which they are continually departing, so that the form of each is obviously more important than its substance, yet they habitually attach the

idea of fixedness and durability to inorganic solids. This is a great mistake. Truly did the inspired writer of Ecclesiastes say, "all things are full of labor, man cannot utter it;" for calomel, when first sublimed, is a transparent solid, which slowly becomes opaque, owing to a rearrangement of its atoms. Phosphorus, heated to 150° F. and suddenly cooled, is a black solid, but its flesh-colored translucency is soon restored. Sulphur may be obtained in the form of a waxy solid, capable of receiving and retaining the impressions of seals, but in a few days it resumes its crystalline texture and loses its plasticity. Sulphate of Nickel crystallizes in six sided prisms, which change to octahedrons, without liquifying, as soon as they are exposed to the sun's rays. Even well annealed copper wire has been found to lose its tenacity, after a series of years, and to consist then of minute cubic crystals. A multitude of other facts, which could easily be specified, demonstrate the mobility of atoms in the densest solids. And, though the process of crystalization is facilitated by the passage of matter from a liquid or gaseous to the solid state, amorphous solids can assume a crystalline structure. The particles of solids can and do move.

Indeed, the most striking proof that endless change, incessant motion, ceaseless activity of every particle of matter, is one of the laws of creative wisdom, is found in the fact, that the very agency employed in creating a structure, is most active, when that structure is finished, in reducing it to its primitive condition. Thus, the power, that forms crystalline rocks, is often more active than chemical affinity, electric currents, or other force, in reducing them to atoms; for when water percolates into cavities of rocks and pores of minerals, its congelation and crystallization are attended with so resistless an expansive force, that soils crumble, minerals disintegrate, and rocks split with explosive violence. It is to the crystallization and consequent expansion of water, more than to any single agency, that we must ascribe the gradual destruction of existing rocks; and many geologic phenomena, such as the deposits called drift, indicate the former existence of protracted periods, when much of the globe was enveloped in ice. Hence, probably, the same force has always been active in destroying its own works. And the same may be said of

each of the other forces. Nor is it at all strange, for not one of them acts uniformly under all circumstances. Each is modified by any change in the conditions under which it acts. And as so many are ceaselessly at work altering the conditions of all, can the result be other than ceaseless change? Is such a state of things compatible with our idea of a balance of forces? And if a balance should occur in one place sufficient to produce rest, might it not occur in others, more and more easily, till all motion would cease? Is the supposition—is the absolute rest of an atom—consistent with scripture representations of the Omnipresence, Omniscience, Omnipotence, and constant superintendence of a God, who numbers the hairs of our heads? "All things are full of labor, man cannot utter it!"

If, then, we reflect on the activity of the crystallogenic force—on the grandeur of its displays of power, the extent of its domain, and the beauty of its structures, it is not surprising that the "Oriental story-teller," ignorant of the God of the Bible, "makes the interior of the solid earth a place of rare beauty—a great temple studded with lustrous gems, in which reside the spiritual governors of the inorganic world."

In pursuance of our design, we proceed, now, to consider briefly some of the effects of the more subtile agencies, which produce every thing that is beautiful and joyous in this world. A volume could easily be written on the subject, and therefore, to avoid being tedious, we will confine our illustrations of the ceaseless activity of matter to the more obvious effects of these agencies.

What is their nature, is a question still open for the investigation of that genius, which finds its enjoyment in struggling with the secrets of nature. "Science, with the wand of induction, interrogates; but the only answer is the manifestation of power in startling effects." Slight friction ignites a match, and causes are set at work, in an instant, capable, if unresisted for a few hours, of dissipating in vapor, smoke, and gases, a cottage, a palace, or a city. What is the nature of these causes? Perhaps the best description of them is that of Newton, slightly altered in the verbiage. "They consist in minute vibratory motions in the particles of bodies, and this motion is communicated through an apparent vacuum, by the undulations of a very subtile elastic medium."

The friction of the match subverts the apparent, not real, balance of forces in the causes of change; for the match, before ignition, is not inactive. Held in air, at night, it glows and smells of sulphur and phosphorus. Ignited, we see the light, feel the heat, perceive the wonderful energy of chemical change, and can readily demonstrate the rapid propagation of electric force and magnetic influence. All is motion. Matter rapidly assumes new forms. The burning city is in substance the same, though to us it is a scene of wild commotion in Nature's unchained powers. The heavens are illuminated, black clouds congregate, winds howl, lightnings flash, and torrents of rain descend.

Yet, reflect a moment. How insignificant is this scene, compared with what is ceaselessly in progress in the whole interior of the planet! A mile in depth below this or any spot on its surface, the rocks are hot enough to boil water; and as the heat rapidly increases with the depth, the pent up powers, increasing each others intensity, in their antagonistic struggles, shake the globe with earthquake tremors, pour deluges of lava through one or other of three hundred volcanoes, rend the air with chemical and electric explosions, and startle mankind by mysterious displays of magnetic storms, aurora borealis, and other phenomena. Calorific, electric, magnetic, and chemical phenomena, indicate clearly that all within the crust of the earth is in commotion, and geologic science demonstrates that such has been the case since the world began. And how legibly does the expert geologist read, in the crust itself, evidence of ceaseless flow of currents of these resistless agencies! Each atom seems to say, *no rest*.

But behold the sun, a great fountain of all these forces; yea, myriads of suns in the apparent stillness of night, each millions of times larger than our earth; each ever pouring floods of influence on all parts of God's creation; and that influence consisting of a marvelous union of heating, illuminating, electric, magnetic and chemical power.

A sun-ray is a magic thing. Its heat, resisting cohesion, controls by expansion the volume of all kinds of matter. Its light, by altering molecular arrangements, spreads over nature most lovely tints. Its electricity is sent round and through the earth to perform its wondrous work of giving

structure to rocks, form to minerals, and position to metallic ores. Its magnetism makes the earth a great loadstone, thereby binding all its parts together, each with a directive tendency, as when a magnet holds in its embrace a mass of tacks or nails. Its chemical influence modifies endlessly the composition and properties of matter. "On the sun-ray depends the sweetness of the flower, which lifts its head to the morning radiance, and the vivacity of the bird, which warbles soft melody at twilight." The morning sun-beam falls on the mountain top, and its radiating influence is instantly felt to earth's centre.

To make this part of the subject more intelligible, we refer the reader to the *solar spectrum*, which all have seen, when a beam from the sun, passing through a small orifice in the window shutter of a dark room, is intercepted by a transparent glass prism. The beam, by unequal refraction, is decomposed, and the separated rays or forces are caught on a screen. In the centre of the screen are represented the colored rays. These give rise to all the phenomena of color and vision. Below the illuminating rays, where scarce a trace of light can be detected, is a space in which various heating rays, as different from each other as are the colored rays, produce a variety of curious calorific effects, expanding bodies and setting in motion most manifest currents of electricity. Above the spectrum is another space, in which the poetic dreams of the ancients, the incantation scenes of the dark ages, and the magic mirrors of eastern fable, have been surpassed by scientific realities. In that space, actinic rays produce chemical changes, which we still witness with admiration in Daguerreotype pictures of endeared friends and lovely scenes—pictures, which the artist's pencil cannot approach in accuracy. These impressions are made, not on polished silver plates only, but on all bodies whatever; and the discoveries of Daguerre, Talbot, Herschel, Draper, and others, in the various branches of Photography, Heliography, and Thermography, demonstrate, beyond all doubt, the truth first pronounced by Niepce—a truth not inferior in importance to Newton's law of gravitation—"that no substance can be exposed to the sun's rays without undergoing a chemical change."

Nor is the change or motion in material particles limited

to daylight, for we have seen that these actinic rays are not luminous. They are absorbed by all bodies—granite, sand, metals, ores, liquids, gases, plants, and animals.—During this absorption, all bodies experience active molecular changes; and Sir J. Herschel has proved, in his papers on Photographic processes and on Parathermic rays, that all bodies, which undergo molecular changes in daylight, have the wonderful power of gradual restoration to their original condition during the darkness of night. Daguerreotype plates, metal tablets, and photogenic papers, on which sun-drawn images are not fixed, as the artist terms it, prove this in a most convincing manner. Thus, if paper be prepared with iodide of platinum, and impressed by sunshine with an image of a flower or key, and then placed in darkness, the image is effaced in a few moments, and the paper is restored to its original sensitiveness. How strangely does this show a necessity for the alternation of day and night; and how wonderfully may the comparative permanence of rocks and soils, and the health of animals and plants, depend on this mysterious law!

So strikingly are these forces—these actinic, chemical agencies of light—modified by circumstances, that by one ingenious contrivance an artist can take a perfect Daguerreotype copy of an object placed in darkness, while by another modification of his apparatus, no image can be obtained from an object illuminated by the strongest light. Indeed, the sun itself, setting behind an atmosphere which gives it a pale red or rich yellow disc, cannot impress its image on the most delicate plate, because the actinic rays are absorbed by such an atmosphere. In this way, the different states of the atmosphere cause the sun's influence to vary on consecutive days, and give rise to those differences in its heating effects, in spring, summer, and autumn, with which experience makes us familiar, though till recently we knew not the cause of the difference.

Time forbids my dwelling longer on the multiplied phenomena of molecular motion, resulting from the modifications of active illuminating, calorific rays, found in a single sun-beam.

When we attempt to form a conception of the aggregate amount of change and motion, effected silently by the

solar and astral flood of influence shed on the crust of the earth, during each diurnal revolution, the mind is lost in admiration. And as the planet wheels in its different motions, with inconceivable rapidity, presenting, at each instant, different portions of its surface to the sun, the balance of forces is ever varying, and currents of force, now increasing, now diminishing, are unceasingly traversing the earth in different directions, and stirring the atoms of which it consists. Nor must we forget that these impulses on the surface are met by similar, though feebler ones, from the heated interior. We must remember, too, that in many cases, as Herschel discovered, when action is once begun by even a momentary exposure to sunshine, "it goes on slowly working its effect even in darkness, apparently without other limit than is afforded by the supply of ingredients present." Thus, when any of the salts of gold are spread on paper, ribbon, or other organic substance, and exposed for an instant to the sun, decomposition begins, and progresses slowly even in the dark, till all the gold is reduced to the metallic state.

Other subtle agencies are at work around us, producing changes on a grand scale, yet of such a mysterious kind, that they are as little seen, though as real, as the animalcules of the microscopic world. I can merely glance at a class of discoveries made by Moser, Draper, Hunt, Faraday, Brewster, Riechenbach, Gregory, and others, which show that we have a certain glimpse of fields of research, in which will be made full developments, not only of powers already slightly known to us, but of other higher and more subtle influences, which, though now dreamed of, are not yet known certainly in our philosophy.

What an immense advance has been made in chemistry, electricity and zoology, since Davy, Wollaston and Cuvier died, a few years ago!

But I proceed to the enumeration of a few facts to show, that unknown forces *are at work* around us, which consist of radiations capable of effecting astonishing changes in matter.

Hunt proved that chemical action is begun and decomposition produced by the mere juxtaposition of bodies; for when he suspended an amalgamated plate of copper over iodide of silver spread on glass, the iodide was decomposed and the silver reduced to the metallic state.

Moser ascertained that various bodies, by some unknown radiating influence, impress their images on each other. Thus, an engraved plate, or a cylinder of wood, placed near a polished metal, will impart to the latter an image, which may be so distinctly evolved, as to show even the fibres of the cylinder of wood.

So, a printed page, suspended facing a polished metallic plate, imparts to the latter, in a few days, an impression of each letter, which is wholly dormant and invisible, but which may be developed by vapor, oxidation, or other means, and made distinctly legible. The black letters radiate heat more readily than the white paper, and this difference in the power of calorific radiation may be the cause of the image.

Any bodies, which differ in their electrical states, act on each other. Thus, arsenic, which is negative, impresses its image on positive copper.

Indeed, we may lay down as a scientific principle, clearly proved by facts, though the cause or causes of the facts may not be fully known, that any bodies, in proximity to each other, which differ either in their chemical relations, or in their power of radiating heat, or in their electric state, or in their magnetic condition, impress dormant images on each other, which are, in many cases, permanent, and which may, by various means, be evolved.

And do *we*, then, through these mysterious radiations of influences, which are capable of effecting even visible changes in matter, leave on the objects about us an ineffaceable impress of our most secret actions and softest whispers? Are all recorded, thus, against us? Are the objects around us, as Dr. Hamilton says in his sermon on Retribution, "time's leaves, each catching and retaining a history—daguerreotyped, fixed forever—borne *on* and *on* to the great archives of eternity, there laid up safe in the repository of the Almighty, and constituting '*the books*' out of which men shall be judged?" Do we see in these phenomena, as the learned and pious Babbage thinks, "established laws, by which every criminal is irrevocably chained to the testimony of his crime." Do the acts of murderers, the oaths of the profane, the looks of gamblers, and the arts of seducers, record themselves on walls, rocks, trees—all objects in their vicinity? Is this what is meant

by those dark passages of Scripture: "There is nothing hid that shall not be manifested;" and, "What ye have spoken in darkness shall be manifested in the light?"

Say not that so many motions must obliterate one another. All things are possible with God. Each sound vibrates through the whole air, leaving the atoms arranged as they never were before. Each pebble dropped in the ocean moves every particle of water in it, and gives each a new and distinct position. No two leaves in the forest are identical. No two human countenances are precisely alike. Individual distinctness is characteristic of all God's works. Each leaf—each countenance—is the result of a peculiar combination of actions; and may not the acts and words of each of us so impress matter as to form, by their combination, a legible record of the life and character of each?

This is not more strange than the fact that geology enables us to read in the rocks a marvellously clear history of whole races of plants and animals, which were created successively, during numerous inconceivable protracted periods anterior to the human era. The strata of the earth are *the* leaves of a faithful and instructive historic record of the beings of past ages; and who can say what evidence may be laid up, by Infinite wisdom and power, in material elements, against that great day, when, endued with higher powers, each individual will be made to read, in imperishable material atoms, the history of every act of his mortal career?

From what has been said, it must be evident, we think, that every particle of matter is unceasingly at work. To this, probably, the first chapter of Ecclesiastes refers. The writer states that "the earth abideth *forever*," meaning obviously, not "from everlasting," but from the beginning to the close of the existence of measures of time; and geology shows that as a planet, it has existed in past periods, and probably will exist, (the end of the present state of things being succeeded by "new heavens and a new earth,") during periods so long, that we may literally apply to them the term *forever*. He says, also, "generation succeeds generation," referring, obviously, to unceasing changes in the organic world; that the "sun hasteth to the place where he arose," alluding to the endless revolutions of the heavenly bodies; that the wind, in its "circuits," "whirl-

eth about continually," showing the restless state of the whole atmosphere ; and that "the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full ; unto the place whence the rivers come, thither they return again," illustrating the vast changes occurring daily in the waters of the earth. The subject of unceasing change in the material universe, being thus fully before his inspired mind, he abruptly says of rocks, sand, all inorganic bodies, what the ignorant may regard as hyperbole, but what physical science has almost demonstrated to be literally true, "all things are full of labor, man cannot utter it."

ARTICLE IV.

AN INQUIRY ;—ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL ?

Six Sermons. BY GEORGE STORRS.

Of the author of these discourses we know nothing except his name. He is no doubt sincere in believing the doctrine here advanced with considerable boldness. Since persons may be sincere, however, in adopting and expressing erroneous sentiments, the chief question in regard to a book presented to the public should not be who is its author, or is he sincere in embracing his published opinions, but whether they are supported by valid authority and indisputable evidence. If the testimony in their favor be strong and cumulative, or light as one of the imponderable agents, the questions that might be raised concerning the author or his sincerity, must be relatively useless and unimportant. Intelligent readers feel a deeper concern for the truth or falsity of the doctrines and opinions of writers, than for their names or the motives which induce them to compose their works and give them to the world.

The author of these sermons commences by bestowing a panegyric on the Athenians, for the respectful and courteous manner in which they listened to the preaching of Paul, on the resurrection of the dead. Although the doctrine was strange and new to them, yet they desired to hear

and know what it was. He declares that, in this respect at least, they manifested a better disposition than many at the present day, who are so wise in their own estimation, that no person can advance an idea to which they will pay any attention whatever, unless it has first passed through the head of some Doctor of Divinity. He appears to possess a sovereign and unmitigated contempt for Doctors of Divinity, and boldly asserts that in the present exhibition and defence of his peculiar views, he calls no man either father or master. On reading this solemn and impressive declaration of mental independence, we expected to discover a doctrine different from what we had been accustomed to believe ; and our expectation has not been disappointed. We had learned from ecclesiastical history that the doctrine of the finite duration of future punishment was maintained by the teachers of the Alexandrine school.— They derived their mode of representation from the principles of the Platonic philosophy. Plato regarded punishment merely as medicinal, designed to effect the cure of human maladies. He supposed that all spirits not wholly irreclaimable, would be morally purified and renovated by means of punishment, and would in this way attain to eternal happiness. Even in the works of Clement of Alexandria, we find a clear exhibition of the Platonic ideas.— Origen endeavored to establish this doctrine in his works “*Contra Celsum*,” and “*De Principiis*.” This is one of the points respecting which (according to Neander) his opinions afterwards changed. Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuesta, and others, entertained the same view. Hieronymus and Augustine inform us that in the fourth century this opinion was widely disseminated in the Latin Church. Such an opinion we deemed very erroneous ; but Mr. Storrs proceeds a step further. He attempts to prove by scripture, that the souls of the wicked, dying in sin, will be reserved unto the judgment of the great day, and that instead of consignment to hopeless and everlasting misery, in a state of conscious being, they will then be annihilated by the Almighty power of God. He maintains most clearly, that their punishment will consist in a *total* and *final* *extinction* of *soul* and *body*. The same opinion was held and defended by Mr. J. Scott, Mr. Marsom, Mr. Taylor of Norwich, and Mr. Bourn of Birmingham. These gentle-

men contended that the terms kill, death, punishment and destruction, when used in scripture, concerning the future destiny of the wicked, are not employed to convey the idea of even a miserable existence, but a complete and final annihilation of their entire being. Mr. Storrs has contributed nothing original or important to the principles and arguments of his predecessors. He is perhaps more arrogant and presumptuous. He assumes an air of confidence which is likely to create an impression that his opinions are capable of being sustained by reason and the word of God. They belong to that class of opinions which suit and please the taste of the natural man. They tend to rob God of the attribute of justice, to divest his law of its awful sanctions, and to remove from the minds of the impenitent, that conviction of the deep and aggravated guilt of sin, which the scriptures are designed and adapted to produce.

Mr. Storrs lays no stress, whatever, on the arguments usually employed by reason in defence of the immortality of the soul. The reader is doubtless aware, that this doctrine has been frequently argued from the vast capacities of the soul, its boundless desires, its capability of indefinite improvement, its dissatisfaction with the present state, its desires for some species of religion as well as immortality, the general consent of all nations, the consciousness that men have of sinning, the remorse of conscience, the providence and justice of God. "The same causes that tend to destroy the body cannot destroy the soul," has almost passed into a proverb. Consciousness cannot be predicated of mere matter, whatever may be its form, density, bulk, or direction of motion. True, it is susceptible of various modes of existence, but these are all equally foreign to the nature of cogitation. Matter can only be made to think by some new modification; but all the modifications of which it is capable are alike unconnected with cogitative powers. The immateriality of the soul seems to imply a natural power of perpetual duration as a consequence of exemption from every cause of decay. Whatever perishes is destroyed by the solution of its texture and separation of its parts. That which has no parts, and therefore admits no solution, cannot be naturally corrupted or impaired.—The death of the soul must be essentially different from

that of the body. We do not doubt that He who made the soul can destroy it ; since from him it derived its power of duration, and He is able to accomplish any thing that is consistent with his perfections and agreeable to His will. Philosophy plainly teaches that the soul will never perish by any inherent cause of decay or principle of corruption ; but whether it will be annihilated or not by Him who formed it, we must learn from higher authority,—from the revelation of His holy will. Mr. Storrs admits that the scriptures clearly teach the immortality of the souls of believers. On this point we agree. The question for discussion has been formally and distinctly stated by himself. Is it the revealed will of God that wicked men who die in sin shall be immortal ? Mr. Storr denies. We are constrained to affirm. We fully concur with him, in saying that for a solution of this question, we should both appeal to the law and the testimony. It is to be hoped that, although he boldly declares his independence, he will at least consent to be governed by the rules of sound exegesis, and yield to the authority of a few learned lexicographers. At the risk of being esteemed arrogant and vain, we shall briefly consult the languages in which the scriptures were originally written, and thus endeavor to ascertain the proper signification of some of the terms therein employed, concerning the future state. The primary meaning of the derivative words *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* is *always-being* or *ever-lasting*. They may be strictly defined, duration without interruption and without end. Lennep says of *αἰών*, it is a noun of that kind which in its own nature denotes collection and multitude.* Phavorinus calls it the comprehension of many times and periods,—a definition which Saurin says that *αἰών*, both in the singular and plural, signifies eternity, whether past or to come. When used concerning the future state of being, it denotes an endless duration. Bretschneider says that since the rewards bestowed and punishments inflicted after the resurrection, were esteemed by the Jews to be immutable and eternal, we must believe that the expressions eternal glory, life, fire, punishment or destruction, when used by the New Testament writers in regard to futurity, plainly indicate absolute eternity. The Hebrew term, *olam*, is often used to denote

* Etymologium Linguae Græcæ.

future time, and is translated ever, forever, and evermore. The *terminus ad quam* must be ascertained from the nature of the subject and scope of the passage. This word occurs in the Old Testament three hundred and eight times, and with the exception of about twenty cases, is uniformly translated in the septuagint, by the term *αιων*, in some one of its various forms. These two words were, therefore, evidently regarded by the LXX, as equivalent in signification. The question immediately arises, how was *αιων*, when employed concerning the future state, understood by the Greeks? Did they regard it as denoting a limited or an unlimited duration? Aristotle, the illustrious preceptor of Alexander the Great, is one of the best witnesses of the proper usage of this word in his day. Describing the highest heaven as the residence of the gods, he says :

“ It is evident that there is neither place, nor vacuum, nor time beyond. Wherefore the things there are not by nature adapted to exist in place; nor does time make them grow old; neither under the highest heaven is there a change of any of these things, they being placed beyond it; but unchangeable and passionless, having the best, even the self sufficient life, they continue through all (*αιωνα*) eternity. For, indeed, the word itself, according to the ancients, divinely expressed this. For the period which comprehends the time of every one's life, beyond which, according to nature, nothing exists, is called his *αιων*, eternity. And, for the same reason also the period of the whole heaven, even the infinite time of all things, and the period comprehending that infinity is *αιων*, eternity, deriving its name from *αει ειναι*, *always-being*, immortal and divine. Whence also it is applied to other things, to some indeed accurately, but to others in the loose signification of being and life.”*

Nothing could be more explicit and satisfactory than this testimony of Aristotle, in regard to the origin and use of *αιων*. At the very time the septuagint translation was executed, this word when used in the sense of eternity, was used accurately. In his Hebrew Concordance, Taylor gives to *olam* (translated *αιων* by LXX) the sense of for ever in one hundred and seventy-five instances. Gesenius assigns as its primary and proper sense of (*ewigkeit*) eternity. Indeed, this prince of lexicographers gives it no other mean-

* De Coelo, Lib. 1, Cap. 9.

ing, simply remarking that it was often used by the Hebrews inaccurately. The word endless, in our language, has a fixed and determinate signification, and yet we employ and hear such expressions as these, endless talkers, endless litigation and endless disputes. Because this term is sometimes employed in a figurative sense, we should not at once leap to the conclusion that it can never be used to denote endless eternity. It is frequently limited or modified in its meaning, by the subject or connection in which it occurs ; but, unless this is the case, it must always be taken in the sense of unlimited duration. It has been acknowledged a sound rule of interpretation, that the subject including the general scope of the passage, must determine whether a given word shall be understood in a literal or figurative sense. Other rules have been adopted by irreverent and infidel interpreters ; but it will be manifest on a little reflection, that they reduce words to mere cyphers, and if they universally obtained would inevitably destroy language as the vehicle of communicating knowledge. The principle and rule we have laid down, allows every word to have a proper meaning of its own, only modified by the connection in which it is introduced. It is readily conceded that *αἰών* is sometimes employed in the scriptures, to express a limited duration. In one passage it appears to signify merely a long period. One generation passes away and another comes, but the earth abideth forever. If the destruction of the world denotes the annihilation of its atoms, the earth cannot be truly said to be eternal, but it will endure for a long time, compared with a period of human generation. But if, on the other hand, matter be indestructible,—if the constituent elements of the earth survive the final conflagration, and become the materials of the new earth in which righteousness shall dwell, then is the term used in a literal sense, and denotes an endless duration. A servant forever, is a servant during his natural life. An ordinance forever, was an ordinance throughout the Mosaic dispensation. Everlasting hills and mountains denote those mountains and hills that will continue while the earth endures.

After an impartial and a thorough examination of the passages in which the word *αἰών* occurs, we are fully satisfied that, when applied to duration, it denotes the longest

period of which the subject mentioned is capable. If eternal existence is predicable of the subject qualified by this term, it will endure through all eternity. Now, no one will presume to affirm that the soul cannot possibly exist in a separate state. Neither can any one prove that the soul is incapable of living forever ; there is every reason to believe that it may and will. If the souls of the righteous are capable of an endless existence, why may not the souls of the wicked ? Sin does not prevent us from living in the present state, and we see no reason why it should prevent persons from living in a future world. No valid argument can be offered in behalf of the position that the souls of the wicked are incapable of living forever. Reason and scripture unite their voices in proclaiming that all men, whether wicked or righteous, are endued with a capacity for endless duration. It follows, therefore, that if the word *αἰών* is employed by scripture concerning the future being of the soul, it denotes its eternal existence ; for with respect to the soul, such a duration is possible, whether in a state of holiness or sin, happiness or misery. Death passes no change whatever on the moral character of man. If unholy, then he must ever continue unholy. After death, nothing shall occur to render him better in character or condition. When the angel of the Lord shall stand on the earth and sea, and lift up his hand to heaven, and swear by Him that liveth for ever and ever, that time shall be no longer, an unchanging and immutable dispensation will commence.—The voice of God once shook the earth, but he has promised, saying : Yet once more I shake not only the earth, but also heaven. And this word, once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. The things that will not be shaken by the work of Omnipotence here alluded to, must remain, according to His will, steadfast and immovable forever. The moral attributes of God will be unchangeably the same. His justice will ever require the punishment of sin. Indeed, sin will always punish itself. As death cannot change the moral character of those who die in impenitence, they will never cease to sin.

The Scripture frequently gives an account of the characters of sinners in the future world. Our Saviour, speak-

ing to John in vision, concerning those who are excluded from Heaven, says, "Without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie."* Solomon exhorts his readers to be diligent in performing their duties, and enforces his exhortation by adding, "for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the world of spirits, whither thou goest."† It is evident that all those who go into that world, without having performed the needful work, must go there in the character of sinners, and will continue to sin, and may, therefore, be punished with the same justice in the future state as in the present. No good reason can be assigned why the exercise of justice should be suspended after the separation of the soul from the body. It will ever be true that the soul which continues to sin must be continually punished. If the wicked are capable of an endless existence, (and we have shown that they are,) they will inevitably spend that existence in sinning, and since God will be infinitely just through all eternity, their punishment must be necessarily everlasting. Let it be remembered, that life and death are terms used in Scripture to represent happiness or misery. When the soul is described as enduring the pangs of death, we are not to conclude that its being is totally extinguished, but that it is forever deprived of every source of felicity. It is a living death. It is the destruction of happiness, not of the persons who are capable of enjoying it. "It will be inflicted upon the whole man. The soul will be punished by means of the body, and will also undergo sufferings peculiar to itself. Separated from the source of good, it will be tossed with incessant restlessness and feel the torment of desires which it is impossible to satisfy." It will be agonized by a sense of the Divine displeasure, by the upbraidings of conscience, and by the terrors of despair. From this state of dereliction and absolute wretchedness, there is no relief; no prospect of escape. Hope, which comes to all in this life, never comes to those who have failed in the trial. No new opportunity will be given to correct the fatal error. Those who will endure the pangs of the second death, will not be deprived of being, but of *well-being*; their misery will beggar all description. It is

* Rev. 22: 15. † Ecc. 9: 10.

no part of our duty, however, in this discussion, to describe the nature of the punishment of the wicked. We are under no obligation at present to show whether sin will be followed merely by its natural evil consequences, or whether it will also be attended by positive punishment in the future world. It simply devolves on us to prove, in opposition to the dogma of Mr. Storrs, that it is the revealed will of God that the wicked, dying in sin, shall exist in a state of conscious being after death, and that their punishment will be everlasting. We have already shown that when time shall be no longer, an unchanging dispensation will commence. The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are (αἰώνια) eternal. We have also shown that no reason can be assigned why the souls of the wicked may not be properly classed with eternal things, as well as the souls of the righteous. Reason teaches that a sinful soul is as capable of endless existence as one that is holy ; and, so far as we know, the Scriptures assign no limitation to the duration of either class. Both righteous and wicked must live for ever. The phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, for ever and ever, occurs eighteen times in the New Testament. In fifteen cases, it is applied to the continuance of the glory, perfections, government and praise of God. In one, the righteous are described as reigning for ever and ever in the future world. In another, it is said of the devil, the beast, and false prophet, that in the lake of fire and brimstone they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever. In the remaining instance, it is said of those who worship the beast and his image, that the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever. It can scarcely be imagined that the sacred writers would employ a certain phrase sixteen times to denote a duration confessedly eternal, and twice to denote that which is infinitely different, a limited period or complete annihilation. If an uninspired man, of moderate talent and scrupulous integrity, would not use the same words and phrases to express ideas entirely different, can such ambiguity and equivocation be safely attributed to the Holy Ghost ?

At the close of the general and final judgment, those on the left hand of the Judge shall go away into (κόλασιν αἰώνιον) everlasting punishment ; but those on his right hand

into (ζωὴν αἰώνιον) life eternal. The word is here applied in the same manner to the future happiness of the righteous and to the future misery of the wicked. There is not the least insinuation or appearance of an intentional distinction. If the latter phrase means eternal life, then, *per legem disjunctionis*, must the former denote eternal, unending punishment. It should not be forgotten that the term is here employed to designate a duration which will commence after time shall be no more. If a limitation is not found elsewhere, this word, used in an absolute and unqualified manner, must express the longest period of existence which may be predicated of the enjoyments of the righteous and the sufferings of the wicked, and *that is an endless duration*. Some have endeavored to prove that a limit has been assigned by Scripture to the suffering of the wicked, and for confirmation of their opinion, appeal to the declaration of Peter concerning Christ, "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things."* But it is beyond all question that this passage does not teach nor relate to the doctrine of final restoration. Comparing it with another passage,† we are induced to believe that by "the times of the restitution of all things," is to be understood the day of judgment and the end of the world, which is so called by the Apostle: 1st. Because then life shall be restored to the bodies of the dead and the image of God, defaced by the fall, shall be perfectly renewed by the blessed. 2d. Because to God shall then be restored the glory of his most wise government, not thoroughly understood in this world, and of his power, which the wicked seemed for some time to have eluded or escaped, and of his justice, in virtue of which he will then render to every one according to his works. 3d. Because the truth of the divine predictions, promises and threatenings, shall be then, as it were, restored to them by their exact completion, however scoffers and other wicked men may have called their veracity into question. 4th. Because wars and tumults shall then cease, and all things shall be settled or restored to a state of tranquility.‡ This passage, when compared with others and properly explained, does not afford the least evidence that the punishment of the wicked shall be finite, and that they will be restored to

* Acts, 3: 21.

† Acts, 1: 11.

‡ 1 Cor. 15: 25.

eternal happiness. If their punishment be everlasting, it is needless to remark that they must of course exist for ever in order to endure it. That we may be fully assured of the truth of our position, let us examine those declarations of Scripture which expressly state there is no hope of termination to the sufferings of the impenitent. Peter says of the wicked, they will utterly perish in their own corruption.* The immediate means of torment to them are called by our Saviour himself the fire that never shall be quenched.† In several passages the happiness of the righteous and the sufferings of the lost are exhibited in a parallel manner; and yet no intimation is given that the duration of the one will be shorter than that of the other.‡ Our Saviour said, concerning Judas, "Good were it for that man that he had never been born."§ If Judas should have been annihilated, or been miserable for a limited period, and afterward restored to happiness, the saying of Christ must have been evidently untrue. The rich man in torment could not receive a single drop of water. Jesus Christ says, in the most plain and emphatic language, "He that believeth not shall not see life. There shall in no wise enter into the heavenly city any thing that defileth, or that worketh abomination, or that maketh a lie."¶ All impenitent sinners are, therefore, excluded. They shall in *no wise* be permitted to enter heaven. Time and patience would fail us to set down a multitude of other passages in which the same doctrine is taught in the same unambiguous and decided manner.¶

It may be properly remarked concerning these passages, that the sense of annihilation, or of future restoration, does not exhaust their meaning. The former admits of no degrees and implies the suspension of Divine power, whereas the punishment above described is different in degrees and implies an exertion of omnipotence, as well as an eternal duration. The latter opinion denies those declarations of

* 2 Peter, 2: 12. † Mark, 9: 43.

‡ Daniel, 12: 2. Matt. 3: 12; 19: 36; 25: 46.

§ Mark, 14: 21. ¶ John, 3: 36. Rev. 21: 27.

¶ Matt. 18: 8; 2 Thess. 1: 9; Mark, 3: 29; Judea, 7; 2 Peter, 2: 17; Judea, 13; Rev. 14: 10-12; 19: 3, 20: 10; 2 Cor. 4: 18; John, 17: 9; Matt. 12: 31, 2; 1 John, 5: 16; Heb. 6: 6; 10: 26, 27; Luke, 9: 25; Matt. 10: 28; Mark, 9: 43, 48; Luke, 14: 26; John, 3: 36, 8, 21; Phil. 3: 9; James, 2: 13; and many other texts.

God, in which he says that after death there will be no change for the better, either in the moral character or condition of the sinner. The punishment that he will endure will never make an atonement for his guilt nor purify his soul. Indeed, his guilt will always be increasing, and his character will ever be growing more unfit for the enjoyments of a holy heaven.

The doctrines of annihilation and of future restoration, clearly tend to rob God of infinite justice, and also to call His veracity into question. We cannot, therefore, congratulate Mr. Storrs, nor bid him God speed. We hope that he will live long enough to recant his errors, and that if he cannot repair the injury he has already inflicted on the cause of religion, he will be brought to repentance and saved from everlasting punishment.

His discourses are largely imbued with infidel sentiments and full of direct contradictions of the plain teaching of the Scripture. Having determined to adhere to a certain system at all hazards, he tortures Scripture that it may suit his views. He boldly cuts off from that which is too long and stretches what is too short for the dimensions of his theory. Like the German Rationalists, he undertakes to tell God what He ought to be and what He should do, and if he meets with any doctrine that he does not love or fully understand, he explains it till it agrees with his ideal standard ; or, if it is impossible for him to do this, he rejects it altogether, as unworthy of his belief or notice. Nature does not abhor a vacuum more than he abhors the word of God when it does not suit his system. If he possessed more learning, he would be a very formidable enemy of the truth ; he is naturally ingenious and subtle. Did time permit, we might present some evidence of the fact.

Notwithstanding all that Mr. Storrs has advanced in favour of his hypothesis, the word of God stands sure and impregnable. There is a hell—a place of eternal misery for the wicked. Its inhabitants have no God, no Saviour, no virtuous friends, no parents, no relatives before whom they may spread their calamities with the hope of being heard, or in whose hearts or hands they may find a refuge from the bitterness of woe. In each other they can place no confidence, since they will know that at all times and in all things they will be only despised, hated and deceived.

Casting their eyes abroad through the universe, they will be forced to believe that it contains no friend for them. In the midst of millions, they are *alone*. There are sure of being loathed, rejected and shunned by every being in the creation of God. Not a sigh can they breathe; not a tear can they shed; not a sorrow can they unfold; not a prayer can they utter with a hope of being befriended, heard or regarded. Extending their view through eternity, they will not be able to perceive a change for the better. All around them will be gloom and solitude; and all before them will be desolation, anguish and despair, without end.

ARTICLE V.

An Address delivered before the Society of Missionary Inquiry, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., May 10th, 1852.

The year 1851 will probably be known in history as the year of the great exhibition in London. As that was an era in the world's progress, so to have seen it must have been an era in the life of an individual. Among other subjects for study presented there it must have been curious and instructive to witness the different tastes displayed by different individuals. As the tide of human beings poured slowly down the aisles of the Crystal Palace you might have seen, here a crowd collected around some useful invention, there another admiring some piece of exquisite workmanship, and there again another held spell-bound by some creation of the sculptor's chisel. There was in one part of that building an object which must have been gazed at by many with admiration, with gratitude and hope. It was an object which has exerted a wider and more enduring influence on human progress, than all the arts and all the sciences, and was richer in itself than all the jewels of the crown, the giant diamond of India, or the Crystal Palace itself. There were one hundred and fifty copies in as many different languages

of the Bible. Its presence there hallowed the scene, and was a noble characteristic of the age in which we live.—We are glad, that then and there, the Bible was recognized, as at least one of many agencies, which are affecting the interests and destiny of our race. And yet we can imagine, there were many who trod those aisles with pride, cast a wondering eye on the products of so many lands, as in long perspective they lined those narrow walks, and felt themselves exalted by witnessing such proofs of the skill and ingenuity of their fellows, but saw nothing romantic, nothing inspiring in the contribution sent in by the Bible Society.

All this is only the parallel of what is displayed on a wider theatre. Our busy and bustling age is alive with excitement, enterprise and expectation. The aims and hopes of our race are raised, as perhaps they never were before. But these expectations are fed from very different sources, in different individuals. Some are expecting the mechanic arts to reform the world. There are some whose only idea of a happy land, is one intersected with rail roads and the hum of commerce and machinery, breaking the silence of every valley. Others expect this desired result to be accomplished by the press, which quickened into unparalleled vigor and activity, is showering its instructive pages all over the land. Others find a basis for their wildest expectations, in the famous saying of Lord Brougham : "The schoolmaster is abroad in the land." And there are those who include all these agencies in their calculation. If we can believe them, the editor, the engineer and the teacher have now fairly entered on their mission of reforming the world, and the world must now surely take heart, and hope for a brighter history.—And if these invite, as they frequently do, the minister to join the party, it is oftener we fear from motives of personal courtesy, than an expectation that he will contribute any real assistance to the enterprise. There are others, and we believe the number is increasing, who without rejecting any of these instruments, base their hopes of the world's reformation, on that Book which now speaks as no other book does or ever will, in nearly two hundred of the babbling tongues of earth, in the truths it teaches, and the system of faith and worship it suggests and sanctions. It

is encouraging to such, to see that while other progressive influences are in motion, Christianity too seems unusually buoyant, hopeful and venturesome. It is appropriate then, Young Gentlemen, for you to give some part of your time to gathering and diffusing through our community information as to the progress which Christianity is making in the earth. When seeking assistance in this useful work, you have hitherto confined yourselves to those who, from experience or position, had acquired useful information to impart to you. You have now, however, for the first time, been pleased to call for the services of one, from whom I do hope no such information is expected. It requires very little candor in me to say that I am not familiar with this subject. And even if inability did not prevent me, a very obvious rule of propriety would, here in an institution all the members of which are professionally devoted to these studies, from entering on any of the more solemn views of Christian missions, the necessity or warrant for them, the best manner of conducting them or their success. I cannot then approach the center of this great subject, and yet addressing a Society of Missionary Inquiry, I must linger somewhere on its borders. These considerations seem to prescribe the channel in which our reflections must run this evening—the incidental or secondary benefits of the missionary enterprise.

This subject is to some extent the same with this, the incidental benefits of Christianity, for missions produce these effects because they carry Christianity with them.—Has Christianity then done anything for those nations into which it has been carried, anything supplementary to the spiritual work it is said to effect? Anything which the historian could compute or the philosopher detect? Instead of selecting an example from these nations, it will serve our purpose to enquire what Christianity has done for *our* country, as we can here learn what are its tendencies, and what, under various and modified degrees, will be its results elsewhere. The question then arises, a very simple and intelligible one, what has Christianity done for our nation? Has it done any good? Anything which is worth remembering in making an estimate of our social condition as a people? We need scarcely remark, that it is only in a very accommodated and inferior sense, that

the term Christian can be applied to our nation or to any other. And yet when it is asked if Christianity has done any good among us, we can confidently and earnestly affirm it has done much, it has done every thing for us. Imagine if you can our condition, should Christianity entirely withdraw from our land. Let the signal be given at which it is to retire, drawing after it, of course, all those influences, institutions and effects dependant on it? It would of course rob the spiritual man of that which he thinks his treasure, but would it take along with that any thing valued by the moralist, the patriot, the citizen, the infidel, and even the atheist? This new order of things need not be heralded in as with the shock of an earthquake. Let the change be effected quietly if possible. On some bright sabbath let the bells be silent, the churches closed or applied to other purposes. The ministers who stood at their altars need not begin as apostles of a vulgar infidelity. Let them teach the people the beauties of nature, the wonders of science, the delights of education, the proprieties and moralities of life. There are some perhaps who would wish for such a change. But he who would dispense with Christianity considered only as an element of national prosperity, thinking that in doing so he would only be lopping off some external and almost useless member of the nation's body, would be startled to find that he had drawn the life blood from the nation's veins, and laid the hand of disease and death on the nation's heart. It will give us only a feeble illustration here, if we can imagine some mad reformer who, gifted with the power, should aim to hide some mild and feeble star, and in the thrilling moment of his triumph is appalled to learn from the darkness gathering on the sky above, and the gloom settling on the earth beneath, that he has stricken the sun from the heavens. There are some calling themselves patriots who think the only thing needed to make our land like Eden, or rather like Arcadia, is to rid it of Christianity. Let them succeed, and immediately the flight of lovely and beautiful things from our midst will begin, but where will it end? Men would be surprised every day by the sudden disappearance of some blessing or possession, which had never been associated in their minds with Christianity at all, some of them recalled

to heaven palpably and before the eyes of men, like Elijah, and others stolen silently away without giving note or warning of their departure, like Enoch, leaving even to the profane historian no other explanation to give than this: It is not, for God has taken it; and in the worthless remains these men would scarcely recognize the corpse of that beautiful form, which when glowing with life they loved almost to adoration. Christianity while chiefly intent on bartering, or rather giving, to men the pearl of great price, has in her keeping many other gifts, precious though perishable, and these she scatters as her Divine Author does His sunshine and His rain, on the evil and on the good, on the just and on the unjust. We cannot be mistaken in saying that Christianity has given to our country that security and quiet we enjoy. We are aware this could be analyzed and traced to many inferior causes, but our object is not so much to analyze or discuss these effects, as to suggest them in a hurried and somewhat promiscuous manner, and we notice first the security which exists in a country which Christianity has influenced to any considerable degree. Will not a fact serve the purpose of an argument here? Why is it that amidst all the revolutions and changes with which "all Europe rings from side to side," the current of emigration aims at our shores? It is not because our lakes are broader, or our mountains higher, or our climate milder. It is simply for this reason above all others. Notwithstanding all the sectional feelings and home quarrels, which mar the peace of our widespread family circle, (and there are more of these than will serve any good purpose,) there is still something here, which throws a guard around human property, human happiness, and human life, which is not found in all nations of the globe. There are countries where this is not the case. Take as one illustration the testimony of one who went out from our midst. Rev'd. J. L. Wilson, speaking of western Africa, says:

"The people here are everywhere strangers to the blessings of good government. It is doubtful whether a man in this country ever composes himself to sleep at night with a feeling of entire security."

Now this short description of a state of things quite common in some nations of the globe, is almost unintelli-

gible to us. Perhaps none of us can enter fully into its meaning. Certainly, nothing in our whole condition as a people, is more remarkable than that security which surrounds us and ours, and envelopes us like the air, and yet like the air supports and sweetens life, neglected because universal among us. All our institutions too bear the impress of the true religion and reflect its spirit, far too imperfectly all must admit, but that the image is there none can deny. Look at the countless influences at work to restrain evil, and encourage goodness, to multiply the springs and sources of human enjoyment and improvement, physical, intellectual and moral. Look at the organizations and institutions of a charitable nature alone, and if nothing else betrayed the fact, these would, that we live where Christianity has a home. It is familiar to you, that in the Roman language the same word means "stranger" and "enemy." Greece and Rome invented many things, but associations for purposes of charity or kindness, they never thought of to any considerable degree. We suppose this is owing to the simple fact that these institutions in their countless forms, are not the offspring of the intellect, but of the heart. We cannot particularize here, but the weak, the sick, the poor, the unfortunate, do not fare in a Christian land as they do elsewhere. The very idiots of our country, the poor benighted beings who seem to have every attribute of our race except its peculiar and crowning one, would know, if they *could* know anything, that a better religion than nature knows or teaches, is at work among us. Without pursuing this thought we must give one illustration. We have seen it stated that Blackstone in his commentaries, published not quite a century ago, uses this language :

"A man who is born deaf and dumb and blind is looked upon by the law in the same state as an idiot, he being supposed incapable of any understanding, as wanting all those senses which furnish the human mind with ideas."

How strange, how cruel, this language seems to us now, when charity not content to carry knowledge, sacred and secular, to all nations, and to make the Bible speak in so many tongues, makes it speak almost to every sense, so that Laura Bridgeman can trace its life-giving words, and learn its lessons of hope and patience, though her benight-

ed mind is imbedded in unconscious flesh, with "wisdom" at three chief "entrances quite shut out!" A grander triumph of immortal mind, and a nobler characteristic of our age than the engine or the telegraph. There are at work every day in our midst influences and associations which heathenism is as unable to produce, as it is to produce an Alfred, a Wilberforce, or a Washington. If you reckon up all the thousand agencies which work for your good and render life tolerable, you will find them all to have some connexion, direct or remote, with the fact that those who came to these shores brought Christianity with them, or to go farther back, with the fact that missionaries found our fathers in their rudeness and wildness, and taught them. All along our daily path there are trees with their fruit, and flowers with their perfume, which in our thoughtlessness we often reckon to be the wild, spontaneous, productions of the soil. They are spontaneous, but only in a soil over which these pure waters have rolled. The common saying is true: The great argument for Christianity is Christendom. Robert Hall in his sermon on infidelity, charges it with disordering and deranging the present world, not less certainly than it darkens the future. Every argument which he urges against infidelity, is one for Christianity, for what the one destroys the other builds up. Christianity cannot *enter* or *leave* a nation an unnoticed or unattended guest. Its presence or its absence will be felt. Unhappily we are not left to speculation here. This calamity, whether you call it a light or heavy one, has actually befallen nations. When we learn from sacred or ecclesiastical history, that in any country the fires on its altars became darkness, we can learn a lesson if we will turn even to profane history, and ask how long national prosperity and stability lingered behind Christianity, when like an offended vestal, she fled from the polluted land.—France is a very common place illustration here, only because it is a very appropriate one. They are surely wrong who look upon the French revolution with blank amazement, as if it fell causeless on the land of the Gaul. It was no lawless, wandering whirlwind which swept over our earth once, never to visit it again. A whole nation grew impatient of all restraint, human and divine, and longed to be given up to themselves. And the foolish and insane

wish was gratified. In the words of one who lived in those times,

France in wrath her giant limbs upreared,
And with that oath, which smote air, earth and sea,
Stamped her strong foot, and said she would be free.

And France was free, free to write over her populous cemeteries **DEATH IS AN ETERNAL SLEEP**, free to resolve **THERE IS NO GOD**, free to write in blood a page of history which he who reads will never forget, and which we trust no nation will ever disregard. For wherever our race, with our nature is found, there is material for a French revolution.

We have not undertaken to trace all the ways in which a pure religion gives prosperity and quiet to a nation, but we must notice two doctrines of Christianity admirably adapted to produce this end. The first is the Christian doctrine, as to the equality of the human race. You are aware to what expedients other systems of faith and policy have been driven here. Some have pandered to the pride of the high and lofty, by proclaiming an essential difference, not only in rank and fortune, but in nature and destiny, between them and the common herd below. Others have excited and flattered those below, proclaiming an entire and absolute equality, not only in nature, but in station, in possession, and in labor. Neither of these is safe for society, simply because neither is true. Christianity keeps at an infinite distance from each of these extremes without at all approaching the other. It suggests to the rich no haughty or self-complacent comparison, it warrants in the poor no envious or revengeful feelings. It has a warning for the rich, and a blessing for the poor. It lets the rich and poor meet together, not to abolish these distinctions, not to proclaim a carnival, but authoritatively to remind those of both conditions, that one is the maker of them all. In a word it preaches moral equality, and this, it has been well said, is the only equality which can be preached, without convulsing society.—The other doctrine is the estimate Christianity places on property. It frowns as promptly as a philosopher of the Benjamin Franklin school would on the idle and careless, and has a warning for him who thinks his life consists in his treasures. Those who toil to lay up perishing treas-

ures, neglecting all higher claims and duties, have surely not profited by its teachings, and just as surely those who would remove every land mark, abolish all distinction or right of property, and let *all* rove promiscuously *everywhere*, have no warrant, on its pure page, for their scheme of reformation. Another thing in connection with the Christian teaching as to property, is worth attention. It is known that while what we have stated is true, other things being equal, that nation will be the most prosperous, quiet and stable, which has the most equal distribution of wealth, or rather which has fewest citizens laboring under distressing poverty and want. For a nation to have a large proportion of needy, and really suffering, citizens is to be in a perilous condition. This is one of the many perplexing features in connexion with poor Ireland, there are so many with whom the standard of comfort is lowered almost below the point where life can be sustained.— Now the tendency of Christianity is to check and prevent this unnatural state of society. Religion teaches the poor man to pray daily for his daily bread, and then, rising from his knees, to earn it by the sweat of his brow. And it is very easy to suppose a state of things in which, without referring of course to providential dispensations, poverty in any distressing sense of the term would be rare. We alluded to Ireland. How cumbrous and burdensome her apparatus of poor laws and poor rates, how comparatively simple those of Scotland. In our own country, though many things have concurred to retard these tendencies, yet in some parts, even now, this very question is one whose discussion cannot be postponed much longer. In some parts those destitute of homes and settled occupation and support, are beginning to exhibit in a manner too marked to be treated with contempt, that restlessness and insubordination, so ominous and terrible to every patriot and philanthropist. There is a remedy for this evil and every other like it which threatens the peace or purity of society.

We might exhibit the manner in which Christianity combines and harmonizes the love of self and family and kindred with the broader and wider love of country and race, but we pass to notice the effect it has on society by effecting the family and the individual. It has pleased the author of our existence not to crowd men into society

in "undistinguishable heaps," nor yet to plant them solitary and apart, but to arrange them in clusters called families; and cold philosophers and moralists even, have admired the wisdom of the arrangement. The effort has been made to abolish it; some are making it now, but every such attempt will end in failure or disastrous success.—Every well ordered home is an addition to the wealth and strength of the State. Every man surrounded by such has given the government which protects him a pledge, that he will not interrupt its peace. And how entirely does Christianity provide for this all important element of individual, social, or national happiness. What sanctions does it throw round all its members and relations. It guides the parents in the great work of governing their little empire aright. It speaks to children in tones so gentle, that children can understand, and says, Obey your parents. It stands by the servant at his commonest task, and whispers cheerfully and hopefully, Be obedient to your masters, and thus it strengthens and furnishes the entire family.—And is a family entirely under such instruction, or only having the religious element, the dominant one, nothing to the community or State? The picture of a pious family has often been drawn. One has scarcely ventured too far when he said,

Angels might stoop from thrones in heaven to be
Cowshippers in such a family.

Pleasant as it would be to enter and view it from within, we invite you now to view it from without as a part of the society or nation. When Burns drew his well known picture of a pious household and exclaimed,

From scenes like these, old Scotia's grandeur springs,
That makes her lov'd at home, rever'd abroad,

He was not wandering from his subject, but spoke the words of truth not less than poetry. The Christian homes of Scotland, scattered round her lakes and over her glens, have, in great part, made her whatever she has been in history, or whatever she is to-day. May they be increased an hundred fold, not only in the land of Rutherford and Chalmers, but also in that land in which are all our homes. For happy, even in the sense in which a politician might use that word; happy in every sense is the

nation that is full of them. They are schools of Heaven's own appointment, to prepare men for the duties and the discipline of life. They are nurseries of all those virtues which are rather "felt than seen," of gentle sympathies, pure and strong affections, all the graces and charities of life, and all that is lovely and valuable in human character. Now these places are peculiarly the product and effect of Christianity.

We borrowed many words from the ancients, but neither Rome nor Greece had either the reality or the name of a home. That touching word, together with all that it implies and suggests, we borrowed from our own Christianized Saxon tongue and history. In multiplying such places, Christianity affords valuable assistance to society.

Let us glance for a moment at its effects on the individual. Man is by nature bound to his Maker by one great central tie, and growing out of and dependant on that, are innumerable others running in all directions, and binding him to all the family of man. Sin has snapped that parent cord, and in so doing necessarily disordered the network of all the rest. Religion re-unites it. Does it do this and leave the rest in their deranged condition? This cannot be. It corrects and strengthens them all down to the most attenuated thread. It is true, in one sense, that there is no system of faith which so insulates a man as the Christian faith. It makes him feel as no other does, how individual and personal a matter moral character is in all its nature and issues. It makes him feel that the highest good of which his nature is susceptible, must be won or lost by him alone, not as one of a numerous race, but as an entire solitary being. It cuts in a moment all those tendrils which man, in his blindness and weakness, is ever throwing forth to seize on something which may be as a standard and support to him, and plants him, self-poised, on his own allegiance to his Maker. But will not this unfit him for society? However necessary a life of piety may be to perfect his own nature, will it not deprive his fellowmen of his service and example? Will not the man whose mind has been seized by the grand realities which Christianity discloses, set out on his unconscious and abstracted march to meet the future, neglecting all the present? Will he not be deaf to the calls of earthly relation-

ships, and trample upon all their claims and duties, as a man running in haste for his life would be deaf to the song of birds, and trample on toys and flowers? So it would seem. But strange as it may appear, the best way to make a man realize and accomplish the present, is to fill his mind with the future. The surest way to make a man watchful and attentive to the little objects clustering around his feet, is to fix his eye on some commanding object in the distant horizon.

The world has never had better servants or friends than those very men who would not accept it for their portion, but to it only the inferior passions of

Their hearts, their lives, their griefs were given,
While all their serious thoughts had rest in heaven.

This earth, the temporary homestead of our race, has received its best and most valuable improvements from those who looked upon themselves but as tenants for a day.

It will be said by some that however necessary a life of piety may be to secure a life of peace to the individual himself, it is going too far to represent it as a matter of any importance to society, whether this or that one of its members has that "abstraction" which theologians call "faith." We may simply ask if it has not been noticed that where this abstraction exists it is always accompanied in greater or less degrees by virtue, and knowledge, and temperance, and patience, and godliness, and brotherly kindness, and charity? Are these abstractions? Or, are they virtues and graces intimately connected with the peace and purity and progress of society? Cannot those even who despise or overlook the root, prize and admire fruits like these? Let a man be brought decidedly under religious influence, and all who come in contact with him, from the magistrate who rules him to the beggar who asks his charity on the highway, will feel the benefit.—And here perhaps, though not attempting anything like a formal analysis, we have reached the first spring on which Christianity lays its hand to correct and adjust the complex structure of society. It is by purifying and strengthening individuals. There is no other way to reform society. He who attempts to do so in any other way, is as one who attempts to purify a stagnant pool by simply

standing on its bank and waving over it the rod of the wizard, or repeating over it some form of enchantment.—Christianity reforms society as one who would pour into that lake some cleansing liquid, every drop of which shall become the centre of a healing influence, widening and expanding until the whole water shall reflect as a mirror, the beauties of the sky.

We add but one more influence which individual purity has on national prosperity. Cowper, after drawing his inimitable picture of a good man in retirement, says of the country which overlooks or perhaps despises him,

Perhaps she owes
Her sunshine and her rain, her blooming spring
And plenteous harvest, to the prayer he makes,
When, Isaac-like, the solitary saint
Walks forth to meditate at eventide,
And think on her who thinks not for herself.

We do not feel that we have intruded into theology in offering this as one way in which a man becomes a blessing to his country and race. It was drawn from history and experience. In multiplying good men then in any nation, Christianity multiplies the probabilities that that nation will be blessed with prosperity.

To see a false or corrupt religion, superior in power or fortune, does not depress or discourage a believer in the true. He remembers that the triumphs and achievements of his faith lie in quite another direction. Nor would it discourage him even if he saw another religion better able than his to confer happiness or prosperity on a society, or country, or the world. To any boast drawn from this circumstance he might with propriety reply: This is better fitted to bless the earth, mine prepares for heaven, and therefore must rank as far above all others as eternity is superior to time. A confession like this would certainly involve no mortifying sense of inferiority. And yet even this triumph, poor and unsatisfying as it would certainly be, is denied to error in all its forms. Truth surpasses them all, at their own weapons, on their chosen field of effort and display. Christianity does more for this world while passing through it to a better and more enduring one, than error can though it wastes not an effort or an aspiration beyond, but husbands all its strength to use it here. This position the friends of a divine religion will

be forced to abandon, when an instance occurs where an individual, a Church, a community, a nation, or a world has trusted in the Creator, and been left desolate. Let one such instance be shown, and great as are the interests involved in the controversy between truth and falsehood, we consent to resign them all.

The effect of the Bible, considered as one of the influences or agencies of Christianity, opens a wide and almost boundless field. Said Wm. Wirt, "Were I ruler of an empire, I would place a copy of the Spectator in every house, and have one in every family taught to read it."—The conception did honor to his patriotism and taste, and its execution would certainly be a nobler scheme than any of those which often engage the minds of kings. Now the Bible viewed only as Wirt viewed the Spectator, has done much. Forget its divinity. Remember it only as an English classic, a book to arrest attention, a book of good advice, and you can scarcely place too high an estimate on the service it renders to society. "I have seen," complained a patriot of the revolution, "so many books called American Histories, that I am beginning to doubt whether there is such a thing as history outside of the Bible." There *is* authentic history *there*. There is history of all grades, the history of a single human heart like yours or mine; of a family, a tribe, of a rebellious and perverse nation, of a sinful world. Nowhere does plain practical philosophy teach by more instructive examples. Remember too its maxims of worldly wisdom, its teachings of hope, of industry, of patience, and of love. He who adopts it as his text book, besides many truths which the world cannot understand, and therefore does not relish, will find many that it does and has tried to imitate. Take as illustrations the following, and a thousand others of like spirit and application could be found in that book which contains *the whole duty of man*. *Be diligent in business. Weep with them that weep. See that none render evil for evil.* Is it a matter of no importance to society that its members read and obey precepts like these? We now put out of view the connexion between the duties inculcated by these maxims and the happiness of him who obeys them as an individual, and view him as "one in a full procession," jostling and being jostled at every

step in the crowded thoroughfare of life, and notice how they fit a man to act his part towards others.

We suppose one of the effects we are trying to indicate, was expressed with characteristic force by the excellent John Newton, when he said, "If a Christian is only a boot black, he ought to be the best in the parish." Religion not only inculcates those habits of promptness, fidelity and accuracy, from which success is not often withheld, but holds before us exalted models of excellence, and furnishes at once rules and arms by which to work up to them. It is the one unchanging direction given by all who write rules for self-improvement, especially to the young, to raise high, extravagantly high even, their aims and aspirations. Bulwer speaking even of so worthless a motive as the desire of fame says,

Whoever, with an earnest soul,
Strives to some end—from this low world afar,
Still upward travels—though he miss his goal
And strays—but, towards a star.

Now who of any stature of intellect or excellence, of any pursuit or aim in life, will be compelled to lay aside *these* standards as things he has overreached and passed:

The effects of the Bible on literature and language open a subject which, though very closely connected with our main theme, we cannot even enter. We dismiss this whole train of thought with one remark as to its effect on language. Why is it that our language which, up to the seventeenth century, was very fickle and unsettled, has since that time been remarkably stable and unchanging? Why can an intelligent boy read our Bible with less help, than an intelligent man will require to read Shakspeare for the first time, though our translation was made during Shakspeare's life? Our language has been *fixed* by that translation. It must receive additions, it may be swayed hither and thither, but the moorings of our English tongue are in our English Bible, and it will never break away. As in our nature, so in our language, the religious part is the immortal part. The words in which we express the wants and wishes, the hopes and fears, of our undying nature, the words which are indissolubly linked with our earliest associations of sacredness and solemnity, the words which conscience quotes to us, the words which,

when woven into pious songs, mothers use when they soothe their infants with their sweet and sacred lullaby, the words which are heard in the chambers of suffering and pain and death, the words in which we breathe our hopes and benedictions over the graves where we have deposited our dead, these must be the fixed and stable words of a language. Take as a simple illustration, those few lines which parents teach their children, and not unfrequently children have taught their parents, and they suit equally well the wants and understanding of both—the Lord's Prayer. Can any one word in that perfect form of words, ever become a stranger to English ears, and tongues, or exiled from English nurseries or homes? We draw the inference, then, (to be recalled immediately,) that the publication of a book like the Bible, in any language, is an era in its literature and history.

We have hurriedly noticed a few of the points at which Christianity touches the welfare of a nation. Now all the effects we have described, it produces in some degree in every land where it has ever been carried. It gives to the savage a fixed and settled government—a gift he surely needs and cannot get from all his gods. It opens a thousand springs, from which influences, rich even in temporal and worldly good, flow over all the land. It turns the hut, or tent, or camp, into a home, and pours around it all those softening and humanizing influences which will change the savage into a father, a husband, a son, a friend, a man, and open up to him all the privileges and prerogatives which are his birthright as a man. Instances could be given to show that these effects can be produced. No one, perhaps, will serve our purpose better than the mission of John Eliot among the Indians of Massachusetts. We must, before entering into it, make one remark. We cannot appreciate any attempt to improve the character of the Indian without divesting ourselves of a very common prejudice. Poets and orators have thrown such a charm around the red man, we scarcely think of him as a moral being. Many fancy themselves warm admirers of the Indian character, follow him with interest as he walks, and make speeches, and fights, and dies, in Cooper's novels, who would be shocked to think of him as a depraved being. They glow with poetic rapture as they watch him

walking majestic over his native hills, the monarch of the woods, and sink tacitly into the dream, that he is passing through life to some wide hunting ground of the west, where he and his dog alike will roam forever. We have no objection to such views in poetry or novels, but he must utterly reject them who is inquiring into their true condition and the manner of improving it.

We had intended to give some particular account of Eliot's mission, but finding it would lead to an improper trespass on your time, we must merely allude to its results as illustrating several points on which we have touched. His long and useful life extended through nearly all the seventeenth century. He was for many years the beloved and useful pastor of a church at Roxbury, from which point he would frequently go out on tours of discovery among the Indians. His friend and biographer, Dr. Mather, speaking of these natives, says, "though we know not where they came from, yet we may guess that probably the devil decoyed these miserable savages here, in hopes the Gospel would never come here to destroy or disturb his absolute empire over them." We may learn from this they were not, at least, the faultless beings which many now imagine them to be. He gradually succeeded in forming them into a community; he introduced among them many of the regulations and institutions of Moses. He taught them the mechanic arts; he laboured among them at their little farms. The Governor of the colony heard strange rumors of a change in a certain tribe, and came a long journey to see if they were true, and spoke of his visit there as the happiest period of his life. The mother country heard the wonderful news, and Robert Boyle and Cromwell sought the correspondence and friendship of the Apostle of the Indians. The Parliament passed an act for the propagation of the Gospel in New England, the preamble of which is as follows :

"Whereas the Commons of England, assembled in Parliament, have received certain intelligence that divers of the heathen nations, through the care of those who preach to them in their own language, from barbarous have become civil, have forsook their charms and sorceries, and given testimony of the power of God, that they teach their children what they are instructed themselves; we rejoice for their sakes."

This is indeed one of the few bright pages which are in the history of the Aborigines of our country, who once roved over this great continent, countless as the trees, and are now wasting away like leaves in autumn. Imagine the missionary standing in a group of savages, and arresting their attention by the wonderful truths he taught. We give a few of the questions he was often asked by the Indians, in his conversational meetings with them. What is a spirit? Can the soul be enclosed in iron, so that it cannot escape? When Christ arose, whence came his soul? Shall I know you in heaven? When such die as never heard of Christ where do they go? Why does not God give all men good hearts? Since God is all-powerful, why does he not kill the evil one, who makes men so bad? How shall I find happiness? When you see such strange and unusual working in the benighted mind, can you wonder that books, and schools, and aids to instruction, follow close behind the missionary?

We have hitherto only viewed that part of our subject which is identical with the incidental benefit of Christianity, conferred on the nations themselves. In addition to these, the missionary enterprise has conferred benefits on Christendom and the world at large. One very obvious one is the addition it has made to our literature. If the oft-quoted line be true, *A Christian is the highest style of man*, it would seem to follow that Christian biography is the highest style of biography, and Christian man the highest subject of study. The chief benefits of this species of writing are, that it holds before us exalted models and lifts our thoughts above the level of their common channel. It is the best compensation for the disadvantage under which we labor of not being able to associate personally with the wise and good of every age and nation. Every moment of contact between ourselves and a purer and stronger mind, whether in personal intercourse or on the page of their written lives, is a salient point in our own history, at which the probabilities increase, that we will strike a higher track of thought and action. Says Niebhur, writing to a young man, "Turn to those works which elevate the heart, in which you see great men and great events, and live in a higher world. Turn away from those which represent the mean and contemptible side of

ordinary relations and degenerate ages." Such works you may find in the records of missionary life. Has it happened to many books to receive higher eulogies than the following, paid to the life of Eliot, before referred to? To a later edition is appended a letter from Richard Baxter, written shortly before his death to the author, then on a visit in London. It commences thus:

"Dear Brother: Last night, I thought I had been dying at twelve o'clock in bed; but your book revived me. I lay reading it until between one and two. There was no man on earth I valued more than Eliot. I am now dying, I hope, as he did."

The letter concludes in these touching words: "Pray for your languishing, fainting friend. Richard Baxter." Think of a book which could revive and quicken the faith of Richard Baxter, when on the verge of the saint's everlasting rest. In missionary literature, there are lives of men of all kinds of excellence, from the plain, strong, indomitable character of Carey, to Heber, the chaste and polished scholar, who gave to the missionary cause two gifts, either of which would have immortalized him; first he gave the missionary Hymn, and then he gave himself.

The records of the past achievements of our race are valuable, because they vindicate our nature, and show what it can accomplish under the impulse of some noble purpose or generous enthusiasm. Would it not be strange if the highest purpose, the noblest enthusiasm, should have no triumphs to record? The record of Christian heroism is not a dull, monotonous story, "barren of every glorious theme." It, too, can show its Leonidas and Tell, its Thermopylæ and Marathon. Why, then, is it not more read by those who can appreciate sublimity of purpose and achievement? When seeking an answer to this question, we have been struck with an incident which is familiar to you all. Seven years ago, a bold English sailor, who before had gathered laurels in that dangerous service, started out to find his way round our northern coast, from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean. For centuries the world has had this enterprize in view, and another attempt to perform what many men have failed to do, of course excited attention and remark. Year after year passed on. The date fixed on as the longest possible period of his absence approached and passed. The public mind of his own coun-

try and the world, expressed the usual commonplace regrets and wishes, and without turning particular attention to it, were on the point of coldly and formally assigning him a place on the list of "martyrs to science." There was one, however, who felt in him more than a public interest, and sitting in her desolate home, she determined he should not thus be forgotten. She spoke of his case, and being favored with fortune and rank, she was heard with interest and attention. She knelt at the foot of the throne, and a woman's heart, though clad in royalty, beat responsive to her sister's voice. She moved the sympathies of her queen. She stood in the audience chamber of Parliament, and politicians hushed for an hour their angry debates to listen to her appeal. In a word, she roused England, and England roused the world. Many of his countrymen were led, by admiration of his bravery and enterprise, to imitate, if indeed not to equal it. And even from our own shore, more than one gallant crew has shared the danger and the glory of the hunt. Men have been so interested in the fortunes and the fate of him whom they never saw, and would not have known had they met him in the waters of the torrid or the frigid seas, that they have braved all the terrors of an Arctic ocean and sky, they have travelled over many a mile of snow, and left the impress of their feet on many an iceberg,

Whose head in wintry grandeur towers,
And whitens with eternal sleet.

Imagine, if you can, that some one of those who still are unwilling to resign the almost hopeless search, more fortunate than the rest, is successful. Swifter than the light of day travels over our continent, would the tidings sweep over it; a thousand miles of wire would vibrate with the joyful message, and there is not a country in Christendom, there is not a town, there is not a family, into which the newspaper has found its way, where the news would not be caught up with something of the warmth of a personal interest, **SIR JOHN FRANKLIN HAS BEEN FOUND ALIVE.** Nay, if some one could but find his lifeless form, England would send out her choicest escort to bring it home, and lay it in Westminster, there to mingle with royal dust. Now we have alluded to this instance thus particularly not at all for the purpose of saying that all this sympathy

or interest excited in Sir John Franklin's case, is misplaced or uncalled for. It is intended only as a proof that the world is not slow to appreciate and reward boldness or enterprise when directed to certain ends. And yet many who kindle into rapture on meaner themes, are cold on all the enterprizes which Christian charity plans or Christian courage executes. Is it a significant fact here, that you may read all our poets of the first rank, (Cowper and Montgomery alone excepted,) and find no eulogy on missions and missionaries? It is still true, however, that these records vindicate our *Christian* nature. Blot out all memory of the attempts made to spread Christianity among the ignorant portions of our race, and apart from all the spiritual influence likely to result from them, that history which records the achievements of the human mind and heart will want its richest and most redeeming page.

The annual reports of missionaries, their correspondence with religious journals at home, their sketches of men and customs and society, all add to our knowledge of distant countries. There are several countries (Greenland, China, India, for examples,) which cannot be described or understood without consulting these sources. They have given valuable assistance to Philology. Take, as an example, the translation of the Bible into the Indian language, the first Bible printed in the new world. Doctor Mather, when entering on this part of his friend's life, thinks it not beneath the dignity of his subject to inform his readers that the anagram of the word Eliot is "*toile*." He diverts the reader after the manner of his age, with some of his quaint humor. He writes a word of thirty-three letters, and tells the reader to count the letters and he will reward him for his pains by telling him they simply mean "our lusts." Another word of thirty letters means "our love," and another of forty letters means "questions," and finally he gives it as his opinion that "the words of this barbarous tongue seem as if they had been growing since Babel to attain their present dimension." Now, should not the publication of a book like the Bible, in a tongue like this, be an object of interest to the student and the philologist? Remember, then, the thousand books translated by missionaries and you can form an estimate of this department of their labors. Hale, the philologist of the United States

exploring expedition, often refers to and quotes missionary records. Among the books now in course of publication by the Smithsonian Institution, is a grammar of an Indian tongue, by an American missionary. Is it not a fact of interest that missionaries have given languages to those who had none? They have gone among tribes who had but a scanty vocabulary, have added to it, and fixed it into a language on the page of the Bible, or Saint's Rest, or Bunyan's Dream. And in many cases they have not only imparted ideas, but words, in which to clothe them, or (to appropriate the figure of another) "had to construct the vessels into which to pour their sacred wine." In this department, they have rendered science a service which she will hereafter acknowledge, when she finds material accumulated to her hand. Missionaries have made important contributions to our knowledge of Geography. A few facts, which might be easily multiplied, will illustrate this. It is known to you, that since the days of Ptolemy, to find the sources of the Nile has been a problem. Alexander and Cæsar even had their attention drawn to it, and since their day a mysterious interest has hung around the springs of that noble river that rolls by the pyramids. Indeed, the ancients immortalized their sense of the importance of this problem, and their failures to solve it by the proverb, *to seek the sources of the Nile*, which signified any desperate or hopeless undertaking. Just now there is additional interest given to it, from the fact that some German missionaries in Eastern Africa have gained information which may lead to the solution of this problem, which the vulture eye of discovery has failed to find. In looking over twelve volumes of the Transactions of the Royal Geographical Society of London, I found not more than two or three which had not papers from missionaries, and not one, I believe, in which there was not allusion to them as assistants. Auxiliary to this society was one at Bombay, of which missionaries were efficient members. A National Geographical and Statistical Society has just been formed in our country, with Bancroft at its head. In their published circular they mention prominently among the sources from which they expect assistance, the seven hundred missionaries who speak our language.

And why should not two thousand missionaries, scatter-

ed all around our globe, add to the amount of our knowledge? They are, in most cases, if not men of vast acquirements, at least men of education, in the best sense of the term; men trained to thought, and thrown into scenes every way calculated to provoke reflection and observation. The missionary often lives and labors in a land over which history or fiction has thrown its charms, or over which with

Lavish kindness,
The gifts of God are strown.

And will not his works be "sought out of all them who take pleasure therein?" The missionary is summoned, it may be every morning, to his labors from sleep, by the song of birds, which would fall like sweetest music on the ears of a naturalist. He cannot walk a mile on an errand of mercy without trampling on some herb or flower which the naturalist would leap to behold. He is met every hour by human beings, with souls and bodies claiming mysterious relationship to his own, which the student of man would be proud to catechise and examine. He lives under customs, institutions, and forms of society, which would afford subjects for curious or profitable inquiry to the philosopher, the moralist, and the statesman. In a word, he is, by virtue of his office, a member of a Grand Exploring Exhibition, the object of whose search is nature in all her works, man in all conditions of glory and shame, society in all its forms and interests, the world of matter, the world of mind, the world of souls.

"I hope," says Dr. Arnold, writing to a friend a missionary in Australia, "you will journalize largely. Every tree, plant, stone, and living thing, is strange to us in Europe, and capable of affording an interest."

It might be shown that missionaries have done good to the bodies of men, by introducing new remedies and new comforts for the sick. We will not dwell upon the good they have done by elevating the condition of one half of every society which they enter, "the sex whose presence civilizes ours," not because we think it a small achievement, or a trifling contribution to the sum of human happiness, but it has been so often illustrated, we need only suggest it to your minds.

There is another view which may be taken of this sub-

ject. There is in every virtuous, intelligent community, a standard called public opinion, from which it is not expected there will be frequent or great variations. An act of injustice or cruelty thrills through the whole community. We think it is in a great degree owing to the advances and encroachments of Christianity, that there exists now, more clearly defined than ever before, a rude outline of a great public opinion through the civilized world. An act of cruelty or injustice on a large scale, sends a sensation feeble but perceptible, a ripple, perhaps, rather than a wave, which runs around the wide and expanding area of Christendom. If it is said that this feeling is certainly capricious and weak as yet, we answer it never was stronger than now. If it is said that the missionary enterprise, instead of being the *cause* of this, is only its *effect*, or is only this feeling taking a Christian direction, we might accept the explanation (though not convinced of its truth) and claim that it has at least reacted powerfully on its cause, increased the feeling which gave it birth, and drawn nigher than ever before the bonds between man and man. And in no other way than by the spread of Christianity can any meaning be given to some very common expressions—human family, family of nations, and others like them. There is no other system of morals, or philosophy, which can so extensively prevail as to cause a universal or even very general agreement in opinion or practice. All others are local and sectional. There is a striking passage in Pascal's thoughts, where he complains of this uncertainty in the standard of justice and truth.

"There is scarcely anything just or unjust which does not change its nature on changing its climate. Three degrees of elevation in the pole overturn all jurisprudence. The meridian determines a truth. Fundamental laws vary. Fine justice this, which is bounded by a river or a mountain. Truth on one side of the Pyrenees is falsehood on the other."

Now, the spread of Christianity is not only the best but the only corrective of this we know of. It is curious and interesting to the philosopher and moralist, to see how missionary labor is gradually bringing one nation after another abreast with others, and extending the line along which runs and thrills the cord of union. Missionaries have added to the area of civilization, by gaining foothold in savage

countries, and thus not only improved their internal condition, but have given them an importance in the eyes of other nations which they never possessed before. They have thus laid the foundation of their history. A great historian says there are some nations, and very populous ones too, in whose changes and successions of government, and wars, we have no more interest than in the "quarrels of a rookery or the revolutions of a beehive." Into just such societies missionaries have gone, and quietly deposited an element which turns their tedious and barren records into history. Take, as an illustration of this, the effect of our language, the prevailing one in the field of missionary enterprise. See how it carries with it in some degree the religious savor with which it is imbued. The English language, which, in the words of another, "was baptized in its infancy and not converted in its old age, like those of Greece and Rome," has never yet entered a nation without carrying a Christian element into its literature, bringing it within the circle of those ties which bind enlightened man to his fellows, giving it the freedom of the choicest company in the world and establishing some communion of mind and heart between it and the best nations of the globe. How full of interest in this view is the fact that from different nations, from remote islands of the sea, have come in contributions to swell the amount which Christendom devotes to charitable and religious purposes. China lately sent a contribution to California. You cannot now travel many degrees of the earth's surface without seeing something to remind you that the dominion of evil is nowhere entirely unbroken or unquestioned; it may be only a missionary hut, a solitary Bible, a single pious tract, making glad its little spot with light, like a glow worm in a wide and darkened plain,

Old ocean, with its isles awakes,
Cold Greenland feels unwelcome flame;
And humble Afric', wondering, takes
On her sad lip a Saviour's name.

We add a few thoughts, which, though not connected with each other, have perhaps some common relation to our subject. A good illustration of the spirit of the age is found in an incident connected with our north-western territory beyond the mountains. Very early when English

and American statesmen were warmly pressing their respective claims to Oregon, Christian missionaries very promptly decided that there was no uncertainty about *their* master's claim; and it is an historical fact, that before there was an organized government for his protection, the missionary had reared his humble dwelling and consecrated it with prayer. We have loved to think of this, not only as a striking characteristic of our age, but also as an omen of good to our sister State, that when England and America were eager for it, Christianity, without prejudicing or forestalling the rights of either, claimed it as her own; when the Lion and the Eagle were exchanging angry glances across its threshold, the Dove flew in between, bearing not the olive branch of peace alone, but, better still, a branch from the tree of life.

Prof. Guyot, in his excellent work on Physical Geography, mentions it as a striking instance of providential adaptation, that the range of mountains which runs down our western shore, did not run along our eastern coast, the coast which looks towards Europe, as the effect would most probably have been to delay, for centuries perhaps, the settlement of this continent. But is not a recent page in our history equally marked by a wise arrangement? When the westward wave of population had just reached the base of that great natural wall, and we began, accustomed though we certainly were to rapid progress and change, to think it would surely pause there and take time to rise to the level of that barrier and flow over its summit, almost at that precise moment a cry was heard in the valley beyond, which set in motion some of the swiftest and strongest impulses of our nature, and immediately, as in a dream, that vast wilderness became a nation. And we now stand at that critical, that almost thrilling moment of our history, when our free institutions look upon two oceans, and a zone over the whole continent is ours; ours not surely for purposes of holiday display or thoughtless declamation, but ours for a marked effect, not only on our times, but on all time. It will be happy for us as a people if one effect of our missionary enterprise shall be to make us prize, more than ever before, the influences and institutions of that pure faith which, even in an earthly sense, is for the healing of the nations. We would then harbor no

fear that any weapon formed against us would prosper. We would as little fear that any, or that all, of the restless or violent nations of the earth would make a successful onset against us, as that the "brute creation would rise in rebellion against mankind, and try the force of horns and hoofs against reason and the laws of God's creation." And who, seeing the almost endless resources of our nation, who seeing the strong throbbings of its youthful heart, its whole frame quivering with eagerness and excitement, can repress the involuntary wish, Let not all this power be wasted on the earth; give the better portion of it a higher, a sacred direction. In the great Olympian struggle of the nations, enter a Christian athlete and run for a noble prize. Surely it should be ours, together with our English brethren, who, with the same origin, the same language, and the same faith, are one with us for all great purposes, to take the front in the long line of nations, and allure them on to the conquest of a high and glorious destiny; to practice ourselves and recite to others, the songs of Christian brotherhood and love,

Until nation after nation taught the strain,
Earth rolls the rapturous Hosannah round.

Perhaps no one ever spent a serious hour with the subject of missions on his mind, without comparing what has been done with what still remains to be done. And here we are often conscious of a painful reaction in our bosoms. When listening to the reports of some good men who "rapt into future times," speak of the triumph as if all accomplished, we expect almost immediately to hear the shout which will herald in the world's conversion. But when we are met, as we soon will be, by the awful fact that measured by their highest purposes and objects, missions have as yet but gathered a leaf here and there from a stately tree, or rather from a forest of such trees; when we remember that wisdom's ways are yet but thinly travelled in heathen or even in Christian lands, we feel as if an imposition had been practised upon our feelings and our judgments. Just at this point the strong mind of John Foster gave way, and he fell into doubts which it would have been well for his own peace if he had banished, and well for the cause he surely loved if he had never divulged. This is a memorable though not solitary case, and

may teach us, among other lessons, this most important one. In that book which "explains all mysteries except its own," there are limits which not even a Foster can venture over with impunity, which the boldest must respect, or receive as their lightest punishment a bewildered imagination.

A writer describing a simple race of men, says they looked upon life and its duties as a battlefield,

Whose great plan and scope
They little cared to know,
Content, like men at arms, to cope
Each with his fronting foe.

This will perhaps express the spirit with which the Church should struggle with each "fronting foe" of evil, without waiting to trace what effect each single effort will have on the grand result. We must not wait with the precious seed in our hand to ask, before we scatter them, the omniscient and omnipotent one, how many of them he will bring to fruit, or how many and which particular ones he will allow the cold, earthly soil to kill.

It is a point now exercising the minds of many, whether a period of great light and enlargement may not be near at hand to the Church. When, and how, shall the end of this great struggle be? On this question, which has such attraction to many in our day, I have not a word to say. Having suggested to your minds many familiar thoughts, I wish to close with one more familiar still, and leave your thoughts revolving around a more absorbing question, or subject rather, for it is not a question. *What shall the end be?* Not only is it possible to speak with confidence here, but it is irreverence, it is blasphemy, to speak of it in any other tone than confidence and certainty. Darkness which no eye but one can pierce, rests on that great contest between good and evil, of which our world is at once the subject and the theatre. But the end, whether to come a century or a thousand centuries hence, the end is radiant with the light poured on it by the sure word of prophecy. This contest, tedious and protracted as it may seem to be, has all along been hastening, is hastening still, to an appointed end. The world has a Moral Governor, and he "sits on no precarious throne." He may come in haste to close this great controversy, or may wait until a profane

and infidel world shall assail the Church in days to come as it has in days that are gone, with the taunting question, Where is the promise of His approach? But whether the end come speedily or tarry, of one thing let the Church and the world rest assured, it will not come too late, too late for the relief and rescue of those who, in His name, are struggling against His enemies and theirs; too late for the integrity of that empire which spreads through all space and extends through all eternity, or too late for the full and triumphant vindication of all the "ways of God to man." The temple of evil has been permitted to stand for nearly six thousand years on the domain of the Lord of Life. There have never been wanting a few faithful followers to hurl an imprecation at it in his name. But after spending all their fury on it, leaving it apparently unharmed, they have fallen, generation after generation, and perished at its base, And to-night it throws its dark shadow over far more than half the human race. But that temple, gigantic as it is in all its proportions, venerable as it is with age, crowded as it is with worshippers, is built with perishable material, and must fall. The weakest believer will yet stand, entire, on its ruins and lift up his exulting voice to sing, **HE HATH DONE ALL THINGS WELL.**

Young Gentlemen, you hope to dedicate your lives to the service of Christianity; not because it produces the perishable effects we have noticed, but because it is a revelation of that name which is above every name. It would perhaps be needless for any one, it would certainly be inappropriate for me, to remind you that the positions you are soon to occupy are higher than any of the eminences of the earth. Let me rather breathe an earnest wish, that He who has called you to this great work, may fully prepare you *for* it, and abundantly prosper you *in* it. May you find His strength to be sufficient for you, even when you come to stand in that

Awful post,
In which the best and worthiest tremble most:

ARTICLE VI.

NECROLOGY.

Under this title we propose to give to our readers the biographies of some of those men whose pious labours have laid the foundations of the Church in our Southern Zion. We commence with the following Memoir of

THE REV. JAMES WHITE STEPHENSON, D. D.

Of the many distinguished men whom a wise and beneficent Providence granted as a rich boon to our country, during the last century, none, doubtless, rank higher in the sphere of usefulness than the Ministers of the Gospel. The names of Davies, Whitefield, the Tennents, Blair, Smith, Edwards, Witherspoon, and many others, will be handed down to posterity as worthy contemporaries, in advancing the cause of religious liberty, of Hancock, Adams, Franklin, and Washington. In natural, intellectual might, ardent piety, and fervent zeal for the upbuilding of Zion, even admitting their inferiority in extensive erudition, they were not a whit behind their illustrious Puritan predecessors of the preceding century. Though they gave not to the world the learned and ponderous folios of Owen and Baxter, they did that which was not less important to the great cause of evangelical Christianity. In physical energy, self-denying exertion, and eminent godliness, they have been excelled by none perhaps since the days of the Apostles. And their labors were not in vain, either for the Church or the State. It is supposed, on good grounds, that the youthful Davies, by his masterly discourses, of which Patrick Henry was a hearer for eleven years, unconsciously enkindled the latent fire, and afforded the model of the eloquence of that great statesman, and thus laid the foundation of his future fame and usefulness. And the mighty influence exerted by these men in the Academy, in the Pulpit, and in their godly example, on the minds of the youth of the colonies, preparing them for the great problem of self-government, and thus moulding the future character and destiny of this Republic, can never be fully

known and appreciated until the secrets of all hearts are revealed in the day of final reckoning.

It is true that in the production of the heart and mind we have some specimens which will not suffer by a comparison with those of any age and country. The sermons of Samuel Davies, written and preached in the wilds of Virginia, and which, under God, were instrumental in laying the foundation of Presbyterianism in that colony, are justly regarded as among the best in the English language. The profound metaphysical disquisitions of Edwards, completed amidst the arduous and responsible duties of a pastor, astonished the most astute philosophers of the old world, and must ever be ranked with the very highest achievements of the human mind.

But it is not in this field of usefulness that we are to expect the champions of gospel truth, in this country, to compare as a body with the theological giants of former days. But while many of them were denied the advantages of a thorough University training, such as their transatlantic brethren enjoyed, they nevertheless evinced not the less zeal, power and success, on that account, in advancing the cause of their Divine Master. Their motto seems to have been, "He that winneth souls is wise," and it was their happy distinction to turn to the best account those talents which their Lord had entrusted to them. They found themselves called *less* to the duty of writing Theological Systems and learned Defences of the Truth, than of profitably using those already prepared for them. The battles against Romanism, heartless Formalism, and the various schools of error, had been fought before for them, and they could see clearly how to make a profitable use of the armour placed in their hands.

The labors appropriate to the American ministers of the eighteenth century, were, to a great extent, missionary labors. Their warfare was not *so much* against heresies as the powers of darkness in general. And from the dangers of flood and forest, the self-denying labors of carrying the gospel to the savage tribes, and from the pains of fine and imprisonment for conscience sake, they did not shrink. Like the Apostles of old, they assiduously preached Christ and him crucified, from house to house, and from one province to another. The days of Whitefield, Davies, and

the Tennents, were days of wonder in God's earthly Zion. Seed was then sown broadcast through this wilderness land, which, like the dragon's teeth of Cadmus, sprang up and produced a noble band of heroes in the army of the Lord of Hosts.

Among the number of those ministers whose praise is in all the Churches, it is no more than a matter of justice to reckon that esteemed servant of God, whose name stands at the head of this article. The parents of James White Stephenson were from Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, and of the Scotch-Irish stock, and composed a part of that large body of Presbyterians that emigrated southward and settled in Virginia and the Carolinas during the latter half of the last century. Leaving the scenes of their early associations an hundred years ago, they halted and sojourned for a period of two or three years in Augusta county, Virginia, where, in 1756, the subject of this memoir was born. Soon after this event, they removed to Lancaster district, S. C., and settled near the old Waxhaw Church, where they spent the remainder of their earthly pilgrimage. In this field their son began that career of usefulness which was destined to be, in no ordinary degree, signal and protracted. Of his youthful days and early manhood, but little is now known, but judging from his subsequent life, and the character of his parents, his early training was in strict accordance with the customs of the Presbyterians of those times. Taught the infant prayer, the Catechism, and the word of God, and the reverence of the Sabbath and the Sanctuary, it is not a matter of wonder that he was faithful, during the whole of his protracted pastorate, in exercising the people of his charge in the same duties.

Where and under what instructor of youth he obtained his first knowledge of the Latin and Greek languages, cannot at this distant day be ascertained. The late Judge Smith, of this State, but more recently of Alabama, is known to have been one of his fellow students and associates in early life. The advantages of a College curriculum, such as are now liberally afforded to young men, he never enjoyed; and it has been a matter of doubt with his friends whether he entered College at all, as there remain no family records to attest the fact. An aged and venerable Elder

of the Church, however, who yet remembers well the early days of that institution, feels certain that he entered the Mount Zion College at Winnsboro', at the same time with the Rev. Humphrey Hunter, D. D., in 1785, and after passing through the usual course, obtained his diploma there. Many, we know, were the gifted and successful Ministers of the Word, who completed their literary course, and obtained their College honors, from that Institution, then under the direction of the Rev. Thomas H. McCaule. And upon unquestionable living authority, we may safely regard Mr. Stephenson as one of its alumni, together with the Rev. Messrs. Robert McCulloch, Wm. C. Davis, James Wallis, Humphrey Hunter, Robt. B. Walker, David Dunlap, John B. Kennedy, S. W. Yongue, John Robinson, Wm. G. Roseboro, John Cousar, John B. Davies, William Dargau, and some others, who graduated there during the first eight years of the existence of the College.

But Mount Zion College, with a perpetual charter and fully empowered to confer degrees, was, like Fag's Manor and the Log College at Neshaminy, merely an Academy of high order. These were the kind of institutions that sprang up from the necessities of that early period, before the country was prepared to furnish the funds for the endowment of larger schools of learning, or literary men, apart from the ministerial profession, to fill their professorial chairs. Notwithstanding these disadvantages, however, the men who obtained their whole literary and scientific knowledge from these sources, did not rank so far below the graduates of the present day as is generally supposed. That many of them were learned, and profoundly so, admits not of a doubt. Though their course of studies was not so extended, they were decidedly more accurate in what they attempted; what they lacked in one respect they made up to a great extent in another.

A glance at the history of the past will demonstrate the truth of this, especially in regard to the study of the Latin and Greek languages. In the classical schools of the last century, the writer is assured, from positive testimony, the Latin tongue was made, at an early stage of progress, the only medium of communication between the teacher and his pupils during the hours of school. And the late President, S. S. Smith, of Princeton, informs us that in his pre-

paratory course, at no advanced period of proficiency, a violation of grammatical rules, or even striking idiomatic errors, were made subject to discipline.

On this point we are not a loss for authority of the most weighty character. The late Dr. Miller, one of those links but a little while ago severed, which connected us back to the past century, thus speaks :

“The classical literature, especially, which was possessed by the Tennents, the Allisons, and the Blairs, at that period, was much more deep and accurate than is commonly acquired at the present day by most American scholars. They received it from the best European sources, and their first pupils, like themselves, were generally well educated and instructed, and bore no mean resemblance to the literary stature of their masters.”

Again:—

“Many persons are apt to suppose that the race of divines who flourished in our country seventy or eighty years ago, though pious and excellent men, had a very scanty supply of books, and in many cases a still more scanty education, compared with the divines of later years, and especially of the present day. This opinion is not only erroneous, but grossly so. Those venerable fathers of the American Church were more deeply learned than most of their sons. They read more, and thought more, than we are ready to imagine. The greater part of the books of ancient learning and ponderous erudition which are now to be found on this side of the Atlantic, were imported and studied by these great and good men. Original works are actually in fewer hands in our day, compared with the number of readers, than in theirs. They read solidly and deeply; we hang over compends and indexes. They studied systematically as well as extensively; our reading is more desultory, as well as more superficial. We have more of the *belles lettres* polish; but as biblical critics, and as profound theologians, we must undoubtedly yield to them the palm of excellence.”*

Our readers are perhaps not prepared to receive, without a degree of caution, that a large proportion of the most learned and distinguished men in our Church, to whom reference is made in the above quotation, were not graduates of Harvard and Yale, or of the Scotch and Irish Universities, but from the country Academies, conducted for

* Life of Dr. Rodgers, pp. 25-26.

the most part by a single man. And we hazard the opinion that had the squeamish sentimentality which so sadly afflicts the Church at the present day, making it absolutely necessary for a man to be from a particular University and Theological Seminary, prevailed a century ago, Davies and Finley had never been consecutive Presidents of Nassau Hall, and that too immediately succeeding the mightiest genius of the age; nor had Rodgers ever attained to the distinction which accrued to him as pastor of the first Presbyterian Church in New York.

But such were the men who, under God, were furnished to the Church by Fag's Manor, Log College, Mount Zion, and kindred institutions. They were raised up for a specific purpose, and were great in spite of all the difficulties that lay before them. Like Richard Baxter, under the promptings of an unconquerable desire for knowledge, and this in order that they might consecrate it to the glory of God, they allowed no impediments nor discouragements to damp the ardour of their pursuits.

Such a man was the subject of this memoir. Though destitute of the learned instructions and richly stored libraries of the Seminaries of the present age, he nevertheless, by dint of persevering application, made himself an accomplished scholar and profound theologian. The first notice that we are able to obtain of him, at this remote period, after passing from the peaceful shades of the Academy, is in the capacity of Principal of a classical school, over which he presided for some years, in the vicinity of the old Waxhaw Church. Here the future hero and President, Andrew Jackson, while a boy, was one of his pupils. This circumstance, as may reasonably be supposed, was not forgotten in after life, when teacher and scholar met in the West, whither both emigrated, and recounted the trying scenes of earlier days; and where both lived not far from each other, to an advanced age of more than ordinary usefulness, and alike died in the triumphs of a common faith.

But as it was Mr. Stephenson's lot to be brought into the world amid "wars and rumors of wars," so he was destined to spend no small part of his early life in those fearful and bloody scenes which, under God, resulted in throwing off the British yoke and securing the liberties of the

country. The Scotch-Irish of that day were mostly Presbyterians, and the Presbyterians were generally the friends of liberty, because their faith made them so; and they hated the tyrant because the tyrant had persecuted them in the mother country on account of their religion. It would have been hardly a possible thing, then, for an athletic young man of 24 years, of such a race of people, to escape his share of the dangers and duties, which fell to the lot of all, in this trying crisis. And accordingly when the war of the Revolution invaded South Carolina, Mr. Stephenson broke up his school and joined the standard of liberty, which he followed until the return of peace. With one of his brothers, he joined the army under the command of General Sumpter, and participated in the battles at Blackstock's, Hanging Rock, and some other engagements. In one of these fearful scenes, while the battle raged and the messengers of death flew thick around, a ball from the enemy struck the breech of his gun and broke it off, and then glancing, killed the man that stood next to him. On another occasion, it became his duty, in turn, to stand as sentinel at a certain place, but being indisposed that night, a fellow-soldier kindly volunteered to take his place, who was shot dead at his post. Thus in two striking instances a watchful, overruling Providence saved him from the shafts of death and preserved him for great and manifold usefulness in after life. A long and arduous warfare was before him, the weapons of which are not carnal, and there was no furlough nor discharge till that was accomplished.

Mr. Stephenson being a man of peace as well as of singular modesty, was seldom known in after life to speak of the part which he took in these bloody and dangerous scenes, contrary to a general characteristic of old soldiers, and especially of those who participated in the Revolutionary struggle. He even manifested a dislike to conversing about them, and but for the interest taken in them by some who were his companions and fellow-soldiers, the events would probably have sunk into oblivion.

After the return of peace, he was induced, by a mandate which he dared not disregard, to direct his attention to that warfare, the reward of which is on high. The energies of his mind were then diverted from secular pursuits to a

speedy and thorough preparation for the Gospel Ministry. Having passed the usual course at Mount Zion College, as has been already stated, he applied himself to the study of Theology, but under what instructor we have not been able to ascertain. After completing his studies preparatory, and submitting the necessary parts of trial, he was licensed in 1789, by the Presbytery of South Carolina, then embracing the entire territory of the State, and soon after accepted a call to the pastoral charge of the Bethel and Indiantown Churches, in Williamsburg District.

Before proceeding to give an account of the ministry of Mr. Stephenson, it will be necessary to advert briefly to the history of the Churches, and the condition of the field in which he was called to labor. This is not only desirable as a matter of important information, but really necessary, in order fully to delineate the character of the man and the success of his labors in the ministry.

A few years previous to this time, the Williamsburg Church had been greatly distracted on account of the alleged doctrinal errors and unministerial conduct of the acting pastor, the Rev. Samuel Kennedy, a native of Ireland. This Church, which had been regularly constituted at least as early as 1736, had been signally blessed with a succession of able and godly ministers and pious and exemplary people, who inherited largely of the pure faith and walk of their fathers, the Covenanters of Scotland. And through the blessing of God on this Church, a number of the other Churches on Black River had been formed of colonies from it. But for some years previous to the Revolution, large numbers of Presbyterians immigrated from the North of Ireland, and joined it, who were less strict in doctrine and practice. And during nearly the whole period of the war, it remained vacant, from its former pastor, the Rev. Thomas Kennedy, having gone on a visit to Ireland, from whence he never returned. This long period of destitution of the means of grace, and the evils consequent upon a state of war, in which the District of Williamsburg was fiercely engaged, proved, as might be expected, in a high degree unfavorable to the increase of piety in the Church. In this condition the Church was found when the Rev. Samuel Kennedy was invited to the pastoral care of it, for the limited term of three years. In

a very little time, however, Mr. K. began to preach doctrines at variance with the acknowledged tenets of the Presbyterian Church ; and his life not being of that strictly exemplary character which had distinguished their former ministers, the descendants of the original founders of the Church began earnestly to demand his removal. But being now in the minority, their remonstrances were in vain. Mr. Kennedy was not only retained the three years originally stipulated for, but continued by the majority for a longer period. The minority now despairing of all hope of redress, determined to devote to destruction that which they were unable to rescue from what they deemed desecration. The zeal that laid the plan soon carried it into execution. And, according to a previous understanding, the dissatisfied party met one morning in the month of August, 1786, with about one hundred negro men, and in a few hours the entire Church building was razed to the ground and the materials removed from the spot. The pulpit, which, as tradition relates, is the same that now stands in the old Church devoted to the use of the blacks, was carried a distance of three miles and concealed in a barn.

The consequences of these violent proceedings were a rupture in the Church, a wasting law suit, and lasting and bitter animosity between the two parties. The minority, with Jehu-like zeal, having completed their work of destruction, withdrew, leaving the majority in possession of the name and property of the Williamsburg Church, and were in a short time regularly organized by the Rev. James Edmonds, of Charleston, and took the name of the Bethel Church. To the pastoral charge of this Church, in connexion with that of the Indiantown, Mr. Stephenson, then a licentiate, was called. Mr. Kennedy, a short time after the schism, removed into North Carolina, where he died, and the Rev. James Malcomson, a native of Ireland, was named as his successor. The ordination of Mr. Stephenson took place some time between the meeting of Synod in 1790 and 1791, and he is first reported by Presbytery in the Fall of the latter year.

The foregoing statement will enable us to form a pretty correct idea of the delicacy of the position in which the young licentiate was placed, and the difficulties he would

be called to contend with. But it is a fact that reflects highly in his favor, as a prudent and pious man, that amid all the rancour of feeling which existed between the Churches, no breath of slander was ever blown against him, and no controversy ever arose between him and the pastor and people of the other congregation. To avoid a collision of some sort with the two bodies worshipping, as they did, only about fifty paces distant from each other, and separated only by a ditch, the trace of which is yet plainly visible, required a no ordinary degree of piety and circumspection.

On the 4th of August, 1791, Mr. Stephenson was united in marriage with Miss Elizabeth James, a pious and excellent lady, and well qualified for the important station which, in the providence of God, she was called to fill; and her memory is still cherished by some who were personally acquainted with her. She was the daughter of Major John James, who was celebrated for the active part which he took in the Revolutionary struggle, and particularly for the daring feat of knocking down Capt. Ardeisoff, a British officer, in Georgetown, with a chair.

This union was of short duration. Mrs. Stephenson died on the 29th of July, 1793, and her mortal remains repose beside those of her father, in the Indiantown graveyard. The marble that marks her resting place bears the following inscription :

In Memory of
MRS. ELIZABETH STEPHENSON,
Consort of the Rev. James W. Stephenson,
who departed this life
July 29th, 1793,
aged 24 years.

After this bereavement, Mr. Stephenson devoted the untiring energies of his life, undividedly, to the service of his Divine Master. In the duties of preaching the word, pastoral visitation, and catechising both old and young, he was faithful and assiduous. And his labors were not in vain in the Lord. Ever living near the mercy seat himself, it was his blessed privilege to see his people following

his example. The praying minister was blessed with a praying people. At one time, according to his own testimony, there were forty-five families in which the morning and evening sacrifice was regularly offered up, in the Bethel congregation alone. Few such pastors and congregations, it is feared, are to be found at the present day. His success in catechetical instruction was eminently happy, and the influence of his labors in this respect are not soon to pass away. An aged member of the Church, yet living, is accustomed to relate the following anecdote, illustrative of the felicitous manner in which he instructed the youth of his charge, and the reverential awe with which he was regarded by them. The question propounded was, "What is sin?" And the prompt answer of the trembling youth was, "Sin is the offering up of our desires unto God, for things agreeable to his will." The very wide mistake was corrected by the interrogator in so pleasing and amiable a manner, as to remove all embarrassment and fear, and lead the boy, by the exercise of his own mind, to the correct answer.

In the reproof of vice, as well as its removal, Mr. Stephenson was not less successful than in the more welcome functions of his office. A number of pernicious practices were found prevalent in the congregations when he entered upon his duties in them, which he felt conscientiously bound to correct, trusting to God for the consequences. The principal of these were dancing, horse-racing, and treating at funerals. It is a fact well known to all who are conversant with the history of the Church in the last century, that the practice of drinking at the burial of the dead, prevailed to a melancholy extent; and not a few instances are given of ministers being disciplined for indulging too freely on such occasions. And too frequently the living were not sufficiently sober to follow with becoming decorum their departed friends to the grave. The people, convinced by the warning voice of their pastor, put an end to the practice. Another monster evil which he was successful in opposing was horse-racing, usually followed by music and dancing, and kindred amusements. Regarding these as wholly inconsistent with Christian character, he ceased not to denounce them as such until they were mostly discontinued. And it is but justice to state, that to

Mr. Stephenson belongs the honor, so far as it is known, of commencing, in this part of the country, the benevolent work of evangelizing the negroes, and preventing them from laboring on the Sabbath for themselves, as they had too generally been permitted to do.

As Mr. Stephenson was a man of eminent piety, and deeply imbued with the spirit of his Divine Master, it is not wonderful that he partook eagerly of the revival spirit. And in the remarkable outpourings of the Spirit, with which the Churches throughout the land were blessed in the early part of the present century, the congregations of his charge shared most bountifully. Many still living remember the scenes of that eventful period—a period when, from the general prevalence of infidel sentiments, both in Europe and America, the hearts of the stoutest “trembled for the ark of God ;” but when the Almighty, in a most signal manner, overthrew the power of his enemies, and made his own name glorious.

Thus the Word of God prospered more and more under the ministry of Mr. Stephenson, until the congregations under his care became large and abundantly able to support the Gospel. In 1802, Bethel Church was reported to the General Assembly as having 104 communicants, and Indiantown 96. In this prosperous condition of the Churches, the pastor and a number of his people began to turn their attention to the favorable openings in the West, and forthwith determined on carrying the light of gospel truth into that wilderness region. With their minister in company, about twenty families emigrated to Maury county, Tennessee, and jointly purchased a large tract of land, belonging to the heirs of General Greene, of Revolutionary fame. There they erected the tabernacle of the Lord in the wilderness, and organized the Zion Church, about five miles from Columbia.

Mr. Stephenson preached his valedictory discourse in Indiantown Church on the 28th of February, 1808, and on the 3d of March following set out on his journey to the West. On the 20th of May of the same year, he was again united in marriage to Mrs. Mary Fleming, a member of his own Church, and one of the emigration from Williamsburg. In this new field of labor, he exercised his ministry with zeal and fidelity, and his popular talents as

a preacher of the gospel, combined with the intelligence and piety of the people of his charge, soon attracted the favorable notice and secured the friendship of some of the most prominent men of the State, among whom were the Hon. Felix Grundy and Andrew Jackson.

But Mr. Stephenson still lived in the affections of an extensive acquaintance, which he had left behind him. He was not forgotten by the friends of former years, though his voice was heard by them no more. And in 1815, the Board of Trustees of the South Carolina College, rightly appreciating his worth, on motion of Chancellor James, conferred upon him the well-merited degree of Doctor of Divinity. Nor was he less esteemed, nor less useful, in the State of his more recent adoption. He was, during life, President of the Maury County Bible Society, and a life member of most of the National Benevolent Associations of the day. At an early period, he ardently espoused the cause of Foreign Missions, and made the Chickasaw schools, under the Rev. T. C. Stuart, the particular objects of his fostering influence and support. Being blest with a strong physical constitution, he enjoyed almost uninterrupted health, and is believed never to have been prevented attending upon the services of the sanctuary until near the close of his life. He continued to discharge his pastoral duties until old age and debility admonished him that the time of his departure was near; and for about a year before his death, he was assisted by the Rev. James M. Arnell, who was unanimously chosen as his successor, and who has recently followed him to his reward on high. At length having "served his generation by the will of God, he fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers." On the 6th of January, 1832, he rested from his labors, at the advanced age of 76, having been the pastor of a portion of his congregation for more than forty-two years.

Dr. Stephenson, in personal appearance, was tall and of commanding proportions, and from a uniform solemnity and dignity of manners, always secured the profound respect of his people. His style of preaching was instructive, plain and pointed, always earnest and often eloquent. It might with truth be said of him, as it was of Baxter:

"He preached as though he ne'er would preach again,
Preached as a dying man to dying men."

He delighted to present truth in the language of the Holy Ghost ; and the Scripture quotations with which his discourses abounded every where throughout, glittered like gems on the dark ground of his own phraseology. He was seldom ever known to conclude a sermon, even to believers, without a pungent and pathetic appeal to the unconverted, generally closing with the words of the prophet Isaiah, "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near," &c.

He studied and wrote much, leaving behind him several hundred sermons in MS. only two or three of which were ever published. Could not some friend who heard them delivered, make a selection from the mass and give a volume of them to the public ?

Dr. Stephenson died as he lived, in full hope of a blessed immortality. The closing scene of his life, says one who knew him long and intimately, "was all that the Christian could desire to see ; his hope was strong and bright, and his faith unwavering. The young of his charge who visited him, he earnestly and affectionately urged to seek the one thing needful ; the more advanced in life he exhorted to give more diligence, to make their calling and election sure." He went down to "the grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in his season." And as his mortal life was long and useful, doubtless the crown of his rejoicing is bright and glorious, and gemmed with many stars. He sleeps about the centre of the Zion Church burying ground, and around him, on every side, lie the remains of the patriarchs that removed from Williamsburg. Of that band of pilgrims, who, near half a century ago, crossed the Alleghanies, and boldly plunged into a savage wilderness, not one that was the head of a family now remains. With their beloved minister, they have gone to their reward on high, where together "they sing the song of Moses and the Lamb." Together, too, their bodies shall sleep till the resurrection morning, when they shall be called up to bear witness for each other, and to receive from the glorious Judge the crown of righteousness which shall be given to all them that love his appearing.

Such was the life and character of James White Stephenson. His name, with that of Reese, Edmonds, and a long list of others, is embalmed in the hearts of multitudes

yet living. Let the Church pray that their mantle, like that of Elijah, may fall upon the youth of our Zion, that many, like them, may be raised up, to stand in their places, and copy their example in generations to come.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV'D. THOMAS REESE, D. D.,
OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

Dr. Thomas Reese was born in Pennsylvania in the year 1742. When young he came with his parents to Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, and commenced his classical studies under the direction of the Rev'd. Joseph Alexander and a Mr. Benedict, who had charge of an academy in Mecklenburg county, and which was then the only one within the distance of 100 miles. Having completed his academical education, he entered the Junior class in Princeton College, and graduated during the Presidency of the late Dr. John Witherspoon in the year 1768. After a proper course of theological studies, he commenced preaching, and accepted a call from Salem church, Sumter district, South Carolina. At this place he resided during the early part of the revolutionary war. The state of society at this period was such, that violence and misrule had usurped the place of law and order; and not only the civil, but the religious rights of the community had been invaded. This was more especially the case, during the years 1780 and 1781, a period in the history of South Carolina, truly distressing to the philanthropist, and much more so to the christian. From the surrender of Charleston, all public education was suspended, and soon after all public worship was discontinued, most of the town and country churches were burned, or made depots for the stores of the enemy; and in some instances appropriated to more improper uses. In a camp where there was no permanency, and but little rest, there was no place for chaplains, and at home even pious pastors were insecure; consequently as the more prudent course they generally went into exile. Among the latter was the subject of this memoir. It was in his congregation, that the murders perpetrated by Harrison of Tory memory and his followers

commenced, and the respectable members of his flock fell victims to civil rage. Had he gone about to administer comfort out of his own family, it would have been termed sedition, and Dr. Reese would have made himself a voluntary martyr. He took the wiser course of retiring before the storm, and went with his family to Mecklenturg, N. C., where he continued to preach under many privations. After the peace of 1782, he returned to his congregation in Salem, and pursued his duties with an ardor and diligence, rarely exceeded in South Carolina. He amassed a large fund of useful knowledge in divinity, moral philosophy, and other branches of science auxiliary to the formation of a complete theologian. He then began and completed his admirable essay on the influence of religion in civil society. He pursued the argument through a variety of relations, and demonstrated from reason and history, that all human institutions are in their own nature, and have ever been found in practice, insufficient to preserve peace and order without the sanctions of religion. The execution of the work would have been reputable to the pen of Warburton or Paley; but like most American productions of that day, it was soon neglected, and did not pass into a second edition. It is, however, preserved in Carey's American Museum, and will be an honorable testimony to posterity of the literature of South Carolina in 1788. It procured for the author the well merited degree of D. D. from Princeton College, which, as far as can be recollected, was the first instance of its being conferred on a Carolinian.

About the year 1790 circular letters were written by Mr. Austin, editor of the *American Preacher*, to distinguished preachers of all denominations, requesting them to furnish two sermons annually, that a selection might be made from them, and published as specimens of pulpit eloquence in the United States. One of these letters was addressed to Dr. Thomas Reese, and he sent on two sermons which were published. In the 4th volume of this excellent miscellany, he appears as the only contributor South of Virginia. Among his unpublished manuscripts, were specimens of poetical talent, highly creditable. His farewell sermon to his congregation in Salem, was published at the request of his church, and is still possessed by some of the mem-

bers of his church, and esteemed for the excellent advice it contains. Dr. Reese was in person easy of access, a friend to human nature, but particularly attached to men of science and religion. With powers of mind equal to his benevolence and piety, he justly held a conspicuous station among eminent and good men. As a proof of the deference paid to his talents by his brethren in religious assemblies, he was selected by some leading men of the Presbytery of South Carolina, on a certain occasion, to repel the charges brought by the Rev'd. W. C. Davis in a discourse preached before that body, in which he, Davis, denounced all his fellow christians who owned slaves.—This reply of Dr. Reese met the entire approbation of the Presbytery, and greatly mortified Davis, this early *advocate* of abolition, in 1794. It is an able argument on the subject of slavery, and shews how early this vexed question had been introduced into the Southern church. It is still extant, and in the possession of his quondam pupil. Dr. Reese's Theological opinions were founded solely on the authority of the scriptures, and of course Orthodox.—His appearance in the pulpit was graceful and dignified, his style flowing and elegant. He was in the habit generally of writing out his sermons with great care, and seldom, if ever, took the manuscript in the pulpit. His preaching was of the extempore kind, adding to the mature reflections of the study, the powers of his native oratory. His flowing tears, and often suppressed voice, told the feelings of the heart, anxious only for the salvation of souls and the glory of God. Like Paul he warned his hearers day and night with tears. His success in his ministerial labours, evinced the power and presence of the Holy Spirit. It is a subject of painful regret, that the examples of such men as Dr. Reese, Edwards, Whitfield and others should be lost, and that their successful manner of awakening and instructing their hearers, should be supplanted by the cold and prosy reading of sermons from the pulpit, which so effectually lulls to sleep a waiting audience, or binds them up in the present day. Dr. Reese was also an ardent lover of sacred music, and was careful to have his congregation well instructed in this devotional part of worship. His own melodious voice mingled with those of the whole congregation, filled God's court with

sounding praise. He did not trust this part of divine worship to a *choir* which, as the proxy of the congregation, might sing praises to God ; but adopted in his teaching the language of David in the 67th Psalm. Let all the people praise thee O God ; repeating the injunction in the 5th verse, *Let all the people praise thee O God.* For classical literature, so much decried by the superficial, he was a great advocate, and to evince his sincerity, retained the knowledge of the dead languages as long as he lived.

As a teacher he had a peculiar facility of communicating knowledge, and the happy talent of commanding respect without severity. For a period of five or six years of his life, and that too, past the meridian, exclusive of his performing the regular duties of a pastor, preaching on the Sabbath and lecturing the coloured part of his congregation, he superintended a small farm, and attended to a large classical school with but little assistance in the course of the week. And it is well recollected that during more than one season, he preached two sermons on the Sabbath, and performed besides the other duties mentioned above.

Dr. Reese was "given to hospitality," and evinced his benevolence by visiting the sick and afflicted, and relieving the wants of the poor and needy. Having read many medical authors, and being conversant with physicians, he had acquired a pretty general knowledge of Southern diseases, and in his visits to the sick frequently imparted not only spiritual consolation, but medical aid. This was the more acceptable, as at that time there were no physicians near him. In the winter of 1792 and 1793 he removed from Salem to Pendleton district, South Carolina, being among the first who removed from the low country to the upper.

Having settled near Pendleton village, he took charge of two churches, one near Seneca river, in the neighborhood of Generals Pickens and Anderson, the other church some ten or twelve miles distant. In these he laboured some years ; but the climate of the upper country not agreeing with his constitution, his health declined. He was attacked with Hydrothorax in the latter part of his life, and such was the nature of his disease, that he did not lie down for weeks previous to his death. He bore

this affliction with great patience and resignation to the will of his divine Master, and died in 1796, aged 54 years. His remains lie in the grave-yard, attached to the Old Stone Church, near the village of Pendleton.*

Chancellor James of South Carolina, in his life of Marion, speaking of Dr. Reese, says :

“In contemplating the meek and unobtrusive manners of this eminent servant of the most High, we do not hesitate to say he was a pattern of christian charity, as nearly resembling his Divine Master as has been exhibited by any of his contemporary fellow labourers in the Gospel.”

It may truly be said in conclusion, of this excellent man, that he lived esteemed and died lamented by an extensive circle of warm and devoted friends.

J. R. WITHERSPOON.

BROOKLAND, near Greensboro', Ala., {
6th September, 1851. }

ARTICLE VII.

REASON AND FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

There are no errors in the present generation more widely spread, or more generally attractive to the minds of sinful men, than those which regard the doctrine of Divine punishment for sin. Among errorists of every class, there is a growing laxity of opinion upon this subject, which loudly calls upon the friends of truth to gird on their armour and stand in defence of the right ; and this right should be de-

* EPIGRAPH OF THE REV'D. THOMAS REESE, D. D.

Here rest the remains of the Rev'd. THOMAS REESE, D. D., a native of Pennsylvania, who departed this life in the hopes of a blessed immortality, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety-six, aged 54 years. He was pastor of Salem church, Black River, about 20 years. He was then chosen pastor of Hopewell and Carmel congregations, and died a few years after. Exemplary in all the social relations of life, as a son, husband, father and citizen, he lived esteemed and beloved, and died lamented. His talents as a writer and preacher were of a highly respectable grade, and were always directed to promote the virtue and happiness of his fellow-men.

fended by every weapon of legitimate warfare. In former struggles, it has generally been deemed sufficient to draw our weapons of defence from the armory of God's word; and thus we would ever do, for we know no more effective thoughts to reach the conscience of sinful man, than the simple declarations of the scriptures. But it is also well to meet errorists upon their own ground, and beat them at their own game. "Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, slew an Egyptian, a man of great stature, five cubits high; and in the Egyptian's hand was a spear like a weaver's beam; and he went down to him with a staff and plucked the spear out of the Egyptian's hand, and slew him with his own spear." The time has been when even infidels, professing to take reason as their guide, did not deny the doctrine of Future Punishment; and when Universalists appealed to the Bible as proving their tenet. To a great extent the matter is altered now. Universalists deny the inspiration of the Scriptures and refuse to be bound by their teachings upon this subject; and the advocates of Reason, as a sufficient guide in religious truth, agree with them in rejecting the doctrine of future punishment. It is, therefore, not improper for us to make the appeal they demand, and ask Reason what are her serious responses concerning a Judgment in the world to come.

If we enter into the inquiry, what views do the infidels of our day entertain upon the subject of future punishment to the soul of man, we would be generally, if not strictly correct to affirm that none of them believe in future punishment at all. We have said the case was formerly different even with the deist. Lord Herbert, of Cherbury, in reducing what he calls his universal religion to five articles, gives the fifth thus: "That there are rewards for good men and punishments for bad men in a future state;" or, as he sometimes expresseth it, "both here and hereafter."* To the same purpose Mr. Blount, in the Oracles of Reason, says:

"There are many arguments from reason and philosophy to prove the immortality of the soul, together with its rewards and punishments; but that there is no argument of greater weight with him than the absolute necessity and convenience that it

* Leland's Deist. Writers, 1, 5.

should be so, as well to complete the justice of God as to perfect the happiness of man, not only in this world but in that which is to come."*

But as one generation of deists does in no wise feel bound to adopt the opinions of a previous age; as their views are constantly changing and constantly deteriorating, for error always grows worse and worse, so we think we are not wrong in our statement that infidels in our day generally disbelieve in future punishment. No one of them will ever be found arguing in its favor, and many of them professedly reject the Bible on this very ground, that it teaches the doctrine of eternal punishment. This is not indeed a new objection against the Scriptures. As long ago as the days of Lord Bolingbroke, it was urged as an advantage of the prevalence of his sentiments that "*the burning lake would disappear*."† But as an objection to the Scriptures, this doctrinal reason is now more universally urged. It is not unlikely that the influence of Universalism as a heresy of those that profess to believe the Bible, may have led infidels more boldly and commonly to deny all future punishment. They are ashamed to be less liberal than those who call themselves liberal Christians. And as we have intimated, the advocates of Universalism have become so liberal, that while they claim the name of Christians, they surrender not only the doctrine of future everlasting rewards and punishments, but such vital doctrines of Christianity as the atonement of Christ and the inspiration of the Scriptures. The alliance between heresy and infidelity has become so close in our day, as to justify the propriety of an appeal to just and reasonable principles, apart from the sacred Scriptures, as indicating and corroborating the doctrine of the Bible upon this important subject.

Before we commence the discussion, we may make the obvious remark, that every sinful man who forms an opinion upon this subject, makes himself a judge in his own case. For, as a sinner, he decides upon the rectitude of a penalty in which he himself is liable to be involved. The probability is then that his judgment will be biassed to a decision favorable to his own case, and to the denial of a

* Leland, 1, 323.

† Letters on the Study and Use of History, 2, 221, in Leland.

doctrine which he earnestly wishes was not true. Yet we propose to investigate this matter without bringing into view the doctrine of the Scriptures of judgment or atonement, of repentance or remission. The question simply is, What ought to be a man's intelligent belief upon the subject of Future Punishment, when he forms his own reasonable conclusions, from every source of natural and providential evidence that can justly bear upon the point?

Our starting point is the fact that this is a sinful world. The fact will not be denied. We have heard, indeed, many eulogies upon the dignity and excellency of human nature, chiefly from those who call themselves rational Christians. But our present argument can be sustained without urging man's original or universal sinfulness, and without settling very definitely the boundaries of human guilt. Let it be confessed, as it must be, that men are sinners; and that some men are flagrantly and absolutely wicked; and while we may leave untouched the question of comparative guilt, we have foundation sufficient for our present argument in the simple and undeniable fact that this is a sinful world.

The great question which arises in view of man's sinfulness is this: How will God deal with the sinner? And one of two things must be true. God will either PARDON the sinner or he will PUNISH him.

Let us first make the supposition that God *pardons* the sinner; and let us look around for any proofs which we may discover that He ever does pardon. But bear in mind, distinctly, that in this discussion we are to lay out of view the teachings of the Scriptures, and the doctrines, especially, of satisfaction and remission through the precious blood of Jesus. As Christians, we have no difficulty in settling the question, *Does God ever pardon?* and we stand ever ready to vindicate the excellency and righteousness of that saying, faithful and worthy of all acceptance, "that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." But we are now arguing on other principles, as if the precious tidings of a Saviour had been blotted out from the page of human knowledge, and as if men were left to gather the indications of God's mercy in the best way they can, without a revelation.

To the man who rejects the sacred Scriptures as authority upon the dealings of God with sinners, there are

open but two sources of information : 1st, he may reason upon just principles to discover what God will do ; and, 2d, he may observe what God really does, so far as he can trace the dealings of his hands.

Now we remark *first*, that our reasoning upon God's character cannot afford any assurance that He will ever pardon sin.

When we reason about God, one of two things is true : Either God is just, or he does not regard justice. We suppose no one will be found daring enough to say that God can or will do any injustice. If any one is so daring, a few words will show that to make God capricious or unjust, places us all in a condition infinitely worse than the most fearful doctrine of Future Punishments has ever asserted ; for punishment with a just God has regard to measure of right, which his perfections bind even him to regard. But in the power of an unjust God, no creature, holy or unholy, can possess permanent peace or happiness. It is not within God's own power to bestow happiness, supposing him to be unjust, for an essential ingredient of perfect happiness is confidence in God for its continuance—a confidence which no mind can repose in an unjust being. There is no encouragement for the right, no restraint for the wrong, from any thoughts of a God, either indifferent to our actions or capricious in his rewards of them. If God is not necessarily and inflexibly righteous, the vilest wretch may hope for his favor, and the holiest servant may fear for his frown. Would it be strange for an unjust being to reward an unjust being, or to smite a just one ? And yet as injustice is variable and inconsistent with itself, there could be no confidence in any creature that God would permanently bless him, be his conduct what it might. It is an appalling thought for the entire universe, and to eternal interests, that by any possibility God can love evil or bless iniquity.

It is reasonable to say that God is just, inflexibly and unchangeably so ; and any act of injustice would be a blemish on Him. And we may remark that skeptical men, perhaps generally, agree that God is just, however this may disagree with other opinions they advance. Thus Lord Bolingbroke says that "justice requires that punishments should be measured out in various degrees and measures,

according to the various circumstances of particular cases, and in proportion to them.”* And this sentiment he repeats: “Justice requires that rewards and punishments should be measured out in every case in proportion to the merit or demerit of each individual.”†

Let us take the principle, God is just; and we maintain that consistently with it, God can pardon sin only when justice allows of the pardon. For a judge to condemn a person known to be innocent, is a most serious blemish on his character: for him to acquit the guilty when he is known as guilty, is equally wrong. Now we affirm that reason teaches us no way in which God can pardon sin. If a guilty man is treated like an innocent man, how are we to discover the difference of guilt and innocence in God’s esteem? Our view is that God abhors sin; that His nature is necessarily against it; that he himself must meet an impossible and most undesirable change before he can smile upon evil; and that it is not a defect, but an excellency of Jehovah, that he necessarily abhors iniquity. If, then, he abhors sin, he will punish and not pardon it. If he fails to punish it, his law is broken, but justice is forgotten. True views of justice demand that God should deal with every man as he deserves; *but pardon is not what the sinner deserves.*

To avoid misconception, we repeat, that we are ready to vindicate the Christian atonement consistently with these views; but arguing upon the principles of those who reject revelation, no man can show that it is consistent with God’s perfections for Him to pardon sin.

But it is one of the sentiments, at least of the former deism, that upon the principles of natural religion, God will pardon the repenting sinner. This is one of the principles set forth by Lord Herbert. Upon this affirmation we have three questions to ask. We are told that God pardons the repentant sinner. We ask then, 1st, What becomes of those who do not repent? For it is by no means certain that every man who sins repents of his sins. The very idea that repentance is requisite to pardon, implies the possibility that repentance may not be exercised, and that in such a case God would not pardon. Now we

* Works V, 494; in Leland 2, 217.

† Works 5, 495; Leland 2, 218.

ask, what becomes of those who do not repent? Is there a future punishment for them, even admitting the previous principle?

Our second question is, How does the sorrow of a repentant man change the decision of a just law against him? Do the tears of repentance wash out the fact of transgression? Is a man innocent because he weeps for guilt? Can justice let a man go free for any thing short of innocence on the one hand or full satisfaction made on the other? Let the question be fairly met. We deny that tears are any satisfaction for sin.

Our third question is, Where does this doctrine come from—"God pardons the repenting sinner?" If it comes from the Christian Scriptures, the advocates of natural religion have perverted it. The Scriptures teach that pardon and repentance are connected together in God's government; but they never teach that men are pardoned through any virtue or excellence inherent in the repentance itself. They make the atonement of Christ the sole ground efficaciously of pardoning mercy. This we can understand. But we cannot, by any powers of reasoning which we possess, learn where those who reject the atonement can find reasons to believe that there is any justice in connecting together repentance and pardon. What is the train of reasoning which can leave God just, and yet allow him to pardon simply on the ground of repentance? We conclude upon this point that we do not know any reason, flowing from God's own character, why he should pardon a sinner. On the contrary, our reasoning leads us to believe that God will punish those that offend him.

It seems to us that two lines will contain an unanswerable argument to establish from reason the doctrine of Future Punishment. If every sinner is to be pardoned, then any being may, with perfect impunity, set God's laws at defiance. If some only are pardoned, there must be punishment for others.

But second, we proposed to inquire what God really does upon this subject. We appeal to facts. Of course if the Bible is to afford no testimony in settling the inquiry, our thoughts must be confined to the present world alone. The eye of reason cannot penetrate the veil that hides eternity from our view; reason cannot determine that the wildest

conjectures respecting eternal sorrow are certainly untrue: our experience is nothing. But with the means of information which God's dealings in this world can afford to us, we do clearly deny that we have ever seen any convincing proof of God's pardoning mercy to an offender. We are free to acknowledge that there is a singular mingling of judgment and forbearance in the dealings of God's providence, and that through this, extreme judgment is often long delayed; but we have never seen any example of actual pardon to an offender, if on this interesting subject the testimony of the Scriptures is to be shut out. Even the gospel does not profess to arrest for the penitent the ordained consequences of providential law. In providence itself, there is no pardon for an error, but fixed and unflinching law takes its course. Let a man abuse his person by indulging in intemperate or licentious habits, and the most that repentance can do for him is to give him the benefit of his future self-denial. It grants no compensation for the time or health already lost; nor will it even stay the ravages of disease which flow from sins now given up and abhorred. Repentance possesses no power to restore health, property, peace, or life, to him who has squandered all these in days of folly. It will not bring back for the murderer the victim of his madness; it will not restore to the idler the lost hours of existence; it will not educate and reform a neglected child, though the parent should weep tears of blood for his past remissness. As far as the indications of providence can be traced, we may judge that repentance brings a blessing upon the future, and this only because it preserves from repeated transgression; but repentance throws no blessing upon that which is past. If pardon includes the remission of a penalty, and we cannot imagine what less it can include, then the lesson taught us upon every page of providence is this: that no such remission ever takes place. In the operations of providence, sin and misery, offence and punishment, are indissolubly connected. No man can strike a knife to his neighbor's heart and expect that repentance will staunch the flow of blood; no man can neglect the flight of time and expect that repentance will bring up his arrears of duty; no instance can be brought forward, if the Bible is shut out as a witness, in which God exercises

pardon for the offence of man. Indeed, the idea of remitting the penalty of an offence against law, is thoroughly foreign to the train of argument usually employed by sceptical men against the miracles of the Bible. If God never interferes with the strict and invariable execution of natural law; if even for the most important purpose such an interference is inadmissible; if, according to the words of our objectors, so remarkably expressed by an ancient writer, "since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the foundation of the world;" surely it is in the highest degree unreasonable to expect His interference with invariable law to accommodate the repentance of an individual. It is most preposterous that men should on the one hand deny the miracles of the Bible, not for lack of historical proof, for even Mr. Hume has not had the temerity to attack this, but on the ground that the unvarying order of nature will not allow of their occurrence; and then on the other hand, that the same men should affirm that in every case of repentance remission of penalty is granted; in other words, to benefit the entire race, the unvarying order of nature cannot be disturbed; to benefit an individual sinner who repents, it can be and repeatedly is.

If the objection is made that no reasonable man expects by repentance to set aside the penalty of natural and providential law, then our argument is granted. For our observation of God's dealings is confined to these; and if reason cannot here point out facts to prove the pardoning mercy of the great Ruler, then such reliance must be unreasonable, for there is no evidence to support it. Aside from revealed testimony, man can bring forward neither facts nor reasonings to prove that God ever pardons.

We may turn now to our second supposition. Suppose God punishes sin. This we affirm he does; and all our previous reasoning has a just bearing upon this affirmation. And the punishment of sin must either be complete in this world or continued in the future state.

Sin is not fully nor equally punished in this world, and it is punished in the world to come. This, we shall endeavor to show, is the just conclusion of serious and thoughtful reason.

1st. An unequal distribution of rewards and punishments in this life, makes it reasonable to expect a state of future punishment.

Justice requires that crimes of equal guilt should be equally punished, and that there be no respect of persons in the execution of justice. While, then, it is clear that vice is punished and virtue rewarded in this life, yet it has been the subject of remark in all ages, that the wicked often triumph and the righteous are oppressed. The wicked often leave an influence behind them which is working mischief long after they have left the world, and for which they are justly responsible; and in this way they cannot receive their punishment in this life, unless providence is supposed to punish a mischief before the offence occurs. Suppose a bad book is not published until after the death of its author. How can his sin be punished in this life? Not only in such, but in many other cases, the wicked are cut off from life before punishment comes, and the righteous fail to receive the slow moving reward of their uprightness. This inequality of the dealings of God's providence in this life, has been acknowledged alike by Christians and infidels. Mr. Hume says, "Such is the confusion and disorder of human affairs, that no perfect economy or regular distribution of happiness or misery is, in this life, ever to be expected."* And Lord Bolingbroke says "that the ancient Theists were persuaded that nothing less than the existence of all mankind in a future state, and a more exact distribution of rewards and punishments, could excuse the assumed irregular and unjust proceedings of providence in this life, on which Atheists founded their objections."†

While, then, it is allowed that men sometimes suffer severely for their sins in this life; while we recognize that the *tendencies* of providence are invariably for the detection and punishment of sin; while we believe that the way of transgressors is hard; yet we cannot avoid the conviction that here punishments are unequally distributed. Innocent men often suffer the severest penalties of human laws, and wicked men often enjoy the honors of the world. What comparison we may ask for example, is there between the guilty seducer, who spends years of *thoughtless gaiety*, full of the applause of the world, and

* Moral and Polit. Essays, 244; Leland 2, 42.

† Works 5, 308; Leland 2, 271.

his degraded victim, who, perhaps, more sinned against than sinning, is cast off from society, spends a brief existence, whose dragging months are by shame and agony lengthened into years, and sinks to her dishonored grave? If again, a wicked man takes the life of a good man, and immediately commits suicide, who can decide that the good and the bad receive their just deserts, unless there is punishment in the world to come?

But we pass to a second reason for believing that men are punished in a future world as they are not in this life. We observe it as a prominent fact in human history, that men grow careless and hardened in crime; and that very frequently the more guilty they are, the less are they troubled by their own guilt. This fact is utterly inconsistent with the doctrine that men are fully punished for their sins in the present life. The advocates of Universal Salvation find it convenient to overlook this truth in the government of the world. When we point them to the fact that wicked men seem to prosper, they reply, "You cannot judge how much a man suffers in mind." And is our ignorance of the amount of suffering, to be plead as a firm argument to prove that men do suffer? Must the argument stand thus: "We do not know that they suffer, therefore they do suffer?" We affirm on the contrary that by certain proof we can ascertain that sinful men may become reckless in their sins by the habitual practice of them; and that remorse for past sins, instead of deterring from further iniquity, is so subdued that the last sins in a bad man's life are committed with decreasing concern. It is a principle of the human mind, that we are less and less affected by familiar things; so that by habit we may do things easily, which at first required pains-taking and thought and labour. In learning to read, for example, the letters are slowly learned, and the words doubtfully and slowly spelled out; but the scholar after a few years, forgets his early labour and reads off paragraph after paragraph, without any distinct recognition of the individual letters, as differently as possible from the former painful process. A man begins to play upon the flute, with slow and doubtful efforts. First one note is sounded, and then another, and he cannot regard time or tune; but the experienced player forgets these dull efforts and glides over the

same, or far more difficult notes, and is hardly conscious that a distinct effort of the mind and the fingers is bestowed upon each. It is thus with every thing to which man is trained. The mind is not impressed with a familiar object, as it is when that object is not familiar. The pertinacious ticking of a familiar clock, gives no annoyance; and the hum or thunder of some huge factory soon ceases to be disagreeable to the operatives. This familiarity of the mind with objects frequently presented, extends to moral matters. It is easy to do what we are wont to do, let it be good or bad. If a man observes the dictates of his conscience, it will not fail to warn him of his sin; but if he disregards its warnings, they will influence and move him less and less.

Let two men be discovered in the commission of a common crime. The one is young in guilt; it is his first offence, and to this he has been seduced by the bad counsels and evil influence of his companion. That companion is an old offender. He has been before in the hands of justice; his reputation is that of a bold, bad man, and his crimes are greater than his fellow men are aware of. Of these two men it is easy to judge which is the greater criminal; and yet so far as inward trouble is concerned it is as easy to see that the severest present punishment is not upon him. The victim of his guilty persuasion is almost overwhelmed in an agony of remorse, and can hardly look a friend in the face; while the oldest and worst criminal has outlived his shame, and lifts up his bold and impudent brow upon which we cannot trace the least evidence of feeling. The fact seems to be that instead of suffering more and more anguish of conscience the more they sin, men seem to become more and more careless.—The greatest offenders have the most unfeeling hearts. In other words, in this life the more men deserve to suffer in conscience, the less they do suffer.

That these were the views of even Mr. Hume upon this subject will appear, if we quote more at large, the same passage we formerly adverted to. These are his words:

“Though virtue be undoubtedly the best choice where it can be attained, yet such is the confusion and disorder of human affairs, that no perfect economy or regular distribution of happi-

ness or misery is in this life ever to be expected. Not only are the goods of fortune and endowments of the body unequally distributed between the virtuous and the vicious; but the most worthy character, by the very economy of the passions, doth not always enjoy the highest felicity. Though all vice is pernicious, the disturbance or pain is not measured out by nature with exact proportion to the degrees of vice, nor is the man of highest virtue, even abstracting from external accidents, always the most happy. A gloomy and melancholy temper may be found in very worthy characters that have a great sense of honor and integrity; and yet this alone may embitter life, and render a person completely miserable. On the other hand, a selfish villain may possess a spring and alacrity of temper, a certain gaiety of heart, which will compensate the uneasiness and remorse arising from all the other vices. If a man be liable to a vice or imperfection, it may often happen that a good quality which he possesses along with it, will render him more miserable than if he were completely vicious. A sense of shame in an imperfect character is certainly virtue, but produces great uneasiness and remorse, from which the abandoned villain is entirely free."

It seems that in this life, remorse of conscience springs from some recognitions of virtue which the mind has not yet lost; but the longer a man indulges in crime the less likely is he to feel aright. Hence men are accustomed to feel that there is still hope of reform for one who has not lost all sense of shame. But when shame is lost the man is incorrigible. Yet we do not excuse him because his crimes are many, and he will not blush. The worst term of reproach that we can use, is to call a man *a hardened wretch*.

We might show still further that men do not receive punishment in this life, through the agency of a remorseful conscience, by adverting to the fact that the same man may be filled with anguish for some imaginary crime, while he is perfectly careless for some real one. The Hindu worshipper of Kalee will feel satisfaction in sacrificing the life of his child at the altar of his sanguinary goddess, and be filled with horror at the idea of striking an axe into the sacred peepul tree. A Spanish bandit, who can rob and murder with indifference, would fear and tremble at the threatened refusal of his priest to render him a worthless absolution. The consciences of men, blinded and ignorant as they are over the wide world, are

as unequal in the distribution of rewards and penalties as any other part of an unequal providence; and in this life men do not suffer by conscience, as justice would dictate they should suffer.

But we have another most serious objection to the idea that men suffer, through remorse of conscience in this life, the full punishment of sin. We ask the question, which of two men deserves our most severe reprobation? Let us suppose them both equally guilty, and the one repents of his sins, weeps at the mention of them, and feels that he cannot do too much to repair the mischief he has done, while the other laughs at reproof, hardens his heart against all feeling, and goes on still in his way of iniquity. Surely we pity and help the repentant man, while we are indignant at the hardihood of the other. And now let common sense answer the question, Which of these men has the most trouble of mind? The one is full of bitterness of spirit, and the other is unblushing; the one gives evidence of awakening virtue by efforts to reform, and the other shows his wickedness by going on still in sin. Is it not plain that the better man of the two has the most trouble? Is it not of the very nature of penitence to fill the soul with grief, and of the very nature of impenitence to put away all feeling? If the doctrine is true that men suffer in conscience in this life, all they shall suffer for their sins, then the harder a man can make his heart the less he will suffer; and he is the greatest of fools who allows himself to think upon his sins, or willingly to weep one tear of repentance. In other words, according to this doctrine, the more a man deserves to suffer the less he will suffer; and when a man has virtue enough to feel for his sins, he suffers far more than the hardened wretch who has no such virtuous feelings.

We conclude, then, that conscience does not punish men in this life as they deserve; that here, as truly as in external things, the ways of providence are unequal; and we argue that a state of future rewards and punishments is needed to vindicate the dealings of God with men.

But there is a *third* important point, which, upon principles of reason, should shut out every wicked man from all hope of the favor of God in the world to come. The wickedness of a man lies in his character, and we have

no reason to believe that that character undergoes any change in passing from this world to the next.

Suppose that the police of New York should receive notice from the police of London that a notorious burglar had left England to come to this country ; a description of his person accompanies the notice, and though no requisition is made, they are put upon their guard. Accordingly, the New York officers watch that man ; they are suspicious of every movement ; and if a daring robbery is committed, they are on the alert to discover any traces which may point to him as the perpetrator. But why is it that this stranger, more than another who lands upon our shores, is dogged from place to place, scrutinized in his most innocent actions, and suspected in every casual visit he pays to a bank or a counting room ? He has done us no harm. If he were now taken before a court of justice, no charge could be sustained to justify his confinement. For aught our officers know, he may have reformed during his voyage across the Atlantic. Why is he an object of suspicion ? Because his character is known. Our officers have no just reason for believing that a change in country makes a change in the man. A villain in England is not likely to be an honest man in America. The breezes of the ocean have no power to change the heart. "*Coelum, non animus mutant, qui trans mare currunt.*"

What reason have we for supposing that the soul of man is different in moral character and feeling after death, from our knowledge of it in this world ? We see men live in wickedness, which grows worse and more obdurate as they draw near the close of life ; we hear them advocating the most pernicious principles even more strenuously as they grow older ; we see no sign of change for the better till the grave closes over them ; and if reason and experience are our sole guides, there can be no possible evidence of a change after this. Reasoning from analogy, we would declare there is no change. To pass from this world to the next, has no more tendency to change the character of a man, than to leave one country and dwell in another. But if a holy and just God abhorred the sinner's character before he died, can he approve of that unchanged character the moment after death ? Is there any just reason to believe, on the one hand, that death changes the character

of a wicked man; or, on the other, that God will smile upon the unchanged sinner? And if death does not change the sinner, or render God propitious, what reason have we to think that to all eternity any thing will ever make a change in his character, or allow a holy God to smile upon him? If the soul of man is immortal, may it not be immortal in wickedness? We find in this life that the longer a man goes on in sin the harder it is to effect any change in him; we seldom see old offenders reformed, and if we are the same beings in the future world, if we are there influenced by similar principles to those which operate here, then the characters of wicked men will grow worse and worse; their separation from God wider and wider; their aversion to holiness and holy services more and more inveterate; the hope of any restoration less likely; and thus it appears eminently reasonable that the separation between God and the sinner will be endless, and as long as God lives, and as long as the sinner lives, the Divine displeasure and wrath will be upon the wicked. Unless, then, those that reject revelation can point out some reasonable method by which the characters of wicked men become changed; unless they can show that there is a new state of trial beyond the grave, the necessary result of candid reasoning will prove that there is punishment in the future world for the wicked; that there is a separation between God and every sinner; and that separation and punishment, in the very nature of the case, can never end. But the rejector of revelation laughs at conversion and knows nothing of a changed heart. On his own principles there must be a separation between a holy God and a wicked heart, and that separation will be everlasting. The true doctrine of reason is thus remarkably according to the verdict of the Scriptures. Every sinner deserves and must receive the wrath of God; and every wicked man, dying in his wickedness, shall go away from God under his everlasting displeasure.

Other arguments are not wanting to show that the teachings of Reason, when carefully gathered by a thoughtful mind, or rather when not wilfully rejected by a prejudiced mind, lead us to the belief that the future punishment of the wicked will be everlasting. The doctrine of universal salvation, by the acknowledgment of many of

its own advocates, is one dangerous for general belief. We have been personally told by Universalists that some persons ought not to believe this doctrine, lest they should be without restraint. In other words, what they call truth has an immoral tendency. We believe this false doctrine has this necessary tendency upon every mind. And if we are to blot out all idea of future punishment, we not only set men loose for the wildest crimes, but allow them to dishonor God with perfect impunity. If there is no such punishment, then a man may trample on every law ; may blaspheme God in every possible way ; and then, by striking at his own life, may be immediately ushered into an immortality of favor with his Maker. Such revolting and dangerous results cannot belong to the truth. Truth is ever lovely ; it ever blesses man and honors God ; and we have no fear of the bad consequences of proclaiming it. The doctrine of no future punishment is pernicious if it could be true, but it is false, every way we take it.

And it is true, undeniably, that almost the universal belief of man includes this doctrine—the future punishment of the wicked. This will prove at least that the opposite doctrine is not an instinctive and intuitive truth ; and those who maintain it, should prefer strong and good reasons for their views.

We conclude, then, upon this subject, that they who reject the Bible because it teaches the future punishment of the wicked, do not find themselves any better off when reason is seriously consulted. Even upon one point which we have omitted to press, reason may be found not so far behind the Bible as its votaries imagine. The Bible is strict in its views of sin, and men are usually lax in their opinions, and regard sin as an evil of less serious importance. But this is only so when each man looks at his own sin. The very man who most flatters himself, and apologizes for his iniquity, is keen-sighted and censorious in judging, not only the actions, but the motives of others. How severe is the sentence they often pass upon others ; and can they reasonably think that a holy God will less deeply search or less severely condemn than themselves ? It may be easy for a man to shut his eyes to all these legitimate sources of evidence, but it will be hard to show that he can really be any better off for his wilful blindness. God's

character and providence clearly declare that it shall not be well with the wicked. The rejector of revelation has quite as much reason to fear for the anger of God as the believer in the Bible for the terrors there set before him. Between them there is this great difference, that no ray of hope gleams in the dark sky of him who gropes his way into eternity without a revelation. He sees that God is just and inflexible in his justice; he has no rule by which sin and the penalty of it can be accurately compared; and he has no reason for concluding that God ever shows mercy. Really when we come to look at it, this boasted religion of reason is the most hopeless upon the face of the earth. Mohammedanism promises paradise to the faithful; Paganism assures its votaries that their sins are washed away in rites of pollution; and whatever may be the fancied difficulties of Christianity, no believer in it has ever doubted the cheering and satisfactory announcement, "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin." There is hope held out to all else by plain teachings, false or true; but if the deist would have peace and quiet, it can be only by shutting his eyes against the legitimate results of his own principles. His is a religion that tells of a just God, but gives no intimations of mercy: a religion without pardon, because without a Saviour.

If, then, we were called upon to characterize the religion of him who proposes to worship God according to the dictates of nature and reason to the rejection of revelation, we would say it is the religion of NO HOPE. Practically, indeed, deism is essential irreligion. It is a mere cloak assumed to cover over the fact that the individual professing it has no God and looks not forward to futurity. Deism, as we usually see it, is not a religion of serious meditation and sober thought and prayerful anxiety; and so far as concerns the present comfort of its professors, it is well that it is not. The serious rejector of the Bible must necessarily be an unhappy man. His is the religion of inflexible law; law that knows no apology for offences; law that respects not persons; law whose penalties are the dark recesses of an unknown world, may possibly be more dreadful than the most morbid fancy has ever suggested. The very lightest conclusion from these thoughts is, that the votary of mere reason is unable to show any good

ground of confidence that his shall be a happy eternity. There are some who have ignorance or hardihood enough to declare, that all they ask of the hands of their Maker is even-handed justice. For our part, we tremble at the thought of receiving what we deserve. As for us, let our souls rest for peace here and for salvation hereafter, upon that simple truth, worth all the world besides, CHRIST DIED FOR OUR SINS, ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES.

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *The Testimony and Practice of the Presbyterian Church in reference to American Slavery: with an Appendix, containing the Position of the General Assembly (New School), Free Presbyterian Church, Reformed Presbyterian, Associate, Associate Reformed, Baptist, Protestant Episcopal, and Methodist Episcopal Churches.* By Rev. JOHN ROBINSON, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Ashland, Ohio. Cincinnati: 1852. pp. 256. 12mo.

The object of the author in compiling this "HAND-BOOK" [Why transfer the German word "*Hand-Buch*?" Why not use our own word, "*Manual*?"] "ON THE SLAVERY QUESTION," was to stay, as he says, the progress of Schism, withstand the onsets of fanaticism, establish the truth, unite the people of God;" and so far as these things are involved, we must hail him as a fellow labourer in promoting the best interests of our land and the Church. His book, too, furnishes to our hand a useful digest of the deliverances of our Church courts on the subject of slavery; and as its chief design seems to have been to stay the tide of fanaticism by which he was surrounded, we must commend him for his laudable undertaking, and for the ability with which it has

been conducted. One main point in his argument is to show that "Secession is not a duty." But let no one suppose that he therefore belongs to the "Co-operationists" of our own recent political struggle. Far from it. He is arguing with the abolition men of his own region, to show them that there is no such sin in American slavery itself, and no such sanction of its abuses in the past action of our General Assembly touching this subject, that they should secede from it as a corrupt body and set up for themselves a separate tabernacle. But any argument to induce a real abolitionist, "dyed in the wool," to stay in our Church, certainly would be regarded by us a work of superogation; and we believe the author of the "Hand-Book" was rather anxious to justify our branch of the Church, amidst the violent attacks of his abolition neighbours, than to induce any of them to remain in our connection. We cheerfully bid farewell to the few who have retired from our ranks and contributed to form that body which by a strange misnomer they call "The Free Church," since the only sense in which it is so, is, that it is free from those restraints of reason, prudence and charity, which in these matters guided the Apostles and early saints, while it is bound fast by the spirit of revolution and misrule. Being released from the dominion of Christian charity, they have become δούλοι to another master, and are grinding in the prison house of the Philistines. Resistance to slavery is a narrow basis on which to erect a new denomination, and that will be a singular ecclesiastical communion which draws into its enclosure those of every variety of faith and order, and who harmonize only in this.

We are struck with the evidence this book affords us of the conservative spirit of Old School Presbyterianism. It has become so more and more amidst the agitations which have been going on around it. Its later utterances on the subject of slavery are far more considerate and more adapted to perpetuate our national integrity than its earlier, when the institution pervaded our entire territory. Indeed, the more this subject has been studied in its wide bearings, and the more the light of unwrested Scripture is shed upon it, the more kind and charitable have our brethren of the Presbyterian faith become towards us, the stronger and more

impregnable has our own position seemed even to ourselves, and the more secure are we rendered against a reckless and meddlesome fanaticism. We confess ourselves surprised at the report of the Committee of the Synod of Kentucky, (on this subject, a *border State*,) published in 1835. We think Mr. Robinson must be mistaken in supposing it expressed the views of nearly all the members of that venerable body. It contains many unguarded, unconsidered expressions. It is new to us that the Greek language, spoken by the slaveholding Greeks, has not a single term answering to the word *slave*. That they had not a term to designate what existed in all their families, is "passing strange." So, too, that slavery is forbidden in the New Testament as gladiatorial shows are forbidden, and that the texts against oppression and robbery, in the Old Testament, have any application to a system which existed in town and country, in the habitations of prophet and priest, as well as in those of the people; in the temple where they worshipped, as well as in the places of their daily toil. We think there were other reasons besides "the fanatical excitement at the North," why this extraordinary paper did not pass that Synod. Our brother looks at this subject from a Northern point of view and not a Southern, from a spot where he is envied by the enemies of the South, and not from one occupied wholly by its friends. For this we make due allowance. We wish his book were more full and complete than it is. Not by his own fault we presume, but from the difficulty of procuring the documents, the proceedings of all the Synods touching the subject are not given. On the whole, we can assure the author that we of the South were never at any past time more satisfied with the position we occupy in God's holy providence, never more resolved to go forward and perform the various duties devolved upon us, whether of resistance to the fatal intermeddling of others, or of attention to the religious wants, moral culture, and earthly well being of our home population.

2. *Wesley, and Methodism.* By ISAAC TAYLOR. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852.

Probably no production of this profound and extensive writer is more adapted than this one to awaken anxious thought and exert a practical influence on the churches and the ministry in general. Methodism, and especially Wesleyan, is felt, as widely as our language is spoken, to modify the religion of the masses, more or less, even where this religion is antagonistic in doctrines and forms of worship. The history, elements, excellencies, defects and ultimate results of this mighty influence, are unfolded with great power and depth of analysis by Mr. Taylor in this work. The sketch of its founders, which constitutes the first part of the volume, has indeed but little charm of biography, being devoid of graphic power to a great extent, and barren of incident; yet it strikes us as eminently just and faithful in its brief estimate of the original Methodists, both Calvinistic and Arminian.

The solution of Methodism into its elements, a work which the peculiar talent of the author is fitted pre-eminently to perform, though at fault with his peculiar dogmatism and formal precision of manner, is very able and instructive, and fraught with the suggestion of great principles, which every minister should apprehend and study. But the best part of the book, perhaps, is the last, which detects, with masterly exposition, the great deficiencies of this system as a distinct organization or separate Church. So grave and numerous are these defects, that the reader is compelled to believe, with the author, that Methodism is appointed to a transitory errand, rather than a permanent and distinctive form of the Church on earth: that so even its founders seemed to consider; and that after it shall have diffused the pietism it came to kindle in the bosom of existing Churches, it will pass away like the new measures of some revival season, or become essentially modified, so as to resemble the Churches it came only to excite and enliven. Some of the author's positions are questionable, some of his generalizations are unwarrantable, but the volume, as a whole, must prove exceedingly useful in guiding men of reflection to right views respecting the power of preaching to the

masses, and the completeness of development, which a true branch of the visible Church should attain.

3. *Salander and the Dragon: A Romance of the Hartz Prison.*
By FREDERIC WILLIAM SHELTON, M. A. New York: John
S. Taylor. pp. 250.

This little volume ought to have received from us an earlier notice. It is an allegory in the John Bunyan style, exhibiting the sad effects of slander in blighting the good name of men and filling society with distress and bitterness. The book bears evident traces of genius, taste and humour; the moral is excellent, the story sufficiently interesting, and the style piquant enough to arrest the attention to the close. There are not a few in every community who would be benefited by the perusal. It is a vivid commentary on the declarations of the divine word, that "Death and life are in the power of the tongue;" that "it is a fire, a world of iniquity, an unruly evil, full of deadly poison, setting on fire the course of nature, and is set on fire of hell." All may read it with profit.

4. *Romanism at Home. Letters to the Hon. Roger B. Taney, Chief Justice of the United States.* By KIRWAN. New York: Harper & Brothers. pp. 272. 12mo.

These letters are evidently a supplement to those formerly addressed by the author to Bishop Hughes, and which enjoyed an unexampled run in this country. We cannot think this volume equal to its predecessor. It seems to consist of notes of travel very hastily put together for the press, with too much reliance on the part of the author upon a previous reputation. The invective is often severe, without being keen; awakening in the Romanist resentment for injury, without making him smart under the in-

fiction. Kirwan's name will, however, carry the book against criticism, if it does not to a great extent disarm it.

As it is the leading object of this book to depict the influence of Romanism on social life and civil liberty, as well as upon religion itself, it was a happy conception of the author's to address these letters to Chief Justice Taney, who, though a professed Romanist, presides over the Judiciary of this great country—the august representative of that mighty power which throws the shield of protection and law over person and property alike.

5. *The Ruling Eldership of the Christian Church.* By the Rev. DAVID KING, L.L.D. Glasgow. New York; Robert Carter & Brothers. 1852. pp. 165. 16mo.

This volume first appeared in 1844. The second Edinburgh edition, in 1846, was noticed by us in our first volume. The present republication of the Carters is from the Glasgow edition of 1851. The introductory portion of the earlier editions is omitted in this, that it may be expanded into a general treatise on Church polity, in reply to the recent works of Drs. Wardlaw and Davidson, and that the present volume may assume a more exclusively practical character. A valuable appendix by James Peddie, W. S. on the Liability of Elders and other Ecclesiastical office-bearers to actions for damages for their official acts, though adapted to the laws of Scotland, is not without its utility to Church officers in our own land. The whole furnishes an acceptable aid to the conscientious Elder, anxious to know and discharge his duty to the Church.

6. *Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity, delivered at the University of Virginia, during the session of 1850–1.* pp. 606. 8vo. New York: Carters. 1852.

This work has not received an earlier notice at our hands simply because we had hoped to do it more ample justice in an ex-

tended review. We have been led to expect from one accomplished writer an article taking in its compass all the Lectures in this volume, and from another distinguished gentleman a special review of the Lecture on the Internal Evidences. In the hope of being able, at a future time, to lay these productions before our readers, we prefer still to withhold any minute expression of our own judgment. As might be expected from so great a variety of authors, there is great variety in the character and excellence of their contributions. Some of them, as the first in the series, do not seem to us to grapple with the real metaphysical or practical difficulties of the subject. The Lecture devoted to the refutation of Mr. Morell's theory of Inspiration, is scarcely equal to its task. Those on the Internal Evidences, and on the difficulties of Infidelity, are decidedly able, and worthy of their authors.

We are glad to see an example set of Lectureships for the propagation of Christian truth. There are many circles of doctrine which might be thus ably discussed, with the advantage of pouring the fresh light of advancing science, and meeting the controversies in the new phases they from time to time assume. It is very evident, for example, that the old defences of Christianity, so satisfactory a half century ago, will not meet the present attacks made by Infidels and Rationalists. However valuable the writings of the old apologists may be, constituting a precious portion of our religious literature, and rendering impossible the resurrection of the exploded systems of the earlier infidels, yet must the Church furnish new champions, who shall rescue the truth from those that seek to overwhelm it with false science, or to supersede it with a spurious Psychology. Able as these Lectures for the most part are, they by no means exhaust the subject; and it would be a happy omen if our more prominent Colleges would follow the lead of the Virginia University, and thus become the centres of a diffusive as well as sanctified literature.

-
7. *The Bible in the Family, or Hints on Domestic Happiness.*
Philadelphia. pp. 343. 12mo.

The Lecture allows a greater freedom of discourse, and a more

extended and continuous handling of a subject than a regular sermon, which presupposes a unity of subject and its complete treatment within the brief time in which an audience can be held together with convenience to themselves. The book before us impresses us with the author's ability in this useful department of a pastor's labours. It suggests to the reader many things suited to make our homes happy, which in our careless living in our social and domestic relations, never occupy our thoughts. We are engrossed with our studies, labours, and worldly plans. To our children, relatives and friends, we have a true and uninterrupted affection; but how we shall advance their well-being, improve their characters, increase their own and our enjoyment while we live, by diffusing considerably the corrective and joyous spirit of our religion over all the relations of life, gives us far too little concern. If we would realise that "godliness is profitable unto *all* things, having promise of the life that *now* is," we may be assisted to do so by the perusal of this volume.

-
8. *Daily Bible Illustrations.* By JOHN KITTO, D. D. F. S. A. *Evening Series. Job and the Poetical Books.* pp. 410. 12mo.
9. *The Lost Senses. Deafness and Blindness.* pp. 379. 12mo. *New York: Carter & Brothers.*

The first of these reprints is a continuation of the interesting series of Observations on Scripture, the preceding volumes of which we have successively introduced to our readers. It carries us over the books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles, and though different from the others in its more literary cast, is yet replete with illustration drawn from the Oriental experience of the author.

It was not till we met with the second of the volumes whose titles are given above, that we knew that one who has seen so much, and to such good purpose, is deficient in any of those organs of sense which are the inlets of all our knowledge from the external

world. But at twelve years of age, by a fall upon the pavement from a great height, he received a shock from which he slowly recovered, but which deprived him utterly of the faculty of hearing, and affected painfully and permanently his power of articulation, not indeed to deprive him of speech, but to render it strange and unearthly to the ears of others. The volume on the Lost Senses gives, so far as his deafness is concerned, his own sensations, privations, mortifications and adventures, which have been the result of his want of hearing, and in relation to the other sense, sight, is an interesting collection of facts connected with the loss of this sense, and an account of some of the principal instances of blind travellers who have gone abroad to see the world, of blind poets, blind musicians, blind divines, (we trust their number is not large,) and blind philosophers. The whole is written in his easy and graceful style, and while it will be read with peculiar sympathy by those whose hearing is impaired, will be found quite a readable volume by all.

10. *Wheat or Chaff?* By the Rev. J. C. RYLE, B. A. New York: Carter & Brothers. pp. 382. 16mo.

The motto of the book is the following sentence from Flavel, "Men have their winnowing days, and God hath his." The subjects of the several portions are as follows: "Wheat or Chaff?" "Watch," "Prove all things," "Are you regenerate?" "How should a child be trained?" "Be not slothful, but followers." The book is written in the style of "Living or Dead," its predecessor from the same mint. The author has learned the power of reproof, and knows the way to the consciences of men.

11. *An Analysis and Summary of Thucydides, with a chronological table of the principal events; money, distances, &c. reduced to English terms; a skeleton outline of the geography,*

abstracts of all the speeches, &c. By the author of "An Analysis and Summary of Herodotus," &c. Oxford: England. pp. 376. 12mo.

12. *An Analysis and Summary of Old Testament History and the laws of Moses. With an introductory outline of the geography, political history, &c; the prophecies, types and intimations of the Messiah; Jewish history from Nehemiah to A. D. 70; Chronology added throughout; examination questions, By the author of "An Analysis and Summary of Herodotus." Oxford: England. pp. 285. 12mo.*

The compiler of the above named volumes is J. Talboys Wheeler, of Cambridge, England. Their design is to assist the student in the English Universities in "getting up" the books of which they give the analysis for examination. They may serve a similar end in those colleges and schools where the students are examined *in extenso* on these branches of study. They add nothing in the way of explanation, but are merely labor-saving *machines*, bringing immediately before the student's eye what he may wish to have infixed in his memory, so as to *pass muster* before his examiners in the day of trial. The analysis of the Old Testament is surpassed, it seems to us, by many books in this country, prepared for the ordinary classes in our Sabbath schools. The mere outline of Scripture facts which it contains, when the Chronology is deducted, is hardly more than floats in the memory of our more advanced Sabbath scholars.

-
13. *The Heavenly Recognition; or an earnest and Scriptural discussion of the question, Will we know our friends in Heaven? By Rev. H. HARBAUGH, A. M. Second edition. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1852. pp. 288. 12mo.*

The writer, in this somewhat discursive volume, has brought together from various quarters whatever seemed suited to strength-

en the conviction which it is not difficult to entertain, that we shall know each other in the heavenly state to which all believers are hastening. To those bereaved of pious friends, the thought is full of consolation, that Heaven is the meeting place of all the saints. They at least will thank the author for so grateful a labour as that of giving substance to the belief ever deepening within them, that the world of glory which has received the Saviour, holds also those to whom their hearts have been knit in love and friendship here, with whom they shall again hold intercourse when the brief and troubled season of life is passed. The circle of proof by which this point is established, is indeed of no great amplitude, yet sufficient where there is so little opposing evidence, to render it more than probable.

14. *The Mystery Solved, or Ireland's Miseries. The Grand Cause and Cure. By the Rev. EDWARD MARCUS DILL, A. M. M. D. Missionary Agent to the Irish Presbyterian Church. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1852. pp. 346. 16mo.*

One is astonished at the facts this book presents. In five years, from 1846 to 1851, the population of Ireland has diminished 2,500,000, or more than one-third. The famine destroyed 1,000,000; the country has lost the remaining 1,500,000 by emigration. America now holds of the Irish people 1,000,000 more than Ireland herself retains. In ten years, no less than 269,353 of all the inhabitants of the country have been swept away. The gentry in many instances have become impoverished, and in one instance an Irish Baronet is a common turnkey in a public prison. And yet Erin is the fairest of the British isles, and nature has lavished her favours upon her. Dr. Dill points to the blighting influence of the Romish faith as the chief cause of her wretchedness. The province of Ulster, which is filled with a Protestant population, has steadily increased in numbers, wealth and prosperity, amid the general downfall. And in proportion as the Popish faith prevails, in the same degree is there the absence of thrift and the prevalence of ignorance, poverty and wretchedness.

16. *The Indian Tribes of Guiana.* By the Rev. W. H. BRETT.
New York: Carters. pp. 352. 16mo.

The Rev. Mr. Brett is the first of the Missionaries sent out by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, to British Guiana. He has given us in this volume an interesting account of his labours among the savage tribes of that portion of South America, the whole interspersed with descriptions of the various tribes of Indians, of the country, its natural history and productions.

16. *God in Disease, or the Manifestations of Design in Morbid Phenomena.* By JAMES F. DUNCAN, M. D. Physician to Sir P. Dun's Hospital, Dublin. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blackiston. 1852. pp. 232. 16mo.

Two errors prevail in respect to the visitations of disease, one that it results from the necessary condition of our being and is a casual occurrence, regulated by no law; the other that it is a punishment inflicted for some previous misconduct, and is altogether penal in its nature. Although the distinctions of the author do not appear to us altogether accurate when he claims that disease is never a punishment, but always sent as a *corrective*, we agree with him that its main design is disciplinary, aiming at the correction of the offender. He maintains that this is the case even in reference to impenitent men who die in their sins, because in strict punishment inexorable justice inflicts the full amount of the deserved penalty with no mixture of mercy, but the merciful provisions apparent in disease show it to be of the nature of discipline, rather than of punishment. The author applies the argument from design to the whole subject. Even where disease ends in the destruction of the temple of the body, there is such a method in it that the various ends the Great Ruler had in view are often discoverable and the moral influence perceived by the attentive observer. The ends of sickness are discussed, the ob-

jects accomplished by the varieties of disease, by the pain, by the modifications of pain, by the other unpleasant sensations experienced in sickness, by the processes of a preservative nature occurring in disease, the processes of reparation and adaptation, and the illustrations of spiritual truth which these physical states afford, are all handled with comparative fulness. The thoughts, if not original with the author, are out of the ordinary train of observation, and would hardly have occurred to any but a Christian physician, viewing the phenomena which he daily witnesses in the chamber of sickness, in their religious and moral bearings, and as illustrating the wisdom and goodness of Him who does not willingly afflict or grieve the children of men. Let those who are accustomed to trace the hand of God in his works, trace it also in those processes by which these works are finally resolved into their original elements, preparatory to that reconstruction which yet awaits them in the distant future.

17. *The Friend of Moses; or A Defence of the Pentateuch as the production of Moses and an inspired document, against the objections of Modern Skepticism.* By WM. T. HAMILTON, D. D. Pastor of the Government-street Church, Mobile, Alabama. New-York: M. W. Dodd. 1852. pp. 547. 8vo.

The substance of this volume has been presented to the Christian public in a more ephemeral form in the columns of one of our religious weeklies, having first been delivered as popular lectures to the author's own congregation. The phases of scepticism are constantly varying, and the defences of Revelation must vary to meet them. And yet those objections which strike the mind as so new, and which lead the believer in revelation into unusual paths of research, in order to refute them, have not so entirely the recommendation of new discoveries, and do not so fully mark the progress of mind, as those who offer them apprehend. The opaque orb of error revolves but slowly on its axis, the eccentric comet revisits us but after the lapse of centuries,

and the generation which beheld the existing phase of the one, or the portentous flight of the other, have long gone to the land of silence, and have left behind them sometimes but the briefest record and sometimes none at all, of what they witnessed and what they thought. So these modern controversies are but the revival of ancient doubts. The cosmogony of Moses has had to fight its way at all times against opposing theories. The same difficulties have always been felt respecting the deluge, the peopling of the world and the dispersion of nations. The Jew in Egypt before Christ, and the Nestorian in China since, though centuries still have passed, have seen the contest between the chronologies as vividly as our most astute unbelievers, only with vastly better means of proving the truth. The negro for unknown ages has been as black, the Indian as red, and the Mongolian as peculiar as now. And there are traces left that these things have been subjects of thought and of discussion, that the Bible has fought its way and approved itself, notwithstanding opposition, to the philosopher and the scholar, as well as to the uncultivated man, even as now. Geology alone is new, but is becoming more sober and more deferential to the Scriptures the older it grows. These subjects have been somewhat amply discussed in our pages. Dr. Hamilton has also been led by the force of circumstances to give them his attentive consideration. His volume will be read with profit by those who desire information on these topics, and who would know how the Scriptures are assailed and in what manner they may be defended. If the author's life is spared, he will doubtless pursue the subject further. He has already sailed for the old world with a view to prosecute his researches. We expect soon to hear of him from the cataracts of the Nile, from the pyramids of Gizeh, the temples of Esneh, Dendera, Edfou, and Beit-ou-Walleh. We wish him much success amid the hitherto baffling enigmas of Egyptian history. Ariadne's thread, if he could find it, to guide us through this Labyrinth, would indeed be just now an acquisition.

18. *Christ our Example.* By CAROLINE FRY. *To which is prefixed an Autobiography of the author.* New-York: Carters. 1852. pp. 386. 18mo.

The autobiography of this excellent lady has interested us deeply. Her religious experience was so clear and lively, her repose on the justifying righteousness of Christ so perfect, that she was well qualified by the spirit's teaching to present to others Christ as our example. The day before her death, in a letter to a friend, she says: "The bright, the blessed hour for which I have toiled and waited so many years; the panacea at all times of every painful, every fearful thought, has seemed in my spasmodic agonies of breathlessness, immediately at hand." And on the next day she exclaimed, "This is my bridal day, 'the beginning of my life.' I wish there should be no mistake about the reason of my desire to depart and be with Christ. I desire to go to Him that I may be rid of the burden of sin." *O sic si omnes!*

-
19. *The Holy Testament, or the Book of the Holy Gospel of our Lord and our God, Jesus the Messiah.* *A literal translation from the Syriac Peshito version.* By JAMES MURDOCH, D. D. New-York: Stanford & Swords. 1851. pp. 515. 8vo.

We chronicle thus late the publication of this volume. The Peshito Syriac is the oldest version of the New Testament, having been made, it is believed, late in the first or early in the second century. It is the most accurate of all the old versions of the Scriptures, of great critical value, and not without its use in the interpretation of the text. The translation of the translation appears to be a faithful one, and will place much of the advantage to be gained by the study of the Syriac version within the reach of the mere English scholar.

One proof of the great antiquity of this version is that it did not embrace the second of Peter, the second and third of John, the epistle of Jude and the Apocalypse at first, but only those

portions of the New Testament which had been acknowledged by the Church of Syria as apostolic writings. These have since been added from the later Philoxenian or Heracleian Syriac.

20. *Historical Commentaries on the State of Christianity during the first three hundred and twenty-five years from the Christian era, being a translation of the Commentaries on the affairs of the Christians before the time of Constantine the Great.* By JOHN LAWRENCE MOSHEIM, D. D. late Chancellor of the University of Gottingen. In two volumes. Volume I. translated by R. S. Vidal, Esq; volume II. translated and both volumes edited by James Murdock, D.D. New-York: S. Converse, 1851.

The Commentaries of Mosheim on the affairs of Christians for the first three centuries, have always been much valued by the student of history. They embrace a full discussion of the main particulars embraced in his general history, which includes only the results of these more extended labours. The translation by Vidal has long been before the English public, and we are glad that the whole work has now been made accessible to the American reader. The later researches of Neander and others have not superseded the learned and, for the most part, impartial labours of Mosheim. These are at least free from the transcendental mysticism of the late German scholars, and are not inferior to their writings in genuine learning.

21. *Die Offenbarung des heiligen Johannes für solche die in der Schrift forschen erläutert* von E. W. HENGSTENBERG, Dr. und Professor der Theologie in Berlin. Erster Band. Berlin. 1849. pp. 632. 8vo.

The Revelation of St. John. Expounded for those who search the Scriptures. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, Doctor and Professor
VOL. VI.—No. 1. 11

of Theology in Berlin. Translated from the original by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, author of Typology of Scripture, &c. Volume I: New-York: Robert Carter & Brother. 1852. pp. 581. 8vo.

The German copy of this first volume came into our hands soon after its publication, but we have not seen the second volume as yet, nor can we judge of this latter part of the exposition save as it was anticipated in the *Kirchen-Zeitung* for 1847 and 1848, published by the same author, or has been reported by others. This exposition of the Apocalypse was suggested to the learned author during a season of sickness, which interrupted for some months his official duties. Looking around for a rod and a staff to comfort him, he soon met with the Revelation. Pondering it day and night, one difficulty, he tells us, vanished after another. Having completed his Commentary on the Psalms, he went with great zest and enjoyment to this labour. He would have published both volumes simultaneously, but could not hold back the rich treasure of counsel and comfort which the Lord had provided in this book, from those who needed it. Every one is anxious to know what view so distinguished a scholar has taken of the Apocalypse. Our limits do not permit us to indicate them save in the briefest manner. With Vitranga and the older theologians he places the composition of the book in the closing period of the reign of Domitian. This effectually cuts off the application of the former part of it to the destruction of Jerusalem. The subject of the book is Christ's judgment upon the world and his protection and exaltation of the Church. The epistles to the seven Churches he does not consider with Vitranga as of a prophetic character, but as intended to introduce this book to them and through them to the whole Church, and to exhort and warn them as to their own duties and dangers, that they may prepare the way of the Lord. Corresponding with the group of the seven letters is the group of the seven seals. Corresponding again with both is the group of the seven trumpets. The seven seals of the book of God's decrees respecting the ungodly, are successively broken, and judgments are poured forth on the enemies of

God, but the elect are sealed and protected in these seasons of judgment. The seven trumpets are the annunciation of war and defeat to the hostile world. Then come the three enemies of the Church of God. (1.) The great red Dragon, or Satan, ch. xii. (2.) The Sea-Monster, or the ungodly world-power, xiii. 1-10. (3.) The Earth-Monster, the earthly, sensual, demonical wisdom, xiii. 11-18. The woman clothed with the sun is the Church of God; the man child, the vigorous growth of the people of God. This Church the dragon seeks to destroy but is defeated. Here the present volume stops. It is evident that the beast with the seven heads and ten horns is not, in his view, the papal power, but any persecuting worldly power, and especially that of paganism. The numbers, too, of the book of revelation, with him, are symbolical, and indicate no definite time. The thousand years reign of Christ he believes to be already past. And this he thinks is comforting to us, that we have left this period behind, that we have not before us the twilight, but the bright, clear day; not those preliminary triumphs which are followed by discomfiture, but the great final one. A digest of the various opinions entertained of the Apocalypse from the earliest times, would, we think, repress the dogmatism of its interpreters, and convince each one that what he brings forth in the way of explanation should be with modesty rather than in the tone of confidence. The spirit of Hengstenberg will be admired, even if his opinions are not adopted.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER II.

OCTOBER, 1852.

ARTICLE I.

PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN ECONOMY.

The history of the Christian world shows that there has been a wide-spread sensibility, in the conscience of Christians, to the sin of indulgence in superfluities. This sensibility has sometimes shown itself in a morbid, and sometimes in a blind, undistinguishing way. Among the mendicant and some of the monastic orders of the Romish communion, poverty and simplicity of life formed a part of the vows and rules, however little part they may have had in their practice. Among the Churches of the Reformation, we find the Mennonites forbidding, not only all luxuries of dress, equipage and furniture, but even the fine arts and liberal education. The denomination of Quakers, as is well known, practised a similar sobriety. A part of the original discipline of the Methodists was to enforce a strict renunciation of all the pomps and vanities of the world. These facts indicate that the conscience of the Christian world has had an extensive feeling of the obligation to moderation and self-denial in the use of wealth, though they may prove that this feeling has not been very well defined nor intelligent.

Several things in the present state of the Church induce the belief that there is a strong demand for the discussion and enforcement of the true principles of Christian economy at this day. These circumstances are the great increase of material wealth, and consequently of luxuries, in

civilized nations, in consequence of the amazing applications of philosophy to the arts of production; the obvious and constant progress of genteel society in the style of living; the strong similarity of rich Christians to rich unbelievers, in regard to the style of living; and the peculiar demands of God's cause for pecuniary resources in this, the golden opportunity for evangelical effort.

If the attempt be made to settle the principles of Christian self denial in expenditures, by drawing a line between the part to be appropriated to ourselves and the part to be appropriated to God, we see not where or how that line can be safely drawn. How much revenue has God a right to draw from our possessions? How much is due to us? What general ratio shall be taken for making the division? We can see but one scriptural or rational answer which the Christian can make to these questions: *Our property is purely a trust fund, and the whole of it is to be used for the benefit of the owner.* There is to be no division at all. There is to be no line drawn between God's portion and our portion. All is God's, and all is to be employed for him. Here is the only true and safe starting point for deducing our practical rules of Christian expenditure.

The idea of a stewardship is a correct illustration of the nature of the tenure by which we hold our possessions. This is plain from the fact that the Scriptures employ it to illustrate our responsibility for all the means of serving God, and our property among the rest. A steward is one who manages property which does not belong to him. This is just the case with us. The property in our hands is, literally, God's property. He created it. He preserves it. He calls it his own while it is in our hands. "Every beast of the forest is mine and the cattle upon a thousand hills." The most important property of a pastoral people is cattle, and God expressly claims the domesticated cattle, as well as the wild animals which were not appropriated as individual possessions. Now, it is the plainest truth in the world, that the steward is to manage the estate committed to him, not for his private advantage or profit, but for that of the owner. The owner, as a just and benevolent man, will of course allow his steward a competent subsistence out of the estate; but the profits of the property are his, not his servant's: and the general aim with

which the whole is managed is to promote his advantage.

But the Scripture likens our relation to God to one far closer and stricter than the steward's. We are ourselves God's property. We belong to him, body and soul, just as truly as the riches which he has lent us. "And *ye* are not your own, for ye are bought with a price. Therefore glorify God in your body and your spirit, *which are God's*." "Also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant." "Ye also have a Master in heaven." It is a settled rule of law, that a slave can own no property. Whatever he has, and whatever he may acquire, belong to the master; to whom he belongs, except so far as the master may lend him the use of it. So we, God's slaves, can own nothing. Hence we argue that if all which is, in human language, most essentially our own, our limbs, our faculties, and the fruits of their exertions—if we ourselves, in the very essence that constitutes our being, belong to God, and ought therefore to be employed for his exclusive use, much more does our property, which is only entrusted to us. Our property may be viewed as one class of material and instruments, lent to us, with which to work. Now, of course, if the limbs and faculties, with all the products of their exertions, belong to God, the results of these borrowed tools and materials belong to him by a double right.

The same conclusion follows from all those passages of Scripture in which it is taught that we are to render to God all the service of which our faculties and circumstances admit. We are to employ all the lawful means within our reach, and to exert every nerve, to serve and glorify Him. "For of Him, and through Him, *and to Him*, are all things." "And whatsoever ye do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength." And Christian love is a feeling eminently practical; "for this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." According to these rules, the only limit to the service we are to render to God is the limit of our strength, means, and opportunities. In whatever way it is possible for us to do any thing, without

sin, whereby the glory of God may be promoted, that thing it is our duty to do. We are to serve God *with all our strength*. Our property is a part of our strength, and therefore we are to serve him with all our property. It is to be noticed, also, that though no Christian acts up to this perfect rule, yet no true Christian desires, or aims at, any less. No true penitent is satisfied with any imperfection, for imperfection is sin. If, then, there is any part of our property of which it is *impossible* to make any lawful use for the glory of God, that part, and that part alone, we may spend upon ourselves. And where shall that part be found? when there is so much want, ignorance and sin to be relieved, and while there are so many thousand thirsty channels in which benevolence might flow.

It is important also to bear in this mind; it is not enough to be able to say that the use which we make of our property is an innocent one, and has some tendency to promote the glory of God. It is our duty to make the best use of every part of our possessions that is possible in our circumstances. If there was any way within our reach in which our money might have produced more good and more honor to God, when we spent it in something innocent, but less beneficial to his service, we have come short of our duty. *We have sinned*. For the only rule allowed us is to serve him "*with all our strength*." We have no right to waste any part of our efficiency.

The principle that we are to use the whole property entrusted to us for the highest advantage of the owner, is surely established by superabundant proof. The steps by which the above reasonings have led us, are so simple and short that there can be no hesitation in admitting them, unless hesitation be produced by what is very obvious at the first glance, that the principle now established will condemn the habitual conduct of Christians to a woful extent. How few are there who put their hands into their pockets with a constant and conscientious recollection of their stewardship? How few earn for God? How few look around them amidst the demands of God's suffering cause, or suffering poor, for the strongest claim, and the best means of glorifying him with their superfluous wealth? Do we not rather look within, among the idle desires of vanity or self indulgence, to see which we shall gratify

first, thinking we have been very conscientious if we stop to enquire whether it is innocent?

We pass now to some specimens of the manner in which this principle applies. And first, it is proper that we should employ so much of God's property as is necessary in our own sustenance. The servant must be duly fed and clothed, in order that he may be able to work for his master. This expenditure is, most strictly, an expenditure in God's service, since it results in work done for him. And this justifies us, not only in expending on ourselves what is needful to sustain the body, as wholesome food, raiment, and shelter, but also whatever is truly needed to give the highest efficiency to both body and mind for God's service, and whatever truly promotes the noblest development of our moral qualities. This will include, for instance, that comfort and cleanliness in food and dress, and those recreations and enjoyments which are necessary to give the greatest firmness to the muscles and most healthy energy to the animal spirits, food for the mind, such as judicious education, good books and useful accomplishments, proper medicines and remedies in sickness, and a wholesome and natural cultivation of those tastes which tend to refine and elevate the moral nature. We believe that neither God's providence nor law has designed that man shall serve him as a dull, over-worked hack, but that the rendering of the highest, and best, and greatest service, is perfectly consistent with man's highest enjoyment of the natural and rational blessings of life. The simple and temperate use of all those enjoyments strengthens man for his work, by promoting the contentment and cheerfulness of his feelings. In one word, it is right to expend on ourselves all that will qualify us to serve God with the greatest efficiency. This is, strictly, expending God's property in his own service.

If we are asked whether this admission can be extended to an allowance of artificial luxuries, and the costly refinements of fashionable life, an answer will be found in this question: Can any way be shown in which they make us more efficient servants of God? Do they promote health? No, they are debilitating. Do they cultivate the mind? No, they dwarf it. Do they promote cheerfulness? They are much more fruitful of care and petty jealousies. Are they necessary to give that respectability among men

which extends the influence for good? No. Do they promote that humility, that spiritual mind, which are more essential to usefulness than health or animal spirits? Alas, no. Let an honest conscience answer these questions, and an answer is found for the other.

Second: it is right to employ a part of our Master's possessions in sustaining and rearing the families which he has committed to us. Next to the preservation of our own lives, this is the most obligatory of all uses which we are required to make of the property entrusted to us. God's providence points at us as the proper agents for the sustenance of our own families, and the training of our children for usefulness, by placing them nearer to us than to any one else. In sustaining his servants, and rearing new servants for his use, we are strictly applying his property to his advantage. And the same remarks made concerning the extent of the provision for our own sustenance and equipment for service, apply to our households. We should expend on them so much as will bring their bodies, minds, and hearts to the highest efficiency for God's service, that our circumstances will permit. But surely we have no right to mis-spend our Master's property in providing for our families, luxuries, amusements, fineries, or wealth, which add nothing to their energies, bodily, mental, or moral; but, on the contrary, produce vanity, effeminacy, envy and self-indulgence, and unfit them to "endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ." That this is the tendency of the refinements and luxuries of fashionable life, especially with the young, whose characters are in a forming state, is too clear to be disputed. Let this single fact testify, that not only in the Church, but in the worldly professions, few of the men who make their mark, and serve their generation, are reared in the lap of wealth. The *useful men*, the working men of every community, are usually the sons of poverty, or of plain mediocrity. To use God's wealth in bestowing such indulgences, is a double dishonesty. It embezzles the trust, and it robs him of the services of our children by disqualifying them for active usefulness. A kindred abuse of the trust is committed by those who stint their children of a thorough education for usefulness, because so large a portion of their means is appropriated to selfish indulgences, or more frequently to the schemes of avarice.

Third: a part of the possessions entrusted to us may be rightfully employed in making a reasonable provision for ourselves and those dependent on us against the contingencies of the future. As the parent is charged now with the sustenance of his children, it is proper that he should lay by in store something to keep them from want when he is taken from them by death. How much of God's property may be rightfully retained for this purpose, must be decided in each case by its own circumstances. But this much may be said, in general, that we are certainly not justified in laying up wealth for our children, by any consideration of our obligation to God. For, as experience declares, there is nothing which is so apt to make a young person worthless, both to his Maker and his fellow men, as a large inheritance. How, then, can we be right in abstracting a large part of that trust which we are bound to use wholly for God's glory, and employing it to destroy the usefulness of one of his creatures? The rule proper to men of large wealth seems to be this: that they shall set apart for those dependent persons whom they shall leave behind them, a comfortable maintenance; and appropriate the rest to the glory of God. Or if they leave more than this in the hands of their heirs, it should be with the express understanding that those heirs shall take it only as the successors in their stewardship. Where there is a reasonable probability that the heir will not be faithful to this trust, the parent has no right to bequeath them the surplus property above a competency, whether the unfaithfulness of the heir arise from wastefulness or avarice. What would be thought of a steward who, when compelled to take a long journey and to employ a substitute in his trust, should entrust his master's property to a hand known to be faithless? So, the steward of God, going that journey from which he will never return, has no right to commit his master's possessions to faithless hands, because those hands happen to be his son's. He should himself appropriate his surplus wealth to its owner's use before he goes hence. There is nothing which more betrays the defective views of Christian men concerning this property, than the manner in which they bequeath it. How few are there who remember, in making a will, that the possessions of which they are about to dispose *do not be-*

long to them, and that the utmost they can presume to do, as Christians, is to appoint successors to themselves in their stewardship? If they wittingly appoint an unfaithful one, from their weak partiality, they are themselves unfaithful stewards. How shall they be able to stand up in judgment and "give an account of their stewardship," when its last act has been to place the trust in a defaulter's hands? When the conscience of the Church is properly awakened and enlightened on this point, there will be more instances like those rare and honourable ones of which we occasionally hear; when Christians who are entrusted with much wealth, will bequeath more of it to pious and charitable uses than to their children.

Those who have any property remaining after these three lawful deductions are made, are required, obviously, by our principles, to use it in doing good. The particular modes in which wealth may be made to promote the glory of its owner, God, are exceedingly various; and the choice in each case must be left to the conscience of the individual steward. But there will be no danger of serious mistake, if the sincere purpose in every case is to use all our possessions for the highest glory of God. And let the truth be again impressed, that, as we are commanded to love and serve God with *all our strength*, it is not enough to be able to say that the object we have selected for the expenditure of any surplus wealth, is innocent, and has some tendency to honour God. Our duty is not done till we have conscientiously selected that object by which our expenditure will do the highest honour to God, and good to his creatures that are within our reach.

It now requires little argument to show that the whole list of superfluities, fashionable indulgences, and extravagances, is cut off. No Christian, no man, can expend his master's wealth upon them without committing sin. For we might even admit that a multitude of these extravagances were innocent, that they had some tendency to refine the taste; in a word, we might admit all that the softest luxury could plead in their behalf, and yet, while it is true that there are other ways open, in the providence of God, in which wealth may do a higher good, it is a sin and a waste to spend any of it in superfluities. Who does not know that there are thousands of ways for doing that

higher good with wealth, in this world of want and ignorance? And the greater the contrast between the beneficence and utility of these works of mercy and the supposed advantages of these selfish superfluities, the clearer is the sin of indulging them. Some may ask, "What is superfluity, and what is extravagance?" We do not at all dispute that to draw the line between the allowable comforts of life and sinful extravagance, by a general rule fitting every particular case, may be impossible. But it is not at all necessary to draw such a line. All that is necessary is to establish in the consciences of men sound principles on this subject, and in their hearts the supreme love of God. The particulars will then easily take care of themselves.

But it will not be difficult to illustrate the subject by a number of instances, which are clearly on the wrong side of the supposed line, and in which multitudes of wealthy Christians will find themselves clearly condemned. When a Christian man, who has professed to dedicate himself and his all, body, soul and estate, to the highest glory of God, and love of his fellow-creatures, passes by the hundreds of starving poor, and degraded sinners around him, the thousands of ignorant at home, and the millions of perishing heathen, whom his money might, instrumentally, rescue from hell-fire, and sells for a song his safe, strong, comfortable family carriage, and expends hundreds in procuring another, because his rich neighbour is about to outstrip him in this article of equipage; or when he sacrifices his plate and china to buy new at a great cost, because the style of the old was a little past; or when he pulls down his commodious dwelling to expend thousands in building another, because the first was unfashionable; is not this sinful waste? When hundreds and thousands of God's money are abstracted from the wants of a perishing world, for which the Son of God died, to purchase the barbaric finery of jewelry, as offensive to good taste as to Christian economy, jewelry which keeps out no cold blast in winter, and no scorching heat in summer, which fastens no needful garment and promotes no bodily comfort, is not this extravagance? When large sums of money are expended on exotics not half so pretty as a clover blossom, nor so fragrant as a common apple-tree flower, whose only merit is

that no other lady in town has obtained one, what is this but extravagance? We are deeply convinced that if our principle of self-dedication were honestly carried through the usages and indulgencies of fashionable society, a multitude of common superfluities would be cut off. Indeed, we doubt not that the depth to which it would cut, and the extent to which it would convict the fashionable Christian world of delinquency, would be the grand argument against it.

In a word, the awakening of the Christian conscience of the Church to the truth, and to its duty, would reduce all Christians to a life of comfortable simplicity, embellished, among those who possessed taste, by natural and inexpensive elegance; and all else would be retrenched. The whole of that immense wealth now sacrificed to luxury, would be laid on the altar of religious benevolence, or devoted to works of public utility. The real politeness and true refinements of life would be only promoted by the change. Every useful branch of education, all training by which mind and body are endued with a higher efficiency for God's service, would be secured, cost what it might. Every truly ennobling taste would receive a simple and natural cultivation. But the material luxuries and adornments of life would be sternly retrenched, and Christian society would be marked in dress, in equipage, in buildings, sacred and domestic, in food, and in every other sensuous gratification, by a Spartan simplicity, united with a pure and chaste decency. Wealth would be held as too sacred a trust, to expend any part of it in any thing which was not truly necessary to the highest glory of God in the rational and spiritual welfare of his creatures, our fellow men.

As has been before indicated, every one will perceive that such an application of the principles of Christian economy would bring about a great revolution in the manners of our Christian people. Even well meaning Christians who are possessed of wealth, every where allow themselves a vastly wider license, and act on far different principles. We shall therefore beg leave to pursue the discussion of this part of the subject farther, and suggest other reasons for carrying our Christian sobriety to the extent indicated.

And first, we strongly urge that some principle far stricter than that on which Christians usually act, is imperatively demanded, to remove the reproach of worldly conformity. The external likeness of the Church to the world is the bane of our efficiency in saving souls. We profess a difference between ourselves and the unrenewed, as radical as that between light and darkness, almost as wide as that between heaven and hell. But in all the visible and practical concerns which interest the unrenewed heart, we nearly resemble them. Our words say that we believe riches to be vanity and emptiness. Our acts seem to say that we love and seek them as intensely as those do who make them their all and their god. We say in words, that "we have here no continuing city," but in act are as eager to adorn our dwellings here as though they were our only home. We profess that we have richer and nobler enjoyments than the pomp of this life, and then swell and rustle with as much pomp as any other human insect of a day. What is the result? The world believes our conduct and not our words—like a shrewd world as it is. Practical skepticism seals their consciences against the teachings of the pulpit. Our worldly conformity gives the lie to all our assertions of nobler principles, of the birth of a new and higher nature, and of the treachery of earthly good. However inefficient the world's conscience may be to control its own sins, it is abundantly acute to perceive the demands of consistency, and men feel that those who have the hopes and principles, those who acknowledge the tremendous obligations to a dying world of brethren, which Christians profess, ought to use their wealth in a manner utterly unlike the world. When they see us use it on the same selfish and grovelling principles with themselves, the inevitable impression, unacknowledged it may be, in the consciousness of those who were trained to respect religion, but yet potent and blighting in all, is, that religion is a "sham." But now let Christians seek and use wealth wholly for God. Let them show by their conscientious simplicity of indulgence and conscientious alms-doings, that they have conquered that covetousness which worldly men feel to be *their* strongest passion, and could calmly place their feet upon those indulgencies and vanities which worldly men feel to be *their* highest pleasures; and the

world will own, with conviction and reverence, that Christianity is a living, a lovely and fearful thing. The world will, at least, believe that Christians believe that there is a heaven, a hell, and a strict day of account. The world will be convinced, at least, that Christians believe their perishing fellow men have souls to be saved, worth a little more than fashionable *éclat*, jewelry and equipage. Men will at least believe that we are in earnest in our warnings.

In this connexion it may be remarked, that the extent to which the worldly conformity of the Church follows on the heels of the advancing luxuries of the world, plainly indicates that something is wrong with us. Every age has added to the wealth of civilized societies, and every generation, nay, every year, the style of expenditures advances. More costly dwellings are built. What were commodious and respectable mansions a few years ago, are now dragged away as so much rubbish; and if Providence permits our much-abused wealth still to increase, the places we now build will be pulled down to make room for the more luxurious palaces of our children. New and unheard-of indulgencies are invented. What our fathers regarded as luxuries almost extravagant, we have accustomed ourselves to look upon as ordinary comforts, almost despised for their cheapness. More capricious wants are indulged. More costly articles of adornment are invented. And, as if to repudiate, in the most direct and expressive mode, every remnant of the obligations of sobriety, *costliness* has become the very element of fashion. Because the ornament is monstrously expensive, in proportion to its true utility, therefore it is sought. Now, let extravagance of expenditure take as enormous strides as it will, the indulgence of Christians follows close on its heels. No species of adornment, however outrageously wasteful; no imaginary indulgence, however capricious, has become fashionable, but rich Christians have soon proceeded to employ it, almost as commonly as the world. Some of the most enormously luxurious dwellings are those occupied by Christian families. The most extravagant finery is often seen on Christian backs. Now, where is this to stop? Do the principles on which Christians now expend God's possessions fix no limit *any where*? If they do not, they must be erroneous. Let us see some line

drawn, beyond which artificial and imaginary wants are not to encroach on the claims of our stewardship. No such line exists. On the present principles of the Church, luxurious expenditure has before it the prospect of indefinite progress. And let it be observed, that those who ride on the flood-tide of extravagance, are not merely those inconsistent persons, whose piety is under grievous suspicions on all hands; but often they are those who stand fair and are much esteemed in the Church. Now, if it shall be objected to the principles here advocated, that there will be no limit to their fair and legitimate application till they reduce us to a cynical rudeness of life, the just retort is, that to the opposite principles on which the Christian world usually acts, there is no limit. They will admit one extravagance after another, on the plea of usage and the customs of society, and the innocence of the particular indulgence in itself, to the utmost extent to which an apostate world may please to run, in its waste of God's abused bounties. Hence it is evident, that there must be error in those principles. And let any one attempt to go back and review them, comparing them with the principles of the Bible, in order to eliminate that error, and he will find that there is no rational or scriptural stopping place short of the strict rule we have advocated.

Another reason for the application of this strict rule is found in the prevalence of covetousness in the Church. Much has been said, and justly said, concerning this sin, and the opposite virtue of Christian liberality, recently. The religious world has rung with denunciations of prize tracts, some of which have proclaimed covetousness to be the master sin of the Church. This may be true or untrue. It is sufficient for our purpose to say, what everybody will admit, that it is a sin prevalent and ruinous, to a fearful extent. Now, we believe that the great spur to covetousness, in the general, is this custom of fashionable expenditure, prevalent in the Christian world. That the fiercest covetousness must usually be the result of prodigality, has been clearly seen, at least since Sallust's well known character of Cataline was written, "*Alieni appetens, Sui profusus, ardens in cupiditibus.*" And we suppose that, usually, the craving for gain is the child of a craving to spend. Few examples of the actual miser pre-

sent themselves, where coin is hoarded and gloated over and loved for its own sake. Money is usually valued inordinately, because men's hearts inordinately desire the supposed style, *éclat*, and distinction of fashionable expenditure, which wealth will enable them to attain. But now, could the pulpit and the religious press only succeed in establishing correct sentiments of Christian economy in the public opinion of the religious world; could all useless expenditure in a Christian be set in the same inconsistent and odious light in which cards and dancing are usually regarded by Presbyterians, the sinews of covetousness in the Church would be cut. The usual motive to covetousness would no longer exist with any who regarded their good name; because that expenditure could not be indulged for which large wealth is coveted. When those who made large gains were compelled to regard them as gains made for God, the instances of rapacity would be as rare as the instances in which servants and apprentices are found too industrious in earning money for their masters.

The nature of the motives by which luxurious expenditures are prompted, one would think, ought to be sufficient to reveal the inconsistency of all such indulgences in Christians. Very innocent and plausible motives may be feigned, and in some cases may be truly felt; as when men say that they are only filling the obligation of their stations and complying with the demands of genteel society, in living expensively. There may be some who persuade themselves that this is their feeling. But it is very plain that the usual motives of expensive living are self-indulgence and sensuality, ostentatious pride, cowardly weakness and dread of the charge of singularity, petty rivalry, and personal vanity. Are these motives which Christians ought to foster? Surely they are utterly at war with the humility and spirituality which our Saviour commands. It is our constant duty to choke them and watch against them; and were expensive living perfectly innocent and free from other objection, the fact that it ministers to feelings so vile, would require us to shun it. The mere fact that it was often the minister of these unholy and contemptible sentiments, in other minds, should lead us to shun it, though as yet unconscious of their taint. We are

told to pray : "Lead us not into temptation." If we would not be hypocrites, our conduct must be conformed to our prayers.

A reference to the views which prevailed in former ages concerning the evil effects of luxury, will suggest another consideration. The time was when wise heathens and wise Christians, alike, looked upon luxury as a vice in itself—a thing which emasculated the hardihood and energy of the character, stimulated all the vices, as tropical heat and moisture force up the vegetation of a wealthy soil, and unfitted man for usefulness. Wise legislators excluded luxury as the bane of commonwealths, and as a crime unworthy of manhood. Historians constantly pointed at the luxury which accumulated wealth had provoked, as the cause of Persian imbecility, of Grecian decline, and of the downfall of imperial Rome. Senates made repeated attempts to restrain it by sumptuary laws ; attempts which were vain indeed, and ill-judged, but which evinced the reality of the evil. The plain, good sense of the olden times pointed out the stubborn fact, which men had not then learned to dodge by a deceitful philosophy, that luxurious expenditure, in wasting the labour of working hands and the products of labour, must be ruinous to public wealth. What has now become of these old-fashioned facts and truths ? How is it that a Christian ethics, in a Christian age, professing to be unspeakably purer than all Pagan systems, is silent concerning a vice which old Pagan Sparta and Rome reprobated ? How is it that Christian people indulge, without a whisper of disapprobation, or a frown of public opinion, in luxuries more elaborate than those which even a polished Cicero denounced as disgusting and contaminating, in the young men of licentious Rome ? How is it that it has become proper, and manly, and wise, for the soldiers of the cross, who ought to be girded for the terrific war with "principalities and powers, and spiritual wickedness in high places," to soften their effeminate limbs with indulgences, which would have been shameful and ruinous in the secular soldier or the athlete ? It passes our wit to tell ! To us, who remember how Paul commanded, "to crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts," how he set the example of "keeping under his body and bringing it into subjection," and how he has

charged us "to endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ," how every Christian has dedicated himself, professedly, soul and body, to a tremendous conflict, for a stake which is composed of his own soul, worth more than a world, and a world of immortal souls like his; to us it does seem, that every indulgence which diminishes the hardihood and self-denial of the man, or unnerves him for the strife, is a crime and a treason, leaving out of view the waste it causes of the material means for carrying on the great cause. Do the fashionable indulgences now common among rich Christians, have this effect? Let the fact before referred to give the answer: that the *working men* of the age are usually the sons of simple mediocrity.

And not only are these indulgences objectionable as weakening to the Christian character, but they waste the attention and time of those who love them. He who goes to warfare should not encumber himself with much baggage. The true soldier has no time to provide gorgeous caparisons for his horse, and drapery for his own limbs. All that he can take care of is, to have his weapons in fighting order. All else is an incumbrance. When Darius and Alexander met at Arbela, the Macedonian phalanx was horrid with brass and iron. The only things which glittered along the sturdy ranks were the deadly points of the pikes, and the sword blades. But the half-armed men and horses of the Persian came sweating under gorgeous draperies of worsted, and purple, and gold, which swept the earth. Which conquered? Of Frederic the Great, Macaulay says:

"Some young Englishmen of rank proposed to visit Germany as volunteers, for the purpose of learning the art of war under the greatest of commanders. This last proof of British attachment and admiration Frederic politely, but firmly, declined. His camp was no place for amateur students of military science. The Prussian discipline was rigorous even to cruelty. The officers, while in the field, were expected to practise an abstemiousness and self-denial, such as were hardly surpassed by the most rigid monastic orders. However noble their birth, however high their rank in the service, they were not permitted to eat from any thing better than pewter. It was a high crime even in a count and field-martial, to have a single silver spoon among his baggage. Gay young Englishmen of twenty thousand a year, ac-

customed to liberty and luxury, would not easily submit to these Spartan restraints. And the king could not venture to keep them in order as he kept his own subjects in order."

Thus act the children of this world who are wise in their generation. And thus should act the children of light. They should be too busy in the service of their king to have a thought for gewgaws, and too anxious for efficiency to burden themselves with superfluities.

But, after all, the most plain and direct reason for strict simplicity of expenditure is found in the fact that God has condescended to make wealth an instrument for promoting his cause, and in the urgent demands of that cause. When we consider the good that money may do, if prayerfully devoted to God's service, and the good that needs to be done, how can any one who professes to aim to love God with all his strength, and his neighbour as himself, waste any portion of it in any thing approaching superfluity? Let those to whom God has entrusted wealth, think how many destitute families there may be within their reach, who suffer acute anxieties and many destitutions from poverty, to whom a little aid would bring unspeakable relief and thankfulness. Let them think how many agencies of good near them, how many Sabbath schools, how many poor ministers, are crippled by want of pecuniary means. Let them listen to the continual prayer of all our missionary departments for more means. Let them remember the almost countless plans and schemes of beneficence, devised by pious zeal, in which money may promote the glory of God and the good of man. Let them cast their eyes around a perishing world, where hundreds of millions are hurrying, in one generation, to eternal, irreparable destruction, for lack of the gospel, and remember that money can be employed as an agency to assist in their rescue, and that their almsgiving can now be borne speedily to any remote and destitute spot on the wide field of death. And then let them ask themselves, with the cry of a perishing world in their ears, and that dread account in their eye, where we must answer for having done our utmost for the rescue of our race, whether they have any thing to spare for superfluities. Is it enough, when this tremendous destitution stands before us, that we shall be able to say that we have made contributions to all the

usual objects of Christian alms-giving, and contributions liberal, according to the public opinion of a perverted and selfish world, while stores of wealth still remain to be wasted on objects which are required by no rational want? No, it is not enough. We have not done our duty till we have looked above and beyond the grovelling standard of self-indulgence, and have exerted the full efficiency of all that God has entrusted to us, be it units or millions.

Could the Church but be brought up to its duty, possessing as it does, in all Protestant lands, so large a share of the world's wealth, how would Zion prosper? While no true comfort of life would be deducted, and no rational and wholesome enjoyment lost among the rich, while the true dignity and refinement of society would be only promoted, how would the Lord's vineyard flourish? Our missionary boards, staggering under the burdens of perishing millions at home and abroad, would no longer groan for aid, but would thank God and take courage. Instead of crying for means to feed their poor, half-sustained and faithful workmen, with overflowing treasures they would call for willing hands to approach and employ the bounty of the pious. How many hearts among the poor would sing for joy? How many useful hands and heads would be raised from obscurity and poverty, and made fruitful of good to their fellow men? The Church would again advance on her grand mission of evangelism, with a power and speed fulfilling the prophetic vision of the Apocalypse, "an angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to every nation, and kindred, and people, and tongue."

Protestants look upon the Bible as their complete and sufficient rule of duty. Hence our readers may feel that, after representing Christian economy as so strictly binding, and superfluous expenditures for things not in themselves necessarily sinful, as so clearly a sin, we should be able to show that the Bible is not silent on this subject. It is to be observed, however, that the Bible never promised to give a specific precept for every detail of duty. It is a complete rule of life, in laying down principles and precepts which, by clear and easy application, will direct us in all the details of duty. We refer our readers, accordingly, to the scriptural truths from which we set out; and demand if

our application of those truths was not fair, easy and obvious. If it was, this is enough. But we are not compelled to fall back on such a reference by any dearth of specific precepts in the Bible. In Luke, 14: 12, our Saviour expressly asserts the principle, that the rich should refrain from ostentatious and unnecessary hospitalities to their equals, in order to be able to relieve the truly destitute. We see not how one who believes in plenary inspiration, and who reverences the word of Scripture too much to tamper with its fair meaning, can make this passage any thing else than an explicit prohibition of unnecessary expenditure in hospitalities. And this, too, is one of the most generous, graceful and popular modes of expenditure; the form of extravagance which men would regard as most "leaning to virtue's side." 1 Timothy and 1 Peter, forbid Christian females to indulge in "gold, pearls, brodered or plaited hair, and *costly* array." A most sensible expositor has well remarked, that the prohibition would of course have been extended to the stronger sex, had not the apostles taken it for granted that manliness alone would be a sufficient safeguard against such follies in them. Now, we by no means exalt the letter over the spirit, so far as to interpret the apostles as meaning that curled hair would be innocent, while braided hair was sinful, or to interpret them as placing obedience to the precept, in the shunning of those particular follies there mentioned. But a fair interpretation cannot avoid this conclusion, that the two apostles concur in explicitly forbidding personal adornment with means expensive, either of time or money, as a thing inconsistent with Christian character. We are all aware that an accommodating exegesis has frequently come to the aid of fashionable Christianity in attempting to whittle away the point of the precepts. And among others, a recent writer has politely come to the rescue, in remarking upon the passage from Peter, by representing the gist of the apostle's meaning as this: that Christian wives may wear these follies: he, of course, does not condescend either to allow or forbid things so innocent, and unessential, and trifling; but if they wear them, *they must not regard them as their ornaments*. We think it reply enough to ask, *for what* should the good ladies

wear them, then? We feel sure that the female mind, at least, will concur with us in saying, that to forbid the wearing of any costly array *as ornament*, will be a very efficient, practical prohibition of wearing it at all. Once compel people to regard it as no adornment, and they will not trouble themselves to put it on. Let the reader also consult 1 John, 2: 16.

The remainder of these remarks will be devoted to considering the most common objections which are made against the principles we have advocated, and in justification of expensive habits. In this negative form, some ideas may perhaps be introduced which are of great importance as positive supports of our views.

We are well aware that the prompt objection against what we have said will be this: that if the principles we have advocated were carried out to their fair extent, they would cut off every thing but the baldest necessities of life and reduce society to a Gothic rudeness. Every man who would be truly consistent must be a Diogenes. The same rule which would forbid the expensive refinements of the most wealthy, if justly applied, would also cut off the cheaper refinements of middle life, and would reduce man to just so much clothing as would cover his nakedness, and that of the coarsest quality which would suffice. The very buttons on the backs of our coats must be cut off and thrown into a missionary box, because they can button nothing. And thus, as our principles prove too much, they prove nothing.

Now what is all this but an argument to our ignorance and our prejudices? It does not disprove the Scripture rule, but only announces *fear* of it, lest it should cut deeper than the self-indulgence and weakness of the objectors possibly can or will endure. Grant that the rule, when strictly applied, should cut off all the refinements now common in Christian society, it might only prove that society has gone exceedingly far astray from its duty, (a very possible supposition, at least with those who believe in the universal depravity of human nature,) and not that the rule was false. Suppose that those who support this rule in theory, and among others, the author of these remarks, should be found unwilling to follow it to the extent of cut-

ting the buttons off the backs of their coats. It might only prove that their conduct was inconsistent with their principles, and not that their principles were wrong.

But a further and an entirely satisfactory explanation of the objection will be found by recurring to what was said in defining the allowable and proper subsistence of one of God's servants. In order that he may be fitted to work most efficiently for his master, that subsistence should include, not only supplies for his immediate bodily necessities, but all that promotes the most noble and perfect development of the bodily, mental and moral man. Neat and decent apparel, lodging, food, *are necessities of life*, not indeed of animal existence, but of that dignified, rational and moral existence by which God's servant is able to glorify Him and bless his fellow men. The natural and useful accomplishments of life *are necessities of life*. They are necessary to that highest style of man by which most good is done and most honour rendered to the power of Christianity. And we do assert, that the distinction between that sordid manner of life, which sacrifices one's usefulness by inevitably incurring constant ridicule, contempt and dislike, and a chaste and strict simplicity, is a distinction perfectly easy to all except those who do not wish to see it. There is an extreme of simplicity in dress and living, to which any man of truly respectable qualities may go, without incurring inconvenient notoriety as an oddity, and without incurring necessary contempt. This is evident from the Spartan example of many noble men, of whom we may mention John Howard and Chief Justice Marshall. And we do assert, again, that this extreme of simplicity lies far, far beyond the customary style which the average of rich Christians now allow themselves. *There lies the proper line.* Any man whose heart is right can find it.

The objection we have described might be sufficiently removed, even by considerations of pecuniary economy. We do not dress in blankets and live in shanties because true economy forbids it. The coarse fabric will become so worn as to admit the assaults of the weather and disease, so much sooner than the moderately fine and substantial cloth, that it is true economy to wear the latter. *It might be possible to live in a shanty of board ; but this*

shanty would require to be so perpetually patched and renewed, that, in the end, it would prove more expensive than a substantial brick house. And, again, good taste costs no money, when allowed its true, natural and chaste developments. Economy itself having dictated that we shall select for a covering a moderately good cloth, we discover that it is actually less wasteful to cut this cloth into decent and comely shape than to make a clownish botch of it. The parent of six children observes that health, and decency, and chastity require that his dwelling shall contain a given number of chambers. And when this is determined, he will find that a true architectural taste is perfectly at one with economy. To adopt a chaste and graceful outline for his building, in which every essential element of the construction shall be an ornament, and no ornament shall be superfluous, to protect his materials with good paint, to employ skilful mechanics who will keep out the weather by making good joints, all this is as necessary to procuring the requisite cubic feet of house room, at the cheapest ultimate cost, as it is to true architectural taste. And any thing more expensive than this, is as truly a sin against pure taste as it is a sin against Christian economy.

We have thus passed to the discussion of what we had marked down as the second objection; that so stern a simplicity would cut off the indulgence and education of all the refining tastes. This objection proceeds upon the postulate, that wherever our Creator has implanted native and instinctive propensities in us, their very existence shows that there must be some innocent and proper indulgence for them somewhere. Thus: it was he who implanted hunger; there must be, therefore, some indulgence of the appetite, which does not partake of the sin of gluttony. It was God who implanted the capacity for feeling indignation. There must be, therefore, such a thing as "being angry and sinning not." If every possible exercise of the propensity had been sinful, a holy Creator would not have implanted it. But surely this does not imply that every indulgence to which the perverted propensity may attach itself, is therefore innocent. Is there then nothing by which those instinctive and refining tastes for the graceful and beautiful in form, colour and sound, may be gratified, except the "costly array" of luxury? If we condemn, as

sinful waste, the employment of a company of foreign musicians, at a cost tenfold greater than that which would procure the labours and talents of the noblest warriors and statesmen to the nation, or at a price sufficient to feed all the starving poor of a commonwealth, shall we be charged with banishing every indulgence of musical taste, when we leave to men the music of nature, of singing birds, and babbling brooks, and sighing winds, the sweet symphony which comes up with the morning breeze from the lowing kine, mixed with the ploughman's mellow song as he lounges field-ward, and the cooing of the dove in the dewy tree top? Shall we be accused of banishing music, when we leave men the inexpensive but sweet domestic concert, the song of praise to God, and the soft harmonies of children's voices? And if we forbid men to waste God's precious treasures in barbaric fineries of dress, or building, or equipage, shall we be accused of robbing them of all that is beautiful, in form and tinge, when we leave them the countless beauties of sky, and earth, and sea? No. We admit that the proper cultivation of these tastes has a true tendency, though, where unaccompanied with better agencies, a most weak and insufficient tendency to elevate man's soul. But their proper and beneficial cultivation is by the enjoyment of the beauties and harmonies of nature. The artificial and expensive pursuit of the fine arts, as it is seen in luxurious society, tends only to substitute in place of true sensibility, a nauseous affectation of taste, concealing a callousness as truly brutal as that of the Vandal. The truest and most wholesome indulgences of taste are those which nature presents to us at least cost. Luxurious indulgences deprave this capacity of our souls as truly as they waste God's property.

Again: in support of expensive living, we often hear a great deal said about "the style proper to one's standing in society." And such a style is represented as necessary to distinguish the different ranks in society. The truth lies in just the opposite direction. This is just one of the chiefest social evils resulting from luxury, that it assists in confounding the proper distinctions of society. When expensiveness of living becomes the index of rank and gentility, then whoever can procure wealth, by fair means or foul, claims that rank. Thus, by this very boasted means

of keeping up the proper distinctions of society, vulgar and ignorant persons are admitted into the society of the pure and well-informed, and that vilest and most despicable of all aristocracies, an aristocracy of wealth, is introduced. The consequence is, that the coarseness and low principles of the rich bores are diffused through all the circle into which their luxuriousness has introduced them. And an unrighteous standard of admission is erected, which excludes humble worth, and talent, and taste, because united with poverty. But if extravagance were disreputable and were banished from professedly virtuous society, if the rich practised a simplicity of living equally attainable by all of moderate means, the distinctions of society would necessarily be drawn by some other criterion than wealth. They cannot possibly be drawn by any other so base and injurious.

But let us admit that the principle claimed is correct. Let us suppose that there ought to be gradations of expenditure according to the possessions and social position. The Christian who professes the obligation to use all his property for the glory of God, surely ought not to assume any higher grade of expenditure than is really necessary to maintain his social position. Surely he should not expend for this object, granting its propriety, more of God's wealth than is necessary, when so much is needed for the cause of God and our perishing fellow men. Now let us take, for the sake of example, some one grade of wealth and social standing. Let it be the hundred-thousand-dollar men. Among this class, several will be found who, either from prudence, or from covert avarice, or from a sort of very sensible laziness, which is unwilling to be fatigued with pomp, spend far less than the average of their peers. They are not sordid; but they live far within their means and beneath the expenditure of similar men around them. Every large society presents such instances. Now are these men ostracized by their class? Is their social position compromised? Is there any lack of respect when they enter the society of their equals? Not at all. The fact then proves that a higher grade of expenditure than theirs is not necessary for any social advantage. Why, then, cannot all Christians of a similar grade of wealth stop at their limit of expenditure? Even upon the mistaken

grounds upon which we argue, all that goes beyond this is clearly sin. It is waste and perversion of a trust that should have been sacred to noble and blessed ends. All know how far rich Christians, even those whose religious character stands fair, go beyond that line of supposed social necessity, as it is drawn by the actual facts of society. Even by this imperfect rule, a great dereliction from Christian economy is proved upon the Church of this day.

There is another justification for luxury which assumes a profounder air and proceeds upon pretended grounds of political economy. It is claimed that "luxurious expenditures, on the part of those who have wealth, are, in fact, beneficent to the community, by encouraging, and employing, and paying the industry of all who produce those luxuries. Such expenditure," it is said, "is the legitimate means for distributing again the accumulations of wealth, so that they may circulate for the common good. The rich man, therefore, who, without immoral dissipations, expends a splendid income in splendid living, is fulfilling a public duty." We unhesitatingly assert that he is a public curse. His splendid living may, in one sense, "distribute" coin or bank notes, but it is a whirlpool that absorbs and destroys public wealth, and his luxuries, instead of encouraging and rewarding industry, only pervert it and misdirect it. We will explain.

It is the most vulgar delusion to suppose that coin or bank notes are public wealth. Every college boy knows that they are only the conventional representatives of wealth. The wealth of the community consists in the productions of the skill and labour of its citizens, exerted on material nature. If a ploughman expends a year's work in raising five hundred bushels of corn, that corn is a part of the public wealth. If an artisan expends a year's work in making a trinket worth five hundred bushels of corn, that trinket is public wealth. If the five hundred bushels of corn are exchanged with a foreign merchant for a basket or two of costly wine, that wine is a part of the public wealth. But if that trinket or wine is bought by some rich citizen for money, the community is no richer than before. The purchaser now has the item of wealth, and the seller has in its stead some coins which are not wealth, but which being the established representative of

wealth, will serve him to procure him some other item of wealth when he pleases. Now let us suppose that this rich purchaser thrusts a hole through his daughter's ear with an awl and sticks this trinket in it, where it is **finally** lost, or becomes worthless through change of fashion; or that he drinks up this wine at a splendid entertainment, then there is a positive and irreparable loss of public wealth. This item is forever consumed and has **left no** equivalent behind it. A year's work of an industrious citizen is consumed. And the skill, industry and time of its labouring citizens, are the true wealth of a community, because they alone produce wealth. The money which this rich man paid for the year's work which **has been** destroyed, is not a substitute for its value to the community, because the community before possessed both the money and the commodity; now it has only the money. Every luxurious indulgence is therefore destructive of public wealth. As all political economists know, it is *unproductive consumption*. The idea on which the old sumptuary laws were partly founded, that every luxurious expenditure tends to impoverish the country, is a **stubborn** fact.

Let us look also at "the encouragement of industry" which such expenditures produce. We have said, what none can dispute, that the true wealth of a nation consists in the time, skill and labour of its working citizens. The public welfare, so far as it is corporeal, consists in an adequate supply of all the objects required by man's actual and natural wants for all the people. A certain total of those objects, such as food, clothing, &c. will be necessary, annually, to provide for all its citizens. *Now the only source from which the nation can draw this supply is the annual industry of its own citizens*, (unless, indeed, it is engaged in predatory warfare). Some of the articles of that supply may be imported from abroad, but if so, these imports are procured, not with money, but with some product of the nation's own industry. International commerce must always be, in the main, a barter. A certain number of the working hands of the nation must, therefore, be evidently employed annually in the production of the supply for the natural and necessary wants of the whole people. If too few hands are employed, the supply

becomes inadequate, and those who are least able to buy at increased prices, suffer want. Now it is very plain, that if many of the working hands of the nation are turned aside from the production of these supplies for real wants, to producing the objects of imaginary and artificial wants, by the seduction of better wages from the rich, the result is an inadequate supply of solid values, and suffering and misery at the other extreme of society. The perversion of industry may result in an increase to the individual labourer, in the shape of larger money wages, but the inevitable result to the nation at large is a deficiency of the necessaries of life and consequent misery to the labouring class in general. Money fills no hungry stomach, and clothes no shivering back, of itself. It is only the representative of other things which do. We will illustrate. Let us suppose that the increase of luxury causes the transference of a thousand labouring hands from the production of corn, or other actual values which the nation bartered for foreign corn, to the production of plate and jewelry. Their wages as farm labourers were fifty cents per day, and their wages as artisans are now one dollar per day. The change has seemed to result in advantage to these thousand labourers, because their wages are better. But the total result is, that there is thus much less corn in the nation to feed it, and the price of corn rises, and as many people suffer for bread as were formerly supplied by the industry of these thousand men. And the use of the plate and jewelry produced is wholly an unproductive consumption, a total and irreparable abstraction from the national wealth, while a large part of this corn, if these labourers had been suffered to continue producing corn, would have been eaten by working men, who would have used their strength in earning wealth in some form. Thus it would have been productive consumption.

The expenditure of money on artificial wants is, therefore, not an encouragement, but a misdirection of industry. It results, not in the increase, but in the final destruction of portions of the public wealth. Instead of diffusing accumulated wealth for the benefit of the labouring classes, it depresses those classes in general, begets starvation, and enhances the prices of the necessaries of life. The artisans who profit, at the time, by these expenditures, of course

deny these conclusions, but just as sure as there is truth in political science, or the teachings of history, they are correct in the main.

These remarks explain at once the fact, so often remarked, that in every country the extremes of destitution among the poor are equal to the extremes of accumulation among the rich. The usual result of accumulated wealth must be indulgence in luxury, and luxury begets a misapplied industry and consequent want.

A plan corollary from these truths is this, that all laws of primogeniture, and all legislation which fosters large accumulations in single hands, are hostile to public wealth and the general good of the people. That nation is always most truly rich and prosperous to whom the words of Horace apply :

Privatus illis census erat brevis, commune magnum.

We have here an explanation, also, for the anomalous evils of English society. In unfolding this explanation, we shall illustrate the truth we have attempted to explain. The English are an industrious nation. Their agriculture and manufactures are eminently skilful. No where on earth is science made to do so large a share of the productive work of human hands. And yet, with all this teeming production, England cannot comfortably feed and clothe her people any year. We do not now allude to the effect which her taxation and naval and military expenses may produce, but only to social causes. England is distinguished above all other nations by overgrown private fortunes. The incomes of these fortunes seek channels of expenditure, and the result is, that a vast portion of the productive labour of the nation is perverted to the production of supplies for artificial wants. Her aristocracy have acted upon the mistaken policy of "encouraging industry" by splendid expenditure, until the industry of the nation is crushed. Men who ought to be producers of food and clothing, or of solid values to be bartered with other nations for food and clothing, have been seduced, by the offer of better money wages, to expend their labour on ten thousand things which satisfy no actual necessity of any man; on the manufacture of jewelry, and of dress, and equipage, on the building of useless palaces, on the enclosing of useless, or partially useful parks, with unneces-

sary iron railings; on the laborious construction and keeping of pleasure grounds, on the watching of hares and partridges, on the tending of useless horses, dogs and deer, on the driving of unnecessary vehicles, on the rendering of unnecessary menial services, and a hundred other things. Thus, myriads of hands, which ought to be producing the solid supplies for the nation's actual wants, are industrious about nothing. And although, personally, these attendants may receive better wages, the general result is a waste of national industry and national want.

Let none then attempt to defend expensive living on these grounds. This plea contains one of the most valid reasons against it. The Christian should feel every superfluous indulgence a sin, because its general tendency is to blight the public welfare.

We shall be asked, possibly, "What, then, do you propose? Shall the incomes of the rich be hoarded, from year to year, while they confine themselves to the frugal expenditures of this Christian economy?" We answer, by no means. Let them flow forth freely, and to the last drop; but let it be in the channels of a true and a wise beneficence. Let a reasonable share of our wealth be devoted to the improvement of the agricultural and other resources of the country, with a benevolent regard to the temporal comfort of our fellow-citizens. But above all, let it be expended with boundless liberality in the great labours of evangelism; in printing saving truth, in sustaining teachers and preachers, in diffusing knowledge at home and abroad. Thus will our superfluous wealth employ and reward the industry of multitudes of meritorious men, who perform this labour of love. And, unlike the expenditures of luxury, it will not be an *unproductive* industry, to which our money will entice them. There is no labour that is more fruitful of public wealth than evangelical labours, whether in the domestic or foreign field. Every ignorant, degraded man, who is enlightened and sanctified, becomes at once a producer of material wealth, for he is rendered an industrious citizen. And every heathen community that is evangelized, becomes a recipient and a producer of the wealth of peaceful commerce. Thus, superfluous riches may be scattered, not to create a devouring vortex of the national wealth, but to become, in turn, the

seed of wealth, and to bless our fellow men and the world with temporal welfare. And above all, an income of praise and a harvest of souls may be collected for the great Giver and Owner : " For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things : to whom be glory for ever : Amen."

ARTICLE II.

THE CONSOLATIONS OF SURVIVORS IN THE DEATH OF THE PIOUS.

" It is appointed unto all men once to die, and after that, the judgment." The Creator of the universe, who brought all men into existence, continually exercises a controuling power over them in every period of their history, and interferes by his providence in every incident of their lives. Things, to us, apparently trivial or important, are equally the offspring of his decree, and are but visible manifestations of his previous designs. To whatever afflictions or sorrows we may be subject, they must be ultimately ascribed to the agency of him " who worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will, and hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass." " The hairs of our heads are all numbered, and not a sparrow falls to the ground without him." The same guardianship with which he watches over our mortal life, he exercises over that solemn period when " our bodies return to the dust whence they were taken." " Thou turnest man to destruction, and sayest, Return, ye children of men."

The prevalence of death is universal. No rank or condition of life is exempt from its power. The rich and the poor, the bond and the free, the righteous and the wicked, must all " go to their long home, and the mourners go about the streets." The successive generations of men act their part upon the theatre of life, and then disappear, and the places which for a time they have occupied, " shall know them no more." Reason and philosophy acknowledge the evil, but the cause and its remedy are far beyond their skill. Death, as the wages of sin, is a divinely or-

daigned penalty, and to it there can be no possible resistance. It is enforced by an unalterable statute of Jehovah. Ever since the fall, and the concomitant introduction of sin into the world, the successive generations of earth's inhabitants are doomed to go down to that "bourne whence no traveller returns." And under every circumstance, death is an event which must affect with sorrow the mind of every one who is alive to the ordinary sensibilities of our nature. Grief seizes the heart at the disruption of ties which have bound us to our friends. To be severed from those around whom our fond affections cling, and for whom our attachments have been strengthening, few can refrain from the tear of sorrow. When the pulse of life has ceased to beat, when the voice is stilled, and the eye that beamed with affection no longer meets the glance that enkindled it, and when the last fond look has followed the departed to the land of silence, the smitten heart turns away to seek for a balm to heal its wound, and for some relief to assuage its grief. But at this sad season, when the fleeting scenes and perishing things of earth but enhance the melancholy, the Christian turns to the contemplation of the word of God. He there learns that "there is balm in Gilead, and that there is a physician there." He finds a sacred solace in the declarations of him who has said, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die."

The Bible is well calculated to afford consolation in times like this; for if pain, suffering and death were not our lot, its sacred truths would be inapplicable to our state. On almost every page, and in the experience of every saint whose history it contains, we have the testimony of its power to console amidst the troubles and griefs of life's pilgrimage. Many of its expressions of consolation and promise are addressed to us as beings subject to sorrow. It sheds a hallowed light on life's otherwise dark pathway, it irradiates the tomb, it unveils to the eye of faith the glories of eternity which lie beyond.

That death, or the dissolution of our bodies, is in its very nature irreversible, is a truth which needs not the aid of argument to establish it. Let him who would cavil at the proposition, or who would be disposed to put away

from his mind a proper consideration of the subject, look around him for those who peopled this earth in ages that are past. Or let him who has arrived at the age of three score years and ten, ask for those who commenced with him the journey of life. They have fallen by his side, the grave covers the most of them, and he is left to tell of the bereavements of life and the ravages of death. Ever since the fall of man and the death of the first martyr, the inhabitants of earth have marched in generations down to the shades of the dead. Have they returned to greet the bereft, and to dispel the clouds of affliction? Have they come back from the silent resting places to rekindle the flame of affection, and to light up the countenance darkened with grief?

The body of man is the tabernacle constructed for the habitation of the soul during its stay on earth. In the course of time it either becomes dilapidated and falls into ruins, or by early disease is shattered and crumbles into earth. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," is the decree of the Creator, and every day manifests its fulfilment. It is the law of Jehovah with regard to our race. It is inflicted as the curse of sin, as the penalty of his law, which he, in his sovereignty, has not seen fit to repeal. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon *all* men, for that *all* have sinned." "Death reigns even over those who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." "It is appointed unto all men once to die." Against all of our race, the penalty of the law in regard to the death of the body remains in force, and must be exacted. "What man is he that liveth and shall not see death?" "Rich and poor shall go down to the grave, and worms alike shall cover them." These bodies, which are but the external habitation or frame-work of the soul, shall be dissolved and fall, and none but he who created us at first, is able to gather up the fragments. "We must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered again." We must all go down to our friends in the grave, we cannot bring them back. "But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

Man is a compound being, constituted in his mortal state, of soul and body. The one formed of the dust of the earth, the other by the breath of God. "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Man does not *all* die. The soul, the noble part of the human constitution, survives the wreck of the material body. It suffers not death with it. But after the body has been dissolved and disorganized through the influence of death, the soul, the spiritual part of man's composition, shall exist in all the vigour of its powers. The essence or real nature of the soul comes not under our observation. . But we know that the mind acts without the energies of the body, and that when the eye is closed in sleep, and the external senses are locked in its embrace, the spirit is beholding visions and experiencing joy or grief. When, therefore, this active spirit is disunited from the body which clogs it ; when this prison is destroyed which confines it ; when this habitation shall fall to ruins, which now shelters it ; then with new powers and increasing strength, with its faculties unencumbered and expanding, it shall, if sanctified, advance in knowledge and happiness forever. This spirit is, therefore, not designed to be immured within the walls of its clay tenement, "For if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

The soul is immaterial, not consisting of parts, and consequently not subject to dissolution at the death of the body. It is endowed with powers not only different from all which we observe in material substances, but far superior to them, and capable of unending expansion. And conscience, the vicerent of God within the bosom of every one, bears its unequivocal testimony to the doctrine of an hereafter, where each shall be rewarded according to his doings here. But these evidences may be so obscured by the gloom which hangs around our fallen nature, as to cease, in a measure, to call forth the contemplation of our minds to this subject. In the word of God, however, we have the doctrines connected with the future existence of the soul, anterior to, as well as contemporary with, the resurrection of the body, so fully revealed, that "he may run that readeth it," and the wayfaring men, though fools,

"may not fail to discover them." Life and immortality are brought to light in the gospel. "Then the dust shall return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." "To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Lazarus died, "and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom." "While we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord; we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." "For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better."

"This is the bud of being, the dim dawn,
The twilight of our day, the vestibule;
Life's theatre, as yet, is shut; and death,
Strong death, alone can heave the massy bar,
The gross impediment of clay remove,
And make us, embryos of existence, free."

The dissolution of death, then, is but the dismantling, for a time, of our immortal nature. When the spirit is wearied with the toils and troubles of a vain world, it lays its robes aside, and is carried above to the courts of God, and if an heir of a blessed immortality, to the glories of his people's rest.

But the body, also, which shall have undergone decay and dissolution by death, shall hereafter be reorganized for the habitation of the soul in heaven. "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The body "is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." Although it is true that death reigns with unmitigated and irresistible violence, and sweeps off each successive generation with the same rapidity as ever, although he lays us in the grave he cannot chain us there.

"An angel's arm can't snatch me from the grave;
Legions of angels can't confine me there."

He lays his icy hand on every one, but the power of him

who has conquered death will bring us deliverance. A hand infinitely more powerful than death shall remove the weight that oppresses and confines us, and these forms shall again be reanimated for eternal existence. At the winding up of the last dispensation, when the Lord of glory descends to judgment, the sound of the trump and the voice of the archangel shall be heard resounding through all the chambers of the dead, to awake their sleeping dust. "And the sea shall give up the dead which are in it, and death and hell shall give up the dead which are in them." The Lord, our Saviour, who was put to death upon the cross for the sins of his people, triumphed over death, and broke asunder the mighty barriers of the grave, and reanimated the same body which was crucified. He contended with death in his own dominions and vanquished him. He arose from the grave, and ascended on high, leading captivity captive, and receiving gifts for men."

"Then first, humanity
Triumphant passed the crystal ports of light,
Stupendous guest! and seized eternal youth,
Seized in our name."

And as he ascended, the chorus of triumph by angels was sung, that the monster of the grave has been despoiled of his power, and the bodies of men delivered from his thralldom. And now, from the world of the heavenly glory, the rays of light penetrate the dark domains of the tomb, irradiating the way that leads us to the "bosom of God, which is the home of the soul."

To all, death is a most momentous occurrence. It is one which will introduce each one into a state of bliss and glory without end; or into a state of woe everlasting. It is as if the last trumpet had sounded, and the son of man had appeared in his glory, as the judge both of the quick and of the dead. All preparation for a peaceful exit and a happy immortality must be made before it arrives. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest."

It is a glorious truth revealed in the word of God, that there is a heaven of eternal rest after we have ended our labours and performed our pilgrimage through this world of sorrow. There the inhabitants shall not be weary,

neither shall any say, "I am sick." There the last tear of sorrow shall be wiped from every eye. "Nought but joy can touch immortal hearts" there. But that place of unmingled felicity is not to be the abode of all indiscriminately. Else why the revelation of God's will to man? Why the denunciations of wrath, and the threatenings of eternal condemnation contained in his written word? Is it not because he has made an everlasting distinction "between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not?" Heaven is the home for those of our race only who are redeemed. At the moment when the fatal deed was committed which "brought death into the world and all our woe," spiritual death also began to reign. Satan, the arch-enemy of God, having seduced the first man and head of the race into transgression, assumed the sceptre of earth's dominion, and since that time, leads its inhabitants "captive at his will." The affections of our nature are estranged from God. "There is none that doeth good, no, not one." Our hearts are naturally in rebellion against God, "not being subject to his law, neither indeed can be." "There is no man that liveth and sinneth not." Has the Majesty of heaven, who holds in his hand the destiny of earth's population, revealed his firm decree, "The *soul* that sinneth it shall die?" "That every transgression and disobedience shall receive a just recompense of reward?" Then death prevails naturally over the *souls* of men. And in comparison with this, all the sorrows and terrors which are the accompaniments of the death of the body, sink into insignificance. It is, upon earth, the continual absence of the light of God's countenance. It is living without a single beam of hope to light up the dark pathway of the tomb. It is to go down to the grave without a single ray of light from the Sun of Righteousness, to penetrate its dark recesses. It is "eternal banishment from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power." It is to dwell with devouring flames, and to lie down in everlasting burnings.

But amidst the general wreck and hopelessness of our nature, God in mercy has displayed his grace. There are those whom he has "chosen to salvation, through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth." And here we assert our belief in the salvation of all those who die

in infancy, "not having sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." This is doubtless the sentiment entertained by the King of Israel, when at the death of his child he uttered the words, "I shall go to him but he shall not return to me." The prospects of the mourning parent could not have been circumscribed by the limits of the grave. This would have been poor consolation when sorrowing over the death of a beloved child. But when the eye of faith penetrates the veil cast over human prospects by the darkness of the tomb, it beholds the departed child clothed in robes of immortality before the throne of God. Relying upon the efficacy of the grace of God and the faithfulness of his promises, he is assured of again embracing in the world of bliss the loved one so unexpectedly taken from him. Hence the hope so full of comfort with reference to all dying in infancy. They are removed by the great spiritual husbandman as plants from the uncongenial soil of earth to flourish forever in the paradise of God.

The Saviour has his followers on earth who are living in anticipation of entering the rest which God has provided for his people. They have heard and embraced the cheering truth, that for sinners of our race, redemption has been found. Whilst the law, whose curse was suspended over us, was uttering the denunciations of heaven's wrath and sending forth its thunders of condemnation and death throughout the family of man, the sacrificial victim set apart in the counsels of eternity, the lamb slain from the foundation of the world, in the fulness of time came forth for our deliverance. "The son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost." "God manifested in the flesh," undertook to satisfy for the sins of his people, and by the power of his divinity roll back the tide of woe which had deluged our race. He met the demands of the violated law whose condemnation we had incurred, and spoiled death of his sting. For "the sting of death is sin." He had undertaken the work of our redemption, and "had entered into a covenant of grace to deliver us out of our estate of sin and misery, and to bring us into an estate of salvation." And never did he retire from the work which his Father had given him to do, until it was accomplished. He agonized in Gethsemane and died on Calvary, to bear

away the curse which hanged over his covenant people. When on the cross he cried, "It is finished," bowed his head and yielded up the ghost; the great work of atonement was completed. The curse is removed. The law is magnified and made honourable.

"O love, all height above, all depth below,
Surpassing far all knowledge, all desire,
All thought! The Holy One for sinners dies!
The Lord of life for guilty rebels bleeds,
Quenches eternal fire with blood divine."

But his soul was not left in hell, neither was that holy one suffered to see corruption. The Saviour of men "burst the bars of death and triumphed over the grave," ascended on high, where "he ever liveth to make intercession for us." Now when the law is magnified and justice satisfied, "God can be just, and the justifier of the ungodly." The Redeemer has arisen and gone to his throne in the heavens. But having lifted up the doors, and unfolded the everlasting gates, and entered upon his dominion in glory, he has not forgotten his people. He has cast down from heaven the casket containing the jewel which is mighty to withstand our spiritual enemies, counteract the sting of death, and secure admittance into heaven. He has given us the instrumentality, in the use of which we live in hope, and die in the anticipation of meeting our friends on the plains of the heavenly paradise. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Faith, then, which embraces Christ, is the instrumentality by which we are rescued from condemnation and delivered from death. The atoning blood of Christ is adequate to the removal of our multiplied transgressions. It blots out all our offences and turns our mortality and death into the strong assurance of immortality and eternal life. This was the foundation for the hope of all those who have safely reached the heavenly inheritance. This is "the anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast, entering into that within the vail." By means of a true and living faith in the Redeemer, as he is offered to us in the gospel, we may go to those who have left us dying in hope. "They are now before the throne, serving God day and night in his temple, having washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Although the grave has covered their mortal bodies, death

was the last foe which they had to encounter. The weary are at rest when they have fallen under his stroke. All the sorrows and ills of this life to them have passed away. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, yea, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours." "The souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory." Like the spirit of the penitent malefactor, they are the same day with Christ in paradise. As soon as the Christian is by death delivered from the sorrows and ills of this life, he enters into the joy of his Lord. As soon as he leaves the wilderness of time, he "comes to Mount Zion, to an innumerable company of angels, to the spirits of just men made perfect, to Jesus the mediator of the New Testament and God the judge of all." There redeemed saints, with pure and immortal tongues, and with faculties enlarged, sing the song of triumph, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing." And now as amongst the redeemed in heaven, they stop to behold the things of heaven, their toils are over, their troubles are ended. There, sickness and pain, and sighing and death, are felt and feared no more. We may go to them, but they cannot come to us.

But *shall saints in heaven recognize each other?* Impressed with a sense of immortality and cherishing the anticipation of enlarged faculties and advancement in knowledge in that heavenly world, one would think there was no room left for conjecture, or for entertaining a doubt concerning so reasonable and consoling a doctrine. It would not be consistent with the perfection of heaven to have all memory of past association obliterated, and to meet as strangers in that sanctuary where all the redeemed shall worship. Heaven is not a place of solitary bliss, where all the happiness consists in individual contemplation of and communion with God. It is true that Jehovah, as exhibited there, will be the most important object of admiration and the source of the joys of heaven. But that the redeemed around the throne will not be instruments for displaying the glories of Christ as Mediatorial King, in the conquests of his grace, is a thought which cannot be cherished. The doctrine of identity rests upon

the faculty of memory. A consciousness that we are the same that we were in time past, is the evidence we have that we are ourselves. The ransomed soul in heaven shall therefore remember its previous existence, with all its associations in this world. And as upon the plains of the celestial paradise, ransomed souls before the throne cast a look over the hosts of the redeemed, they shall no doubt recognize those with whom they associated here, and with whom they often went to the house of God in company. The doctrine of immortality is deprived of half its consolation and shorn of half its glory, when separated from the anticipation of future recognition.

In the scriptures this doctrine is apparently more assumed than explicitly stated and substantiated. It was the earnest expectation of the apostle Paul, that he should meet in heaven those who had been converted through his instrumentality. "Knowing that he who raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you. For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming? For ye are our glory and our joy." The reward which the Apostle hoped for cannot be separated from the recognition of those who were the fruits of his ministry and the seals of his success. And when, by the spirit of prophecy, he lifts the veil that conceals futurity from mortal vision, he unfolds more distinctly and impressively the truth of this doctrine, and developes more fully its consolations. "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, 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. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we be ever with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." Here, communion of saints in heaven, who

have loved and sympathized with each other on earth, is held out to believers as an antidote to sorrow. There, parting shall no more be apprehended. "Death will be swallowed up in victory." There they cry,

"Where is thy sting,
O death! where is thy victory, O grave!
Thanks be to God, eternal thanks, who gave
Us victory through Jesus Christ our Lord."

"Man is born to trouble, as the sparks fly upwards." But there is no affliction so painful as the death of friends. The cords of affection which have been strengthening with our years, have been suddenly rent asunder. "Man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets." What a balm to the wounded spirit is the hope that in the realms above we shall be restored to their fellowship! Then when death has made a breach in our household, where a friend has died in faith, let the thoughts of survivors follow the buried one, not only to the darkness of the grave, but into the invisible state, and with fondness and expectation contemplate a re-union in a world where partings are unknown. How should Christians rejoice in the prospect of spending a blissful eternity with those whom they loved on earth, when they shall, like them, have emerged from the ruins of the fall, and the degradation of personal sin, not only uninjured, but improved and purified, with every tear wiped from their eyes, clothed in immortality, standing in celestial garb, before the throne of God and of the Lamb! There,

"In snow-white robes, around the throne of God,
All sorrow banished from their sinless hearts,
The emerald vales of heaven, and shining hills,
They fill with echo of their Maker's name."

In the land of promised inheritance, the parent shall know the child whom he followed mourning to the grave; the child, left in an uncharitable world, will be made acquainted with the parent whose fostering protection he had but little experienced; the husband shall meet his wife, and the wife her husband, whose removal from earth had cast a cheerlessness and gloom on a previously happy home. There they shall renew the sweet counsel they have taken together, and recount the history of the past, with all the sorrows and tribulations of time—the

"Pleasures, on which the memory of saints
Of highest glory, still delights to dwell."

They shall surround the throne of God in company, and join the harmony of heavenly harps and voices, until their thoughts are absorbed with the splendours and fruitions of the beatific vision. Whilst, then, Christian friends are departing from this world of sorrow—when the glories of eternity are bursting on their vision, and the music of heaven is falling on their ears, and angel guards are waiting to waft them to their home—when the everlasting doors are open to receive them, let us not wish to detain them.

“Their home shall be in heaven, that happy land,
Whose meanest subject is more glorious far
Than all the titled monarchs of the earth.”

If we consider ourselves created for immortality, and as aspirants after the bliss of heaven, it becomes us to regard this life, with all its vicissitudes, as a preparatory state, and to look upon every thing that is not, either directly or indirectly, conducive to our eternal welfare, as foreign to our purpose and undeserving of our pursuit. “Only let your conversation be as becometh the gospel of Christ,” is the dictate of prudence and of scripture. It is proper to place our affections where we anticipate our felicity. By too great a devotion to the interests of time, we disqualify ourselves for “placing our affections above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.” We cannot divest ourselves of the sentiment of death. It obtrudes itself upon our thoughts, although often an unwelcome visitor. And when by the loss of friends we are forcibly called on to take a glance at the darkness of the tomb, the silence of the grave, and to cast our thoughts beyond and contemplate invisible realities, our enjoyments are imbittered and our repose is disturbed. We can neither enjoy the calmness of insensibility, nor the triumphs of faith. But when we live under the habitual influence of that faith which makes the believer one with Christ, and of those dispositions which qualify us for heaven, we derive from a view of the eternal world, a “joy unspeakable and full of glory.” In a habitual frame of soul such as this, amidst the severest disappointments and bereavements of human life, secret consolations spring up in the heart, of which the world knoweth not, that disarm it of its terrors, rob death of its sting, and afford a foretaste of heavenly joys.

But whilst it is true that the souls of *all* men survive the dissolution of the body, it is equally so that those of

the righteous are made partakers of eternal happiness. The impenitent and unsanctified, when they leave this world, go into a state of unmingled woe. In the case of such, not only is the body consigned to the grave and corruption, but the soul is irrecoverably lost. The life of the human soul consists in the enjoyment of God's favour and communion with him. Its death consists in banishment from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power. When death destroys the union subsisting here between the soul and the body, it also forever terminates all human devices and schemes. All preparations for a coming eternity are confined to this life, so short, frail and uncertain. Hence it is, in this world, if ever, that we must be truly interested in the blessing of everlasting life. If we are not here enabled by the divine spirit to renounce every dependence in our own righteousness, and in the exercise of an active faith, to rely upon the finished work of him who came into the world to save sinners, we are assured, both by the dictates of reason and the light of revelation, that we shall never afterwards enjoy any opportunity of saving grace. Lost souls once past the limits of time,

"Must daily grow in sin and punishment,
Made by themselves their necessary lot,
Unchangeable to all eternity."

How important, then, is it that we improve the only period allotted to men for escaping the punishment of the wicked, and securing the joys of heaven. We should always remember how short life is, and by what a frail tenure we possess it. That we should not procrastinate, and "boast ourselves of to-morrow, for we know not what a day may bring forth."

Happily, "the lines are fallen to us in happy places, yea, we have a goodly heritage." We are blessed with a revelation from God, which makes known the grand and only scheme of redeeming mercy. It is a sovereign remedy. It is adequate to all the wants and necessities of our fallen nature, and therefore it should exclude all others from our confidence and trust. Christ, the Saviour of sinners, "has wrought out and brought in everlasting righteousness, and made reconciliation for the transgressors." Then through him who is "the way, the truth, and the life," is marked

out the only way to the Father and the mansions of the blessed. Nothing short of true religion, "repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," with all the attendant graces which the spirit imparts, is essential to our preparation for the coming of God and the solemnities of death. To live with guilt unforgiven is to abide under the frown of God; but to die without pardon is to die without hope. None should therefore cherish the delusive anticipation of meeting God and departed friends on the shores of the celestial paradise, but those who have "fled for refuge to the Lamb of God; "who have laid hold of the hope set before them in the gospel," and thus embraced the covenant of peace. Christ, the son of God, is the representative of a lost people in the covenant of redemption. He has been constituted mediator between the sovereign of all and our rebellious race. And whilst as our advocate he pleads our cause in the court of heaven, he receives from the Father his signature to our acquittal and reaches it over to the hand of our faith. "In Christ we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace." And to such, "there remaineth now no condemnation."

But to be fully prepared for the enjoyments of the blessed in heaven, we must possess not only renewed but also sanctified natures. We cannot meet God and the saints in comfort and peace unless we be "conformed to the image of his son." Without renewed and sanctified affections, our hearts could not be tuned in unison with those who sing the song of redeeming love in the heavenly sanctuary, and the discordance of our notes would disqualify us for the heavenly communion. If there was no guilt to prevent an unrenewed sinner from entering into heaven, there is enough in his disposition, his unhallowed affections, and unchanged heart, to render him miserable even there. But the scriptures declare, that "without holiness no one shall see the Lord." Hence the beauty, fitness and glory of the plan of redemption. Inasmuch as those who are washed and justified are also "sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God." With natures renovated and purified, those who die in faith are prepared to lay down, at the Master's call, the perishable robe of mortality, and clothed with one of spiritual texture, to ascend

to their Father and Saviour, to join "the general assembly and church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven."

If, then, sin is pardoned through the righteousness of Christ—if guilt is removed through the blood of atonement, the bitterness is abstracted from the cup of death. And if our natures are sanctified, so that by the promise of God there are reserved for us in heaven the splendours of a blessed immortality, every thing terrible is taken away from death. "O, death, where is thy sting? O, grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law, but thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." When we hear from the lips of the dying their confidence in the promises of God, and see the evident triumphs of their faith, death is robbed of his sting. And when calmness and resignation sweetly rest on their countenance, it is because there is one with them in the valley and shadow of death, whose rod and staff comfort them. "O, let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his."

If such are the hopes held out to the bereaved, in the scriptures of truth—if such are the consolations of the gospel amidst the sorrows of affliction—we should quietly submit to the divine disposal, when those whom we love are taken from us. Their removal is in the hands of him who, as mediator, holds "the keys of hell and of death," and who is "the resurrection and the life." They have been nurtured by him for a time in this uncongenial world—they are now transferred to bear immortal fruit in heaven. There they shall be forever refreshed with the pure water of the river of life, and display the glories of saving grace in the fruits they bear. No more shall the rough tempests of time disturb their tranquillity, but the gentle breezes of heavenly bliss shall forever regale their ransomed spirits. Then why not be resigned, since our loss is their immortal gain? They have finished the strife and warfare of time, they have exchanged earth for heaven, and are now in possession of their unspeakably precious reward, an unfading crown of life.

And instead of repining or murmuring at the dispensations of Providence, we should acknowledge and adore the

munificence and power of divine grace by which such unworthy beings, as sinners of our race, may be qualified for associating with such an assembly as worships in the courts of the Lord's sanctuary on high. There, too, in that innumerable company, shall be found long-departed friends. Instead, therefore, of looking down after them in the dark grave, let the eye of faith be cast upwards to the celestial regions with their glorified inhabitants. And as we contemplate that happy land as our prospective home, and by faith in Christ discover an inalienable title to all its glories, let the most profound gratitude to our redeeming God fill the heart. And let the hopes of eternal felicity, and the prospect of going to those who have gone before us, actuate us to live to the glory of God, and to suffer with patience the sorrows and bereavements of earth.

And finally, the subject of death and the glories that lie beyond, when this mortal body, so liable to sickness, pain and sorrow, shall rest in the grave in hope, should induce us to wait with patience the days of our appointed pilgrimage until our change come. And to let the doctrines of immortality exhibited in the word of God, exert their legitimate influence in regulating our lives, in dispelling the terrors of death, and in consoling us in the loss of those we fondly love. By the light of truth, and the power of faith, follow departed friends into the eternal world, and behold them still under the eye and guardianship of a covenant-keeping God. The period of their trial is ended, they have entered into rest, they are sheltered from the storms of life and the dangers of temptation, and their happiness is forever fixed and unalterable. Our separation from them is not final. The pious living and the pious dead constitute one great family under the same glorious head. And "when he who is our life shall appear, then shall they also appear with him in glory." The friendships which have had virtue and religion for their union on earth, shall survive the terrors of death—the last fire that shall destroy our world—and shall constitute a portion of the happiness of the blessed. Instead, therefore, of murmuring at such afflictive dispensations as break the ties that bind us to those we esteem and love, let us employ them as inducements to fix our thoughts on a better world, where we shall shortly join them. And let us be consoled

with the thought, "that whatever ties of affection are broken by death, are taken from the enjoyments of time to enrich the prospect of eternity."

ARTICLE III.

THE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.—NO. 1.

The question of the existence of a state of punishment in the world to come, is important beyond all others, whatever theory may be adopted concerning it. If the affirmative be true, and the statements of the Bible are at all reliable, the grandeur of the subject, in its bearings upon the destinies of man, admits of no dispute. If the negative be allowed, and it should be established by irresistible evidence that no such state existed, still the revolutions such a discovery would create in all the relations of society, in the force of the public laws of the great commonwealth of nations, and in the peace and prosperity of society at large, would still give most extraordinary interest to the great truth. Whatever supposition, then, is made about the substance of the great truth, the importance of it is undeniable.

It would seem that a doctrine of such transcendent importance would attract the most eager attention of all men. But it is a dangerous logic to reason from the probabilities of propriety to the actual developments of human experience. So far from this subject attracting the notice of men, there is none within the wide range of the human mind which is met by such an universal and virulent current of prejudice. With the exception of a few bold and speculative men, who approach the subject as a lawyer examines a case, not to discover the truth, but to find a plausible argument on either side, as the case may be, the large majority of men eagerly and laboriously shun even a glimpse of the awful issue. The very mention of it is intolerable, and a hint is sufficient to shut the whole mind against every approach of the question, under the influence of a prejudice stronger by far than any other prejudice upon

any other subject. The essence of every other prejudice against any other feature of the revelation of God, is hatred to this great and terrible disclosure. Men would be willing cheerfully to admit every doctrine of the Bible, if that book contradicted the supposition of future punishment. A thousand objections are raised against this and the other doctrine of the gospel, but every one of them, when resolved into their last analysis, display the doctrine of divine wrath as the seminal principle that produced it. There would be no more objections heard to the doctrine of predestination, if men were taught to believe a universal decree of salvation to all. Men would cheerfully agree to any theory of the Trinity, or any view of human depravity, if taught to allow that all men, however vile, should finally rejoice in the vision of God, however the Godhead might subsist. Aversion to this terrible proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ, has produced and given energy to every separate attack upon every distinct feature of the Christian system. On the supposition that the Bible contains the doctrines of universalism, the intense and multiplied opposition it has encountered, is the most mysterious of all mysteries. If men were taught to believe that they should finally be saved any how, whatever might be the moral character of their conduct, it is impossible to conceive a theory more attractive to the heart of all men, in every rank and condition, of every age and every quality. It would allow the amplest indulgence of every desire of the heart, unchecked by the fear of retribution, and it would enliven the loud revel of guilt with the assurance of a happy immortality. If the revelation of God then actually teaches the doctrines of universalism, how is it possible to conceive that it should have excited such intense and protracted opposition? The persecutions of the Church—the flames rising from a thousand stakes, and the groans echoing from a thousand dungeons, are alone sufficient to refute every defence of universalism bottomed on the word of God. It is no answer to the argument to adduce the resistance to universalism, since it has been actually taught, because our opposition has been altogether created on the theory that it was a false system. It has been resisted simply because it was supposed to be a deadly and destructive heresy. But why it should be resisted

when received as true upon the authority of a record admitted to be authoritative, certainly surpasses all human ingenuity to explain.

The sources of this tremendous prejudice against the doctrine of future punishment, are as numerous and inexhaustible, as the force of the hostility itself is powerful and pervading. Among these springs of the evil, we may notice some that are special and limited in their operation; but there is one which universally exists and operates in every individual case. This general source of the evil under discussion is the universal consciousness of *guilt*. The universal dread with which men contemplate the supposition of a future state of punishment, can only be explained by the theory, that if the doctrine is true, each ~~man~~ feels that he is exposed to it. Why should a man dread the fact, unless he felt the consciousness that if it were true, he is in some way in peril? It is absolutely impossible to account for such a dread and opposition to the doctrine, except upon the supposition of a consciousness of guilt pervading the universal conscience of the race of man. This is the grand source of prejudice to the doctrine of the gospel on this awful subject. There is something in man that hints in a mysterious and most significant way that he has sinned; that sin deserves to be punished; and that a just God would be bound to give it its deserts. This is the true explanation which rises from the honest and keen analysis of those blind and indeterminate impulses which spring from the consideration of a future retribution by a carnal understanding.

But there are various minor sources of this prejudice. Narrow and imperfect views of the nature and sanctity of moral law, and the real evil of sin, are fruitful sources of the skeptical prejudice we have just noticed. If such an uneducated or blinded moral sense is joined with a heart and temper of peculiar amiability and sensibility to the pain of physical suffering, it is almost impossible to keep such an individual from rejecting the doctrine of future punishment. There are certain vices which pre-eminently prepare the mind for the reception of universalism, particularly the vices of sensuality. Wherever licentiousness or high living and great gayety and dissipation prevail in a community, there you will find the way prepared for these

deadly heresies. There are certain books that help the result. There is a tendency in fictitious reading, in novels and plays, to produce the same effect. The same principle pervades all these different causes and gives its power for evil to them all. Whatever tends to soften and effeminate the mind—to throw it into a soft and luxurious temper, and at the same time to stupify its moral perceptions, will intensify the natural hostility of the heart to the stern and awful severity of the holy and inexorable law of Jehovah. Men of active and speculative minds, especially when the natural skepticism of their minds, their aversion to receive any thing except on overwhelming evidence, is strengthened by any particular vice or pride of opinion, or some similar stimulant, are all greatly exposed to the rejection of the doctrine of punishment. Of the same general character is the cause why so many of the prominent literary men of modern times are infected with the same destructive error. The modern literature of both England and America, and especially of Germany and France, abounds in the tinctures of this species of infidelity. In almost every composition of the great lights of the modern empire of Britain, we may detect open insinuations or statements directly contradictory to, or inconsistent with, the doctrines of divine revelation. Poetry shudders at the horrors of a hell; criticism hints a defect in the argument to prove it; social reform is indignant in its melting charity for the filthy and ghastly inmates of the dens of a great city, that any should be so brutally barbarous as to consign them to a worse perdition in eternity. While the more ambitious speculators in the deeps of moral science harshly determine all such terrors to be superstitious and absurd. The reason of all this heretical tincture of literature is obvious. The pursuit of letters has a tendency to refine and elevate the mind, to render it sensible to the bitterness of human misery; but it has no accompanying effect of sufficient power to open the eyes of the understanding upon the true nature of sin and the real deserts of human guilt; consequently the mind thus refined and purified in its perceptions by literary pursuits, and yet unblessed by the illuminating grace of the Holy Spirit, can see nothing but such a discrepancy between the idea of divine perfection and the infliction of such terrible and infinite pangs as to

render it impossible to credit both at the same time. One is to be rejected, and as the goodness of God is past dispute, the doctrine of future punishment is promptly rejected as inconsistent with the perfection of the divine benevolence.

But the simple, undeniable truth is this, that from whatever sources this opposition of feeling may arise to the doctrine of retribution, the prejudice is hurtful and ought to be resisted. Admitting the truth of universal salvation, it is certainly discreditable to hold the truth simply on a prejudice. The prejudice necessarily involves a certain degree of reflection upon the candor and honor of the inquirer. But on the supposition of the falsity of this theory and the truth of a coming retribution, the absurdity and danger of a prejudice which deliberately shuts out all approaches of warning and then secures the damnation of the soul by securing its stupid insensibility to what it admits to be true, is perfectly transparent.

The inference from all this is, that we should each one for himself begin firmly to repress every inclination of our dislike to the doctrine to lead us to avoid it. We are bound by an infinitely holy and powerful obligation to seek and receive the truth on this subject, let the consequences be what they may. This obligation springs from the authority of truth, and is measured by the immensity of the interests staked on the issue. We are under an infinite obligation to receive every truth presented to our understandings; and there is a new obligation which is susceptible of indefinite increase, arising from the degree in which our welfare may be concerned in its reception or rejection. The innocence of error is a terrible folly. There are degrees of culpability in its indulgence, it is true; some may be wilfully wrong and others may be wrong by mistake; but in either case the consequences of the error are not avoided. These consequences will be more terrible in case of voluntary and intelligent error; but the mere fact of honesty in a mistake will not stop the awful ruin that it may attract. A man may honestly mistake arsenic for a less hurtful medicine, but the fact of his honestly making a mistake will not stay the ravages of the poison upon his life. Even so it is with the doctrine of a future retribution. If one honestly suffers a delusion to prey upon his

mind in relation to it, and under the influence of this delusion fail to make the necessary preparation to escape it, he will not therefore escape in reality. If the doctrine be false, then it makes but little difference, so far as eternity is concerned, whether a man is deluded or not, or on what side of the question he may be deluded. But if the doctrine be true, then delusion about it will not make it untrue. Nothing but a correct apprehension of it can be at all serviceable in securing a full salvation from its terrors. An error on this awful subject will be productive of inexpressible calamity, on the supposition that the common doctrine is true. If that doctrine be false, then so far as relates to the affairs of eternity, an error in believing it to be true will not make it true, and cannot be productive of any destructive effect. On either supposition then, the advantage is altogether on the side of those who adhere to the affirmative division of the issue. We would therefore solicit a strong effort on the part of our readers to give as candid and impartial a consideration to the evidence on the subject as they can possibly command. Let us remember that error is in no sense innocent, and that it is ruinous precisely in proportion to the importance of the subject about which it is mistaken. If by the innocence of error we mean the moral guilt or the contrary involved in it, the influence of the will determines at once the existence and degree of that guilt: it will be wrong in proportion to the degree of wilfulness involved in it. If it means the hurtfulness of the error on the happiness of man, it is obvious that no amount of honesty, in a mistake about it, will avail to nullify the calamity, and that nothing but an apprehension naturally correct, if not honestly entertained, can possibly give even a chance of escape. Let us then remember the dishonesty and evil of all prejudice and the ease with which hatred to any doctrine will prepare the mind to receive its opposite. Let us also reflect that prejudice in the human mind acts against this doctrine with a force with which it acts on no other subject whatever, in the whole range of human inquiry. Let us remember how dreadfully this striking fact exposes us to a rejection of the testimony of God, and let us make one honest and determined effort to give an impartial hearing to the evidence. It will assist us greatly in suppressing the guilty resistance

of our fears to this proposal, if we will dwell for an instant on the tremendous force with which our happiness is involved. If the doctrine is false, surely it will be no irreparable loss to give a candid and intelligent examination to the evidence that establishes its falsity. But if it be true, no language can describe the real worth of an argument that will demonstrate that truth, and explode those delusions about it, by which so many would have been hopelessly exposed to its penalties.

We begin, then, with an examination of the most distant presumptions that incline towards a settlement of the question, intending to pursue the inquiry through the various ascending grades of analogy by which the truth of this great doctrine is reduced to a moral certainty. But we would premise at the outset that this is a question of *fact* simply, which is only susceptible of absolute determination by the testimony of a competent witness; or, in other words, that the final decision of it will have to be referred to the decision of the word of God. Questions of fact, as distinguished from other forms of truth, are only susceptible of proof by the concurrence of other facts, composing a circumstantial evidence, or by the testimony of a competent witness. For example, we may prove that man is rendered unhappy in this world by certain causes attached to his moral nature, and that these causes will just as surely make him wretched in eternity as they have done in time. This single argument would settle the question, if it were ascertained that *no change* would be effected in the operation of those causes. But *whether these changes will be made then or not*, is a simple question of *fact*, which can only be determined by testimony from within the veil—by a revelation from God, or some other competent witness. But as these changes can only be effected by God, and as none can tell what God *will do* until he declares his *determination*, it follows that God alone can be a competent witness in this great cause. Thus our assertion is proved, that absolute demonstration on the subject is only attainable through a revelation from God.

But while this is true, while an absolute certainty is only attainable by a revelation from God, there is an amount of *significance* in the analogies and presumptions created by

the facts of human character and human life, which places the question on a position just short of absolute demonstration. It places it in such a position that nothing short of a revelation from God could unsettle the tremendous presumption it creates for the reality of such a state in the future. With these preliminary remarks, designed to set forth distinctly the true state of the question, we are now ready to enter upon the inquiry :

1. In the first place, the consciousness of every individual member of the human family creates a presumption of very striking significance. If there is any fact in human experience susceptible of absolute demonstration, it is that there is misery now existing in the world. The same testimony which proves that there is misery at all, proves that it is *universal*—that is, that all men are more or less unhappy, and also that it is *constant*—that is, that it pervades the whole human life from the beginning to the close of it. This fact is absolutely unsusceptible of dispute. Now let us take the widest latitude in its application to the subject—let us extinguish the existence or personality of God—let us admit the truth of the theories of Atheism or Pantheism—let us allow that men are irresponsible to any distinct law or lawgiver. When this admission is made, it does not disturb the unquestioned and unquestionable fact of the existence of misery among all men and in all ages. What is the presumption created in this position of the argument? It is simply this, that as we are miserable now, it is likely we shall be so hereafter, on the supposition of our existence in a future state; and the presumption from our existence now is, that we shall be in existence then. It is likely that the same causes that brought us into existence, and the same that now render us unhappy, will continue us both existent and miserable. Such is the unquestionable presumption created in this aspect of the question—an aspect based on the denial of a God, and therefore the most favorable to the theory of universalism that can possibly be taken from this distant view of the whole subject. But it may be objected that while man is unquestionably unhappy in the present state, it is also undeniable that there is much of pleasure mingled in his cup, and therefore a presumption from this pleasure, that he will be *happy in eternity*, is just as allowable as a

presumption from his misery in time, that he will be *miserable in eternity*. The facts do not conflict with each other, nor do the inferences from the facts destroy each other. If we attempt to combine them and draw a graduated inference from both, we shall reach a conclusion equally fatal to the theories of universalism as the actual demonstration of punishment would be; for the graduated inference alluded to, could only be that man would be partly miserable and partly happy in eternity, as he is here. This conclusion, however, would be only more satisfactory to the heart of man than an actual state of unmitigated misery, inasmuch as it would contain a *less degree* of terror to his fears: but it would by no means give any rational consolation to his hopes. It would only prove that future misery would be *less in degree* than had been anticipated; but it would *admit the existence of some degree* of punishment. Taking, then, the sum of the utterances of nature, we are still forced sternly back on the unquestionable presumption of future misery.

But it is not allowable for us to strike a general conclusion from two inferences, as distinct from each other as any two facts in the universe. It is not allowable for us to *amalgamate* them, because we cannot *reconcile* them. Admitting that the inference from the happiness of man in time to his happiness in eternity, to be perfectly legitimate, this inference does not *disturb the independent inference of his misery hereafter from his misery in time*. Both stand erect in their places. Both are intelligible in the hints which they give. We are not perplexed to know what they say, but only to reconcile the substance of their statements. This inability to combine the utterances of nature into one consistent whole, only proves more clearly the assertion that this question is only susceptible of definite determination by a revelation from God. Let it be remembered that our present argument is merely on the *presumptions* in the case, and that one fact and its legitimate inferences are not disturbed at all by any other fact and its peculiar logical expatiations. Man is miserable now, and the presumption remains undisturbed that he will be miserable hereafter. Combine this inference with the inference from his present pleasures, and we still have a presumption of a *lower degree* of misery than is promised by the

single inference from his present woes. The sum of the *two then adds strength to the presumption* of future misery. Which ever way, then, we take it, the argument is impregnable.*

But let us advance another step and introduce a new element into the question. Let us admit that there is a God, and the distant presumption just brought into view expands rapidly in size and force. On the supposition that there is an individual or personal God, crowned with the perfections that necessarily pertain to every correct idea of the divinity, who is the creator of the world and its inhabitants, it follows inevitably that he must be deeply concerned in the career and conduct of his works; for he must have had some design in creating the world, and it is an offence to all our conceptions of wisdom to imagine the indulgence of a great aim, worthy of God himself, and the arrangement of the means to secure it, and then the indulgence of a perfect indifference on the part of the creator as to whether his arrangements worked effectively to the attainment of his end. *All the moral attributes* of God require the supposition that he should be concerned in the fates and fortunes of the works of his hands, and particularly in the career of the intelligent and responsible portion of his creation. If, therefore, God is really concerned in the attainment of his ends and in the welfare of his works, there is at once created a powerful presumption that any departure of those works from the order he has ordained for them, would be followed by some signal expression of his displeasure. The actual facts as we see them displayed, give proportionable force to this presumption. If the sun should refuse to shine, or the rain to fall, or the grain to grow, or the earth to put on her garments of material beauty, it would be absolutely impossible that barrenness, desolation and darkness, should not shroud the world in

*The writer would acknowledge his indebtedness for the hint of the first part of the presumptive argument in the text, to the noble lecture of Dr. Robert Breckinridge, on the Internal Evidences of Christianity, recently published as one of the Virginia University Lectures, on the general subject of the Christian Evidences. He is conscious of indebtedness to no other, or in any other portion of the article, as the general argument from the analogies of nature cannot now be ascribed to any one writer. Particular views of those analogies will necessarily occur to different minds, for which their authors are entitled to be credited; but the general argument has long been the property of every speculator in the metaphysics of natural religion.

terror and despair. But let us again introduce a new element into the materials of our judgment. Let us introduce the idea of human responsibility. That man is responsible, is one of those simple dictates of consciousness that no man who knows what he means can possibly deny with honesty. Even if we deny the existence of a God, to whom man is responsible, that denial would only render the responsibility of man an *anomaly* in his nature, but it would not destroy the *fact* of his responsibility. Now since man is responsible, and since responsibility implies perfect freedom of action, it follows inevitably that God will be as much more concerned in the nullification of his will by the deliberate and voluntary action of those who have intelligence to understand and a conscience to enforce his authority, than he would be concerned in the blind disorder of the mere material creation, by as much as there is more of wickedness and insult in the one rebellion than in the other.

From this view of the subject we ascend to this conclusion, that if God is at all concerned in the conduct of man, the presumption is prodigiously strengthened, that he will give some expression of his displeasure, no matter what or how long that expression may be, whenever the conduct of man is offensive towards him. Here, then, is a separate question, whether God is really concerned in the conduct of men, and if so, to what extent? and just in proportion to the strength with which it can be shown that he is, and that he is *greatly* concerned in it, will be the strength added to the presumption growing out of that doctrine. We may here take the united testimony of reason and scripture to the doctrine of the intimacy of the divine concern in the affairs of men. But this will be done hereafter in its appropriate place. If it can be shown from any source that God does give expression to his hatred of sin in time, it will afford a most powerful presumption that he will do it in eternity. *The discovery of any penal infliction for sin takes the whole controversy from the ground of fact, and makes it simply a question of duration, degree and locality.*

But there is another presumption entirely distinct from the principles on which the presumptions already explained have been deduced. We allude to the overwhelming

uniformity of the creeds of all nations and ages in the inculcation of this great doctrine. Jews, Heathen, Pagans of every type, Christians of every shade of difference in opinions, Mohammedans, Deists, Infidels of various types, and even large majorities of the Universalist body itself, have allowed the doctrine of some kind of punishment to some degrees of duration. For let it be noticed here, that the question is simply as to the *fact* of a future punishment, not as to its *nature* or its *duration*. Even among professed universalists, the absolute denial of all punishment in the future is by no means universal. It was not admitted at all by the earlier adherents of that doctrine, and is at the present time rapidly declining in the opinions of modern Universalists. Now how is it possible to explain this universal and overwhelming admission of a doctrine that all would so eagerly deny if they could, except on the supposition of its truth? It is true, mere numbers do not prove or disprove the truth of any doctrine; but nevertheless it is equally unquestionable that there is a species of presumption that the more minds are employed in the contemplation of a subject and agreed in one uniform representation of it, the more likely it is that their representation is correct. This presumption grows rapidly in strength as you increase the numbers agreeing, and reduce the number of the dissentients, until when we conceive of an agreement so absolutely overwhelming, bearing a proportion of *ten thousand to one* to the dissentients, the presumption becomes so indescribably overwhelming as to amount actually to a moral certainty of the correctness of the views so universally taken in every age of the world, and by every peculiarity of temperament, age, education, degrees of civilization and fundamental differences on other subjects. At all events, the presumption is so powerful for the truth, as to render it unsusceptible of any rational and just explanation on the contrary supposition.

But, again: there is another and distinct ground of presumption in favor of the truth of the affirmative of this great issue. That *truth* is more valuable than *error*; is one of those plain dictates of reason and experience which the most hardy sceptic would hesitate to question. The circumstances in which it would be even temporarily best for an individual, and still more a community at large, to

believe what is false and to do what is wrong, are always adventitious and transitory. Even when a temporary advantage might be gained by the adoption of error, the long run will show that adherence to the truth, even at a temporary loss would have been best in the end. The exceptions to the rule are unfrequent in occurrence and delusive when they occur; the general rule is absolute and unsusceptible of dispute. Let us take this rule and watch the nature of the presumption it will raise on the question under discussion. Let us apply it to *individual interests*. We affirm that upon the admission of the truth of Universalism, the believer in the doctrine of future punishment has the advantage of the Universalist. For allowing the truth of the universalist creed, both are equally safe, while the rejector of the truth has a reversion in his favor, if any discredit should be thrown upon the truth. This is a real advantage. A military commander, on going into action, always counts it a capital advantage to have room for retreat in case of disaster; and the possession of such an advantage is extremely valuable, although victory may never require him to use it. It becomes more and more valuable as you withdraw the admission of the truth of universalism, and allow it to be susceptible of dispute, until on the admission of any doubt of any real force, the advantage of the believer in future punishment is overwhelming. If universalism be true, then both are equally safe; but if it be doubtful, the rejector of it is safest; and if it be false, the universalist has all the disadvantage heaped upon his head. On whatever supposition, then, as to the substance of the doctrine, the advantage is *decisively and permanently with the believer in a future state of punishment*. Now allowing universalism to be true, when before did it happen that *error was more valuable than truth*, and that it was to the true and permanent interest of man to possess his mind with a lie?

The case grows prodigiously in strength when the great principle of the superior value of the truth is applied to *society at large*. There is no principle in politics more clearly established than the necessity of a responsibility to a higher power to give force to human law, and to restrain the excesses of human passions. So completely was the necessity of the existence of a God to the welfare of so-

ciety proven by the event of the first French Revolution, that Robespierre, the great leader in those calamitous events, declared that if there was no God in fact, it would be necessary to invent one. But the existence of God is *only* valuable to human government on the supposition that he is the *punisher of crime*. If the existence of God be admitted, and he is represented as only a rewarder of all men indiscriminately, irrespective of their character, *his existence* would be a *disadvantage* to all organized society. For so far from being a terror to evil-doers, the prospect of final bliss, under any circumstances, would give a most powerful stimulant to the unrestrained indulgence of every passion and every vice. Let the doctrines of universalism prevail and society is dissolved; all law must be abandoned; the whole civil arrangements of human life would be instantaneously revolutionized. Let the seducer be told that his spirit will wing its flight heavenward from the scene where the hand of human justice avenges the wrongs of an injured family, and who can estimate the multiplication of the shrieks and cries of violated innocence that would ensue? Let a premium of eternal bliss be paid upon cheating and fraud, upon murder and rapacity, and this world would rival hell in the ripeness of its atrocities within the compass of one revolving moon. Now let us admit universalism to be true, and we have the *portentous anomaly of a great truth, not only incompatible* with the interests of society, but the *direct producer* of crimes and calamities of unexampled bitterness and horror. We have the equally unaccountable anomaly of a *tremendous fraud necessary* to the providential government of Jehovah, and of the entire interest of society and of every individual in society, whether rights of person or property; and the whole machinery of civil government indissolubly bound to the largest lie ever imposed upon the credulity of mankind. Nay, more, it will become necessary for the very existence of human society to train the teachers of religion to the most consummate perfection in the arts of fraud, and to form a body guard of religious scoundrels, skilled in every department of the most vigorous and versatile lying to maintain the delusions necessary to the maintenance of every right and comfort of associated life. If there be any presumption of the truth of an idea so absolutely essential

to all the rights and happiness of mankind, or if there be any force in the superiority of the value of truth to error, then the presumption growing out of the great facts just stated, amounts again to a moral certainty of the truth of future punishment.

But this is not all. We now approach to the consideration of strict analogies, the force of which mounts higher than a mere presumption. There can be no doubt of the existence of sin; nor can there be any more doubt that sin is the parent of suffering. The daily events of life are perpetually uttering commentaries on the text, *The way of the transgressor is hard*. Sin is the want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God. This grand principle of connection between a neglect or a violation of the laws of God, pervades every department of human nature. It is as true of sins of omission as it is of sins of commission. If a man overstrain any of his muscular energies, he must suffer pain in consequence of it. If he does what is wrong, he must suffer the tortures of conscience. If he abuse the powers of his mind, he must sink into imbecility or flame into madness. Or if he omit to take food he must starve; or to provide clothing and shelter, he must groan under the fury of the elements. Expand the analogy and behold its application to the physical nature of man and to the physical universe itself. Sin in man is a violation of law. Let us suppose that all the parts of the creation should refuse to discharge the functions imposed upon them by the law of the Creator. Suppose the earth should refuse to grow the grain, or the grain to spring up from the earth; suppose the sun should refuse to shine, and the rain to fall, and the limbs of the human body to perform their functions, what would be the inevitable and necessary result? Why man would stand a motionless statue of flesh, upon a dead and barren earth, all shrouded in midnight darkness, the silent and desolate prison-house of a rebel against God, unvisited by one vernal ray, or one breath of balmy air, where the only sign of life would be the fierce anguish of a living spirit, struggling in its motionless case of blood and bones and shrieking for deliverance. This would be the result; nothing else could be the result; and this would be hell enough to establish forever the great fact that *any departure from the laws ordained by God*

must be productive of *disorder* in the *material* and of *misery* in the *sentient* universe. We may grasp the great analogies of nature on this subject in its broadest extent, or we may search for their most minute application to particular events, and the uniform testimony of all will be the same. It will be found true of the general idea, and true in the particular instance, that a violation of the laws of God will produce sorrow. Every special violation of any particular regulation of the great Ruler will be followed by its peculiar punishment; and the strength of the final inference from all is proportioned to the combined force of the whole series of analogies. Since, therefore, the laws of God extend over every atom, in every department of the universe, both moral and physical, and since the violation of any and all of them in their most minute ramifications is productive of its own peculiar punishment, it follows that the *real strength of the argument for future punishment from the analogies of nature, is as absolutely boundless as the universe of God and the laws which control every part of it.* There is a connection between sin and suffering so clearly established in the very necessities of the case, that *if we admit man to exist at all in a future state, the doctrine of his wretchedness in that state inevitably follows, unless it can be proved that he will undergo a revolution so complete as to prevent the possibility of his sinning.* If man is not miserable in eternity, it must result from one of the following suppositions:— Either he must be annihilated, and thus rendered incapable of either joy or sorrow, a supposition opposed to every presumption and analogy in the case; or his nature must undergo such complete revolution in the character of its passions and desires, as to render their gratification compatible with each other, with themselves, and with the nature of things; a supposition which is incapable of proof, except on the testimony of him who alone can effect such a change; or the nature of things must be so changed as to allow sin to be committed without entailing suffering, which is absurd and impossible.

Here, then, we stand upon the brink of eternity, to inquire what is the actual fact as there existing behind the impenetrable mystery of the grave. We have arrayed presumption after presumption, and analogy after analogy,

and we stand on the borders of the unseen country burdened with a series of presumptions which indicate the realization of our worst fears, with an emphasis only susceptible of refutation by a contradictory revelation from God. We have arrived at the conclusion that man is miserable now; that he is made miserable by laws pertaining to his very nature, and therefore that this nature must be changed, or those laws must be altered, or else his eternal wretchedness is sealed past all possibility of doubt or escape. Whether these changes will be made, depends upon the will of God, which he alone is competent to declare. Our position, then, at this stage of the inquiry, is just outside of the Bible, without one invincible objection to the presumptions warning us of the answer that must come from the gloom of the veiled future, and telling us with an assurance just short of demonstration, what is the great reality. A voice has come from within the veil; the only competent witness has actually spoken; and now we would turn with solemn awe to the records of the revelation from God. Let us see what is the *simple fact* on this most intensely absorbing of all the inquiries of the human mind.

ARTICLE IV.

REV. ROBERT HALL.

At eleven years of age, his extraordinary talent and devotional feeling suggested to his excellent parents the expediency and propriety of devoting him to the sacred office. Mr. Beely Wallis, at whose house young Hall was a visitor, several times requested him to deliver short addresses to a select auditory, invited specially to hear him, so impressed was Mr. Wallis with his precocity of talent. This prominent notice of him, inspired young Hall with vanity, and he lamented it in after life, as a positive injury done him. He was for a short time at Dr. Ryland's school, at Northampton. When about thirteen, he left that school, and studied divinity and some collateral subjects, principally

under the guidance of his father. Having given satisfactory proofs of his piety, and of a strong predilection for the pastoral office, he was placed at the Bristol Institution in October, 1788, being then in his 15th year.—*Memoirs of R. Hall, by Dr. Gregory, Harpers's edition, New-York, 1833, vol. 3d, pp. 5-6.* Dr. Gregory remarks: "There is reason to apprehend that at this period of his life, Mr. Hall, notwithstanding the correctness and excellence of his general principles, and the regularity of his devotional habits, had set too high an estimate on merely intellectual attainments, and valued himself not more perhaps than was natural to youth, yet too much on the extent of his mental possessions." (p. 7.) His mind, we infer from this, was not suitably impressed with the true, spiritual, holy and responsible nature of that office to which he aspired. Yet his father, fully satisfied that his piety was genuine, as well as that his qualifications for the office of a preacher were of a high order, and not wishing to rely upon his own judgment, submitted his son's case to the Church of which he was pastor; and on the 13th of August, 1780, he was examined in the presence of the Church by his father, respecting his inclination, motive and end, in reference to the ministry, and was likewise desired to make a declaration of his religious sentiments, all which being done to the entire satisfaction of the Church, they therefore set him apart by lifting up their right hands and by solemn prayer. When thus regularly set apart to the sacred office, Mr. Hall had but just a few months entered his *seventeenth* year! (p. 8.) He took his degree of A. M. at Aberdeen, March 30, 1785, and while at College "was considered by all the students as a model of correct and regular deportment, of religious and moral habits, of friendly and benevolent affections." In this year, and when he had just attained his majority, he was settled as colleague with Dr. Evans, at Broadmead Church, Bristol.

His popularity as a preacher and as a man became very great, and continued to increase until he removed from Bristol to Cambridge. "Yet it ought not to be concealed (for I simply announce, says his biographer, his own deliberate conviction frequently expressed in after life,) that at this time he was very inadequately qualified for the duties of a minister of the gospel. He had, it is true, firmly em-

braced and cordially relied upon those fundamental truths which are comprehended in the declaration, "He that cometh unto God must believe that He is, and that He is the *rewarder* of them that diligently seek Him." And he often expatiated, and with much originality and beauty, upon the divine attributes, and constantly exhorted men to adhere closely to the path of duty, yet not often from the higher, namely, the evangelical motives to pure and benevolent and holy conduct. His knowledge of Christianity, as a system of restoration and reconciliation, was comparatively defective and obscure, and he felt but little alive to those peculiarities of the new dispensation upon which, in maturer life, he loved to dwell. In his preaching, he dealt too much in generalities, or enlarged upon topics which, though in a certain sense noble and inspiring, and thus calculated to elevate the mind, did not immediately flow from the great scheme of redemption, which it was his special office to disclose. The extent of God's matchless love and mercy, the depth of the mystery of His designs, the inexhaustible treasury of His blessings and graces, the wonderful blessings flowing from the incarnation, humiliation and sacrifice of the Son of God, the delightful privileges of the saints, were themes to which he recurred far less frequently than in later days. The notes of several of his sermons preached from 1785 to 1789, taken down by one of the congregation, and which are now in my possession, confirm to a considerable extent the existence of the serious defect, which he subsequently so much deplored." (pp. 12-13.) The Rev. Andrew Fuller and Dr. Ryland stood in fear for him. The former prayed in his private journal, "The Lord keep that young man." "The Lord in mercy to him and his Churches in this country, keep him in the path of truth and righteousness." The latter prayed for him thus, "O that the Lord would keep him humble and make him prudent." "O that God may keep that young man in the way of truth and holiness." (p. 14.) Mr. Hall at this time knew not the Lord. Such was his own deliberate judgment afterwards. He continued at Bristol until July, 1791, when he removed to Cambridge, to take charge of Dr. Robinson's Church, vacated by his death. He left Bristol on account of a misunderstanding with Dr. Evans, and under some imputations of want of

orthodoxy. Certain is it, his views of some of the fundamental doctrines of grace were obscure and erroneous : (pp. 17-22)—and it was partly on account of his supposed *liberal* views that Dr. Robinson's people called him. His personal friend, Mr. John Greene, says, "I have frequently heard him say, that when he first received the invitation to Cambridge, he had just a sufficient quantum of orthodoxy to pass muster with the pious part of the members, and not too much to be refused by the refined and speculative part of the congregation." An acquaintance of Mr. Hall, not himself in favor of Calvinism it would seem, who knew him intimately from 1793 to 1796, says: "At that period his creed was imperfect, wanting the personality of the Holy Spirit, and wavering between the terrors of Calvin and the plausibilities of Baxter." (p. 26.) His indecision in doctrine is exhibited by the fact of his omitting the Epistle to the Romans, in his expository discourses at Cambridge on Sabbath morning; and when Mr. Greene inquired the reason, he replied, "I do not understand it, sir. The Apostle says there are *many things hard to be understood*. I shall reserve the exposition of that epistle for the last work of my life." (vol. 4, p. 17.)

The death of his pious and venerable father, which occurred in March, 1791, produced much serious thought, and the affliction resulted in important changes in Mr. Hall's sentiments, and among these changes was his renunciation of his *materialism*, which he often declared he "buried in his father's grave." His belief on this point had been, "that the thinking powers and faculties are the result of a certain organization of matter, and that after death man ceases to be conscious *until the resurrection*." (pp. 19, 21-22.) The word of God could have been but imperfectly studied by Mr. Hall. His chief studies were more literary and classical than theological and biblical, though he united all. (p. 30.) In 1799, a severe fever brought him to the brink of the grave, and for about two days he apprehended himself to be on the borders of eternity. Writing to his friend, Rev. James Phillips, he says, "I never before felt my mind so calm and happy. Filled with the most overwhelming sense of my own unworthiness, my mind was supported merely by a faith in Christ crucified. I would not for the world have parted with that text, 'The

blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." I never before saw such a beauty and grandeur, in the way of salvation by the death of Christ, as on this occasion. I am fully persuaded the evangelical doctrines alone are able to support the mind in the near views of death and judgment. May you and I be more and more grounded in a conviction of their truth and acquainted with their power. It is to these doctrines the revelation of Christ is chiefly indebted for its efficacy in the hearts and lives of men." (vol. 3d, p. 213. At this time, according to Mr. Hall's conviction afterwards, he was not a regenerated man, and his exercises upon what he conceived to be his dying bed, are not at all inconsistent with the supposition, for many in such an hour are calm and even happy, and express great faith in an atoning Saviour and admiration of the beauty and grandeur of the plan of salvation, who have no real, hearty and spiritual union with the Lord Jesus Christ, and frequently survive to convince their friends and themselves that they were mistaken in the genuineness of their exercises at the time. However, the impressions of this illness were both salutary and abiding, and prompted him to the investigation of one or two points with regard to which he had long felt himself floating in uncertainty. "Although he had for some years steadily and earnestly enforced the necessity of divine influence in the transformation of character, and in perseverance in a course of consistent obedience, yet he spoke of it as "the influence of the Spirit of God," and never in express terms as "the influence of the Holy Spirit." The reason was, that though he fully believed the necessity of spiritual agency in commencing and continuing the spiritual life, he doubted the doctrine of the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. But about this time he was struck with the fact that whenever, in private prayer, he was in the most deeply devotional frame, "most overwhelmed with the sense that he was nothing and God was all in all," he always felt himself inclined to adopt a Trinitarian doxology. This circumstance occurring frequently, and more frequently meditated upon in a tone of honest and anxious inquiry, issued at length in a persuasion that the Holy Spirit is really and truly God, and not an emanation. It was not, however, until the year 1800 that he publicly included the personality of the Holy Spirit in his statements

of the doctrine of spiritual influence." (pp. 25-36.) If he arrived at a conviction of his error in regard to the personality of the Holy Spirit in 1799, or shortly after his illness, how can it be accounted for, that he did not immediately make a public acknowledgment of his error, and immediately commence the public worship of the precious comforter, the regenerator and sanctifier of his soul, and the souls of all God's redeemed ones on earth? His God apparently had been Father and Son! Dualism! Thus for *twenty long years* he had been preaching, and knew not if there was any Holy Ghost!

In 1804, and again in 1805, Mr. Hall suffered temporary but very distressing fits of derangement, proceeding from disordered body and a mind overstrained, and too much seclusion. Both attacks were within the year, and it was regarded as essential to the permanent possession of mental health and vigor, that he should resign the pastoral charge and seek retirement and relaxation. Accordingly, March 4th, 1806, he resigned his charge in Cambridge, which he had held for fifteen years. We now approach the period when Mr. Hall conceived himself for the first time in his life a child of God. He had made advances in doctrinal knowledge and in greater seriousness of life, but had never before in his own experience and judgment been born again. "His own decided persuasion was, that however vivid his convictions of religious truth, and of the necessity of a consistent course of evangelical obedience had formerly been, and however correct his doctrinal sentiments during the last four or five years, yet that he did not undergo a thorough transformation of character, a complete renewal of his heart and affections, until the first of these seizures, (1804). Some of his Cambridge friends, who visited him at Shelford previously to his removal to Dr. Arnold's, and witnessed his deep prostration of soul while he read the fifty-first Psalm, and made each verse the subject of penitent confession and of distinct prayer, were rather inclined to concur with him as to the correctness of his opinion. Be this, however, as it may, (and the wonderful revelations of "the great day" can alone remove the doubt,) there can be no question that from this period he seemed more to live under the prevailing recollection of his entire dependence upon God, that his habits were more

devotional than they had ever before been, his exercises more fervent and more elevated." (p. 52.)

No one can doubt but that Mr. Hall was the best judge of his own spiritual state. He seems to have reviewed his life carefully and conscientiously. His change in heart and life afterwards confirmed his conclusion. And thus he was twenty-four years in the ministry ere he was a soundly converted man.

He resumed the active duties of the ministry as soon as it was considered safe for him to do so after his second attack, and was settled over the Baptist Church in Leicester, where he remained nearly twenty years, a period in which Dr. Gregory remarks, he doubted not, "he was most happy, active and useful." Shortly after his settlement in Leicester, he made an act of *solemn dedication of himself to God*, which he renewed annually on the recurrence of his birth day, 2d May, 1809. (pp. 52-53.) Mr. Hall was so impressed with the emptiness of his former ministry, that after his change and removal to Leicester, he destroyed his manuscripts of sermons. To what extent is not known. Of his Sabbath morning sermons at Cambridge, he said they were "good for nothing; they had very little of the Gospel in them." They were then in a pile in his study, set aside for the fire.—*Reminiscences by John Greene, Works vol. 4, p. 12, and note at foot.*

In the former part of his ministry, he was admired, lauded, and courted in public and in private as a great and an eloquent, agreeable and striking man. He was devoted to learning and literature, to finished and captivating discourses, and literary society. He was filled with admiration of talent and genius, and aspired after intellectual greatness. The aspirations of his soul found expression in his deep hours of affliction. His friend, Mr. Greene, visiting, "found him in bed, engaged in one continual stream of incoherent talk to himself. I wept to hear him. He called upon Mackintosh—"I shall be greater than Mackintosh, greater than Mackintosh. I shall be greater than the angel Gabriel—I shall be next to the Lord Jesus Christ himself." (vol. 4, p. 30.) In the latter part of his ministry, he became more devotional—more alive to his great work, the glory of God in the salvation of souls. His effort was to be useful, and his ministry was more blessed and his

sermons more devoted to the exposition and application of the great plan of redemption by Jesus Christ our Lord. Hence he was still admired as a great man and a great preacher, but was more loved as a *good man*. His last days were necessarily his best days. In 1812, he commenced the practice of setting apart one day in a month for special prayer and fasting, and found it eminently conducive to his own spiritual peace and comfort. (pp. 61-62.)

In 1826, he was called again to the Church at Broadmead, Bristol, and here ended his ministry, where he had begun it. His habits of devotion and his spirituality, increased with his years. He died at Bristol in 1831, in the 68th year of his age, in the triumphs of faith, though in great bodily suffering. Mrs. Hall said, in great agitation, "This can't be dying," when he replied, "It is death, it is death—death! O, the sufferings of this body." Mrs. Hall then asking him, "But are you comfortable in your mind?" he immediately answered, "Very comfortable—very comfortable!" and exclaimed, "Come Lord Jesus, come." He then hesitated, as if incapable of bringing out the last word, and one of his daughters, involuntarily, as it were, anticipated him by saying, "Quickly," on which her departing father gave her a look expressive of the most complacent delight." (p. 74.)

ARTICLE V.

BACONIANISM AND THE BIBLE.*

We live in an age distinguished by the wide diffusion of scientific knowledge. This results from the independent labours of two distinct classes of minds. Beside the great masters of thought, whose inventive genius gives birth to systems of philosophy, has sprung up a race of interpreters, who translate the mystic Cabala of the learned into the common dialect of mankind. Incapable themselves of educating a single new truth, their humble, but useful office,

* The substance of an address delivered before the Literary Societies of Davidson College, N. C., August 11, 1852.

is to transfuse the great thoughts of others into the popular mind. Without making any substantive addition to real science, they extend its dominion by serving as reporters, and furnishing a larger audience to the true thinkers of our race. Thus, theories and systems, which in former ages were locked up in hieroglyphics, known only to the High Priests of Science, become, through these interpreters, the common property of man. They catch the thoughts of cloistered students, and, like answering cliffs, swell the echo until the reverberation fills the world.

The second class, to whom this dissemination of knowledge must be ascribed, will embrace a nobler order of minds, whose aim is not to translate great thoughts, but to reproduce them in other forms. They are not engaged in the discovery, but in the application, of truths. They find science occupied with experiment and hypothesis as instruments to establish some theoretic principle; but the principle, when demonstrated, they embody in some practical invention. With a genius intensely active and utilitarian, they seek to realize the abstract in the concrete. They entice science from her recluse meditations, to plunge her into the activities of the working world. They arrest philosophy in her empyrean flight, soaring with transcendental wing to gaze upon the absolute, that she may work practical reforms upon earth. They stand as godfathers to science, giving her, a fair bride, in productive wedlock with hardy labour. It is science which, with labour's rough hand, tunnels our mountains, spans our vallies, fertilizes our fields, reaps our harvests, moves immense structures of wood and stone like figures on a chess board, weaves our clothing, grinds our bread, bores our wells, empties rivers of water into our cities, sketches the human form with a sunbeam, lights our dwellings, propels our vessels, telegraphs our messages, prints our books, suspends bridges in the air, delicate and graceful as though woven with threads of gossamer:—but where shall the breathless catalogue end? So, too, the most abstract principles, thought out by great minds amidst the haze and mist of metaphysical speculation, are wrought into new forms, and combine to new results, when thrown again into the forge of a practical mind. They henceforth construct great systems of education, remodel political constitutions, work reforms

in jurisprudence, and searching downwards, effect organic changes in the social condition of mankind. They tone the oracles delivered from a thousand pulpits, and flash out even amidst the raving and cant of the platform. Knowledge, so to speak, is taken in by absorption, as plants derive their colour from the sun. The plough-boy comes into acquaintance with Liebig and agricultural chemistry, as he pulverizes the guano upon his fields; and the sooty engineer will talk, with scientific precision, of the valves and pistons of the bellowing monster which he guides.

Under the united labours of these two classes,—by the free translations of the interpreters on the one hand, and by the tangible inventions of the mechanicians on the other,—the finest discoveries of science and the nicest theories of philosophy are diffused like the beautiful light of heaven, and the world breathes an atmosphere of knowledge. But there is nothing perfect on earth. This proud result is marred by one incidental evil: the knowledge is shallow in proportion to its diffusion. A brood of sciolists is nurtured, who are perpetually mistaking the first generalizations of science for its ultimate conclusions. Confounding the mere scaffold on which the builder stands for the temple which he is erecting, hypotheses framed only for the purpose of investigation, are assumed as fixed facts; and these are arrayed in deadly conflict with the teachings of Revelation. These smatterers, who have no scope of knowledge to discover the real unity of truth amidst seeming diversities, have raised the senseless clamour which on every side vexes our ears, that scripture is a foe to science—the dogmatic sway of the one crumbling beneath the stealthy advances of the other. Alarmists, too, peal the tocsin throughout the Church, as though vanquished Christianity was about to surrender at discretion to her armed assailant: while scoffers fling back this shameful distrust as itself an impeachment of the scriptures; and boast of stronger faith in the discoveries of philosophy, than Christians feel in the testimony of inspiration.

It is time these schismatics were exposed who thus rend apart the followers of truth. The profound thinkers, who open the sluices of human knowledge, never speak in the flippant tone of these half fledged witlings. They never regard their first generalizations as final truths, but as suc-

cessive rounds in the ascending ladder of science—processes for the elimination of mysteries still concealed. They authenticate no conclusions, till the widest induction has been reached, and the last analysis has been made. Nor, on the other hand, do theologians, who have measured the full argument of inspiration, flout or dread the growing discoveries of science. He who gave the Bible built the universe, and His voice must be heard in the utterances of both. If science lifts a theory against the inspired record, they calmly wait till a larger induction shall blend these discords into the melody of truth. Neither philosophers, nor theologians, who are truly such, share in the jealousy of mere empirics. They can stretch their hands in friendly greeting, however their responses may be drowned in the hoarse clamours of the half-taught million. Philosophers know the history of science too well as a long record of conjectures to be verified, and of mistakes to be corrected: a wholesome recollection of which forbids the too positive assertion of hostile theories which may soon require to be vacated. Theologians know Christianity not only as a record, but as a life. For eighteen centuries, she has turned the edge of every sword and blunted the point of every spear, that have rung upon her harness. Even when struck with the leprosy of error, her inherent life has thrown off the hideous scales and “her flesh has come again like the flesh of a little child.” What has this invulnerable and immortal system to dread in the encounter with human wisdom?

It should stifle forever the ignorant fears of timid Christians, and the malicious scandals of scientific gossips, that this charge has a thousand times been raised and refuted. When, for example, a hundred years ago, Kennicott and De Rossi began the collation of their 1700 Greek and Hebrew MSS. and spoke of their 800,000 various readings thus detected, the Christian world rose in arms against critical labours which have now settled forever the integrity of the sacred text. The well known blunder of the French savans is equally illustrative, who assigned to the Zodiacs taken from the temples of Dendera and Esneh an antiquity fatal to the scriptural chronology. But Champollion's key revealed the name of Augustus Cæsar in those mystic signs said to have been traced 4000 years be-

fore the Christian era; and placed in the reign of Commodus, 180 years after the advent, the temple said to have been built 7000 years before. The time would fail to tell how infallible Popes, with pious fathers of the ancient Church, thundered anathemas against the theory of Antipodes: yet the earth, without heresy, is now a globe. Or, of the solemn council of Salamanca denouncing the geographical hypothesis of the continent which Columbus discovered and we inhabit. Or, of Galileo—whose restless ghost, like that of Banquo, is daily conjured up to scandalize the Church—recanting the system of Copernicus before the inquisitors of Rome. In a word, there is not a province in the whole circle of human knowledge, in which science has not sometimes tripped, and her progress been challenged through superstitious fears. In metaphysics, astronomy, natural philosophy, political economy, therapeutics, anatomy—on the subjects of witchcraft and spectres, usury and tithes—truth has fought her way against prejudice and calumny: and saucy skeptics, while sapping the Christian faith, have hurled back the innocent anathemas of frightened Churchmen. The past is nevertheless a guarantee for the future. If these strifes have been composed, let us not smile at the spectral apprehensions of our fathers, without learning wisdom from their folly. The harmony now established on these points, affords strong presumption that all moot questions of the present day will find an equally happy adjustment; and that the most contentious of our geologists, ethnographers and chronologers, will clasp in orthodox embrace our doctors of theology.

These preliminary observations open a pathway into the present discourse. This alleged opposition of science and revelation, we wish to confront with one great historical fact: *that the only philosophy which has given to the world a true physical and intellectual science, is itself the product of Protestant Christianity.* This fact, if established, concludes debate. It will then matter little that philosophers, in the enthusiasm of early discoveries, have sometimes swept beyond their premises. It will matter little that preconceived and cherished opinions have been slowly surrendered, and sometimes obstinately defended against advancing science. It will matter little that sophists have often seized the inquiries and conjectures of science

as levers to overturn revealed religion. If in the scriptures we find the genesis of that philosophy which gives the world its only true science, there can be no antagonism in the case. It will devolve upon us, therefore, to show the radical deficiency of the science and psychology possessed by the ancients, until the inductive method was fully expounded by Sir Francis Bacon; and then to show the historical and logical connexion between his philosophy and the Christian scriptures.

Let us, for this purpose, place ourselves at the two periods described by Whewell as "the first waking of science, and its mid-day slumber;" and examine the Greek philosophy before the Christian epoch, and that of the schoolmen in the middle ages.

It is impossible to contemplate the intellectual achievements of the ancient Greeks, without intense admiration of their genius—a genius imparting sanctity even to their errors, which we ascribe to the irregular working of mighty intellects, evincing singular acuteness, invention and logical scope. In some departments, particularly the æsthetic, this genius has embalmed itself in models, which it has been the highest ambition of modern art to re-produce. The *Iliad* of Homer, the *Philippics* of Demosthenes, the *Odes* of Anacreon, the *Lyrics* of Pindar, the *Dialogues* of Plato, the *Tragedies* of Sophocles, the *Ethics* of Aristotle—what are these but classical urns from which is still drawn the literature of the world? The vestal flame which these early priests kindled on the altar of human thought, burns with a brightness which even the choke-damp of the world's millennial night of ignorance and barbarism did not extinguish; and is not obscured by the brilliant Drummond light of our recent civilization. In painting, the names of Zeuxis and Apelles, of Parrhasius, Aristides and Euphranor, will ever be associated with the more recent names of Raphael and Michael Angelo, of Titian, Correggio and Rubens. In sculpture, the Greek model is confessedly unsurpassed. None have yet eclipsed the fame of Phidias, Praxiteles, Lysippus and Polydorus:—and the statues of Minerva and Venus de Medici, the group of Laocoon, and the Apollo Belvedere, still provoke to envy the genius of the Italian school. In architecture, while the immense structures of Babylon and Persia convey the

impressions of vastness and strength, and a gloomy grandeur reigns throughout the vast piles of Gothic Europe; yet to this day must we borrow from Greece the beau idéal of architectural beauty and grace still to be discovered in the ruins of the Parthenon. As the mathematician who applied geometrical measurement to the famous dome of St. Peters, and discovered the curve of greatest beauty to be also the curve of greatest resistance, so we are struck with this instinct of genius which has drawn, with mathematical precision, these proportions of exquisite grace.

"Science in his secret laws hath found out latent beauty,
Sphere and square, and cone, and curve are fashioned by her rules."

But perhaps the proudest and most permanent monuments of the inventive genius of the Greeks lie in the department of mathematics and in the science of astronomy. As to the latter, advances were made which excite astonishment, either that they were made at all, or that they should have stopped short of the results attained in modern times. The names of Meton, Aristarchus and Hipparchus, are identified with the calculation of eclipses, the grouping of constellations, the cataloguing of stars; with discoveries of the obliquity of the ecliptic, the length of the solar year, the lunar cycle, the precession of the equinoxes, and, as some allege, of the sphericity of the earth, and its annual revolution about the sun. In geometry, we find the name of Pythagoras associated with one of its most beautiful and fundamental problems; while the elements of Euclid have not yet been superseded as a text book in the present advancement of mathematical science. To the Platonic school we owe the geometrical analysis and conic sections—and Archimedes, who has been beautifully styled the Newton of antiquity, passing over his discoveries in mechanics, and his quadrature of the parabola, directed a sphere and a cylinder to be placed over his tomb—resting upon the discovery of their relations his highest title to posthumous fame. These imperishable names shine with the lustre of fixed stars, amidst clusters of others of sufficient magnitude to be revealed by the telescope of history. We pay this cheerful and earnest tribute to the knowledge of the ancients, that it may not seem to be a narrow and envious spirit which prompts the denial that they possessed any *science*, in the compre-

hensive significance of this term. Says Professor Playfair:*

“ One ought to listen with caution to the encomiums sometimes bestowed upon the philosophy of those early ages. If these encomiums respected only the talents, the genius, the taste of the great masters of antiquity, we would subscribe to them without any apprehension of going beyond the truth. But if they extend to the methods of philosophizing, and the discoveries actually made, we must be excused for entering our dissent, and exchanging the language of panegyric for that of apology.”

Many of their alleged discoveries were fortunate conjectures, which have since been verified: for in science, the just maxim must hold, that nothing is discovered which is not proved. When, for example, Empedocles taught that the moon shines by light borrowed from the sun; and when Democritus taught that the spots on her face arose from inequalities upon her surface; a random guess certainly hit the truth in the eye, but it was not shot with an aim. When Aristarchus is supposed to have taught the spherical form of the earth and its diurnal and annual revolutions, if this rested upon demonstrative proof and formed a part of the *knowledge* of mankind, it is strange that for two thousand years it should have been displaced by the Ptolemaic theory that the earth is a flat and immovable disc. What if this vaunted discovery should be only a lucky hypothesis, framed upon the Pythagorean tenet that fire—of which the sun was considered a solid ball—holds the central place in the universe †

But what is science in its broadest import? Surely it is not the mere stylus, which records phenomena as they are observed—for the more obvious motions and combinations of the heavenly bodies attracted the attention of early Chaldean shepherds, as they do now that of the ignorant sailor, who never dreamed of a science. Nor can it be the simple classification of facts: for this marshalling of kindred phenomena into their proper ranks, while it is the first step of the inductive philosophy, of itself yields no results. The dignity of science is not reached until after these successive steps, the great laws have been evolved

* Preliminary Dissertation.

† Encyclopædia Americana. Art. Astronomy.

in accordance with which the whole machinery of nature is regulated. It is when the various processes of observation and arrangement, of hypothesis and experiment, of induction and generalization, have been successfully gone through; and when the secret powers, both near and remote, which underlie the outward and tangible, have been detected, that science, in robes of majesty, ascends the throne she may never abdicate. The Greek philosophy was entirely barren of fruits like these. In its whole course, no universal and pervading laws were proclaimed,* such as those which have immortalized the names of Kepler and of Newton. It had therefore no key to unlock the cabinet in which Nature treasures her mysteries, and the baffled curiosity of mankind laboured vainly in the search of her undiscovered secrets.

It is a singular fact, to which attention must now be drawn, that the Greeks, whose genius peopled the world of the ideal with the most beautiful creations, and whose keen reason pushed so far the application of pure mathematics, should have so signally stumbled over the very threshold of physical science. In support of this charge, it will not be necessary to collate single instances in which natural philosophy seemed almost to be the object of luresque. As, for example, that the stars arise from vapours which are ignited in darkness and extinguished by day—that the sun consists of fiery particles collected by humid exhalations—and that the phenomena of electricity are due to an inherent soul or essence, which, awakened by friction, comes forth from the amber, and seizes the floating atoms around it. It will be far more impartial and just to draw our judgments from the systems of the great masters. Let any one then take into his hands the physical treatises of Aristotle, and deliver, if he can, a favourable verdict upon the natural science of antiquity. This arch-philosopher, whose breadth of mind enabled him, like Sir Francis Bacon, to present in his works a complete panorama of the entire learning of his day, unlike Bacon, gave no clue by which his vast apparatus of knowledge could be turned to account.

* "Of such an examination [of facts] neither Aristotle, nor any other of the ancients, ever conceived the necessity; and hence these laws [of motion] remained quite unknown, throughout all antiquity."—*Prof. Playfair's Prel. Dissertation.*

What must we think of a physical philosopher who talks to us of a first matter, without quality or quantity, or any of the properties of body,* on which forms may be impressed? Who invents a secret principle, concealed under the indeterminate appellation of Nature, for the purpose of uniting matter and form together, and which shall be the internal cause of all motion and arrangement? Who teaches that heavy and light are not relative, but absolute terms; descriptive of original properties, by which fire and air have their natural motions upward, and water and earth have their natural motions downward? Who, to explain circular motion differing from either, makes it peculiar to heavenly bodies, which are thus separated by a wide interval from bodies terrestrial? Who argues against a vacuum, that in it there is neither up nor down, and thus no scope for the natural motions of bodies? Who defines motion in such unmeaning generalities as these, "the act of a being in power, as far as in power," and defines light "the act of a transparent body in as much as it is transparent"—and who proves by syllogism the incorruptibility of the heavens, because celestial motions are circular and have no contraries? If we pass from the Peripatetics to the Old Academy, what are we to think of the ideas of Plato, eternal and self-subsisting, forming a world of archetypes, the only subjects of which truths and definitions can be predicated? Plato has been styled "the Homer of Philosophers;" but that great poet never indulged a wilder rhapsody, if this doctrine of eternal exemplars answering to outward phenomena is presented for physical philosophy. It may come under the broad charter of poetic license, but not of scientific explanation, to say that things are respectively beautiful or great or cold or hot, according as they partake of the abstract ideas of beauty or greatness, of cold or heat. If we pass still to the Italic school, what natural science is to be decyphered from the mystical numbers of Pythagoras? In what sense these were the principles of things, except as they were mere *symbols* of

*"Though we can suppose body divested of any one particular figure, and of every sensible quality, such as colour, odour, taste, &c. and the *substratum* or *basis* or *matter* of it, still to remain; yet it seems impossible to conceive it divested of *solidity* without supposing it totally annihilated."—*Ency. Brit. art. Metaphysics.*

these, it is perhaps impossible to understand. Yet the frenzy of this scientific dream will be forgiven, for the sublime poetry of that conception to which it gave rise, the music of the spheres.

Let it not be alleged that this miscarriage in physical science was accidental. How should it then have been the opprobrium of all the schools alike? and how should the seven sages, who presided over the inauguration of Grecian philosophy, have come nearest the truth, and science retrograde in the hands of their successors? The great vice of their physical science was the unchastened use of the speculative faculty. Not content with the relative knowledge of properties and qualities and the fundamental laws under which these are developed, they indulged the presumptuous hope of penetrating, by one transcendental effort of thought, into the essence of matter. Unmindful of "the great object of Natural Philosophy, which is to ascertain the conjunction of events," they set off upon the Quixotic attempt "to discover the efficient causes of these events, and by synthetical reasoning to deduce, as necessary consequences from their supposed causes, the phenomena and laws of Nature."* The adoption of the a priori method of investigation was thus necessitated, which shortly interposed a barrier against all progress in knowledge. As soon as philosophy became systematized, the effort was to arrange into distinct categories the most general and abstract conceptions, such as space and time, number and motion; and then by logic to predicate of all the individuals grouped under a class, whatever may be affirmed of the class itself. Thus were the philosophers of antiquity walking forever the dull round of the syllogism, making few discoveries, and scarcely enlarging the horizon of human knowledge. For, as in the syllogism, the conclusion is always embraced in the major premiss, we do not by it discover a new truth, but only develope what is already known into a more particular form. It was thus true of them, as Whewell remarks, that "they did not collect clear fundamental ideas from the word of things by *inductive* acts of thought, but only derived results by *deduction* from one or other of their familiar conceptions."† The in-

* Stewart's *El. of the Human Mind*, ch. 4, sec. 1.

† *Hist. Inductive Sciences*, vol. 1, p. 39.

evitable result of which was a laborious trifling with words of equivocal import, and overwhelming the facts of science with petty and barren speculations: and the philosophers, to use the biting language of Lord Bacon, "flew off from particular objects to the greatest generalities, as the axes around which their disputes may revolve."

This *a priori* investigation, which so utterly failed to give the countersign affording entrance into the sanctuaries of Nature, was, however, precisely adapted to the mathematical sciences. In these, a few axioms, intuitively perceived, afford the data from which the mind develops link after link of the most lengthy and intricate demonstrations. Hence we need not be surprised at the brilliant results attained by the Greeks in these departments, as compared with the poverty of their physical researches. Their success in the one, and their failure in the other, receive the same explanation. It is a remarkable confirmation of this, that the branch of physics in which they made the most advance was that of mechanics; and in that portion of it, the equilibrium of forces, which admits of being treated by *a priori* reasoning; and that by this process alone, without a single experiment, Archimedes framed his ingenious demonstrations of the lever and the centre of gravity.*

The transition is easy from the physics to the metaphysics of the ancient Greeks, since the same method of inquiry was pursued in both, and with like results. If a single illustration of the haze which hung around their psychology be sufficient, simply ponder the various definitions of the human soul enumerated by Cicero in his *Tusculan questions*. One thinks it to be the heart; another, the blood diffused through the heart—one regards it as a certain part of the brain; another, as the vital principle itself—one, more dreamy than the rest, defines it the harmony arising from the tension of the body, as of a stringed instrument—Pythagoras identifies it with his perfect number, 4—Plato treats it as an emanation of the deity, through the soul of the world, which animates and pervades all things—Aristotle blunders into greater vagueness still, and derives it from a "*quinta essentia*," a new element for which he invents a name that cannot be trans-

* Prof. Playfair's Prelim. Dis. Ency. Brit.

lated,—Entelechy,—combining the conceptions of perfection and activity. What a labyrinth is here! Not, however, to take a snap judgment from such a motley assemblage of crude opinions, let us turn to the digested systems of some one of the acknowledged masters. Plato, who, in speculative philosophy, takes precedence of all the rest, held that those ideas, which are the archetypes of things sensible and material, exist in the mind as its original furniture, and form the source of all our knowledge. The various objects in nature recognized by the senses, suggest the reminiscence of those primitive cognitions enjoyed by the soul in a pre-existent state. With this starting point in his psychology, the only possible method of inquiry was the *deductive*; precisely that adopted in physics to so little advantage. All philosophy, as all science, was built upon these original ideas, by a process of reasoning developing them in various particulars. As in physics, men ceased to inquire about properties in the presumptuous hope to compass the knowledge of essence; so in metaphysics, the search was after abstract being and the whole science of ontology,* to the neglect and disparagement of the facts of their inward consciousness. How opposed this psychology and its method of inquiry are to that productive philosophy which has been advocated by the English and Scotch metaphysicians, it is almost superfluous to remark. Bacon taught the true method of inquiry in all science to be inductive, the reverse of that *a priori* method pursued by the ancients. This mighty Reformer called men off from transcendental inquiries to observe and to classify facts; to ascend carefully through more comprehensive generalizations, till the most general axioms are arrived at. Locke, following in the avenue thus opened, taught that the origin of all our knowledge is found in experience. Just as observation collects the materials of natural science, so consciousness presents the facts of experience as the data of mental science; and thus the great inductive principle is boldly applied in developing the laws of mind as well as of matter—which, like Ariadne's clue, guides us through the labyrinth of opinion

* A striking parallel to this may be seen in the German Metaphysics, where the same vicious method of investigation has terminated in similar disasters.

and wild conjecture into the remunerative science and philosophy of our times.

But if these barren results alone repay our gloomy search into the ancient systems which at least were fresh with the dew of original thought, what must we expect from the middle ages, when philosophy in her dotage drivels in all the absurdities of the schoolmen? During the long interval between Archimedes and Galileo, no solid contribution was made to science. Mind, though sufficiently active, was occupied with studies so utterly trivial as to exhaust it of productive power. "Science had become a mixture of art and mysticism," and clowns travestied what once philosophers discoursed. Uncouth caricatures took the place of nature, and men worshipped the grotesque instead of the true. Astronomy no longer numbered the stars, or marked the courses of the planets; but astrology calculated horoscopes and measured the stellar effluxes which control human destiny. Chemistry, with its crucibles and solvents, sought not to detect the secret affinities of matter; but Alchemy laboured to transubstantiate its properties and accidents. While magic, maintaining a supernatural causation where only it should have discovered a physical connection, converted nature herself into a juggler, and science into legerdemain. In metaphysical reasoning, all calm and patient thought was drowned in the dim and clatter of dialectic wrangling. The barbarous scholastic jargon stuns the ear, and the brain whirls in the struggle to recognise as entities what before were only abstract conceptions. Substantial forms and essences, quantities and qualities and quiddities, formalities, realities, and individualities, dance in fantastic motion before the mind, like sprites and fairies in a mid-summer's night dream. How many angels can dance together on the point of a needle, what is the gradation of rank in their hierarchy, what their employments and medium of conversation, what are their morning and evening states of understanding—"subtle, vermiculate questions" truly, as Lord Bacon sharply terms them, "which have indeed a kind of quickness and life of spirit, but no soundness of matter or goodness of quality." Such was the scholastic philosophy of the middle ages, when "angelical doctors" kept up for generations the game of battledoor; and Thomists and Scot-

ists watched the long night through with quirks and riddles equal to those of the Egyptian sphinx.

Compare now with these chaffy speculations the extension and rich discoveries of modern science. It is needless to enumerate them, for they lie all around us, and are in contact with the humblest minds:—blessings not within the monopoly of wealth, but freely dispensed to the poor, whose comforts they increase, and the labourer, whose toils they abridge. As one has described it, it is “the philosophy of utility, the philosophy of lightning rods, of steam engines, safety lamps, spinning jennies, and cotton gins—the philosophy which has clothed the naked, fed the hungry, and healed the sick—the philosophy of peace, which is converting the sword into the pruning hook, and the spear into the ploughshare.”* It is a philosophy which, while applying her principles to useful and practical ends, does not pause in the career of investigation and discovery. With relentless purpose, she still pursues Nature through all her departments; who cannot retreat into deeper mysteries without yielding her discovered secrets to this relentless interrogation. Astronomy, with her telescopic eye, pierces further into that unmeasured space in which planets sweep: and Geology digs up from the deep foundations of the earth the rocky records of extinct races, carrying us through vast cycles of years nearer to the moment when the great clock of the universe ticked its first note of time. This “philosophy of utility” walks henceforth upon the two equal legs of *discovery* and *application*. While perfecting her researches, discovering by stricter analysis the original elements of matter, and unfolding the laws of their combination, she at the same time reduces every new fact to practical use. At the very moment she is discussing the nature of electricity, and testing, if possible, its identity with heat and magnetism, she is also stretching the telegraphic wires over mountain peaks and under the ocean’s bed, converting the world into one great whispering gallery—where distant nations over continents and seas exchange thoughts of the passing hour. Catching the spirit of romantic adventure, she seeks new regions for her conquests. Having subdued the land and the wave, she re-

* Tyler’s Discourse on Baconian Philosophy.

vives the fable of Dædalus, and seeks to steer her flight above the clouds. She laughs at impossibilities; and even in moments of discomfiture, holds up her past success in rebuke of the stubborn skepticism which predicts her failure. We listen with amiable credulity even to sciences which, from their manner of prosecution, bear all the marks of bastardy. "A man cannot tell what shall be"—a falling apple suggested the great law of gravitation; and we smile upon the lofty pretensions of phrenology and mesmerism, not knowing what lucky accident may spring a hidden mine of truth, and lead to "things in heaven and earth which our philosophy hath not dreamed of."

It is not our purpose to inquire into the causes of difference between the garrulous and disputatious philosophy of antiquity and the practical and remunerative science of our day. It would be sheer empiricism to assign the change to any single cause; and to search for all the influences which have occasioned it, would be to write the history of modern civilization. But we wish you to note the historical line of separation between the two. Until the moment when Sir Francis Bacon expounded the inductive method of inquiry, and exposed the baldness of all a priori researches into nature, there was no comprehensive science in the world. For two thousand years, the great problems of physical and mental science went unresolved. Men stood rooted, like statues, to the earth "their nerves all chained up in alabaster," or else, bound up in the fetters of a stony logic and balancing in the endless seesaw of the syllogism. But in the 17th century arose the great intellectual Reformer, who, snatching the wand from the hands of the Stagyrite,

"With his rod reversed
And backward mutters of dissevering power,"

freed science forever from the enchantments of the wizard.

The date of this new and practical philosophy reads a lesson to those who shamelessly represent scripture and science as irreconcilably at feud. What says history to this? Why, that up to the Christian epoch, and before the revelation of God was either completed or made the inheritance of mankind, philosophy lay in swaddling clothes, rocking and sleeping in her cradle—that while Christianity was struggling for life against the rage of persecution, and

shaking the pillars of heathenism, the Platonists and Aristotelians came, like the Philistines of old, and put out her eyes and paralyzed her strength, and then science slept on and had deeper dreams:—that during the dark ages, when the Bible was banished into convents and only read there at the end of a rusty chain, philosophy in her slumber raved as one troubled with the nightmare and cannot awake—that at length God, in compassion for man's blindness and misery, sent Wiclif, and Huss, and Jerome, as forerunners of one greater that should come after: and again he sent Copernicus, and Galileo, and Tycho Brahe, as heralds of another style of monarch—that when Luther entered the pantheon of popery, and shattered the idols of the Church, just one century later another Iconoclast arose who smote the "idols of the tribe," and of "the den," of "the market" and of "the theatre," in the temple of science—and that Tindal's translation of the English Bible preceded by nearly one hundred years the publication of the *Novum Organon*. What does history say more? Why, that up to this hour there is no country unenlightened by the Bible, whose darkness is penetrated by the rays of science—that there is no land in which the suppression or corruption of the scriptures does not prove, in an equal degree, the suppression or corruption of philosophy—and that where genius has been most sanctified by its contact with divine truth, has science found her noblest votaries, and gained her proudest laurels. A recent writer* has quaintly enough affirmed that coal is a Protestant formation, since by a singular providential distribution, this mighty agent of civilization and element of political wealth, is possessed almost exclusively by the Christian and Protestant nations of the earth. It might profit some of our dilettanti philosophers gravely to consider what it is that has bound Biblical Christianity and the inductive philosophy and Anglo-Saxonism together for the past two hundred years—and whether it is this conjunction of the Bible and Science that has put this race, like ancient Judah, in the leadership of modern nations. At any rate, let this authenticated fact, that the Bible, throughout all history, has been the *precursor* of genuine philosophy, decree the just doom of him who still persists that they are foes.

* Read's "God in History," p. 49.

These rapid and suggestive touches are sufficient to trace out the historical connexion between the Baconian philosophy and Christianity, as agencies intended by God for the elevation of mankind. That there is also a natural affinity between the two, we might safely infer from their constant conjunction. But it will not be difficult to show why this philosophy should be the philosophy of Protestantism; and we enter upon this final track of thought the more readily, inasmuch as it will afford the more abundant illustration, that Revelation, so far from being inimical to science, contributes a powerful incidental influence in its favour.

1. The Theologian and the Inductive Philosopher proceed on similar principles in the construction of their respective systems. The materials of science lie scattered in the utmost disorder through the broad fields of Nature—here a rose and there a star. The business of the philosopher is to collect these, as a printer would his types, and put them together on an intelligible page. As he ascends in his generalizations, phenomena the most unlike are grouped in the same class; mere outward analogies are disregarded, and secret affinities are detected, until at length he reaches formulas expressing the great principles upon which nature acts. The key to the cypher once found, nature comes to be read like a great folio; on every leaf a new science, and its various chapters unfolding the history of Providence.

The materials of theology indeed are not gathered precisely in the same way by observation and experiment, but are given immediately by Revelation. Nevertheless, the revelation is not made in a logical and systematic form, but in the most fragmentary and undigested manner. Its doctrines are strewn in magnificent profusion through the histories, narratives, poems, epistles, predictions of the Bible—given sometimes in the form of ethical precepts, and sometimes in the more elaborate form of logical argument. The same patience, and diligence, and caution are required in ranging up and down the Record, as in surveying Nature: the theologian collates his passages as the philosopher collects his facts, and by analogy constructs his divinity as the latter builds up his science. The *a priori* method which we have seen so signally failed to open the mysteries of nature to the ancient Greeks, has wrought

equally disastrous results when applied to the interpretation of scripture. Theology, no less than philosophy, rejects the doctrine of innate ideas: and revelation affords the materials of knowledge in the one, as observation does in the other. In both alike, man is but an interpreter, to decypher the record, and to read out the lessons of truth, syllable by syllable. It is perhaps through this similarity of research that some of the most successful prosecutors of physical science have been accomplished divines, who have turned from the written oracles to interrogate the dumb oracles of nature. The training they have received in the one school has disciplined them for large success in the other—and many of the ablest works in defence of Christianity and its records,—as for instance, the *Bridge-water Treatises*, the *Horæ Paulinæ** of Paley, and the famous analogy of Bishop Butler,—breathe throughout the spirit of the Baconian philosophy, and are framed most obviously upon the inductive method.

2. A second feature of resemblance, or point of contact, between the two, is the faith which lies at the foundation of both. The Bible reveals the existence of God, but who can know the Almighty unto perfection? It speaks of a future and unknown world, for the glories of which thousands of our race are daily rejecting the world of sense in which they live. It partially unfolds many mysteries, which are never compassed by the understanding, yet distinctly received as articles of belief. But why insist on a point so familiar! The Bible everywhere inculcates faith, while it rebukes credulity: two things which sciolists confound, but which are wide apart as the poles. Credulity believes without evidence; faith receives only upon evidence. It demands a testimony which it remits to the most searching scrutiny of impartial and enlightened reason; and then it receives as fact what perhaps may never be compassed as knowledge. But does not faith lie as truly at the foundation of science? The first great injunction of the Inductive Philosophy is faith in well authenticated facts. As reason examines the evidences of a revelation that faith may rest upon a divine testimony, so sense

* "It is throughout a tracing of the thousand fibres by which a long series of events connects itself with the warp and woof of human affairs."—*Taylor's Spiritual Christianity*, p. 34.

scrutinizes the phenomena of Nature that philosophy may have her facts. These facts, however inexplicable, are received upon their own evidence: and upon this faith, science proceeds to classify them, and finally to eliminate the powers by which they were produced. Thus faith in what is unknown, yet fully attested, is the necessary antecedent of all scientific research and philosophical analysis. This conviction of mind arising from testimony, and this resting belief so exclusively upon facts, call largely both in the philosopher and the divine for the exercise of private judgment; and made Bacon a protestant against the infallibility of the Schools, as they before made Luther a protestant against the infallibility of Popes and Councils. Just in so far then as the Bible, with its impenetrable but authenticated mysteries, nourishes the principle of faith, does it beget and strengthen the true philosophic spirit. Lord Bacon never uttered a truer aphorism than when he said, "a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth man's mind about to religion;" and Newton, the brightest English name on the scroll of physical science, is himself a beautiful example of that faith in philosophy which points a true index to faith in God. In the language of another too elegant for me to suppress, "after Newton had stepped from the golden ladder of geometry upon the remotest star, and looked down from that summit of science, in the spirit of philosophy he directed his eye still upwards, and saw the heights of inductive science towering still far above him, and stretching on to the throne of an intelligent Creator; and then with the same confidence in which he had written the other great truths of nature, he penned his general scholium, declaring there is a God, and made it the sublime conclusion of his immortal labours."*

3. A third particular in which the Bible exerts its influence upon philosophy, is by stirring the human intellect, and preserving it from relapsing into apathy. There are obviously two conditions to be fulfilled in all search after knowledge; these must be first the *object*, and then the *organ*, of inquiry. As in optics, there must be the mate-

* Tyler's Discourse on Baconian Philosophy, pp. 326-7.

rial universe, and the open eye; so in philosophy there must be the objective truth and the awakened intellect. If the latter be wanting, there may be truth, but there cannot be knowledge. Now the mind can never stagnate in countries where the Bible lifts up its strong and solemn voice. It announces truths of the first interest to man. It tells of God, what His glories and perfections are—of the creative power by which He brought all things into being, and of the providential care with which he sustains them. It teaches man what he himself is, partly matter, and partly spirit—explains the mysteries of his earthly lot, what is the source of all his blessings, and the spring of all his sorrows. It speaks of law and accountability, of sin and redemption, of atonement and pardon, of holiness and bliss. It throws a gleam of light into the shadowy land of death, and reveals another state of existence, with its solemn conditions. It enumerates all the relations of human society, and prescribes the duties of each. These topics, moreover, are such as must command the attention of men. There is a congeniality between them and our religious nature, by which they must be received and retained, as the materials both of worship and of thought. From this congruity between our religious consciousness and the spiritual truths taught in the Bible, the latter cannot but arouse the intellect even from its deepest slumbers. Like the silver trumpet hanging against the wall in fairy tale, at whose first blast the disenchanted horsemen leaped upon their steeds, the Bible, as the voice of God, breaks the spell upon the human soul, awakens its religious element, and calls forth a response as certain as the echo of the hills.

As the scriptures have power to awaken the sluggish intellect, so they can retain their ascendancy, preventing all relapse into apathy. The truth which they reveal is that which takes possession of all the powers of the soul, and reigns with equal supremacy in each. It gives exercise to the understanding, controls the affections, and subdues the will; thus subjugating all the faculties of thought, feeling and action. Of this omnipotent truth the Bible is the repository: shall one be brought within the circuit of this voltaic pile, and the repose of every muscle and fibre not be disturbed by the passage of the electric current? Apart, oo, from this galvanic energy of truth, there is a seductive

charm in the reserve with which the mysteries of the Bible are partially unfolded ; which, while it gratifies inquiry by knowledge, at the same time stimulates research by curiosity. A ray of revelation lights up the edge of some unsearchable mystery, which, like the fringe of gold that the setting sun places on the border of a sombre cloud, kindles the imagination to paint the glories hid within its dark ground. Thus incidentally does the Bible lend aid to philosophy, by sharpening the instrument with which all her researches are to be prosecuted.

4. A fourth advantage accrues to philosophy from the complete information afforded on all moral subjects, by which the mind is released to pursue the studies of science. No one can peruse the speculative writings of the ancients without perceiving how these were intermixed with their theological inquiries. What God is—whether a distinct person having intelligence and will, or simply the *anima mundi* informing and actuating nature—what precise relation he sustains to the universe, and in what way his power acts upon it—whether matter be eternal, and what are its constituent elements—what the human soul is, whether a spark emitted from the divine essence, or only matter in its most ethereal form—whether it be immortal, and how it survives the shock of death—whether in the world of spirits it will have an individual subsistence as on earth, or be re-absorbed into the substance of deity—whether a judgment shall be rendered upon human actions, and what shall be the recompense of transgression : these and kindred inquiries were the absorbing themes upon which the speculative genius of antiquity wasted its strength. From what has before been said of man's religious constitution, it will appear, that until they were answered, all other subjects must be kept largely in abeyance. Yet without a special revelation, what data exist from which the solution of these problems may be drawn? Hence the ancients toiled on, weaving their cosmogonies with infinite labour, which, like Penelope's web, were doomed to be as laboriously unravelled. Upon these subjects, however, the Bible pronounces with all the authority of God. A divine testimony reduces conjecture into knowledge, and opinion into faith. The mind is released from the torture of doubt, as well as from the agony of unbe-

lief: with its systems of theology and morality constructed, it can turn to reap the knowledge which may be gathered from the fields of science. The soul's yearning after its Creator once satisfied, and its longing to know itself fully met, it is disengaged from studies in which, untaught, it could never come to certainty, and is sent forth to interrogate nature and gather her responses from a thousand oracles.

5. Revelation does not confine itself to these indirect methods of benefiting science. It reveals the uniform laws of God's moral government, and thereby hints to science her true province, that of tracing and expounding the fundamental laws of the physical universe. It was something gained to truth, when God and Nature came to be viewed apart—when the world ceased to be considered as the outward garment of the deity, and God as only the animating soul of nature. It was the first great lesson taught in science, not less than in religion, when God stood forth to human thought as the great Creator in whom all beings live and move. But when through all his works a glorious unity of design was perceived, and the sublime idea of a law was framed, expressing the uniformity of the divine operations, then was discovered the great secret of philosophy, the first suggestive hint of science.

"A slight suggestive nod to guide the watching mind,

A half seen hand upon the wall, pointing to the balance of comparison.'"

If there be one idea, more absolutely a reigning idea, in the scriptures, it is that of *LAW*—law written upon man's heart, defining his moral relations—law, whose transgression placed him under the dominion of guilt and death—law, whose demands, inflexible, because just, cannot be relaxed, but requiring, in the sinner's salvation, all that is involved in the terms atonement and sacrifice. Like the higher generalizations of the inductive philosophy, the Bible extends the empire of law, until its jurisdiction shall embrace angels in their unspotted holiness, and devils in their guilt and despair.

Now this conception of law, embodying the will and operations of one supreme and intelligent being, is the germ of all true science. It rectifies the blunder of the ancient sages, who could not successfully disentangle the Deity from Nature; and confines philosophy to the inter-

pretation of the physical laws by which the universe is directed. As one infinite, designing and governing mind presides over all the phenomena of nature, there must be perfect harmony in all her parts. The philosopher having confidence in the certainty of these connexions, and in the energizing power of God, argues boldly from effect to cause. The golden thread which conducts him through all the mazes of physical research, is

“The wonderful, all prevalent analogy that testifieth one Creator,

The broad arrow of the great king, carved on all the stores of his arsenal.”

6. But the Bible contains within itself the highest philosophy. Its subject is man, in the full exercise of all his powers, and exhibited in all the relations which he can sustain. It does not, like philosophy, give us the mere anatomy of human nature, dissecting its parts, and technically describing their several functions. But it clothes that nature with feature and form, breathes into it the breath of life, and presents it to our view as living, speaking, acting,—concrete. Under both the economies of law and grace, the scriptures exhibit this nature before us in complete and varied development. We study the grand scheme of truths by which man is enlightened; we examine the complex apparatus of motives by which his affections are plied; we scrutinize the scale over which his practical duties are graduated:—and in all we see him a being of action and passion—of thought, of feeling, and of will. Is there no philosophy in this? And what finer scope is there for the speculative faculty than to analyze human actions, the compound results of thought and emotion—to detect the processes through which the mind is carried, from the first dawn of light upon it till the volition is consummated in the overt act? Indeed, it is conceded that a knowledge of the laws of mind is essential to the theologian. However useful the preacher may be, drawing from the stores of his own experience and proclaiming the practical precepts of Christianity, yet he can never take rank as a *divine*, without becoming to a large extent the *metaphysician*. Indeed, the cases are not rare in which a careful study of the scriptures alone has gradually imbued the mind with the profoundest truths of mental science.

What philosophy is more comprehensive than that of government and law? Yet the Bible reveals both upon

the grandest scale, as God administers them over moral beings in heaven and upon earth. It reveals both, not only in the didactic exposition which we find in statutes and ordinances, especially as summed up in that comprehensive compend known as the decalogue; but illustrated and enforced by that diffuse commentary running through the whole of sacred history, the narratives and biographies of the inspired volume. We cease then to wonder that the fathers of a true speculative philosophy were not born before the Bible was drawn forth from its concealment. For while this blessed book was given to teach something far better than either philosophy or science; and while, as Gaussen admirably remarks, no physical error can be found upon its pages, because its language is discreetly framed to adapt it to the growing discoveries of science, yet even the Bible cannot do its higher office of inculcating religion without at least insinuating philosophy. It places the concrete man in the full circle of his duties as an object of study; just as nature presents a concrete world in the midst of all its phenomena. The exposition of those moral laws by which the one is governed, and the interpretation of those physical laws by which the other is directed, constitute philosophy in its two great divisions, the philosophy of mind and the philosophy of nature.

We thus discover the relations of true science to revelation. There never could have been a Bacon without the Bible. The world travailed long and anxiously, giving birth to many philosophers; but Francis Bacon was the offspring of the Reformation, doing that for philosophy which Luther had before done for religion. The one brought out the Bible and read it aloud to the nations: the other brought out the older volume of Nature and interpreted its cypher to mankind.

There is little danger, perhaps, that many will be captivated by the vulgar infidelity of Paine, or by the cold skepticism of Hume, or by the ribald scoffing and profane wit of the French Encyclopedists. These have had their day, and it will be in another cycle when such baleful comets shall burst with lurid glare upon the world. But error will never cease its struggles to usurp the throne and to sit in the temple of truth until "the Lord shall consume it by the brightness of his coming." The dapper

infidelity of our day sits, with a spruce and jaunty air, in the halls of science and in the chairs of philosophy. Too bland and nice ever to distort its features with a sneer, a smile of vanity ever lurking upon its lips, it simply handles its fossils and ignores the Bible. Putting on its wise spectacles, it reads off, from Egyptian monuments and Chinese records, the world's chronology in millions and billions of years, just as calmly as though God had never written a book, in which was set down the age of man. Or, shutting up its eyes in grave abstraction, it talks of its logical and intuitional consciousness, and solemnly denies the possibility of an objective revelation of spiritual truths. Would Bacon have done so? While constructing a science from disjointed and scattered materials, would not this mighty Demiurgus put forth his lens to collect every ray of light shooting athwart the chaos in which he moved? And would he have excluded any verse of scripture, because forsooth this was meant to teach religion and not science. No! the very genius of the inductive philosophy forbids the exclusion of a single pertinent fact from its generalizations, from whatever quarter the fact may come. The philosophy, therefore, which will ignore the Bible, and cancel its testimony, is not only baptized into the spirit of infidelity, but has apostatized from the fundamental articles of the Baconian creed. The union of these two depends upon affinities which cannot be destroyed. If, then, science proclaims a theory seemingly at variance with scripture, the alternative is plainly this: Either the interpretation of scripture is wrong, or else science has made a blunder. If the former, as we have no *a priori* scheme of interpretation, we are willing to correct our errors by any light which can be turned upon the sacred volume. If the latter, we wait till science shall gather other facts and make a truer induction. By the one or the other method, the two must eventually harmonize in their teachings. But when the theologian employs the facts of science in aiding his interpretations of scripture, he manifests a confidence in the inductive principle, and puts to shame the philosopher who refuses to employ the facts of scripture in generalizing the conclusions of science.

It is with an earnest purpose we labour to establish the harmony of scripture and science. For if they are made

antagonists, and science build up its glory upon the ruins of revelation, the issue joined is most appalling. There is no system, either of philosophy or science, which rests upon such various and satisfactory evidence as the Bible. There is no system which has stood for ages as the Bible has done, impregnable against the most furious and persevering assaults. If, then, you shake my faith in it, you destroy belief in every thing. If science turns upon me her discoveries, sweeping away in their ruthless current that system which met all the wants of my nature, and which I had supposed to rest upon immovable foundations, upon what that is firmer and better attested can my faith fall back? I dare not trust to the sequences of mathematical reasoning, for I know not but the next moment their evidence shall be destroyed, and all the links of demonstration fall apart, or else the entire chain be unbolted from the conclusion to which it was riveted. I dare not trust myself to metaphysical researches; for lo! the magician has been there, and jumbled together in inextricable confusion all the experiences of my consciousness. I cannot trust the evidence of sense so far as to believe in an objective world, lest some one arise to destroy this illusion, and all the beautiful things in nature disappear like the phantoms of a dream. I cannot even receive the philosophical theories which this fatal science would substitute for the faith it destroys; lest while I am gazing upon the magnificent creations, they too sink out of sight, like the deceitful mirage which mocks the pursuing traveller. Destroy my faith in the scriptures of God, resting upon higher and broader evidence than every thing else, and you launch me upon a sea of doubt which has neither bottom or shore. Steering by no chart, guided by no compass, wafted by no breezes, without observation of the stars or sounding of the deep, with no haven in prospect, without cargo to lose or save, with eyes, but nothing to see, and ears, but nothing to hear, without aim and without heart, I drift a wandering wreck, in hopeless Pyrrhonism, till death's vortex swallow me in eternal night. From such a doom reason shrinks back aghast. Give me the fate of Prometheus, bound upon the Caucasian rock, a living prey to the vulture; let me, with Sisyphus, roll with weary labour the restless stone; or, like Tantalus, feed the hungry eye upon

untasted viands, while gliding waters mock the thirsty lips ; but, oh, give me not over to the doom of cherishing forever the instinct of faith, with nothing to believe ; nourishing powers of reason, with nothing to demonstrate ; conscious of an understanding, with nothing to know ; and feeling the movements of passion, with nothing to love or to hate.

Such are the appalling consequences of this momentous issue to all who have once been persuaded of the inspiration of the scriptures. Those, indeed, who are content to abide in the solitudes and mists of a dreary deism, may experience no such shock. But all who have gone round about the Bible as the citadel of revealed truth, and have "marked her bulwarks" and "counted her towers," will have nothing left for hope or faith, when philosophy has put this in siege, and science has razed it to the ground. The harmony of science with revelation might be shown in detail, by a particular comparison of the established truths of both. But such a line of proof requires a minuteness of learning which few, outside the Professor's chair, may expect to command. This discourse gives, in two words—Baconianism and the Bible—a portable argument paralyzing the skeptic with the shock of the torpedo. The Baconian philosophy is the mother of that proud science which sheds such glory upon the age in which we live ; and this philosophy, as already shown, has historical and logical connexions with the Bible, the charter of our religious hopes. We may rest, therefore, in the conviction that, as the Bible has conferred the largest benefits upon philosophy, true science will yet repay it with the largest gratitude. Kindling her torch at every light between a glowworm and a star, she will read to us "the silent poem of creation." She will appear, like an ancient priestess, in the sacred temple of religion ; and burn the frankincense of all her discoveries upon the altar of inspired truth. She will assemble the elements and powers of Nature in one mighty orchestra, and revelation shall give the key-note of praise, while heaven and earth join in the rehearsal of the grand oratorio.

ARTICLE VI.

THE PHENOMENA OF FREEZING WATER IN THE BOOK OF JOB.

Ch. 37: 9, 10—"Out of the north (cometh) cold; By the breath of God frost is given, and the breadth of the waters is straitened." Ch. 38: 29, 30—"Out of whose womb came the ice? and the hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it? The waters are hid as with a stone, and the face of the deep is frozen; (margin) taken."

The process by which ice is formed upon streams of water, bridging them over, is here briefly, but accurately, described. We will first show how the natural phenomena occur, and then compare with that description this, which is found in perhaps the most ancient of writers. The surface of water in lakes and rivers cools by exposure to the air, or by the passage over it of the wind, here called poetically the breath of God. That film of water that is on the surface thus cooled, becomes contracted and heavier than that beneath it-and sinks, bringing to the top a new surface, to undergo the like process; and so there is a series of currents, both up and down, at the same time, in the body of water, going on until the whole mass is reduced in temperature to forty degrees, or eight degrees above the freezing point, according to the thermometer in common use. Then ice begins to form. But if the water is so deep that this operation is never completed, it never freezes; as it is said there is a lake in Scotland, on the top of a mountain nearly two miles in perpendicular height, which is of unfathomable depth, and never freezes over. At the temperature of about forty degrees, water has its greatest density, and when it is reduced below that, to thirty-two, it expands and becomes specifically lighter than before, and therefore remains on the surface. Were this not the case, ice would begin to form at the bottom of ponds and streams, and then another layer upon the first, and then so on until the whole would become solid, and would never thaw out. So that God has here interposed an exception to the general law that heat expands and cold contracts all bodies; and that, too, just at the point where it was necessary for our interest and safety.

But to return to the matter before us—how does ice begin to form? “When water, in a body, begins to freeze, along the edge of a rivulet, long needle-shaped crystals will be seen darting from the ice that fringes the bank, towards the centre of the stream, and which, rapidly interlacing with each other, soon unite into one compact mass: Often upon raising a thin sheet of ice from the water, the under surface will be observed covered with a net work of crystals.”*

These filaments or spiculae shooting out and interlacing in all directions, cross one another regularly at angles of sixty and one hundred and twenty degrees. This process of crystallization begins, not in the middle of the stream, but at the sides, for there the reduction of temperature goes on the most rapidly. The water, in general, is there the shallowest and the stillest, and the heat is given off to the air, the rocks in the banks, and so on. Thus the sharp pointed crystals continue to advance and the ice to grow outward from the banks, in both directions, till the two edges meet in the middle: then they shoot their filaments across and join their work in one solid bridge, from shore to shore, like a work of art. In a manner, the banks take hold of each other. The mobile fluid is congealed: its motion is stopped. The stream grows narrower and narrower, till it hides itself, and, to appearance, the channel is closed.

And how do we find this described in the Book of Job?

1. There is the wind, “the breath of God,” as the cause or agent in lowering the temperature of the surface.

2. The breadth of the waters is straitened, or contracted.

3. The surface of the deep is frozen, or as in the margin, taken.

4. The waters are hid as with a stone. As the sense requires, we have reversed the order of the clauses in ch. 38: 30, for the idea of freezing over, must precede the concealment of the current.

We can perceive, then, a perfect agreement between the words of God inbreathed into the minds of holy men, and the effects of that “breath” as a natural agent: the opera-

* Views of the Microscopic World, p. 111.

tion of his fixed laws that work out now, expressions of his will, who "sendeth forth his commandment upon earth : whose word runneth very swiftly : who giveth snow like wool : who scattereth hoar frost like ashes : who casteth forth his ice like morsels : who can stand before his cold ? who sendeth out his word and melteth them : who causeth his wind to blow and the waters flow."*

But the beauty and force of the words in the original ; their power to present a distinct picture of the object described, to the eye of the mind, will better appear, on further examination. Natural phenomena are represented in the Bible as occurring by the direct agency of the Almighty, without any secondary causes intervening, in order that men may have their attention directed to the great first cause as the object of worship, and not do homage, like the heathen, to the winds, and the sea, and the sun, and the moon. Hence the wind is "the breath of his mouth," the thunder is his voice, the lightning the flash of his wrath.† The freezing up of the streams of water, so that their "breadth is straitened," is a direct effect of his agency. He not only "causeth his wind to blow, and the waters to flow," but also by the same means, in an opposite direction, arrests their flowing. We have brought to view the cause, and then, next in order, the first consequence of its action, the stream becomes narrower, the width of the flowing channel is contracted ; or, more literally, and to mark better the progressive action, it is expressed by a noun and a preposition ; in or with a contraction.

Next, "the face of the deep is frozen," not the shallow parts of the stream near the shore, but the deepest parts, the middle is frozen over. The word *deep*, is the one used for the deepest parts of the sea. And as the word translated frozen, means to take or seize, and is in the Hithpael conjugation, which is reflexive, it may be explained here in two ways :

* Ps. 147: 15-18.

† The Hebrew poet does not depict nature as a self-dependent object, glorious in its individual beauty, but always as in relation and subjection to a higher spiritual power. Nature is to him a work of creation and order, the living expression of the omnipresence of the divinity in the visible world."—*Cosmos*, vol. 2, p. 57.

1. The surface takes hold of itself, holds together, particle joins to particle, as in the case of congelation, crystallization, and in the fine net work that we see when ice begins to form. This gives the best idea of the process that we can have—a substance taking hold of itself! And especially when we remember that the word for waters in the original is from the idea of mobility. That which is mobile by seizing upon itself, stops its own motion. This, then, would express the extension of the ice across the whole surface of the water so as to unite the banks.

2. The word face sometimes means edge, or side, as in Ez. 21 : 16,* and Eccl. 10 : 10. This might be the case here, because the banks *face* the stream, and look into it as into a mirror; then the meaning would be that the banks take hold of each other, which agrees with the facts in the case.

In the next place, "the waters are hid as with a stone," where, as before, the verb is in the reflexive conjugation. The waters hide themselves, which is philosophically correct, for the water forms its own solid covering, like a stone laid over it. And ice may become exceedingly hard like a rock, as is shown by the fact that when the Empress of Russia, in 1740, made her famous palace of that material, six cannon, formed and mounted on wheels of the same, were ranged before the door, and fired more than once, carrying a hempen bullet through a board two inches thick, at the distance of sixty paces.† And we know that in northern countries the ice furnishes a convenient bridge for crossing rivers with heavy loads, for several months in the year: "though smooth and slippery the materials, yet frost bound firm as a rock."

How literally exact is the writer of the book of Job, in his descriptions of nature. The author of Cosmost‡ says of it:

"The meteorological processes which take place in the atmosphere, the formation and solution of vapor, according to the changing direction of the wind, the play of its colors, the generation of hail and of the rolling thunder, are described with individualizing accuracy: and many questions are propounded which

* Ez. 21 : 21, in Heb. † M. de Romare, Chem. Cat. ‡ Vol. 2, p. 59.

we, in the present state of our physical knowledge, may indeed be able to express under more scientific definitions, but scarcely to answer satisfactorily. The book of Job is generally regarded as the most perfect specimen of the poetry of the Hebrews. It is alike picturesque in the delineation of individual phenomena, and artistically skillful in the arrangement of the whole work."

It will not be amiss to compare the mode of expression in the writer before us with the descriptions found in some other writers. How do the same objects strike different minds in different ages and countries? Ovid says, *frigore constitit Ister*; the Danube was obstructed, stopped by frost. Horace uses the same verb when in his Odes he says, "*geluque flumina constiterint acuto*." The streams are stopped by sharp frost.* Virgil has, *concresecunt subitae currenti in flumine crustae*.

Undaque jam tergo ferratos sustinet orbes,

* * * * *

Et totae solidam in glaciem vertere lacunae.

In the running stream sudden crusts [of ice] collect, and now water bears on its back iron bound wheels; and the whole lake turns itself into solid ice.†

Horace again, in Epist. Lib. 1, 3, 3, says, *Hebrusque nivali compede vinctus*. And Hebrus bound in frosty fetters.

So, too, in the free translation by Cooke of Hesiod's extended description of winter :‡

————— "When raging forth
O'er the wide seas, the tyrant of the north
Bellowing through Thrace, tears up the lofty woods,
Hardens the earth, and binds the rapid floods."

Of our English poets, we will also give a few specimens. Cowper, in his Task, has

"On the flood,
Indurated and fixed, the snowy weight
Lies undissolved; while silently beneath
And unperceived, the current steals away."

* Lib. I, Ode IX.

† Georg. III, 360. See also Hor. Od. Lib. II, 9, verse 5, "*glacies iners stat*."

‡ Hesiod Opera et Dies V. 502-561.

Thomson, in his *Winter*, seems to have had the scriptural description in mind :

"With the fierce rage of winter deep suffused,
An icy gale, oft shifting o'er the pool,
Breathes a blue film, and in its mid career,
Arrests the bickering stream. The loosened ice
Let down the flood, and half dissolved by day,
Rustles no more; but to the sedgy bank
Fast grows, or gathers round the pointed stone
A crystal pavement, by the breath of heaven
Cemented strong: till seized from shore to shore
The whole imprisoned river grows below."

And again :—

"Ocean itself no longer can resist
The binding fury: but in all its rage
Of tempest *taken* by the boundless frost,
Is many a fathom to the bottom chained,
And bid to roar no more; a bleak expanse
Shagged o'er with wavy rocks."*

*"The process of congelation begins at the surface of the sea with the formation of slender, prismatic crystals resembling wet snow, termed by the sailors, *sludge*. The surface is at first rough, but by the union of the numerous crystals, becomes smooth, and forms a continued sheet."—*Barrington's Physical Geography*, p. 22.

ARTICLE VII.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Have you ever sat down, with a Bible in your hand, and reflected upon its wonderful history and character? Although the copy you hold may have a new cover and fresh type, and may be worded in the most recent English, yet is that a very ancient book. Moses, who is the alleged author of its first five divisions, lived some six or seven hundred years before Homer. He is to be regarded, however, not simply as an original historian, but also as the compiler of earlier records. The book of Genesis is the result of this compilation. These records and narratives (arranged by one inspired, if ever man were inspired,) reach back some twenty-five hundred years earlier, furnishing us, not only with a brief account of the worthies of those remote periods, but a cosmogony of the world and the origin of our race. What gray antiquity overhangs

that book—what monuments mark and consecrate its hoary age.

It is also remarkable in what esteem this book has been held by a large portion of mankind. The Israelites, among whom it originated, kept a copy securely deposited in their sanctuary; it was the statute book of their kings; the authority appealed to by their teachers; and the daily meditation and study of their devout saints. In later times, their learned men wrote prolix commentaries on it; counted its very letters, and paid both a literary and pious homage to its text. Nor have Christians esteemed it less. Its literary history has been travelled over again and again; all its numerous translations collected and compared; commentaries upon it, that would fill the largest library cases, have been written in various languages; systems of ethics and theology have been deduced from it; it has been expounded, Sabbath after Sabbath, from thousands of pulpits; it has been opened and read morning and evening around the family hearth; the mother has commended it to her son when leaving his home for some distant region; and multitudes, when dying, have welcomed it to their bedsides and their bosoms with more than an earthly interest.

The general influence, too, of this book on society is remarkable. It has banished heathenism, overset barbarous customs, removed feudal abuses, moderated the severity of laws, softened the temper of kings and magistrates, fraternized hostile nations, elevated depressed classes and races, extended the bonds of brotherhood, and is gradually and constantly melting down the selfishness of the species into love and mutual esteem.

But what is most remarkable about this book, after all, is, *that it transforms individual character*. Thousands on thousands there are and have been, in almost every age, who ascribe to the *moral power* of this book, a transformation of views, feelings and purposes, which is both radical and permanent. Some of these have been the most abandoned, some the most reputable of men. Some of them have been distinguished for intellectual greatness; many of them have been children and slaves. Nor have we to rely upon the testimony merely of these persons as to the reality of the change: it has been apparent to the eyes of whole communities and the world. The sensual

have been rendered chaste, the penurious liberal, the drunken sober, the revengeful forgiving, the contemners of the gospel its friends and advocates, and the despisers of God and religion, devout and sincere worshippers. The change has been both internal and external, and has not only softened to its subject the ruggedness of life, but led him to a happy and triumphant death. Now, a book that can produce such effects upon the hearts, lives and hopes of men, must possess extraordinary character, and should be considered with far more than common interest.

There are two questions that suggest themselves in the contemplation of this volume—"What object does it propose?" and, "Is it true?" Every book that is published is supposed to have some end in view. What is the design of the Holy Scriptures? It no doubt serves a great variety of ends. It is useful to the antiquarian, to the lover of polite literature, and the philanthropist. It is a great moral code, and serves to direct human conduct. It confirms the deductions of reason in reference to the existence of a Creator and the soul's immortality. It enforces public and social morality by the highest sanctions, and furnishes the brightest examples known of exalted virtue. But these, high as they are, inestimable to this life as they are, these are not *its great end*. The Bible, from its beginning to its close, is *a revelation and a history of man's redemption by Jesus Christ*.

We have already noticed, that man, becoming a sinner, the expedient adopted by his Creator, was that announced above. Possibly even in an unfallen state, our race may have required some *directory* for its conduct; but it certainly would never have needed such a book as we now have. One of its earliest statements announces a Deliverer to be born. Soon a particular nation—the Israelites—is selected to be the repository of all that complex apparatus of means which was to precede the birth of this extraordinary person. Among this people, the priesthood, royalty, and even the doctorate of the prophets, were to be but so many roads of ascent to that lofty summit on which the Messiah was to be crowned "Prince of Peace" and Saviour of the world. The birth of the great Peacemaker at length arrives. As his first work was one of humiliation, every circumstance of his life is selected with a wise refer

ence to that end. His natal place is a stable, his royal couch a manger, his metropolis Nazareth, his courtiers fishermen. Even under these circumstances, however, he not only performs the most extraordinary miracles, but teaches a set of doctrines, and announces a system of ethics, that even yet, after the lapse of eighteen centuries, manifest the fragrance and the dews of their heavenly origin. Pythagoras and Plato, Socrates and Solon, Confucius and Zeno, are all cast into the shade, in the presence of the Great Teacher of Galilee. But another work was before him. Sin cannot be expiated by *doctrine*, nor can heaven be purchased by a *holy life*. He must *die*. Yes, before the key of heaven and hell, of time and eternity, can be placed in his hand, he must *die*. As an innocent person, he could not, and as a divine one he could not suffer death. These impediments, however, are removed; the one by the assumption of humanity, the other by his voluntary espousal of human guilt. Here, then, is the sacrifice, the great sacrifice, for sin. Behold it! Was there ever such a death; can there ever be another like it? It is the great sin-offering and peace-offering of the world. But his services are soon required elsewhere. He has died as a sacrifice; he must now reign as a prince. Behold the scene! While blessing his disciples on Olivet, the heavens open, angels appear, and he ascends to his Father's right hand. The promised spirit is sent down upon his apostles; a church is organized; repentance and faith are preached to men; nations are converted; the world is placed under a general system of teaching and discipline, and even now we see its rapidly proceeding *moral* revolution, the dawn of a triumph such as history no where records, man never enjoyed.

Now is all this true? Is the Bible a revelation from God, with so extraordinary a theme? Surely it must accord with our best wishes that it were true. A book of such a character, and contemplating such an end, ought to be welcomed and valued by all. Whence, then, the propensity to deny its truth, to pervert its doctrines, to trample upon its authority? This lies wholly in *ourselves*, and in the *false light* in which we contemplate the subject. Ignorance, pride, conceit, often transfer in their possessor's eye, their own evil qualities to this holy and blessed book.

The tyranny, too, of false teachers, the presumption of pretended friends, and the errors even of real disciples, often raise a dense fog over the heaven-lit pages of this precious volume, that men contemplate it as a traveller does the sun, struggling amid clouds and gloomy hills. But, dissipate all these; take the book as it is, read it, understand it, and in what a radiance of love and light are you encompassed in a moment! Your heart beats with a new throb, your eye beams with a new ray, your soul melts with a new fervour, and eternity opens with a new glory! Would you banish such a book from the world? Would you sever, at one rude blow, all these bonds of man to man; of man to God? Would you strike from the hand of affliction this soothing comforter; from the vale of poverty the richest solace; from the shadows of death this only lamp? Surely, no one, with the sentiments of a man, with the sympathies of a man, could desire a work like this to be done, unless there were *palpable* and *certain* evidence that the volume is a forgery and its advocates lunatics. Let us, then, briefly consider the *counter* evidence which proves that the Bible is not a fiction but a well-accredited revelation from God to man.

That the great and uncreated mind can communicate with the mind of his creature, is what all must admit. Now, as God is a pure spirit, and man a spirit in clay, there are two obvious methods of conducting such communication; by calling the human spirit, as it were, out of the body, or by appearing to it in some visible form. Either, then, by *trance*, or by apparition, (not to deny other methods,) God may communicate with man. Now, supposing such a communication to have been made to some one individual, the question arises, "How is he to convince others of the fact that he has received such revelation?" His character for veracity may go far to produce conviction, and the nature of the revelation may also afford a presumption in its favour. But it is evident that these alone could never establish a perfect and general faith in the fact. One of two sorts of evidence is here indispensable; either the predictions of such prophet must be fulfilled, or he must work a miracle in confirmation of his testimony. The latter is the readier, the former the slower mode of demonstration.

But suppose such prophet or law-giver to have demonstrated his mission in this way to the men of his own generation, the question still recurs, "How can such demonstration reach and convince posterity?" In two ways. The testimony of eye witnesses to the miracles wrought and the prophecies fulfilled, must be recorded, and thus transmitted as matters of authenticated history; and, secondly, the accomplishment of those predictions which refer to later periods, must occur in the times of those who are thus called upon to believe. In the former instance, our faith in miracles and fulfilled prophecy rests upon precisely the same ground on which we credit any, or all of the facts of history. The wars of Alexander, the death of Cæsar, the conspiracy of Cataline, and the pandects of Justinian, have not a whit better evidence to support them than the miracles of Moses and the prophecies of Isaiah. The case of *fulfilling* prophecy is different—here we ~~are~~ made eye-witnesses ourselves of the facts predicted.

Just at this point we wish to make ~~two~~ remarks on Mr. Hume's celebrated argument against the evidence of miracles. We shall not offer a direct answer to that argument, as it has been so ably confuted by others. We wish to exhibit its futility in another way. We have just seen that miracles are necessary to authenticate a revelation; but they go further—it is by them that the *being of a God is satisfactorily established*. The physical argument for a first cause is a *deduction* merely from reason—it is not attended, therefore, with that *positive certainty* which is required on so important a subject. That certainty can be given only by *miracle*. Let a being actually appear among men who suspends the laws of matter at will, who walks on water, stills the tempest with a word, and raises the dead, and it is evident that he is either an accredited servant of the God of nature, or that God himself manifested in a visible shape. Thus, in attempting to pull down the fabric of Christianity, Mr. Hume destroyed that of *practical* deism, and, Sampson-like, involved himself in the ruin he designed for others. Again: suppose the great syllogism to have overthrown miracles: it has destroyed but one species of the evidence on which Revelation rests. Prophecy still remains; and that, as potently as the suspension of the laws of nature, demonstrates the truth of a

divine commission. Suppose, for instance, that Jesus Christ never performed a miracle, or that his miracles are proved to be fallacious, what will you do with his predictions concerning Jerusalem and the Jews? These last have been fulfilled to the iota, and the evidence of the fact is before the eyes of the whole world.

That the truth of Revelation is based primarily upon miracles and prophecy, the scriptures themselves teach. When the angel at Horeb conversed with Moses, the appeal, both for his own conviction and for that of the Israelites to whom he was sent, was to *miracle*. A rod was converted into a serpent, and the serpent back again to a rod—his hand was made leprous by placing it in his bosom, and it was restored by taking it out. These signs of a divine commission he was directed to repeat to the Israelites, and if they were not satisfied, he was to convert water into blood before them. Jesus Christ, too, appeals to his *works* as the seals of his mission. "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but, if I do, though ye believe not me, believe for the works's sake." He also makes an appeal to prophecy with equal confidence. "Search the scriptures, for they are they which testify of me." Revelation then makes its first appeal to *miracle* and *prophecy*.

Have such miracles been wrought—have such prophecies been fulfilled? Every civilized nation, and almost every religious sect, has its history. This history is composed of certain facts that occurred at its origin, and others which followed its development. These facts being authenticated and recorded, constitute the web of historical narrative. Belief in them follows as a matter of course. There are still, however, two grounds of doubt left. The earlier parts of a nation's history may be fabulous or traditional, or some things may be admitted to the records upon insufficient evidence. Now, the Old Testament scriptures are not only a professed revelation from God, but they are essentially the records of Jewish history. So, also, the New Testament is not simply a text-book of Christianity, but its earliest *history*. Note this, however, that the two grounds of doubt above alluded to, exist in neither of these histories. Moses sustained essentially the same relation to the Israelites in this respect that Cyrus did to the

Persians, or Augustus to the Romans. The life and teachings of Jesus Christ, also, are as much in a blaze of light as the wars of Cromwell or the revolution under Washington. In neither case is there fable or tradition, but well-tested and lucid *facts*. The mission of Moses lasted for at least forty years; and, if we associate Christ and his apostles, theirs also continued for as long a time. Now, is it possible to conceive that for so long a period, thousands on thousands of men could have been deceived as to the reality of such miracles? Not a whit more than the Romans as to the facts of the reign of Augustus, or the French as to the battles of Napoleon. The occurrences in each case were submitted to the senses of whole communities and nations, and those communities and nations could just as soon have doubted the revolutions of the seasons, or the existence of the stars, as the incidents presented so obviously to their view.

With equal clearness were the early prophecies of ancient times fulfilled. Jeremiah, for instance, predicted, years before, the capture of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. Isaiah also foretold the fall of Babylon by Cyrus. Here are two sets of prophecies which must stand or fall by the events. But they were both fulfilled, and in the manner predicted. That Jerusalem fell under the power of Nebucadnezzar, and that Babylon was captured by Cyrus during the reign of Belshazzar, are recorded facts in Jewish, Assyrian and Persian history. The predictions of Daniel, also, concerning the rise of the Grecian and Roman governments, were accomplished with an accuracy that almost astounds belief. And what is noticeable here is, that Providence has employed to a large extent heathen and uninterested historians to record the fulfilment of prophecies delivered originally by his prophets and servants. Thus, Herodotus, and Diodorus, Livy and Tacitus, Josephus and Gibbon, with no design of the sort whatever, are the elegant and classic narrators of scenes and events that the prophets of God had long before predicted.

But there are prophecies in the scriptures that are *now* under fulfilment—a world-wide fulfilment. Take two of these. The Bible, in a great variety of texts, foretells that the advent of the Messiah would disperse the Jews and bring in the Gentiles. Has it not been done? While the

descendants of Japheth are congregated around the banner of Jesus—while they, who were once aliens, have become the rich heritors of the blessings of salvation—the sons of Abraham, once the favourites of God, are dispersed among all the nations of the earth! Here, then, is a fulfilled prophecy, that stretches as a sort of moral horizon over the whole earth. Every Messiah-less Jew and every Christian Gentile on earth, is a witness to the fulfilment of this prophecy. Again: Isaiah and Daniel, and several other seers, predict, that in the latter days society should be greatly elevated and improved—that knowledge, and especially the knowledge of the Lord, should be widely diffused, and that men should forsake war and delight in peace. Are we not now in the ascending wave of this glorious revolution? Vast efforts are now making to employ every creature in man's profit—to develope science, to perfect art, to remove obstacles, to improve commerce, to facilitate travel. Earth, air, water, steam, magnetism, electricity—in short, all the powers of nature known, are put under contribution to the improvement of man's terrestrial dwelling place. What endeavours, too, to disseminate intelligence! See the rapidity with which books, pamphlets and papers are printed—how, like the locusts of Egypt, (though on a very different errand,) they almost darken the air in their onward flight. See what scores of living teachers are going forth to instruct the rude and unenlightened—how Bibles, and tracts, and religious books, are disseminated over the earth. Surely here is the state of things which Daniel foresaw, and which Isaiah and John have eloquently described.

We have already intimated that the character of a prophet and of the doctrine taught by him, could not of themselves establish a divine revelation. The justice of this position will appear, when we consider how exceedingly difficult it is to scrutinize human character, or to decide what doctrines are, and what are not consistent with divine benevolence and wisdom. The Calvinist, the Arminian, the Unitarian, the Neologist, and the Quaker, would certainly not be very apt to agree upon the harmony of any particular set of revelations with the government and character of God. Revelation, therefore, does not make its appeal primarily to the erring judgments of men, but to

something far more sure—to their *senses*. It seeks an establishment among our convictions in the same way that the facts in nature are believed. After this primary conviction is produced, however, the lives of “holy men of God,” and the excellent doctrines they taught, come in as powerful, possibly as *necessary*, auxiliaries to faith. One of the strongest convictions of our natures is, that God, should he employ any, would employ *good men*, through whom to communicate his will. Nor do we believe with less certainty, that all truths and doctrines revealed by him, would be, like himself, excellent and holy. In essential value, these last grounds of faith are superior possibly to miracles and prophecy. They address themselves to the moral instincts and desires of our natures: indeed, they are the very *food* of those natures. Still, in the order of *begetting belief* in revelation, they occupy, not the first, but the second position. They are a sort of demonstration upon demonstration—the moral echo of that *positive* voice which speaks from heaven.

In closing these remarks on the evidences of the truth of Scripture, there is one species of testimony we wish to present, too often overlooked—the demonstration given to the truth of God’s word, *through its power of converting men*. By conversion here is not meant a transfer of belief from infidelity to Christianity, or from heathenism to the Gospel. The term is used to denote a change in the moral condition of our natures. We have already seen that a certain *vice of nature* has been transmitted from Adam to all who are born of his blood. Now the *removal* of this internal vice is what we here designate conversion.—And, it is a remarkable fact, that so far as we know, such conversions take place only in connexion with the moral truths of this holy book. We do not allege or believe that these truths, by any innate power of their own, produce the effects here referred to. They are simply, according to their own testimony, the instruments or means of man’s spiritual renovation. By them the Spirit of God, exercising a sort of twofold energy, eradicates the vice and implants the original virtue of our natures. Now, it can be truly maintained, that according to all our knowledge of the laws of mind, a change like this is philosophically and truly a *miracle*. The laws of mind are every whit as

fixed and uniform as the laws of matter—they are of a different *nature*, but act with equal *certainty*. Now there is no law of our mental constitution, more fixed and absolute than that of depravity. It operates in all climates—in all conditions—in all men. It is in the moral world what gravity is in the physical—equally potent—equally diffused. Must not, then, the suspension or rather subversion of this law amount to a miracle? If a man was to make a stone ascend, or a stream run upwards, all would readily believe that such phenomena were miraculous.—With equal reason can it be maintained, that the overthrow of the power of sin within us is miraculous. Indeed, as spirit is superior to matter, it is the greater miracle of the two. The question then comes up, “Is not the truth of Scripture supported, even in our day, by an array of miracles, such as Moses never wrought, Christ (in His human nature) never performed?” The only question here is, whether such conversions or *moral miracles* actually occur. The evidence in this case is of course somewhat different from that which substantiates a *physical* miracle. The work takes place not on the *body*, but on the soul. But are not the methods of ascertaining mental exercises and phenomena equally sure with those that are applied to matter? May not anger, or love, or joy, be as easily discerned as the burning of a fire, the budding of a rose, or the undulations of a forest? And when a moral change within reverses the whole course of a man’s life, and not for a short time, but until death, gives it a different direction—is not the evidence of miraculous power just as strong as when lame feet are rendered serviceable, or a withered arm energetic? When, too, we remember that our nature is evidently *vitiating*—that the Gospel provides a remedy—that God commands a change—is it wonderful that *conversions* should take place? When we see the vapours ascend—the clouds form—the lightnings flash—and hear the thunder roar—is it wonderful that these should be *rain*? Conversion, which is the bringing back of man to God, is the great *moral design* of the Gospel. Besides, men have professed it, in whose veracity we must have confidence. The change then *does* take place, and yet it never occurs but by the intervention of *divine* power. Depravity is a *lusus* that only a *God* can untie.

What, then, is our situation in reference to the evidences that establish the truth of scripture? Superior even to that of the Israelites, when gazing upon the fires of Sinai, or fed with manna in the wilderness. Superior to that of the Jews, who saw the person and witnessed the miracles of Christ. The evidence which was designed for their conviction, has been weighed, recorded and transmitted to us as a matter of history. But beyond that, we live under the light of many prophecies that have since been fulfilled and are now fulfilling around us. Nor is this all—a class of miracles, superior to the raising of the dead or the stilling of a tempest, is continually occurring around us, with even startling interest. Where, then, is there any rational ground for rejecting revelation? Is it based upon the dissensions of religious creeds—upon the persecutions of past ages—upon the errors and imperfections of Christians—upon the treachery and wickedness of hypocrites and pretenders—or on the sophisms of the ingenious and subtle? Do these, any or all combined, constitute even a pretext for discarding that *powerful direct testimony* by which the truth of scripture is confirmed? Just as wise would it be to deny the existence and glory of the sun, because clouds exist, or lakes and mountains are sometimes enveloped in fog. Just as philosophical would it be to deny the existence of the ocean because floats of straw are sometimes seen upon its bosom, or to doubt the solidity of the earth because caves and caverns sometimes perforate its crust! No, no; there are no good reasons, there can be no good reasons for rejecting this testimony. It is responded to from the present and the past, from heaven and earth; and the echo of that response pervades every faculty and emotion of the human soul. The book is from God. Its history, its contents, its influence, all go to prove that point. Indeed, were human nature in a *sane* condition, there would be no more necessity for logic or argument here than to prove to the world, by a series of well constructed syllogisms, that there is such a luminary as the sun. If, however, men were born blind, it might become a difficult matter to establish even this great physical truth among them. And this is the onus in the present case. There is a moral darkness upon our race that requires something more than logic or argument to dissipate.

But admit the truth that the Bible is from God, and what an awful majesty invests that book at once! He who radiated yon sun—who fixed in their places those sweetly shining stars—who rolled the mighty ocean together, and hung the earth upon nothing—even He conceived these thoughts, penned these lines, uttered these revelations. What an authorship! What a blaze of divinity irradiates each page. What a holy *schekinah* enshrines the entire volume. Let it then never be rejected. Study the mind of God here with even a profounder awe than you would in nature. Let your spirit here commune with his spirit—your thoughts be mixed with his thoughts—your very being, as it were, absorbed into his essence.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE *ἀγὰθόν* OF SCRIPTURE; OR, THE RULE, BASIS AND EFFECTS OF SPIRITUAL VIRTUE.

It would be an unfailing source of encouragement to any individual, whose only road to a distant country is encompassed with countless dangers, to be fully assured by competent authority that, if he would commence and prosecute the journey before him, he should be securely defended at every step and eventually arrive in safety at the place of his destination. A powerful stimulus of this character is frequently prescribed by the word of God for the special benefit of each pilgrim to that land which Jesus has bought with His own blood for believers, and of which the unsanctified intellect can form no adequate conception.* He is not merely informed that if he persevere, he shall certainly persevere, but is infallibly assured that the strength of Israel will enable him to persevere in holiness till invincible grace shall remove the sting of death and hope perform its last office by introducing the waiting prisoner into the free realms of everlasting bliss. In the form of a pertinent and forcible interrogatory, an inspired apostle pens

* 1 Cor. 2: 9, 10.

the animating declaration, that no beings, persons, or objects, shall ever be able to inflict a material injury on those who imitate and follow what is good.* This proposition immediately suggests the inquiry, What is good or excellent in morals? It must be conceded by those who are acquainted with the records of the past, that pagan philosophy, with all its achievements of industry and monuments of genius, signally failed to establish a satisfactory, uniform and an authoritative definition of moral virtue. On this subject, the dissensions of ancient philosophers were so great that it is almost impossible to enumerate their different opinions. Whilst Aristotle defines the *καλόν* of the Greeks to be that which is praiseworthy, Plato says it is that which is pleasant or profitable. The peripatetic philosophy, founded by the former, represents moral rectitude as consisting in the mean between two extremes. Zeno describes it as living according to nature, and declares that all crimes are equal. The system of Epicurus, in its best estate, described it as living as free as possible from the evils incident to life, and in the enjoyment of as large a measure as possible of its happiness. In its subsequent corruptions, it was a system of mere animal pleasure and unrestrained sensuality. Aristippus affirms that as pleasure is the *summum bonum*, a man may commit theft, sacrilege, or any other crime, as he may have opportunity. According to Cicero, virtue proposes glory as its great end, and expects no other reward. Since these philosophers, and others we might mention, did not agree in stating the chief end or good, they necessarily differed in regard to the entire system of precepts for the regulation of life. This diversity gave origin to a number of sects, each maintaining its peculiar tenets and maxims. So eloquent are their widely different harangues and treatises on the subject of morals, that many might be induced to believe they were a class of sages who spent their days in the study and practice of virtue. The particulars of their history convince us, however, that they were unprincipled declaimers, whose conduct gave the lie to their precepts. Their "*media officia*" may be properly described as virtues of glass, uniting the splendor of the diamond with the brittleness of crystal.

Their learning, like the Sirius of Homer, flashes a strong light upon us ; but, though brilliant, it is baleful, and, while it dazzles, causes us to tremble for our safety. Their genius, like a lamp set on the gate of a palace, serves to cast a gleam of light without, whilst the inhabitant himself is enveloped in thick darkness. In the sober discussions of such moralists as Seneca, and in the sparklings of pagan poetry, there are occasional scintillations of moral sentiment that are just and exalted. But they are varying and contradictory. They affirm and deny almost in the same paragraph. What one inculcates as a virtue, another, equally profound, condemns as a vice. A deduction of reason, their system of morals wielded no influence over the heart. The motives by which it was enforced could neither counteract native depravity nor overcome the temptations to which they were continually exposed. It was exceedingly imperfect, because it was destitute of authority, and failed to erect great landmarks of truth that would definitely settle the boundary line between the paradise of good and the territory of evil. It is not denied that the heathen possess a natural conscience. There seems to be something of this kind in the minds of all men. There are traces of the divine law on the heart of every individual. Even in the darkest regions of earth and among the rudest tribes, a distinction has been made between just and unjust, a duty and a crime. We need not stop to prove that the ancient poets and philosophers observed such a distinction. But it was not sufficiently definite and exact. Their good and evil shaded into each other. There are both graces and sins, virtues and vices, which the language of paganism has not words to express. Their consciences, when interrogated, did not give just and correct responses, because they were obliged to speak *through* false principles instilled into the mind by defective education and customs prevalent in consequence of natural depravity. Being destitute of spiritual knowledge and religious instruction adapted to dispel darkness and correct errors, they did not exhibit a just and exact discernment of moral distinctions, and were, therefore, uncertain and fallible guides. Though conscience is a strong evidence for the righteousness of God, yet it must be well-informed and properly instructed ; and if we do not thus improve the

light we enjoy, we cannot justly cast the blame of our misconduct upon Him. Whenever we think of the ancient heathen in connexion with this subject, we are reminded of the forcible and appropriate words of Cowper :

"Sages after sages strove

In vain to filter off a crystal draught
Pure from the lees, which often much enhanced
The thirst that slaked it, and not seldom bred
Intoxication and delirium wild. Their answers, vague
And all at random, fabulous and dark,
Left them as dark themselves. Their rules of life,
Defective and unsanctioned, proved too weak
To bind the roving appetite and lead
Blind nature to a God not yet revealed."

When we turn our attention to the moral code of deism and infidelity, we discover in it the same want of certainty, authority and uniformity. Let the present generation of skeptics keep silence and derive instruction from an impartial examination of the witnesses in the case. Lord Herbert says that men should not be hastily condemned who are led to sin by bodily constitution, and that the indulgence of anger and lust is no more to be blamed than thirst occasioned by dropsy or drowsiness produced by lethargy. Hobbes asserts that the municipal law is the sole foundation of right and wrong, and that every man has a right to all things and may lawfully get them if he can. Lord Bolingbroke resolves all morality into self love, and contends that man lives only in the present world and is merely a superior animal. He maintains that it is the chief end of man to gratify the appetites and inclinations of the flesh, that polygamy is a part of the religion of nature, and that adultery is no violation of the law of nature. He gives it as his opinion that there is no wrong except in the greatest profligacy. In this expression we are reminded of old Ferdinand of Naples, who was addicted with so loyal a fondness to the chase *aux oiseaux*, that he could not be prevailed on to intermit his diversion even on the death of the queen. As a compromise to conscience between love of his amusement and grief for his bereavement, he told his courtiers he would shoot nothing but very small birds. According to Lord Bolingbroke, a man may commit little sins without blame, and still greater ones with impunity if he does not run into excess. Hume asserts that there is no sin in adultery, and that it ought

to be practised. He says it is right for a man to take his own life. What can be the harm, he asks, in diverting a few ounces of blood from their natural channel? Gibbon clearly showed that he possessed no fear of God, no reverence for sacred things, no regard for the welfare of the race; but, on the other hand, he exhibited the most heartless and sordid selfishness, vain glory, a desire for admiration, adulation of the great and wealthy, contempt for the poor, and supreme devotedness to his own gratification. The moral principles and life of Voltaire are well known. In what light Helvetius regarded the institution of marriage, may be inferred from his writings.* According to his own confession, Rousseau was a thief, a liar and a debauched profligate. He seemed to have had no conscience nor idea of moral obligation. He says:

"I have only to consult my own feelings. Whatever I feel to be wrong is wrong. Whatever I feel to be right is right. All the morality of our actions lies in the judgment we ourselves form of them."†

Had such systems of morality perished with their authors or advocates, we should not have troubled the reader with them; but we are fearful lest their influence has extended to the present day, (and having withered with its simoon blast the virtues of individuals, has invaded the civil rights of society.) The errors which have sprung up in the political, social and religious world, are legitimate consequences of substituting the dictates of reason and feeling for moral rectitude. Moralists of this class create a standard of excellence out of their own imagination. They pronounce that to be morally good which they desire to be so. Whatever is agreeable and profitable is right. This theory is at once accepted by those who contemplate fallen humanity with a complacent eye, and whose feelings are circumscribed by the limits of their bodies, who consider this earth the scene of their perpetual enjoyment, and whose ideas concerning the nature, condition and destiny of man place him in the scale of being but little above the irrational creation. The spendthrift, drunkard, and every person of depraved habits proceed on this principle

* De l'Esprit, Tom. 1, disc. 2, ch. 15, p. 176.

† Emilius, Tom. 1, pp. 166-8.

in devising schemes for their amusement and pleasure. They pronounce any thing to be truly good, whatever its moral character or ultimate tendency, that satisfies their appetites and passions for the present hour. They do not take account of the evil results awaiting them in future. True, they enjoy pleasure, but it is sensual, short-lived, and being sinful, will be attended with remorse of spirit, a thousand ills in this life and unmitigated sorrow through a whole eternity. The tears of bitter grief shed by the wicked over their folly and ruin, will indefinitely outnumber the drops of flattering sweet poured in their cup by sin. Their way appears to them right and good, but its inevitable end is misery and despair. A continued violation of the laws of the human constitution is followed by physical suffering. A constant disregard of the monitions of conscience produces a sense of disapprobation and excruciating remorse. Repeated transgressions of the divine law must procure eternal and hopeless exile from the life giving presence of God. The voice of the dying sinner, as well as revelation, proclaims, the wages of *sin* is death. With bewitching smile and flattering words it promises to its persevering devotees the unadulterated gold of pleasure, but pays them in the base coin of present inquietude and future misery. It gives them ashes for bread, a scorpion for an egg, and death for life. Now, every impenitent person will acknowledge that to his nature a life of sin is positively agreeable. His chief and only delight is in the service of Satan. He labors with conscious freedom and zealous activity, drawing iniquity with cords and sin with a cart rope, only to obey the will of the devil and sink himself into endless perdition. He acts as if he believed, like Carpoocrates, that the shortest and surest way to heaven was to sin with all his might and in all possible ways. He does not consider that his moral nature has undergone a complete revolution. The diamond crown of holiness has fallen from his head. The resplendent gold of his happiness has become dim. The faculties of his soul have not been destroyed, but it is destitute of the garments of righteousness with which it was originally invested. It follows, therefore, that so long as man remains in such a moral state, every thing is not right and good that is agreeable to his feelings and pleasant to his taste. They should duly

reflect on this truth who suppose that society has improved to such an extent, under the genial influences of the nineteenth century, that she is the proper judge of good and evil, and that whatever is agreeable to her will is right. We cannot believe that human nature, even in its best and most cultivated state, is absolutely perfect or competent to frame a code of holy precepts. Most certainly it cannot enact laws higher and better than those contained in the scripture. If it were now left to the present age to give a definition of moral virtue, there would be a remarkable diversity of sentiment. It would mean whatever each community would choose to make it mean; whereas, if they were able to decide on moral questions with infallible certainty, they would all correspond with each other.— Another class of moralists contend that whatever is profitable and useful to man is morally excellent. (They pronounce on the goodness of any thing according to its utility. They enter into nice calculations of loss and advantage. They ask at every step, *cui bono*? After all has been said that can be advanced in behalf of this theory, it will be evident that it makes virtue to originate in self-love and to be recommended and enjoined by self-interest. If any thing promotes my own advantage and happiness, it is morally good or excellent, and all the means adapted to effect this end are strictly honorable and wholly unexceptionable. If I am fully persuaded that the act of taking money from my neighbor, or a traveller, will be advantageous to me, I may innocently steal, become a highway robber, or commit a murder, if by so doing I may accomplish my object. Acting on this principle, I may set at defiance and violate with impunity every law, both human and divine. Besides, what may be profitable to one will not be so another. But it is said in reply, the meaning is that whatever contributes to the advantage of the human race, upon the whole, is morally excellent. To this we answer, that man cannot see the end from the beginning. It is a principle too unwieldy for his grasp. But we shall speak of this more particularly in another place.

The theory of Hobbes makes right and wrong arbitrary distinctions and dependent on custom and the opinions of men. In common with the other theories we have been

considering, it leaves out of view the immortality and accountability of man and the will of the Supreme Being.

We have said enough to convince the unprejudiced reader that reason, in its most exalted and refined state, is incapable of setting up a correct standard on the subject of morals. It is evidently concerned, however, in judging of the expediency, propriety and consequences of actions which do not involve feelings of moral duty. It is also its province to judge of a description of cases in which a modification of feeling arises from the complexity of actions. This may be illustrated by the difference of moral sentiment which we attach to the act of taking away the life of another, when this is done by an individual under the impulse of revenge, by some individual in self-defence, or by a judge in the performance of his public duties.

There is another theory which the progress of events and the rapid advancement of error have conspired to render important. According to its teaching, all men must regard the Roman Pontiff as "the supreme, infallible arbiter to decide when individuals are criminal and when the civil power acts with injustice."* But history informs us that popes have contradicted popes and councils have annulled the proceedings of preceding councils. The fathers differ from each other. Oral tradition must, from the nature of the case, be ambiguous in its teaching.†

All the theories we have yet considered are destitute of certainty, authority and uniformity. Indeed, they put evil for good, darkness for light, and bitter for sweet. These trees and fountains may be known by the fruits they yield and the waters they send forth. It was a well-considered and true remark of Victor Cousin, Tell me the philosophy of a nation, and I will tell you its character. Let us know the moral principles held by individuals and communities, and we will show them to you in their true light. When we cast our eyes on the errors that prevailed in the reign of Charles II, we feel that no further evidence is necessary to satisfy the mind that it was a corrupt and profligate age. When we are credibly informed that there are communi-

* Brownson's Lectures.

† For farther information on this subject, we refer the reader to the *Annals of Baronius*, and also to the very learned and excellent works of Breckinridge, Thornwell, Edgar and Brownlee.

ties in our land in which persons appeal to sympathy and a mawkish sentimentality as an infallible standard in morals, as Gesenius and De-Wette did to their critical *Gefuehl* in biblical exegesis, we are not surprised to read and hear of virulent opposition to capital punishment, slavery and other institutions.* When we learn that any individuals or nations adopt the creed that whatever is agreeable and profitable is right, we are prepared to listen to accounts of robberies and murders, polygamy and communism. When we are told that many place their consciences under the control of the priesthood and servilely submit to the dictation of the Pope, we look for nothing but abject slavery, degradation and misery. Let the fact be ever so often denied, it is nevertheless a *fact* that the religious creeds of men exert such a powerful influence as to govern their practice. In the midst of so much confusion and uncertainty, we may well be excused for crying like Alcibiades to Socrates, I am prepared to decline none of those things which may be commanded by that man, whoever he is, if I shall by him be made wiser and better. As Homer represents Minerva taking away darkness from the eyes of Diomedes, that he might distinguish a god from a man, so it is necessary that some competent being should remove moral darkness from our mind and then bring near those things by which we shall know good and evil.

Avowed Atheists, when listening to the voice of reason, cannot resist the evidence of the fact, that the first link in the great chain of creation could not have produced itself. There must be a Supreme Being, by whatever name he may be known. If He whom we call God created man, it

*The reader will perceive an allusion to the theory of Dr. Adam Smith, commonly called the theory of Sympathy. It requires for our moral sentiments respecting an action, that we enter into the feelings both of the agent and of him to whom the action relates. If we sympathize with the feelings and intentions of the agent, we approve of his conduct as right—if not, we consider it as wrong. If, in the individual to whom the action refers, we sympathize with a feeling of gratitude, we regard the agent as worthy of praise—if with a feeling of resentment, the contrary. Upon this system, Abercrombie justly remarks, the statement of what every man feels does not supply the place of a fundamental rule of right and wrong; and indeed Dr. Smith does not appear to contend that it does. We might add that, in the judgment of many, this principle, or theory, would justify the work of kidnapping and of concealing and protecting fugitive slaves. It seems to be carried out in some parts of our country.

is not difficult to admit that He knew him well and held social intercourse with him as friend familiar with his friend ; and would afford him sufficient evidence that it was He and not another who thus conversed with him. Having assented to this truth, we can perceive nothing incredible whatever in the proposition that it was entirely possible for Him to qualify men to communicate His will to the race ; and that He would accompany it with indisputable evidence that it was His will and not another's. It would shine by its own light. It would contain within itself irresistible proofs of its heavenly origin. Miracles would be performed—holy men would utter prophecies whose boldness should be equalled only by the precision of their fulfilment. The testimony in its favor would be uncontrovertible. It has been shown a thousand times that all this is true of the Holy Scriptures. The external and internal evidences in their behalf are so abundant and decisive, that they cannot fail to convince every one who is actuated by a supreme regard for truth. They deserve our serious attention and profound investigation. Professing to contain the will of the Supreme Being, and accompanied with such proofs, they should be examined with great diligence and perseverance.* In them we discover the great doctrine that man is accountable for his religious belief as well as his practice. The divine Saviour declared to the Jews that if they did not believe Him to be Messiah, they should perish in their sin. When the evidence is placed immediately before the mind, we are forced to believe, whether we desire or not. In such cases, belief is independent of volition. But there are other instances in which the state of the will determines that the evidence shall not be presented to the judgment, or that the decision shall be made before the proofs and arguments are collected. If, through depravity and indolence, any part of the evidence is kept back, we are justly blameable, and without repentance must endure the wrath of God. The Jews should perish, not because there was not sufficient evidence, but because the state of their hearts was such as to shut out the light and refuse to let the evidence be presented to the mind in all its clearness and fullness.

* John 5 : 39.

If, therefore, we build the temple of our faith out of wood, hay and stubble, instead of precious stones, silver and gold, we may expect to suffer loss. It is not a matter of indifference with God whether we believe him or not. To suppose that we are not accountable at His bar for our moral opinions, would be equivalent to saying that He beheld our lost and helpless state; that, being moved by infinite compassion, He undertook to deliver us from the power of death and restore us to a kingdom of life, light and immortality; that, to accomplish this great object, He employed means infinitely beyond the conception of men or angels, and which should continue to engage their admiration and wonder forever; that in doing all this He had not left himself without witness, but attested His glorious work for the restoration of man by pouring around it such a flood of light that all must be convinced of its divine origin, except those who love darkness rather than light; and yet after all it is a matter of complete indifference whether we believe or not; whether we gladly receive His communications or remain ignorant and unbelieving; whether we joyfully accept the offers of His boundless mercy or despise and reject them. How preposterous and absurd would such a revelation be. The question may be asked, How shall we arrive at the full and true meaning of the scriptures? Every particular passage should be interpreted according to the peculiar circumstances of the case. The literal ought to be considered the true and only meaning, unless a remoter sense is clearly indicated by some peculiar aptitude, correspondence, or fitness in the words and ideas of the text; or unless it be referred to something else in the scriptures themselves. Good sense and the analogy of faith are the guides we should follow in interpreting the Bible.* This book, taken in its obvious meaning, reveals a law remarkable for the truth and justness of its moral distinctions. It extends to the heart and the life. It is applicable to all men alike, and may be carried every where. It is inflexible in its claims and requires a sinless obedience. It stands enforced with equitable penalties. This law is comprised in ten precepts written by

* We refer the reader to an excellent article in this journal on the office of Reason and Revelation.

the finger of God, and requires us to love Him supremely and our neighbors as ourselves. In illustrating this great rule of morals, the blessed Saviour went about doing good according to the will of his Father. He tells us to imitate him in all his imitable perfections. We can only do this by obeying the moral law. Before we can render the required obedience, a change must be effected; the tree must be made good; the fountain must be purified. One inspired writer describes the man who follows what is good, and says that he is kind, loving and benevolent, from evangelical motives, and is born of God.* Another declares that he is an imitator of God who walks in love as Christ has loved us, and follows after charity.† Jesus intended something more than what is usually meant by a moral life, when he said of Mary, she had chosen that good part which should never be taken away from her.

Though there may appear to be no difference between the expressions "moral virtue" and "spiritual virtue," yet we prefer the latter; 1st, because the former is frequently used to denote an upright life in the estimation of the world; and, secondly, because the scriptures expressly declare that men must possess light, knowledge, understanding, or wisdom, before they can clearly perceive or fully appreciate the just and exact distinction between good and evil in morals, or relish and delight in moral excellence, when displayed by others. We love darkness rather than light. We hate the light and refuse to come to the light. Viewing the subject in this aspect, we believe that spiritual virtue, or the virtue of the scriptures, consists in loving God and in the love of promoting the real and highest good of the race, according to the revealed will of God as the rule and His glory as the end of our intellectual, moral and practical life. With this definition, the mind is relieved and satisfied. Having wandered like Noah's dove, it finds here a resting place.

Those who practice the virtue of the scriptures are diligently engaged in doing what God has approved as right and inseparably conjoined with their eternal happiness. They repent of sin and rely on Jesus alone for salvation. United to Him, they are delivered from the moral law as a

* 3 John, 11. † Eph. 5:11, 2. 1 Cor. 14:1.

rule of justification. But they are still bound by it as a rule of obedience, as will appear from the following considerations. When Adam broke the covenant of works, he did not thereby produce a change in the character or law of God, nor release himself from obligation to render a continued obedience. God is as holy now as then. His law has not been so relaxed as to admit of a sincere and an imperfect instead of a perfect obedience. We are now as truly bound to yield a sinless obedience to the divine law as was Adam when he sprang full grown from the hand of his Creator. The reason is obvious. The obligation to render obedience to God depends not on ability or disposition, but on the relation which we sustain to Him. Had Adam passed the period of his probation without sin, he and all his posterity would have been in a justified state; and it is manifest they would have been still under obligation to obey the law of God. Jesus Christ restores believers to the same relation to this law they would have sustained had sin never entered the world; and, as they would have been on the above hypothesis, so are they now under the same obligation. If the believer were free from obeying the divine law, it would be a curse instead of a blessing. The principle of faith, ever active and vigorous, leads its possessor to seek to resemble God, and, that he may attain this end, to obey the moral law, a transcript of His perfections. If he were debarred from obeying this law, therefore, it would cause him great distress and place him under a yoke of intolerable bondage. By faith we do not render null and void, but rather establish the moral law. How shall we that are dead to sin continue any longer therein? The Antinomian doctrine is entirely overthrown. The moral law is a permanent and uniform rule for the life of believers as well as the ungodly. By this we are enabled to settle with clearness, authority and un-deviating uniformity, the boundary line between holiness and sin, virtue and vice, or moral good and evil.

"'Tis Revelation satisfies all doubts,
Explains all mysteries, except her own,
And so illuminates the path of life,
That fools discover it and stray no more."

Compared with the rule of the scriptures on this subject, all the theories of human invention, with all their defini-

tions and maxims, dwindle into obscurity and insignificance. Speaking of the vagaries of a hunger-bitten and idealess philosophy, Coleridge remarks:

"These are but empty echoes which the fancy arbitrarily associates with the oppositions of matter, less beneficial but not less shadowy than the sloping orchard or the hill-side pasture field seen in the transparent lake below. Alas ! for the flocks that are to be led forth to such pastures ! Oh that we should seek for the bread which was given from heaven, that we should eat thereof and be strengthened ! Oh that we would draw at the well at which the flocks of our forefathers had living water drawn for them, even that water which, instead of mocking the thirst of him to whom it was given, becomes a well within himself, springing up unto life everlasting ! When we reflect how large a part of our present knowledge and civilization is owing directly or indirectly to the Bible ; when we are compelled to admit, as a fact of history, that the Bible has been the main lever by which the moral and intellectual character of Europe has been raised to its present comparative height, ~~we~~ we should be struck, methinks, by the marked and prominent difference of this book from the works which it is now the fashion to quote as guides and authorities in morals, politics and history."*

The Holy Ghost speaking in the scriptures is the supreme judge in all moral questions. We have endeavored to follow His teaching in defining and settling the rule of spiritual virtue. We appeal to the law and to the testimony and say, Let God be true though every man be a liar ; and whatever we do should be done to the glory of God.

II. It is important to arrive at a correct understanding of the basis of virtue, or, in other words, to know the great reasons why a life of virtue is enjoined in the scriptures. One class of moralists contend that the reason why we are commanded to practice spiritual virtue is because of its general utility to mankind. Paley says :

"Actions are to be estimated by their tendency. Whatever is expedient is right. It is the utility of any moral rule alone which constitutes the obligation of it."

That we may not misrepresent him, he admits that an action may be useful in an individual case which is not

* Lay Sermons.

right. To constitute it right, it is necessary that it shall be "expedient upon the whole—at the long run, in all its effects, collateral and remote, as well as those which are immediate and direct." Dwight maintains that virtue is founded in utility, and defines his position by saying that "utility constitutes its value and excellence." It is manifest that in these propositions the legitimate effects of a rule are confounded with the reasons why it should be obeyed.* This is no small error. It is a complete *non sequitur* to say that because moral laws are productive of happiness, they had no other cause, and were intended to accomplish no other design. These laws might result, for aught we know, from the nature of things or the relations which subsist in the universe, and the good flowing from them might not be the ultimate end, but a consequence of the benevolence and wisdom of the Creator. The authors we have mentioned ascribe to man more comprehensive views than he is known to possess. He cannot see the end from the beginning. He is by no means a competent judge of what is upon the whole good for the world. (Governed as he is now by self-love, he would frequently substitute particular and private for general and public good. Some actions and dispositions are approved and condemned by conscience, without taking into consideration their tendency to promote the happiness or increase the misery of the whole race, which would not be the case if the great and true reason why virtue should be practised was its general utility. According to the view which Dwight and Paley take of the subject, all our knowledge of what is morally good is derived from experience, and is, therefore, posterior

* Hume asserts that the terms right and wrong signify nothing more than sweet or sour, pleasant or painful, being only effects upon the mind of the spectator produced by the contemplation of certain conduct. This, he says, resolves itself into the impression of usefulness, by which alone he estimates the virtue of an agent and an action. According to this view, a steam engine or a printing press might be as meritorious as a man of intense virtue. Hume was obliged to admit that the sense of utility must be combined with a feeling of approbation. He ought to have inquired and shown on what this feeling of approbation is founded. General utility or general happiness is only the effect of virtuous conduct, not the cause or principle which constitutes it virtuous. This distinction has been well stated by Professor Mills, of Oxford. He defines morality to be "an obedience to the law and constitution of man's nature, assigned him by the deity in conformity to his own essential and unchangeable attributes, the effect of which is the general happiness of his creatures."

to moral obligation. This is tantamount to saying that we cannot know what laws are binding till, after a long lapse of time and innumerable blunders, we at length discover whether they tend to promote the happiness or increase the misery of mankind. There is another objection to the view presented by those writers, and it is briefly this: If we deliberate respecting a certain action which we perceive would be eminently expedient and useful in an individual case, and which we feel to be desirable in reference to that case, we shall not be in a likely condition to find our way to a sound conclusion respecting the consequences of the action upon the whole, at the long run, in all its consequences, remote and collateral. The prospect of immediate utility would materially interfere with our calculation as to the ultimate expediency. In our judgment, the works of such authors, on such important subjects, inculcate a loose morality and should not be used as text-books in colleges, without furnishing an antidote to the poison. We take leave of this part of the subject by quoting the words of Bishop Butler, in his sermon on the love of our neighbor:

“As we are not competent judges what is upon the whole for the good of the world, there may be other immediate ends appointed us to pursue, besides that one of doing good or producing happiness. Though the good of the creation be the only end of the author of it, yet he may have laid us under particular obligations, which we may discern and feel ourselves under, quite distinct from a perception, that the observance or violation of them is for the happiness or misery of our fellow creatures. And this is the case. For there are certain dispositions of mind and certain actions, which are in themselves approved or disapproved by mankind, abstracted from the consideration of their tendency to the happiness or misery of the world, approved or disapproved by reflection, by that principle which is the guide of life, the judge of right and wrong.”

The expression “fitness of things” can only be used in an intelligible sense when it denotes that constitution of things which God has appointed, from which the duties of his creatures naturally result. According to this explanation, (and we cannot understand it in any other way,) the fitness of things and the will of God signify the same thing.

Another class of moral philosophers maintain that virtue and vice, right and wrong, are arbitrary distinctions. They would have had no existence independently of the divine will. Had no law been given to man, vice would have been as excellent in itself as virtue. God willed virtue to be excellent without any reason. He could not see any moral distinction between good and evil, between virtue and vice, independently of their actual existence in created beings. He could not be infinitely holy himself without an act of his will that He should be holy. He may determine to be malevolent and wicked, and require us to adore and praise Him for his malice, cruelty and oppression. Can any one believe these things to be true? The scriptures consider moral beings and actions as differing in their very nature and independently of the divine will determining such difference. They exhibit God not only as holy, righteous, just, true, faithful, kind, and merciful, but as excellent on account of those qualities. He is styled the excellency of Jacob. His name is excellent in all the earth. He is excellent in working. Without farther quotation, it is evident that God is excellent in His own nature, without any direct act of His will that He shall be so. His law is perfect. His commandments are pure, holy, just and good. His statutes are right. Why? Because He willed them to be so? Not at all; but because they possess these kinds of excellence in their own nature. Any other mode of interpretation would introduce tautology into the scriptures. We should then read, Oh God, thou art what thou art, thou doest what thou doest, thy commands, statutes and laws are thy laws, statutes and commands.

It is said in one place, The righteous Lord loveth righteousness and hateth wickedness, and it is an abomination unto him. In another place, he requires men to glorify Him, because He exercises loving kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth. In these things I delight, saith the Lord. We are again told, It is impossible for God to lie. He is infinitely disposed to speak truth. He is infinitely indisposed to utter falsehood. The one is obvious in itself, the other in itself lovely and desirable.

With reverence we say that God could not have exempted us from the duty of loving him, nor made it our

duty to hate him or our neighbor. If you ask, then, why God requires us to avoid vice and practice virtue, the correct answer is at hand; because there exists an inherent and immutable difference between them; whilst the one is good and excellent in its nature, the other is in its own nature odious and evil. This view of the subject, so far from weakening moral obligation, imparts strength. We are bound to practice the virtue of the scriptures, because it is the revealed will of God, and He has revealed this as His will because He saw and knew it was in itself right and good.

III. The legitimate effects of the practice of spiritual virtue are numerous. We shall content ourselves with mentioning a few. The first is an increasing confidence in our own personal security and in the truth of the Christian religion. Jesus said, "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." Men should be doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving themselves. For if a man be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass; for he beholdeth himself and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed. Practice makes our knowledge sure. It is so in the exact sciences and in the useful and ornamental arts. Above all, it is so in religious truth. It is the very life of piety, the very end of divine teachings. The believer is not only convinced, by holy practice, of the truth of Christianity, but he is also assured of the safety and security of his soul. He knows in whom he has believed. God will not turn away from him to do him good, and will put His fear in his heart that he shall not depart from Him.—Neither death, nor life, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate him from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Such an assurance affords him encouragement.

2. In the constant practice of virtue, the believer will scatter blessings around his pathway. Thousands will derive benefit from his benevolent spirit and exertions. His

example will excite admiration and induce others to act in a similar manner. His conduct will add beauty to the complexion of his love, and impart strength to the fabric of his faith, while at the same time it will serve to display the reality and power of religion. If all were truly virtuous, all would be happy.

3. The essential glory of God can neither be increased nor diminished. To this the holiness of all the angels and saints cannot contribute a single iota; and the misery of the earth and the lost in the world of despair cannot diminish it. But His declarative glory may be increased by the conversion of souls and a life of practical piety. Each Christian is a miracle of grace. He is a beauteous gem in the diadem of Jesus. An innumerable company, redeemed by His blood, will swell the loud anthems of praise and glory to His name for ever and ever.

ARTICLE IX.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Exploration and Survey of the Valley of the Great Salt Lake of Utah, including a reconnoissance of a new route through the Rocky Mountains.* By HOWARD STANSBURY, Captain Corps Topographical Engineers, U. S. Army. Printed by order of the Senate of the United States. 8vo. pp. 487. 1852.

It is but yesterday the Rocky Mountains were considered the natural boundary, which would for a long season check the tide of emigration westward. Scarcely, however, had the rolling wave washed their base, when the discovery of the precious metals on the Pacific coast occasioned a sudden overflow through their rocky passes, and lent a new and overwhelming interest to the country beyond. The work, whose title is given above, is due to the efforts on the part of Government to ascertain the character and resources of those vast regions thus unexpectedly brought under its

jurisdiction, and which are rapidly filling with a heterogeneous population. It is written in an easy and graceful style, though its business character, as an official document, would naturally retrench many of the elegancies of composition. Throughout the exploration, minute attention was given to the flora, natural history, and geological formation of the new country, the specimens of which, collected and arranged, are presented in the drawings and tables found in the appendix. These contributions will render the work attractive to men of science, while the description of landscapes, with features unlike any that are found upon the Atlantic coast, will engage the attention of the general reader. As the expedition travelled the usual route of emigrants to California and Oregon, their journal affords a lively impression of the hardships and toils endured throughout the long and dreary pilgrimage to the land of gold. A hasty survey being made of a more direct and easy route, with some reference to the location of the great Pacific Rail Road, which has begun to be freely discussed; all these circumstances impart a deeper interest to the volume before us.

The valley of Utah has, however, an importance of another kind, and which will continue for some years to increase, arising from the settlement of the Mormons, and their projection of a new and singular empire. This body of fanatics, after abortive efforts to establish themselves in the States of Missouri and Illinois, finally resolved to escape from persecution by emigration, and to found a commonwealth in the untrodden wilds west of the Rocky Mountains. Their movements were concerted with admirable wisdom, and they finally settled in the Utah territory, and began to build their city near the Great Salt Lake. In four years, they have been increased by swarms of their brethren, and with praiseworthy industry and enterprise have laid the foundations of a prosperous State. The account given by Capt. Stansbury is the most full, and doubtless the most impartial, we have ever seen of this people. He represents them as orderly and patriotic, anxious to abide under the shelter of the American eagle, and exempt from those excesses which have been charged upon them, and which would seem to flow necessarily from their system.

It seems to us very obvious, even from these most favourable representations, that they can only exist as a separate community, and that contact with others will either result in material modification of their views, or in violent collisions with those who are organized upon essentially different social principles. It is probable, likewise, that they cohere only so long as they remain in their feeble, infant condition, and under a heavy pressure from without; and that the extension and prosperity which they covet, will develop the elements of strife which are now latent, and lead either to the destruction or reorganization of the entire body. At any rate, it is a singular social experiment going forward before our eyes, and one which will further test the flexibility of our government.

It only remains to add, that the book before us is illustrated by thirty-five lithographs of natural scenery, besides many drawings of plants, insects and reptiles, and two large maps of the route taken by the exploring party, and of the Great Salt Lake and adjacent country. Nearly half the volume is occupied with mathematical statistics of the survey, and with description of the zoology, botany and geology of the country.

2. *The Constitution of the United States of America, with an alphabetical analysis, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the prominent political acts of George Washington, Electoral Votes for all the Presidents and Vice Presidents, the High Authorities and Civil Officers of Government, from March 4, 1789, to March 3, 1847, Chronological Narrative of the several States, and other interesting matter, with a descriptive account of the State Papers, Public Documents, and other sources of political and statistical information at the seat of Government.* By W. HICKEY. Fifth edition. 12mo. pp. 521. 1852.

We copy without abbreviation this lengthy title page, as it affords the best description of the book. The edition of the Con-

stitution has been critically compared with the original in the Department of State, and certified to be "correct in text, letter and punctuation." An immaculate text on paper we certainly do not deprecate, but it were better if this noble instrument was graven with a pen of iron upon the hearts of our rulers. It has been, however, so ruthlessly invaded, and its wise and equitable provisions so profanely trampled under foot, that to us it wears the melancholy aspect of a Constitution in ruins, proud and majestic even in its decay. The analysis of it, which extends through nearly one hundred closely printed pages, is remarkably minute, affording easy reference to every item of this great document. The remainder of the book is occupied with matter of various interest. Perhaps the most valuable is that which covers the period of transition from the old confederation to the American Union and the adoption of the existing Constitution. The chronological narrative of the several States, giving the dates of their creation and admission into the confederacy, is also valuable for reference. Indeed, the compiler seems to us to have executed his task with great judgment; and there is no part of his materials which the reader would throw aside. The book is one which should be in the library of every gentleman, embodying, as it does, so much of the most valuable documentary history of the country. From the numerous testimonials which introduce the work, testimonials given by the first men in our National Congress, it would seem to be duly appreciated by statesmen.

3. *Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform: chiefly from the Edinburgh Review, corrected, vindicated and enlarged, in notes and appendixes.* By Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON, Bart. 758 pp. 8vo. Edinburgh. 1852.

An important portion of our permanent literature is gathered, like the volume before us, from the different Reviews. The British Essayist, embracing in several volumes the contributions of Macaulay, Mackintosh, Sidney Smith, Jeffrey and others, the Dies

Boreales of Professor Wilson, the Miscellanies of Foster, and in our own country the Princeton Essays, and the critical articles of Legare, extracted from the Southern Quarterly, are illustrative examples.

The philosophical articles of Sir William Hamilton attracted general attention and excited profound admiration, upon their first appearance in the Edinburgh Review. Several of them were reprinted in Germany and France, and enjoyed thus an extensive circulation in languages different from that in which they were originally written. The collection of these in a separate volume has been more than once recommended by leading American journals; so that a wide diffusion of this volume may reasonably be anticipated. It would be a work of supererogation to introduce to the public the writings of this distinguished metaphysician; as all that are here presented have passed the ordeal of public criticism, and received the imprimatur of general and warm approval. We are glad to learn that there is a prospect of the publication of his University Lectures; which, together with the volume before us, and his edition of Reid's works, will present the results of the life-long study of one of the most acute thinkers of our day.

4. *The Epistle of James, practically explained* by Dr. AUGUSTUS NEANDER. *Translated from the German by Mrs. H. C. CO-NANT.* 115 pp. 12mo. *Lewis Colby, New York.* 1852.

Somehow, these expositions of German critics always disappoint us when they appear in an English dress. The work before us is exceedingly meagre, far inferior to several we could mention of English commentators—Manton, for example, who is, however, far more elaborate and extended. The chief merit of this little book consists in drawing out distinctly the character of the apostle James, and throwing the light of this fully upon the epistle itself. As an exposition, it is far too cursory, and deals too much in vague generalities to be satisfactory to the student of the Bible.

5. *The Works of John Owen, D. D. Edited by Rev. W. H. GOOLD, Edinburgh. Volumes 4th, 5th, 14th and 15th. 8vo. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York. 1852.*

We notice these volumes, lately received by us, simply to draw the attention of Presbyterian ministers to this edition, which is now in process of publication. There are few of our brethren, we suppose, who do not greatly desire to possess of works of this Nonconformist divine. Hitherto, it has been beyond the means of most, and difficult to obtain even at a heavy cost. The enterprising firm of the Carters have made arrangements to circulate in this country, at a cheap rate, the edition which Mr. Goold is bringing out at Edinburgh. All of Owen's works, except his Exposition of Hebrews, are to be published in sixteen volumes, for the sum of twenty dollars. Four volumes are issued each year for five dollars, so that the cost of the whole series is not only greatly reduced, but the payment is so distributed through successive years that few are too poor to afford it. Eight volumes have already been issued.

6. *A Digest of the Acts of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Board of Publication. By order of the General Assembly. 296 pp. 12mo.*

Our clerical readers are familiar with the old Digest prepared by Drs. Janeway, Neill and Ely, and have often referred to it to know the law of the Church on various points which it has decided in years past. The present book has been compiled from the records of the original Synod of New York and Philadelphia, and of the General Assembly from its organization. "The plan adopted in the work has been to arrange the decisions of the Assembly in judicial cases, and on other important points, under the heads in the Form of Government and the Discipline which they serve to illustrate." This has been resorted to for ease of reference. Whether every decision of importance has been

brought forward it would require much reading for us to determine. We have some reason to fear that there is some measure of failure in this. But we have the testimony of the Editor of the Board of Publication, that frequent reviews of the Minutes and Records of proceedings, stretching almost through a century and a half, have secured according to the original design, "all such matters as seem to be of permanent authority and interest." Such publications are exceedingly useful. And if the process could be carried through the decisions of Presbyteries and Synods, we should have a body of ecclesiastical law of far more value than the ponderous Tomes of Canon law which have regulated affairs in past ages. If then, a clear mind could state in a commentary like those of Blackstone, the law of the Church, the work would thus reach its ultimatum. Whether such a work is a desideratum worthy of the labour it would cost, others must judge. It will be many long years before we see it.

7. *Counsels of the Aged to the Young.* By the Rev. A. ALEXANDER, D. D. pp. 67. 18mo.
8. *Early Religious History of John Barr, written by himself, and left as a legacy to his grand children. To which is added a sketch of his character.* pp. 80. 18mo.
9. *An Affectionate Address to Fathers.* By the Rev. D. BAKER, D. D. of Texas.
10. *The Flower Transplanted and the Blind Boy.* pp. 64. 12mo.

These are issues of our Board of Publication. The first is marked with all the wisdom and practical tact of the lamented Dr. Alexander, and is an appropriate book for the young just entering upon active life. The second exhibits the religious experience and character of an elder of the Church. Mr. Barr was born in 1749, and was elder in the Church of Thyatira, and afterwards

in that of Back Creek, in North Carolina. His unobtrusive Christian virtue, his industry in the attainment of useful knowledge in the intervals of his daily toil, and the degree to which he was successful, make him a model worthy of all imitation, especially to that numerous class of men who are situated as he was in the outward things of this life.

In the address of Dr. Baker, we have useful counsels to fathers, who too often, in the multiplicity of their engagements, leave the care and control of the family wholly to the mother, till the boys especially, for the want of a father's authority, instead of yielding submission to their mother, domineer over her. And the "Flower Transplanted and the Blind Boy," teach our children by example, the most instructive of preachers, the way in which they should go.

11. *Polyglotten-Bibel zum praktischen Handgebrauch. Die ganze heilige Schrift Alten und Neuern Testaments in uebersichtlicher Nebeneinander-stellung des urtextes, der Septuaginta, Vulgata und Luther-Uebersetzung, so wie der wichtigsten Varianten der vornehmsten deutschen Uebersetzungen. Bearbeitet von Dr. R. STIER und Dr. K. G. W. THIELE. Bielefeld, 1848, 1851.*

This cheap and convenient Polyglott is from the prolific press of Tauchnitz, in Leipzig, which has put so many learned works into the hands of scholars at a reasonable price. It exhibits, in the first place, in the Old Testament, the Septuagint version in the first left hand column, in the second the original Hebrew; on the right hand page, the German translation of Luther in the first column, and the vulgate Latin in the second. Beneath the German version are exhibited the variations of the different editions of Luther, and of the translations of De Wette, Van Ess, Allioli, and the Berlin Bible. The Latin is according to the Clementine edition, with the variations of the Sixtine and some others. The Greek is the result of the labours of Dr. Boeckel, of Oldenburg, and the Hebrew is according to the fourth stereotype edition of

Hahn. This book was prepared for German scholars, as its arrangement shows. By the side of the original Hebrew and the German are placed the two Factors, as the editors term them, of the version of Luther. This does not impair the value of the book to our American students, but enhances it. The work is to be comprised in four volumes, of which the first and fourth are complete; the second is nearly through the press, and the third will soon make its appearance. Each volume will contain about 1000 pages. The type is open and clear and the paper good. Rudolph Garrigue, No. 2 Barclay-street, New York, will furnish to any who may desire it, this or any other work from the Northern States of Europe, at a short notice.

12. *The Presbyterian Psalmist, a collection of Tunes adapted to the Psalms and Hymns of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Approved by the General Assembly. Edited by THOMAS HASTINGS. Philadelphia: Pres. Board of Publication.*

If to read a work unfits one for the task of reviewing it, as has been somewhat sarcastically affirmed, then our ignorance of music as a science and our innocence of it as an art, admirably qualify us for noticing the above work. Indeed, to lay aside all badinage, we should hang our heads under the consciousness of attempting a fraud upon the confiding public in penning this notice, if it were not for the ingenuous feeling which prompts us to confess and repair a wrong. When the General Assembly undertook in 1848 to provide Music for our Churches, we were among those utterly skeptical of their success. The diversity of taste, and the collision of opinion, if not of conscience, were so great on this subject, that we even more than doubted the power and influence of the Assembly to harmonize the Churches upon one style of music. It was a new thing under the sun for a large deliberative body to cater for the taste of the religious world; and we confess we were not without fear that the approval of the Assembly might

indirectly be given to the flashy and false style of Church music which in some quarters prevails. The Assembly, however, had the wisdom in the first instance to appoint a trustworthy committee, and the greater wisdom to commit the whole business to it without interference. It is to the credit of this committee that it sought to ascertain, as far as possible, the tunes that were popular in different sections of the Church, and that it placed the materials thus collected in the hands of so judicious an editor as Mr. Hastings. The selection of this gentleman to supervise this publication was eminently fortunate, and will secure beforehand the confidence of the public. Of high American repute in the musical profession, he was not less qualified for the work by his sincere and undoubted religious character. Mr. Hastings has distinguished himself, in his public lectures and in the instruction of classes, by his efforts to reform the Church music of this country, and to re-introduce the simple congregational singing of other days.

We are much pleased with the remarks, found in the preface of this collection, upon the severe chastity of style which should characterize the music with which we worship God. If these views have been carried out in the selection of tunes, as we have little reason to doubt, a great end has been attained. It will be no small advantage if, under the auspices of an authorized Psalmody, all the parts of the Presbyterian Church are brought into uniformity in their style of music, as they are united in the sentiments and doctrines embodied in their Hymns of Praise; and it will be an unspeakable blessing if the style adopted should be one which all consciences can approve, and all Christian hearts can love. We commend this collection of tunes to the attention of our Churches.

13. *Catechism of Scripture Doctrine and Practice for Families and Sabbath Schools, designed also for the oral instruction of Coloured Persons.* By CHARLES C. JONES. Board of Publication. 154 pp. 18mo.

This Catechism was prepared by Rev. Dr. Jones during his

labours as Missionary to the Coloured People in Liberty county, Georgia. It is the result of much experience of what is needed by people as little acquainted as they with the system of truth contained in the scriptures. Dr. Jones has taken much pains in arranging and simplifying it, and adapting it by repeated trials to the capacities of those for whom it was originally designed. It has been found an excellent help to family instruction, and the best and most convenient book which our missionaries could use in instructing those among whom they were sent. It was translated some years ago into the Armenian language. Its present publication by the Board makes it accessible to all.

14. *On the Study of Words.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, B. D. Vicar of Ichenstoke, Hants; examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford, and Professor of Divinity, King's College, London. From the second London edition, revised and enlarged. Redfield, New York. 1852. pp. 236. 12mo.

We have rarely met with a more instructive and entertaining volume. We always read with profit and delight the writings of Trench. But he has presented us here with something, if not new, yet out of the beaten track of literature, and in a style more popular and flowing than in his former writings. Those were addressed rather to the eye of the scholar, these are lectures, addressed originally wholly to the ear. Balbi has shown us how we may trace a nation's history in its language, and others have told us that a word is often the amber which both excites the electric spark of thought and preserves the knowledge of past generations for those that come after. But no one has entered so fully into the subject of the morality in words, and the history in words, or has more felicitously shown the rich fruits which may be gathered by shaking vigorously each word and making it render up whatever its root and branches are able to yield. To any one who wishes to use his own language with exactness, or to know the

thousand things the words in his own mouth express which he has never supposed them to mean, we recommend the study of words in the manner of Trench. To the student of the scriptures this process is all important. Nor do those uninitiated in these researches know what surprising and exciting instruction the epistles of Paul, the words of the Saviour, or of the prophets, give forth when subjected in the original to this mode of research.

15. *Experience of the past should inspire confidence in the future. A Discourse on Domestic Missions, delivered during the Annual Sessions of Flin and Rion Presbytery, in the Presbyterian Church, Americus, Georgia, April 3, 1852. By JOHN L. WILSON, Pastor of the Decatur (Georgia) Presbyterian Church. Published by the Presbytery. Atlanta, Georgia. 1852.*

This is a valuable and to us a very interesting discourse. The facts it embraces respecting the early history of the American Presbyterian Church, and that portion of it especially embraced within the Synod of Georgia, will be exceedingly welcome to the Christian reader. It breathes, too, and inspires in those who peruse it an earnest, working spirit. Well may our brethren of Georgia "thank God and take courage." Enjoying the blessings of a free and pure gospel, through the self-denying labours of those who have gone before, and having much land yet to be possessed, they must be stimulated constantly to increasing effort. The children they now have will soon be saying, "The place is too strait for me: Give me place that I may dwell." We shall look with interest for the more complete account of the origin and progress of the Presbyterian Church in Georgia, which the author promises.

ters felt more concern to perpetuate intercourse between themselves by a common dialect, than to establish sympathy with the boorish multitude who spoke their own vernacular. The strength of this feeling may be measured by the fact that as late as the 17th century such a mind as Lord Bacon's, not content with writing his greatest works in this ancient language, expressed the wish that his English writings should be transfused into the same. We cannot tell how long this exclusive aristocracy of learning might have continued, had not social convulsions broken up their charmed circle, and led men of genius to impregnate the inert mass of uneducated minds. It did not affect the result, whether this change was wrought by the expansive force of genius from within, striking the trammels which confined it, and seeking a wider range; or whether some influence from without broke the artificial crust of society, and mingled its elements more perfectly together. The classic tongue of modern Italy was perhaps occasioned in the former way, while those of Germany and of Britain were occasioned in the latter. Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio, the creators of Italian literature, set forth their hands to find a happy fit for the song with which they were inspired, and which could not be breathed in the cold measures of Latin verse. They swept the efforts in the hearts of their countrymen, and instantly from the discordant dialects around them arose in its perfection the Italian tongue. On the other hand, the English and German languages scarcely attracted the notice of native scholars, until at the period of the Reformation the leaven of true religion became diffused through the masses, and thus the educated and the illiterate were bound together in strongest sympathy. No historical fact is more certain than that Luther's version of the Bible gave stability to the German language, while that of the sixth Edward, and afterwards the more perfect version of King James, anchored the English, which was before afloat. Dean Swift has said that if it were not for the Bible and Common Prayerbook, we should scarcely be able to understand any thing that was written two hun-

* D'Israeli's *Amenities of Literature*, vol. 1, p. 120: which has suggested a considerable portion of this section.

dred years ago. Certainly, no language could long be preserved intelligible amidst the constant flux of words and idioms which marks a living tongue, except by the influence of some great and recognised classic giving its responses like the Delphic oracle:

"Oracle truer far than oak,
Or dove, or tripod ever spoke."

These references are sufficient at least to show that adverse influences may long counteract an instinctive affection for our mother tongue, and suppress its cultivation. The spell is indeed broken which, two centuries since, forced genius within the iron embrace of a dead and inflexible language. English authors can now write for posterity, and yet write in the same tongue in which they think, as did the great masters of antiquity. Our language has been polished till it has become worthy of the proud literature it contains: and the hard necessity no longer exists of filtering our noble thoughts through the cold forms of a language which has lost all plastic power, and has passed away with the iron race which spoke it. But important as this reformation was, it needs to be followed by another; and English scholars have to recognise a broader claim of their mother tongue. It demands to be placed on an equal footing with the ancient languages in a course of liberal education. It claims to be studied with a superior devotion to these: to be critically known in its grammatical and logical structure, in the forms of its syntax, in the powers of its roots, in its historical changes, in the factors which compose it, in its apparently lawless idioms, in the composition of its words, and in the genealogy of their derived meanings. It is needless to say that in this thorough and comprehensive method, the English language is studied by none save by a few amateurs. In many schools, after learning the power of the English letters, and acquiring the art of combining them into words and sentences, a boy is first put to the study of grammar in the acquisition of Latin—as though the English was an offshoot from it, and had not a root of its own, giving rise to peculiarities which no explanation from that source can unravel. It seems either to be forgotten that the structure of English is organically different; or it is assumed, that

the young linguist is competent to eliminate the principles of universal grammar from a language confessedly narrow and defective, like the Latin. Even in seminaries where English grammar professedly is taught, it is with a hurried devotion and to a partial extent. The pupil is supposed to have mastered English, when he can resolve the parts of speech, and then combine them into sentences by rules of syntax. As soon as it can be converted into the vehicle for the conveyance of other knowledge, all study of it as a language is at an end. He hies away to the acquisition of Greek and Latin, and soon has an interior knowledge of these, far beyond that he is destined ever to have of his birth-tongue. Nor is this neglect repaired when he enters upon the wider curriculum of college discipline. He indeed masters logic as an art, so as to parry and thrust with the most accomplished dialecticians; he learns metaphysics as a science, so

"He can distinguish and divide
A hair 'twixt south and south-west side;"

he yields to the sweet seductions of Belles Lettres, and drinks nectar with the gods upon Olympus: but the glorious language itself, which conveys these treasures of knowledge, is never compassed—and the diviner's rod does not "track the secret lodes" of unwrought and precious ore. If love be due to our native tongue, then has the English language a large arrearage against our scholars. A heavy indemnity is due for the long embargo put upon it, when the cumbrous Latin usurped its place, till the stanzas of Chaucer and of Gower commenced the reign of English verse. It may take reprisals for the hostile array of Latin and Greek words, with which such writers as Jeremy Taylor, and Sir William Browne and Dr. Johnson have threatened to overwhelm the native Saxon, like the Tarpeian maid beneath the bracelets and shields of the Sabines. It may bring a suit in chancery against those who have jostled it from the side of the classic tongues; and compound interest for the long neglect, during which its vast resources have been undeveloped, and its surpassing beauties unappreciated. It may insist that the Belles-Lettres department in our colleges shall no longer be content with the mere rope-dancing of rhetoric:

but that it shall unfold all the powers of the English tongue, and thus prepare the way for a perfect analysis of the great classics with which it is enriched. Nor will its claims be finally cancelled, until English scholarship shall take the precedence in our schools of learning; and the English Professor not be the least among his brethren of the gown.

II. But English deserves cultivation as *the language of the great Anglo-Saxon race, and the portraiture of their soul*. All history will confirm the observation which has been made, that at every period some one nation or race takes the lead so pre-eminently that its superior influence cannot be disputed. Perhaps, substantially for the same reason that it is the destiny of the million, in every department of science, of business and of art, to follow in the wake of some masterful intellect, blocking out for them the path of thought and action, and leaving every where the impress of its own energy. The ascendancy of this dominant race is usually destroyed by great political convulsions; like the awful changes which geologists tell us have once and again shattered the solid frame of the earth; and from the chaos springs a new dynasty, like the renovated earth which has been purged by flood or fire. The Grecian States, for example, were consolidated into an empire through the ambition of Philip, long after Greek genius had framed those polished models, which have shaped the literary castings of every age since theirs. The disciplined phalanx of Alexander was precipitated upon the feeble dynasties of Asia; and the Grecian empire, like a huge Colossus, bestrode the continent, one foot resting upon Macedon, and the other upon India. Under his four successors, this huge fabric was dissolved into petty monarchies, which floundered like wrecked vessels in an angry sea, till the fourth beast in Daniel's vision, "dreadful and terrible and strong exceedingly," made its appearance in the Roman commonwealth. For how many centuries this gigantick empire ruled the destinies of the world, pouring its armies, like streams of lava, over the inhabited earth, history has long since told us. Nor are we now to learn how the barbarians of the North, in their turn, swept over the effete and bloated empire of Rome, and for ten centuries, chaos and night reigned upon the

earth. A thousand years of strife, ignorance and barbarism, like a broad, dark belt, divide ancient from modern history. Then, from the womb of chaos, a new order of things arose: and the emergent race, which is now for centuries to wield the destinies of the human family, is that Anglo Saxon, speaking the English which we boast as our mother tongue. No race is more widely diffused, and none marches with a more victorious tread. In the beautiful language of Mr. Webster, the British empire is "a power, which has dotted over the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts; whose morning drum-beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England."*

Where shall the limit be set upon the progress of this heroic people? The word of Canute was not more impotent to restrain the advancing tide, than any spell to fetter the diffusion of the English tongue. Already has it spread eastward and westward with Anglo-Saxon empire, planting itself with the conqueror's cannon upon the plains of India, overleaping the chafing ocean, and pushing aside the savage dialects which, with the war-whoop, re-echoed over this western continent. It is the language of that new empire which has sprung up by enchantment on the Pacific coast: amidst the confused Babel of dialects there spoken, the accents of the English hold an imperious sway. When commerce shall lay its iron track from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, binding the continents which two oceans have hitherto divorced, English, from its diffusion, must become the paramount language of the world. England and America, sweeping the seas with their universal commerce, enriched by the proud discoveries made in every science, adorned with every art, ennobled by the freedom of their political institutions, and stimulated by the zeal which Christianity inspires, must long maintain themselves as leaders in our modern civilization.

As the portraiture of Anglo-Saxon character, the English language claims attention from the curious. It is no new truth that "the heart of a people is its mother tongue." The whole image of a race is reflected in its tones and

* Speech on the Presidential Protest. Works, vol. 4, p. 110.

words. Who can fail to discover the imaginative, acute and witty Greek in the flexible and polished dialect of Attica? or the hardy and haughty Roman in the buskin of his stately Latin? or the proud and courtly hidalgo in the dignified and sonorous Spanish? or the volatile and chatty Gaul in the curt and sprightly French? or the craven and voluptuous Italian in his

"Soft, bastard Latin,
Which melts like kisses from a female mouth?"

So the English, with its strong aspirate, its open vowels, its close consonants, its array of monosyllables, its straightforward idiom, represents a race bold, daring and abrupt, full of enterprise, driving on to its aim with an outbursting energy which no obstacles can bind. Like a crystal palace, reflecting its noble inmate from a thousand angles, the English language, from the face of every word and syllable, presents in varied attitude the great indwelling Saxon race: worthy of profoundest reverence, for picturing thus the noblest people that ever lived for noblest ends upon the earth.

III. We may next consider the value of the English tongue as *a monument of history, an avenue of philosophy, and a mine of poetry*. The antiquarian, standing amid the ruins of Karnac or of Luxor, traces with an envious eye the proud hieroglyphs which, under excruciating torture, refuse to yield their secrets. He feels that if the key to this cypher could be discovered, treasures of historic lore would be unlocked, and a flood of light be poured upon the races which have entombed their history in these curious and stubborn records. Yet, perhaps, he has never reflected that the language which is daily on his lips, the base vehicle of much common and sorry talk, is itself a prouder monument than all the obelisks of Egypt; that it is covered with inscriptions recording a succession of dynasties more important than any found in the royal rings in the famous tablet of Abydos. Probably, this is true of all languages alike: but in those which have ceased to be spoken, the clue may be forever lost, and the fragments of ancient history may be too far imbedded in the language to be uncovered. But in living languages, where the pedigree of words can easily be

traced, and the history of the people is so recent as to be known in detail, every great social revolution, like an inundation of the sea, leaves a deposit of new words upon the language. It is by no means difficult, for example, to trace the Moorish conquest over the Spanish peninsula, in the words from this stock grafted upon that language: so that if the history of this period were obscure, a disputed event, or perhaps a doubtful date, might be determined from the language alone. This is more particularly true of English; since the facts which make the frame of English history are attested by the existing state of the language. The earliest inhabitants of Britain known to history were of Celtic origin. It is notorious also that these were, at an ascertained period, supplanted by the Gothic hordes which, pouring down from the north of Germany, over-ran the southern provinces, and found their way over the water to the coast of Albion. Now, exactly corresponding with these facts, we find small trace of the Celtic tongue in the existing English. A few names of common objects, as basket, rail, button, crook, like the Indian words "squaw," and "wigwam," remain, the fossils of an extinct language: and a few geographical names, as Kent, and Thames, like the Indian names of localities amongst us, are the only memorials of the aboriginal race, whose title to the country has been cancelled by their own extermination. The rest of the language was obliterated with the race, except the trace still to be found in the Welsh and Gaelic dialects; which are precisely the districts whither the Celts were driven, and in which they held the longest footing.

Again, as the Romans were the earliest conquerors of Britain, we should expect a large infusion of the Latin language. Indeed, chronology would lead us to expect the Latin would be the basis of the new tongue to arise upon the displacement of the Celtic. Yet, in fact, we discover the Latin element to be introduced at a much later day, and by an indirection, through the Norman French. This anomaly is soon explained, by remembering that the Romans held military occupation of the country merely; and at no period intermingled largely with the natives. Their dominion was vexed, through its entire period, by ceaseless conflicts with the aborigines; and finally, the

island was voluntarily abandoned, and their garrisons withdrawn. It is interesting, as showing the minuteness of the record which history chisels upon the face of a language, to observe, that the few words introduced at this period from the Latin, clearly point to the military tenure of the Romans: as *street*, from *strata*; *cest*, in Gloucester for example, from *castra*; and *coln*, as in Lincoln, from *colonia*.* On the other hand, history informs that the Teutonic races poured in such numbers upon the British isle, as finally to absorb the original population which remained after so many exterminating wars. Accordingly, we find the Saxon tongue of these invaders supplanting the original Celtic; and becoming not so much an element of the present English, as the substratum—the main stock, into which grafts from other languages are inserted.

Following the stream of chronology, we are brought, in 1066, to another revolution, permanently affecting the history and language of the English people. I allude, of course, to the Norman conquest. As two races were now introduced into the country, with two distinct languages, and the Norman ascendancy was sufficiently protracted, we might antecedently expect considerable modification of the old Saxon. Accordingly, we discover the Saxon gradually dropping its numerous inflections, and exchanging its awkward inversion of style for the simplicity and directness of the Norman. But of this change, we will have occasion to speak more minutely in another place. It is remarkable to what extent we can trace, in single words, the relative position of these two races. The Normans, as conquerors, would naturally occupy all places of trust and power, while the native Saxons would sink into the condition of serfs. As estates, benefices and civil dignities, are transferred to the former, so all the terms of honor and pre-eminence, and all words that relate to war and chivalry, come to us from the Norman. The words *duke*, *count*, *baron*, *villain*, *service*, *throne*, *realm*, *royalty*, *homage*, *sceptre*, *sovereign*, *palace*, *castle*, *chancellor*, *treasurer*, and the like, will be taken as sufficient examples. Trench, from whom the above statement is drawn, with the minuteness of a finished and accurate scholar, remarks that the

* Latham's *Hand-book of the English Language*, p. 47.

word "king" is an exception to this list;* significant of the fact, that William came to the throne by a claim to the succession, and did not break the continuity of the nation or of the government. On the other hand, the names of common objects, the words that are used in practical life, the terms that are employed in business, are all of Saxon origin. The readers of *Ivanhoe* cannot fail to recall the philosophical illustration given by Wamba, the jester, of the relative posture of the two races. The names of animals are Saxon in the field; Norman, when brought into the market. Ox, steer, cow, are Saxon; beef, is Norman. Sheep, is Saxon; mutton, Norman. "He, is Saxon," says the jester, "when he requires tendance, and takes a Norman name when he becomes matter of enjoyment." Other illustrations, still more minute, might be afforded of history thus imbedded in a language. Few persons are aware that a historical explanation can be given of countess, the irregular feminine of earl. The irregularity is due to the circumstance that one word is Norman, and the other Saxon. Earl was the Danish-Saxon designation of a certain order of nobility; but was displaced by the Norman count, upon the ascendancy of the latter race. In the changes of fortune to which languages as well as men are subject, earl has recovered its place: but the conflict of races is marked in the retention of countess, as the name of its fellow. So the words shire, and county, are used interchangeably in common English: shire, from a Saxon word signifying to cut off, designating the territory put under the jurisdiction of a noble: but upon the Norman invasion, this jurisdiction passed into the hands of the Norman count; and the Saxon shire becomes the Norman county. The substitution too, of Anglia, instead of Britain, as the name of the island, just about the period when Egbert united the Heptarchy under his single sceptre, is another minute coincidence of language with history.— But we must refrain from these particular illustrations of the manner in which the Philologist will disinter facts concealed, from careless observers, within the body of a language.† As the Geologist will describe the successive

* Trench on the Study of Words, p. 76. † *Ib.* pp. 203, 225.

‡ For example, the word cabal, formed from the initials of the names Clifford, Ashley, Buckingham, Arlington, and Lauderdale, who constituted the Ministry of the Second Charles.

formations upon the earth's surface, so will the Antiquary describe the historical changes which have left their inefaceable marks upon the language of every people.

But the English is not only a monumental record of historical facts; it is also an avenue of philosophy. The study of all language is the study of the laws of the human mind. It has been well said that "the origin and formation of words, and the structure of sentences, as exhibited in etymology and syntax, taken as a whole, are but a counterpart of those mental phenomena which have been collected and classified by the masters of mental science. The laws of suggestion, of memory, of imagination, of abstraction, of generalization and reasoning, are distinctly exhibited, not merely in the higher specimens of eloquence and poetry, but also in the common forms of language; so that there is truth in the remark, 'that we might turn a treatise on the philosophy of mind, into one on the philosophy of language, by merely supposing that every thing said in the former of the thoughts as subjective, is said again in the latter of the words, as objective.'" If language be "the incarnation of thought," as it has been beautifully described, then its verbal forms cannot be studied without opening treasures of philosophy. It is not our purpose, however, to plunge into the intricacies of universal grammar. However interesting it might be to trace the working of the human mind in forming the necessary parts of speech, and in the various modifications of nouns and verbs by gender, number, case, tense and mood, such a digression would entirely defeat that particular advocacy of English, to which we are now committed. (a) we will therefore confine our attention to those features of the English language which would naturally engage the attention of a philosophical student. And that which would first strike the eye of a classical scholar, is the comparative absence of all transposition in the construction of its sentences. The idiom of the Greek and Latin languages allows the words to be arranged according to the taste or caprice of the writer; while the idiom of the English follows the natural order of thought as developed from the mind. The subject is stated first, with all the qualities which belong to it; then comes the action, with all its relations; and last follows the object, upon which all the

preceding must terminate. This difference of structure draws after it a greater difference in the very character and genius of the language. Words cannot be widely transposed, without undergoing great changes by inflection. It is only by this artifice that endless confusion is avoided. If, for example, a dozen words intervene between the noun and its adjective, there must be some sign common to both, by which they may be collated and construed together. Hence arises the inflection of nouns by case and gender, which must also be extended to the adjectives by which they are qualified. The direct style of the English, on the other hand, avoids this whole difficulty, since it expresses the relations between words by means of connectives and auxiliaries. There can be little doubt that the latter idiom is far the more philosophical. As a test of this, take the beautiful statement by Kuhnner, of the Greek cases. He says, "all the relations, which the language denotes by the inflection of the substantive object, were originally relations of *space*. In this manner the object of the verb appears in a threefold aspect; namely, first, as that out of which the action of the verb proceeds; secondly, as that to which the action of the verb tends; thirdly, as that by or in which the action of the verb takes place. In this way three cases originate: the genitive, denoting the direction whence; the accusative, whither; and the dative, the place where." He proceeds to show that the same principle may be extended to time and causality: the genitive, denoting the time whence; the accusative, the time whither; and the dative, the time in which. So again, the cause of an action is put in the genitive, as expressing its outgoing; the effect or consequence is put in the accusative, as to this the action tends; and the means, by or in which the action proceeds, in the dative. Now as a classification of facts, this is extremely just and striking: but can we penetrate its philosophy? Can we assign any reason why the genitive should be the *whence* case; the accusative, the *whither* case; and the dative, the *where* case? What is there in certain terminations of words to suggest, and therefore to signify, these relations? Perhaps, if we had known these languages when they were crystallizing into shape, we might be able to detect some natural association between the two. It

might they appear that these terminations, by which the stem noun is modified in the different cases, are in reality but fragments of original words expressing these relations; and that by agglutination they have become so thoroughly incorporated into the main word, as to seem only a part of it. Thus the inflection of nouns by cases might have originated, like the inflection of nouns in the Shemitish languages by suffixes of the pronouns. However this may be, such connexion is now forever lost. We cannot trace the origin of these terminations of case, and therefore the arrangement seems to be purely arbitrary. In the English, however, these relations of time, space, cause and the like, are expressed by the aid of prepositions. The nouns themselves discharge the single office of designating the thing spoken about: and a whole army of connectives spring forward as servitors to wait upon the noun, and express its relations to other things. This is far more philosophical, since one set of words is assigned to a single function, and not to the double office of both designating and defining. If we adopt the view taken by Horne Tooke, which to us appears sufficiently substantiated, that these prepositions, conjunctions, etc., are fragments of original nouns and verbs, which have been washed up from the detritus of language, and made to serve as "wheels for the more easy and rapid conveyance of thought," the advantage is most clearly for English. According to this theory, every word, however humble its office, can show a patent of nobility. No word is so insignificant, but it has its independent meaning; and if that meaning conveys the ideas of time, and space, and causation, then is the connection not an arbitrary vinculum to bind words together, but is the natural nexus connecting a word with the circumstances from which it cannot be viewed apart. The advantage of expressing all relations by means of separate words devoted to that office, will signally appear from the fact that neither the Greek nor Latin language can inflect their nouns so as to dispense, altogether, with the aid of prepositions. To multiply cases so as to express every possible relation in which one word may stand to another, would be to render the language so unwieldy that it could never be employed. Hence, in these tongues, the relations which we express

by the prepositions before, behind, around, above, below, within, without, can only be conveyed by corresponding connectives:* a clear confession of the greater simplicity and completeness of the English method.

If we pass from the consideration of case to that of gender, we shall be more fully persuaded of the philosophy of the English language. In the Latin and the Greek, the distinction of gender extends to multitudes of nouns which are not susceptible of sex. What is still more anomalous, this distinction extends also to the adjective, which, as it denotes an abstract quality only, does not admit of gender. Yet this invasion upon sound philosophy is necessary, to remedy the inconvenience arising from the singular inversion of their style. If the adjective be dissociated from its proper noun by many intermediate words, the expedient is devised of putting it in the same gender; and by this sign the noun recognises its own qualifying and descriptive epithets. But in English there is no sign to indicate gender, except in a few cases, which are easily enumerated; and gender is applied only to those objects which naturally have sex. This is not only more philosophical and true, but it contributes not a little to vividness of style, by giving frequent occasion for personification. When the Greek, for example, puts sun in the masculine gender, and moon in the feminine, it is a mere trick of grammar, by which these words may know their places in a sentence; while in English, the application of the personal pronouns to them, in giving gender, is a beautiful figure of rhetoric.

It is, however, in the use of auxiliaries, by which the modifications of the verb are expressed, that the peculiar advantage of the English is perceived. The same remark will apply to the conjugation of verbs, previously made of the declension of nouns, that the various terminations employed do not philosophically denote the changes which they indicate; or at least the clue is lost by which the significance of these terminations might be ascertained. But in English, these modifications of the original verb, both in tense and mood, are denoted by auxiliaries, such as do, can, may, shall, will, have, be, was, and others; and these auxiliaries are themselves verbs, still retaining

* Kuhner's Greek Grammar, p. 410.

their primary significance. By means of them, every possible shade of meaning may be expressed. As too, it is impossible to multiply cases so as to express all the conceivable relations of the noun, so is it even more impracticable to multiply tenses which shall convey all possible modifications of the verb. Hence the immense advantage of English in the matter of precision. The shades of meaning which we convey by the auxiliaries might, could, would, and should, must in the Latin and Greek, be conjectured, from the context; since they are all embraced within one tense, and no sign is employed to discriminate between them.*

Thus it is seen that the main characteristics of the English language, distinguishing it from the ancient classic tongues, are directness in the structure of its sentences, as opposed to the great transposition of words; and, the employment of auxiliaries, prepositions, conjunctions, and other connectives, to express all the accidents and properties and changes to be noted, rather than the inflection of the noun and verb in declension and conjugation. That in these respects it is the more philosophical language, will appear from the ease with which it may be spoken, even by the illiterate. All that needs to be known are the names of those objects about which we speak, and the words which will convey what we desire to affirm, and nature herself will prompt the order of utterance. But in the classic languages of antiquity, a correct style of conversation required the same cultivation of taste, as a correct style of composition requires now; and he who could speak them with accuracy, received as much praise as a good author with us. For the same reason, the Latin language was almost unfit for the drama; and produced no literature of this species at all equal to the English.—Equally so, in regard to epistolary composition: it tasked the versatility of even Cicero's genius, and his profound mastery of his native tongue, to preserve himself from comparative failure in the Letters he has left us. It is no slight confirmation of this that the Greek, which is far more perfect than the Latin, is far less inverted, approach-

* See, on the topics of this Section, Art. Language, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

es the excellence of the English in its abundant use of particles and connectives, and pre-eminently excels in the power of combining words. It is, perhaps, a higher proof still, of the superior excellence of the direct idiom, that with the example before them of the transpositive languages, the modern tongues of Europe, not excepting those formed on the basis of the Latin, pursue the more philosophical order: though in this respect, neither the French or Italian, or Spanish will compare with the English.

It is a curious circumstance in the history of the English language, that it has changed in its progress from the one idiom to the other. The old Saxon was strongly marked by the inflexion of its names and verbs, as well as by the inversion of its style. In passing into the present English, it presents the singular fact of dropping its inflexions, and substituting in place of them the connectives and auxiliaries which now abound. It might be interesting to inquire into the causes of this remarkable change, and Dr. Latham seems to challenge such investigation by laying it down as a universal law that "the earlier the stage of a given language, the greater the amount of its inflectional forms—as languages become modern, they substitute prepositions and auxiliaries for cases and tenses, while the reverse of this never takes place."* He evidently considers this the natural developement of language, and certainly admitting of philosophical explanation.—Outward influences may accelerate the change, but do not originate it. In the English language, this change has been usually ascribed to the influence of the Norman Conquest. The idiom of the Norman French being more direct, would naturally improve the Saxon by introducing a more natural order in the construction of its sentences. Dr. Latham suggests a doubt of this, from the fact that in Sweden, Norway and Denmark, a similar transition has taken place, without any such conquest to which to ascribe it.† Sharon Turner ascribes to the Norman influence a greater attention to euphony, and greater directness of style; but attributes the general abandonment of inflections to their extreme irregularity, and the confusion of

* Hand-Book of the English Language, p. 65. † Ib. p. 68.

thought thus occasioned. Only a few have been retained, sufficient to mark the genius of the original Saxon, which are now inwoven into the very frame of the language. These remarks will at least indicate the philosophical researches to which we may be introduced by the critical study of our mother tongue.

But the intrinsic worth of the English language is not fully appreciated, unless we consider the wealth of Poetry stored within the recesses of almost every word. Thoughtless men, for centuries, have trodden the ruins of Pompeii and Nineveh, ignorant of those exquisite specimens of ancient art and skill which antiquarian research has recently disinterred. In like manner, few have ever broken through the outer crust of words, and opened the hidden chambers of imagery, adorned with paintings fresher and brighter than any found in the temples and tombs of Egypt. The changes of meaning to be traced in words present a series of dissolving views, which melt into each other like the fading clouds of summer, as the setting sun illuminates the scenery of the sky. To every word belongs one radical and essential meaning. How it should acquire this, we may be unable perhaps to discover, except in that class of words known as onomatopoees: and there must be a starting point in language as in every thing else.* In the

* The following passage, taken from the Introduction to Nordheimer's Hebrew Grammar, will be of interest to the reader, as throwing some light upon this difficult point: "Since however, the external sound belongs entirely to the material, and the idea which it represents as exclusively to the immaterial world, the two stand at a distance so remote from each other, that the connexion between them has hitherto been a complete *res occulta*; and such doubtless it will continue, so long as we shall remain ignorant of the nature of the union subsisting between the body and the soul. * * * All that we can hope to accomplish in the vast majority of cases, is to find out the primitive idea or signification of a word, for the expression of which the organs, through the power of the soul, were first set in motion: and when once the word, with its individual meaning, has been thus established as an integral part of the language to which it belongs, the formation of derivatives may be shown to take place on principles, the determination of which is comparatively easy."—*Heb. Grammar*, vol. 1, p. 7.

Resuming this topic in the Introduction to his second volume, Nordheimer supposes four principles to co-operate in the formation of language. The first he terms the *imitative principle*, when there is an objective resemblance in words to the sounds which the words indicate, as in crash, buzz, slam, etc. The second he describes as the *symbolic principle*, where there is no direct imitation, but only an analogy between certain ideas and certain sounds, as in sloth, hurry, calm, and the like. The third principle, which he calls the *analogical*, prevails, when having arrived by one or other of these two processes

lapse of time many secondary significations will develop from the primary ; some of them so remote that a scholar can pass from one extreme of the chain to the other only by closely observing the intervening links. Two causes exist for this : first, that as sense is the inlet of our ideas, we must draw from the objective world the bullion which the mind may stamp in its own mint, and circulate as its coin ; the second is, that to frame a new word for every shade of thought, would swell language to such bulk that life would be consumed in its study, and the very design of it as a means of intercourse would be defeated. In drawing out these secondary meanings, the nicest philosophy is disclosed. We trace the operation of the mind itself, developing the thought which is embodied in the original word. But these transitions are often as beautiful as they are philosophical. In proportion, however, as the new meaning comes to be regarded as conventional, and its derivation is overlooked, the beautiful image is buried beneath the popular and unreflecting usage, like the fossil remains of some once living, but now extinct, animal. Trench, in his little work before mentioned,* remarks, "many a single word is a concentrated poem, having stores of poetical thought and imagery laid up in it. Examine it, and it will be found to rest on some deep analogy of things natural and spiritual. The image may have grown trite and ordinary now ; perhaps, through the help of this very word, may have become so entirely the heritage of all, as to seem little better than a common-place : yet not the less he who first discovered the relation and devised the new word which should express it, or gave to an old never before but literally used this new and figurative sense, this man was, in his degree, a poet." From this source arises the exquisite pleasure experienced in the study of the sacred Hebrew, and its cognates. Every word being significant, we are opening treasures of philosophy and poetry at every step. Beautiful crystals of

at the representation of an idea, other analogous ideas are expressed by similar sounds. And the fourth, or *synthetical* principle, causes a compound idea to be represented by a combination of the words denoting the constituent simple ideas, or the most important elements of such words."—*Heb. Grammar*, vol. 2, pp. 7, 8.

* On the Study of Words, p. 14.

thought are seen shooting up; and the same poetic glow enlivens us which fired the heart of the first framer. Who, for instance, can trace the Syriac word for "truth" to its primary sense, which is the passage of an arrow through the air, without feeling the beauty of the imagery—truth speeding without deflection to its mark? And who can uncover the radical signification of the Hebrew word for "man," denoting weakness or frailty, without dropping a tear over this pathetic memorial of the fallen condition of the human race?

In the so called dead languages, considerable attention must be given to etymology, in order to their acquisition. In the effort to associate certain ideas with certain words, we are compelled to aid the memory by tracing the connexion in their significations. This, however, can be done to a partial extent only; in many instances the origin of words is lost beyond recovery: it is chiefly in compounded words that we are successful, and that simply in resolving them into their constituent parts. But in a living language, the process is daily going forward by which words change their meaning, and a clue is furnished to guide our investigations. We have a knowledge of the great factors of the language, so that no limit can be assigned to a successful analysis of its words. Yet a familiarity from infancy with our vernacular tongue, blunts the edge of inquiry. We know the conventional meaning which usage assigns, and thus are not driven back upon the pedigree of words to gain such an acquaintance as shall be available for practical ends. Thus, it has been well remarked, to a classical scholar, the dead languages of Greece and Rome may have more of life than that he was first taught to lisp at a mother's knee. Should English, however, be studied in the original power of its roots, and in the derivation of meanings from the same—should attention be given to the heraldry of its words, the language becomes instinct with life, and glows with the poetry with which it is inspired. One has but to open such a work as Richardson's Dictionary, to see words, which at first view are like marble statues standing silent in their niches, start forth into life, bright with intellect and warm of heart. We pick up the acorn at our feet with livelier interest, upon decompounding the word and recognizing it as the

oak-corn. We feel a new friendship for that little word "can," when we remember its first sense, to know, still preserved in the Scotch, to ken; and trace its kindred with its low relative, cunning: and we cannot put it away, without pausing upon that analogy which transfers the signification from knowledge to power. The "fog" which surrounds our dwelling on some autumnal morning, grows denser as we trace it to the Anglo-Saxon *feg-an*, to gather or collect; and new relations spring up before us, as from the same root we develop the words *fagot*, and *pettifogger*. The husband becomes a more august personage, when he stands revealed as *vinculum domus*, whose authority binds the house together as a unit: and the correlative, wife, is infinitely dearer, when in the Saxon, she is presented as the woof-man; engaged in domestic pursuits, of which weaving may be deemed the type. "Man" stands forth in greater dignity and robustness, as derived from the Saxon, *megan*, to be strong. "Virtue" has a more comprehensive sense when, from the Latin, *vir*, it includes all the traits which should adorn a man. "Woe" has a deeper significance, when traced to the Saxon, which sighs it forth: and "wrath" is more terrible, when it is identified with "writhe," and expresses the torture which is felt. Thus, like the immense coal formations of our native land, the English language is a perfect bed of what Emerson calls "fossil poetry." Whether, then, we view it in relation to this feature, or consider it as a monument of history, or a repository of philosophy, in each aspect its intrinsic worth as a language establishes a just claim to the critical study of scholars.

IV. It is another argument for the assiduous cultivation of English, that we employ it as *the instrument of guiding the minds, and controlling the opinions of men*. Probably, there is not a nation upon the globe so essentially a speech-making people as our own; with whom, therefore this consideration should carry greater weight. Our form of government is one which draws the masses together, in their primary assemblies, to discuss political measures. A people as busy as ours, and yet as free and inquisitive, will depend much upon the ear for acquiring knowledge, and gather in lyceums and debating clubs, and rally at the camp of lecturers, who go in shoals over the land. They

are also a religious, and therefore a reading people, holding large communion with unseen authors, whose living thoughts breathe upon the printed page. Besides this occasional use of language as the vehicle of thought, there are four distinct classes whose profession requires its habitual employment: the Jurist, engaged in the distribution of justice, and the enforcement of law,—the Divine, expounding the great rules of human duty, and tracing the mysteries of the future world,—the Statesman, shaping the political history and destiny of the commonwealth,—and the whole army of writers, from the paragraphist of the newspaper to the conductors of grave Reviews, and the authors of ponderous volumes. Surely, an instrument so much wielded for the instruction and pleasure of mankind, should be fully understood and appreciated. Even the sawyer and axeman will not go to their daily toil without a proper edge upon their tools; how much more stupid is the attempt to control the thoughts and passions of men without comprehending the instrument employed in so serious a task!

The English needs to be carefully studied with reference both to *power* and *precision* in its use: and this necessity will more distinctly appear, upon remembering that English is not strictly a homogeneous language, developed from a single stock. Disregarding the slight infusion of words from other sources, it is doubtless true that Latin and Saxon are the two great factors of which it is composed: * and skill in its use will turn greatly upon the proposition in which these elements are mingled. To make this apparent, I cannot do better than condense some statements found in an admirable article of the Edinburgh Review, for the year 1839. Of 38,000 words, then, which constitute the English vocabulary, about five eighths, or 23,000, are Anglo-Saxon; the remaining three eighths including words from all other sources, though chiefly from the Latin. This is the relative proportion; if

* A German Philologist, speaking of the English language, says, "Its altogether intellectual and singularly happy foundation and development, has arisen from a surprising alliance between the two noblest languages of antiquity—the German and the Romanesque—the relation of which to each other is well known to be such that the former supplies the material foundation, the latter the abstract notions."

we take the census of the whole language. If, however, with Sharon Turner and Sir James Mackintosh, we select passages from the best and purest writers, the proportion of Saxon words is far greater. An estimate has been made upon the basis of passages taken at random from the Bible, Shakspeare, Milton, Cowley, Thomson, Addison, Locke, Pope, Young, Swift, Robertson, Hume, Gibbon, and Johnson; and the general result gives the Saxon element, predominating in the ratio of four to one. In none of these passages was the number of foreign words greater than one third; in many, less than one tenth. If, then, the number of words be the only criterion of judgment, the Saxon is clearly the controlling element of the language.

But if we consider further the *classes* of words and their relative importance, the supremacy of the Saxon will no longer be questioned. Condensing still the admirable generalizations of the Edinburgh Reviewer, it appears that English Grammar is almost exclusively occupied with what is of Anglo-Saxon origin. What few inflections exist of noun and verb are Saxon—the articles and definitions of every sort—the pronouns—the auxiliary verbs, prepositions, conjunctions and adverbs, almost without exception—the terminations which express comparison—all these are of Saxon derivation. Again: the names of most objects in nature come from the same source, as sun, moon, and stars, earth, fire, water; the names of three of the seasons—spring, summer, winter; all the divisions of time—day, night, morning, evening, sun-rise, sun-set, noon, twi-light; the names of heat, cold, frost, hail, rain, snow, sleet, thunder, lightning; all the features of a diversified landscape—land, sea, hill, dale, wood, stream. The Saxon too furnishes that vivid class of words which express the cries and postures of animated existence, as to sit, stand, lie, run, walk, leap, slide, stagger, yawn, gape, fly, crawl, creep, swim, spring, spurn, etc.: the very terms which form the staple of all impressive, poetic descriptions. To the same language we are indebted for the names of our nearest and dearest connections, as father, mother, husband, wife, brother, sister, son, daughter, child, home, kindred, friends; also, the names of hearth, roof, fire-side, with which our earliest and holiest remembrances are linked. From the same fountain we draw the language

of our strongest and tenderest emotions, as love, joy, grief, hope, fear, sorrow and shame; and the names too which we give to the outward signs of these emotions—tear, smile, blush, laugh, sigh, and groan. From the Saxon again we borrow the names of practical life, the language of business, the nomenclature of the street, the market, the workshop and the farm; the dialect, home-spun yet forcible, which utters our national proverbs, is original Saxon. The language too, of satire and invective, of pleasantry and humour, the colloquial terms of ordinary intercourse, are Saxon. While too, our general and abstract terms are derived chiefly from the Latin, those which denote special objects are Saxon. For example, colour is Latin; but the varieties of colour, white, brown, green, blue, red, yellow, and black, are all Saxon. Crime too, is Latin; but theft, murder, robbery, and the like, are Saxon. Animal is Latin; man, cow, sheep, are Saxon. Number is derived from the Latin, through the Norman French; while the Saxon gives all the cardinals and ordinals, from one to a million. From this condensed statement of facts, it is obvious that the Saxon element in our language must be studied, in order to appreciate its power: and that neither speakers nor writers are capable of wielding this great instrument, until they have mastered both constituents of the language, and can draw from either as the nature of their subjects, or the character of their hearers, may demand. If the speaker's object be to sway the judgment of the masses, he should draw chiefly upon the Saxon portion of the language, every word of which goes with a home influence to the bosoms of men. So too, if his aim is to excite vivid emotions, and call into play the passions of men, he must rely upon those special and poetic terms which the Saxon affords; if his object be denunciation or pleasantry, he must again from the Saxon armoury draw the bolts of satire or the shafts of ridicule. If, on the other hand, his discourse be upon subjects of science, the foreign languages will suggest the proper terms. If the effort be to soften what is harsh, or to vary what is trite, or to dignify what is low, the classic terms will afford the euphemisms that are needed. Disregard of these independent sources of the English tongue has been the cause of serious injury, defacing its beauty, and retrenching its power. To

this disregard we must refer those hybrid words, which, springing from a Saxon stock, put on a Greek form. A graver offence is the importation of foreign idioms, forcing the English into the strange, unnatural forms of a different dialect; as when Dr. Johnson introduced his cumbrous, periodic style, which was neither Latin nor English, but which Macaulay hits off as Johnsonese; and when Carlyle and his bombastic imitators strive to force a German idiom, and only succeed in turning the English, like a glove, wrong side out. These corruptions of our mother tongue would never have been perpetrated, if the native strength of the Saxon had been understood. A full conviction of this too, would restrain the fantastic desire of sewing what Horace satirizes as "purple patches" upon a plain style; peppering it over with grotesque citations from Greek, and Latin, and French authors;* which the Edinburg Reviewer tartly says resemble classical compositions, as much as the hortus siccus of a botanist resembles the parterre of a flower garden.

The study of synonymes also, is essential to those who undertake to write or speak English with precision. Even those languages which are developed from a single root will exhibit many words of similar import: and the scholar must learn to detect the slight variations of thought which they discover. But a language, like the English, which draws its life from two breasts, imposes a sterner vigilance, and a keener discrimination upon all who hope to master it. Two distinct languages, as the Latin and the Saxon, might be expected to have each its own word to express the same idea. When these two are fused into one language, as the Saxon and the Latin into English,

* Reminding one of Hudibras, who spoke

"A Babylonish dialect
Which learned pedants much affect;
It was a party-coloured dress
Of patched and piebald languages;
'T was English cut on Greek and Latin,
Like fustian heretofore on satin.
It had an odd promiscuous tone,
As if he talked three parts in one:
Which made some think, when he did gabble,
They heard three labourers of Babel;
Or Cerberus himself pronounce
A leash of languages at once."

what become of these rival terms? And when one shall gain the ascendancy, what modifications are put upon the other to extinguish this identity? It is astonishing how fast the supposed synonymes of the English disappear, upon close inspection; so that a careless use of them must introduce great confusion of thought. As in the Daguerreotype the slightest motion will blur the picture, so in language the least shifting of thought will obscure the synonyme. A close attention to this distinction of words will tend greatly to correct redundancy. The effort to conjure up the word which will precisely express the thought, serves to exclude many which are inadequate; and after all, a redundant style is felt to be a grievance, not so much from the overloading of the idea, as from the confusion of mind produced by this mingling together distinct shades of thought. Illustrations of this could be produced without limit. How many writers, for example, would distinguish between bravery and courage—referring the former to what is constitutional, and the latter to what results from principle and by reflection? “Many words,” says Graham,* may be observed to differ from each other, as the *species* from the *genus*, as we may perceive between to *do* and to *make*; a very large class of words may be distinguished under the heads of *active* and *passive*, as between *ability* and *capacity*; the principle of *intensity* may be observed to operate in the difference between the words to *see* and to *look*; others have a *positive* and *negative* difference, as between to *shirk* and to *avoid*; and many, which do not appear to depend on any uniformly acting principle, may be ranged under the head of *miscellaneous*.” This classification of words is like the classification made by Naturalists of the animal kingdom: and disregard of the essential differences of words will produce as great confusion in language, as a similar disregard of the differences of animals would produce in natural history. Hence the value of that advice suggested by Coleridge:† “accustom yourself to reflect on the words you use, hear or read—their birth, derivation and history. For if words are not *things*, they are *living powers*, by which the things of most importance to mankind are actuated,

* English Synonymes, p. 7. † Aids to Reflection.—Preface.

combined and humanized." Language, as the medium of thought, should be transparent as the purest crystal: it should neither refract nor discolour the truth which it transmits. The blending of images by the indiscriminate use of synonymes, like the distorted image reflected from the uneven surface of a mirror, shocks where it was intended to please; and misleads where it was desired to guide. If a writer on morals, for example, uses the word *obligation*, when he means *duty*, he insensibly shifts the ground upon which his injunction rests; and makes a voluntary contract or promise the basis of action, rather than the natural relations of society from which there is no escape. So, if a metaphysician represents that as *evident* which is really *obvious*, he utters a half truth and weakens his argument by the feebleness of the term chosen: while he is thinking of truths that are *intuitive*, the reader recognises truths that are *demonstrable*. If, then, no higher appeal could be made to the hearts of our scholars in favour of this critical study of the English language, this cold, utilitarian argument should convince their understandings, and a motive of policy prevail where the promptings of affection prove ineffectual.

V. But as this article must be contracted within the limits of the reader's patience, we shall be content with suggesting only one consideration further: *the treasures of Literature laid up in the archives of the English language*. The enthusiastic admirers of ancient classic genius love to expatiate upon the philosophical and poetical remains of Grecian literature. But there is no language, living or dead, ancient or modern, which hoards so vast a store of intellectual wealth as the English. Perhaps, in one or two single departments, it may be surpassed. In fiction and romance,—possibly too, in the Natural sciences—larger contributions may be gathered from the French: yet it is hard to admit that Walter Scott and Bulwer can be surpassed in the first; or Brewster, and Davy, Lardner, and others, in the second. So too, in dry, verbal criticism, in the dray-horse plodding of mere learning, the Germans may bear away the palm; though, as to valuable results, one page of English criticism will outweigh ten pages of German. But the English sweeps with the broadest wing over the entire circle of human

knowledge. To recite the names of distinguished writers in the different departments, would be to count the stars in the firmament. Among the poets, there is Pope, with scarce a ripple curling the surface of his flowing verse; and Moore, whose lyrics breathe the voluptuous softness of the ancient Syren; and Byron, like the Phoenix enveloped in flame, consuming amid the fires of his own terrific passions; and superior to them all, the immortal Milton, like an eagle from its eyrie, "soaring to the key-stone of Heaven." Among the essayists which crowd the milky way of English literature, it is almost invidious to speak even of Addison, and Steele, and Swift, and Lamb, and Johnson, and Goldsmith, and Foster, and Mackintosh. Among historians, the names of Hume and Gibbon, and Robertson and Alison, and Macaulay, shine with splendor undimmed by the halo which surrounds the names of ancient Thucydides and Livy. In the class of orators, we follow the stately and sustained tread of Robert Hall; or revel in the elegant declamation of Burke, often from the highest pinnacle of philosophy "swooping like a falcon to his quarry," in the happy use of some colloquial phrase which awakens all the home-thoughts within a man. In the drama, it is enough to repeat great Shakspeare's name, whose creative genius presents a world in miniature, tossed with the same jealousies and passions which have always rent society with the terrors of an earthquake. But it is especially in the department of philosophy that the robust English mind leaves the impress of its greatness. Compared with the calm and healthful writings of Locke, Reid, and Stewart, Brown and Hamilton, all the transcendental rhapsodies of the French and German schools, are but as the exploding rocket, compared with the quiet, twinkling star; or as the lawless comet with the steady moon, reigning with queenly majesty amid the hosts of Heaven.

But we cannot pause even to group in proper clusters the great lights of English literature and science. It is enough to say that a people as vigorous as ours, as impatient of dictation, and enjoying the stimulus of free institutions, cannot lag in any career upon which they may start forth: and the closest scrutiny of facts will sustain this antecedent presumption. There is however one branch of

literature in which the English mind has utterly distanced competition. I refer to all that the English language contains upon civil liberty, and Protestant Christianity. All that the world enjoys of regulated liberty, it owes to the Anglo-Saxon race. The modern English Parliament may unquestionably be traced to the Saxon Witenagemot as its root: and though the people were not directly represented in that, but only the magistracy, yet, beyond doubt, it is the germ of all that exists among us of popular representation.* That great bulwark of liberty and justice, trial by jury, took its rise in the early period of English history, and was gradually moulded into its present form during the progress of civil freedom. And the great body of common law, now of force, both in this country and in England, has come down from Saxon times, enlarged and greatly modified during the Norman rule. But it is needless to go into detail, when the whole drift of English history is but the progress of regulated civil liberty. The great clue to its interpretation, from the granting of Magna Charta by the feeble John in 1215, to the overthrow of the treacherous House of Stuart in 1688, is simply the struggle between prerogative and privilege,—the conflict of the crown with the parliament. Even Hume declares the revolution that placed the Prince of Orange upon the throne of England to have decided forever this great issue: "the precedent of deposing one king, and establishing a new family, gave such an ascendant to popular principles,† as has put the nature of the English Constitution beyond all controversy: and it may be justly affirmed, without any danger of exaggeration, that we, in this island, have ever since enjoyed, if not the best system of government, at least the most entire system of liberty, that ever was known amongst mankind."‡ If this could be safely written of the British isle one hundred years ago, the achievements of the Anglo-

* Pictorial History of England, vol. 1, pp. 239, 240.

† "When the English Revolution of 1688 took place, the English people did not content themselves with the example of Runnymede; they did not build their hopes upon royal charters. * * * Instead of petitioning for charters, they declared their rights; and while they offered to the Prince of Orange the crown with one hand, they held in the other an enumeration of those privileges which they did not profess to hold as favours, but which they demanded and insisted upon as their undoubted rights."—*Webster's Speech on the Revolution in Greece: Works*, vol. 3, pp. 70, 71.

‡ Hume's *History of England*, vol. 6, p. 363: Harper's edition.

Saxon race since then, have not reduced the world's indebtedness for the developement of social and civil freedom on this western continent. What language then, but the language of this imperial race, contains the noble records in which Liberty reads both her struggles and her triumphs? It is the glory of the English tongue to be the vernacular dialect of civil freedom, in which are bequeathed to mankind the united blessings of liberty and law.

Intimately associated with this is the identification of our language with Protestantism. "It is a most significant circumstance," says Mr. Macaulay, "that no large society, of which the tongue is not Teutonic, has ever turned Protestant; and that wherever a language derived from ancient Rome is spoken, the religion of modern Rome to this day prevails."* It is irrelevant to my purpose to investigate the causes of this fact, which, in its broad generality, with some understood exceptions, is beyond the reach of contradiction. The fact is enough. The German and English languages, for the most part, comprise the History of the Reformation: but the latter excels the former in the vast body of religious literature which it contains. No dialect spoken on the globe preserves so vast and so valuable a store of theological learning, as that produced by English divines during the 17th century, and by English, Scotch and American divines of a later day. It is the crowning glory of the English language to be even more identified with the *spread*, than with the *literature*, of Protestant Christianity. While Germany, which once took the lead in the great battle with Anti-christ, can now scarcely recover herself from the depths of rationalism and infidelity, England, Scotland and America have formed a triple and a holy alliance to bear the banner of the cross to the bounds of the earth. Happy in a three-fold union, of blood, of language and of religion, they seem the selected instruments of evangelizing the globe; and the sacred pre-eminence is thus assigned to the English language of revealing Christ and his gospel to the race of man. In three of the greatest aspects in which a language may be viewed, English has already a paramount influence, and is predestined to increasing dignity and power: it is at

* History of England, p. 53: Boston edition.

once, the language of commerce,—the language of civil freedom and popular rights, and the language of a universal religion, for the entire globe.

We must here snap the thread of discourse, though far from having filled out the plan which we originally drafted. It is perhaps necessary to a full discussion of this theme to trace the discipline by which this mastery of English can alone be attained. We had designed to insist upon a careful study of the Latin and old Saxon tongues, which, though now obsolete, are still the sources from which the present English is drawn. A thorough comprehension must also be had of the principles upon which the compounded and derived words are framed. We desired also to insist upon the importance of studying those periods of English history during which the language received its greatest modifications, as well as the character and genius of the men whose writings have chiefly moulded it: and last of all, we did wish to urge a more thorough course of instruction in English literature, upon those who have in charge the education of the country. It surely is time that the Professor of Belles Lettres in our colleges should teach something beyond the mere graces of Rhetoric—time that English, as a language, should be taught; and the genius of our great English writers should be analyzed. But all these points we must forbear, leaving the simple suggestion of them for the private meditations of the reader. We shall be well repaid for the labor of compiling this article from the various authorities we have consulted, if but a single mind fires with the purpose to honour his native tongue with the devotion of an enthusiastic student; and thus a widening influence be created, which shall finally exalt English to the same pre-eminence among the languages, which those who speak it enjoy among the nations.

ARTICLE II.

UNREGENERACY IN THE MINISTRY.—THE FACT.

The sacred ministry owes its existence to the love of God in Christ Jesus to a fallen and ruined world. It has existed from the beginning, and shall continue to exist unto the end of time.

Beyond all question it is the most exalted office conferred on man. It originates immediately from the ever living and true God—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; *Exod.* 28: 1. *Deut.* 10: 8. 21: 5. *Numb.*, chapters 16 to 18. 2 *Ch.*, 26: 16 22. *Matt.* 9: 38. *Heb.* 5: 4. From the ever living and true God it derives its authority and qualifications: *Mark* 3: 14-15. *Matt.* 10: 1-40. *John* 17: 18. 20: 21-23. 13: 20. *Matt.* 28: 18-20. 2 *Cor.* 3: 5-6. 4: 1-7. *Eph.* 3: 7. 4: 1-12. *Isa.* 6: 1-9. *Jer.* 1: 1-19. 3: 15. *Ezek.* 3: 17-21. *Heb.* 13: 17. *Acts* 20: 28. Men are predestinated to the ministry from eternity, and called to it by God's providence and grace in time. *Jer.* 1: 5. *Gal.* 1: 15-16. *Acts* 22: 14. *Rom.* 1: 1. 1 *Cor.* 1: 1. *Rom.* 8: 29. The dignity of the office transcends that of every other on earth. Ministers are taken from among men, and ordained for the benefit of men, in things pertaining to God. In their office they deal with kings and princes, and nobles and common people, and are over them by a divine authority. *Heb.* 5: 1. 13: 17. *Jer.* 1: 10, 17-19. As a Son over His own House, Christ Jesus has set them servants in that House; as the great shepherd of the sheep, He has appointed them his under-shepherds. As the eternal Word sent forth from God, to establish His kingdom on earth, and reconcile the world unto himself, He has made them officers in that kingdom. They stand in his room; they are ambassadors for Christ. "Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." 2 *Cor.* 5: 18-20. *Heb.* 3: 1-6. 13: 20. 1 *Pet.* 5: 1-4. In its purely spiritual nature, the office has no parallel. The world in which it moves and has its being, and in which its duties are discharged, and

its power and authority are felt, and its effects revealed, is the world of the immortal spirits of men. It is occupied with their spiritual relations and duties, and deals with the understanding, the conscience, the affections, the will. These it reaches through the instrumentality of the pure and eternal truth of God; and upon that ministry waits the Holy Spirit of God, in the plenitude of His grace and of His power, to divide it in its savour of life or of death to every man, severally as he will. John 19: 36-38. 6: 15. Luke 12: 14. Dan. 2: 44. 7: 14. Rom. 14: 17. Heb. 13: 17. Ezek. 3: 17-18. 2 Tim. 2: 4. Deut. 33: 10. Neh. 8: 8. Isa. 8: 20. Ezek. 2: 7. Matt. 28: 18-20. Acts 20: 17-31. 2 Tim. 4: 2. 2 Cor. 3: 5-6. 4: 7. 1 Cor. 3: 1-9. And its design casts that of all other offices in the shade, and admits of no real comparison with them: even the manifestation of the infinite riches of the wisdom, and of the power, and of the love, and of the justice, and of the holiness, and of the mercy of God towards the children of men, through Jesus Christ His Son, our Lord; and thereby shall the glory of God be eternally made known, upon the vessels both of His mercy and of His wrath—drawing forth in boundless measure, the praise, the admiration, the affection, the devotion of principalities and powers, and of every creature that dwelleth in the heavenly places. O, then, shall God behold the work of His redemption, and see that it is very good, and rejoice therein! Col. 1: 12-20. Rom. 9: 21-23. Eph. 3: 10-11. Rom. 11: 32-36. Rev. 4: 8-11. 5: 11-14. 21: 22-27. 22: 1-5. And to this office are attached the most glorious rewards, or the most fearful punishments, of God. Faithful ministers shall be associated with the Judge in the last judgment—sitting upon thrones—they shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars, forever and ever. The unfaithful! a woe falleth upon them. It had been good for those men, if they had not been born! They shall bring upon themselves swift destruction; and to them is reserved the blackness of darkness forever! Dan. 12: 3. Matt. 19: 28. 26: 24. 2 Pet. 2: 1-17. Jude vs. 4-13.

Thus the sacred office, as it originates from God, and is sustained by Him, and the honor and glory of God is directly, and without measure, committed to its keeping;

and as it deals with the present world, and with that which is to come, and brings these worlds into immediate connection and stands ministering between them: as it reaches the height of God's throne in the heavens; and yet measures the depth of the abyss of human degradation and misery on earth; and as it attaches to itself directly or indirectly every interest of man as mortal and immortal, and dispenses eternal life and death to millions upon millions—that office must be of all others the most exalted and important, and to those who bear it, the most responsible. If they are true men and faithful, the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, is manifested to the admiration of heaven and of earth: men are saved and made happy eternally, and they render in their final account with joy. If they are false men, and unfaithful, the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ is dimmed and despised; immortal souls are lost; their blood is required at their hands, and they render in their final account with horror and dismay! “Who is sufficient for these things” is a question wrung from the breast of every man who in any degree partakes of the intelligence and spirit of the holy apostle, who first propounded it!

And who are the true and faithful ministers of God? They are the “called of God.” “No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron.” And this calling is a *double calling*. First, *the effectual calling*, according to the election of Grace, which is personal and private. And second, *the ministerial calling*, which is official and public. The first lays the foundation of the second. The second cannot be perfect and complete without the first. This is the decision and order of the Apostle Paul: “it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace, to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles.” Gal. 1: 15-16, and Rom. 1: 5. Eph. 3: 7, and 1 Tim. 1: 11-14. Grace goes before apostleship. The apostle was taught his gospel, he affirms, “by the revelation of Jesus Christ.” Gal. 1: 11-12. This is the doctrine taught by our Lord, concerning the ministry. They only are true who “do the will of His Father in heaven,” as well as prophesy, and cast out devils in His name. Matt. 7: 21-22, and v. 15. Every true minister,

therefore, may say with the celebrated Robert Bruce, of Scotland : "I was first called to my grace before I obeyed my calling to the ministry. He made me first a Christian before he made me a minister."

In His kingdoms of Providence and of Grace, the infinitely wise and faithful God has connected the cause with the effect—the means with the end. He has established a correspondence between the two, and thereby laid the foundation for order and harmony, and for the instruction, the reasonings, and conduct of men. The manifestation of his glory, and the ingathering of His elect, is an ordained end in His kingdom of Grace ; and a ministry graciously and officially called, is His ordained means for the accomplishment of this end. And there is a correspondence between the two—an adaptation of the one to the other. By such a ministry God accomplishes the end. This is a law—the general method of His work—although He reserves to Himself, in His sovereignty, for wise purposes in particular instances, the right to depart from it. There must be an adaptation of the means to the end—a fitness in the instruments for the work they are required to perform. To use the language of Robert Bruce again : "If the spirit be not in me, the spirit of the hearer will discern me not to be sent, but only to have the *word* of the commission, and not to have the *power* ; for the power is the evident argument that a man is sent. Therefore many start to teach this word who are not sent. Except I myself be sanctified in some measure, I am not able to sanctify others." And this but echoes the teachings of the word of God from the beginning : 2 Cor. 4 : 1-7. 1 Cor. 2 : 9-16. 2 Cor. 1 : 4. Hence a ministry *adapted to its end*, is that which the Lord requires in His church, and it is that which alone receives His approbation and blessing.

A man may be in the ministry who has been effectually, but never officially, called ; and a man may be in the ministry who has been officially, but never effectually, called ; and the latter is the sorer evil, and the sadder and more fearful state of the two. The want of piety disqualifies a man for the right and acceptable discharge of the ministerial office, and is justly condemned and viewed with horror by the sacred scriptures, and by the true church of God, and even by the enlightened ones of the

world. It therefore is a question of vital interest to every one invested with the holy office: Am I effectually and officially called? Am I a regenerated minister of the Lord Jesus Christ? Shall I preach to others, and be myself a cast-away? or, shall I receive a crown of righteousness from the Lord, in that day when I render in my final account?

Affecting as it may be, that men of no piety—that men wholly unregenerate—have been and still are in the ministry of Christ, is an undoubted fact; and it is a fact which we propose now to establish and illustrate.

The fact is established by the testimony of the Holy Scriptures; and their testimony is confirmed by the history of the church, and the opinions of various writers, and is exhibited and illustrated by many remarkable examples.

The *inspired records* teach us that unregenerate ministers were in the church previous to, and at the time of, the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, and continued to be afterwards to the close of the New Testament canon; and they are so spoken of as to leave the impression that they are to be expected and guarded against in all time to come.

The church of Christ on earth properly takes its rise from the fall of man under the covenant of works, and the institution with him of the covenant of grace. The particular external organization of the Church, in the patriarchal ages, from Adam to Abraham, is not revealed; but that the sons of God, or the true believers in and worshippers of God, were distinct in their association from the children of men, is more than intimated: Gen. 4: 14-26. 6: 1-2. The Sabbath, sacrifices, divine worship, tithes, prophets, priests and preachers, existed for the ingathering and edification, and support of God's elect, and for the reproof and condemnation of the world. Gen. 2: 2-3. Heb. 4: 4. 3: 21. 4: 3-5. 7: 2-3, 8. 8: 20-21. 12: 7-8. 13: 4-18. Rom. 3: 21-26. 2 Cor. 5: 21. John, 1: 29. Jude, vs. 14-15. Gen. 5: 18-24. Heb. 11: 4-5. 2 Pet. 2: 5. Heb. 11: 7. Gen., chaps. 6, 7, 8. 14: 18-20. Ps. 110: 4. Heb. 6: 20. 7: 1-28.

The visible Church of Christ is first established in Abraham and his posterity—Gen. 17: 1-27. Comp. 12: 1-3. 13: 14-17. 15: 1-21. 21: 12—and so to be continued, one and the same, to the end of time.

The characters of all the prophets and priests, including the patriarchs in the line of spiritual descent, and the preachers, from Adam to Moses, appear to have been effectually and officially called to their work. Such were Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Melchisedec, Isaac and Jacob. There is no record of any that were false, although it might be too much to believe that none were so during the universal degeneracy that preceded the flood, when Noah alone was found righteous, perfect in his generations, walking with God—Gen. 6 : 1-9. 7 : 1—and none during the degeneracy which succeeded the flood, to the call of Abraham.

In the Mosaic period we have a gathering up, and an arrangement and amplification; indeed, a re-enactment, and a permanent and orderly establishment of every thing divinely appointed in the church, of institutions, ordinances, officers, members, laws and statutes, sacrifices, rites and ceremonies, that went before in the patriarchal period: We have the continuation of the church under the covenant of grace—that covenant more enlarged and illustrated, revealing more perfectly, in its types and shadows, “the good things to come;” the whole to stand in this form until Christ himself should come. The priesthood, as a distinct order, now appears, and the prophets in regular succession. *The sacred office*, divinely appointed in the church, continueth evermore.

And what is the religious character of the ministers of God, from this time onward to the close of the Old Testament canon? To exhaust the proof furnished in the Old Testament scriptures, that there were men in the ministry of God who had never experienced his grace, is foreign to our purpose. We propose to adduce so much of it only as may be sufficient to establish the fact.

The Lord God Almighty warned his people, by Moses, of the coming of false prophets, and furnished them with signs for their detection—Deut. 13 : 1-5. 18 : 20-22—which signs were of service in after ages; for false prophets made their appearance at various times, agreeable also to the assertion of our Saviour, that there were “false prophets” in the days of “the fathers.” Jer. 28 : 7-17. Zech. 1 : 5-6. Luke, 6 : 26; and 2 Pet. 2 : 1.

They are brought to our notice in the history of the

church. Hophni and Phineas, the sons of Eli, not only executed the priest's office in impenitency, but were cut off by the Lord in that state. 1 Sam. 2: 12-25. 4: 11; comp. Judges, chapters 17 and 18. During the frequent seasons of spiritual declension, which occurred while the kingdom of Judah lasted, the priests and the prophets exhibited signs of unregeneracy, and relapsed into sin and idolatry along with the people, and needed, in like manner with them, to be revived again. 1 Ki. 12: 31. 18: 22. 19: 10. 2 Ki. 23: 5-20. 34: 5. It is not necessary to adduce proof, drawn from particular instances; neither will we bring into notice the grand apostacy, as it may well be termed, of the ten tribes under Jeroboam and his successors, where the sacred officers were affected as well as the people; although numbers of both priests and people left the kingdom of Israel, and went and settled in the kingdom of Judah, in order that they might worship God, and be with his people.

These great preachers, the prophets of God, almost from the earliest to the latest of them, have left abundant evidence in their writings, of the existence of false prophets and priests. Isaiah speaks of "the prophet and the priest erring through wine"—28: 7—and Micah of the one "teaching for hire," and the other "divining for money," and yet leaning upon the Lord, and saying: "Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us." 3: 11. As strong proof of a degeneracy, calling for divine rebuke, Jeremiah says: "From the prophet, even unto the priest, every one dealeth falsely. They have healed the heart of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace, when there is no peace." 6: 13-14. 8: 10-11. And again: "For both prophet and priest are profane; yea, in my house have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord;" and Jeremiah most faithfully describes their horrible wickedness and coming punishment. The people are cautioned against hearkening to them, since "they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord." "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that use their tongues, and say He saith." 23: 11-40; comp. 14: 13-15. 32: 31-34. The sins of her prophets,

and the iniquities of her priests, that shed the blood of the just in the midst of her, was one of the causes which poured out God's fierce anger, and kindled a fire in Zion, and devoured the foundations thereof, in the day that God destroyed Jerusalem by the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon. Lam. 4: 12-14. Zephaniah, contemporary with Jeremiah, in one place represents the prophets as light and treacherous persons, and the priests as having polluted the sanctuary, and done violence to the law. 1: 4. 3: 4. Ezekiel, the prophet of the captivity, is inspired by the Lord ere Jerusalem should be destroyed, to prophesy against the prophets of Israel "that prophesy out of their own hearts;" "foolish prophets that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing." They "seduced the people, saying peace, when there was no peace; and one built up a wall, and lo! others daubed it with untempered mortar." Both should perish: "the wall is no more, neither they that daubed it. The priests violated God's law, and profaned His holy things, and put no difference between clean and unclean, and hid their eyes from his sabbaths." 13: 2-16. 22: 24-31. And Malachi inveighs against the priesthood, even after their return from captivity, as despising God's name; offering polluted bread upon the altar, the blind, the lame, and the sick for sacrifice; and who would not shut the door, or kindle a fire for nought. The Lord would neither accept them nor their sacrifice. Mal. 1: 6-10. And the prophet sets before them repentance and destruction. 2: 1-9.

Closing the volume of the Old Testament scriptures, we next travel over a period of some 400 years to the advent of our Lord; and to those who are familiar with the history of the people of God, as given us by uninspired but credible historians, especially by Josephus, the greatest of these times, the assertion will not be questioned, that numbers of those in the priesthood, even in the high priesthood itself, knew not the Lord. What seasons of spiritual darkness did God's people pass through—what afflicting wars and persecutions, and intestine commotions, and contaminating connections with the Heathen, the Medo-Persians, the Macedo-Grecians, the Egyptians, the Syrians and the Romans, who successively ruled over them? And

what dreadful conflicts were there between contending factions for the high-priesthood; and what frequent changes in that office, and what violent and iniquitous depositions of those who held it? The greatest exhibition of piety in priests and people appears during the revolt, the struggle, and final triumph of the Maccabean princes, who have given their name to this period of the church's history. No passage in the life of any people on earth was more wonderful and glorious, or more demonstrative of the protection, the immediate protection and preserving care of Almighty God. These noble princes fought for God and their country, for conscience and liberty. The relentless persecution and cruelties of Antiochus Epiphanes forced the piety of the church into invincible action, and delivered it from gradual decay and ultimate extinction. But the light declines after the Maccabees left the stage of action, and continues so to do until our Lord himself appears.

The religious character of the ministry in the church, all the while He dwelt upon earth, is clearly and fully given. The true Israel of God were reduced to a very small remnant among the multitudes that bore that honored name. Formality, perversion and contempt of the word of God, destructive errors in doctrines and practices, wildness, vice and hypocrisy abounded. It was prophesied of our Lord, that at his coming "He should purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they might offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." Mal. 3: 3. And, verily, at His coming they needed that purification! In what portion of the word of God can there be found a more searching and comprehensive description, and a more terrible and overwhelming denunciation of wickedness under the garb of religion, and sustained, too, by official standing and influence, than in the 23rd chapter of Matthew? Against whom does our Lord array himself in his majesty and holiness? Upon whom does He bring down his fearful epithets—"Ye hypocrites!" "ye fools and blind!" "ye blind guides!" "ye serpents! ye generation of vipers?" Upon whom does He charge profession devoid of principle; a love of pre-eminence, of the applause and honor of men, to the utter neglect of the honor which cometh

from God; external decorum and sanctity, cloaking the purest and fiercest hypocrisy; covetousness, violence, uncharitableness, cruel deceit and oppression, disguised by "long prayers" and "disfigured faces," and "broad phylacteries"—a proclamation, by trumpet, of love to God, and charity to man, and respect to the divine commands in the minutest particulars, while full of uncleanness and iniquity, and bitter hatred of holiness, and the pure and accredited messengers of God? Upon whom does He charge the blood of persecution? Upon whom does He denounce the "damnation of hell?" Upon Scribes and Pharisees, some of whom "sat in Moses' seat," and held the offices of priest and high priest, and who were the spiritual instructors and guides of the people! John, 3: 1-10. Obedient to the order of God's house, and upholding the duly authorised ministers and teachers in it, our Lord commanded the people to observe and conform to their instructions; but in the same breath He warned them of their hypocrisy and wickedness, and forbade their imitation of the examples they set, and the lives they lived. He insisted upon a righteousness exceeding that of the Scribes and Pharisees, if men would enter the kingdom of heaven. Matt. 5: 20. He directed his disciples to withdraw from, and let them alone, as "blind leaders of the blind," going themselves to destruction, and leading their followers along with them. Matt. 15: 14.

The Sadducees, also, who, like the Scribes and Pharisees, numbered priests and teachers among themselves, our Lord condemned and rejected, as filled with the soul-destroying leaven of infidelity. Professing to embrace the scriptures, they explained them away, and by their philosophy sapped the foundation of faith and salvation. Matt. 16: 6-12. 22: 23. Acts, 23: 6-8.

And who were the relentless persecutors of our Lord? Who were his unjust judges and cruel murderers? Who mocked his agonies, and rejoiced in his death upon the cross? Who sealed the stone of the door of His sepulchre? And who, in full persuasion of the fact, bribed the Roman soldiers to propagate a falsehood to their own condemnation, touching the resurrection of the Son of God? These same Scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees, Priests and Chief Priests! John, 7: 32. Matthew, 26: 47, 57, 62-65. 27: 3, 20. 27: 41-43, 62-66. 28: 11-15.

Our Lord finished the work of our redemption, and ascended on high. His apostles and ministers, after the day of Pentecost, went everywhere preaching the gospel of the kingdom. Who were among the first and foremost of their persecutors and slayers? These same Pharisees and Sadduces, priests and chief priests. Acts, 4: 1-6. 7: 1. 9: 1. 22: 5. 23: 4.

But this priesthood is no more. It has found its fulfilment in the coming of our Lord, and has vanished as a shadow away. Yet in its character as a preaching, teaching and ruling order in His church, it is essential, and must endure; and it lives in the regularly called and appointed ministry of the new dispensation. What was the religious character of this ministry, both ordinary and extraordinary, while the Lord Jesus was upon earth, and after his ascension, until the close of the New Testament canon?

In our Lord's wonderful sermon, delivered in the commencement of his own ministry, and immediately after he had chosen twelve to be with him, "whom He named apostles"—Luke, 6: 13—He warns His disciples that "false prophets" would arise in His church, and commands them to beware of them, and to judge and detect them by their corrupt priests. How strong is his language? "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." And in the conclusion of the sermon He affirms, that among the number rejected as false professors in the last day, would be some who had borne high office in his church—men who had "prophesied and cast out devils, and done many wonderful works in his name"—men who were not only ordinary, but even extraordinary officers; of this latter class was Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve! Matt. 7: 15-23. John, 6: 70. "There are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last!" Luke, 13: 23-30. If the words of our Lord are carefully weighed, they certainly leave the impression upon the minds of his people, that these false prophets are to be looked for, and are to be guarded against in his church in all time to come. He foretold the coming, after his death, not only of "false prophets," but even of "false Christs," which also came to pass. Matt. 24: 5, 11, 24. There is no height of dignity, nor of office, to which the desperate wicked-

ness of the human heart may not aspire. "Lo! one as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God!" 2 Thess. 2: 4.

The teachings of the apostles correspond with these of the Master. The apostle Paul, in his farewell address to the elders of the Church of Ephesus, says: "For I know this, that after my departing, shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also, of your own-selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts, 20: 29-30. And was not his work in the Corinthian church marred by "false apostles," "deceitful workers," ministers of Satan, "transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ? And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore, it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness, whose end shall be according to their works." 2 Cor. 11: 12-15. And did he not encounter the same enemies in the churches of Galatia? They preached "another gospel." He said, let them be "accursed!" Gal. 1: 7-8. 4: 17. He seems to have such false ministers in his eye in the exhortations which he addresses to the Romans—16: 18—to the Ephesians—4: 14—and to the Colossians—2: 4-8—and he writes to Timothy—1 Tim. 4: 1—that the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times "seducing spirits" shall appear, causing some to err from the faith. And who are the "unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, whose mouths must be stopped—who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake?" Tit. 1: 10-11. The apostle Peter is very bold: "But there were false prophets among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction!" Hear his description, and his denunciation of them: Their "ways are pernicious;" "through covetousness they make merchandize" of men; "unjust;" "they walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness;" "despise government;" "presumptuous;" "self-willed;" "not afraid to speak evil of dignities;" "they count it pleasure to riot in the day time;" "spots;" "blemishes;" "sporting themselves with their own deceivings;" "eyes full of adultery

that cannot cease from sin ;" "beguiling unstable souls ;" "an heart exercised with covetous practices ;" "they have forsaken the right way ;" "have loved the wages of unrighteousness"—"wells without water ;" "clouds carried with a tempest ;" "speaking great swelling words." "Their judgment lingereth not—their damnation slumbereth not ;" "they are reserved unto the day of judgment ;" "they shall utterly perish in their corruption ;" "cursed children," "to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever !" 2 Pet. 2: 1-19. On reading this passage, the twenty-third chapter of Matthew comes up in the memory ; and the spirit and power of the master lives again in his servant. The description of these false teachers, given by the apostle Jude, is almost identical with that of the apostle Peter ; and it is, indeed, identical in some of its illustrations and expressions, and consequently partakes of the same point and power ; verses 4-16. The aged, the beloved disciple, John, closes the testimony : "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God ; because many false prophets are gone out into the world ;" and he lays down the rule by which they should be tried and proven. 1 John, 4: 1-3, comp. 2: 18 ; and 2 John, vs. 7-11. The warning of our Lord, in his sermon on the Mount—Matt. 7: 15-16—and that of the apostle Paul, delivered in person to the elders, and the exhortation of the apostle John, in his Epistle, were not lost on the church of Ephesus ; for that church was visited with false teachers, "grievous wolves," and it "tried them which say they are apostles, and are not," and "found them liars." Acts, 20: 29-30. 1 John, 4: 3. Rev. 2: 1-2. We close the Holy Scriptures. They prove to us the existence of unregenerate men in the ministry of the Church of God.

If we consult *the history of the church, from the close of the New Testament canon to our own times, that history establishes the same affecting fact.*

The period of inspiration extends from the creation to the close of the first century after the birth of our Lord, and throwing out the interval between the finishing of the Old Testament and the opening of the New, measures, according to the common chronology, some 3,700 years. If unregenerate men are found in the ministry during all

this period, it is certainly too much to expect that the church, in after ages should be free from them. Their coming and their existence in these after ages are divinely predicted. History verifies the prediction.

For the first three centuries Christianity flourished and was widely diffused, and accomplished effectual and permanent triumphs over the Jewish and the heathen world; triumphs the more extraordinary and glorious, because accomplished in the face of disadvantages, discouragements, weaknesses, oppositions, and fearful persecutions, which to the eyes of men appeared sufficient to have crushed and swept it from the earth. The great body of the people of God, through all trials, retained their integrity, and exhibited the fruits of holiness in affecting and heavenly contrast with the world that lay in wickedness around them. Yet persecutions, trials, distresses, heresies, put the piety of many to the proof, and it was found wanting. Their love waxed cold; lukewarmness manifested itself, and apostacies ensued both among ministers and people!

That, however, which perhaps more than any other cause, tended to introduce unsound men into the sacred ministry, was the change in the form of the government of the Church—gradually, indeed, advancing before the accession of Constantine, but fully developed and established during his reign—a change which fostered pride, and opened a way for the display of ambition and the exercise of power; a change which suffered religion to cloak itself under formalities, and furnished most ample means and favourable opportunities for the indulgence of the base lusts and passions, both of the flesh and of the spirit.

From the days of this “blessed Emperor,” as Eusebius calls him, the progress of the Church, at one period measurably checked, and at another greatly accelerated, is but a progress in corruption; her piety gives way to a religion of forms and of State, and her ministers degenerate into mere officials. Above four centuries after, idolatry is openly established in the two great branches into which the Church had been violently and with relentless hate divided. The “falling away,” the grand apostacy had come. The man of sin was now fully revealed. “The mystery of iniquity” reigned triumphant. Ages of

darkness rolled over the apostate Church. Ministers and people departed from the true knowledge of God. His people came out and sought refuge and repose in wildernesses, in mountain fastnesses, in secluded vallies, in dens and caves of the earth. In comparison with the nations of the apostate, they were but a remnant according to the election of grace. This remnant was pursued unto death! Bright lights were one after another extinguished, until in the sixteenth century it pleased God to descend in majesty and great glory, and to pour out his Holy Spirit, upon a great part of the kingdom of Anti-Christ; and He multiplied his called and converted ministers. They published the glad tidings of salvation, and the Reformation spread over Europe. Reformed churches are gathered, with an open Bible, and a spiritual ministry and a spiritual membership. The yoke of Anti-Christ is thrown off. The mother of abominations is cast away, and remains cast away until this day. Her ministry as a class neither are, nor can they be, in the sense of holy scripture, regenerated men, effectually and officially called. Let them alone! Let them be passed by!

Alas! for the progress of the truth, and the purity and glory of religion! The Reformation went not on unto complete perfection. In some countries it was retarded and stifled; in others clogged and fettered, and in all bound to the State. The effects have been appalling. In France, Spain and Italy, it was virtually suppressed. The reformed religion has maintained but a feeble existence in France, and allied to the State, the ministry in general appear to know little of vital godliness. In Protestant Switzerland things go better. In the Germanic States the Reformation advanced to a certain position, beyond which it has not gone. The candles are burning on the altar where Luther left them. The vast body of Protestants on the continent whom he and his noble coadjutors, under God, called into existence, have lost the ardor of their early love to the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, as the necessary and precious food of the immortal mind, together with their hearty devotion to God, and zeal in his service. The very errors left by the Reformers exist in undisturbed repose. The majority of Protestants on the continent appear to know but little of evangelical piety.

The order of their churches brings them to a profession of religion; and the forms having been observed, the reality and value of that profession are not to be questioned. The Church is an institution of the State, to a considerable extent, and men are trained and bred to it as to civil employments. It is a source of respectable revenue, and a field for the display of philosophy and learning. Indeed, philosophy and learning, in their ever-varying forms, have for a long series of years been seriously impairing the authority and influence of the Word of God over the public mind—opening an high-way to the introduction of heresies, and reducing to a very small remnant the true Israel of God. Ministers of course have been leaders in these matters. There have been, and now are, some noble exceptions among them; but with all the influence which station, talent, learning and piety, could give them, they have failed to infuse spiritual life into their brethren in the ministry, or in the membership of the churches, and have been more like stationary witnesses for the truth, than triumphant conquerors through the truth.

The reformation in the kingdom of Great Britain, by the blessing of God, has not altogether paused in its course; on the contrary, it has brought forth fruits that now gladden mankind, and it has furnished exhibitions of piety in the ministry of God, than which no brighter have been known in the history of the Church. But, as upon the continent, so in the British Isles, the connection of the Church with the State has exerted unfavorable influences upon the sacred ministry. It is, however, to be remarked, that the established churches being different in England and Scotland, indeed antagonistical in their form of government, and frequently at variance in their understanding of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, have been mutually beneficial in promoting in each other a spirit of inquiry, and an endeavor after greater purity in doctrine and practice; while the existence of large, and talented, and active, and increasing bodies of dissenters, has exerted an influence productive of the same happy results. The Lord, in mercy to the world, has kept alive spiritual religion in these Islands. *Within* the established churches, notwithstanding all their worldliness and formality, and *without*, among the dissenters, there has existed a nume-

rous body of regenerated ministers, who have adorned their high profession, and been bright and burning lights, and have carried the blessings of the gospel around the world. The breaking of the establishment, in the wonderful providence of God, of a portion of his Church, in the western hemisphere, under a freer civil and ecclesiastical constitution, has contributed in an inconceivable degree to the setting forth of Christianity and its ministry in their true light—in character not of the world, but spiritual, holy and heavenly. The great depository of evangelical religion on earth, at the present hour, is the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, as it exists in various denominations, in the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and in its dependencies, and in the United States of America; and it is in the bosom of this Church that we discover the greatest number of truly regenerated and called ministers of the gospel—ministers who above all others are doing the work assigned them by the Lord, and are filling the earth with his glory.

Without entering more minutely into the spiritual history of the Churches of Great Britain and America, for the purpose of ascertaining the existence of unregenerate ministers in their different communions, the fact may be assumed, which, indeed, no intelligent reader of the history of these churches will deny. And with the assumption of this fact, the testimony drawn from the history of the Church, from the close of the New Testament canon to our own times, is brought to a conclusion.

This article has been protracted beyond the limits which we at first assigned ourselves, although we have not filled up the outline suggested in the commencement of it. We pass over the statements and opinions of many distinguished writers, and of ministers themselves on the subject, and offer a few names of men who have entered the ministry in an unregenerate state, by way of illustration—names of the dead, the recent dead—names prominent in the Church of God, and familiar to every reader of religious history—and because familiar the best for our present purpose: The Rev. Thomas Scott, the author of the well known and best Commentary on the Scriptures in the English language, Leigh Richmond, Robert Hall, Stoddard; and West of New England, Houseman, Stew-

art, Berridge, Grimshaw, and Thomas Chalmers. We may, if circumstances permit, furnish some sketches of the religious and ministerial life of these and some other divines, with reference to the subject which we have now brought to the notice of our readers, and also resume the subject itself in future numbers of the Review.

ARTICLE III.

THE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.—NO. II.

The close of the investigation, as far as we have pursued it, left us standing before the Word of God, surrounded by facts and analogies of the most striking and terrible significance. It is now our business to examine its report on the solemn question under review. Before proceeding to the direct testimony of the Bible, we shall detain the reader for a moment to examine the effect of its testimony upon the several presumptions afforded to the subject, by certain facts within the knowledge of man.

1. In the first place, it has been seen that there is a strong presumption for the truth of a punishment for sin in the life to come, growing out of the supposition that the Divine Being was concerned in the conduct of men. This presumption will, of course, grow stronger, in proportion to the *degree* in which he is concerned. If he is concerned at all, that the regulations he has seen proper to establish should be observed according to the tenor of his will, there is a presumption amounting to a moral certainty, that any violation of those regulations will excite his displeasure. To suppose the contrary, would be to suppose God to care enough for the establishment of laws to establish them in fact, and yet to be totally indifferent whether they are observed or not. But this supposition is absurd; it would make God equally indifferent to the success or failure of his own arrangements. If there are any reasons why these rules should be established, they are equally good for the observance of them. God then must be concerned in the conduct of men, so far as to be

pleased with their compliance with the order he has established for their government, or offended with their neglect of it. Now, if he is concerned at all, the force of the presumption, growing out of the fact, will gather strength with each accession to the depth and keenness of that concern of the Divine mind. Here, then, the question arises, is God really concerned in the acts of man, and if so, to what extent, and in what degree? Here, then, the testimony of the Bible comes in to affect the issue. We have already seen the answer which natural reason gives to the question of the Divine concern in the acts of men. We have seen that every attribute of God concerned in the erection of the universe, binds him to intense interest in the conduct and destiny of each part of that universe; and that the *responsibility of man* so essentially *imposed it*, that it becomes an anomalous absurdity in human nature on the contrary supposition. The testimony of the Bible is still more explicit and overwhelming. It not only asserts that God *is* concerned in the conduct of his creature, but that he is *more deeply* concerned in *more* acts, and in *more secret and unnoticed acts*, than natural reason had ever imagined. The Bible teaches that the Divine interest in the affairs of the world, so far as it relates to material and animal nature, extends even to the fall of a sparrow, or the crushing of one solitary blade of grass. It teaches that so far as it relates to the affairs of men, it is something more than the mere interest of a providential supporter, as closely involved in the providential government of man, as of any other important portion of the animate creation. It asserts the existence of a *moral government* over man—it proclaims the existence of *moral faculties* in man answering to the moral obligations established for the regulation of these faculties. It declares man capable of right and wrong, not merely of perceiving such a distinction, but of impressing it upon his own actions. It proclaims the existence of a moral law, extending over every department of human nature, regulating the thoughts and feelings, the purpose and desires of men, not less than their words and their actions. Such is the doctrine of the Bible, as it relates to the *extent* in which God is concerned in the acts of men. But this is not all; it not only describes *the extent*, but *the degree* of that

concern. It tells us that God is concerned in the acts of men to the full degree of his regard for his own honor, as the providential and moral governor of the universe. We are informed that God has an interest in our obedience ; and that disobedience involves an attack, not merely upon his *authority* as a ruler, but upon his *honor, integrity and worthiness of regard* as a person. When the public law of the commonwealth is violated, the great injury done is the dishonor and contempt poured on the high authority of the law-giving power, together with an implied censure upon the makers of the law. In the case of rebellion against a *Divine government*, the injury done is precisely the same. Not only is the *authority* of God set at defiance, but a direct attack is made upon the wisdom, justice and benevolence of his character. When a man transgresses a law of God, he does, by that very act, proclaim that in his view the law prohibited what it was good for him to enjoy, and thus attacks its benevolence ; that this prohibition mistook what was best for him, and thus impeaches its wisdom ; and that such an unwise and unkind interference with his interests, on the part of God, was unjust, and thus reflects directly upon its justice. But such reflections upon the moral and intellectual qualities of a *law* necessarily convey a reflection upon the moral and intellectual qualities of *the law-giver himself*. Hence the doctrine of the Bible is, that God is concerned in the acts of men, and that he is *not partially* concerned in them ; but that his concern reaches not only the whole extent to which his regard for his *official authority* is concerned, but to the full extent of his regard for his *personal honor* as an intellectual and moral being. It is no trifling matter to God that his laws should be set aside by a rational being, for it implies an assault upon his own personal excellency, as well as upon his authority.

Arresting the inquiry for a moment, and examining the influence of this teaching of the Bible upon the presumption of natural reason, we are forced to the conclusion that the original presumption expands into absolute certainty. The presumption is, that if God is interested at all in the acts of men, he must feel and express displeasure when their acts are offensive. But, if this Divine concern actually reaches to the utmost limit of the activity of men,

and to a degree involving the sanctity of both his *personal* and *official* character, the conclusion is resistless, that he must, and will, both *feel and express* his displeasure when the acts of men are wrong: He must *feel* it, for such action could not fail to excite his displeasure; else we must suppose him equally pleased with both good and evil—with what is naturally more pleasing, as with what is naturally less pleasing—a supposition at once blasphemous and absurd. He must also *express* it; for, if it is becoming and necessary that his displeasure should be excited by sin, it is equally becoming and necessary that he should express it in a suitable way; or else we must allow it to be becoming in God to entertain certain views, which it would be an offence to his own moral nature to express. The doctrine of the Bible about the divine concern in the acts of man, not only confirms the presumptions of reason, but renders the inference absolutely inevitable, that he must express his displeasure when men sin against his laws. To express his displeasure is only another name for the infliction of punishment. Unless the offenders are made to *feel* this displeasure, it is to them as if it did not exist; and therefore every reason that calls for its existence in the mind of God, demands its expression upon those who have enkindled it.

2. But again: We have seen a powerful presumption in favor of the doctrine of future punishment, springing from the invariable immediate or ultimate sequence of suffering upon sin. The presumption is that, as sin produces misery in this world, it will *continue* to produce it in the world to come; on the supposition that man continues to sin, and that man will be miserable just as long as he sins. The presumption is equally strong, from the fact, upon *the duration*, as well as *the existence* of future misery: it indicates that if man continues to sin in the future state, he will not only be *miserable*, but, supposing him to sin forever, that his misery will be *eternal*. The doctrine of the Bible adds prodigiously to the force of this presumption. It teaches that sin is invariably, sooner or later, the parent of sorrow; and that this connection between guilt and misery is not only *morally just*, but under certain aspects of the subject *physically inevitable*. The facts of human life demonstrate this inevitable con-

nection between the violation of the laws of nature, as some are zealous to term them, and the occurrence of physical suffering. But the main service which the Bible renders to the presumptive argument, based upon such facts, consists in the annihilation of the inference from a portion of these facts, which is conceived by some to destroy the force of the presumption upon the doctrine of future misery. It is said, it is true that sin produces suffering; but it is also true that there is suffering in the world, where there can be no overt act of sin, as in the case of infants and idiots; and therefore there is no such invariable connection between suffering and sin as would warrant the presumption in dispute; or at any rate that suffering is no infallible index of the prior existence of sin. Before we allude to the testimony of the Bible on this point in the controversy, we will simply call attention to the fact, that while the fact is allowed as stated, that those suffer who cannot sin by overt acts, yet it *does not disprove the other fact, that sin will invariably produce sorrow*, and consequently *cannot affect the logical inferences springing out of it*. It may be admitted that suffering is *no infallible* indication of the prior existence of sin, but it will not follow that sin will not invariably produce suffering. It may be true that there may be suffering where there has been and can be no overt act of sin; but if it be true that where *there is sin* suffering will inevitably follow, it would still hold good that if man sins in eternity he will be miserable in eternity. Although it is allowed, for the sake of the argument, to the full extent of the significance claimed for it, that man may *suffer without sinning*, yet, if it be admitted that *he cannot sin without suffering*, the argument still presses irresistibly to the inference, that if he *sin* in eternity he will be *unhappy* in eternity. Allowing *the fact* to be all it is claimed to be, it will not disturb the existence of *another fact* or the argument that grows out of it.

But the Bible comes in to the rescue, affirms in its fullest extent that the existence of suffering is an invariable and infallible indication of the prior existence of guilt chargeable upon the individual, and explains that even in the case of those who have done and can do no act involving *moral* wrong, the infliction of pain necessarily sup-

poses the previous existence of a *legal* guilt *justly* chargeable upon them. In other words, it informs us that death, and all other forms of physical evil befall infants, who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, because the great father of the race acted in their individual behalf, and that they are *justly* liable for the acts of their personal representative. *Moral* guilt can only arise under the action of the *moral* or *voluntary* powers of the soul, and necessarily pre-supposes the full responsibility of the agent, arising from the matured powers of physical nature. But *legal* guilt, or the *just liability* of a person for the acts of another acting in his behalf, can be sustained by those who yield no consent to the act of the representative, and thus become *morally* responsible on their own part. *Moral* guilt, then, cannot attach to the persons of infants or idiots, who have not the exercise of the voluntary and rational powers necessary to the creation of this form of responsibility, under the violation of law. But *legal* guilt may as justly and properly attach to them as to any other persons. This great doctrine of revelation annihilates the plea put in bar of the presumption from the connection between sin and suffering. So far from weakening, the plea adds powerfully to the force of the presumption; for it shows that this connection between sin and sorrow is so absolute, that it exists even in those cases where *no* individual act of moral wrong is committed, and where the only guilt that challenges the penalties of law is the imputed guilt of a representative wrong.

But the force of the scripture testimony, on the connection between sin and suffering, is not yet exhausted. The Bible not only states that there is such a connection, and proclaims its justice and inflexibility, but it affirms the *proper penal nature* of the connection; or, in other words, declares that *suffering* follows *sin*, as its *punishment*. Not that the Bible affirms all suffering to be *penal*, and *nothing else*. It allows the existence of *disciplinary* suffering, as well as *penal* suffering proper. All that it is necessary for us to show is, that the great doctrine of the Bible is the existence of a *penal suffering for sin*. It may be that there are other forms of pain, acting simply for their own specific purposes, or rather, speaking with

more precision, as adjuncts to a *penal infliction proper*; but it is all that is necessary to the argument before us to establish the existence of a *penal infliction* for sin. It is absolutely necessary to the existence of the theories of universalism, to deny the existence of any other species of pain but *disciplinary* suffering. Universalism denies that the sufferings of men are, in any true sense, *punishments* for their sins, but only *disciplinary remedies* for their faults. It dare not allow that any *punishment* is due to any crime, however enormous; because so soon as it is admitted to be *just to inflict punishment* at any time, or for any offence, the whole controversy ceases to be a question of *material justice*, and becomes a *mere question of degree*. If this allowance is made, the only debate that can arise will be on the question, *how much punishment* is just—not on the question whether *any punishment* is just.

The question to be settled is simply whether the suffering produced by sin is ever properly its *punishment*, or not. We preface this inquiry by alluding again to the fact, that no matter whether the affirmative of the question can be established or not, yet if sin always produces suffering sooner or later, in some form or another, the argument still holds that if men sin in eternity they will suffer in eternity. But to the inquiry itself:

There is an instinctive demand by the human soul, when sitting in judgment upon the infliction of pain, that *there should be some good reason for it*. The violence done to the instinctive desire of happiness, by the infliction of pain, immediately sets an inquiry afoot, for reasons to *justify it*. Unless there is some just and sufficient cause for it, the moral sense of the soul refuses to allow it to be anything else than an act of arbitrary power, unsupported by any moral ground. This instinctive demand of the moral constitution of man, is tacitly allowed to be entitled to an answer by every system of religious speculation. If we are asked to explain this demand, we can only say that it is an instinctive requirement of the moral sense of the soul; the mind judges an infliction of pain, *without any reason for it*, to be *wrong*, just as the understanding perceives a relation between two and two making four as the result of a combination. The system of the Univer-

salist just as freely recognises this demand of this intelligence within us, as any other denominational creed on earth. Now, various reasons may be presented in answer to this demand, as justifying the infliction of pain. A *physical necessity*, in order to the remedy or prevention of other and higher ills, is the grand plea of justification urged by the supporters of the notion of *disciplinary* suffering. As for example, a man may have his arm shattered by an accident, and it is absolutely necessary to inflict the additional pain of amputation, to save his life. This *necessity justifies* the infliction—or, in other words, this *disciplinary, or remedial suffering*, proceeds, by the admission of its own advocates, upon the *prior consideration of justice* in its infliction, thus *fully admitting the necessity of a moral ground for the infliction of physical suffering*. If the necessity calls for it, it is *just* to inflict it; but if there is no necessity for it, the infliction is obviously unjust. Now, the plea of the Universalist upon this admitted necessity for a *moral ground* of the infliction is, that *there is such a necessity in the constitution of man*, justifying the infliction of the suffering which he is obliged to admit is actually in existence. He does not allow that there is any such idea as that man *deserves*, in the proper sense of that word, the suffering he feels; but that there is a *necessity* in his constitution—a necessity which he does not condescend to explain—which, however, *justifies* the infliction of physical suffering. It will be observed that this necessity of the physical constitution of man, even when most absolute and most distant from any *moral* character of its own, as composing the force with which it demands the infliction of pain, still implies a *moral idea*; that is, the infliction is said to be *justified* by this absolute physical necessity.

What a singular triumph of the moral instincts of the soul, over those who were striving, in the definition of their creed, to shut out the idea of *moral* responsibility, by establishing an absolute physical necessity in its place! This sublime necessity itself reigning over human nature supremely, demanding all sorts and degrees of physical pain upon it, is itself but the servant of a higher moral idea; it comes forward in all its royal grandeur, to *justify* the infliction of pain, before the bar of the ruling moral

instincts of the soul ! Upon this supposition of a singular and inexplicable physical necessity in the nature of man, the advocate of disciplinary suffering leaves his acceptance of that doctrine.

But the question is by no means at end ; it has a much deeper significance. *Why is the human constitution subjected to such a necessity as that alleged to exist by the advocate of disciplinary suffering ?* Could this *physical necessity itself exist*, without moral reasons to justify its existence. The moral instincts of the soul refuse to be satisfied, without moral reasons for a dispensation so awful. It is a dreadful thing for a man to be laid under an inexorable necessity of enduring agonies of pain, as a remedial or preventive agency against other and greater evils. Now, *why* is man subjected to such a necessity as this ? The advocate of disciplinary suffering is bound to answer. *There must be some just ground* for such a necessity, or *it is unjust*. He says it is just to inflict remedial pain, on the ground of this alleged necessity ; *but why are we subjected to such a necessity ?* Where is the moral ground of this necessity, which affords so happy a location for the establishment of the supremacy of physical pain over the happiness of man ? We demand the *original moral foundation* of this whole astonishing superstructure of human agony ! But there is no answer from the opposers of the doctrine of *punishment for sin* ; the question does not admit of an answer in consistency with their views. In truth there is just as much of a demand for the moral reasons justifying this *necessity for physical suffering*, as there was for the justification of *physical suffering itself*. The advocate of disciplinary suffering merely pushes the difficulty one step back ; and in reply to our demand for an explanation of the difficulty, merely answers with a restatement of the difficulty in another form !

It has been seen that moral instincts of human nature refuse to be satisfied without *some good reason* for the infliction of suffering—making it just. Nothing will satisfy the soul but an ample moral reason. The very necessity alleged to justify suffering, itself needs to be justified ; thus forcing us back upon the instinctive judgment of the moral sense, *that suffering can only be justly inflicted as a*

retribution for sin, as a penal evil. Sin arises from the act of the voluntary powers of the soul making a breach in the laws of God. *Punishment*, or physical suffering, as a *penal evil*, is a relative term, holding relation to sin. A man cannot be said to be *punished*, except in a derived and secondary sense, *except for sin*, with which he may be either charged on moral or legal grounds, according as the evil communicating the guilt was his personal act or the act of his agent, for which he is justly held responsible. The moral instincts of the soul demand a *reason* why suffering should be inflicted; they demand a *moral* reason, and refuse to be satisfied unless it can be shown that some violation of moral law lies at the bottom. But the clear establishment of such a reason does satisfy the moral instincts of the soul; and the soul rests upon the assurance that the mysterious dispensation is just. In other words *the violation* of moral law, the contempt of divine authority, is presented to the soul as an ample reason why suffering should be inflicted. No mere physical necessity for suffering will ever satisfy the soul; that very necessity itself is a calamity of such magnitude, as could only be justified as a penal consequence of some moral wrong. Nothing else will do; but as soon as suffering is inflicted for the violation of law, the soul recognises it as the *natural answer of the moral sense to moral evil*. Pain, when thus inflicted, is *strictly penal*; and whenever a violation of law loses the elements that make it *criminal*, it ceases to be a subject for *penal inflictions*. Or in other terms, the foundation of *penal evil* is laid in the *moral* nature of the acts which occasion it. There is a distinction in things which we call *right* and *wrong*. There is a distinction in things which we call *true* and *false*. The natural answer of the soul, when a distinction between *true* and *false* is presented to its notice, is to *believe* the one and *discredit* the other. The natural answer of the soul, when a distinction of *right* and *wrong* is placed before it, is to *approve* the one and *censure* the other. Now, whenever the soul adjudges the *moral* nature of an act to be so offensive as to find its only natural and equitable answer in physical suffering, such suffering is *penal*; it is the punishment of sin. When man is *punished* he is made to suffer, not for his benefit, but because the malign

nature of his conduct cannot find any other equitable judgment upon its real merits from the moral instincts of the soul. He is made to suffer simply because he has done *wrong*; and this is the only reason which will satisfy the demands of the moral judgment of the soul. He suffers because he *deserves* it—because it is *just*—because his sin has imputed to him a guilt, which demands the infliction of physical suffering, under penalty of a violation of *justice*.

From this whole argument the inference is irresistible that *all suffering is in reality penal*, and that *disciplinary suffering* is nothing more than a *secondary idea* based upon the *penal* nature of pain. Or, in other terms, the *discipline* of the soul, which is admitted to be sometimes sought in the infliction of pain, is only a *secondary and collateral end*; which the *mere grace* of the Judge has determined to attain by means of the suffering which he is justified in inflicting, by reason of the moral delinquencies chargeable upon the sufferer. Why should man need this discipline? There can be only two conceivable reasons for it: either there must have been a physical necessity impressed upon the original constitution of his nature, according to the theory just passed in review, or man must have disturbed the original order of his constitution, and introduced faults into his nature, which require the sharp remedy of pain to remove them. But we have already seen that no such physical necessity could have been incorporated in the human constitution, without a moral reason for it. The establishment of any such necessity in the nature of man, prior to any conception of his voluntary action deserving such a calamity, is a direct reflection upon the integrity of the creator. Man could only have been subjected to a necessity for suffering *as a penal evil*, as an equitable answer to the enormity of his own transgressions. He could only have been exposed to a necessity for *disciplinary* suffering, as a *penal* consequence of his own iniquity. *Disciplinary suffering*, then, necessarily implies the prior existence of *penal* suffering as *the only equitable ground* for its own support. For example: there is a man who has just experienced what is usually termed an accidental injury. It may have been the design of a kind Providence to make it the

means of awakening his mind to a sense of religion and of saving his soul. So far as the pain he endures looks to this end, it is strictly *disciplinary*. But now the question arises, what is the good and valid reason which made it *right* to seek an end so desirable, by a means so terrible? Why was it *necessary* to seek the benefit of individual, at the expense of so much agony and distress? To this question the only satisfactory answer must be, the original infliction of the sorrow was one of a series of penal evils which the providence of God was justified in inflicting; and proceeding upon the sins of the sufferer, as the moral ground of its infliction, this pain is, by the mercy of the Judge, diverted to a collateral end, and made to subserve the benefit of the transgressor. *Disciplinary* suffering is the result of *mere mercy*; using the inflictions of *justice* to accomplish the benefit of the sinner. This is the only ground upon which it can be justified. The moral instincts of human nature refuse to allow the equity of the infliction of pain, except as an appropriate answer to the moral evil of sin. No sorrow can be justly inflicted upon a man, even for his own benefit, except it would have been *originally just*; or that, apart from all idea of personal benefit to the individual, and prior to any such conception, it would have been just to inflict it upon him. It is a contradiction in terms, to speak of doing a man good by violating his rights and outraging the justice which guards him. Disciplinary suffering is really only one item in a great series of penal evils, diverted from its original end, or rather used in the accomplishment of its original end as a penal evil, for the accomplishment of another and collateral end. It is merely an *adjunct* of *penal* evil, and necessarily implies it—from which we learn that the great doctrine of Universalism on the nature of physical evil does itself logically and necessarily imply the *original penal nature* of all kinds of suffering.

The Bible fully recognises this doctrine of physical evil as *originally penal*, and only *incidentally disciplinary*, if disciplinary at all. Men are made to suffer, not merely for their benefit, but because it is *just* to punish. The very term *punishment*, implies that the pain is really punitive, and not merely disciplinary. The Bible perpetual-

ly asserts that God punishes sin because it is wrong,—because it is such an outrage upon ideas higher and more sacred than the comfort of a corrupt creature, that absolute injustice would be done, unless it were visited by a calamity equal to its enormity. Man is punished not for his own benefit, but to vindicate the honor of God which he has set at naught, and meet the eternal claims of justice which proclaims it right that the evil doer should be punished. *I will punish you according to the fruit of your doings, saith the Lord. I will punish you for your iniquities. It is an iniquity to be punished by Judges. Thou hast punished less than iniquities deserved. God layeth the punishment of iniquity for children. The punishment of thine iniquity is accomplished. The punishment of my people is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom. They shall bear the punishment of their iniquity. He shall have punishment, in whom is sin.* These passages, selected at random, in different parts of the scriptures, need no commentary. They establish it as the unequivocal doctrine of the Bible, that suffering is inflicted upon man for his sins, not for his benefit—as the natural reply of *justice* to the *enormity of moral evil*. Indeed, if the principle of all human governments, in the infliction of the penal sanctions of law, is correct; if a criminal is punished, not for his own benefit, but for the benefit of society, in the way of justice for his crime; if there be any manner of justice in the connection between sin and suffering, however inflicted, the theories of Universalism are blown into atoms. Admit this, and the whole question is changed; and we are no longer left to inquire whether it be just to inflict *any punishment*, but *only how much* punishment is just.

3. But the Bible influences the decision of this great question to an absolute degree, by another and a distinct form of evidence. We have already seen that the unhappiness of man is, in an immense degree occasioned by his own depraved and ungovernable passions. These causes of his misery being attached to his own existence, forming a part of his conscious being, must be removed, or they will inevitably secure the wretchedness of man in eternity, as they have done in time. There need be no fiercer or real hell, than to rouse the evil passions of the

soul, strip them of all possibility of gratification, and then turn their savage energies in upon themselves. If, then, man is thus made wretched by causes essentially attached to his own moral nature, it follows that he will be made miserable as long as they continue to operate, and that some tremendous change must pass upon human nature before it can be happy anywhere, or under any circumstances. This change in the moral nature God distinctly offers to effect in this world by the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit ; but he distinctly declares that the determination of this great question must be effected in this world by an acceptance or rejection of the offered intervention of Jesus Christ. Death settles all debate upon the issue ; as *the tree falls, so it must lie forever* ; and when the soul passes into the new and fearful existence that lies beyond this present life, its fates are fixed. There is a fearful announcement sounding sharply from the last chapter of the revelation from heaven : *He that is filthy, let him be filthy still ; he that is unjust, let him be unjust still.* Such is the stern and melancholy enunciation that proclaims the hopelessness of all endeavors after holiness and happiness, when the new era shall have begun, and the countless myriads of human souls have been launched upon its mighty and boundless cycles. If men refuse the sanctifying power of the gospel, kindly pressed upon their acceptance in this life, God tells them plainly, no change shall be wrought in them hereafter ; and then the consequences are inevitable. The soul will be enveloped in the fury of all its own unquenchable desires after happiness, turned upon each other, and burning more and more fiercely from one degree of anguish to another, forever and forever.

4. Once more : The Bible doctrine on the nature of sin implies essentially the doctrine of future punishment.—It may be stated with the utmost confidence that one of the great causes of the prevalence of the theories of modern Universalism, may be found in defective views of the evil of sin. It is perfectly certain, unless the mind can see some just proportion between the offence and the penalty, all the moral sensibilities of human nature rise in arms against the equity of the infliction. But when such a proportion is actually discovered—when it is perceived that

there is ample reason for the infliction—when the true nature of the offence is perceived, all the agitations of a rebellious moral judgment are subdued, and the soul reposes on the deep conviction that, terrible as may be the infliction, it is *just*. It would be well, then, for all who are tinctured with a heresy so destructive, to inquire whether it is not caused by an imperfect apprehension of the nature of sin, on their part; by a diseased condition of their moral sense, impairing the accuracy of its perceptions, and not, as they imagine, by its superior depth and delicacy of perception. If they are willing to accept the testimony of God, as to the true nature of sin, the question is susceptible of a speedy and effectual settlement. God has proclaimed in innumerable forms that sin is an infinite evil. The exposition and punishment of the guilt it involves, seem to be one of the grand objects of the word and providence of the Almighty. He has expressed his abhorrence of it by every variety and degree of individual and national suffering. Adam sinned in Eden, and God drove him weeping and groaning from Paradise, and sent death with the whole train of physical evils, to prey upon the remotest generations of the race. The Antediluvians sinned, and their dying shrieks were silenced by the rush of the mighty waters. Sodom sinned, and in a tempest of flame its guilty citizens went down to fiercer and more intolerable agonies, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Now, if sin really appears to the mind of God, as presenting a just occasion for such displays of His power, is it becoming in finite intellects, blinded by a participation in its enormities, and made stubborn in their opposition by the most tremendous of all prejudices, to rejudge the judgments of Jehovah, and impugn both their equity and their correctness. The intrinsic evil of sin is a mystery to the natural mind. For the sake of disembarassing the question, let us suppose that it is not true that sin is what the Bible represents it to be, in the malignity of its moral nature. Now, let us make the supposition that there is *a thing* which is an insult to God, an injury to his government, of incalculable magnitude, a thing so malignant in its own nature as actually to merit, as the only possible expression of a *just* judgment on its real elements, the infliction of the most terrible calamities: let it be supposed

that this thing is, in its own nature, utterly incompatible with the peace and purity of the universe—that it tends to the very extinction of the government and life of God himself, and that it embraces all the possible elements of malignity and abomination: now, let the moral judgments of the soul pass upon what is proper to be done in order to let this malign enemy of all good, receive what is justly answerable to its own nature. Is it *just* that any expression of hatred and opposition should be made to it, or is it not? If it *is just*, then the question before us is settled by the admission that it is just that an evil so malignant should receive a corresponding expression of condemnation. If *it is not just*, we are forced upon the absurdity that it is not just to condemn that which in its nature possesses every element upon which the idea of condemnation could be, and ought to be, based. It is an instinctive judgment of the mind, that it is just to condemn that which is *evil*. To deny it, is to assert the absurdity that it is not just to do that which is worthy of being done; or in other words, that it is unjust to form a judgment which answers accurately to the true nature of the thing in judgment.

Now, if sin be an evil at all, it *deserves* condemnation; and any judgment that awards it, only answers to its true nature. If it be an evil of great magnitude, it will *deserve a corresponding degree* of condemnation; so that we learn the only rule by which to measure the real equity of any alleged sentence of condemnation upon sin, is the intrinsic demerit of sin in itself. What, then, is the real demerit of sin? Sin is the violation of law, and its demerit must necessarily be measured by the obligations to obey it. This obligation, in the case of a violation of *divine* law, may be separated into the various elements that compose it, and we might proceed to consider that part of the obligation to obedience in the *excellency* of the law itself, in the *authority* of the law-giver, in its *adaptation* to the nature of man, and its indispensability to his happiness. But this is unnecessary; it would only protract the discussion to a useless extent. Combining all the various elements of the obligation into one, we have presented before us, as the true test of all the demerit of sin, *the obligation not to commit it*. This is the rule by

which all demerit is properly to be judged. In order to make the argument as comprehensive of particulars as possible, let us assume the broadest and most comprehensive ideas of *duty* on the one side, and *sin* upon the other. The summary of the moral law given by Christ, places the whole series of duties obligatory upon man, under the general term *love*. To love God is the sum of the duties of man to his maker and his neighbor. Since the demerit of sin consists in the violation of law, the extent of its demerit will be measured by the force of the obligation to obey it. What, then, is the obligation of man to the law of God, or why is he bound to love his maker? The answer is brief: he is bound to love God, because of the excellencies of his nature. There is an instinctive demand upon the moral judgment of the soul to approve what is worthy of approval. We always feel bound to love a good man, more bound to love a better man, and most bound to love where most moral excellence is displayed. The natural and equitable answer of the moral sense to any degree of excellence presented to its notice, is to approve it; and any refusal to do it indicates a perversion of its office that involves guilt. We always condemn the man who refuses to do justice to excellence. Now, if the excellency of the divine character afford a legitimate ground of obligation upon the affections of man, it follows that the *strength* of the obligation will be measured by the *degree* of that excellency. But the excellency of the divine nature is absolutely infinite; and therefore the obligation it creates, expands with its expansion, and is absolutely *infinite* in force. The conclusion then follows with irresistible power. Since the demerit of an act is to be measured by the obligation that governs it, it follows that the violation of an infinite obligation involves infinite demerit. From this conclusion we are led to another. If the proper nature of punishment, as distinguished from other forms of physical evil, is determined by the demerit of moral and responsible action, we are forced to concede that the equity of the *eternal* punishment threatened in the scriptures is susceptible of the most rigid logical demonstration. If it is just to inflict pain because *wrong* has been done, it is just to inflict a degree of suffering answering to the true demerit of the wrong. If sin, as the

violation of an infinite obligation, is an infinite evil, it deserves an *infinite* punishment; and the threatenings of the Word of God stand justified by the most obvious suggestions of reason.

If may be objected to this doctrine that it necessarily involves all the intelligent creation in sin. It may be said that the accountable creation are bound by an infinite obligation; that finite creatures cannot fulfil infinite obligations; and that therefore every creature of God, subject to his moral government, is, by the necessity of his own nature, a rebel against God, and a defaulter in duty. How can a finite creature fulfil an infinite obligation? How can an angel love God to the extent of his loveliness, and of course to the extent of the obligation to love him? *If he can*, then the absurdity is proclaimed, that a creature of only a *finite capacity of affection* can, and does, exert an *infinite affection*. *If he cannot*, then does he not fail of his duty, and become guilty of sin, inasmuch as he meets an infinite obligation with a finite payment? for if *infinitely bound* and only *finitely capable*, does not the surplus of obligation over actual duty performed remain unmet and dishonored? This is the only plausible objection which we have ever conceived to be applicable to the clear and convincing logic of the common argument in defence of the equity of an infinite punishment for sin. But it is easy to display the fallacy of the position. It is true that the creatures of God are bound by an infinite obligation; and it is true that creatures of finite capacities of affection cannot exert infinite affections; but the conclusion does not follow that all his creatures are defaulters in duty by a necessity of nature. There is a broad distinction between an *infinite obligation* of affection, and an obligation to an *infinite affection*. A creature may be *infinitely bound* to do a *finite thing*. The *force* of the obligation is not the necessary measure of the *quantity* of obedience. God may impose an infinite obligation upon a man not to eat an apple, and the guilt of a violation of the order would be measured by the obligation to obey, not by the intrinsic evil of the act forbidden—simply because it has no intrinsic evil, and can only become evil by being the occasion of violating a moral condition attached to it. This is a great mistake men generally make in es-

timating the true demerit of their acts before God; they look merely to the act itself, and never dream of considering the true measure of its iniquity—the obligation not to do it. It may be that the act itself may involve no guilt; it may possess no intrinsic evil communicating guilt to the actor; but if prohibited by the command of God, its commission involves all the guilt measured by a contempt of divine authority. The demerit of any act must be measured by the obligation that controls it; it makes no difference whether that obligation may spring from the intrinsic nature of the act itself, or from the arbitrary authority of God, or its relations to the welfare of man, or from all these together. From *whatever source* the obligation may spring, or how many separate elements may compose it, it is the natural and proper measurement of all moral evil. The conclusion from the whole of this protracted view of the subject is two-fold: first that *some* punishment is just, and second, that an *infinite* punishment can only answer to the just and natural demerit of sin.

5. In immediate connection with this argument, we present another consideration of equally commanding import. The doctrine of the Bible, about the nature and requirements of the *justice* of God, necessarily implies a *future* state of punishment. "Truth," says the celebrated John Milton, "truth is but justice in our knowledge, as justice is but truth in our practice." This is only another mode of saying that the judgments of impartial justice must answer to the nature of the case in view, and that the justice of God absolutely binds him to measure his decision according to the true import of the facts before him. To deny this proposition is to assert the blasphemy that it would be lawful for God to express judgments *not* answering to the facts in the case, a supposition which involves a direct attack upon the integrity of his character, and as such is wholly inadmissible. In other words, the honor of God, the integrity of his nature, the inflexible claims of his own eternal and essential attributes, absolutely demand that all his decisions should be fitted to the exact nature of the fact that solicits the judgments of his mind. He is left no option; he is bound by the essential elements of his divinity to be true to the

facts in the formation of his judgments. If the thing be good, he is bound by his justice to approve it. If it is invested with any *degrees* of excellence, his decision must be fitted to the precise claim of each successive development of the excellency, and he must approve that most in which there is most to be approved, and approve that least in which there is the least to be approved. If the thing be *evil*, he is equally bound to condemn it; and he is bound to measure the degree of this condemnation by the *degree* of evil in the thing condemned. If the thing be an object of pity, the natural answer of the eternal mind towards it will be the indulgence of comparison. If the thing be a natural object of complacency and delight, he will indulge towards it the sentiments it naturally demands. But, if the nature of the thing in judgment be such as to naturally demand the condemnation of his mind, he will condemn it, and condemn it by just that peculiar expression of his disapproval which naturally answers to the true nature of the thing itself. Now, let us return again to the supposition, that there is a thing in the universe to which the only natural answer, fitting equitably to the true elements of its nature, is the *infliction of suffering*. Let us suppose that there is no room for the indulgence of pity towards it; but that to the malignant elements of the object, the only possible equitable answer could be the infliction of an awful *degree* of physical pain. Let us suppose that the attachment of this evil to man did not make him an object of *pity*, but *blame*; that it imputed guilt; that its fatal touch rendered every object of its contact justly the subject of odium, and justly the object of the inflictions of physical suffering. When the supposition is complete, we at once perceive that God is absolutely bound to base his judgments upon the true nature of the evil, and to inflict that physical suffering which the supposition makes the only natural and equitable answer to its true demerits. He would be just as much bound, and for the same general reasons, to visit such an evil with its natural answer, as he would be to render a judgment of approval upon that which deserved to be approved, or of blessing upon that which deserves to be blessed. Now, we have just seen that there is a distinction between right and wrong, which the mind receives

and maintains with absolute authority. We have seen that the natural answer of the mind, to that which is *right*, is to *approve* it; and that the natural answer to that which is wrong, is to condemn it. We have seen that *when the expression of this condemnatory sentence, upon the true nature of wrong, took the form of physical suffering, that this suffering was penal*, as distinguished from other actual and conceivable forms of which physical pain was susceptible in a secondary and collateral sense. We have also seen that the only natural and equitable answer of the moral judgments of the mind to the true evil of sin, is the *infliction of pain*. The conclusion from the whole is inevitable. If the justice of God binds him to be true to the nature of the facts before him for adjudication, and if the only equitable answer to the intrinsic evil of sin is the expression of a condemnatory sentence, in the form of physical suffering, it is an irresistible inference that *He must punish men for their sins*—that He has no option left him—and that He is bound by His own immutable attributes to visit sin with that which answers equitably to the true malignity of its nature. If sin were no evil, God could not condemn it. If it were only a physical toil, rendering man properly the object of pity, God would fit his judgments to the facts, and indulge a fully answerable degree of compassion towards it. But let it be remembered that the Bible represents sin as a *moral evil*—as a thing *naturally odious, and deserving of condemnation*—as imputing *guilt*—as rendering man *not properly* the subject of *pity*, in a primary sense, but *the object of moral aversion* and the infliction of physical suffering. If this be the true nature of sin, God is bound to punish it. He is just as much bound to do justice to sin, as to do justice to virtue, and for the same high and inexorable reason. So far as man is unhappy, God will pity him; so far as he is possessed of any degree of excellence, God will regard him; but the fact that man is miserable, and the fact that he has certain degrees of excellence in the composition of his being, do not disturb the independent and equally unquestionable fact that *he is guilty; and as such God must punish him*.

6. But the testimony of the Bible on this great subject is not yet exhausted. There are certain facts in the histo-

ry of man, which bear with strong significancy on the two doctrines of the immortality of the soul, and a state of rewards and punishments in the coming dispensation of the soul. These facts are fully recognised by the Bible, and are explained in their moral bearings upon its pages. We allude to the afflictions of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked, in the present life—facts which are so common in occurrence, and so singular in their nature, as to have attracted universal attention from observant men in every age. The bearing of these facts upon the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the existence of a future state of punishments and rewards, is perfectly obvious. In spite of all the attempts of a corrupt philosophy, to discredit the existence or obscure the dictates of a moral element in human nature, there is a power in the human soul which refuses to admit that there is no distinction between *right* and *wrong*. There is an involuntary and necessary perception of a quality in *wrong* which calls for condemnation, and a quality in *right* which calls for approval. The moral instincts of the human soul utterly rebel against the attempt to erase this distinction, and place both upon the same platform. If there is a distinction between them at all, it is a violation of justice and truth to award the same sentence upon both, and upon those who are severally concerned in them. There is a flash of intuitive perception bursting through all the mists and mazes of skeptical metaphysics, which proclaims it as the deepest and most resistless judgment of the moral sense of the soul, that a difference should be made between the righteous and the wicked, and that the one should be rewarded, and the other should suffer. *This great fact is fully admitted* by the opposers of the doctrine of future punishment, whenever the exigencies of controversy force them to show that the *wicked suffer more in this life than the righteous are ever made to endure*. Allowing the fact, the admission on their part involves the further admission *that it is just and right* that the wicked should suffer more. This admission is fatal to their theories, for it changes the whole aspect of the question, from a question of material justice to a mere question of degree. *Why should the wicked suffer more in this life than the righteous? Why is it just* that such

an arrangement should have been ordained? It is simply because the soul recognises a *difference in the moral character* of the two classes, which forms the ground for this *just* difference, in allotting the arrangements of Providence towards them. This fully allows that a *moral distinction* is a legitimate ground for a difference in these allotments, that *moral evil* deserves to be punished, and that moral excellence deserves to be rewarded. If, therefore, moral evil deserves to be punished at all, it deserves to be punished to any degree answering to the degree of that element in it that justifies punishment at all. If moral evil is a legitimate ground of distinction between the allotments of men, it will justify a *degree of difference* in these allotments, answerable to its own nature. The admissions of the Universalist himself logically involve the whole doctrine of future punishment in the *essential equity* of its infliction.

If this great and involuntary decision of the moral instincts of the soul, upon the essential justice of making a difference between the righteous and the wicked, is correct, the fact bears powerfully upon the question of the existence of the soul in a future state of punishment or rewards. It is certain the wicked are often prosperous in this world, and that the righteous are often overwhelmed with affliction. This state of affairs the soul refuses to allow to be just; and if ever justice is to be done at all, those distinctions which fail to be drawn in time must be drawn in eternity. It is vain to argue that men always suffer in proportion to their wickedness in this life; for it is notorious that constant repetition of crime renders the mind less and less sensitive to its guilt, and consequently less sensitive to the retributive pains of conscience. There is no one fact in the moral experience of mankind, more certain than that—and it settles the question; it proves beyond a doubt that the distinctions in suffering, demanded by the moral instincts of human nature, are not drawn in time, and if drawn at all must be drawn in eternity..

The Bible fully accepts this instinctive recognition of a distinction between right and wrong, as justifying a difference in the allotments of those respectively tinctured with these opposite elements of morality. It not only accepts the recognition, but restates it in stronger and broad-

er terms. It admits that the difficulty created by the moral bearing of the difference in the allotments of the good and bad man, in their life, is a difficulty which can only be explained by the expectation of a future state of existence, where the real distinction between virtue and vice shall be fully admitted and sustained as equitable and eternal. *The brutish man knoweth not, neither doth the fool understand this: when the wicked spring as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be destroyed forever. But as for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked. For there are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm. They are not in trouble, as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. Behold these are the ungodly, who prosper in the world; they increase in riches. Verily, I have cleansed mine heart in vain, and washed mine hands in innocency. For all the day long have I been plagued, and chastened every morning. If I say I will speak thus, behold I should offend against the generation of thy children. When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me, until I went into the sanctuary of God; then understood I their end. Surely thou didst set them in slippery places; thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation as in a moment? they are utterly consumed with terrors. As a dream when one awaketh, so, O Lord, when thou awakest, thou shalt despise their image.** The stern and melancholy music of that inimitable paragraph sounds a startling discord to the dreamy hallelujahs of modern Universalism. The passage implies, as its logical foundation, the essential difference between right and wrong; affirms that this distinction is a just ground for establishing a distinction in the allotments of the moral government of God; admits that this distinction is not fully drawn in this life, and deliberately asserts that it ought to be, and will be, displayed in the time when God shall awake to judgment.

7. But the testimony of the Bible assumes another distinct and striking form, in affirming the truth of the doctrine of future punishment. *All its principal doctrines*

* Selected from 73 and 92 Psalms.

either take this doctrine for granted, or are essentially connected with it after a manner which makes the discredit of this doctrine involve the discredit of some, and the absolute absurdity of others, of its remaining peculiarities. Thus the Bible asserts the moral government of God; but *government* implies *law*; and the *essential* element of law, or at least *one* of its essential element, consists in its *penalty*; for without a *penalty* it sinks into mere *advice*, and ceases to be coercive. It asserts the existence of sin; but sin, as the violation of law, necessarily implies the existence and obligation of *law*, and necessarily its *penalty*. The Bible asserts the reality of an *atonement*; but an atonement implies *guilt*; guilt implies sin; sin implies *law*, and consequently its *penalty*. The Bible asserts a doctrine of a renewal of the moral nature of man; but a renewal of the moral nature of man implies its corruption; its corruption implies the existence of actual violations of law, and so all the necessary elements of law. The whole scheme of the gospel, as a scheme of salvation, necessarily and essentially implies some calamity from which man is to be saved; and any exposure to impending calamity involves the infraction of the laws of God, as the only just ground for such an exposure. Unless man is exposed to perdition, the whole system of the gospel is false, as a whole, and false in every particular. The sacrificial offering of the son of God is not merely inexplicable, but inexplicable from the excess of its folly, unless it were an offering for sin. His advent, and the events which succeeded it, are inexpressible and cruel absurdities, unless he came to seek and to save that which was lost. It is an abuse of terms to say that he came to save men from the various forms of their temporal distress, by gaining for them an entrance into glory after they have passed through these calamities. It is an abuse of terms to speak of man's being saved from evils through which he passes, and they cease by the natural limitation of their power to injure. If this be all the salvation he came to bring, it is no more of a salvation than would have been obtained without his advent, and his advent becomes an absurdity. Salvation implies, in its full sense, deliverance from an evil—not the cessation of an evil by the exhaustion of its own energies. The sim-

ple truth is, that the doctrine of future punishment, and the moral ideas to which it is related, underlie the entire system of the Christian religion ; and if they are denied, the denial logically involves a rejection of the whole of that system itself.

8. But the Bible presents other and most conclusive testimonies to the truth of the doctrine of future punishment. Indeed, the general evidence of the scriptures on this subject is so varied, so multiplied, so interwoven with every part of their teachings on the religious relations of man, that it is impossible to exhaust it by the widest and most complete generalization of its particular testimony. One of these striking features of the sacred volume, is the perpetual distinction which is drawn between the righteous and the wicked, in almost every point in which a contrast could be exhibited. Sometimes the contrast is drawn between the *characters* of the two, in their minute, not less than in their general, peculiarities. Sometimes the antithesis is displayed in reference to the *state*, or the *contentment*, or the *worldly respectability*, or the *conduct* and *comfort* of the classes in affliction. At one time the contrast has relation to life, and at another to death ; now to the general peace and enjoyment of existence, and then to the solid profits which result to the parties from their respective peculiarities of moral conduct and character. The writers of the Word of God accord universally in the declaration : *say ye to the righteous, it shall be well with him ; but woe unto the wicked—it shall be ill with him.* There is scarcely a chapter in the Bible which does not contain some direct or implied contrast between the righteous and the wicked, in some point or another. *The ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace ; but the way of the transgressor is hard. There is no peace, saith my God, unto the wicked ; but great peace have they which keep thy commands. The righteous shall inherit the earth ; but the seed of evil doers shall be cut off.* It would be easy to multiply similar passages indefinitely, all stating points of contrast, which, however different in themselves, all rest upon the essential, necessary, eternal difference between right and wrong, the evil and the good. This perpetual recognition of the differences in moral character and moral deserts, as the

foundation for all these manifold differences, establish the *essential* nature of the connection between the cause and the effects. The inference then moves with rigid precision from the *moral and essential* nature of this connection, to the conclusion that *it must exist in the world to come, as well as in the world that now is*. This inference would seem to be conclusive; but we are not left to rest upon it alone. There are explicit statements of fact in the scriptures, in which the difference alleged to run through all the points of contrast between the righteous and the wicked, is carried forward into the future, and established as eternal. The plea of the theorist, who opposes the truth we are arguing, is that all distinctions of character and condition either cease at death, or at some limited period in the duration that succeeds it. But the Bible states with perfect clearness, *it is appointed unto man once to die, and after death, the judgment*. Nothing can be more definite, and unsusceptible of misconstruction, than the assertion that the *judgment is after death*. Now, in all those awful pictures of the judgment day, which Christ drew for his disciples, he declares that *after the judgment is completed*, he will say to those upon the right hand: *come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from before the foundation of the world*. *But unto those upon the left, he will say: depart ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels*. This surely is enough to settle the question forever, with all candid believers in the divine authority of the Bible. Here is a scene *after* the judgment, which is expressly said to be itself *after* death, in which the difference between the righteous and the wicked is still maintained; and in the reasons assigned by the judge, in both cases, is still based upon the differences in the moral conduct of the classes. The distinction is not only carried beyond the grave, but it is explicitly declared to be eternal and unalterable.

9. But again: the Word of God speaks distinctly of a *place of torment*, and gives a *local habitation and a name to hell*. The usual mode of evading this fact is to attempt to establish that the original Hebrew term, translated *hell*, means nothing but the *grave*. It is admitted that the word sometimes means the grave; but it is not

admitted that it never means anything else. Such an interpretation would render many passages of scripture unintelligible and absurd. When the *wicked are said to be turned into hell with all the nations that forget God*, if it only means that they are to be buried, it follows that the passage is logically defective—for this is equally true of the righteous, and the nations that *do not* forget God. One legitimate mode of refuting this quibble, would be an exegesis of the term, and a particular examination of the passages in which it occurs. But a single statement of fact will explode it forever; it is *after* death, and *after the resurrection* of all men *from the grave*, that the sentence of the Judge drives the guilty from the left hand into everlasting punishment, and leads the saints from the right hand to the rest which remains for the people of God. If this clear and positively undeniable statement of fact is not allowed to settle a distinction between *the grave* and the perdition into which the wicked are driven, *after their resurrection from the grave*, it is useless to appeal to the scriptures as authority on this, or on any other subject.

10. Finally, we may condense the remaining features of the testimony of the Bible, which now occur to us, into the general statement that the Word of God gives examples of future misery: that it describes dimly the *nature*, and more clearly the *duration*, of the torments of the damned; and that it makes one explicit and pointed affirmation of the fact after another, until it seems absolutely astonishing how any one could question whether the Bible taught the doctrine of a future retribution. Once the great Teacher lifted the veil, and from the dim regions beyond there issued a mournful voice: *father Abraham, send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue—for I am tormented in this flame*. Again he sketches a picture for our view, and through the lofty imagery of inspiration, a wide lake of fire gleams fearfully upon the vision, heaving its glittering and agitated surges in thunder upon a shore of eternal adamant, beneath a sky wreathed with portentous clouds, while on the rolling flood toss the huge shapes of damned angel and cherubim, blaspheming and cursing in the sublime frenzy of their despair. If descriptions of the *nature, duration, reasons, conditions, warnings, expostulations,*

and all other relative ideas of a punishment in the future, are not sufficient to establish the *reality* of such a punishment, it would seem to be useless to attempt to make language the vehicle of any species of idea. The explicit assertion, *these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal*, is but one instance of a great class of similar declarations, which cannot be made to assume more clearness of affirmation by any art of interpretation. If any one is candid enough to accept disagreeable truth, when clearly presented to the mind, he can demand no more testimony to establish the reality of a retributive suffering in the world to come.

In conclusion, we have only to say to all such of our readers as hesitate to accept the doctrine advocated in these articles, *be not deceived; God is not mocked: for what a man soweth, that shall he also reap*. This awful doctrine is true; receive it as true, and escape for your life. There is a prodigious tendency to the rejection of this doctrine, in that period of the maturing of the mind when men begin to think of *things* instead of *ideas*, and really recognise the great doctrines of religion as nothing more nor less than descriptions of existing facts. It is difficult, and it is fearful, to look upon the splendid landscape before us—the green and undulating campaign, bounded by the granite battlements of the mountains, the bending arch of the sky filled with rosy and golden clouds, and the sunlight bathing the trees and house-tops of this rugged city with the last rays of its splendor—and realise the grand and awful doctrine of the Bible! Yet it is true; God says so, and it must be true. Where that dread world may be, he has not said, and we cannot know. But let us remember, while there is time to profit by the recollection, that while we walk this green earth, or gaze upon the stars, or mingle in the thousand claims of life upon our attention, there is in some undiscovered quarter of the universe, the *hell* of the Bible, the prison-house of the damned. Remember also, *he that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned*; and remembering these, be reconciled to God. *The night comes when no man can labor.*

ARTICLE IV.

INSPIRATION VERSUS MORELL'S THEORY.

The controversy between the disciples of divine revelation and the advocates of skepticism occupies a new position and wears a different aspect from what it did in past times. Formerly, the impugners of Holy Scripture attacked its external evidences, and sought to prove it a compound of cunningly devised fables. Happily all such efforts have proved signally abortive, as it respects the end they were designed to serve, and have contributed to call forth an array of witnesses in behalf of the truth whose united suffrage no intelligent unbeliever will have the hardihood openly to confront. Philology has established the substantial integrity of the sacred text. History has confirmed the facts, registered the fulfilment of many of the prophecies, and vindicated the reputation of the authors. The literature of contemporary nations, has thrown light upon many of its customs, truths and prominent personages. The discoveries of enlightened science have furnished additional warrants of our faith in its truthfulness, and striking illustrations of many of its doctrines. The researches of antiquarians amid the ruins of ancient empires, have disintombed records of persons and events, and deciphered pages of history which demonstrate the authenticity of the sacred volume. There is no room left for reasonable doubt on this point. There is no valid plea for unbelief except ignorance of literature, history, and science.

Driven from this ground by the force of evidence, skepticism has passed into the domain of mental science, and endeavoured to entrench itself amid the laws and phenomena of man's intellectual constitution. Arrayed in the imposing garb of a philosophical spiritualism, it pronounces the highest and noblest creations of genius the inspirations of the Almighty, sets itself to explode the doctrine of supernatural inspiration, to invalidate the supreme authority of the Scriptures, and to show in a plausible and fallacious manner that there is nothing in the phenomena

which they present, but which may be, and ought to be, accounted for without the aid of this principle. Thus, whilst it has changed its outward form, it adheres to its old purpose, and the real question at issue between those who believe in Divine inspiration, and those who adopt the modern theory. The question which it is proposed to discuss in the present essay, is the following: Were the sacred writers the subjects of a Divine influence which suggested unknown and supernatural themes to their minds, and otherwise qualified and prompted them to write the Scriptures?—or, were the elevations of their own genius sufficient to enable them to discover the truths which they have recorded? Is the doctrine of supernatural inspiration the true one, or is it altogether unnecessary,—a mechanical superfluity, which ought to be supplanted by a theory of mental dynamics? Is all Scripture given by inspiration of God? or could men of the highest order of genius evolve the principles, invent the ideal and construct the reality of this wondrous Book? In 2nd. Tim., 3 ch., 16 v., Paul asserts, that, “all scripture is given by inspiration of God.” It will be shown in the sequel, and is now assumed, that it is equally applicable to the New Testament. The principle which it lays down is that the canonical scriptures are a revelation of the mind and will of God unattainable by the powers of the human intellect, and communicated to the world by a supernatural influence denominated “inspiration.” This principle we shall endeavour to defend.

I. The first consideration which we shall advance in favour of this, which will lay the whole subject open before us, and which is deemed a necessary preliminary to others, is, that the Scriptures teach the doctrine of supernatural inspiration as employed in, and consequently requisite to, the communication of Divine truth to the world in the Scriptures.

The credibility of the sacred canon being admitted on both sides in this inquiry, it is nothing more than right that we should ascertain the Biblical idea of inspiration, before proceeding to examine the modern theory, which according to its author embodies that idea, but which in our view nullifies and destroys it.

Reason dictates that in a book purporting to be a revelation from Jehovah to his creatures, there should be found either plain and pointed assertions, or evident indications, of its celestial origin, traces of divinity, out-beamings of the mind of its author. Such evidences of authorship are generally discernible in works of genius. Whoever reads the Scriptures with an unprejudiced mind, and is content to be governed by the ordinary laws of evidence, will, it is confidently presumed, perceive that the doctrine of supernatural inspiration pervades the whole book as one of its leading principles,—a doctrine which is set before the reader's eye in a great variety of lights,—a doctrine which is embodied in numerous statements,—a doctrine which forms the back-ground of all the revelations which the Scriptures contain, as manifestly as the conception of an Almighty Creator forms the back-ground of every scene of Nature with which we are surrounded. Equally clear is it that this influence, this inspiration, is distinct from the revelation which it was exerted to impart;—the latter being the truths and principles, and disclosures, of persons, and events, and purposes, which form the substance of the Bible; the former the agency or influence by which they were made known and recorded.

The divine influence termed inspiration, in the scriptural views of it, appears to include three elements, which are—the presentation of objective truths to the mind which were not within its grasp, whatever the vigour and penetration of its faculties,—the subjective elevation of the intellectual faculties so as to comprehend, or at least embrace the truths so presented,—and the impulse which prompted the recipient of these revelations to commit them to writing. Thus we have a three-fold idea—the presentation of objective truth from without the mind—the subjective illumination—and the stimulus which was at once a commission to embody the revelations in the permanent forms of written language, and an infallible director preserving them from error, or defect, or exaggeration in its execution. The following passages are cited as specimens of the manner in which the Scriptures illustrate, and confirm this representation of the doctrine. In the announcement, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," which was made to the disciples on the mount of transfig-

uration, an objective truth was presented to their minds, with which they were not previously acquainted,—which they never could have discovered without divine aid,—and which they never professed fully to understand. In the reply of Peter to his Master's question, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," the second element of this idea—the subjective illumination of the person to whom the revelation was given was apparent. Whilst in the assertion of Peter, that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," there is an explicit enunciation of the fact that a Divine impulse actuated the sacred writers to communicate what God had made known to them to the world.

It is implied in this view of the doctrine of inspiration, as evolved in the Scriptures, not only that the writers of Scripture were the subjects of Divine influence, but that the writings themselves possess the same character and are inspired. The Divine affatus, by which the various truths were suggested to their minds and their faculties aided in their perception, did not terminate at that point, and leave them to their own discretion merely in penning these revelations; but continued to move them, in accordance with the laws of their mental constitution, and without violating their individuality, yet so as to guide them into the clear light of heavenly truth in the composition of the sacred books. It held up the truths before their mental vision. It clarified their conception of them. It saved them from mistatement, and set the seal of infallibility upon the records, so that the entire book is of God, having his image and superscription upon it.

II. With this brief statement of the Biblical idea of inspiration, the defence of which will be gone into presently, we now offer as a second consideration in support of the proposition which we are endeavouring to establish, that the doctrine of supernatural inspiration, which the Scriptures teach, is not invalidated, or in any way affected by the philosophical theory which has recently been put forth by Mr. Morell, in his work on "The Philosophy of Religion;" because that theory is insufficient to account for the existence, or explain the phenomena which the Scriptures present.

This theory is designed to set forth philosophically, the
VOL. VI.—No. 3.

subjective process involved in the acquisition of the truths of Scripture, and to account for the existence of this sacred book without what he contemptuously terms a mechanical inspiration, *i. e.* without supernatural inspiration : consequently, if it can be shown that taking the Bible as an existing fact, this theory will not account for its existence, it will follow that, as far as it is concerned, the doctrine of Divine inspiration remains untouched. It may, or may not be true, but it is not discredited by this theory.

The author of this theory, and those who agree with him, assert that inspiration is a phenomenon of what is known in philosophical nomenclature as the "pure reason," or, in other words, the intuitional conscious being, greatly elevated : the writers perceived the truths of revelation without supernatural inspiration. His own statement of his theory is as follows :

"Inspiration does not imply anything generically new in the processes of the human mind, it does not involve any form of intelligence essentially different from what we already possess ; it indicates rather the elevation of the religious consciousness, and with it, of course, the power of spiritual vision, to a degree of intensity peculiar to the individuals thus highly favoured by God. We must regard the whole process of inspiration accordingly as being in no sense mechanical, but purely dynanical ; involving, not a novel and supernatural faculty, but a faculty already enjoyed, elevated supernaturally to an extraordinary power and susceptibility ; indicating in fact an inward nature, so perfectly harmonized to the Divine ideas circumambient around it, so responsive in all its strings to the breath of heaven, that truth leaves an impress upon it which answers perfectly to its objective reality."

In this passage the truths are spoken of, not as conveyed supernaturally to the mind at the moment of inspiration, but as surrounding it just as the ordinary truths of natural science, thus eliminating what we have stated as the first element in the Biblical idea of inspiration—the immediate presentation of what, but for that presentation, would be unattainable objective truth. The second element of this doctrine, the author seems to admit, representing it as a supernatural elevation of peculiar intensity, even to an extraordinary power and susceptibility ; but the third ele-

ment, *i. e.*, the impulse to write down the revelations given, he utterly rejects in sweeping terms. He says in reference to it—

“The question however still comes, admitting them (the Holy Scriptures) to be genuine, and admitting them to be inspired,—what did the authors themselves, in good faith, mean to include under the notion of inspiration? Did they claim for themselves any distinct commission to pen the works in question? Was such a commission, at the time, awarded to them,—or was not the whole of the inspiration attaching to them rather viewed as resulting simply from the extraordinary intuitions of Divine truth which they had received, and which they were here impelled by a deep sense of their infinite value to depict?”

Here we have a clear expression of the naked truth as to what this theory is in itself, and the consequences to which it naturally and necessarily leads. One point is touched in this extract which, although it is a little aside from the main object of this essay, must not be suffered to pass entirely unnoticed. It is the light in which the sacred writers were viewed whilst living—the estimate formed of them by the men of their own times. The author of the theory under consideration says, that a Divine commission to write was not awarded to them by their contemporaries. We have no hesitation in asserting, that precisely the opposite of this is true,—that, in their respective ages, the writers of Scripture were looked upon by their fellow men as divinely taught the will of God, and instructed to disclose it to others. The reverence of the Jews for their sacred books is so proverbial that he must be ignorant indeed who does not know of it. Had our author been as well-read in the records and opinions of ecclesiastical antiquity, as he is in the modern productions of the continent of Europe, he never could have said what he has on this point. He would have known what he evidently does not know, and not knowing which, it was inexcusable and unphilosophical assumption in him to write as he has, that in apostolic and primitive times a broad line of distinction was drawn between those writings which were of inspired or Divine authority, and the writings of great and good men. That those who denied the Divinely inspired authority of the Scriptures were accounted heretics, and

excluded from the recognitions of Christian fellowship. That the early adversaries of Christianity directed their batteries against this as one of the settled articles of belief amongst the Apostolic Christians. Existing documentary evidence establishes these positions as unquestionable, and dissipates the opposite assumption as utterly false and groundless.

Waiving this point, it is obvious from the preceding quotations that the author of this theory excludes supernatural influence in the presentation of the truths of Scripture, and in the writing of the sacred books, from his idea of inspiration, and limits it to the elevation of the intuitional consciousness. All that in his view took place at the moment of inspiration was the elevation of the intuitional consciousness; or, in other words, the stimulation of the intellectual powers of the writers. Taking the Bible as a credible book, will this theory account for its existence? For such a body of pamphlets, containing such truths, is it true to the facts of the case? We think not, and that for many reasons, some of which we will now state.

One objection, which in our judgment is fatal to this theory, is, that it leaves unexplained a very important part of the process by which we attain to the knowledge of objective truth. As a theory of inspiration, it leaves the existence of the objective truths, which the writers perceived and recorded, totally unexplained. Had the Scriptures been only a re-publication of the law of nature, or had they contained merely a system of ethics, it may not have required a special influence to place these truths in the vicinity of their minds. But the ethical truths of Scripture are not, as in ordinary treatises, substantive doctrines: they are simply corollaries of doctrines, and these doctrines are of such a nature as to preclude the possibility of their being circumambient around the writers. Whatever man may have discovered in the department of moral science, he could not have attained to these conceptions, for they were not written on any page of the book of nature; they were not floating about in the regions of space; they were in the mind of the All-wise, until it pleased Him, by a divine revelation, to convey them to this part of his dominions. This theory however, does not show us how such truths were brought within the range of elevated

mental powers, or how such objects came to occupy the field of vision which opened up before the inward view of the writers. However much their powers were elevated, there must have been a boundary beyond which the eye could not penetrate. Besides, a particular state of the intellectual powers is not objective truth, but only the medium of receiving and comprehending it. The ability to read, is not the book read; hunger is not food, nor does it create food; the eye is distinct from the landscape on which it gazes. Suppose the objects removed beyond the sphere of the man's vision, or never introduced within it, and of what avail are his faculties, though never so much elevated? This theory omits this altogether, and presents the clear intellectual vision as the grand phenomenon in the case. Consequently, it is defective on this ground. It does not embrace this primary fact: is therefore unsound and insufficient.

Another objection to this theory is, that whilst the elevation of the intellectual powers may render an individual conversant with present objective truths, it leaves him in total ignorance of the subjective processes of other, and especially of higher, minds. Were the sphere of the mental vision as much enlarged by the process spoken of as that of the natural vision is by the instrumentality of the telescope, it would still embrace only objective truths. It might range from planet to planet, and from scene to scene, but it could not divine the intellectual operations of any one of their inhabitants, except as these were made evident in acts, or words, or features. To maintain the opposite would be to contradict known facts—to run counter to all credible experience—to propound for our acceptance an effect as wonderful as the phenomena of divine inspiration, without any adequate cause. It would really amount to the absurdity of predicating omniscience of the intellect of fallible humanity; which it is in charity presumed the author of this theory is not rash enough to do, or the world not rash enough to believe. The human heart is a sanctuary into which we cannot penetrate. A man's thoughts and intents are known only to himself. Philosophy cannot discern them except by intelligible signs. The eye of the Omniscient alone surveys the hidden recesses of the human breast. If then no degree of intellectual elevation

will enable one man to discover the thoughts of another without external signs, how much less is it able to grasp the mental operations of the Infinite One, except as they are revealed? The Scriptures lay before us the thoughts and purposes of Jehovah, not as they are inscribed on the face of Nature, or indicated in the constitution of man, and the course of Providence; but in a higher and more gracious sense, such as could not be known without revelation. A Divine plan is set before us in some of its main features, and principles, extending from before the beginning, until after the close of time; embracing the character and destiny of all our race; overlaying the counsels of ages and nations, which is only imperfectly comprehended by us; which is unknown where the Scriptures are not; which was not discovered until the revelation was given. It was held in the Eternal mind until it pleased Him to disclose it to his creatures. The theory under consideration will not account for this. It is not true to this primary fact, underlying all the revelations of Scripture. It does not show us how the writers could attain to the knowledge of the secret purposes of their fellow men, much less how they became conversant with the purposes and dispositions of Jehovah. It is untrue, as applied to the human mind. If it means anything, it ascribes to the mental faculties an elevation which the literature of the world certainly disproves, and to which, we submit, they are incapable of attaining.

A third objection to this theory is, that the elevation of the intellectual faculties renders man conversant only with present objective truths, but does not extend to those of the future. A man of lofty genius may indeed so generalize on the operation of existing causes, on the ascertained policy of nations, on the known character of different peoples, and on the facts of past history, as to conjecture the general direction in which the leading currents of the world's life will flow, for a generation or two. In such cases however, it is only probable conjecture at the best, and he is the wisest who imitates the Delphic priestess, and expresses his conjecture in terms which admit of various interpretations. So sudden and so great are the changes which occur in the outward forms of the world's life, so multifarious are the influences at work in the social

system, so mysterious are the developments of Providence, that men cannot tell what an age will bring forth ; and statesmanship, in its highest form, is simply the science of exigencies. Ere two centuries have elapsed, the streams of national greatness may be running in new channels, and governments so revolutionized as to retain scarcely an element of their identity. What will the elevation of a man's intellectual faculties, however great, do for him in such a case ? Just nothing. It will not lift up the curtain of thick darkness, which obscures his prospect at the distance of a few years. It will not reduce the ideal and imaginary forms, which seem to float up and down in the distance, to their natural proportions. It will not bring those future changes into view, because his intellectual consciousness is not prescient ; it takes no cognizance of unexisting things.

But the Scriptures, taken merely as a veritable record, contain predictions of the future, which we know from authentic and independent history, were given many hundred years before the events occurred, and which have been exactly fulfilled. This is a matter of historical verity. To explain this, we are furnished with a recently invented theory of the pure reason. But we have seen that the elevation of the intellectual consciousness is conversant only with present objective truth. Therefore it cannot be admitted in this case. It excludes itself by the natural laws, and the acknowledged capabilities of our intellectual nature. It is a flat contradiction of existing facts. It is an empirical assumption, of which the great thinkers of the world would not have dreamed. It is an exaggeration of intellectual capability ; a philosophical quixotism which the pure reason ought to have stifled at the birth.

It is submitted that these considerations prove this theory insufficient to account for the existence of the Bible, or to explain its phenomena. Were it necessary, other objections might be urged, not without weight, as for instance : it is a theory invented in the author's own brain, without any regard to the facts in the case ; it is a theory without corroborative evidence arrayed against a doctrine sustained by miraculous evidence, to which there is no parallel ; it is a theory which supplants facts, and makes the fluctua-

ting consciousness the basis of truth ; it is a theory which would annihilate a fixed standard of right and wrong, and fling the mind of man adrift upon the troubled waters of a visionary anthropomorphism. But we forbear. It is only just, however, to state, concerning this vaulting philosophy so called, that it has done nothing to warrant this daring assault upon the pillars of all moral certainty and divine truth. We are at a loss to know what it has achieved, that justifies such vaunting pretensions. It has not discovered any new mental power. It has not given us a more luminous view of the mental structure than our own metaphysicians. It has not revealed any latent law of thought, or volition, or association, or emotion. It has not brought any new mental phenomena to light. With all its bombastic and unscholarly professions and verbiage, it has not resolved the nebulæ of the intellectual firmament into globes of clear shining intelligence. Notwithstanding its elevation, it has not mapped out cloud-land, or given to airy nothing a local habitation, or determined the altitude of the elevations of the intuitional consciousness. This we submit it ought to have done, and meanwhile to have left the theory of inspiration undone.

III. The third consideration which we offer in support of this proposition is, that the scriptural doctrine of supernatural inspiration is sustained by all the evidence in our possession. As this is purely a scriptural doctrine, the evidence on which it rests is to be sought for in the scriptures exclusively. A brief enumeration of the leading arguments will suffice.

1. One proof of this doctrine is, that this is the degree of inspiration which the writers themselves claim. True, it has been questioned whether they prefer such a claim, but a perusal of their own statements is sufficient, we think, to place this matter beyond dispute. Assuming that they used words in their ordinary acceptation, as all writers of clear perception and honest purpose do, it is difficult to see how any other construction can be put upon the terms which they use, or any other conclusion extracted out of them. They delivered their messages to different individuals and communities, not in their own name, or as their own productions, composed under the influence of pious and patriotic motives ; but as the Word of God,

prefacing them with "Thus saith the Lord." They repeatedly intimate that they were the subjects of a divine influence, which put thoughts in their minds—caused scenes to pass before their view—and suggested unknown characters and subjects to their understandings. They demand an implicit confidence in the truth of what they say, which no other class of writers deserving respect have presumed to require—and which would be neither reasonable nor modest, were the scriptures, in any sense, the work of their own unaided powers. They denounce heavy woes against men or angels who shall introduce any other gospel, or corrupt the true one, by adding to or subtracting from it. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. 1 ch., 8 v. If there is significance in language, they claim divine inspiration; and this claim is made in a manner which is worthy of the subject, and in beautiful harmony with the simplicity which marks the various works of the Almighty. Instead of inflated demands, based on their intercourse with Jehovah, they modestly utter their communications in the name of God; so that we hear not Isaiah, or Matthew, or Paul, but God speaking to us. We lose sight of the agent, and contemplate only the Divine Author.

2. A second proof of this doctrine is derived from the promise which our Lord made to his disciples, that they should receive the gift of the Holy Spirit to lead them into all truth, and qualify them for their official labors. On four different occasions they received the assurance: when he sent forth the apostles to preach the gospel to the lost sheep of the house of Israel: Matt. 10 ch.; in the discourse which is recorded in the 12th ch. of Luke; when he foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, Mark, 13th ch.; and when he addressed them for the last time, before his passion, John, 14th ch. So clear and pointed are these promises, that they do not admit of question; they are direct guarantees of divine aid. Should it be suggested that they apply only to the oral instructions of the apostles, we answer that they attribute the same authority to their writings as they do to their spoken addresses. In 2 Thes., 2d ch., 15th v: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast,

and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or by our *epistle*." 1 John, 1st ch., 4th v.: "And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full." Extensive and extraordinary, indeed, was the aid which they derived from the agency of the blessed Spirit. He brought the words which Christ had spoken to their remembrance. He imparted revelations additional to those which their Lord had given them. He opened to their view the events of the future. He elevated their powers; illumined their judgments; guided their decisions; and set the seal of truth upon their work, as he did the seal of grace upon their spirits.

3. A third proof of this doctrine is, that inspiration is predicated of the writings themselves, as well as of those who penned them. Whilst the Redeemer treated the Jewish ceremonial as obsolete, he always represented the Jewish scriptures as possessing divine authority, and being of permanent obligation. The passages are very numerous, in which he quotes from the Old Testament scriptures, applying their statements to himself and to those around him—and, either directly or indirectly, bearing testimony to their inspiration. In 2 Tim., 3d ch., Paul mentions the scriptures of the Old Testament, and declares that they were given by inspiration of God. In 2 Pet., 3d ch., 16th v., he ascribes the same authority to the epistles of Paul as he does to the other Scriptures. Statements such as these may be safely left to speak for themselves, without any comment. They distinctly attribute this same inspiration to the sacred writings, as others do to those who wrote them. To this it has been objected that it is impossible; that inspiration being a state of mind, if granted at all to the writers, it could not extend to their writings—an objection which, if it proves anything, proves too much. Let it be supposed that there is some force in this objection, that we may ascertain to what it leads. Genius is a state of mind, but being a mental state, it cannot be transferred to paper; therefore, we have no works of genius. This is a strictly logical conclusion. Genius being a state of mind, if its processes are so transferred to paper, that we have works of genius in history, philosophy, and poetry, then inspiration, being a state of mind, may be equally transferred to paper; and

we consequently have inspired writings upon the same principle as that which gives us works of genius. The advocates of error may as well dispense with this objection, as it is rather injurious to their cause.

4. A fourth proof of this doctrine is the harmony of the writers. In the Bible we have a collection of documents written by fifty different individuals. The first of these men lived hundreds of years before Homer composed the *Iliad*, and the last of them near the close of the Augustan age of Roman learning. They exhibit wide differences of constitutional temperament, education, social standing, and professional occupation. Amongst them are the monarch of Israel; the prime minister of Assyria, and the herdsman of Tekoa; the legislator, versed in all the wisdom of Egypt; the erudite pupil of Gamaliel; and the illiterate fishermen and tax-gatherers of Judea. Nevertheless, all these men are perfectly agreed in their delineations of the nature and perfections of Jehovah; in their views of doctrine; in their standard of practical virtue; in their account of the origin and extent of human depravity; in their exhibition of the sovereign remedy, without which sinners must endure the wrath of God forever; in their representations of Divine Providence, and in their disclosures of the future state of the righteous and the wicked. How can this marvellous concurrence be accounted for, unless they were inspired? On any other supposition it is utterly impossible. We find nothing like this in the world. No equal number of writers in science, or ethics, or history, or philosophy, agree thus. No equal number of the fathers of the early ages of the Church agree thus. No equal number of modern theologians agree thus. No parallel to this is to be found in the history of the world; and there is no way of solving it, except upon the supposition that they were divinely inspired, and that the spirit of truth produced this result.

5. A fifth proof of this doctrine is the fulfilment of the prophecies of scripture. It requires omniscience to disclose the events which are to take place hundreds of years afterwards. He who is all-wise alone knows the end from the beginning; and when we find in the scriptures so many predictions, which were given ages prior to the events, and which have been so fully brought to pass that

the prophecy has been mistaken for history, we cannot, we dare not, as reasonable men, doubt their proper inspiration. To ascribe such predictions to the elevations of the intellectual powers, is revolting to our judgment. We can place our hand on the productions of the master spirits of ancient and modern times, and in their names repudiate the empty dogma. Prophecy cannot be of man; it must be of God. Consider with what precision the prophecies concerning Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre, Jerusalem, Egypt, the Israelites, the man of sin, have been accomplished. So many predictions, delivered so long before the events, realized so literally, recorded in so many forms—on the page of history, on the face of nature, on the crumbling ruins of departed empires, on the memorials of so many governments, and embodied in the persons of Jews, Turks, Arabs, and Christians—constitute a body of evidence which is irresistibly demonstrative. It cannot be gainsaid. As the miracles were ocular proofs, to those who witnessed them, of the divine mission of the persons by whom they were wrought, so the fulfilled prophecies are ocular demonstrations to us, as they will be to all future ages, of the supernatural inspiration of those who delivered them to the world. They furnish a standing testimony, so plain that all men can read it—so strong that none can question it.

VI. A sixth proof of this doctrine, is the moral influence which the scriptures exert over human nature. Viewed in this light, the scriptures stand pre-eminent amid the literature of the world. No other book, nor all the books in the world put together, will bear a moment's comparison with it. The sages of antiquity wrote elaborate treatises on virtue and vice; on the shortness of human life; on the alleviation of sorrow; on the endurance of pain; on the sufficiency of virtue to promote happiness; on age and friendship; on the contempt of death; and even on the immortality of the soul. Still their writings exerted very little practical influence upon mankind. They knew not the nature of the disease with which our race is affected, nor the divine remedy which the gospel reveals.

What all other writings fail to do, the Bible has done, and is doing. The Word of God is quick and powerful,

and sharper than any two-edged sword. It lodges convictions in the human breast, which arrest the individual in his career—transform his views, principles, dispositions, tempers, and purposes—and set him upon an entirely new course of life. It nerves him alike for duty, or sorrow, or sacrifice. It developes his virtues, polishes his graces, and puts the stamp of a divine loveliness upon his character. It makes men true, pure, noble, generous. It creates benefactors, philanthropists, missionaries, confessors, and martyrs. It works the same change in Jews, Turks, Heathens, Deists, Atheists, Libertines, Philosophers, Moralists, Pharisees, and Publicans. It awakens genius, and plumes it for its loftiest flights. “It sustained Origen’s scholarship, and Chrysostom’s rhetoric; it whetted the penetration of Abelard, and exercised the keen ingenuity of Aquinas; it gave life to the revival of letters, and Dante and Petrarch revelled in its imagery; it augmented the erudition of Erasmus, and roused and blessed the intrepidity of Luther. It loaded the treasures of Owen; charged the fulness of Hooker; barbed the point of Baxter; gave colors to the palette, and sweep to the pencil of Bunyan; enriched the fragrant fancy of Taylor; sustained the loftiness of Howe, and strung the plummet of Edwards.” It has evinced the same adaptation, and pronounced the same fruits wherever it has been published. It has dispelled ignorance, subdued vice, redeemed character, revived learning, enthroned law, established freedom, thrown a divine safe-guard around life, liberty and property, fostered art and science, advanced nations to greatness and glory, and led men in the path of light, peace and hope, onward to the habitations of the blest. With facts such as these on every hand of us, how can we do otherwise than believe in the supernatural inspiration of the Scriptures. If this book were not divine, it never could have produced such results as these. It is because the mind of the Eternal is in it, that it subdues, transforms and blesses mankind. It is the orb of truth which heaven has suspended in this moral firmament, in whose light human beings discover their sinfulness, are led to the cross of Calvary, and from thence through much tribulation, to the rest of the saints in light.

The scriptures being divinely inspired, it follows that

they form a perfect and authoritative rule of faith and practice. Our Divine Creator has not left us to the deductions of our own reason, or the traditions of men. He has revealed his mind and will to us. "God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past by the fathers unto the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." In this blessed book he has furnished us with a complete revelation of whatever is necessary to an acquaintance with himself; to our spiritual recovery from sin to holiness; to our fulfilment of the various duties of our moral probation in this world; and to our preparation for the realities and destinies of the world to come. Whilst there is nothing to satisfy an idle curiosity, or foster a morbid sentimental craving after occult and undisclosed truth, nothing is lacking which is necessary to faith, or duty, or hope. It supplies a perfect system of doctrinal principles; a perfect pattern of moral and spiritual grace; a perfect standard of right and wrong; a perfect directory in the affairs of individual, domestic, and social life; a perfect redemption from the guilt, power, pollution and consequences of sin; a perfect covenant pledge, on the part of the exalted Redeemer, to deliver the followers from the second death, and invest them with the purity, intelligence, and blessedness of heaven. Within the limits of the Sacred Canon, we have the law by Moses, and grace and truth by Jesus Christ; the curse introduced by the first Adam, and redemption from the curse made possible by the second Adam; the forfeiture of immortal blessedness, and its re-opening brought to light; the divine image in man effaced by the arch fiend, and its re-impression by the Holy Spirit; the temple of God in the rational creature laid in ruin, and that temple reconstructed, lighted up with truth, adorned with grace and fitted to be the habitation of God, through the Spirit. Nothing is wanting which infinite wisdom deemed necessary. Nothing is left to be added by human device. Whatever it teaches is to be devoutly received. Whatever it enjoins is to be scrupulously done. Whatever is not laid down in it by express statement, or may not be deduced from it by fair and legitimate inference, is not binding. Whatever it proscribes is to be renounced at the peril of our salvation. What John has recorded in reference to the Apocalypse,

is true of the entire canon : "For I testify, unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

ARTICLE V.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.

"The Fifteenth Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. Presented to the General Assembly in May, 1852.

The Presbyterian Church in this land has ever possessed a missionary spirit. Though it is now but fifteen years since she formally entered upon the work, in her ecclesiastical capacity, yet it can be seen, by referring to the very first records of the General Assembly, in 1789, that the duty of missionary operations was recognised and enjoined upon the Synods.* Older proof in the records will show, that though in early days they were obliged to appeal to the liberality of foreign Christians, for the support of weak congregations here; yet, even in their poverty, they were not unmindful of their Indian neighbors, and annual collections were taken up, for missionary purposes, before the Revolutionary war.† But, as a Church, we have but recently girded on the harness. And now, we think that, as by the authority of our own judicatories, and through an agency of our appointment, and under our control, the Presbyterian Church is ecclesiastically Missionary, it may be well for us sometimes to consider the advantages she possesses to encourage her in the work,

* Minutes of Gen. Ass'y., vol. 1, pp. 10, 11.

† Records Synods, N. Y. and Phil., pp. 56, 269, 370, &c.

and to lead us to hope for her eminent success in it. We have no wish to disparage, much less to hinder, the efforts of other Christian bodies, in the same great work. The field is large enough for us and them. The harvest is plenteous; and counting all the laborers from every body of evangelical Christians, and making the largest estimate of their practical efficiency, the numbers are few. We think facts will abundantly prove that our spirit has never been exclusive. From the very first attempt at ecclesiastical organization in the Presbyterian Church, for missionary operations, the design of interfering with the largest usefulness of all our co-workers has been distinctly disavowed. "In reference to the Am. Bd. of Com. for For. Miss," say the Directors of the West. For. Miss. Soc., in 1833, "we hope to cherish no selfish principle, and we shall appeal to no sectarian feeling. We contemplate its past achievements, and its present prosperity with unmingled pleasure. Our only strife will be to copy its every good example, and try not to be outdone by it in kind affection and Christian magnanimity."* In our view, a warm attachment to Presbyterian institutions does no more imply hostility to other churches, than an enthusiastic admiration to our own country implies a hatred to other lands. Surely a man can be a patriot, and not thereby an enemy to all the world beside. And just as truly may we rejoice if Christ is preached by other lips to perishing men, and yet claim that the church to which we belong has peculiar inducements to lead her to missionary labor, as she has peculiar advantages in her organized capacity for its rapid and successful prosecution. We believe that in no better way can Christians in general learn to appreciate in each the Christian character, than when actuated by one spirit to labor for the perishing; we believe that here are good and proper opportunities to provoke to love and to good works, as we also think that whatever system of Christian experience, theological doctrine and ecclesiastical government, is nearest to the scriptural standard, will be found best adapted—because divinely adapted—to promote the spread of the gospel to the ends of the earth. The missionary work will do more to knit together all the

* For. Miss. Chronicle, vol. 1, p. 6.

true followers of Christ, than any other instrumentality; and if, even in form, as well as in substance, the Church becomes one, it will be by uniting upon those principles which actual experience has proved most directly adapted to promote the spread of the gospel.

There are especially three things in the faith and order of the Presbyterian Church, which, in our view, are eminently favorable to her zeal, and energy, and success in the work of evangelizing the heathen.

First, the peculiar type of personal religious experience generated by Calvinistic teachings, naturally tends to give its subjects an interest in the missionary work.

In the purest churches there ever have been, and perhaps, while the church is militant, there ever will be, a large body of professed Christians, whose piety is so feebly exhibited, that both themselves and others are unable clearly to decide as to its characteristics, or even its existence. We look not to such persons in any ecclesiastical connection for definite and instructive proof of what religion is, or of the Spirit's work upon the soul. What we urge is this: that if, under the teachings of the doctrines of Calvinism, and the efficacy of the Spirit through these teachings, a work of grace is wrought upon an intelligent and thoughtful mind, no more effectual preparation can be made for enlisting the energies of that mind on behalf of the perishing heathen. The principles necessarily impressed upon this man at his own conversion; his clear view of his own necessities and unworthiness; his reliance upon the grace of God, and the efficacy of the Holy Ghost, and the preciousness of the blood of Christ; his reception of a new spirit, as a renewed child of God; his grateful surrender of himself, as bought with a price, and his joyful recognition of the excellence and blessedness of his new-found privileges—all tend to awaken his compassion for the perishing, to convince him that they are no further from hope than he himself was as an alien from God, and to urge him from motives of duty, gratitude, and compassion, to teach others also the way of salvation. Let the believer in Christ, who can trace the workings of God's Spirit in his own soul, begin with his first hour of trouble, and follow on the dark pathway, which was succeeded by the day-star of eternal hope, and

the bright beaming of the Sun of Righteousness upon his sinful soul. If he has been taught by the truth, as we hold it, then indeed his first lesson has been one of deep depravity and sinfulness before God. A distinguishing feature of Calvinistic doctrine refers to the entire sinfulness and hopelessness of man; and our teachings upon this subject are thoroughly understood only by an experimental acquaintance with them. Let a man know that he is himself in the horrible pit, and the miry clay; let him feel in his own case that every effort seems but to engulf him the deeper, and the more hopelessly beyond human relief; let him recognise the stirrings of depravity, working all manner of concupiscence against the law of God; let him see yet, that that law, in its entire character and in every requirement, is holy, just, and good; that he is unreasonably wicked, and that though so helpless he is justly condemned; let him be driven from every other refuge—be convinced of God's complete rectitude in his condemnation—and led to wonder how mercy can be exercised towards such a wretch as he; let him kneel at the throne of grace only through that despair of every other helper, which makes this his only refuge; in this dark extremity let him be led by the Spirit to Christ; let him feel, as after such leadings he must feel, that by grace he is saved; let him have this feeling renewed in subsequent days, by repeated experience of his own unworthiness and helplessness, and liability to error, and by repeated recognitions of the grace and efficacy of the Spirit and blood of Christ; and we affirm that in every step of such progress in the Christian life, there is hope for the heathen, and there are practical incentives to every believer, to send them the truths which he has found so precious. If the Christian has had a view of the plagues of his own heart, can he believe that any wretched Pagan is more deeply engulfed than he was in personal ill desert, or more hopelessly beyond the power and grace of Christ? If he has by faith looked into the eternal world; if its terrors and its joys have deeply affected his heart, may he not judge that a knowledge of that eternity, and of the way of escape from its perdition, is as important to these immortal souls as to himself? If he has been led to utter despair of human aid, and to feel that the power is of God alone,

what better preparation could be given for entering upon a work where the earthly discouragements are so numerous, and where is so great need of relying upon Divine assistance? If, finally, his is a new spirit, even the spirit of Christ, what shall we look for, as essential to the spirit of the Master, if we may not expect compassion for the perishing?

Let any man examine the essential features of the work of conversion, and he will find that this great change involves all that is necessary for urging forward the great work of missions. We believe this is so the more clearly, when we fully discern the influences of what are usually termed "the doctrines of grace." We think a little observation will prove that in bodies not Calvinistic, the chief exhibition of the missionary spirit is seen in their members who most nearly approach to our distinctive views. True piety is essentially evangelistic. The new-born soul desires that others may partake with him of the same grace. The restored backslider longs to teach transgressors the way, and to lead sinners to salvation. The doctrines of grace, in promoting a clear and true Christian experience, promote also a missionary spirit.

Secondly, we urge that the Calvinistic doctrines of the Presbyterian Church are peculiarly favorable to her zeal-ous engagement in the missionary work.

It is easy to show that we have all the inducements, arising from the command of our ascending Lord, and from the promises of the Bible, which may influence any other evangelical Christians whose doctrinal views differ from our own. But what we now urge is this: that wherever our views, as Calvinists, differ from the views of other Christians, every item of difference is an inducement, over and above all that we possess in common with them, for our labors in behalf of the perishing. No system more clearly than Calvinism points out the necessities of the heathen; no other links the entire race together in closer bonds, not only of a common origin, but also of a common corruption, derived from a like connection with the same federal head; no other extends over them with the same inflexibility a just and righteous law, known indeed to them only by the teachings of nature, but under its teachings leaving them without excuse; no other magni-

fies more the certainty and the dreadfulness of their perdition without the gospel. Especially do we aver that Calvinism excels all other systems, in its power to encourage every believer who attempts, under the direction of His word, to carry out God's gracious purposes. It is a plain decree of God, revealed as such, that this gospel of the kingdom is to be preached to every nation under heaven. This counsel of the Most High shall certainly stand; it shall further be accomplished through the earnest efforts of the people of Christ; and the man who earnestly and prayerfully goes forth to this work has abundant reason to hope that enlargement and deliverance to God's redeemed ones, shall arise through his instrumentality. The Calvinist who does the work which the providence of God has placed before him, has supports and encouragements in it, which cannot be felt by him who refers not all things to the eternal counsels of God's will, or whose hopes are less dependent upon sovereign and efficacious grace. As no man is taught to be more entire in his dependence on God than the Calvinist, so, if he is consistent with his own principles, there can arise no discouragement in the plain path of duty, which has not an answering support in the gracious dealings and promises of God. There are many trials which may be justly expected in this great cause, both to contributing and praying friends at home, and to the toiling missionary abroad; and it is of the very nature of trial that, in the midst of it, "we walk by faith and not by sight." Faith often, like Abraham on Moriah, discerns the duty and sustains for its painful discharge, but knows not the immediate result. That system of doctrinal teaching which leads us to rely least on the visible and tangible, is best fitted for our support in the delays and difficulties of the missionary work. Let us but consider briefly some of the encouragements of a Calvinistic missionary, as he stands upon heathen ground; and let us take for granted his satisfactory conviction of two truths: that he himself belongs to Christ, and that the Master has placed him at this post of duty. Thus prepared for labor, his doctrinal views are eminently fitted for his support in trial. The troubles which spring directly from the providential hand of God, he knows how to understand, and they are refining to his faith. If his path-

way is shut up by hindrances he did not cause, and which he has no power to remove, he remembers that his sphere of duty is in the church patient as well as militant; and that the suffering and waiting servant is not less acceptable than the active one, and may in the end be not less useful. His feeble health reminds him of his better tabernacle above; the early death of beloved ones assures him that his own crown of victory may be nearly won; and he knows that these things are not contrary to the wisdom of Him who worketh all things after the counsels of His will. From the troubles of human iniquity he has an unchanging refuge. Does discouragement arise from the carelessness and opposition of the heathen around him? Yet he knows that the grosser their ignorance, the more truly are they the objects of his compassion, and the greater is their need of his continued efforts; that sovereign grace may select, and by its efficacious energy may sweetly subdue the most stubborn will; that in every event God's wisdom and rectitude vindicate all His counsels; and that in the discharge of his duty he is a sweet savor to God, even in them that perish. If it is disheartening to say "I have labored in vain; I have spent my strength for nought;" it is sustaining to add, "surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God." Is he disheartened that the evidences of grace are feeble in those upon whom he has bestowed his deepest anxieties; or that some, whose promise was fairest, return again to their filthiness? He is yet supported by the faith that only such go out from us as are not of us; and that where a good work has been begun by the Almighty hand, it will certainly be carried on to completion. Do deeper troubles spring up among his co-laborers from a land of Christian privileges, that some of them are weak in faith, or selfish and domineering in spirit, or that some are led away, by heathen corruptions, to apostacy? Even against these sorrows, he is fortified by his belief in the entire depravity of the human heart; and while deeply grieved and humbled, he cannot be thrown back from his work at these sad exhibitions—for in their grossest forms they do but the more firmly establish the certain truth of his own creed. As no one has a deeper view of sin's intrinsic evil—of its fierce workings in the heart of man; of

its continued hold, even upon the renewed mind ; of its deceitful disguises to the soul's delusion ; so no one should be less surprised than a Calvinist at its manifestations in any heart ; and certainly no one knows a surer or more available remedy in the grace of God. Upon his principles grace demands no previous qualifications in its subjects, and his prayers are justly called forth, rather than hindered, by the abounding of iniquity. In a time of deep discouragement, the heart of a missionary cannot dwell with comfort upon any idea foreign to our views as Calvinists. Strike out any thought from this system, and place in its stead an Arminian or a lower view, and you have weakened his support in trials. Substitute the choice of man for the sovereign will of God ; substitute sufficient grace for all, for efficacious grace to its chosen subjects ; substitute the power of man's will for the efficacy of God's renewing spirit ; let it be said that if man uses well the grace he has, he shall receive more, instead of God's calling and justifying the ungodly ; let it be said that though a good work has been begun, it may be stopped to the perdition of even a regenerated soul ; and every such declension from the rigor of Calvinism is discouragement and declension from his hopes for the heathen. Are his hearers to choose for themselves the service of God by their own mere will, in the use of grace common to all, and dependent upon their good use of the present for the mercy of the future ? Alas ! they have already chosen, and are daily more inclined to choose, the ways of evil ; the common grace to all has led none to the Saviour ; and all their use of grace imparted, forbids the idea that just improvement should betoken future good. Even the good seed already springing up may be nipped in the bud by untimely frosts ; and though angels have rejoiced over repenting heathen, there may yet be malignant triumph in hell, over that same soul's apostacy. Human dependence of every kind, upon ourselves or our fellows, is dangerous ; and if Calvinism is peculiar for anything, it is for its reliance upon the will of God. Faith with us lies between the wide extremes of presumption, which claims that it need do nothing, and despair which claims that it can do nothing. Faith teaches us that the will of God is exerted for the salvation of sinners, in perfect consistency with

man's natural and moral constitution, as a rational and voluntary being. But that the grace and efficacy is of Him, gives us a warrant for prayer, makes our dependence entire, just in proportion to the lack of encouragement from every other quarter, even enables us to feel that when human inattention seems insuperable, and when human opposition rages most fiercely, our path to the mercy seat is as open as ever; our motives for prayer are greatest when it is our only refuge; the grace and power of God are not lessened for the accomplishment of his designs, and the final issue shall be good to them that are the called according to his purpose. We cannot but judge that in the peculiar trials of the missionary life, our doctrines are especially precious; that their invigorating spirit is essential to the strength of the cause; and that every element, foreign to sovereign, electing and efficacious grace, is the mingling of miry clay with the purity of gold or the strength of iron.

Not less do these principles apply to support and animate the zeal of every friend at home, whether his sphere of duty be that of official agent to urge on the work of the Church; or of a pastor leading on his flock; or of a private Christian, reading with interest the missionary news, or praying for the world's conversion, or contributing of his substance to the more direct laborers. No system, we are persuaded, brings more closely home the responsibility of the individual, or allows him to be less influenced by the manifest coldness and remissness of others, or forbids more strictly that the feeblest talent should be hidden in the earth, or encourages more largely the most humble desires and efforts.

We pass to the third, that the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church is an important auxiliary in her efforts to evangelize the nations.

It has often been remarked that the charter of the Church makes her a missionary society. The Church of God has existed in all ages; but under the new dispensation, her ministers have derived authority to teach and baptize, and her rulers to govern, chiefly from the Redeemer's last command. But no words can more distinctly recognise the claims of the heathen, even every creature of them, than does this charter of the Church; and

to every spot of ground, and to every soul of man, she is debtor. Let our church judicatories then be organized upon any form ever adopted in the wide varieties of human opinion; and the representatives of the world may appear before the organized tribunal, and in the name of the Master recognised by it, they may sue out their right to receive the gospel at our hands. Every church Session, every Presbytery, Synod, General Assembly, Association, Convention, or bench of Bishops, sitting for the government of the Church of Christ, must necessarily annul its own authority if it refuses to preach the gospel to every creature.

But while ecclesiastical authority of every form, professing to be based upon the Saviour's ascending command, implies missionary duty upon those that exercise it; and, as we believe, implies that this duty should be carried on in an ecclesiastical capacity; we claim that in a peculiar manner the Presbyterian form of government is of a diffusive spirit, may more easily be established than any other, and is eminently calculated to awaken public interest, whenever it is associated with the preaching of the gospel.

If it is in full consistency with our views of efficacious grace to urge that the views by which the grace influences the minds of men should be adapted, in divine and infinite wisdom, to effect its ends. And thus we claim on behalf of Presbyterianism, a peculiar adaptedness to awaken new thoughts in the minds of the heathen, which will arouse their minds, and prove in the end revolutionary in moral and perhaps civil affairs. We say nothing of that independence of the civil power, so essential to Calvinism and the Presbyterian polity, and which teaches man the infinite superiority of his spiritual over his temporal interests; nor assert now, what seems highly favorable, that distinct from the support of the State, prelacy cannot long exist without introducing, if not ministerial parity, yet at least the Presbyterianism of lay delegation; which change has invaded the higher courts of the Protestant Episcopal Church—has already caused a division among the Methodists—and has recently renewed the assault in their General Conference. But we say, let the missionaries of a prelatial church establish their congregations upon

heathen soil, surrounded by the forms of absolute authority; and in the government of these churches, the heathen will see nothing different from the rule to which for ages they have been accustomed. The rulers are so by divine right; and the people are simply the governed. But let a Presbyterian church be but organized among them, and a lesson of individual rights and responsibilities is at once taught, whose importance it is hard to overestimate. Every such church is taught that while government is from God, the ruler is of the people's choice. Before the eyes of the heathen there is set the novel and spirit-stirring example of a self-governing republic: the educated missionary admits the feeblest member of his flock to a voice in choosing his spiritual guide and rulers; and in the assemblies of the church, a direct influence may be exercised by one who all his previous life has been passively obedient to rulers alike ignorant, rigorous and arbitrary. Such lessons of the superior claims of piety, and of man's rights and responsibilities, cannot be learned in vain.

And if in these instructions Presbyterianism is superior to Prelacy, it is free also from the dangerous tendency of the Independent system towards lawlessness. Our Independent brethren have, equally with us, separation from the State, the parity of the ministry, and the recognized rights and responsibilities of individuals. But they lack that healthful control in government, which is especially needful on the transition of a people long shrouded in ignorance and bondage to the light and liberty of God's people, and which does not cease to be necessary in the most intelligent and best established churches. With us there is the same perfect and simple organization at home and abroad. The congregation of heathen is governed by its own bench of elders; in Presbytery and Synod those elders have their seats, as in this land; there is ever exercised the power of review and control, which operates most healthfully to deter from evil—which, as a preventive of irregularities, is invaluable; which, occurring statedly at brief intervals, takes each rising difficulty before it, has time to grow formidable; and which, even in the monstrous growth of crime or heresy, is efficient to vindicate the just rule of the house of God.

For diffusiveness, and for equality of energy wherever

diffused, Presbyterianism is remarkable. Every American knows how easily and peacefully the government of the United States is extended over territory after territory, of our wide domain. It is but the gathering of a people upon a newly settled soil; the application for admission into a voluntary union; and the freedom and privileges of the youngest State, are secured equally with the eldest. Properly speaking, there is no centralization of power; for if necessarily there is a seat of government, yet the executive officers are substantially at the appointment of the entire people, and the legislators are actual residents, by an equal distribution, of all parts of the empire they govern. There is nothing to prevent the government of an entire continent on these principles; it is the self-control of the several parts, and the voluntary union of the free whole. Now, nearly analogous to this republican government, is the government of the Presbyterian church: and the only points where a contrast may be instituted, are in favor of the church. The church has no separate executive or judicial officers seeking personal aggrandizement; no central point of authority. But her diffusiveness is like the march of civilization between our oceans. A single church upon heathen ground is the germ of a Presbytery; a few widely scattered form a Synod; and from their first organization they are perfect, as free from extraneous control, as capable of participating in all the privileges, and as much bound to engage in all the duties of a pious life, as any church in the oldest Christian land. "From the first," says the present Annual Report, p. 73, "the missionary work has been conducted on the enlarged and comprehensive principles which mark the character of the church at home. The same care to obtain an educated ministry, and a well-instructed membership; the same primitive and scriptural form of church government; the same pure and holy doctrines are as faithfully taught in the mission churches, as in the churches at home." There is indeed a need of pecuniary assistance arising from the feebleness of the flocks thus gathered in the wilderness; but even in dispensing this, the church at large reposed a just confidence in the ecclesiastical assemblies whose province it is to take the personal oversight of the ground, and who are best acquainted with its wants. In the expansion

of the Presbyterian church, there is no increase of power to any individual; no lack of oversight to the most distant and obscure of the frontier congregations, save the destitution arising from the scarcity of laborers; no encouragement to the disregard of lawful authority in any quarter; no undue dependence of the several parts upon each other; and no jealousy of superior prosperity in one or another land. The formation of new Synods on the shores of the Indian and Pacific oceans is matter of joy: and should a General Assembly be formed in India or China, should it separate itself from our General Assembly in every respect except for the fraternal intercourse existing now between us and the Scottish Assembly, not the slightest objection would be made, as we believe, to such a step; we would only be glad to see them able to stand without our help, and to carry the gospel to others; not a word of complaint would be made that our power or our unity was injured; no blemishes would attach of ordination in the interchange of our ministers; and we rather look forward anxiously to the glad day when such Assemblies shall exist in every great empire of the world; when the diffusive spirit of Presbyterianism shall overspread the globe with ecclesiastical organizations, distinct as their respective civil governments, and only united in the same bond of faith, or the breathings of the same spirit, and in vital connection with the one supreme and living Head of the universal church, the Lord Jesus Christ.

If the thoughts we thus express are just; and if, as we confidently believe, they will gain rather than lose in force, the more deeply they are pondered by intelligent minds; then should the Presbyterian church feel more than ever her deep responsibilities, and be encouraged to go forward to her duty. We may rejoice in the ground already gained. The present Annual Report of our Board is a valuable document indeed. But there are some sentences which arrest especial attention. "If the comparatively few members of the church have been permitted to do so much, what might not the whole church do, if all her members were to arise as one man to the Lord's work? p. 73. It is lamentable, that with all our means of efficiency we do so little. "It is a very sad thing to see one-third of our church members with more than half our organized

churches under the care of more than five hundred pastors and stated supplies, doing nothing for a whole year for the benighted heathen." p. 72. The table shows 1404 churches and 67,183 members, as non-contributing, and 1260 churches, and 139,591 members, contributing. This seems to take for granted that every member in a contributing church is also a contributor. If we had the means of correcting this error, it might, and it in all likelihood would appear, that one half the membership of the Presbyterian church do nothing whatever for Foreign Missions. To this matter we direct a few brief closing reflections.

In the first place, upon our system we are at no loss to account for an apathy which we have no wish or power to justify. It arises from the depravity of the heart, which finds ever irksome the duties of faith and spirituality; and which, even in regenerate souls, exerts its power to war against the law of the mind. When we consider that so many in every church are but nominal professors, that others are ignorant of the claims of the heathen, and that the state of piety with yet others is low; we are at no loss to solve the sad problem of our remissness. But this solution is full of grief, and leaves upon us a load of guilt, which we should not lightly bear.

In the next place, the first valuable step towards a better state of things is to present more fully to our people the claims of this great work. It certainly is not within the range of possibility, that the claims of the heathen world have occupied their due share of thought and time in the pulpits of fourteen hundred churches; and that the officers of these churches have offered to raise contributions in them, and yet not one dollar be the result invariably of fourteen hundred efforts. Our experience has sometimes, in a voluntary agency, brought us before some of the feeblest churches upon this subject; and we never yet knew a collection utterly fail.

In conclusion, we may here see upon whom comes the special responsibility. If it is the duty of the church, as such, to carry on this work, then the responsibility of seeing that it is done, lies upon the Judicatories. Our higher judicatories have done their part, at least so far that contributions have been made in every Presbytery. But let it be repeated—let those that are measurably delinquent

be quickened to duty by it—and let those entirely delinquent be urged to their duty. “More than half of our organized churches, under the care of more than five hundred ministers of Christ’s gospel have done nothing for a whole year for the benighted heathen.” Perhaps the Sessions of any one of these churches would immediately take action, if a church member under their care was known to be immoral. This is right. The accused is under their jurisdiction. Let them vindicate the honor of the Saviour, and the purity of His church; and this, though it may cost them many hours of patient investigation. But the general cause of Christ and his honor suffers in another matter, which all having authority to teach or rule in his house are bound to regard. Reproach is cast upon the benevolence of the church; every member of our Zion, by his religious experience, and his solemn vows, and his views of truth, and the imperative call of his Lord, is urged to wipe it away; and especially do six hundred millions of men, in all their misery, appear before the bar of every church Session to say, “Your Master bade you take care of us:” and their urgent plea may be taken from the charter of the church itself. “How can you expect as you **PREACH THE GOSPEL**, that the Redeemer will be **WITH YOU**, while you virtually strike out the clause, **TO EVERY CREATURE**, which he inserted between the command and the promise? If the copula is dropped, your charter and its blessings part company.”

And so it is, He that watereth shall be watered.

Brethren, ministers of the gospel, and elders of the church, you are undoing your authority, and marring your usefulness, while this great cause has so small a share of your thoughts. But let every Session do its duty, and while even then we do not suppose that every professed Christian will do his, yet the most truly spiritual in all our churches will awake, there will be something done in every congregation, and as the light increases upon the duty of the church, the discharge of duty will be more general.

ARTICLE VI.

OUR ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE.*

Plans and Operations of the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia : Published by the Board : 1847.

Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth—Annual Reports of the Board of Publication : To 1851.

The Roman empire was the largest of the four universal monarchies of ancient history. Its palmiest day was during the reigns of Trajan and the Antonines, when Gibbon makes his splendid survey of its greatness. From west to east, it stretched from the Atlantic ocean to the river Euphrates, about 3000 miles. From north to south, it lay between the northern limit of Dacia, and mount Atlas in Africa, about 2000 miles. The empire could never keep northern Dacia for any length of time, and the Danube soon became their northern border line. The empire under Trajan was computed to contain about sixteen hundred thousand square miles. That was a prodigious expanse of territory to be ruled by the sceptre of a single government. The empire of Charlemagne, or that of Napoleon Buonaparte, was but an earldom, or a county, compared to that of Trajan. The old thirteen United States of America, which first set up independence, with their territories, contained, we believe, a somewhat larger geographical boundary than the Roman empire under Trajan. After the acquisitions of Louisiana and Florida, the Union and its dependencies contained 2,300,000 square miles. With the more recent acquisitions of Texas, New Mexico, Utah and California, the territory of the Union is

* NOTE.—In inserting this article, the Editors do not wish to be understood as expressing any want of confidence in those who manage our Ecclesiastical Boards. The suggestions found in the following pages will no doubt receive the attention of the parties especially concerned, and lead them to inquire how far they can properly put forth an influence to accomplish the aims of the writer, and how far the subject is beyond their control.

Eds. S. P. Rev.

a little more than three millions of square miles; that is, nearly double the size of the grand Roman empire, in the palmy days of Trajan and the Antonines. This is the sober dictum of figures of arithmetic, not of those of rhetoric. It stands in chain and compass surveys; not in metaphor and exaggeration.

The conduct of the Abolitionists in Congress, since the passage of the recent Compromise measures, makes it certain that the Union cannot be of long continuance. That basest of factions known to history, have never ceased agitation on the subject of the Southern domestic institutions; and it is now plain that they never will cease agitation, while Southern men are within earshot of their fanatic fury and insult. But while the Union lasts, it is the grandest field for domestic missions that ever yet lay under the sceptre of a single government. With slight exceptions, one language can be read all over it. It is bound together by the cords of a single post-office establishment. Freedom of religion is common to all its States and Territories. To conceive of the whole masses of its population, as animated by the principles of a thorough and vivid spirit of evangelical religion, is to conceive of the most powerful source of influence over the world that ever yet was in it; the most copious fountain of good influences, humanly speaking, that ever sent its streams abroad. So that the motives to vigor, in the work of domestic missions, are the strongest possible. The earthly glory of the Redeemer, the whole weight and worth of the salvation of millions of souls, the influence of wholesome religion on the future permanency of our free institutions, as direct motives; and then, as an indirect consequence, the providing, by evangelization at home, of a place to stand, from which to move the world in the same happy direction.

Every motive which can affect a Christian man calls aloud on the Presbyterian Church to use most diligently the time during which the fell spirit of fanaticism may leave the States in unbroken Union. And, indeed, if anything can change the prospect, and repeal the seeming destiny of the land, it is the thorough evangelization of the country.

It is clear that the management of such Boards as those of Domestic Missions, and of Publication, in our Church,

requires practical talent, executive energy, and Christian statesmanship of the highest order. The Board of Publication has, at the present time, (Sept. 1852,) we believe, no Corresponding Secretary, *functus officio*, but a Secretary elect, and undecided as to his acceptance of the office. That of Domestic Missions has a Secretary, whose praise is wide in the churches—a good and able man, working earnestly, and loving the cause. He has presented reports of a character very superior. But still there is room for greater changes in this respect. The reports of our Boards might be more terse, compact, and readable. There might be less of the κοινή διαλέκτις of slipshod literature in them; less of mere exhortation and pious common-place; more of those calm, and clear, and masterly combinations of the ecclesiastical statesman which are so appropriate to the subject, and would be so instructive and refreshing to the Church. The subjects are not, and never can be, dull, uninteresting ones to Christian ears. What is wanted is simply that depth, and strength, and point, and power, which statesmanlike study alone can impart to them. It is a question well worthy of the Secretaries of our Boards, to what extent the fault is their own, and is to be found simply in the style of the writing, when those reports do not command the attention of the whole Church; and how much of real good fails in their hands when they are not so written.

It is, however, of the books and tracts which the Board of Publication are issuing, that we wish to speak particularly at this time. This Board has such a power for good in the land, the sphere of its operations is one of such peculiar importance for the times, and its work will be of so blessed consequences if well done, that it would seem no Christian heart that accepts the pure system of doctrine which its publications embody, could be satisfied not to pray for it, and pray fervently, and pray frequently, till its power shall go forth mightily, and every impediment be removed from the way of its chariot wheels.

The first ten years of the existence of this Board, as the property of the whole Church, terminated in the spring of 1848. During the first nine years, ending in the spring of 1847, it issued two hundred and twenty-one volumes, together with a number of smaller publications, in the form

of tracts. During the year ending March 31, 1848, it added to its catalogue twenty-one new books, amounting to 24,500 copies; during the year ending March 31, 1849, it added seventeen new books, amounting to 25,500 copies; during the year ending March 31, 1850, twenty-five new books, amounting to 31,500 copies; and during the year ending March 31, 1851, the Board added to its catalogue nineteen new books, amounting to 33,800 copies. The Report for the year ending March 31, 1852, has not yet been received by the writer. In addition to the above, the Board have also issued a large number of Tracts and Catechisms. Down to March, 1851, they had published three hundred and three books. During the four years, from that ending in March, 1848, to that ending March, 1851, inclusive, the whole number of copies of books published was 115,300. And allowing about the same amount of work to have been done during the nine years previous to that period, the infancy of the Board, which is probably about a fair estimate, we shall have, as the whole work of the Board, in the book department, down to March 31, 1851, about 230,000 copies of three hundred and three different books. The aggregate number of books and tracts to the present time, we suspect, is nearly two millions. On surveying this vast mass of printed testimony to the truth as it is in Jesus, scattered broadcast among such a people as ours, our first impulse is to arise and give thanks to Almighty God that he put it into the hearts of wise and valiant men to establish this Board, in what he doubtless saw to be its due season. It propagates a form of truth which the world never loved, and never will love, until the earth shall be wrapped in the glories of the millenium of holiness. It wields a power independent of the smile or frown of President, or Senate, or Supreme Court, or Legislature; it hangs not on the sleeve of King, Emperor, Czar, Khan or Sultan. It asked nothing of the powers of the world, in the beginning, but leave to put forth into life its own vital energies. It asks nothing of the powers of the world now, but to be let alone. We adopt with joy the language of the great Puritan *Vates*, of other days—poet, prophet, and sage, he was—over the times when the printing of books was about to be loosed from its shackles of star-chamber

tyranny: "Now, once again, by all concurrence of signs, and by the general instinct of holy and devout men, as they daily and solemnly express their thoughts, God is decreeing to begin some new and great period in his Church. Behold, now, this vast city—a city of refuge, the mansion house of liberty—encompassed and surrounded with His protection; the shop of war hath not there more anvils and hammers, waking to fashion out the plates and instruments of beleaguered truth, than there be pens and heads there, sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, revolving new notions and ideas, wherewith to present, as with their homage and fealty, the approaching reformation."*

We are sorry to lose the hallucination of this first joyous impulse. But "wiser and sadder" we must awake from it. Let us endeavor to look soberly at the facts. Has the actual influence of our Board been such as might have been expected from its three hundred published works, and its two millions of copies of them? We believe decidedly that it has not. It has published much of the rich wine of the old religious literature, such as Halyburton's *Great Concern*; Vincent's *Spirit of Prayer*; Charnock on the *Attributes* and on *Regeneration*; Fleming's *Fulfilling of the Scriptures*; Goodwin's *Return of Prayers*; Bradbury's *Mystery of Godliness*; Scott's *Force of Truth*, and *Synod of Dort*; Owen on *Justification*, on *In-dwelling Sin*, and on the *Holy Spirit*; Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*; Sherlock's *Trial of the Witnesses*; Guthrie's *Trial of a Saving Interest in Christ*; Baxter's *Saint's Rest*, and *Call to the Unconverted*; Doddridge's *Rise and Progress*, with some other works of the same description. And the Board would not have been established in vain, if it had done nothing but this. Yet, through reverence to the mighty and gifted saints of other days, we must not disguise the fact that much of the excellence of their works depended on the pith and point with which they adapted them to the times in which they were written. And while much of their adaptation to the human soul, under the influence of divine truth, must remain while the world stands, yet many of those finer sensibilities which genius embodies

* MILTON on the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing.

in books, and on which their chance of being read mainly depends, are lost to us in the works of the ancient mighty men of God. It is freely admitted that there are exceptions to this remark. But it is nevertheless firmly believed to be a general truth, and one which a history of the reception with which our books have met, in the community, would fully establish. Where then is the really powerful original book, among these two millions of copies of three hundred different works? Of which book of our Board have the reading and thinking men of the land felt the attraction and the power? Where is the scholarlike, finished, classic book—full of Christ and his cross; full of sound learning, adapted to the American mind, so written that men will not willingly let it die; commanding the attention of those who always love to be spectators of the human mind engaged in heroic thought; alluring wild and unsettled young men, by its exquisite taste and finish; winning its sweet way to the centre-tables of ungodly young ladies, by its silver tones and its pure Christian sensibilities; staring the very skeptics and scoffers firmly in the face; clad in the universal respect which it has commanded; alluring, winning, enticing, commanding, compelling many every way, at least to hear its report? We do not believe that such a book is an impossibility. But where is there a book with the impress of the Presbyterian Board of Publication which approaches this description? None that we know of. They have published Dr. Alexander on Family Worship; Fairchild's Great Supper; Cumming's Christianity from God, and Newman Hall's Christian Philosopher Triumphant over Death." And we have heard of good influences from all of these works. They have told upon society in some measure. They have demonstrated the importance of freshness, and adaptation to the times, as qualities of religious books. Neither of them, however, is on a sufficiently broad ground to meet the description which has been given of a really and extensively effective book. And neither of them, so far as we know or believe, is anything like such a book. We have no quarrel with the Board of Publication—and can have none—unless it shall set itself up as constitutionally exempt from searching criticism, by virtue of its connection with the General As-

sembly—as if the control of the Assembly dispensed with the necessity of discussion, and the spread of light, in the whole body of the Church from which the Assembly is annually chosen! And even on this ground, to which the Board of Publication has been thought, in days long past, to have a little inkling, it would be more appropriate to stand amazed and silent at the fatuous lapses of good and wise men, than to quarrel with our own Board. Yet, we do not think that this Board has already attained, either is already perfect, or can count itself to have apprehended that for which it was brought into existence by the Divine Head of the Church. We pray that it may, in the due sense of the words, forget those things which are behind, and reach forth unto those things which are before—pressing toward the mark for that shining and glorious prize of honor in extensive and durable well-doing, which is within its reach.

There is not space in this article to review the operations of the Board in the work of colportage. We have no fault to find of it, except that there is not an hundredth part enough of it done; no wish to express concerning it, except that the spirit of God may send unto all Presbyterian hearts in the land such a love for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, that they may put an hundred fold more of their money into this work; no other remark to make, except that this work of colportage for the instruction and salvation of unenlightened classes of the country, excellent as it is, does not release the Board of Publication from the duty of providing a literature fraught with good taste, with true refinement, and with all that is good in genuine art and genius, for the higher classes of society.

It is grievous to have heard it said, as we have, that the Board looks, with an indifference almost akin to hostility, on any higher range of literature than that which is adapted to the laboring classes of the country. That charge is not intended to be brought against it here. It is freely admitted that there are perplexing difficulties attending the questions involved. The good and true men of the Church, who have been managing this matter, have, no doubt, done what they thought best for our Zion, and most for the glory of her King. It was, no doubt, better in the

beginning, to issue a plain Christian literature, breathing a solid, and thorough, and sober gospel, coming fully down to men's business and their bosoms, and intelligible to the simplest reader, rather than fine-spun volumes of affected and sickly rhetoric, full of vain philosophy, and science, falsely so called. But what was well in the beginning, will not answer the whole ends of the Board in time to come. The work of providing a plain Christian literature has been, we hope, well nigh accomplished. It has been well done too. Whatever supplementary works may be demanded, from time to time, by peculiar exigencies, ought, of course, to be added, as they are presented to the attention of the Publishing Committee. Ample room will be left for supplying the wants of the higher thought of the country. This can be done without hindering or portage, without restricting unduly the issue of a plain Christian literature—without, by any means, narrowing the base of the pyramid while its apex is builded higher and more beautiful. We should be sad to think that such a cause needed to be much urged, especially among Presbyterians, who have no rotund and rolling Liturgy, no fanatic ordinance, no doctrine fostering spiritual confidence and impudence, with which to allure men to their banners as a denomination; but who exist, humanly speaking, simply by means of the cultivation of the human mind, and by planting in it a thirst for higher attainments of grace and knowledge than are to be found at the common level.

“Philosophy, baptized
In the pure fountain of eternal love,
Has eyes indeed; and viewing all she sees
As meant to indicate a God to man,
Gives *him* his praise, and forfeits not her own.
Learning has borne such fruit in other days
On all her branches; piety has found
Friends in the friends of science, and true prayer
Has flowed from lips wet with Castalian dews.”

Those hallowed and often quoted words of the pious poet speak mightily for us in the present argument, and we hope that few readers will object to seeing them again, though it may be for the twentieth time.

The question will have occurred to the reader before this: “then what kind of books would you have the

Board of Publication to issue, for what you style the higher intellect of the country?" Some hints at an answer to that question have already been given. But it is intended to meet it more fully.

It is not certain to us that the right idea of a Christian book for wide circulation, addressed to the more cultivated minds of the country, has yet been clearly seen. And we stop not to clear ourselves of the charge of arrogance, which illiberal minds might be tempted to impute, while we undertake to contribute some small share of suggestion, to facilitate the production of so excellent and desirable a work.

A book ought, in fact, to be a work of art, just as much as is a marble statue of Washington, or a painting of the Declaration of Independence. It must not only handle an important subject, in an able and intelligent manner, with sound doctrine, and in a pious spirit, but must so handle that subject as to win favor with the reader, and array his reason, his judgment, his conscience, his tastes, and even his imagination, if possible, against sin, and in favor of the cross of the Lord Jesus. It is of no avail how excellent the matter may be, and how pious the spirit, if the manner of the composition be not such that it will be read and respected. A good book, coarsely, carelessly, loosely written will not be much read, and will soon pass out of notice; while a bad book, replete with the charms of bold and high intellectual processes, adorned with the elegances of a rich and classic style, and coming down broadly to the daily feelings and impulses of human nature, with elegant and insidious falsehoods, will be read, and will do manifold mischief. We cannot think that a Board of Publication, appointed to provide (at least a supplement to) the religious literature of a people, is in the performance of its whole duty, if it does not enter into a competition with wicked books, for influence over such minds as can be influenced only by elegance and taste. It is much desired by the writer that he may speak without dogmatism on this point, and with submission to the judgments of those who may be better acquainted than he, with the exigencies of the country and of the times. But to him it does seem that among the ruinous mistakes of the times, concerning religious writing, is the opinion, that style, and

manner, and maturity, and classic finish, are less to be regarded there than in other productions; the error of being in a great hurry in the production of a religious book, of skimming off the mere froth of religious meditations, convictions, and impulses, and calling the records of them literature. It is not every thought of a strong mind, nor every impulse of a pious heart, nor every conception of a gifted imagination which is worth being recorded, or of which the record is worth being read. Do not undertake to serve me on the printed page, any more than in the pulpit, with a strain of mere extempore thought, which you have not yourself deliberately examined and pondered, to see whether it is indeed true, appropriate, and in good taste. The great musician Haydn was a long time employed in the composition of his masterly Oratorio, the "Creation." When some friends urged him to bring it to a conclusion, he replied: "I spend a long time upon it, because I intend it to last a long time." The same remark will hold good in the production of a book. This is conceded. It is true in the production of a religious book. This is not so generally conceded. For it seems to be thought that the soundness, the truthfulness, the piety of a literary production will attract readers to it, let its artistic merits be what they may. There would be a certain propriety in this reliance, if all persons for whose perusal religious books are designed, were lovers of soundness, truth and piety. Even then there would not be a complete propriety in it. For the more finished and beautiful work would make a deeper impression on the minds of its readers, while it continued extant; and it would continue extant a longer time to make that impression. And according to this plan, the Board which issues books, irrespective of their artistic excellence, must suppose itself to be publishing only, or mainly, for those who are already pious. In other words, it must yield the aggressive and missionary feature in its organization. There is little propriety in such a rule, as applicable to persons not pious, and not piously inclined. If we may suppose a crudely and hastily written book, and a classic and elegant one, to be published, side and side, by the same press, to be bound in the same style, with the same soundness of matter, and to be borne through the country in the hands of

agencies and colportage, with the same zeal and with equal commendations, it is but a truism to say, that the latter would be by far the more valuable of the two. And as soon as the experience of perusal came out in relation to them both, the value of the one would wax, and that of the other wane, indefinitely to the end. We believe solemnly that a majority of readers of all classes, and a vast majority of irreligious readers, are now, and are to be in a much greater degree hereafter, attracted to the perusal of religious books by the taste, and elegance, and maturity of finish, and power of thought, displayed in them.

We do not choose to place in doubt at all, in this place, the ardent piety, the intellectual mightiness, the eagle-eyed visions of the truth as it is in Jesus, of those men of other days, whom the lying tongue of detraction has been compelled by an over-ruling and Divine Nemesis, for once to speak truth, in calling PURITANS. They stamped their greatness so deeply upon the things of earth and of time, that the pen of malignant history has not been able to murder their good names among men. And while God shall dwell in immortality on high, and shall continue to send out upon this earth from his lofty throne, the messages of that Nemesis, to raise up the struggling truth, and crush down to dust the crested lie, their memories will continue to flourish among pious men on earth. On that dependence their good name has long rested. There it may safely still be left to rest. We do not acknowledge any band, or any section of modern fanatics, to be their legitimate successors, or their true spiritual children at all. We shrink not from the duty—we claim the right—to cut deeper their records on the crumbling stone, and to twine their tombs with honors ever green. It is as much as could have been expected of them, to uphold truth and liberty against tyrants and Sadducees, in their generation, as they did. Let that generation make light of them that has done a greater work than they did, and has done it more nobly. If they rest in peace till then, they will sleep long in peace.

But the Puritans did not see all things correctly. It is not given to any generation of men to be free from all error and mistake. Their great mistake was an attempted separation of the spirit of pure religion

from the spirit of the beautiful. We do not quarrel with the Ironsides of Cromwell for breaking out the idol-images of the Virgin and Son, from the cathedral windows of England. For it was probably designed as an insult to the Protestant feeling of the country, when Laud and his semi-papists had them put there. Nor do we quarrel with John Knox for such destruction of the cathedrals in Scotland as was necessary to drive away from their nests the lazy and iniquitous monks of that day. But simply, we do dissent from all men who think that there is sin in things beautiful, of themselves, and when disconnected with superstition, with carnality, and with pollution of manners. We say no word in favor of the theatre, the circus, the mass, the gaudy and superstitious procession on the days of the saints. Yet it is astonishing how large a part such things as these continue to bear, even in the literature of the present day, which is devoured with greed by many of the people of the United States. *Mankind run after false beauty in literature, for want of the proper exhibition of the true.* Look, then, into the Bible, and behold how beautifully the finger of God has written it. Look, then, into the pages of the visible creation, and behold how much that is beautiful the hand of God has fashioned in it. Look, then, upon the pages of the book of history and of Providence, and see how many things noble and beautiful are in the records of the moral world, wherever the waves of sin have been, in any degree, beaten back from its shores. If man will never give me another book, in which pure religion is mingled with the light of cheerful hope and sinless joy; in which not only have righteousness and peace kissed each other, but truth and beauty have embraced in ever-during wedlock—still I have one such book, at least, and that book is the WORD OF MY GOD. I have another such a book, in fact. We may read solid and sacred truth in the mountain and in the forest, on the earth and in the sky, in the face of the day and in the face of the night. And around them all there hang the wonderful robes of beauty in which their Maker dressed them. The living and holy God is no enemy of the beautiful. He stretched the robes of glory over the work of his hands, and he breathed into man the power to enjoy it. Most devoutly

do we wish that our ecclesiastical literature might be fashioned after such models as these. We believe it would be one considerable step in advance towards the spread of a sound and sober religion over the continent of America, if we could make our ecclesiastical literature graceful and elegant.

It would be another mighty step in the same direction, if we could diffuse a broad light of *cheerfulness* over it. Neither the piety of the Protestant world, nor the record of that piety in religious biographies, is yet free from fanaticism. Men have not yet entirely escaped the influence of the ancient mistake, that it is the nature of religion to be sour and distressing. We do not seem yet to have learned as effectually as it would be well to learn, that a gloomy and morose temper of life, is not to be attributed to the influence of the grace of God upon the soul of man, but to a deficiency of that influence. That first great and necessary effect of divine grace and truth upon the soul, by which it is awakened to its own lost condition, and convinced of the aggregated guilt of sin, of course marks a gloomy period in the history of the soul. So far from thinking that deep impressions of demerit in the sight of God is a mark of fanaticism, as some ungodly writers, who are enemies to the cross of Christ, use the word in modern times, we believe that there can be no sound religion, ordinarily, but that which has its foundation in such a conviction. *I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came sin revived, and I died.* And that remarkable period in Christian life, ought to have a very distinct and ample place of record, in a complete religious literature. But the records of the soul, even at that time, are not altogether gloomy. The darkness is intense, it is true. The conflict is often severe. But the Lord Jesus is at hand. The hideous forms of horror, which the law sets upon the soul, stop their pursuit, and drop their murderous implements, when the soul finds refuge in Him. Every Christian probably looks back to that period with deep, earnest, seriousness of feeling. But is it a feeling of gloom and sorrow with which he looks back to that period of his life? Did any man in his senses ever sit down and grieve over the fact that a knowledge of the divine law, and knowledge of himself, had scourged him out of all

self-dependence, and stripped him of his own miserable self-righteousness, and driven him, by fierce and relentless pursuit, to take refuge in God's own appointed stronghold? Certainly not. That period of Christian life is not gloomy to subsequent contemplation. It is the foundation of the soul's eternal thanksgiving, the birth of eternal life, the dawn of hope, the first of many days of the triumph of victorious, sovereign, electing grace.

There are often periods of gloom in Christian life, it is admitted, which are to be recorded in Christian biographies. But they are records of imperfectness, and ought to be so treated. We have no right to describe such periods as patterns for the experience of others. A greater portion of the sacred Scriptures is devoted to the comfort of God's people than probably to any other single practical subject, except their duty to keep clear of sin. A Christian life, therefore, which is gloomy, is either one which does not rest with a proper faith upon the promises of God, or it is one upon which there rests the guilt of some undiscovered and unrepented sin, or it is owing to some physical cause. Upon this deeply interesting point, upon which we could wish to dwell for a greater space than it is proper here to occupy, we could wish our ecclesiastical literature not to take Jonathan Edwards, or David Brainerd, or even Henry Martyn, for their models. They are books, which, excellent in many respects as they are, we never lay down without some gloom, for which we do not think religion is responsible. We may not be able to say exactly what that gloom is owing to. We think, however, that it is this: that such books leave with the reader the impression that the struggle of the Church, to bring this world to the allegiance of the Lord Jesus, is a more hopeless and desperate struggle than the Scriptures represent it to be. There is not in them enough of the light of assured hope, which the revealed purposes of God fully justify. We could wish our Board rather to adopt, as its models, the grand intellectual and spiritual joyousness of John Howe, the earnest, glad, hearty piety of Samuel Rutherford, and the wonderfully placid and happy genius of John Bunyan.

Refreshing indeed it would be, to see among the issues of our Board, now and then, at least once in a lustrum, or

a decade, some sacred classic, as finished and elegant as Hall's sermon on Modern Infidelity, as thoroughly religious as Cecil's Remains, or Newton's Cardiphonia; freely opening itself to all the innocent emotions, all the sweet charities, on every side, which cluster, like a choir of Graces, around social Christian life; and employing with thankfulness, every ray of joy, spiritual or natural, which God has made to shine upon the pious heart;—a cheerful book, without vanity or pride;—a happy book, without carnal sensuality;—an attractive book, without reckless and blaspheming ungodliness;—a pious book, without fanaticism;—a classic book, without a stoical or heathenish spirit; an American book, without crude and slipshod haste.

But you are setting up a mere ideal standard of perfection, to which the mind of man never did attain, and to which it never can attain!—says some ever-ready oracle of despondency. We do not believe this oracle of despondency to be true. We believe that the oracle *Philipizes*, as Demosthenes charged the oracle, at Delphi with doing, during the struggle between Athens and Macedon. We believe that its tongue twists to the side of the strong despotism of *common-place*, which is gathering the whole republic of religious letters in its grasp; and that it does not speak from the inspiration of heavenly or of terrestrial truth.

The American mind is not really imbecile, effete, or worn out in any respect. With all the recklessness or party rage, too often attributable to literal drunkenness, which shows itself in the American congress, we still firmly believe that there is as much of genuine intellect, in the aggregate, in the two houses of that body, as there ever was at any former period of our history. Speeches have been delivered there during the session which has just closed, which would have done honor to any session which has been held since the formation of the Federal constitution. *Say not thou, What is the cause that the former days were better than these? for thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this.* Letter-writers go about at the seat of government, to scrape up news for papers of all descriptions, who are not specially opposed to the retail of defamation, because that spicy article is admirable season-

ing for one of the epistles in which their occupation consists. Especially when one of these epistles is threatened with that disease of vacuity, which nature and news-mongers both abhor, they occupy the space, and blacken the fair sheet, with lamentations over the follies of Congress, and the degeneracy of the times. It is true that the mighty men, whose light has been in those halls for forty years, and who belonged, in fact, to a foregoing generation, have nearly all passed away. The great Carolinian, and the great Kentuckian, both sleep in the soil of the States which so loved and honoured and cherished them while living. And the great man of the North, their contemporary and their rival, who, like either of them, would have been *facile princeps* of any other three men of the times, yet lingers on the stage, obviously but for a short time,* while they, in whose giant wars he has borne his part, have nearly all passed by. *One generation passeth away and another generation cometh.* Their successors, we do not rashly say, their equals, have sprung up, and are springing up, and will spring in the broad states.

There is not a single sign extant upon the horizon, that the God of Nature intends to stint his gifts of wisdom and of worth, to the generation which now is, or to those which are to come, of the human race. Freedom of thought and action is one thing which brings out strong minds, and that we have. Objects of real magnitude and importance, constitute another circumstance necessary for the development of the highest mental gifts; and they are here to an extent which exaggerating rhetoric itself cannot hide from view. And another circumstance adapted strongly to contribute to the vigour of the human mind, is a natural form of civilization, not encrusted with artificial distinctions in society, or with the soulless traditions of a ceremonial religion; but one which sets the powers of man to work with natural and real force, that he may strive, and his strength may grow, from conflicts which necessarily belong to the mystery of this life. These great elements of a powerful literature are not wanting in this country. When the era of emigration shall have, in a great measure, passed by, and the intellect of the country shall have gone

* Gone! before this sentence could be issued from the press.—Eds.

steadily to work with the circumstances around it, it will then be seen, if we mistake not, that these conditions of a high mental development, are to be found here more than they have ever been found elsewhere.

If the mind of any European race, or of all the European races is *effete*, that is still not a reason to conclude that the American mind is so at all. We employ the English language chiefly, it is true. And our earliest colonies were from that island. Yet we are not simply a scion of the English stock. Nor are we a French race simply, even in our Huguenot settlements. Nor are we a pure Scotch-Irish race, even in western Pennsylvania and the valley of Virginia. Nor are we a Dutch race, even on the Hudson river. Nor are we a Spanish race, even in Florida and Texas. We are simply an American race—such a mingling of all those races, as will secure us for many generations to come, from either physical or mental degeneracy. We are rapidly losing all similarity to those who remain in our aboriginal seats in Europe. We are fast assimilating to each other, and assuming one or two definite types of character. The world has never witnessed circumstances of this description, better adapted to, or more requiring, high intellectual gifts, a high, pure, powerful, evangelical literature.

When the habits, manners and customs of our people become formed and settled, in a definite type, befitting the institutions of the country, there must be about them, much of that republican simplicity, in all the deed and speech and thought of life, in which nature prevails and shows itself, more than under other forms of civil government. We have not got the ruined abbeys and the haunted castles, and the traditionary ghosts of the European countries. We have, in our annals, no Montrose, no Dundee, no Wallenstein, fighting for false principle, and embalming the memory of corrupt superstitions, by a wild and picturesque chivalry. We have, on the other hand, no Prince of Orange, no Gustavus Adolphus, no Cromwell, maintaining with sword and pike, the truth of God, at periods of time picturesque beyond all others, in their outward shows, and with a pious heroism worthy of eternal record. Yet we have some history of our own, which is not mean in heroes and heroic deeds, of which fourth-of-July ora-

tions speak but too much, and of which there is not time here to speak. Only it has not in it the worship of kings, nobles, and bishops ; it gapes not after palaces and pomps, abbeys, castles and cathedrals. That is, it is natural and republican. And we have the hand of God's providence, working its own wonders in human life, public and private—showing nature at work in her eternal freshness, and leading us more deeply into those wonders of human nature which are really worthy of study, than we could go under the antiquated and artificial systems of Europe. And it is not crowns, coronets, ribbons, garters, or hoary superstitions, which render the providence of God interesting. It is how His hand leads the noblemen of his own creating, with genuine piety, and true heroism, and unsullied purity, through a life of wise and practical usefulness on earth, shining with many good and noble deeds, to honorable and worthy closes of life, and a death of real glory, and a sure entrance upon a happy immortality. We trust that by and by we shall see such things recorded in graceful and classic books, full of the spirit of a pure gospel, in an American language, addressing itself warmly to American hearts. To this we may add the hope that spiritual religion may get the start of the hierarchical spirit, in consecrating to itself the scenery of our country, by a classic literature, breathing its spirit around cascade and cave, lake, bay, river, and mountain, and all notable objects of the land ; and the further hope that religious literature may not continue to neglect, as it has done, the peculiar political phenomena of the country ; but that it may utter its voice of instruction and warning, stating the principles of Christian morality, irrespective of political parties, which apply to presidential canvasses, and all electioneering contests, and to the proceedings of legislative bodies, and to the judgments of the judicial bench, and to the deliberations of the executive chamber, and to all the actions of man—his interests, his duties, his hopes, and his fears—as the citizen of a free republic on earth, and the subject of a sovereign God in Heaven.

ARTICLE VII.

NECROLOGY.

REV. WM. H. BARR, D. D.

The memory of those who have been benefactors of their race should not be forgotten. This is true, whether they have been distinguished in the walks of literature and science; the mechanic arts; the fields of a just and patriotic war; the benevolent enterprises of philanthropy; the pulpit, the bar, or the Senate. The good man, not unfrequently, is a more successful teacher after death than before it. His moral influence, relieved from the rivalries and prejudices which impaired its power while he lived, now glows with undimmed lustre, and like a summer's sun emerging from behind a dense cloud which had long obscured his rays, shines with redoubled radiance. Fortunately for those who survive, death ordinarily seals the lips of detraction; and when the great and the good are removed from earth, we are permitted, without the alloy of passion or prejudice, to recall the lessons they have taught us, and to admire and imitate the example of their lives.

It is a rare event that a man of any distinction passes through life, with all his actions, opinions and motives justly appreciated and impartially adjudged. Men do not always from the same premises deduce the same conclusions. The operations of the human mind are almost as various as are the lineaments of the human face. Hence, justly to appreciate the character of a man, it becomes necessary, not only to see his actions, but to learn his motives—not only to know his opinions, but to understand the reasons on which they are founded. In presenting a sketch, therefore, of the life and character of the distinguished and eloquent Christian minister whose name stands at the head of this article, the writer will endeavor to furnish a truthful portrait—and if there seem to be any striking peculiarity in his opinion, the reasons on which

they were based, as far as they are known, shall be faithfully given.

It is to be regretted that very little is known of the early life of this eminent minister of the gospel. The writer had no acquaintance with him during his school-boy days, nor until after he had commenced his ministerial career. Yet we may well dispense with all note of his early life, when we reflect that the Christian-only begins *truly to live* when he becomes the subject of regenerating grace.

William Hampden Barr, the subject of this sketch, was born in Rowan county, North Carolina, either on the sixth or eighth day of August, 1778. In his baptism, as he himself stated, he received only the name of William; but to distinguish himself from others of the same name, he afterwards assumed the addition of Hampden—whether out of respect to his Alma Mater, or from admiration of the character and principles of the great English patriot of that name, is not known. He was the son of Mr. James Barr, a highly respectable citizen of Rowan county, and his mother was a sister of the late distinguished Dr. McCorkle. His near relations, both on the father and mother's side, were remarkable for their piety, and were in comfortable circumstances, though not wealthy. His family removed to Iredell county when he was yet quite young, and here he grew up to manhood. This fact probably led to a mistake in the obituary notice of him, published soon after his death, in which it was stated that he was born in Iredell county. After acquiring the rudiments of an English education in the common schools of his neighborhood, he was entered as a pupil of the scientific school, then taught by that eminent servant of God, Rev. Dr. James Hall. Here he made such progress in his studies that he was qualified for and entered Hampden Sydney College, in Virginia, and achieved his first degree in one year. His diploma bears date, 24th April, 1801.

With such parents as his, and surrounded as he was in early life, by so many religious influences, it might well be expected that he would not long delay devoting himself to the love and service of his Saviour. From his own account of himself he was a wild and mischievous, though not a very wicked boy. The precise period at which he

made a profession of religion is not known ; but it is believed to have been but a short time before he entered college. Certain it is, however, that he did not *commence* his classical education, with a view to the ministry.

Soon after his graduation, he devoted himself to theological studies, and was taken under the care of Concord Presbytery ; but his health being very infirm, he was not in a condition to receive licensure until about five or six years afterwards. He was licensed by that Presbytery, it is believed, in the year 1806. For a few years after his licensure he was employed in missionary service, in various parts of North and South Carolina. In the early part of the year 1809, he located himself in Upper Long Cane congregation, in Abbeville district, South Carolina ; and having received and accepted a call from that church, was ordained and became its pastor in the month of December, 1809. On the 18th August, 1812, he intermarried with Miss Rebecca Reid, youngest daughter of Mr. Hugh Reid, who was then, and until his death continued to be, a ruling elder in that church.

It is a curious fact, that at a very early period after the Revolutionary war, the Presbyterians seem to have entertained the idea that the whole, or nearly all, of the present district of Abbeville, was to be and continue Presbyterian territory. A general meeting of delegates from the different "settlements," as they were then called, was held, at which a large extent of country, embracing a considerable portion of the district, was formally, and with very precise boundaries, divided between some three or four Presbyterian churches. A paper containing this adjustment of boundaries once existed amongst the records of Upper Long Cane church, and probably still exists. What particular object the actors in this partition of territory had in view, is not very apparent at this day ; yet, beyond doubt it was the consequence of, and indicates the fact, that the first inhabitants of that district were largely, indeed almost universally, Presbyterian. It is also a fact, and one which has in later times caused some difficulty and annoyance, that immediately after the division of territory just mentioned, the annual stipend, or salary, of the minister of Long Cane (and it is probable in the other churches too) was formally, and with an air at least of perpetuity,

established at *one hundred pounds, sterling*. If the church had only a portion of the minister's time and services, they paid him only the due proportion of that sum.

Under this law, just enough, perhaps, when it was enacted, but grossly unjust after the changes which rapidly took place in the condition of society, Doctor Barr took charge of one of the largest and most intelligent congregations in the State—occupied their pulpit every Sabbath but one in each month—for the first thirty years of his pastorate never disappointed his people in the performance of divine service *but twice*—and all this, until a few years before his death, he performed for the pitiful compensation of *seventy-five pounds*, equal to about three hundred and twenty-two dollars, per annum! This compensation for his time and labor being obviously insufficient for the rearing, maintenance, and education of a growing family, he was, of necessity, compelled to resort to auxiliary means for accomplishing these ends. To the business of teaching a school, the common resource of many pastors, similarly situated, he had an insuperable aversion; and having a small patrimony of his own, and receiving some assistance from his father-in-law, he was able to purchase a farm of moderate extent and value. On this farm he settled himself soon after his marriage—and here, too, he terminated his life. Until his first sons attained sufficient age and experience to relieve him from it, much of his own time and labor were necessarily bestowed upon his farm; and to the same extent was his congregation deprived of his private pastoral services. But he was a good economist, and being blessed with a wife who was a better still, he was enabled to rear and educate a family of six children—four sons and two daughters—all of whom are now grown up and respectably provided for.

Doctor Barr was a thorough and accurate scholar, making due allowance for the limited means of instruction in his day; and most deservedly did he receive from the authorities of Franklin College, Georgia, the honorary degree of "Doctor in Divinity."

The life of a retired country pastor seldom affords incidents of a striking or thrilling character. A quiet and unobtrusive walk in the routine of his sacred duties, has everything in it to excite the love of his friends, and little

to provoke the enmity of others. Such was the life of Dr. Barr. The people of his charge were profoundly attached to him, and estimated, in the highest possible degree, his pulpit ministrations. A few years before his death, they raised his salary to six hundred dollars—at that time, and in that locality, a tolerably respectable stipend. For a number of years before his death, his constitution, at all times delicate, began sensibly to decline. He was much afflicted with rheumatism, and endured, with exemplary patience, much bodily suffering. At length, on the 9th day of January, 1843, in the sixty-fifth year of his age, he died, in the faith of Jesus Christ, and as it is believed, at peace with God and all mankind.

Person and Character.

In the remaining portion of this article, the reader will please excuse the use of the pronoun, in the first person, singular. It is more convenient than the usual forms of paraphrase in such cases, and at the hazard of egotism, I shall adopt it.

In person, Dr. Barr was tall and exceedingly lean. His complexion was dark, and rather sallow—almost cadaverous. His gait and manners were awkward; and with all the training in the world, he could never have become a Chesterfield. His voice was harsh and grating; and notwithstanding his excellent education and powerful intellect, he retained to the last many of the improprieties of speech and pronunciation of his earlier years. Yet when he preached, the hearer never thought of noticing all this.

I shall never forget the impression made upon me by the first sermon I heard him preach. I had but little, if any, personal acquaintance with him before I heard him from the pulpit; and his general appearance—the tones of his voice—and his antiquated pronunciation were little calculated to inspire lofty expectations of his rhetorical powers. In person, and voice, and manner, he was altogether peculiar. Although I had heard him spoken of as an eloquent preacher, I had made up my mind that it was a *vulgar mistake*. When he began the services, my attention was powerfully arrested. In his prayer before the sermon

there was a comprehensiveness, a fervor, a deep-toned piety, a lofty eloquence, a something in the voice and manner that almost seemed unearthly. I began to feel that I was in the presence of an intellectual man. He began his sermon. There was no halting or stumbling—no straining for words or ideas—but an uninterrupted and unhesitating flow of pure and classical language. His subject, if I recollect right, had reference to the awful doom of the finally impenitent. His personal appearance, and the sepulchral tones of his voice, doubtless added something to the effect of his fervid eloquence—but when he superadded to the force of his own powerful language quotations from some of the most thrilling passages of Milton and Young, my hair almost stood on end; and when he closed his discourse, I no longer doubted of his eloquence as a preacher.

To show that I was not alone in being thus intensely impressed by the eloquence of this eminent preacher, I take the liberty of mentioning an incident related to me by a respectable and intelligent gentleman, now residing in Alabama, but who, at the time of its occurrence, lived in Lincoln county, Georgia. Dr. Barr had gone over into that county to assist one of his brethren on a sacramental occasion. The communion service had been protracted long, and it was getting quite late in the evening, when Dr. Barr arose in the pulpit to preach the usual closing sermon. The gentleman, my informant, resided a good many miles from the church, and he was rendered very uneasy by the unexpected claim upon him to hear another sermon. But while he was debating with himself whether he should be guilty of the rudeness of rising and going out with his family while the services were progressing, or remain, and thus be obliged to travel part of his way home in the dark, the words of the preacher arrested his attention; the debate in his mind was forgotten; the place and circumstances were forgotten; everything but the preacher and his subject was forgotten—and to use his own words, “he might have preached on until it was pitch dark, and I should never have thought of moving.”

As a preacher Dr. Barr had few superiors. I am not sure that I have ever heard his equal. But his style of preaching was so unique—so unlike that of the best edu-

cated divines of the present day, that it is impossible justly to compare him with them. His sermons varied very little in length—occupying from thirty to thirty-five minutes in the delivery. They were well studied, but not written out—and he was, without exception, the most perfectly correct extemporaneous speaker I have ever heard. Having attended his church regularly for twenty-five years, I do not think I ever heard him utter an ungrammatical sentence, or hesitate an instant for a word or an expression. His sentences were short—never complex and involved. But his pronunciation was sometimes *awful*. As an instance—he frequently used the word “satiety,” and invariably pronounced it “*sash-ity*.” But although he always used the most appropriate and expressive language, he cared less for words and their pronunciation, than for thought and sentiment.

His power of condensation, that rarest talent in public speakers, was very great. And although his sermons were so very short, it was a common remark of his intelligent hearers, that he seemed always to have exhausted his subject. He possessed a rare talent for eviscerating his text. Perceiving, intuitively, the strong points of his subject, he addressed himself to them; and never wasted the powers of his body, or the energies of his mind, on unimportant topics. His definitions were peculiarly precise and satisfactory; and his illustrations of obscure passages of scripture from the habits, manners and practices of the ancient Greeks and Romans were always pertinent and interesting. His sermons were, most generally, of a doctrinal character. It seemed to be his cherished aim to make his people intelligent Christians. He stood, with the hundred eyes of Argus, at the portals of orthodoxy—and his arm never wearied in belaboring error, whether it proceeded from those of his own faith, or the opponents of his creed. Yet, in this species of combat, his weapons were aimed, not at his foes, but their principles. He taught the doctrines of Calvin, without assailing Arminians. As illustrative of this trait, I mention the fact that about the time that the Presbyterian church became seriously agitated by the New-school doctrines and practices, he preached a series of sermons to his congregation at Long Cane, in which he lucidly exposed the errors of those

doctrines, and triumphantly vindicated those of the "old-school," and yet few of his hearers were aware that he had been assailing the errors of a portion of their own church. In short, in his faith, his doctrines, and his practice, he was a thorough-going, old fashioned Presbyterian. He was not a Calvinist *in theory*, and an Arminian *in practice*; but, out-and-out, a whole-souled, old-school, Calvinistic Presbyterian, in theory and in practice. Having adopted the confession of faith of that church, he interpreted and received its doctrines as they were understood by the earlier Fathers, without hesitation or mental reservation.

He was furiously and irreconcilably opposed to dancing; indeed, his hostility to this species of amusement almost amounted to a monomania. As sure as there was, in the village near which his church was situated, either a public ball or a private dancing party, so sure was he, the very next Sabbath, to bear his testimony against it. He found a positive denunciation in the New Testament against this amusement in the word translated "revelings." The original word, he said, was "komoi," and was taken from the feasts of Comus. Whether he was correct in this criticism or not, it is not important to inquire—he was a foe to dancing, and deemed it a sin *per se*; and at an early period of his ministry he had resolved that, whatever else he might do, "he would never preach to a dancing congregation." The following anecdote is so characteristic of the man, that although it may be thought somewhat ludicrous, and therefore out of place, I cannot refrain from relating it. On a certain occasion there had been a ball in the village, and a lady from the country who had been present reported, as she believed, but falsely, as the fact was, that another lady residing in the village, a member of the Doctor's church, and one whom he greatly esteemed, had been at the ball. The Doctor, with his heart full of sorrow, instantly mounted his horse and rode to her residence. He was invited to take a seat in the parlour, and the lady sat before him. It was a strict confessional, for none else was present. The Doctor's face, never short, seemed to be longer than usual. He groaned audibly, and began—"Well, S., I have heard something about you that has pained me to the heart, and

I have come down to talk to you about it." Here the lady found herself trembling all over, for she thought something very dreadful was about to happen. "Please inform me what it is," said she. After considerable twisting and wriggling on his chair, the Doctor brought it out—"I have been told that you were at the ball, the other night."—"Then you have been told what is not true," she replied. "What!" said he, his countenance lighting up, and his face recovering its usual longitude, "is it indeed true that you were not there?" "It is true" said she, "that I was not there, and never had a thought of being there."—"Well, I am truly rejoiced—you have lifted a load off my heart," replied he, "and I shall go home satisfied." The lady then requested to know the name of his informer, but he steadily refused to give it—saying, it would do her no good to know it, and that she had better remain in ignorance on that point. He was a man of peace. The name of his informer, however, was afterwards disclosed by his wife. *Preachers ought to be very careful how they confide secrets to their wives.*

Some have expressed surprise and regret that no Sabbath-school was ever organized in his church, and he has been supposed to have been unfriendly to that beneficent institution. It is true, that in the form in which such schools are now organized, none ever existed in his church. But it is not true, so far as I know or believe, that he was ever opposed to the principle and substance of the institution. His was a very large, country congregation, covering more than ten miles square of territory. It would have been, therefore, exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to assemble any large portion of the children and youth, for instruction, as is practised in the Sabbath schools of the present day. Beside this, the population within his bounds was almost wholly Presbyterian; and generally, the children received faithful parental instruction at home. He was almost extreme in his regard for the sanctity of the Sabbath; and where an absolute necessity did not exist for it, he was probably averse to appropriating the day to mere literary instruction. No such necessity existed in his congregation. The people were mostly able to educate their children; and if not, the State had established a system of free schools, which afforded abundant means for

educating the children of the poor. But although there was no Sabbath-school, *eo nomine*, in his church, the religious instruction of the young was by no means neglected. In the spring and summer months, from May till October, the Doctor instructed a class in McDowell's Bible questions, and a more advanced Bible class, every Sabbath, before the morning service. These exercises, particularly the last, were very instructive and interesting—so much so, that the attention of the whole congregation, old and young, was attracted to them.

In a previous part of this sketch it has been stated that the people of Dr. Barr's charge were much attached to him. As proof of this attachment, and the respect they evinced for him, I take occasion in this connection, to record an incident which occurred several years before his death, and in which his congregation spontaneously represented a real or supposed contempt shewn to their pastor. The American Sunday-school Union had dispatched an agent to the South, whose business it was to enlighten the minds of the people on the subject, and to organize Sabbath-schools in the various churches throughout the country. Long before he reached Dr. Barr's church he had been told by persons (perhaps over officious) that it would be labor lost to attempt his enterprise in that church—that Dr. Barr would not suffer the establishment of such a school within his congregation, or something to that effect. The agent being, perhaps, a little vain of his oratorical powers, (for even *good men* are sometimes vain,) boasted that if the Doctor would only give him the use of his pulpit and the ears of his people, he would ask no more, and would soon shew him whether a Sabbath-school would be organized in his church or not. He came—and as it happened that the next Sabbath after his arrival was the Doctor's day to preach at another church of which he had charge, his pulpit at Long Cane was cheerfully yielded to the agent. It is proper to state here, that I do not, by any means, affirm that the agent alluded to did, in fact, make the boast above stated; but I do affirm, that it was so reported, and that the report was generally known to the people. There was a large attendance of the congregation. The agent took the pulpit, and delivered one of the best and most eloquent sermons it has ever been my for-

tune to listen to. After the sermon, he presented a paper, to be signed by those who were in favor of organizing a Sabbath-school there. A gentleman of distinction and influence, now dead, was called up to the front of the pulpit, and the paper put in his hands. He invited the people to come forward and affix their signatures, but no man left his seat. After a painful silence of a few minutes—as painful, no doubt, to the people as it obviously was to the agent, he dismissed the congregation and left the house, most deeply mortified. Now, in all this, both parties were probably in the wrong. There was an unchristian spirit on both sides. Many of the people, I know, deeply regretted that a profound and merited respect for their pastor, in their opinion, demanded at their hands such a mortifying rebuke to a supercilious agent. And, possibly, after all, he may not have been guilty of the arrogance imputed to him. The incident is only mentioned here to show the attachment of the people to their pastor, and how sensitive they were when, as they believed, his honor was in question.

But there is yet another topic, which a just regard for the ministerial character of this distinguished preacher renders it necessary for me to notice at some length. By some he has been blamed for his supposed opposition to what are commonly called *revivals*, and *revival preaching*. To what extent he was justly obnoxious to this imputation, will be seen from the following statements—the truth of which will hardly be questioned by those whose intercourse with him was, in any degree, intimate, or who were in the habit of hearing frequently his pulpit ministrations. And if it were necessary to account for his very stringent views on this subject, by any consideration outside of the rational convictions of his judgment and conscience, guided by an intelligent apprehension of the Calvinistic doctrines of his church, his experience of the excesses and unmitigated evils of what has been called “*the great revival*” of the first few years of the present century, might be cited as a cause well calculated to produce such views. By this strange work—this wonderful convulsion of the moral and religious elements of society, unparalleled in modern times—he, as well as all other prudent and thinking men, was painfully convinced of the

dreadful extremes to which the human mind may be carried under the influence of fanaticism inflamed by mere animal excitement. He knows little of the philosophy of the passions, and the waywardness of the human heart, who is willing to trust the interests of our holy religion to the unchecked influence of mere excitement and passion. That there can be no genuine religion without feeling—often strong and overpowering feeling—is true; yet it is not less true, that there may be much feeling and high excitement where there is not a particle of religion. That the extraordinary work alluded to was, in some sort, connected with religious feeling; and that there were some, possibly many, genuine conversions during its progress, no one ever doubted. But that the cause of true religion was greatly retarded, if not seriously injured by it, few, if any, good and reflecting men, in the end, had any doubts. Independent of the loss to the Presbyterian church of that large body which now goes by the name of a seceding Presbytery, and which constitutes a new and distinct denomination, a general coldness and spiritual apathy enshrouded the church for many years. Infidels scoffed and became confirmed in their unbelief—while many weak-minded professors became abandoned sinners, or avowed infidels, for the want of that high-strained excitement which had afforded them a temporary enjoyment. Dr. Barr himself, once told the writer, that to such excesses had this maniac excitement led some very susceptible but unthinking men, that a whole church in North Carolina abandoned the use of wine in the communion service, and substituted in its place a tea made from what is familiarly known by the name of the *cross vine*!—influenced, doubtless, by a fancied likeness to the cross of our Saviour. Familiar as he was with the mortifying excesses and extravagancies of this great moral convulsion, it is not surprising that he should, ever after, at least fear and doubt the results of great excitement in religious exercises. But it must not be understood that his views were based wholly, or even mainly, upon his knowledge of these excesses; on the contrary, they were the calm and well-considered convictions of his judgment.

The intimate and cordial friendship which subsisted between the Doctor and myself, from the commencement

of our acquaintance to the day of his death, and the frequent and unreserved conversations we have held on this and other cognate subjects, enable me, I think, to present his opinions on this point as they were entertained by himself.

He believed that so far as the services of the pulpit are concerned, and not discarding the other scriptural means of grace, the faithful preaching of the sublime truths of the gospel, with the fervent presentation of the motives and sanctions of our holy religion, was all that was either necessary or proper for the conversion of sinners. That urging upon the impenitent any considerations or motives not expressly set forth in, or fairly deducible from, the word of God, was (to use a legal phrase) "travelling out of the record," and improper. He was, therefore, most decidedly opposed to what he was in the habit of calling "mechanical means" to get up an excitement at religious meetings—and he seriously distrusted the genuineness of conversions where such means were used, and followed by what he deemed their natural result, *mere physical excitement*. He was, therefore, not favorable to camp-meetings, where he believed such objectionable means were but too apt to be resorted to. But it is not true that he was opposed to revivals. He only preferred, greatly preferred, a solemn, deep and silent work of grace, superinduced by the plain but warm and heart-searching preaching of the gospel, under the blessing of God, to that other work, *called a revival*, where those objectionable means have been used, and where there is often more apparent feeling, and more numerous supposed conversions. To illustrate, in some degree, his views and feelings on this point, I will relate another incident of my free and familiar intercourse with him:

We were riding together one day, when our conversation turned upon this subject. After giving his views very fully and freely on the subject of revivals, (so called,) I remarked to him that although he had never had any great external exhibition of religious excitement in his church, I did not think he had any cause for discouragement; that I had been a close and somewhat interested observer, and it seemed to me that he had had a steady and not discouraging increase of his church membership

ever since he had been the pastor of that people. "Yes," cried he, with much warmth and animation, "since I have preached to this congregation, now about twenty-five years, there have been added to the church an average of about fourteen new members every year; we have had a continued revival." And I will add, that I do not recollect a single instance in which any of those who joined his church during that time were ever subjected to church discipline, or in the eyes of the church or the world, disgraced their profession by an ungodly walk. Of the heart we cannot and dare not judge. It is proper here to remark, that as the above conversation is related by me from memory, after the lapse of many years, I may be mistaken as to the number added to the church—or, as the Doctor spoke from a mere general recollection, and only designed to approximate the number, as near as might be, from such recollection, that he made it a little over what it should be. On examination of his Presbyterial reports, for seventeen years, the average appears to be *ten*, of those who were admitted *on examination*.

I have, thus, endeavored to furnish a sketch (imperfect, as I feel it is,) of the life and character of the late Rev. Dr. Barr. It may be unduly colored by the partiality of friendship—but if so, I am unconscious of it. I have not pretended to note his faults or his frailties. He had them, for no man is without them. "*Nil de mortuis, nisi bonum*" is not a bad maxim, and I have thought it well to follow it.

P. S. A portion of the foregoing article was written, in the form of a letter, at the request of Dr. W. B. Sprague, of Albany, N. Y., and forwarded to him several years ago, to be inserted in a work which he is preparing for the press. Dr. Sprague's work has not yet appeared—and the writer of this article being requested to prepare a sketch of the life and character of Dr. Barr for the Southern Presbyterian Review, did not feel at liberty to decline it. This explanation is deemed necessary to account for the identity of language, in the two, if Dr. Sprague's work shall hereafter be published.

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *The Scots Worthies ; containing a brief historical account of the most eminent Noblemen, Gentlemen, Ministers, and others, who testified or suffered for the cause of Reformation in Scotland, from the beginning of the sixteenth century to the year 1688. By JOHN HOWIE, of Lochgoin. Illustrated. New York : Robert Carter & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 632.*

This "family piece" of the Scottish peasantry is exceedingly welcome ; especially in the handsome form in which the enterprising publishers have presented it. For the last three quarters of a century, this book of noble traditions has nourished the masses in Scotland with fascinating instruction—and next to the Bible, and the Confession of Faith, has done more than any other book, to diffuse intelligence, vigor, patriotism, and attachment to Presbytery—for which they are so much distinguished in the front rank of Christian civilization. It is rich biography ; it is authentic martyrology ; and being the production of a moorland farmer, a man of extraordinary genius and piety, who, without the advantage of a liberal education, mingled all his life with the common people, it has a charm for them, like that of the Pilgrim's Progress, which a more cautious and profound erudition might only have marred. Yet the extensive research, the dignified style, and the copious allusion which characterize the work, make it entertaining and profitable to the most cultivated reader.

We commend it to all that delight in this delightful species of literature ; and especially to those who would see how nobly the Presbyterian Faith has witnessed for God, triumphed over bitter persecution, and bequeathed a legacy of truth, freedom and honor, to all that are so happy as to bear its name, and labor for its propagation.

2. *Daughters of China; or Sketches of Domestic Life in the Celestial Empire.* By ELIZA J. GILLETT BRIDGMAN. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 285 Broadway. 1853. pp. 234.

This is a sprightly and instructive picture of female life and character in China. We are led here to estimate the superlative value of Christianity, in social life, and to the lot of woman. Bondage and degradation betide her, in the best forms of civilization that were ever attained, without the Bible. The book is got up in beautiful style—the free and inartificial manner in which it is written gives much entertainment—and we hope the object will be accomplished—to awaken more interest among the pious females of our country, in missions to China, and bring home to them personally the question of duty. The jealous exclusion of male missionaries, from intercourse with the families of China, renders large reinforcements of female laborers indispensable to the successful establishment of the gospel there.

-
3. *The Spring Time of Life; or Advice to Youth.* By Rev. DAVID MAGIE, D. D., Elizabethtown, N. J. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 285 Broadway. 1853. pp. 328.

We thank the venerable author, for this ripe and excellent contribution, to the supply of a need, which is always fresh, in the rapid succession of our youthful generations. Every decade of human life, in these days of change and progress, demands new counsels, appropriate to the new evils, new disguises of temptation, and new responsibilities of the rising race. These are best given by such men as the writer of this book. God has ordained it, that the parental style—grave, chaste, solemn, earnest, and benevolent—shall be blessed the most, in benefitting the young. We have too much of the piquant, in sermons and addresses to young men, at the present day—which seems to aim at the captivation and excitement of youth, as if these alone

were sufficient to gain and guide them in the way of safety. We would rather have the mellow blessings of age, after a well-spent life, and listen, for our sons, to men who, like "Moses before his death," uttered words of paternal advice and expostulation—which were none the less potent because they were dignified and tender. "My doctrine shall drop as the rain; my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass."

-
4. *Daily Commentary: a Practical Exposition of Select Portions of Scripture, for every morning and evening throughout the year. Being a compendium to Family Worship. By one hundred and eighty Clergymen of the Church of Scotland. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853. 8vo., pp. 968.*

This book is a portion of a work issued in Scotland, to promote and aid the good old custom which has been the honor of Presbyterian Scotland since the Reformation. It brings to our memory Burns' description in his "Cotter's Saturday Night."

"The cheerful supper done, wi' serious face,
 They round the ingle form a circle wide;
 The sire turns o'er, wi' patriarchal grace,
 The big Ha' Bible, once his father's pride—
 The priest-like father reads the sacred page,
 How Abram was the pride of God on high;
 Or Moses bade eternal warfare wage
 With Amalek's ungracious progeny;—
 Then kneeling down to heaven's eternal King,
 The saint, the father, and the husband prays;
 Hope "springs exulting on triumphant wing,"
 That thus they all shall meet in future days."

This custom to Niebuhr was ineffably distressing. "There is no nation," says he, "that can be compared to the Scotch for piety; they not only go to church *every* Sunday, but to both the

services ; and all, high and low, conclude the day of rest with prayer and singing." The book before us is a portion of a larger work, embracing prayers for every morning and evening throughout the year, each prayer being accompanied by a brief comment on some portion of Scripture. The prayers have been issued by the Carters separately. To complete the work, the comments are now issued in a uniform volume. Although Niebuhr said of the ministers of the Church of Scotland, "The clergy in general are not good for much," we are of a very different opinion. The volume before us is a favorable specimen of their intelligence and piety. Would that Germany could show us such a volume coming from the pens of her living ministry. Among the one hundred and eighty clergymen are some of the most distinguished names of the Church of Scotland. The conception of the book is happy, and the volume is equally adapted to the purposes of family worship and private devotion. If it errs at all, it is in the length of the passages selected from the Scriptures and of the comments upon them.

5. *Ancient Christianity Exemplified in the private, domestic, social, and civic life of the primitive Christians, and in the original institutions, offices, ordinances, and rites of the Church.* By LYMAN COLEMAN. Philadelphia : Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1852. pp. 645. 8vo.

This is a new and greatly improved edition of a valuable book, in a department of knowledge in which English literature has not much abounded, the department of Ecclesiastical Archæology. We have the "Primitive Christianity," "Apostolical Antiquities," and "Primitive Fathers" of Cave; the "Ecclesiastical Antiquities" of Bingham, a work *viginti annorum*, of great research, but ill digested, confounding all chronology, and which represents the prelatical form of Church government, which did not show itself till the latter part of the second century, as the earliest form of Christianity. There is also the work of Lord

King on "the Primitive Church," which Dr. Coleman appears to have overlooked—a work of no great extent, but, in its comparatively limited compass, replete with learning. The German scholars of the present century have followed in the footsteps of their predecessors, the Magdeburg Centuriators—who did such service in the cause of the Reformation—with the enthusiasm of learned research, though not with the same sound evangelical spirit. Dr. Coleman has availed himself of the labors of these men, incorporating also the results of his own studies, so that it is a far more independent work than its parent volume, which was issued by him in 1841, as a translation from Augusti, with additions from Rheinwald, Siegel, and others. The portion on infant baptism is one which has received material improvement; that also on Presbyters; and in various other places there are marks of the maturer studies of the author. For this he was prepared by his intermediate work "The Apostolic and Primitive Church," published in 1844. The book is still susceptible of improvement. There is perhaps too great a leaning on the authority of Planck, Augusti, Neander, Boehmer, and other German Archæologists, whose labors have furnished the chief materials wrought over. We doubt, for instance, whether it be true that in the earliest Church there was no distinction between clergy-men and laymen. The name clergy, κληρος, may not have been applied; but there certainly was from the beginning a distinction between the teachers and the taught, the rulers and the ruled. Even when in a church many were endowed with miraculous gifts, and while exercising them were, for the time being, distinguished from the rest; in the midst of these there were permanent teachers who had the λογος σοφιας and the λογος γνωσης, word of wisdom, and the word of knowledge permanent κυβερνησεις governments and permanent ανηλεησεις helps. And however it may have been the duty of all the members to spread the gospel, they never were authorized to usurp these offices. And although the converts of one city formed one church, and although they were in a measure independent of any foreign power, and competent to transact their own ecclesiastical business, yet it is impossible that in such a city as Jerusalem the many thou-

sand converts should have formed one congregation, worshipped under one and the same pastor, and been under the supervision of absolutely the same church officers. In other words, these considerations destroy the principle of absolute independency of individual churches, and render it necessary to infer Presbyterian government, in which alone, Prelacy being out of the question, the *oneness* of the church of any large metropolitan city, such as Jerusalem, can be found. It is very desirable in an Archæological book like this, that reference should be had always to chronology in giving the condition of the Church. This is one of the greatest faults in Bingham. He mixes authorities of the fourth and fifth centuries confusedly with those of the first and second. However this may do for those anxious at all hazards to maintain the Prelacy, it is not for the interests of Presbyteriana. We are glad to see the pains taken by the author, in this particular, in many parts of the volume, and only wish it had been uniform throughout.

We hail the appearance of such works as this with pleasure. History is often the best refutation of error. If the rites and formalism of the Papacy and Puseyism are ancient, truth is more ancient. When you have shown the rise of the Papacy, you have refuted it. When you have shown that Peter and Paul, Apollos and Barnabas, know nothing of the sign of the cross in baptism; of the worship of Mary; of bowings and genuflexions; of the sacrifice of mass and purgatory; of waxed tapers and the holy Chrism; of stoles, albs, chasubles, mitres and croziers; of auricular confession and extreme unction, and have shown when man's folly gave birth to these purities, you have destroyed the whole ground-work of Popery, in the Romish Church and out of it.

-
6. *The Bible the Book of the Lord, or the Divine Authority of the Sacred Scriptures; Addressed especially to the Young.* Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 48.

This appears to be a valuable little book, and is written with the simplicity and condensation which are suited to the object.

Yet, the utility of such publications may be somewhat questioned. Apologetic Christianity is never introduced into the nursery with much advantage. Occasionally, a lad may stumble on a doubt, and be staggered with the objections of infidelity; but, in the great majority of cases, argument on this subject, in a formal way, does more to perplex than relieve a child. A score of doubts may be started while one is removed, by this process of formal reasoning. It is better that the watchful parent or teacher be ready, in familiar conversation, and a manner suited to each particular case, to answer the difficulty or objection. Let the internal evidence beam on the mind, from a memory well stored with the letter of God's Book, before the external evidence is argued; and then it is felt with a force and fulness of conviction, which requires but little polemical pains.

7. *Daily Readings. Passages of Scripture selected for Social Reading, with applications.* By CAROLINE FRY. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 288.

There is much vivacity and comprehensive brevity, in the reflections with which these scripture readings are accompanied. They do not profess to be commentary—and yet, in most instances, they present the main thought with great justice and beauty.

8. *A Manual on the Christian Sabbath.* By JOHN HOLMES AGNEW. With an Introductory Essay, by the Rev. S. MILLER, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 198.

This little book is replete with important argument and exhortation—in which we have a judicious condensation of the

usual proof, that the Sabbath is of moral and perpetual obligation ; that the day has been changed with divine approbation, &c.—along with seasonable and pertinent reprehension of certain violations of this consecrated time, which are legalized in our country. It is well adapted for general reading ; and the Introductory Essay itself, gives it value enough to be eagerly desired by every family in the Presbyterian Church.

9. *Evidences for Heaven. Written in the year 1650. By Mrs. THOMABEN HEAD, for the benefit of her children. Philadelphia : Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 101.*

An excellent manual, for aid, in the great duty of self-examination, as well as the way to attain eminent holiness. Occasioned by the distresses in which the authoress, the widow of a minister, was involved by the "Irish Massacre," it exhibits unusual excitement of mind, in recounting the "Evidences for Heaven ;" but, on that very account, the pages are more interesting and instructive.

10. *Memoirs of the Lives of Robert Haldane, of Airthrey, and of his brother, James Alexander Haldane. By ALEXANDER HALDANE, Esq., of the Lunar Temple. Barrister at Law. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853. 8vo., pp. 604.*

The name of Haldane has long been dear to us, as of those bound to us by house-hold ties. Familiar as we were with the outline of their religious history, and conversant with the writings of at least one of them in exposition and defence of the sacred Scriptures, it has been refreshing to peruse these extended memoirs, from the pen of one intimate enough to give the full details of biography. Exemplifying in their own persons the

power of divine grace, and singularly blessed in their efforts to revive true religion, both in England and on the continent, the book has a peculiar spiritual flavor to all who relish devotional reading. As the brothers were largely engaged through a long tract of years, and in many enterprises of Christian benevolence, with the purest and strongest men of their age, these memoirs possess attractions for the general reader, beyond most religious biographies. The American religious public are brought under obligation to the Messrs. Carter, for adding this book to our religious literature, in the American edition they have produced. Its circulation and perusal cannot fail to inspire with zeal and animate with hope, all who engage in labors for the extension of Christ's kingdom.

11. *The Well-Watered Plains, or Instructive Lessons from the History of Lot.* By H. N. BRINSMADE, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 93.

An interesting and instructive topic—well handled, by a sound, discriminating, and benevolent mind.

12. *Romanism as it is. An Oration, delivered by the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, D. D., of London, with an Appendix, by the Editor.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 70.

We are glad to see this eloquent tract, by one of the ablest champions against Popery, of this or any other age. The editor, with his usual good judgment, has given body to this pamphlet, by adding certain documents of an extraordinary character, and of great interest to American Protestants, viz: The bold avow-

al of intolerance by a Roman Catholic paper, at St. Louis, "The Shepherd of the Valley," with elaborate justification of it; and the reasons given by the Rev. Pierce Connelly for his renunciation of Popery, and return to the Protestant Church. It is a valuable service, to preserve for us, in this way, such papers.

13. *The True Source of National Happiness: a Sermon*, by Rev. H. B. CUNNINGHAM, of North Carolina. *Delivered on Sabbath, July 4th, 1852, and published by request.*

This is a well-written and very appropriate discourse. It is manifestly the product of an original and vigorous mind. The author is bold enough to advocate the claims of Presbyterianism, and to maintain its republican tendency; and has shown a knowledge of historical details amply sufficient to enable him to execute the work in an admirable and masterly manner. No occasion or locality would be more suitable than the anniversary of our national existence, or the place where the first formal declaration was made, for a full exhibition of the powerful influence which the Presbyterian Church exerted in promoting the Revolution, and securing American independence. May these sacred principles of political and religious liberty be preserved by the embalming grace of our heavenly King, to bless the coming generations, and save our government from the fate of former republics.

S. C. P.

14. *Robert and Harold, or the Young Marooners on the Florida Coast.* By F. R. GOULDING. Philadelphia: William S. Martin. 1852. pp. 422, 18mo.

We recommend this to our youthful friends as a most instructive and fascinating book. It describes the fortunes, misfortunes,

courage, perseverance and ingenuity, of the children of a family residing temporarily on the Florida coast, who had embarked on board a boat for a marooning party, and who, ere their parents had joined them, were carried out to sea by a devil-fish, which had tripped their anchor by catching its cable chain under one of its flippers, and holding on, according to the known habits of the monster, with a deadly grasp. At length they made the coast in a dangerous part of that unfrequented shore, where they laid some months, thrown entirely on their own resources, far away from human beings, amid the ferocious beasts of the woods. Our children read it as they read Robinson Crusoe, only with more sympathy in the adventures of the young heroes, and are not contented with a single perusal. Mr. Goulding has been most successful in this department of juvenile literature, and has abundant encouragement to try his pen again.

We have received from the Presbyterian Board of Publication the following works:

1. *Pictorial Scenes, illustrative of Christian Missions.*
2. *My Own Hymn Book.*
3. *Grandmother's Parable: or the Young Pilgrims.*
4. *A Forest Flower, or a Memorial of Daniel McKillican, who died in the fourteenth year of his age. By Rev. JAMES DRUMMOND, Missionary of the Free Church of Scotland Madrad.*
5. *The Youth's Gleaner, or Ripe Fruits of Piety.*

These publications are designed for the benefit of the young; and in this department of literature the Board has been most eminently successful.

We have also received from Robert Carter & Brothers an exquisite edition of GRAY'S Poems. We could not have had a richer treat. To praise GRAY is like carrying coals to New-Castle. The edition in question is beautifully printed, and adorned with numerous engravings.

VL - # 12

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER IV.

APRIL, 1853.

ARTICLE I.

CONSCIENCE—ITS NATURE, OFFICE AND AUTHORITY.

I. *Moral Science.* By A. ALEXANDER, D. D.

II. *Dick's Theology.* Lecture LXXVII.

III. *McCosh on Divine Government.* Book III: Chapters 1 & 2.

IV. *Paley's Moral Philosophy.*

V. *Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind.* By THOMAS BROWN, M. D. Lectures LXXIII. and LXXXII.

Has man a conscience? This is one of the most important enquiries in mental and moral science. It is not only a question respecting all moral duty, but concerning the nature of man himself. Man possessed of a conscience is certainly a very different being from man considered as destitute of such a faculty. Subtract from human nature the reason, and substitute in its stead mere brute intelligence or instinct, and how completely has man lost his character! So, if the conscience be obliterated from the list of mental faculties, an intellectual and social being may be left, but one utterly incapable of every moral act. This question then, affects the very nature of man, and

Vol. VI.—No. 4.

31

affects that nature too, where it rises highest in the scale of being, and by its capacity for virtue approximates nearest to Divinity.

Those who have objected to the existence of such a mental faculty as conscience, have done so on what may be termed subjective and objective grounds. They have considered it difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish the exercises of what is termed conscience, from other mental operations. This objection, however, proceeds upon the supposition that, to exist at all, conscience must have a simple existence,—that is, that it must be one definite mental faculty, exercising one specific office. But this is applying a rule to the conscience which is demanded for no other mental faculty. What we call reason, or the understanding, perceives, compares, judges, generalizes, argues, etc; and yet we designate this faculty, with all its diversified operations, simply as the reason. The same is true of the will, of memory, and of the imagination. The truth is, that if we should ascribe every species of mental operation to some definite faculty, our metaphysical nomenclature would become cumbersome and unwieldy, and the science of mind would be rendered even more unintelligible than it now is.

But it has also been alleged, that the decisions of conscience concerning moral actions have not only been various, but contradictory. Admitting, for the present, the whole force of this objection, still it does by no means prove the non-existence of such a faculty as conscience. The same objection may be raised against the reason, the will, the emotions; and, indeed, against the very appetites and tastes of mankind. All these, in many respects, operate variously in different ages and nations, and among different individuals; yet who, on a ground like this, would divest men of these essential characteristics of their being?

By conscience is meant that faculty or power of the human soul by which it perceives the difference between right and wrong, approving the one and condemning the other. In this definition, two things are to be observed: first, that conscience is a mental power or faculty, the same as the reason, the will, or the memory. Paley speaks of it as an "instinct." Butler calls it "a princi-

ple"—"a law"—"a determinate rule"—"a sentiment of the understanding, and a perception of the heart."—McCosh designates it as "a law,—a faculty, and a sentiment." Dr. Brown terms it "the moral principle." Language of this sort, whatever may be the soundness of an author's creed, is well calculated to mystify the very existence of conscience, and thus unnecessarily to lead men into error. It must also be observed, that conscience, like the will, is not a simple, but a complex, faculty. The will is the faculty of choice: but in order to its exercise, there must be an antecedent exercise of the reason. The objects from which a choice is to be made must be perceived and compared, before the will can choose. So it is with the conscience. The moral actions concerning which it is to be employed must be first perceived; then compared with the rule of duty; a judgment is next formed concerning them; and the feeling of approbation, or of disapprobation, results last of all. It is true, that this is accomplished by the mind so rapidly as to seem but one act. Such, however, it is not, but a rapid succession of different mental acts. Some philosophers, wishing to indicate what is *peculiar* to the will and the conscience in such exercises, consider simply *preference* or *choice* to be the province of the will, and the exercise of moral approbation or disapprobation as that of the conscience. Dr. Brown maintains this ground strongly as to the conscience; nor does Dr. Alexander differ but little from his opinion. "The moral part of this compound, says the former, is the *emotion*, and the *emotion only*." "So far," says the latter, "therefore, as conscience is a judgment respecting any moral subject, so far it is an exercise of the understanding. We have not one faculty by which we discern physical truths, another by which we judge of mathematical theorems, and another for matters of taste; but all these are the one and the same understanding, exercised on different objects." The truth is, the faculties of the mind, like the colours of the rainbow, may be said to run into each other. For the most part, whenever one acts, there is a concurrence of all; some being more prominent, others more obscure, but all efficient. The duty of the philosopher is simply to designate that *peculiar action* which belongs to any one faculty, and marks its specific character.

That man possesses, a conscience, that is, a mental faculty that judges of right and wrong, approving of the one and condemning the other, may be fully proved from the four following considerations:

1. The existence of moral distinctions, which none can deny, supposes a faculty or power in the mind by which they are perceived and estimated. That there is an adaptation of physical nature to the physical constitution of man, all must admit. Light is suited to the eye, sound to the ear, and the whole arrangement of nature to the laws of the human understanding. Now, whether man were created subservient to the external world, or the latter created in subserviency to man, it matters not; the harmony between them is apparent to all. Whether, then, we argue from external nature to the human constitution, or from the latter to the former, our conclusions are equally legitimate. Now, as there is a harmony between external physical nature and man's physical constitution, so is there a like harmony between God's external moral government and that moral constitution with which he has endowed our species. If, then, the existence of an external moral government be assumed as a fact, the existence of an internal moral capacity to discern and appreciate that government, must follow as a consequence. Those philosophers, therefore, who have denied the existence of conscience, upon the ground that its judgments are irregular, have yet given to us the fullest desirable data to prove its existence, by admitting the reality of moral distinctions. The one truth involves the other, since the only method by which we can perceive and estimate moral distinctions is some power or faculty in the mind to which they make their appeal.

2. Without a conscience or moral faculty, man is utterly unfit to be the subject of a moral government. A moral government is one based upon the distinctions of right and wrong. It supposes certain actions to be wrong, and therefore forbids them; and it supposes others to be right, and therefore enjoins them. To the one class of actions it attaches rewards; to the other punishments. But in all this, it supposes the creatures over whom such government is established, to possess a nature to perceive these facts,

and to appreciate these motives. Now, that part of the human constitution which enables man to appreciate such a government as this, is conscience, or the moral faculty. Even brutes have a species of intelligence; they also possess memory and will. But that which places them below the grade of responsibility is the lack of conscience, or the moral faculty. Nor will it do to say that simple reason would fit man for such a government. Reason is not a moral, but an intellectual faculty. Nor is it certain, that mere reason would employ itself on moral subjects at all, unless man possessed a moral nature or conscience, leading him to the contemplation of such subjects. Men seldom or never employ their understandings about things for which they have no taste or relish. The existence of the moral faculty would seem necessary, therefore, to induce the human reason to employ itself on moral subjects. But suppose the reason, independent of any moral propensity that way, should turn its attention to the objects of morality.—What could it accomplish? Just as much, and no more than it has accomplished in the kingdom of nature: It might originate a system of philosophy—a system of *practical morality*, or *religion*, it could never introduce. Its discoveries would be facts; but facts not at all calculated to move the heart, determine the will, or control the life. For the latter effects, there must be a constitutional *moral basis* in the mind itself, in the absence of which the conclusions of reason would be mere dry and heartless speculations.

But man's unfitness for a moral government in the absence of the moral faculty becomes still more clear, when we consider how completely the sanctions of such a government would be overthrown under these circumstances. The very essence of punishment and reward consists in the operations of a conscience or moral faculty. God has so created us, that when we obey him, there arises up in the mind a delightful sense of peace and joy; and when we disobey him, shame and remorse are the consequences. This is our nature, and it harmonizes exactly with our relations to our Creator. It is by a nature such as this, that we are taught to place our highest happiness in virtue; that is, in obedience to the will of God. Now, if man had no conscience, that is, no moral faculty to perceive

and appreciate the merit or demerit of his actions, it would be impossible for him to exercise self-complacency when dutiful, or self-torture when disobedient. And as these are the primary and the most efficient methods by which souls can be either rewarded or punished, the favor or anger of God would become nugatory did they not exist.

3. Human consciousness, in all ages and countries, has testified to the existence of a moral faculty in man. Certainly, if there be such a power as conscience in the human soul, its operations must be a matter of positive knowledge to the soul itself. A mental power that never acts, or that acts so feebly as to awaken no sense of its exercises, can exist only in name, and deserves, of course, no attention. But we maintain that the human conscience is one of the most active of our mental faculties, and that no other faculty announces its existence and office with even half the force that this does. See the frantic madness of multitudes in the early commission of crime, who even prefer death to life, and are ready to sever every human tie for even the possible re-possession of that peace which they have lost:—yea, who would think annihilation itself a boon, compared with an existence thus tormented by remorse! What other mental faculty can produce such pangs, such despair, such absolute self-negation?

Men have borne this testimony to the existence of conscience, by the universal admission that certain actions, intentionally performed, are right; and others, of an opposite character, are wrong. Among actions of the former class, are the worship of the Deity, reverence for parents, affection towards friends, justice to others, truthfulness, and chastity. These, and other similar virtues, have received the universal esteem of mankind. Evidence of this exists in the following facts: parents have taught them to their children; philosophers and legislators have inculcated them by argument and appeal; laws have been enacted to enforce them; and men have been considered good or bad, honourable or base, as they have, or have not, practised them. Now, if we wish to get at the real opinions of a nation, we must not select individual instances, but consider the institutions, laws and habits of the people, as a whole. And in the application of this principle to all mankind, of whom we have once heard, we hesitate not

to affirm, that their uniform and consistent testimony is, that there is such a thing as moral virtue, and that it is both to be esteemed and practised. Nor is it any objection to this to affirm, that the *same specific acts* have not been universally considered as virtuous, in all ages and countries. The modes of religious worship, the manner in which respect is exhibited to parents, and justice exercised towards others, have been various in different ages and countries. These are matters of usage, of positive statutes, and of circumstances. That in which men have agreed is not in the form or manifestation of a particular virtue; but in the virtue itself. In America, patriotism prompts to the defence and maintenance of republican institutions; in Europe, to the advocacy of monarchy. Under an episcopal form of church government, the people defend bishops; under one more democratic, they maintain the parity of the clergy. In all such cases the patriotic or religious principle is the same; its form or manifestation is different. So the laws of different countries may define murder, or theft, or falsehood, or blasphemy, variously; and yet be all agreed that such crimes should, when ascertained, be punished. Even the Atheism of France, during the Revolution, is no exception to what is here affirmed. This horrible creed was adopted by the bloody leaders of that Revolution as a means to an end. Resolved to overthrow every form of monarchy and aristocracy, the politicians of that country struck a blow at the Catholic Hierarchy and Priesthood, as either being themselves a sort of ecclesiastical royalty, or as interested to sustain the prerogatives of the throne. Along with the priesthood, religion itself became to them a matter of disgust, and they attempted in their madness to abolish it altogether. But this was the conduct of but a political junta in the State, and even they hurried on by a storm of passion which it was impossible to control. But when this unnatural outburst of a nation's fury had subsided, we see that very people returning again to the creed and the practices which they had abolished. Conscience in France was overborne for a time; but it soon recovered its ascendancy and proceeded again to its legitimate work. Thus is it true, that mankind, in every age and nation, have maintained a radical distinction between virtue and vice, religion and irreligion.

4. It is to the faculty of conscience in man, that the Christian doctrine of repentance is chiefly addressed.—That “God now commandeth all men every where to repent,” is the definite statement of the Apostle Paul. But what is repentance? It is a strong and fixed conviction in the mind of past ill doing, and a determination to forsake such evil course from a sense of its inherent demerit. Now all this is the work of conscience. The charge of guilt is pressed home upon the sinner, either by the Word, or the preacher of the Word. To that charge there is a response within—a full consciousness that the state of the heart is as described, and that from it have proceeded innumerable transgressions. These facts arouse the conscience—a sense of guilt is felt—the soul tosses and heaves under its burden, and seeks earnestly for relief. It was in this way that thousands were “cut to the heart” under the preaching of Peter, and that the jailer at Philippi “fell down trembling” with the question on his lips, “Sirs, what must I do to be saved?” Indeed, without a natural conscience, or faculty of moral judgment, mankind would be as incapable of repentance as the very brutes around them.

It is amazing, in view of the facts stated above, that Dr. Paley, in constructing a system of Moral Philosophy, should have attempted to disprove, at the very outset, the existence of a moral faculty. But this he does, and in the most stoical language possible. “This celebrated question, therefore, becomes in our system a question of pure curiosity, and as such we dismiss it to the determination of those who are more inquisitive than we are concerned to be about the natural history and constitution of the human species.” Had this language fallen from the lips of the infidel Hume, Paley’s illustrious predecessor in utilitarianism, it were consistent enough. But that a Christian moralist and a preacher of the gospel, should thus sarcastically entomb the conscience of mankind, is wonderful indeed. And yet, there is a greater wonder—it is this: that Christian colleges and schools, both in this country and England, should, for so long a time, have continued this Philosophy as a text-book for the young. Nor is it any apology for such conduct, to announce, as most professors and teachers do, that on this point and

that, Dr. Paley is considered unsound. There are, we will admit, many excellent things in Paley, but as a system of morals, his work is rotten from beginning to end. The difference between Paley and Hume consists simply in this, that while the latter places the objects of selfishness in this life, the former transfers them to the life to come. Nor is the criticism of Dr. Brown on the Arch-deacon at all too severe:—"This form of the selfish system, which has been embraced by many theological writers of undoubted piety and purity, is, notwithstanding, I cannot but think, as degrading to the human character as any other form of the doctrine of absolute selfishness; or rather, it is in itself *the most degrading of all the forms which the selfish system can assume*; because, while the selfishness it maintains is as absolute and unremitting as if the objects of personal gain were to be found in the wealth or honors or sensual pleasures of the earth; this very selfishness is rendered more offensive by the noble image of the Deity which is continually presented to our mind, and presented in all his benevolence, *not to be loved, but to be courted with a mockery of affection.*"

The chief objection to Paley's system is not that it is utilitarian, but that it is *immoral*. We do not mean by this, that Paley discountenances virtue and inculcates vice: this is what no man may do and have a hearing. But we mean, that he advocates the moral virtues upon the ground of expediency and profit. Virtue and vice, in his system, are as much articles of traffic as cotton and grain in our ordinary markets. The great question for every man to propose to himself when he contemplates a certain course of conduct is, "What shall I gain or lose by it?" Now, we deny positively, that virtue can exist in a mind that makes such a calculation. There is something noble, certainly, in repentance; but if you abstract from that virtue all that is disinterested, and make it simply *a price* for procuring pardon, it becomes at once a base and contemptible feeling.

That Paley's system should be *immoral*, was inevitable from his rejection of the moral faculty. If man have no conscience, he has no power of perceiving the intrinsic excellence of virtue. Right becomes to him, of course, just what Paley has defined it to be, "that which is expedi-

ent." Now, a system of pretended morals, based upon such a view of human nature as this, to have any success at all, must address itself, not to a sense of moral obligation,—not to man's constitutional capacity to appreciate virtue, as virtue,—but wholly to his *interest* in his own welfare. And this is Paley's system. His definition of virtue is, "the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for *the sake of everlasting happiness.*" And, as if this were not plain enough, he announces it distinctly, that "*everlasting happiness is the motive of human virtue.*" A beggar stands at the door of some citizen, and asks a charity. The landlord gives him five dollars, but induced thereto solely upon the consideration that the government is to remunerate him the next day with five hundred! Is such a gift an act of benevolence? Nor does it matter a whit, whether it be a human or divine government, that is to compensate the giver: the principle is the same in both cases; and we deny positively, that there can be any virtue at all, where such a motive predominates. The whole tendency of such a doctrine is, to make hypocrites and deceivers. It was precisely the religion of the Pharisees in the time of Christ, and is now that of multitudes among the ascetics and devotees of the Papacy and Heathenism. Once make virtue or morality a matter of barter, and it ceases to exist. Our own impression distinctly is, that a virtuous mind would do a virtuous act, however greatly it should suffer for the deed. At any rate, such a mind abhors all idea of reward as the chief *motive* to the performance of virtuous actions.

Dr. Paley's system is equally subversive of morality in his views of moral obligation. "Why am I obliged to keep my word?" he asks. The reply is, "Because I am urged to do so by a violent motive resulting from the command of another." The violent motive here alluded to, he defines as "the expectation of being after this life rewarded if I do, or punished for it if I do not." "This solution," he continues, "goes to the bottom of the subject, and no further question can reasonably be asked. Therefore *private happiness* is our motive, and the will of God our rule." Now, all this is legitimate enough, if the Doctor's first principle be admitted, that man has no conscience. Surely, if there be in man no nobler principle

than self-love to control him, this, and this alone, must be addressed. But if man have a moral faculty, the very office of which is to perceive and appreciate the excellence of moral virtue, and to practise it as something attractive in its own nature, then we affirm, that this definition does not "go to the bottom of the subject," but leaves the main question, not only unsolved, but *untouched*. A virtuous man feels bound to keep his word, not through a law of compensation, but through a law of morality. He has no eye whatever to what will be his gain, either in this world or the next, by observing truth. He does so because it is *right*, and he would do so, though he should be persuaded that suffering, and not happiness, would be the result.

But we have another argument against Paley. It is this: that if mere self-love, under the command of God, becomes such an efficient motive to the exercise of obedience, how much stronger must be the motive, when that command is addressed to an *internal* and *constitutional sense of moral obligation*? Notwithstanding the "violent motives" of which this author speaks, we are firmly persuaded that no inducements whatever, as addressed to human selfishness, are strong enough to keep men in a state of obedience, apart from the office and exercises of a sound conscience. Once admit that man has in his *nature* a foundation for morality, and once implant upon that foundation its inflexible principles, and you have a character as stern as adamant in the performance of duty. But send forth the seller of rewards to buy up the allegiance of a revolted race—let him offer considerations of even the highest conceivable value to the multitudes around him,—what will be the results of such a mission? Why, that amid the full flow of present earthly gratification, the sinner will scarcely give the offer a moment's attention; or should he do so, he will approach it with substantially the same feelings that he does a market or a counting-house. But suppose the bargain to be made. What then? Have you secured your man? Not at all. He will sell himself to the next comer who offers what he conceives to be a higher consideration, as cheerfully as he did to you! No; mere selfishness we affirm to be incapable of entertaining a motive strong enough to keep man in the pursuit of virtue. Such a motive must address itself,

not to the diversified interests of the heart, but to the radical and ineffaceable sentiments of an indwelling morality. Then, and only then, can it be strong enough to keep mankind in the paths of virtue and in allegiance to God.

Notwithstanding the length of these remarks, we beg leave to lay before our readers the opinions of one, on the doctrines of Paley, who must ever have weight in this country, on the subjects both of theology and morality. We mean the Rev. Dr. Alexander. In a recent and most admirable work of his, on the science of morals, he expresses himself thus:—"According to this view, unless a man is persuaded that he shall gain something by keeping his word, he is under no obligation to do so. Even if God should clearly make known his will, and lay upon him his command, he is under no obligation to obey, unless certain that he shall receive benefit by so doing. This is indeed to make virtue a mercenary thing, and to reduce all motives to a level. And as self-love, or the desire of happiness, is the only rational motive, the only conceivable difference between the good and the bad consists in the superior sagacity which the one has above the other to discern what will most contribute to happiness." It is evident that this system, in its practical operation, must ever contravene that system, both of morality and religion, taught in the Holy Scriptures. The great object of that Book is to bring men off from the basis of selfishness, and to place them upon a basis of virtue. Its great command is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and all thy soul, and all thy mind, and all thy strength." Now, is it possible for a creature, who possesses such an affection to the Deity as this, to serve him from the hope of reward? What need of such an expectation? How abhorrent the very idea of reward to a bosom filled with such love! This affection itself—(and it is the very soul of all true morality and religion,)—prompts to obedience; it is the only principle that can prompt to obedience. Now, to supplant this principle, as also that of love to man,—to supplant these, and substitute in their stead *supreme self-love*, is to overthrow both the teachings of Christ and the principles of sound morality. And we venture, moreover, to say, that the greatest conflict of the pious, and of all generous minds in this life, is to separate

from the true motive of morality and religion this very element of self-regard. The feelings of self-esteem and self interest are so strong in us all, that it requires great effort and *great grace* to suppress their intrusions upon even our best actions. They spring up unbidden, and often poison with their moral malaria even the good deeds we are attempting to perform. But according to Paley, we should contend just the other way. We should not strive to repel these intruders, but welcome them as guests, since their presence and operation are *essential* to the virtue of an action !

We come now to what we consider the most difficult part of this discussion ; and the more so, because we are compelled to differ from some of those excellent Divines with whom we have heretofore so heartily agreed. When we speak of the authority of conscience, we are apt to be misled by the language. Authority is exercised by kings, magistrates, officers and parents. It supposes an intelligent ruler, a system of laws, and rational subjects. But when we apply this term to a *mental faculty*, we must certainly exclude from it all these accessory ideas of regular human administration. And yet, even metaphysicians, when discoursing upon the mere *powers* or *capacities* of the human mind, employ a sort of court-language, as if they were describing the administration of some great monarch. This is a great fault, especially with Mr. McCosh, whose vivid imagination seems always ready to give a scenic representation to mental processes.

That the different mental faculties have distinct offices, and that each one either does or ought to predominate in its specific sphere, will be readily admitted. Reason is supreme in all abstract truth ; the will on all matters of choice ; the emotions in all objects of affection ; the imagination in the province of fancy ; and the conscience in the domain of morals. Now, each of these mental faculties does and must take the lead in its particular field of operation. Yet, as our consciousness will testify, most of our actions are the results of not one only, but of several of these mental powers. Indeed, the relation between these mental faculties is so intimate, that in most cases the action of the one must take place before the action of another can exist. All then, that we can mean by the authority

of a mental power, is simply its precedence over the rest in any one action. And all that we can mean by the obedience, or subjection of one mental faculty to another, is simply the posteriority of its operation. Reason asserts that a certain abstract proposition is true; at once the will and the heart concur in the conclusion. The proposition was addressed to the reason, and *its* decision must be, of course, that of the entire mind or soul. At another time, an object may be presented to the emotion of love. The point now to be decided is, shall such an object or person be loved? If the case be a doubtful one, the reason may again be called upon to do its office: that is, to compare, judge, decide, etc. In other cases, however, the heart overleaps the tardy work of reason, and responds at once to the object, as soon as presented. Shall a mother love her babe? It is not her intellect, but her heart that solves that question. The same is true of the conscience.—Where a question of morality admits of doubt, the reason may be called in, and may be long employed in its investigations before the conscience is prepared to act. But in all obvious cases, this faculty acts *instantly*, and approves or disapproves of a certain act as soon as perceived. There are obviously then a precedence and a sequence in mental operations. But when we transcend this beautiful order in which the mental faculties operate, and establish within the soul a sort of spiritual administration, with all the paraphernalia of courts and palaces, we evidently use language very loosely, and are in danger of being misled altogether in reference to the mind and its powers.

With these explanations, we proceed to consider the question at issue: *Is a man bound to follow his conscience when its judgments are erroneous?* That the real point of debate may be understood, we give the following quotations from Drs. Dick and Alexander:—"An appeal" says the former, "may always be made from its (conscience's) decisions to the word of God, and as soon as a difference is discovered between its dictates and those of Scripture, the sentence which it has pronounced is void. Hence it is plain, that the plea of conscience will not be admitted to exempt us from guilt and punishment. And this, we may observe, is the unhappy situation of those whose consciences are not sufficiently enlightened; that

they sin, whatever they do ; in disregarding the voice of conscience, and in obeying it." Dr. Alexander maintains the same position :—"It is true, if a man's conscience dictates a certain action, he is morally bound to obey ; but if that action be wrong, he commits sin in performing it nevertheless. He who is under fundamental error, is in a sad dilemma. Do what he will, he sins. If he disobey conscience, he knowingly sins ; doing what he believes to be wrong ; and if he obey conscience, performing an act which is in itself wrong, he sins ; because he complies not with the law under which he is placed." Now, as much as we esteem the sentiments of the authors above quoted, we must think they have both fallen into error on this subject. This will appear from the fact, that they have here introduced two *opposite* rules of conduct, each of which the subject is bound at the same time to obey. The law of God dictates one course ; and the law of conscience another, directly opposite. To each of these laws a man is morally bound to submit. Now, it is evident, that a man can no more obey two such opposite rules at the same time, than that he can occupy two places at the same time, or than he can both love and hate the same object at the same time. The thing is *impossible*, and therefore cannot be a matter of moral obligation. The same difficulty is also seen when we consider the moral qualities of the action : it is both right and wrong—worthy of reward and also worthy of punishment ! Now, a human action *cannot* possess two qualities so diametrically opposite. As the same object cannot be white and black at the same time, so the same moral act cannot be both virtuous and vicious.

The errors in these statements, as we conceive, are twofold. The one consists in giving conscience a supremacy which does not belong to it ; the other in blending two distinct moral acts, and ascribing a common moral character to them, as if they were one. Conscience is neither a moral governor, nor a moral law. It is a faculty of the soul, fitting man for a moral government existing, not within, but without him. God is our only true moral governor, and his will is our only supreme moral law. Our subjection then, is not to be a subjection to conscience, (which, being a part of ourselves, would imply subjection

to ourselves,) but a subjection to God, as our moral governor. The very moment we set up conscience as a sort of rival to Jehovah, that moment we become idolaters, and sacrifice our real liberty. The care is very much that of the Papist, who is perfectly satisfied that when he has heard his priest he has heard his God; and that when he stands well with his priest, he also stands well in the court of Heaven. Now, to exalt the conscience into any such high position, and to obey its dictates with the full assurance that they must be right, is but to deify a faculty of the human soul, and to fall down in worship to ourselves. Man is a moral agent, possessed of certain mental faculties, all of which are designed to aid him in the prosecution of a virtuous course of conduct. But he is depraved; and there is not a mental faculty that is not erroneous in its operations. The reason is more or less blind, the will is perverse, the passions are deranged, and the conscience is dull, inefficient and easily perverted. This condition of the human soul is taught us by experience, observation and scripture. For a man, then, to trust himself to the dictates of any one of his faculties, or of all of them combined, is necessarily to hazard the peace and well-being of his soul. The decisions of conscience in many cases are just as much to be held in doubt, as those of the reason. And in attempting to ascertain our duty in such cases, we are not to consult, but to *instruct* our consciences. We must take the conscience itself to the revealed will of God, and there, and there *only*, obtain that light which is to guide us in the path of duty. Now, when this course is honestly and faithfully pursued, it is next to impossible that the conscience should be in "fundamental error." To suppose so, is to suppose either that the Bible does not adequately reveal the will of God, or that man is incapable of understanding that will when so revealed.

But our theologians will tell us, that the case supposed is that of one who has done all this, and is still in error. He has examined the Scriptures prayerfully and honestly, and has conscientiously come to certain conclusions, both as to its doctrines and precepts. Still those conclusions are erroneous. Now, in such a case, we say without hesitation, that such a man is bound to receive, as God's revealed truth, that which, after such examination, he

conceives to be such. But this is not subjection to conscience, but to God. Faith is here placed, not in the decisions merely of a mental faculty, but in the infallible teachings of the Holy Ghost. That such a man should err as to the *essentials* of the Gospel, is improbable in the last degree; that he should mistake on some of its minor points, is very likely. We cannot conceive, however, that such mistakes should vitiate his obedience. Errors in religion, when they arise from carelessness, prejudice, pride of intellect, or any other like cause, are certainly criminal. But those errors, which even the best men are liable to make on this subject, and which arise from causes beyond their control, can certainly never inculcate them in the sight of God.

Another mistake, as we conceive, in these statements is, that actions are blended that are entirely distinct. We will illustrate our meaning by the following supposition: A man is on trial for his life. He is really an innocent man, but is accused of murder. Evidence is adduced on both sides; but the jury incline to that which condemns him. They bring in a verdict of "guilty." Now, if these men are entirely honest and conscientious in such a sentence, they certainly cannot be blamed for it, though it consigns an innocent man to the gallows. Where then, is the error? It consists in their not giving sufficient weight to the exculpatory evidence. This is the error; and it becomes a crime, or not, just as it originated in good or bad motives. If the jury were prejudiced against the accused, or if they were bribed to bring in such a verdict, we consider them as guilty in the highest degree. But if the error arose from incapacity, misrepresentation, or any like cause, it was certainly not criminal. How would it sound in this case to say, that if the jury should bring in a verdict of "guilty," they are criminal, because the man is innocent; or, if they should pronounce him "not guilty," they are equally criminal, because they have violated their consciences! Here are certainly two distinct acts—the one which considers and examines the testimony; and the other which pronounces the sentence. The verdict is evidently erroneous; but it is *criminal* only as it has been arrived at by honest or dishonest means. In the days of Calvin, it was believed

to be right to punish heretics with death. Such punishments are now considered by most Christians, as altogether improper and wicked. Now, if the Reformers were entirely honest and sincere in their belief and practice, we may consider them as in error, very great error; but certainly not as criminal. That which inculcates a very large portion of mankind in obeying, as they allege, the dictates of conscience, is not that they yield to honest convictions, honestly formed, but that "loving darkness rather than light," they give themselves up to their evil prejudices and practices, without the use of those means of information that might easily rectify their conduct. It is in this way that the great body of papists and of heathen idolaters continue in sin. The one class refuse to employ the light of nature for the correction of idolatry; and the other class, with equal pertinacity, reject the Scriptures, in order to preserve their traditions. Such persons are guilty, not only for their corrupt practices; but for their perverted consciences. What, then, is their duty? To obey a misleading conscience, and continue in idolatry? Evidently not. Their first and chief obligation is to come to the light, and to test their creed by whatever means God, in his providence, may have afforded them. But such persons, it is alleged, believe that they are already *in the light*, and that all others are in darkness. We admit this; but deny still that they are morally bound by either their faith or consciences. In *their own view*, they are so bound; but such a view is erroneous, and might easily be corrected were they disposed to use the proper and obvious means for such correction. Their indisposition to do this is their chief crime, and any creed they may form, and any judgments of conscience they may make, in this state of voluntary ignorance, is a nullity; yea, an impiety: and they are in truth bound by them in no sense whatever. All acts of worship, too, rendered to God under these circumstances, so far from being acceptable, can only meet with his abhorrence.

We will close these remarks by a brief consideration of the case of the Apostle Paul. Saul of Tarsus having been educated "after the most strictest sect" of the Jewish religion, and at "the feet of Gamaliel," was of course a bigoted Pharisee. So far then, as education and position are

concerned, he was ill-situated to appreciate the facts and evidences of Christianity. Still, the moral phenomena that had taken place in Jerusalem for several years previously were very remarkable, and such as should have called forth from him a candid examination. Instead, however, of giving to the subject such attention, he became exceedingly indignant, and continually "breathed out slaughter and threatening" against the church. The remarkable testimony and triumphant death of Stephen, which he witnessed, made no impression on him whatever. In fact, it seems to have quickened his false zeal, and to have made him but the more active "in binding and delivering into prison both men and women." Now, upon this conduct of his, the Apostle afterwards both pronounces a reprobation and enters an apology. He declares that "he is less than the least of all saints, and not worthy to be called an Apostle, because he persecuted the church of God." In another place, he designates himself, on the same ground, as "the chief of sinners, a blasphemer, a persecutor and injurious." Now, it is evident that Paul's conversion had no effect whatever in changing the moral character of the persecutions that took place before that event. It changed his *views* of those persecutions, taking them from a false, and placing them in a true light. But the moral character of those acts were the same, both before and after the Apostle's conversion. His conduct, then, as a persecutor, was in truth criminal, in a very high degree. Was he, then, *bound* to pursue such a course? What bound him? Not truth and righteousness, for these were on the other side of the question. Not the Scriptures, for these predicted the coming of the Messiah. Not any command from God, for he was persecuting and destroying his church. What bound him? Hear his own testimony—"For I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." It is here stated, that his erroneous convictions led him to persecute the church. This is the *best* certainly that can be said of the case; for it is certain from the narrative, that along with such false views of duty there existed great violence of passion and prejudice. The amount of this explanation is, that the Apostle, at the time, *believed* that he ought to persecute the church; *therefore*,

it was his duty to do. But this conclusion requires another condition to make the justification complete. His belief must have resulted from a careful and candid investigation of the whole subject. But he never instituted such an investigation. He arrived at his conclusions from ideas already existing in his mind, and took no pains to inform himself on the subject of Christianity. Hence his ignorance was criminal, and could be no justification of his conduct. Still, however, as such ignorance did exist as to fact, and his persecutions were not in the highest sense *wilful*, he mentions it, not as an apology for his crimes, but as somewhat mitigating their heinousness:—"But I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." Here it is intimated, that had the Apostle acted as he did, with a full knowledge of the facts, his sin would have been strictly *unpardonable*. But his actual, though criminal ignorance, somewhat abated the malignity of his crimes, and "he obtained mercy." Will any one say then, with these facts before him, that Saul of Tarsus was morally *bound* to persecute the church? That he believed himself bound, he asserts. But was it so? Were not his views entirely erroneous? And can *error* bind? We believe firmly, that man has a conscience, and that there are innumerable cases in which he is morally bound to obey that conscience; but we cannot persuade ourselves that the same obligation exists where the conscience prompts to acts of immorality and sin. An enlightened and sound conscience never does this; and it is only to *such a conscience* that we consider a man morally bound to submit. When a man is perfectly sure—and this is not always easy to be ascertained,—but when a man is perfectly sure, that he has used all possible methods with absolute candor, to ascertain his duty, then his convictions are legitimate, and although his intellect may be in error, his conscience is sound, and its promptings are to be regarded. But there is an infinite difference between this case, and that of one who suffers his conscience to be perverted through inattention, false education, prejudice or passion.

But we must close; yet cannot do so, without recommending most cordially to the public, and particularly to the teachers of youth, the work of Dr. Alexander on Moral

Science. If this little volume have defects, they are chiefly these two, excessive brevity on the subjects treated of, and the omission of many topics that might be introduced. It is its *practical character* that gives such weight to the work of Paley. Nor is it likely that his book will be supplanted, until another, with sound principles, shall develop somewhat as he has done, the details of a moral system. Yet it is better to inculcate sound principles apart from the practical, than to enforce the latter upon a false basis. Truth is as necessary to sound morality as to pure religion; and if the practice of morality be enforced upon false principles, the fruit must be like the tree, beautiful without, but rotten within.

NOTE.—Since penning the article above, the writer has read in the Westminster Review, quite an able defence of the utilitarian doctrine, as held by Jeremy Bentham. The views of Bentham differ from those of Paley in this respect, that while utility is applied by the latter chiefly to the interests of the agent himself, the former gives it a broader signification, by making it refer to others also. The reviewer distinguishes between these two systems, designating the one “The Happiness Theory of Morals,” and the other, “The Theory of Motives, or the Selfish System.” “He (Bentham,) never dreamed of defining morality to be the self-interest of the agent. His greatest happiness, principle, was the greatest happiness of mankind, and of all sensitive beings.” This theory is certainly far less objectionable than that of Paley; and did it but extend itself beyond the limits of humanity and of all “sensitive beings” on our earth, and refer also to God and all his intelligent creatures, it would approach very nearly to that of Edwards, in his treatise on “God’s last end in the creation.” We subjoin, upon this theory, the two following observations. It errs, first, as we conceive, in a mistaken view of the relation between utility and right. There can be no doubt but that whatever is right is useful, or that whatever is truly useful is right. Rectitude and utility are inseparably connected; and the only question is, which has *precedence* of the other—which are we to consider as *causal*, and which as *consequential*. The defenders of independent morality, place rectitude or

right in the foreground; the utilitarians place it in the back-ground. The subject, it appears to us, is of easy explanation. Right, or rectitude, is the agreement of an accountable agent's conduct with some moral rule previously existing. Both parties make this to be right; or rather right to mean this. The only difference here is, that the one class deduce the moral rule or law directly from existing relations; the other from such a law from experience, upon the principle of deduction. When a certain relation is perceived to exist, the absolute morality men either infer the rule of duty from it, or admit the justice of a rule already enacted. The utilitarian deduces his rule from a great number of the general consequences of an act, all tending the same way, viz: to the happiness of mankind. Each, however, establishes his rule or law, agreement with which is what is meant by the term *right*. Take, for instance, the crime of murder. Both parties have admitted it, as a rule, or principle, that murder is wrong. But how have they reached this rule, or principle? The advocate of absolute morality, by considering the *relation* of man to man, and of all men to society and to God. The utilitarian, by casting up the evil *consequences* of permitted murder. Yet, with each murder is a crime; and agreement with the rule or law prohibiting it, is a virtue.

Agreeing thus in the establishment of rules, and in the nature of right, and also, for the most part, in external morality, wherein do these men differ? As already stated, in the *relative position* of right and utility. The one class consider utility the cause, and right the effect; the other maintain that right is the cause, and utility the effect. With the latter it is that we agree. The subject may be illustrated thus: In the family there exists a law requiring children to obey their parents. Now, what is the basis of this law? Is it that obedience to parents is useful in its general consequences? or, is it the relation existing between parent and child? Certainly it is the latter, and not the former. Utility follows as a consequence; but it is not the "foundation" of this filial morality. So in the State; there exists a rule that the subject shall obey the sovereign. But what is the basis of this rule? The relation between sovereign and subject, or the general good

consequences of obedience? The former, unquestionably, and not the latter. The peace and order which spring from obedience to constitutional authority are the *fruits* of such obedience—the virtue of the act consisting essentially in the obedience itself. The same result is attained, if we proceed a step higher, and apply the principle to the Divine government. The creature should honour, worship and obey the Creator. But why? Is it because the general consequences of such reverence and obedience are beneficial, or on account of the relationship between the parties? Certainly it is the latter, and not the former. Still we maintain that right and utility are inseparable. Considering the relations between parent and child, sovereign and subject, Creator and creature, as so many fixed conditions of things, it is impossible but that a law, harmonizing with these relations, should be right; or that conduct, agreeing with such law, should be anything else than useful. Right, however, both in every act of legislation, and also of obedience, has unquestionably a higher place than utility, and should always claim from men superior regard.

Our second remark is, that the same objection may be raised against the utilitarian scheme, as to its *fickleness*, that has been advanced against the doctrine of absolute morality. Both Bentham and Paley treat the subject of conscience, as applied to morality, with ridicule. "One man," the former says, "has a thing made on purpose to tell him what is right and what is wrong, and that it is called a moral sense; and then he goes on to work at his ease, and says, such a thing is right, and such a thing is wrong. Why? Because my *moral sense* tells me it is!" It ought to be remarked here, that this objection lies not against the legitimate exercise of conscience in matters of truth and duty, but against its *perverted* exercise. We must think that many absolute morality writers carry the doctrine of conscience too far. As, however, we have already discussed this subject, we need not allude to it here. But are not the same objections available against the advocates of utility? Utility is by no means a matter so palpable that all are agreed concerning it. Indeed, there are quite as many debates and controversies on this point as on that of right. And here too, every man has

his *notion*, or *opinion*, or *conviction*, as in the other case. Indeed, it could not be otherwise. How is utility perceived? By the understanding. And how are moral relations and laws perceived? By the understanding. How is it, then, that the understanding can be infallible in one of these cases, and altogether erroneous in the other? Are we told that the general consequences of actions are more obvious than the relations that mankind sustain to each other? This we deny. Are not the relations of parent and child, sovereign and subject, as palpable to the understanding, as are the consequences that flow from obedience or disobedience, oppression or protection? Indeed, we consider the *relations* as decidedly more clear than the *utilities* arising from them. And if this be so, then is there likely to be far more difference of opinion among men, as to the utility of laws and actions, than there can be as to their essential morality. We do not then, consider the doctrine of utility as answering its purpose, either in furnishing a more obvious "external object" as the basis of morality, or in harmonizing the diversified opinions of men. It fails in both particulars; relations being fully as palpable to the mind as general consequences, and right creating not more controversy certainly, than utility.

ARTICLE II.

UNIQUENESS AND SUPERIORITY OF OUR LORD'S TEACHING.

The only panacea for our sin-disordered world is faith in God through our Lord Jesus Christ. If religion is worth anything, it is worth everything. So it has been regarded by the wisest and greatest, best and happiest men that have ever lived. The salvation of the soul is, therefore, the highest personal concern of every man. It is the great necessity of his nature. Even the trials and sorrows of the world teach us that we need higher consolation than this earth affords. The Gospel reveals to us this higher consolation. It leads us to a Rock that is

higher than ourselves. It introduces to us the Great Teacher, who is Himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

For gaining confidence in God and the comfortable assurance of His good will, and that His government does not overlook or neglect any of His creatures, there are two great sources of information to be used. One is a close, attentive, intelligent study of the works of nature and the ways of Providence in nature and in human history; and the other and greater and more certain means is the reading of the Bible. There is nothing to be compared to the Bible as a source of consolation. In both the Old and New Testament we see the general guidance of God and the universal government of His Providence. And from patiently considering the facts and examples of the Old and New Testament, a religiously disposed mind gains the deeply fixed and ineffaceable conviction, that even the order of things under which we, ourselves, suffer, is the most wisely appointed, and the most beneficial, not only for the whole, but in consequence of that, for the sufferer himself. "In the New Testament itself especially, is there such a full predominance of the spiritual and the moral—everything is so completely rested upon and carried back to purity of mind, that whatever else external or internal may happen to man, if he but strive earnestly and eagerly after this, all the rest falls back into shadow."*—Misfortunes and sorrows thus lose their oppressiveness—at least their bitterness. The infinite mildness of the New Testament doctrine, which figures God almost entirely on the merciful side, and in which the self-sacrificing love of Christ for the human race is everywhere brought forward, joined with his own example, alleviates, like a healing balsam, our every pain, both of mind and body.

"The tongue is a little member, but it boasteth great things." And, indeed, it hath done great things. The success of the great Tempter in Paradise was owing in no small degree to the persuasiveness of his eloquence. In all ages, orators, generals, advocates, senators and preachers, or public lecturers and expounders of science and truth, have produced wonderful effects by their speeches.

* *Willhelm Von Humboldt.*

The prophets, apostles and first preachers of Christianity, and the early Reformers, are all examples of the wonderful power of the human voice when employed in preaching truth and righteousness. There is, however, no serious-minded man, I am persuaded, who contrasts the pulpit of modern times with the preaching of the Apostolic age, who does not earnestly wish that the ministry was now more effective. We are all ready to join in the prayer: Oh, that our preachers could pour more effectually upon the minds of their hearers the light of eternal truth, and throw around their hearts the cords of persuasion, and draw them from those seductions that threaten their everlasting ruin! Happily for us, we have found a Preacher equal to our highest conceptions and most ardent wishes. All our demands are more than fully met in Him, who was anointed by the Spirit of the Lord God to preach good tidings unto the weak—to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God. God has in these last days spoken to us by His Son. And never man spake like this man.

Jesus as a preacher is incomparably the greatest and best the world has ever known. It is fit that in "all things He may have the pre-eminence." As the Infinite source of all that is excellent and admirable in the best of human characters, it was to be expected that He would discover infinite superiority in every character and office that He might assume for our sakes. As the Redeemer, He is the King of kings and the Lord of lords, and his kingdom ruleth over all. As a Priest, He is greater than Aaron. Jesus offered himself as a sacrifice once for all—a sacrifice that needed no repetition, like that of ordinary priests, but was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. As a Prophet, Jesus is greater than Moses or Isaiah. God at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, but now hath spoken to us by His own Son, who is greater than them all. None of them ever spake as did the Son of God.

The *uniqueness and superiority* of our Lord's preaching will appear by considering—

1. *The Matter of His Preaching.* Originality in the

absolute sense of the term is not necessary to successful teaching. It is, indeed, not given to many of our race to have absolute originality in many and varied subjects. There is such a flux and reflux of ideas by means of the press, lecturing, and conversation, that it is impossible for a mind somewhat enlarged to know what and how much of its contents and furniture, ornamental and useful, is of home manufacture or imported. It is impossible for the most impartial and honest minds to draw definitely the line between *meum et tuum* in relation to their stock of ideas. In teaching others, the best method for an instructor is that of the bee, to extract the sweet from all that comes in the way.

The matter of our Lord's sermons was, however, such as became a teacher come from God. He revealed the Divine character. In his discourses there is none of that learned trifling which distinguished the teachings of the Scribes, and Pharisees, and Rabbi of the Jews, and the wise men of other ancient nations. It is not too much to say that there is more of the true knowledge of God displayed in one single discourse of Jesus than in all the volumes which heathen sages have ever produced.

Jesus Christ also gave the *true explanation* of what had been communicated to man by the prophets in former ages. God had spoken to the Patriarchs and Prophets. The ten commandments were from heaven; but the Jews failed to give them their true spiritual meaning. Our Lord, in his sermon on the Mount, and at other times, corrected their mistakes concerning the law of Moses, and instructed them in the nature of the worship God required. He taught them that God required penitence, faith and charity,—that true religion was *internal and external*,—that it was love to God and love to man.

Again, the Divine authority of our Lord as the great Teacher, is shown in the fact that He was the grand theme of all the Old Testament writers. The most important personages of antiquity were His types and fore-runners. Enoch, the first who was exempted from death, and Noah, the second Father of our race, and the prophets, who were the organs by which the Divine will was made known to men, were all preachers of righteousness and types of Christ. The first preacher of the Gospel was Je-

hovah himself. The text was, "and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed, and it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."—Gen. 3 : 15.

Paul also, tells us that "God preached the Gospel to Abraham." And to him all the prophets give witness. And the Apostles made Christ the great theme of all their discourses and epistles. They regarded Him as the fountain of truth and Head of all things for His church.

Again, Jesus Christ *unveiled the invisible and eternal world*. This He did in regard to the economy of salvation, and in regard to its coming realities, and the personal concern that every one of us has in these realities, a part of which every one of us must soon be and bear for himself. Jesus Christ was himself a living manifestation of the love of God to sinful men. He was the only begotten Son of God, who came into our world to die for us. He also declared himself to be "the Son of Man who came to seek and to save that which was lost." "The Son of Man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." "Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

He brought life and immortality to light. The future world which had been dimly disclosed to the patriarchs, He brought out clearly and plainly. He taught His followers not to fear them who can kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather to "fear Him which is able to destroy both the soul and body in hell." Thus plainly did He teach the future existence of the soul and the nature of the future world. How solemn, also, are our Lord's descriptions of the general judgment, of the resurrection, of the last day, and the final separation of the wicked from the righteous, as the tares are separated from the wheat—the bad fish from the good—the wise from the foolish virgins, and the eternal destiny of both.

2. The *uniqueness and superiority* of our Lord's character and teaching form one of the most strikingly original attributes of the whole Gospel narrative.

The unique superiority of Christ's character is a very strong evidence of the truth of His history. The term unique, though scarcely a word that belongs to our lan-

guage, is used because I am not acquainted with any other one word that so exactly expresses the idea I wish to convey, namely: that the history of Christ is so unlike all other histories, or biographies, that there is but one such in all the world. The life of Christ, taken in connection with his death, stands more completely apart from and above and superior to all other narratives, than the sun in the heavens does from all other created objects. We do indeed conceive of other suns, and with the telescope even see them in their vast orbits sweeping through the heavens of their respective systems; but there is no process by which we can bring to light another Jesus, or show to the world another such history. Whoever catches the true idea of this Divine story, even in childhood, commences a career of discovery, admiration and delight, that eternity itself shall not be able to diminish. He feels in a higher degree what we are sometimes conscious of on surveying a magnificent pile of architecture,—it grows upon our admiration the longer we view it, till we can scarcely refrain from thinking that the object itself swells and acquires new grandeur and new beauties with every step of the march of time. The birth, life, miracles, death and resurrection of Christ are all unique, original and superior. And it is certainly remarkable that we should find in Him the attributes of perfection which a heathen sage considered necessary to constitute his *ideal perfect man*. In the bodyings forth of his almost Divine imagination, he describes a perfect man as one who should possess the very attributes of character that the Evangelists have described as existing in the Founder of Christianity. Now, the simple history, much more the conception of such a unique, original and perfect human being as we have in the Evangelists, is a strong proof of His Divinity and of their inspiration. There is nothing sectarian, conventional, national or temporary and capricious in the character of Christ as drawn by the Evangelists. His character in itself and its description is as unique, original and superior, as his doctrines and manner of life were infinite in excellence and sublimity. We cannot conceive of a race of men, nor of a college of writers in any age or nation that could segregate themselves wholly from the prejudices of their education and from their nationality, and go out of and beyond their

own physical characteristics for their type of ideal perfection. For example, an Egyptian writer in the matter of beauty of human form could never, by any mere abstraction, have generated a style of art, in which the color, shape and features of his divinity, should be purely European. Nor could the Greek give to his hero the tawny hue, narrow eyes and protruding lips of the Ethiopian; for each to the other would have seemed deformity, rather than divine beauty. So, neither could the Evangelists, nor the men of any age or nation, much less uneducated fishermen of Galilee, have framed to themselves an ideal type or canon of moral perfection, which arose not from what to them seemed most beautiful and perfect. And if it were possible for them to have risen so wholly above all the impressions of early education and of nationality, as to have faintly conceived of such a character, they could not have executed it. Why have not our poets and fiction writers, whose domain is the "wide, wide world," possible, impossible, grotesque and supernatural, conceived an original, unique and perfect character like that of Jesus Christ? Their characters are all copies. A Hindoo does not conceive of his Brahmin saint otherwise than as possessing in perfection the silence, the abstemiousness, the austerity, and the minute exactness in every trifling duty, which he admires in his living model. Plato's Socrates, the perfection of a philosophical character, is composed of elements perfectly Greek, being a compound of all those virtues which the teachings of his school deemed necessary to adorn a sage. The same principle is seen in the pictures of Jesus Christ and of his blessed Mother, which are used in Italy and Naples, and other parts of the old world. The hair, features, complexion and *tout ensemble* of the pictures are in exact accordance with the prevailing tastes of the people. How comes it, then, that the Evangelists have both conceived and executed the history of such a life as that of Jesus Christ? A life that not only differs from, but is essentially opposed to, their types of moral perfection. We have in the writings of the Rabbins ample materials wherewith to construct a Jewish teacher. We have the sayings and doings of Hillel, Gamaliel, and Rabbi Samuel. And perhaps a large portion of their teaching and precepts is imaginary, never having had an

existence; but still all their sayings and doings bear the impress of national ideas. The character of Jesus Christ as drawn by the Evangelists is, however, not composed out of Jewish elements. How comes it, then, that such writers as Matthew and Mark, Luke and John, ignorant of the school learning of Greece and Rome, and of the profound teachings of the Rabbins, should represent a character absolutely inimitable,—a character perfect, and yet wholly different from their national and natural types?—How does it happen that they conceive and draw such a character, in spite of their national customs and education, and in contempt of their patriotism and religion? And what renders it still more difficult to consider such a character a mere human invention, is the fact that the Sacred historians, while recording, each in his own way, the same facts, and sometimes each one recording other and different facts from his fellow-writer, yet still all agree in bringing out the same Heavenly character. They go to work and chisel out each for himself his statue, and when they are presented at the exhibition, they are all alike, all unique, original, absolutely perfect. How can we explain this? Here is the key. If four artists were employed in different parts of the country, each to produce for the Crystal Palace in New York, a form embodying their ideas of perfect beauty,—and all four should exhibit at the appointed time, figures, equally shaped upon types and models differing from all ever seen before in this country, and yet at the same time, each figure unique, original and absolutely perfect, and perfect in their resemblance one to another; I am sure such a fact would be regarded as incredible, except on the supposition that these four artists had been educated by the same preceptor, and had all copied the same original. This is precisely the case with the Evangelists. They, each in his own way, copied from the living model. Mathew's Gospel is not John's, nor is Luke's that of Mark. The four Gospel narratives are but one picture, and yet they are four distinct, unique, original and perfect portraits. What then must have been the perfection of their model? Surely, He was not as other men, who was in the world, and yet infinitely above it. In His character we find nothing sectarian or national.—The Evangelists have borrowed nothing from the Egypt-

tian, Judean, Greek or Roman types, and yet the character they have drawn is the model of perfection for all nations and ages. Jesus Christ is the One altogether lovely to sinners of every hue and clime. Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, Europeans and savages of the desert and of the wilderness have heard his voice in the forgiveness of sin, and have followed Him in the regeneration, and have entered the kingdom of Heaven. His love moves alike the heart of the Hottentot and of the Islanders of the South Seas. He is the Saviour of the prince and the sage, the Redeemer of the slave and of the mighty of the earth.—“He is able to save to the uttermost all that will come to God through Him.

ARTICLE III.

ON THE NATURE AND IMPORTANCE OF A CHRISTIAN PROFESSION, AND ITS CONNEXION WITH MEMBERSHIP IN THE VISIBLE CHURCH.

What is a Christian profession? What is implied in membership in the visible Church? These are solemn and important questions; but few, perhaps, have studied them with the attention they deserve. To most of our readers the views now to be presented will probably seem novel and objectionable.* They have not, however, been adopted hastily, or on slight grounds; and whatever may

* From the days of Pres. Edwards till now, they have had little currency in this country. That distinguished man, as is well known, contended that none but those who give satisfactory evidence of true conversion should be admitted to full communion in the visible Church; and this view, which caused his rejection by his people at Northampton, after having served them faithfully for twenty-three years, though it met with strenuous opposition in quarters hardly to be expected, has long prevailed in the Presbyterian Church in the United States. The arguments of Edwards, in his “Enquiry concerning qualifications for Communion,” and in his reply to Williams, have never yet been satisfactorily answered. The Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, however, practice on a different principle, and though dissenting from them, and the author of this article, it is but right that we should allow the discussion as he has ingeniously conducted it, a place on our pages.—EDS. SO. PRES. REVIEW.

be their merits, should the exhibition of them lead to thorough investigation, we shall not have laboured in vain.

As there will be frequent occasion to refer to the following passages of Scripture, we deem it expedient to introduce them here.

Luke 12: 8, 9.—Also I say unto you, whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of Man also confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me before men, shall be denied before the angels of God.—

Romans 10: 8-10.—The word is nigh thee, even in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shall believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. *Hebrews*, 10: 23.—Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering;

(for he is faithful that promised.) *Mark*, 16: 16.—He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. *Acts*, 2: 37-47.—Now,

when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, 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, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. And fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done by the Apostles. And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and hav-

ing favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved. *Matthew* 28 : 19, 20.—Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. *Genesis* 17 : 7.—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. *Verses* 9-11.—And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee ; Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin ; and it shall be the token of the covenant betwixt me and you. *Exodus* 12 : 48.—And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it ; and he shall be as one that is born in the land. *Isaiah* 56 : 6, 7.—Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant ; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer ; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar : for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people.

From the first five of these passages we shall now deduce a series of observations, which will serve as a foundation for much of our subsequent reasoning, and to which the careful attention of the reader is earnestly solicited.

1. The *confession of Christ*, enjoined in the first and second of these texts, is evidently identical with the *profession of our faith*, mentioned in the third—and is that *Christian profession* which we are to consider. This, it is presumed, will be admitted without an argument.

2. The first of these passages teaches us that the confession, or profession in question, is an infallible test, by which to distinguish the heirs of salvation from the heirs

of perdition ; all who make it, belong to the former class ; all who *refuse*, to the latter.

3. From the third of these texts it is evident that the profession must be permanent. Though made, *original-ly*, by a single act, it must be adhered to, *under all circumstances*, to the end of life.

4. In the case of persons not previously baptized, the divinely appointed mode of making this profession is in baptism. We are not representing confession and baptism as the same thing. The one is the duty of which we speak ; the other we affirm to be the divinely appointed mode of performing that duty ; and what would be the effect of an involuntary mistake as to the mode, we are not now inquiring. So explained, the truth of our observation is established by a comparison of the second and fourth of the texts quoted. In both, the terms of salvation are professedly and formally stated ; and as there can be no contradiction between them, it follows that in both the same duties are enjoined. In the one, they are to believe and *confess* ; in the other, to believe and *be baptized*. Of course, the command to confess, and the command to be baptized, relate to the same duty. A Baptist, we know, would object to the limitation which we have mentioned. That question need not be here discussed. If the observation is admitted as true of all the cases to which we have applied it, our reasoning will not be invalidated, even though it be extended to others.

5. It is by baptism one becomes a member of the visible Church. This is evident from the fifth of the passages quoted. The last sentence in this passage, let it be observed, relates to persons not previously mentioned. Here, for the first time, is anything said about admission to the Church ; and here is not one word about baptism. If, then, our observation be incorrect, the following consequences will follow : On the one hand, we have no account of the admission of the three thousand into the Church, though they evidently enjoyed all the privileges of membership ; and on the other, as to those who are recorded to have been added to the Church, notwithstanding the emphasis with which baptism was enjoined on others, we have no evidence that they ever received that ordinance.

6. From the truths now stated, it follows that the pro-

fession to which the promise of salvation is annexed, is the same which an adult is divinely required to make in baptism, and the same that he is divinely required to make in becoming a member of the visible Church.

Our materials are now collected, and we proceed to use them. Our first position, then, is this :

I. *A Christian profession does not consist, either wholly or in part, in a declaration that he who makes it either is, or believes himself to be, a regenerate person.*

That every unregenerate person is absolutely disqualified for making that profession, is certain ; the reason for this will be given hereafter. But there are those who believe that, according to the will of God, the Church is to consist solely of regenerate persons ; that her peculiar privileges are designed exclusively for *edification*—not at all for *conversion*—and that should one of her members be duly ascertained to be still unconverted, his connexion with her ought, *on that account alone*, to be dissolved.

To these views we oppose—

1. *Infant baptism.*

So far as external ordinances are concerned, our Saviour has instituted but *one baptism*. It may, indeed, be administered in different circumstances ; and these may vary the consequences *incidentally* connected with it. But to imagine a difference as to its primary design—its direct meaning and effect, is to imagine a plurality of baptisms. But an infant is not baptized in the character of a regenerate person. The reason for baptizing him rests not at all on any supposition of his having experienced that change. Of course, in the case of an adult receiving the same ordinance, a declaration on that subject cannot be the direct meaning and design.

The argument will appear still stronger, if we reflect on the ecclesiastical effect of baptism. The party baptized, whether infant or adult, is thereby constituted a member of the Church. Is that relation intended solely for the edification of believers, and not at all for the conversion of sinners ? Why, then, are infants admitted ? On this hypothesis, it must be absolutely useless till they are converted. Why not wait, then, as in the case of those who are born of unbelieving parents ? That an infant may be regenerated, we have no doubt ; and in such a case, should

life be continued, the evidences of piety would be exhibited just as soon as the evidences of capacity for moral action. But such instances are, at best, *extremely rare*; and it surely will not be contended that God has established the general law of infant baptism merely as a provision for such rare exceptions.

Besides, it will hardly be contended that, in all ordinary cases, persons baptized in infancy ought to be excommunicated as soon as they exhibit satisfactory evidence of having arrived at years of discretion. A position so paradoxical, so manifestly unsupported by the word of God, and repugnant to the dictates of common sense, need not be examined, unless it should be distinctly affirmed. But if this idea be rejected, the doctrine we are opposing will lead to another conclusion, equally strange and unreasonable. It will require a distinction to be made in the administration of ecclesiastical censures; the delinquent, if born of pious parents, must be dealt with on one principle; and if his connexion with the Church was formed by his own act, on a different and harsher principle. When this conclusion shall have found an advocate, we shall be prepared to discuss its merits.

2. *The original Constitution of the Church.* In common with Pedo-Baptists generally, we regard the covenant with Abraham, (already cited,) as the charter under which the Church exists at the present moment. The *token* of the covenant has, indeed, been changed; but it by no means follows that the covenant itself has been abrogated. Paul expressly affirms that, *by circumcision*, Abraham became the father of all believers, whether circumcised or uncircumcised. See Romans 4: 11, 12. The terms of membership, no doubt, have been more clearly illustrated since the time of Abraham; but to suppose that they have been essentially altered, is to suppose that the original charter has been revoked, and a new one granted—which would be a surrender of the foundation on which infant baptism rests. What, then, was necessary to constitute one who had been born of Gentile parents a member of the Jewish Church? Our quotations from Genesis, Exodus, and Isaiah, are intended to throw light on that question, and will be used for this purpose hereafter. At present our inquiry relates to a single point:

Was such a person required, as a condition of admission, to avow a persuasion that he was already in the enjoyment of Jehovah's favor? Let the reader examine the texts which we have quoted, and judge for himself. So far as we now recollect, that idea has never yet found an advocate.

The arguments hitherto offered, we are aware, would have no weight with a Baptist; the same is not true of those which remain to be adduced.

3. *The principle that Christian baptism is not to be administered to the same person more than once.* This may be safely assumed; and we have only to inquire how far it is consistent with the theory under discussion. Suppose an adult baptized on a profession of faith. This, according to the theory, is a public declaration that his sins are pardoned, and his nature is renewed. It is afterwards proved by sufficient evidence, and even declared by himself, that the fact is otherwise. As to the present argument, it is quite indifferent whether he deceived himself, or intended to deceive others. We ask, does the effect of his baptism continue? Is he still to be numbered among baptized persons? Answer in the affirmative, and you have the singular assertion, that a claim which a man has once set up in his own favor, remains in force after it has been deliberately, publicly, and formally retracted. Answer in the negative, and the conclusion is inevitable, should he be truly converted at a subsequent period, there will be precisely the same reason for declaring that fact in baptism as if he never had been baptized. In short, if, in the case of adults, to be baptized is to claim the character of regenerate persons, then to retract the claim is to nullify the ordinance; and all who now disclaim the character are, with respect to baptism, on the same level—whence it follows that, if on conversion, it becomes the duty of any to be baptized, the same, in like circumstances, becomes the duty of all, without any distinction between those who have and those who have not been baptized at an earlier period.

IV. *Apostolic teaching and practice in reference to baptism.*

The ordinance now in force was first administered on the day of Pentecost; and no instruction necessary to a

proper reception of it, we may be assured, was omitted on that occasion. Did Peter, then, require of his hearers a persuasion that they were already in favor with God, as a necessary qualification? Did he intimate that baptism was an expression of such a persuasion? Assuredly he did not. The whole passage has already been quoted; and, in reference to this point, is now commended to the careful examination of the reader. It is utterly impossible to gather from it that baptism is an avowal of any sentiment or state of mind not included in the repentance with which it is connected. *Repent and be baptized, &c.* Could the three thousand learn from this that before being baptized they must receive an assurance, or entertain a persuasion that their sins were already pardoned? Here it may be proper to mention another passage in which the qualifications for baptism, in the case of an adult, are formally stated: Acts 8: 36-38. "And as they went on their way, they came to a certain water: and the eunuch said, see, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? and Philip said, if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered, and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him." Here, it is evident, the profession made related solely to the Lord Jesus; the applicant expressed his views and feelings in reference to *him*—but neither gave, nor was required to give, any expression of opinion, as to himself as a pardoned or unpardoned sinner. And we may add, there is not an instance recorded in the New Testament where a candidate for baptism was required to express any opinion on that subject. The question, uniformly, is not *what think ye of yourselves?* but, *what think ye of Christ?*

Self-examination is the principal means for determining whether our sins are forgiven or not; and in this view it is frequently enjoined in the New Testament. But the injunction is uniformly addressed to those who are already members of the Church. Nowhere is the candidate commanded to examine himself, in order that he may know whether he is qualified for admission; and in no instance is it recorded that baptism was delayed in order to give

opportunity for such self-examination. The danger of inconsiderate haste is, indeed, brought distinctly to view ; but the remedy prescribed by the Redeemer is not *examine yourselves*, but *count the cost*. Consider the life you must live, the sacrifices you will be required to make. When a scribe proposed to follow him, he said not a word about self-examination. His answer was of a different kind : "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests ; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." "You propose to follow a Master who is poorer than birds or foxes ; and *the disciple is not above his Master*. Will you be my disciple on these terms." And the means he employed for this purpose were uniformly of the same kind.

5. *The requirement of steadfastness in the Christian profession.*

When the Apostle says, *Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering*, he surely does not mean that we must, under all circumstances, persist in the declaration that our sins are pardoned, and we are heirs of glory. Such an interpretation is utterly irreconcilable with the injunction : *Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith*. It follows that *the profession of our faith* does not include the declaration specified. There is not a passage in the word of God which *so much as seems to suggest* that the question, whether a man's connexion with the Church shall be continued or dissolved, must be decided by self-examination.

There are, we know, some who believe that a right to membership in the Church necessarily involves a right to the Lord's table ; and it is sometimes asserted that a member of the Church who, in consequence of doubts as to his own piety, abstains from the sacred supper, commits a disciplinable offence, which, if persisted in, ought to draw down upon him a sentence of excommunication. This whole theory we unhesitatingly pronounce unfounded and unscriptural. And a single text ought to dislodge it forever from every Christian mind. 1 Cor. 11 : 26-29. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But, let a man examine himself, and so let him

eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

From this passage we learn that a spiritual qualification is indispensable to an authorized approach to the Lord's table—that the communicant not thus qualified incurs all the guilt of neglecting that ordinance, with the additional guilt of profaning it—and that self-examination is necessary, because to eat and drink unworthily is worse than to abstain entirely. But when do we read of withdrawing from the Church because self-examination has detected the want of that spiritual qualification? This passage, assuredly, contains not a syllable that ingenuity can torture into such a meaning.

If a member of the Church evinces by his outward conduct that he is not qualified for an acceptable approach to the Lord's table, the spiritual officers of the Church ought to forbid his approach. But if, while his behavior is in other respects such as becometh the Gospel, he refrains in consequence of apprehensions in his own mind that he is unqualified, the matter lies between his own conscience and his God; and his fellow creatures may not interfere, except by simply giving him such instruction as may aid in self-examination. For what purpose can discipline be applied? To induce him to communicate, without reference to the question whether, in his own judgment, he is qualified or disqualified? According to the scripture just quoted, for him to do so, would be daring impiety. Shall he be censured, merely because he judges unfavorably of his own case—doubts his own piety? How is the remedy suited to the disease? or where has God prescribed it? The Scriptures, then, require a man to examine himself, in order to ascertain whether he is in the faith, and whether he is qualified for the Lord's supper; but they do not require him to determine by self-examination whether he shall continue in the Church, or whether he shall retain his Christian profession. Let the reader draw his own conclusion.

6. *The connexion between a Christian profession and salvation.* See Luke 12: 8, 9—already quoted. Did the Saviour make it a condition of salvation, that we should declare before men that we are already heirs of salvation?

If not, the theory under discussion is irreconcilable with this passage.

II. We proceed to state what we conceive to be the true theory.

The Church is the visible kingdom of God, distinguished from every other society by this important circumstance, that all her members, and no others, are bound by a solemn and public covenant to the evangelical service of Jehovah. That obligation may be described in other words, thus: They are bound by such a covenant, to trust and love, to serve and glorify the Mediator, in the character in which he is revealed, as Lord and Saviour. As it is by baptism one is made a member of the Church, it is, of course, by that ordinance he is brought into this covenant. And a Christian profession is simply a cordial and open acknowledgement of the obligation which the covenant imposes. By saying, the acknowledgement must be cordial, we mean simply that it must be prompted by a state of heart corresponding with it nature. It is not needful to dwell on the distinction between entering into this covenant by baptism, which, in the case of those not baptized in infancy, is the prescribed mode of originally making this profession, and the subsequent acts by which the obligation of the covenant is recognised. There is evidently no such difference as can affect the nature of the profession.

Hoping that this statement of our views will be found to be sufficiently clear and explicit, we proceed to exhibit our proofs.

Here we lay much stress on *the connexion between a Christian profession and salvation*. Notice the first of the passages quoted at the outset. (Luke 12: 8, 9.) It will, of course, be admitted that the *confession* here required must be cordial, that it must be connected with a state of heart corresponding with its nature; but this is only saying in other words that it must spring from a heart that recognises Christ as Saviour and Sovereign. And such a recognition is the faith to which the promise of eternal life is uniformly annexed. *He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life.* And as it is a living faith that is required, the believer cannot, of course, be either afraid or ashamed to acknowledge his obligation to the

Redeemer. Understood as now explained, the text referred to is in full accordance with the uniform teachings of the word of God; but the same will not be true, if we attach any other meaning to the term *confess*.

Let this passage be compared with the second which we quoted. (Romans 10: 8-10.) In the one, no duty is specified but *confession*; in the other, both *faith and confession*. On our principle, the difference is easily explained. It will not be imagined that a hypocritical profession will meet the Redeemer's requirement; but such is the nature of the thing to be *confessed*, that without faith the *confession* cannot be sincere. The mention of faith in the latter text, therefore, explains the nature of the confession required. In the same paragraph which contains this latter passage, faith is described by its immediate effect—calling on the name of the Lord. *Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved*. The state of heart involved in a Christian profession is, therefore, identical with that which is implied in a sincere application to Christ for his salvation; and he who is qualified for the latter is qualified for the former.

Our theory removes every appearance of difficulty from the inspired exhortation: *Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering*. Whether a man may claim before his fellow men the character of an heir of salvation, depends on the results of self-examination; but whether he shall recognise and acknowledge his obligation to trust, serve, and glorify the Lord Jesus, is a question about which he may not hesitate for a single moment, or under any circumstances; and such is the duty to which that exhortation relates.

Our next argument is drawn from *the Saviour's manner of treating those who proposed to become his disciples*.

The general direction to *count the cost*, has already been noticed. We have mentioned, too, his reply to the scribe who proposed to follow him. One more passage of the same class will suffice. Luke 14: 25-27. "And there went great multitudes with him; and he turned and said unto them: If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my

disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple."

What means, then, did the Saviour employ to prevent unsuitable persons from enrolling themselves among his disciples? Did he tell them to examine themselves? Did he require an account of their past religious experience? Did he give a particular statement of what that experience ought to have been? Nothing of the kind. He simply stated the terms of discipleship, and called on them to decide whether they would be his disciples on these terms. In other words, he set before them the obligation of the covenant into which they proposed to enter, and demanded neither more nor less than their hearty consent to that covenant.

We have already promised to state the reason why every unregenerate person is incapable of making a Christian profession, and disqualified for uniting himself, by his own act, with the Church of God. We now fulfil that promise: *No such person sincerely consents to God's covenant.* That covenant requires a cordial recognition of Jesus as Lord and Saviour, in the sense in which these characters are ascribed to him in the sacred volume. But, *No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.* (1 Cor. 12: 3.) If, then, a man heartily consents to this covenant, it follows that the spirit of Christ dwells in him, and, of course, that he is Christ's. (See Romans 8: 9.) But, let it be observed, his consent to the covenant is the evidence of his Christian character—not his Christian character the evidence of his consent to the covenant—and he who can sincerely signify his consent to the covenant is, therefore, qualified for admission into the Church—no matter whether he has or has not drawn the delightful inference that he is a child of God, and an heir of glory.

Our next argument is drawn from the original Constitution of the Church—the Abrahamic covenant.

At the outset, we quoted, from the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, the covenant, and the appointment of circumcision as its token. Here, for the first time, did Jehovah authorize mortals to speak of him as the God of Abraham; and whenever this title is applied to Him, the reference is to this covenant. In whatever sense, then, He is the God of Abraham, in the same sense is He the God of all who

are reckoned, according to the covenant, as the seed of Abraham. This, however does not include all who are bound by the covenant, or whose visible relation it determines: "For they are not all Israel which are of Israel; neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." (Rom. 9: 6-8.) The next passage which we quoted, (Exodus 12: 48,) provides for the admission of strangers (persons who were Gentiles by birth) into this Church, or covenant relation; and *that*, in the case of males, was by circumcision. We have already referred to Romans 4: 11 and 12. Let the reader examine it attentively, and he can hardly fail to perceive that Abraham "*received the sign of circumcision*" in the specific character of a believer; and furthermore, *that circumcision constituted him the father of all believers, whether circumcised or uncircumcised*. But this latter proposition is only expressed in terms slightly varied, when we affirm, that Abraham was constituted the *father of believers, by the covenant of which circumcision was the token*; and that is to say, it is by faith one becomes a child of Abraham in the sense of the covenant. Of course, every person included in that covenant, as to visible relation, is bound thereby to the exercise of a faith like Abraham's—an evangelical, living, active, obedient faith.

If further information on this point be required, we have only to refer to the last of the passages quoted at the commencement of this discussion. (Isaiah 56: 6 and 7.) The last sentence, we conceive, contains a promise, the fulfilment of which belongs to the Christian dispensation, though the language is accommodated, as in many other instances, to the dispensation then in force. The rest of the passage announces a general principle, applicable, as we think, to the Church, under all dispensations—certainly applicable to the Jewish dispensation. The candidate was required to enter into covenant with God; or, in the emphatic language of inspiration, to "*take hold of my covenant*." The meaning is, he must heartily consent to the covenant, and signify his consent in the prescribed

form, which then was by circumcision. And the following are specified as the duties to which he bound himself by that act—to love the name of the Lord, to be his servant, and serve him, and to keep the Sabbath from polluting it. The Abrahamic covenant, then, bound all who were comprehended under it to the evangelical service of God; and all who were prepared to enter into such an engagement, (and, so far as adults were concerned, no others,) were prepared for admission into the visible Church. That the same principle is still in force, is the precise doctrine of this article. We proceed, then, to notice, as our next argument,

The teachings of the New Testament in reference to Christian baptism.

Among the texts which we quoted at the commencement, is Matthew 28: 19 and 20, to which the serious attention of the reader is now requested. The nations are to be baptised *in* (or into *εἰς*) *the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*—thus bought into that visible family of which the Most High is the acknowledged Father and Sovereign—and solemnly and publicly devoted to his service. This view is corroborated by the following words: *Teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you.* It is natural to understand this direction in reference especially to persons already baptized; and the meaning will then be, “illustrate, in all its extent, the obligation of the covenant into which they have entered; inculcate the duties involved with the utmost zeal, and enforce obedience by all the means which I have appointed.” If this is the true interpretation, (and to us it seems indisputable that it is,) this passage establishes the proposition, that the party baptized is thereby brought into a covenant with God, precisely similar to, or rather identical with, the Abrahamic covenant already noticed; nor is it any objection that the three Divine Persons are expressly mentioned in one passage, but not in the other; in each, he is solemnly bound to the evangelical service of the same God, and the corresponding blessings which he is authorized to expect are the same.

Let us next turn to the passage which was quoted from the second chapter of Acts. The clause most material to

our purpose is, *Repent, and be baptized, &c.* Few will need to be informed that the word translated *repent*, means to change one's mind ; and whether a general or a particular change is meant, can be determined only by the connexion. In this instance, as appears from the context, Peter was replying to an inquiry extorted from his hearers by the overwhelming charge, made and proved against them, that they had rejected Him whom *God had made both Lord and Christ*, and had horribly signalized that rejection by procuring his crucifixion. When in connexion with this subject, Peter said, *Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ*, what could they understand but this : that they must so change their minds, as to receive as Lord and Christ him whom they had hitherto rejected, and, as a public acknowledgement of him, must be baptized in his name ? So explained, this text accords with all those passages which connect faith with baptism, as saving faith consists in receiving Christ. It receives him as both Deliverer and Sovereign ; nor can he be received in either character, unless he is received in both ; but it may be proper to observe that, in this instance, the latter, but not the former, is expressly mentioned. Such is a fair specimen of the uniform teaching of the sacred writers. They represent Christian baptism as an oath of allegiance—a solemn acknowledgement of the supremacy of the mediatorial King. Hence the obligation to a holy life, which they connect with that ordinance. *How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein ? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death ? Therefore we are 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.*

Before leaving this part of the subject, it seems proper to mention two additional considerations, which the reader is at liberty to take for arguments, or not, according to his own pleasure. One is, that

Our theory gives a clear and consistent view of the meaning and effect of baptism, as administered to an infant.

Whether it is administered to an adult, or to an infant,

the rite is the same, and its symbolical meaning the same; moreover, it seals the same promises, and imposes the same obligation. Of course, it is the same ordinance. The difference is purely circumstantial, and it is this: In the one case the person enters into this relation by his own voluntary act; in the other, he is brought into it through his connexion with others. A foreigner arrives on our shore, and in due time takes the oath of allegiance; his children born afterwards are born citizens—brought into that relation, not by their own act, but through their connexion with him—and are as strictly bound to all the duties of allegiance, as if they had taken the obligation by their own act. They are not, indeed, subjected to any rite corresponding with the oath administered to their father. But, though the parallel does not hold in every particular, here is the principle upon which infant baptism rests—the child brought into a covenant relation through his connexion with his parent. We pass to the other consideration:

Our theory suggests the reason why baptism may not be repeated. That ordinance is designed to bring the subject under the obligation of God's covenant; of course, it is presupposed that he is not already under that obligation. But, the relation once formed, the obligation is perpetual, and can no more be canceled than the soul can be annihilated.

But, we shall be asked, Would you retain a man in the Church, when it is evident that, were he not already a member, he must be judged utterly unqualified for admission? Undoubtedly. In taking an oath of allegiance, a man ought to act sincerely and advisedly; but he who has taken it, no matter in what state of moral feeling, is truly a citizen; nor can he be permitted to plead, in answer to a charge of treason, that he took that oath rashly, or in jest, or that at the moment of taking it he meditated treasonable designs.

Thus we have endeavoured to explain the nature of a Christian profession, and its connexion with membership in the Church of God. Let us proceed to consider,

III. *The importance of such a profession.*

This the Son of God has exhibited in the strongest light, in the memorable declaration: *Whosoever shall*

confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God; but he that denieth me before men, shall be denied before the angels of God.

In the case of those who have not been baptized already, this *confession*, as we have seen, is required to be made by connecting themselves with the Church of Christ; of persons who have been baptized in infancy is demanded a cordial, solemn, and public recognition of the baptismal obligation, to be given in the specific character of members of the Church. To every reader who has not already done so, we say: This is your duty; you are bound to embrace the earliest opportunity for performing it; and for the consequences of neglecting it, you are referred to the awful words of your final Judge, which have just been quoted.

You ask, then, can no man be saved who does not place himself in the condition of a communicant? Undoubtedly, if God, in his providence, denies him the opportunity. The opportunity being supposed, the question resolves itself into this: Whether any person, supremely desirous to do the will of Christ, is ever left to mistake that will in reference to this matter? and this can never be a practical question with any man, in reference to his own case. The denunciation is leveled, not against invincible ignorance, involuntary error, or a failure to do what Providence has rendered impracticable; but against resisting the Saviour's authority, and wilfully neglecting to render him the honor which he claims. Every man shall be saved who believes in Jesus with the *faith that worketh by love*; but where there is affectionate faith, there is submission to His authority—there is the spirit of unconditional obedience to all his known requirements.

The obligation rests on the revealed will of Christ.—Still the reasonableness of the requirement is, in several views, exceedingly obvious; and devout meditation on this subject is both proper and profitable.

The Church is the kingdom of Christ—all without it, the kingdom of the devil. If, then, you heartily submit to Christ, can you wish to remain, formally and visibly, in the kingdom of Satan?

Piety, necessarily, spreads its influence over the whole character of its possessor. It must control every part of

your conduct—that which is open and visible, as well as that which is secret. Now, if ashamed or afraid openly to acknowledge Christ as your Lord, will you not be ashamed or afraid openly to do His will in other respects?

If a believer, you regard the Lord Jesus with supreme reverence and love. But, entertaining these sentiments, you cannot possibly be reluctant to honor Him, and acknowledge your obligation to Him, in the boldest and most open manner.

Many of the most formidable difficulties that attend a life of piety, arise from the influence of the ungodly. Let it be known, then, that you belong to a different class—are actuated by other motives, guided by opposite principles, and bound by the most solemn vows to the service of another Master. Nothing can tend more obviously to diminish the number and force of the temptations arising from that quarter, or to facilitate the work of resistance.

Intercourse with the pious, in the specific character of a fellow-disciple, is a divinely appointed and most precious means of grace; and the same is true of that official supervision, government, and discipline, which God has established in his Church. But these you cannot enjoy, unless you are connected with the Church.

God, only wise, has instituted the Church for the most important of all ends—the glory of his own name, the honor of his Son, the salvation of a lost world. To decline connexion with the Church is, therefore, palpably inconsistent with sincere attachment to these momentous interests.

Say not, I doubt the reality of my own conversion. You are not required to make any declaration on that subject; but you are required to declare, in sincerity and truth, the following things: That you regard Jesus as the only and all-sufficient Saviour of lost sinners, and therefore rely exclusively on his atoning blood, his perfect obedience, his prevalent intercession, and his boundless mercy, for your own salvation; that you regard him as supreme and rightful Lord of all—and therefore, relying on his grace, are resolved to devote yourself henceforth to his service. And the evidence on which all this is to be declared, is *your own consciousness*. Do you still refuse? Then observe the true nature of the controversy between

the Redeemer and yourself. He commands you to seek assurance of his favor by doing his will; and you answer that you will not do his will, till assured of his favor. Will you yield? or do you think he will?

Another excuse relates to the division of the Church into various denominations. But can you find no particular society which you can conscientiously recognise as really a Church of Christ, and which does not require, as a term of membership, anything that you deem sinful? If you can find one such society, your duty is plain; if more than one, it is still plain: form that connexion which at present you judge to be most conducive to your spiritual welfare; and should you ever perceive it to be your duty to transfer your membership to a Church of a different denomination, there can be no real difficulty in doing so. *It is better to be in any part of the kingdom of Christ, than in the kingdom of Satan.* (Our views on this topic will probably be more fully developed in a future article.)

IV. It cannot be expected that we should attempt to develop all the consequences that flow from our doctrine; but on two subjects its bearings are too important to be passed over in silence.

1. *The duty of ecclesiastical officers as to receiving persons into the communion of the Church.*

There is a duty required of every hearer of the gospel, to be performed by *their* assistance; and the only question for their consideration is, whether what the candidate proposes to do is really the duty enjoined by Christ. Here is no room for consulting either their own wishes, or the dictates of human prudence. A definite profession is to be made, and they have only to inquire whether the profession offered is such as the law requires. They may not administer the oath of Christian allegiance to one who does not understand its nature; or who gives them reason to think he is in sport, seeking to deceive; or acting under the influence of caprice or momentary excitement. But these seem to be all the grounds on which they are authorized to reject an applicant.

There are, in the opinion of many persons, serious objections against receiving very young persons into the communion of the Church; and ecclesiastical officers, there is reason to think, have often felt some difficulty on

that subject. Let it be remembered, no one is required to believe in Christ who is not likewise required to confess him before men. Hence it cannot be consistently maintained concerning any human being, that he is too young to become a communicant, unless it is maintained that he is likewise too young to become an evangelical believer; and that the command to believe has, as yet, no application to his case. A child, we know, is peculiarly prone to act hastily. But it is not more difficult to distinguish a deliberate act from a mere ebullition of excited feeling in his case than in that of an older person. Nor is there any peculiar difficulty in judging of his sincerity, or of the degree of his religious knowledge.

But much may be said of the immaturity of judgment, and unsteadiness of purpose, which mark that tender age. We shall perhaps be reminded, that to become a communicant is a transaction of the utmost solemnity and importance; and that, according to the common sense of mankind, a child is not competent to transact serious business. We answer: As to maturity of judgment, a child is capable of deciding, which is preferable, the service of Christ, or the service of Satan. As to steadiness of purpose, the perseverance of the oldest Christian depends solely on the grace of Christ; and that grace is as sufficient for a little child as for any other. Besides, it is *in the Church* we enjoy those means which the Saviour has appointed for *confirming the souls of the disciples*; hence the more pressing the danger, the more urgent the necessity for such a connexion. And finally, the Redeemer's command to believe in His name, and to confess Him before men, is attended with no limitation as to age. To defer on this account, or to require or advise others to do so, is, therefore, at once to question his wisdom, and to violate his law.

2. *The nature and proper grounds of excommunication.*

A member of the Church is one who stands in the public and visible relation of a servant of Christ. How far he is an obedient servant, is a very different matter. He is bound by the baptismal covenant; and if capable of acting for himself, acknowledges the obligation. Excommunication transfers his public and visible relation to the

kingdom of Satan. It is the act described by Paul in the awful phrase, *to deliver such an one unto Satan*. This differs widely from mere suspension. The suspended member is still regarded as a citizen of Christ's kingdom; but a disorderly citizen. He is still under ecclesiastical government; and the power of that government is exerted for the special purpose of bringing him to repentance; therefore he is debarred from some of those privileges to which, if an orderly citizen, he would be entitled. We count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother. Excommunication, on the contrary, is thus described by our Saviour: *Let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican*. The excommunicated person is an enemy, not a brother. To him, as to other sinners, the gospel must be preached; but he is not under ecclesiastical government. He has assumed such an attitude of daring rebellion, that, in this sense, the Church can interfere no farther. She leaves the controversy to be settled between the rebel and the eternal Sovereign whom he has defied. He is without: and, *What have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person*.

In view of these truths, we may easily discover what is the only lawful ground of excommunication. It is that **the person concerned has renounced the baptismal covenant**; in other words, has renounced his allegiance to the Lord Jesus. This crime may be committed in various ways; it may be done either directly or indirectly; but to warrant the sentence in question, it must have been done unequivocally. On no other ground can the sentence be valid. He who has been brought into the baptismal covenant, is still in the visible kingdom of Christ; nor is it in the power of creatures to transfer him to the visible kingdom of Satan.

The covenant may be renounced by resisting ecclesiastical authority when properly exercised. This is evident from Matthew 18: 17. While the Church is doing only what her Lord has required her to do, to resist her is to rebel against him. Before proceeding on this ground, however, it must be satisfactorily ascertained that the re-

sistance relates not to a doubtful matter, springs not from involuntary error, or even from a momentary excitement ; but can be rationally ascribed to nothing short of contempt for the Redeemer's authority.

Suppose one not previously charged with any disciplinable offence shall signify to the Session a wish to be regarded no longer as a member of the Church ; how ought such an application to be treated ? To this question, with which many have been perplexed, our doctrine furnishes, as we conceive, the true solution. All will agree that the Session ought, in the first place, to satisfy themselves that the application is made intelligently and deliberately. The applicant ought to be carefully instructed in the true nature of the step he proposes to take, and ample time afforded him for reflection. And we now add that if, after this, his intentions remain unchanged, he must be excommunicated. Excommunication is simply an official declaration, that the party concerned has renounced the baptismal covenant ; and, in this case, the declaration is based, not on an inference, but on the explicit avowal of the person excommunicated.

Such an avowal places him who makes it in the attitude of an avowed enemy of God, and of his Son, and of his Church—differing from other avowed enemies only in this, that to the common guilt of daring impiety he superadds the peculiar aggravation of the basest perfidy. Before God, and angels, and men, he declares that, preferring the service of Satan to the service of Christ, he will submit to no government administered in the name of the latter. He is an apostate ; and, as to the nature of the crime, it makes no essential difference whether he serves the devil in the form of mere godlessness, or in some form of Pagan idolatry. Against no other sin are the denunciations of the word of God so awful as against this. *Now the just shall live by faith : but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the*

holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb : The dog is turned to his own vomit again ; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire. The Scriptures contain not a solitary intimation, that he who has once been a member of the Church, can either withdraw, or be lawfully excommunicated, without placing himself in the condition these passages describe.

ARTICLE IV.

THE UNPARDONABLE SIN.

The Gospel is a remedial scheme. The Father devised it, the Son executed it, and the Spirit applies it. Sin is the disease, and it may be considered under a two-fold aspect, to wit, in its guilt, and in its power. Its guilt is its desert of God's wrath, and curse ; and apprehended under this notion, produces a sense of ill-desert, and shame, and "a fearful looking-for of judgement, and fiery indignation." Its power is its dominion over the moral nature, by which the faculties are perverted, the springs of action corrupted, and the will enslaved ; and apprehended under this notion by the religious consciousness, it forces the believer to cry out, "wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death." The Gospel is a remedy for sin in that it reveals to faith an all-sufficient atonement for its guilt, and by the truth instrumentally, and the Spirit of God efficiently, destroys its power.

The Gospel speaks of itself as a remedy for *all sin*, 1st. indirectly, by teaching that no sinner, however numberless and aggravated his crimes, is excluded from its blessings, if he will comply with its terms ; "The Son of Man was lifted up, that *whosoever* believeth in Him might not perish, but have eternal life," (Jno. 3: 14, 15,) and by recording examples of such desperate cases, in which it actually

proved efficacious, as that of the thief upon the cross, and that of Paul, the Apostle, (Luke 23: 39-43; 1st. Tim. 1: 13-16): and, 2ndly., directly, by asserting the truth in so many words, "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from *all* sin," (1 Jno. 1: 7.) To this universal efficacy of the Gospel, however, there is one exception, expressly mentioned,—a sin which "hath never forgiveness, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." It is proposed in this article, to investigate the nature of this sin, the only one in the list of crimes against God, which excludes the sinner from all hope of pardon under the Gospel of grace.

In this investigation, those passages of the word of God which describe this sin with particularity, will be passed in review, and subjected to a somewhat thorough examination. It is by searching out the mind of the Spirit, expressed by His own chosen organs, that we shall obtain a just knowledge of this great sin against Him.

As the law is called the dispensation of condemnation and death, in contrast with the Gospel, which is characterized as the dispensation of the Spirit, it might be doubted whether this sin, which is denominated, by way of eminence, the sin against the Holy Spirit, could be committed under the law. There are, nevertheless, obscure intimations of the unpardonable sin in the Old Testament. In the presumptuous sin, or sin with a high hand, mentioned in Numb. 15: 30, 31, which admitted of no expiation, and doomed the wretch who committed it to excision from Israel, we see traces of that form of the unpardonable sin, recorded in Matt., 12th chapter. In the sin of defecation from the law, accompanied with a secret attempt to entice others, described in Deut. 13: 6-11, for which the father was commanded not to spare even his own son, if found guilty of it, we may trace a resemblance to that form of the unpardonable sin described by Paul in the 6th and 10th chapters of the epistle to the Hebrews. The Old Testament, moreover, mentions the cases of individuals, in whose crimes some of the features of this sin occur, as, for instance, those of Esau, Pharoah, and Saul. Esau, selling his birth-right for a mess of pottage, through a carnal contempt of its spiritual privileges and blessings, is a type of these apostates, who deliberately barter away the

inestimable blessings of the Gospel for the temporal good of earth; and between Pharoah attempting to throw discredit on the miracles of Moses, and rejecting with proud contempt the message of God, clearly proved to be such by the most stupendous exhibitions of Divine power, and the Pharisees, ascribing Christ's miracles to a satanic agency, and contemptuously rejecting him, as the Messiah, there is a manifest resemblance.

But while the Old Testament gives only obscure hints in regard to this sin, the New describes it clearly. The fullest and most explicit account of it is contained in Matt. 12: 22-33, and in the parallel places in Mark, and Luke. It is to the account as given by Matthew, that our attention will be directed in the first place.

One possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb, was brought to Christ to be healed. The devil was cast out, and the man instantly recovered his lost sense, and the power of speech. The people standing around were filled with amazement at the miracle, and by a rapid process of thought, a kind of intuitive logic, grounded on the great national expectation, inferred from it that Christ was the long looked for Messiah. Some of the Pharisees were present, and saw the impression which was made. To counteract it, they asserted in the ears of the crowd, perhaps in an under-tone,* that Christ cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils. Whereupon Christ took them up, shewing the groundlessness and malignity of their reflection, and charging them with blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

Christ's discourse has a direct bearing on the sin committed by the Pharisees, and deserves a careful consideration. He starts out with the self-evident truth, that a kingdom, city, or house divided against itself, must come to ruin, and consequently, if Satan cast out Satan, he was divided against himself, and his kingdom could not stand. In this part of his argument, Christ assumes that the nature and tendency of his doctrine were such as to shew an evident opposition between himself and Satan; and

* In the 25th verse, it is said, "Jesus knew their *thoughts*," implying that He did not hear their *words*. They were probably restrained by a consciousness of their wicked intention, from boldly speaking out their blasphemy.—See 9: 4.

therefore, if Satan enabled Him to work miracles in attestation of that doctrine, he was divided against himself. Hence, *he* was either acting out of character, or their assertion was utterly devoid of even the slightest plausibility,—it was as senseless as it was malignant. He next convicts them of gross impartiality in their judgement of him. They ascribed the reputed power of their exorcists to cast out devils, to the Spirit of God; on what principle, then, did they ascribe his power to do the same thing to the Prince of devils? If there was no mark evidently stamped upon his miraculous work to manifest a Satanic agency, their judgement in the case of their own exorcists would prove them guilty of the grossest injustice in their judgment of him. Assuming, in the third place, that they must grant that he cast out devils by the Spirit of God, he argues that these miracles were evidence that the kingdom of God, *i. e.* the glorious dispensation of the Messiah, had come nigh to them: in other words, that He, who performed these miracles, was the promised Messiah, whose advent they looked forward as the time for the introduction of a new and glorious state of things. Building on the foundation which He had laid, he goes on to shew, that the fact that He could cast out devils from their strong-hold in the human soul, clearly demonstrated that he was Satan's superior; "or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house." He then asserts that this contest with Satan admitted of no neutrality; "he that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad." After this follow the words in which he not obscurely tells them that their sin in ascribing the dispossession of the demoniac just wrought by him to a satanic agency, was the sin against the Holy Ghost, "which shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." He concludes by urging them, as they could not deny that his life was holy, and the tendency of his doctrine and works good, not to be guilty of the gross inconsistency of asserting that he was confederate with Beelzebub.

It is evident that Christ's discourse, from the 25th to the 30th verses, stands connected with the 31st and 32d verses, as the conclusion, which was in His mind from the

beginning;* we may therefore expect to find him dwelling at least on the principal features of that sin, which he calls the sin against the Holy Ghost, and declares to be, in its very nature, unpardonable.

Christ assumes that the casting out of devils was the highest objective evidence of his Divine commission as the Messiah, who was to introduce and establish that kingdom, or dispensation of religion, predicted by the prophets, foreshadowed by the types of the law, and anticipated and longed for by the people of God. It is evident, however, that though Christ speaks only of the casting out of devils, he does not exclude as equally strong demonstration of his divine commission, his other miracles, which no less illustriously displayed his divine power. It is clear, moreover, that the Pharisees would no more hesitate to ascribe these last to the devil, than they did to ascribe that of which they happened to be eye-witnesses.

It is necessary to consider more attentively the circumstances of this sin, as they may be gathered from the narrative, and the address of our Saviour.

The Pharisees ascribed the miracle wrought on this occasion, and in fact, in so many words, all miracles of a like kind, to Satan working in and through him, not as a passive instrument, but a conscious and willing agent; and this constituted the overt act declared to be the sin against the Holy Ghost. This assertion was made in violation of all the principles of evidence. The casting out of a devil from a human being, made manifest to the eyes of all by instantaneous restoration to soundness of mind, or the recovery of some lost sense, or faculty, can produce but one impression upon the minds of unprejudiced observers; and that is, that he who does it, must be an enemy of Satan and his kingdom. This was the impression produced upon the minds of the people, who saw this miracle of Christ. It is possible to conceive that Satan might enable some agent or emissary of his to work an apparent mira-

* "Propterea dico vobis."—*Illatio hæc non ad proximum membrum restringi debet, sed pendet ex toto contextu. Postquam enim docuit Christus, scribas non posse improbare, quod dæmones ejiceret, quin regnum Dei oppugnent, tandem concludit, non leve, nec tolerabile esse delictum, sed nefandum crimen, quod scientes et volentes spiritum Dei contumelia afficiant.*—Calv. in *Har. Pars Prior*: p. 294. Berlin, 1833.

cle, seemingly benevolent, and in opposition to his interests, on some principle of infernal policy. He might do a seeming good, to accomplish a real evil; or forego a less, to gain a greater advantage. But the Pharisees could not resort to such a subterfuge as this. All the miracles of Christ, the whole tenor of his life, and tendency of his teaching, were of a piece; in perfect harmony with that divine intention which appeared on the face of this miracle, which impressed so deeply the common people. No word, act, or work of the blessed Jesus, during his whole previous career, could be detected by the most rigid scrutiny, which prejudice or envy could so torture as to afford the slightest support to the charge, that he had any feeling or aim in common with the Father of lies. His whole previous course was of such a character, in all respects, as to demonstrate triumphantly that he was the God-anointed Messiah, sent to destroy the works of the devil; and the rays reflected in such abundance from it, were concentrated in a luminous point on this miracle. The Pharisees, then, in ascribing the miracle of Christ to the devil, not only sinned against the evidence afforded by this solitary act of Divine power, but against all that concentrated light of evidence which streamed from his previous holy life, divine teachings, and miraculous works.

Moreover, as the casting out of a devil proves opposition to Satan and the kingdom of darkness, so it proves superiority. "How can one enter into the house of a strong man, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house." Viewing the miracle wrought on this occasion as proving opposition to Satan and his designs, it was absurd, as well as wicked, to say that a spirit, so cunning and wise, *would* delegate such a power to Christ; viewing it as demonstrating superiority, it was as absurd to say that he *could* do it. From the one point of view, it would argue inconceivable folly in Satan to enable Christ to dispossess the unfortunate beings subjected to him by the indwelling of a demon; from the other, it would do violence to common sense, to suppose that he was capable of doing it. Does the spoiler, who has succeeded, by his own might, in entering the house of the strong man, who has bound him hand and foot, and who departs in triumph, loaded with his booty,

need the aid of the being he has overcome and despoiled? As the miracle, then, wrought on this occasion, manifested Christ's opposition, as well as superiority to Satan, as his whole previous life, and his many works of divine power as illustriously displayed the same, the Pharisees, in ascribing it to Satan working in and through Christ, sinned against the clearest objective light. And this, namely, the clear objective light against which they sinned, constituted, in part, that crime which hath never forgiveness.

But, in the next place, when objective light is presented to a rational being, it is followed by subjective light; that is, evidence presented to the mind produces a greater or less degree of conviction. This is a law of the rational nature. However fully a man may have convinced himself of the correctness of his erroneous belief, and wrong course of conduct,—however set in his ways, he cannot hear a clear refutation of his false creed, or an exposure of his evil practices, without misgivings and doubts. The calm of his long repose is disturbed, and a stormy scene of internal struggling and conflict succeeds. He cannot assume his old position without doing violence to his better judgement, and stifling the voice of conscience. The Pharisees were no exceptions to this law. The Saviour takes it for granted, in what he said to them, that they were the subjects of such internal convictions. The character of their attempt to make it appear that Christ was in league with Satan, shews a state of mind in which, while they had no reasonable ground for cavil or doubt as to the source from whence Christ derived his miraculous power, they were determined, at all risks, to invalidate his work; a state of mind in which they had resolved to pursue a certain course, while in their hearts they were not convinced that it was right. The thought to which the people gave expression, moved by the evident display of divine power and beneficence in the miracle, doubtless darted into their souls like a flash of light, revealing Christ's divine glory, and irradiating for a moment their dark recesses, but was quickly repressed. The Pharisees, then, sinned not only against the clear objective evidence which was presented to them, but against internal light or inward conviction; and this constitutes another part of their unpardonable blasphemy.

It is moreover evident that this language was not forced from the enemies of Christ by any sudden and transient excitement of feeling. The exclamation of the people, and the feeling towards Christ which it indicated beyond question, excited them, and was the occasion of their blasphemy, but we must look deeper than any transient excitement for its remote and efficient cause. The Pharisees were, from the first, predisposed to assume an attitude of hostility to the Son of God; all the elements of that bitter prejudice and malignant enmity which manifested themselves so soon after Christ began his public ministry, already existed in a latent state within them; and when he made his public appearance, the independence of all human authority which he assumed in his teaching,—the pure morality illustrated by his holy life, which he inculcated,—his bold attacks on their traditionary system of belief,—his fearless exposure of the hollowness of their pretensions to a superior sanctity,—of their faithlessness, selfishness and rapacity, developed them in all their intensity and power. When they had once assumed their position, and given vent to their feelings, the miracles he wrought—the more clearly they proved his mission to be divine, and the deeper and more favorable an impression they made upon the popular mind,—would the more confirm them in their stand, and impart a higher degree of bitterness to their enmity. Whatever Christ did, or said, the less the fault which could be detected in it, the more clearly it manifested his excellency, the more it increased his popularity, and strengthened his influence,—the more it inflamed them. Hence, from the moment in which the wrong bias of the Pharisees assumed an active form, their enmity to the person of Christ, and their opposition to his work, had been accumulating intensity and strength, and needed but a slight occasion to call them out, and make them manifest to all, in word, or deed. The miracle wrought on the demoniac, afforded the occasion; and the bitter waters which had been so long pent up, burst through all restraints. These feelings of enmity, conceived against a Being infinitely lovely, and exasperated and rendered more and more malignant by the very qualities of character and actions that should have conciliated esteem and love, and under circumstances that should have

disarmed the soul of all prejudice and hostility, constituted no unimportant feature in this act of sin.

From what has just been said, it follows that the sin of the Pharisees was not committed through infirmity, or under the influence of any surprising and overpowering temptation. Men are often driven by passion, suddenly aroused,—by mortal fear, in view of death,—by lust, and appetite excited to a high degree by the presentation of their objects, to commit acts which exceed in wickedness the measure of their growth in depravity. We often hear the remark in reference to a very wicked deed, “it was not he (*i. e.* the sinner,) who did it,” or, “he was not himself;” implying that it was out of character for the man to commit such a deed; and sins done under such circumstances are always followed by the bitterest regret, after the flush of excitement is over, and the man returns to cool reflection. Such, however, were not the circumstances under which the Pharisees committed this sin. The miracle was an appeal, not to any infirmity of human nature, but to the reason; the inquiry of the people, springing as it did out of the spiritual consciousness nurtured by prophecy, and excited by an exhibition of divine power, while it *did* prove a temptation to them in their then moral state, was, nevertheless, not such really, and in its own nature. Moreover, so far were the Pharisees from repenting of this sin, that they continued to pursue Christ to the end, with the same relentless malignity, though he was as clearly witnessed to by the Holy Ghost, during his whole after career, as at this time. Beyond this, a careful examination of the account, as given by the Evangelist, will convince the mind that these words were spoken with forethought and deliberation, and not under the influence of any unpleasant surprise, produced by any circumstances connected with this transaction. The language used was not uttered by one only of the Pharisees, and caught up suddenly, and repeated in a spirit of temporary recklessness, from mouth to mouth, by the rest. The record reads, “When the *Pharisees* heard it, (*i. e.* the question asked by the astonished people,) *they* said, this fellow,” etc., as if they had previously considered and determined upon their mode of procedure, so soon as Christ, by the performance of a miracle, should afford them an opportu-

nity. This act of the Pharisees, then, did not exceed the measure of their growth in evil: it was not a sudden outburst, following a momentary increase in malignity; it did not spring from any involuntary feeling, or principle, unexpectedly excited; and this circumstance must not be lost sight of in judging of the nature of this sin.

The direction of this sin is revealed by its name, "the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost." All works of a miraculous kind, in attestation of a Divine commission, or a revelation from God, are wrought by him as a part of his office-work in the economy of redemption; and, in general, the work of conviction, and persuasion,—the work of presenting evidence to the human mind in the matter of salvation, is his. The miracle wrought by Christ on the one possessed, was a visible and stupendous sign of the immediate presence of the Holy Spirit. In reviling the miracle, therefore, the Pharisees reviled the Holy Ghost. The organ, it is true, in which the Spirit dwelt, and through which he operated, was humble and mean; but to excuse themselves for their reviling language on this ground, was vain. The darkness of the cloud gives a more dazzling brilliancy to the lightning's flash; and so the humility and meanness of Christ's personal appearance were calculated to render more dazzling and overwhelming the blaze of Divine glory which shone forth from the miracle. The Pharisees could not plead ignorance of the authorship of the miraculous operation; in the miracles, real or pretended, of a like kind, wrought by their own exorcists, they acknowledged the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost. There was nothing in this work of power,—nothing in the character, life, teaching, and deeds of Christ, to prove the presence in him of any agency of another and opposite kind. If they did not reason from the one case to the other, and if therefore, the thought, clear and well-defined, that the Holy Ghost was present, was not in their mind, yet those feelings of awe,—those feelings which men have under a lively impression of the Divine presence,—which were experienced by the people, when the dumb and blind man spake and saw, at Christ's command, were not altogether absent from their souls, and it required an effort to repress them. If the Pharisees, then, were not conscious of the presence of the Holy Spirit, they were conscious of

the presence of some supernatural power; and if they did not sin intentionally against him, they did sin intentionally against the light of evidence reflected by him into their souls.

The sin against the Holy Ghost is not so called because it is committed against his essence, but because it is committed against him officially. He is the same in essence with the Father, and the Son; and a sin aimed against him, in his essence, impinges equally against the other persons of the Holy Trinity. But he performs in the work of redemption different offices from the Father and the Son, and hence the sin distinctly against the Holy Ghost is a sin against him in some one or all of these offices. It is not necessary in order to the commission of the unpardonable sin, that a man should know what offices the Holy Ghost performs, or that he should be conscious, when he is under his influences, that they are those of the Spirit; it is sufficient for the commission of this deed, that he should actually sin against his operations, under certain circumstances of great aggravation. Granting, then, that the Pharisees were not conscious of the Spirit's presence in Christ, and that the miracle was his distinctive work, nevertheless their sin was actually committed against his operations, and impinged directly against him in his official character.

The immediate object of the Pharisees was to invalidate the force of Christ's miracles as testimony in favor of his divine mission. Miracles are the only sufficient evidence of the divine mission of a messenger from God to his contemporaries. He may utter predictions; but as predictions relate, for the most part, to events remotely future, they are intended not for contemporaries, but for distant generations. Internal evidence relates to the message rather than the messenger. The messenger must have his credentials, which shall entitle him to a hearing; not until he is heard can men weigh and examine his message, in order to know whether it is divine. These credentials are miracles. They are heaven's commission, and heaven's seal; they entitle a man to a hearing as a messenger from God. Hence Christ says: "the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me."

And in another place he demands the belief of the Jews on the ground of his works. "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not: But if I do, though ye believe not me, *believe the works*, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him." (John 5: 36—10: 37, 38.) The Pharisees, in asserting that Christ's miracles were wrought by the power of Satan, intended to make the impression on the minds of the people, that heaven's commission and seal were forged in hell, to impose upon and deceive them. They virtually closed up the door of communication, which God had opened; "they would not enter in themselves, and those that were entering in they hindered." In other words, the legitimate tendency of their sin was to exclude God from all communication with his apostate creatures, through his chosen messenger, and to shut out immortal souls from all the benefits of the mission; and this consequence of their deed, so far as Christ was concerned, was clear, in their intention when they uttered their blasphemy.

Lastly. The Pharisees continued to shew to the end of Christ's mission, and afterwards, when the apostles took up the work where he had left it, an opposition continually increasing in malignity to the great truth, which this and his other works of divine power proved beyond all reasonable contradiction, to wit: that he was the Messiah, to whom the law and the prophets pointed,—and as the Messiah was by way of eminence the prophet like unto Moses, to whom the people were to take heed, on the penalty of excision from the commonwealth of Israel; as he was the divine logos, the great revealer of the nature and will of God,—in malignantly opposing him as the Messiah, they opposed his teaching as God's prophet, and his clear revelations as the divine logos; in other words, they set themselves in malignant opposition to the revealed truth of Jehovah. Opposition to the truth is of two kinds, sophistical and tyrannical; in the one case, men oppose or fight against the truth by argument, as is done by infidels; in the other they fight against it with the civil power, or by the sword, as is done by persecuting rulers and governments. The Pharisees fought against the truth in both ways. They combined together and assaulted Christ by sophistical reasoning, endeavoring to silence and confound

him before the people, or to involve him in contradictions. They used unscrupulously their spiritual authority as the recognised expounders of the divine law, and religious instructors of the Jewish Church, to put him down, and to prejudice the common people against his teaching. When they found that argument and authority were vain, they called in to their aid their power as rulers; they framed against him false charges of crime, committed against Moses and against Cæsar; they seized, tried, scourged and crucified him. When Christ had disappeared from the earth, and his apostles took up the great work of teaching and propagating the truth, they used the same weapons against them. Their war against the truth was one of extermination, malignant, relentless, and persisted in to the end. Such are some of the prominent features of that sin committed by the Pharisees on this occasion. They sinned against objective and subjective light, against evidence presented from without, and conviction produced within; their sin sprang from a fixed malignant state of feeling, and was not committed under the influence of sudden surprise, or fear, or through the presentation of any overwhelming temptation; or to be more explicit, no force except from within was brought to bear upon the reason, and to extinguish its light; they did what they did, not with reluctance, but, as is said in common language, *with a will*; their crime impinged directly against the Holy Ghost, in his official character in the work of redemption; its tendency was to invalidate the force of miracles as evidence of a divine mission, and of the right of him who works them to be heard as a messenger from God; and lastly, it was persisted in, assuming the character of a fixed and malignant opposition to the truth and cause of God.

Having examined this passage, it will be necessary to direct our attention to others which speak of an unpardonable sin. For since Christ explicitly asserts that *all manner* of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, it is evident, whenever the scriptures speak of a sin as unpardonable, that this must be the sin against the Holy Ghost. Hence, in order to obtain a knowledge of the nature of this sin, other passages of the word of God, which describe

it, should be examined and compared with that in Matthew.

The fullest description of this sin is contained in the epistle to the Hebrews, ch. 6 : 4-6, and 10 : 26-29. John (1st epistle, 5 : 16) mentions "a sin unto death," for the forgiveness of which he intimates that Christians should not pray, but enters into no details respecting it. Peter (2d epistle, 2 : 20) describes certain persons, (the false teachers spoken of in the previous part of the chapter,) "that had escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and had become again entangled therein, and overcome, whose latter end would be worse than their beginning," as, however, every essential feature of the sin here described is brought to view in the places in the epistle to the Hebrews, just referred to, we will confine our remarks to them.

The passages in Hebrews 6th and 10th, are strictly parallel, and describe the same class of persons. The former brings to view the state of mind, the degree of spiritual enlightenment, and the measure of spiritual influences, of which these apostates were the subjects ; the latter dwells more at large upon the character of their sin, and its dreadful consequences. In the passage contained in the 6th chapter, there are three principal and two subordinate or amplifying clauses—the former connected in the original by the conjunction, and the latter by the particle.* The principal clauses assert of the persons described that they were once enlightened, were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and had tasted of the good word of God ; the subordinate, which amplify the thought in the first and third principal clauses, teach that they had tasted of the Heavenly gift, and the powers of the world to come. The moral state here described was one of great subjective light, or inward illumination, in connection with which there was also a taste or perception of the objective light of Christ, who is its source, resembling the spiritual relish of the renewed—of participation of the Holy Ghost in his miraculous influences, and common operations—and one in which the subject had tasted, or had some impressions

* See Tholuck's Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, on these verses. Biblical Cabinet, No. 38.

of the preciousness of the divine promise,* and anticipations of that to which the divine promise referred, viz: the blessedness of the righteous in a future world. To fall away from such a state, is to sin wilfully after having received the knowledge of the truth;" (10: 26.) Of such persons, it is said here, negatively, that it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; and in the 10th chapter, affirmatively, that "there remains for them a certain fearful looking-for of judgement and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries," and a severer punishment than awaited him who sinned presumptuously, or with a high hand, under the law. The deadly nature of such falling away, or wilful sinning, arises out of the fact, that it involves inwardly the crime of crucifying the Son of God again, and the holding him up as an object of contempt, as was done by the Jews, outwardly; that such persons count his atoning blood as a profane, or unclean thing, and do despite to the Spirit of Grace, or in effect, blaspheme Him.† Now, in this case, here described, as in

* *Καλον ῥημα*, if translated "good word," and referred to the Gospel, would be but a repetition of the sentiment expressed by the words "Heavenly gift." Hence, it is rather to be taken as equivalent to the Hebrew *dabhar tobh*: Josh. 21: 45; 23: 14; which may be rendered "the good promise of God;" to wit, concerning the land of Canaan.

† The question which has greatly divided critics and theologians is, "Are the persons here described true Christians, or those partially enlightened?" In favor of the opinion that the Apostle is speaking of true Christians, it is argued, 1st. The Apostle addresses Christians. His object was not to keep those who were merely awakened, from apostacy, but those who were by profession, followers of Christ. The proper exhortation to those who were merely awakened, and not truly converted, would be to become Christians, not to warn them of the danger of falling away. To which it may be answered, that it may be granted that the Apostle is addressing true Christians, and yet it would not follow that he is not describing apostates from a partial state of illumination. There is no inconsistency in his warning Christians of apostacy, and citing the example of apostates to enforce his warning. In a former part of this epistle, he earnestly exhorts believers not to come short of the promised rest; and to give force to his exhortation, dwells at large on the case of the Jews, who perished in the wilderness, and came short of the earthly Canaan.—(Chap. 3: 9, to the end; and 4: 1 seq.) It is argued, 2ndly, "How could the Apostle so solemnly warn those who were mere pro-

that which we have just considered, there was great objective light. These apostates were probably eye-witnesses of "the signs and wonders, and divine miracles," by which God bore testimony to the Apostles.—Heb. 2: 3, 4. They had been made partakers of the Holy Ghost in his miraculous gifts; and hence, not only saw, but wrought miracles.

But, while in the case of the Pharisees, it is the objective light which stands out most prominently to view, in the

fessors of Christianity, against defection and apostasy?" Defection from what? From a graceless condition, and from a state of hypocrisy."—Stu. on Heb., exc. 12, —.) Ans: Those who hold that true Christians are not described in vs. 4-6, are not driven to the necessity of holding that the Apostle "here solemnly warns *mere professors* of Christianity against defection and apostasy." He describes the apostacy of those who were partially enlightened, and their miserable condition, and warns *Christians* by their example. 3rdly, It is said that none but true Christians can be *renewed again* unto repentance, or by repentance. "How could he (the Apostle) speak of being renewed again by repentance, if he did not address them as once having been renewed by it?"—Stu., as above. To which we reply, that the word translated "to renew again" does not necessarily imply a former state into which its subject is renewed. It is a frequentative form of *ανακαινωω*, which means, "to renovate," in the sense of "to emend," "to change from a carnal to a Christian life;"—(see Rob. sub voc.,) and such forms, according to the grammarians, often scarce differ in force from the primitive forms.—"To beget again unto a lively hope," (1 Pet. 1: 3,) does not imply that those spoken of had before a lively hope, which they had lost, and to which they were now again begotten. The meaning of the clause is, simply, "it is impossible so to renew them again as that they can exercise true repentance."

On the other side, to wit, that the Apostle describes here the case of persons only partially enlightened, we argue 1st, from the fact that he seems expressly to distinguish the case of these persons from that of true Christians, v. 9: "But, beloved, we are persuaded *better things of you, and things that accompany salvation*, though we thus speak." And 2ndly, that the whole verse, with the single exception of miraculous gifts, very accurately describe the case of many, even in our day. "They have knowledge, convictions, fears, hopes, joys, and seasons of apparent earnestness and deep concern about eternal things, and they are endued with such gifts as often make them acceptable and useful to others, but they are not truly humbled: they are not spiritually-minded; religion is not their element and delight; they do not cordially receive Christ in all his offices, or sincerely love the spiritual excellency of his people, his ordinances and commandments."—Scott's Com. on the Passage.

present case, it is the subjective. These apostates were "enlightened," and, as a consequence, had certain exercises of soul resembling the actings of the gracious principle in those renewed; "they had *tasted* of the heavenly gift,—of the good promise of God, and of the powers of the world to come." They renounced Judaism, and embraced Christianity by a public profession of faith in the Gospel; thus exposing themselves to much temporal evil, and subjecting themselves to the obligations and discipline of the Christian religion. The earlier theologians distinguish the illumination of the Spirit into four kinds, or degrees: * theoretical, or instructing, which consists in illumination simply; coercing, by which men are induced to make efforts at reformation from grosser sins; convincing, by which sinners are convinced of the truth and goodness of the Gospel proposed to them, and are urged by various motives to embrace it; and lastly, persuading, or converting, by which men are brought cordially and savingly to believe the Gospel. A sinner simply convinced regards the Gospel, not as a suitable and adequate, but only as a pleasant and useful good. He apprehends the Gospel, and follows it for a time, as some pleasant and savoury good, which, by its novelty, sweetness and liberty, or a certain admirableness in its doctrines, attracts the minds of men to it, and pours into them an unusual pleasure,—whence such are said to receive the word "with joy;" (Matt. 13: 20,) or he regards it as some good, useful and convenient, which can confer upon him in this life some remarkable benefit. But he never rises to the notion of a true and saving good, which consists in communion with God through holiness and eternal happiness. Such, probably, was the degree of illumination experienced by these apostates. Their inward light, beyond question, far exceeded that of the Pharisees; it produced an assent of the understanding to the truth of the Gospel, and ranged them by an external profession on the side of Christ, a point which the latter never reached.

The sin of these professed Christians was also characterized, as in the case already considered, by a malignant enmity of heart to Christ and the truth. They inwardly

* See Turretin's Theol. Vol. 1, Sec. 9: Quest. 14, §§ 7, 8.

consented to the deed of the Jewish people, by which the Son of God was nailed to the cross, and thus crucified him afresh ; by apostasy to Judaism, they proclaimed him to be an impostor, and worthy of his doom ; they counted his blood, shed to atone for sin, as profane ; and they treated with contempt the Spirit of Grace. The attitude they assumed, which indicated inwardly, and proclaimed outwardly, so much, they continued to maintain. It is generally true that when an apostate from a former faith returns to it again, he goes far beyond those who remain steadfast in intemperate zeal for its dogmas and interests ; and it is also true, that his hatred of the faith which he deserts for his first belief, is far more bitter than that of those who have always been its enemies. These two classes of feelings operated in the case of these apostates, and drove them beyond question to more extravagant lengths in their malignant opposition to the Gospel than they went who remained from the beginning its consistent enemies.

It seems evident, moreover, that the persons here described cannot be classed with the "lapsed," who, under the influence of fear, denied Christ, and who afterwards repented of their sin, at the head of whom stands Peter.— Having fallen away, they persisted in their spiritual treason ; shewing thereby that they acted, not from any transient feelings, or sudden impulse, but from some permanent internal principle, kept for a while in a state of abeyance, and rendered more intense in its operation afterwards, by the very cause that should have mortified it.

The sin of these apostates was committed against the Holy Spirit in his official character, but rendered more aggravated than that of the Pharisees by two circumstances. In the first place, the latter sinned against the Holy Spirit bearing witness to Christ by an external miraculous work ; while the former sinned against him, not only as he bore witness by an external work, but as he bore witness by internal illumination. 2ndly, The Pharisees did not sin *consciously* against the Holy Spirit, that is, knowing that it was the third person of the Trinity against whom they were lifting up their arm ; but the apostates *did* commit their sin consciously. They knew there was a Holy Spi-

rit, for they had been baptized in his name,—they had been made partakers of him by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles,—they had wrought miracles through his energy, and they had felt him in his gracious, though partial operation on their natures. It seems evident from these circumstances, that in sinning against the Holy Ghost they did it knowingly.

There are these points of difference in these two cases, of the unpardonable sin, to wit: The overt act in the one case consisted in the language uttered; in the other, in that final step by which the apostates ranged themselves on the side of Christ's revilers and murderers; the sinners occupied different stand-points—that of the one class was the Jewish dispensation, just at the dawning of the Christian; that of the other was the Christian dispensation, now fully declared and established; in the one case, the blasphemy was uttered against a present and seen Christ in his state of humiliation; in the other, contempt was poured upon a risen and exalted Christ, and invisible, though manifested to the consciousness by the truth and the Holy Spirit; and lastly, the object of the Pharisees was to maintain their authority and position; that of the apostates was to justify their desertion.

From this examination of the passages in the word of God, which contain the clearest and fullest account of this sin, we conclude that the circumstances necessary in order to the commission of it are, great objective light, accompanied by a certain and in most cases by a high degree of inward conviction, and an intensely malignant enmity of heart against the truth, conceived and developed under circumstances calculated to conciliate love and esteem. That it consists in some one act or series of acts, (committed not from human infirmity, or under the influence of any surprising temptation,) such as blasphemy or apostasy, which impinge against the Holy Spirit, in his official character; and that it draws after it, as its infallible consequence, not so much from the practical act of God, abandoning the soul, as from the very character of the sin itself, a permanent state of feeling, viz: a malignant opposition to the truth of God, expressed in word and deed, and persisted in to the end.

The sin against the Holy Ghost is not final impenitency.

All who commit it will die impenitent, since it is characteristic of those who sin against the Holy Ghost, that they cannot be renewed again unto repentance; but all who die impenitent do not commit the sin. The Scriptures plainly distinguish this from all other sins, and teach that the moment it is committed, it seals a man over to perdition, without remedy; so that he must of necessity die in impenitency because he has committed it, and not of necessity commit it because he dies in impenitency. They seem, moreover, to imply that it is but rarely committed, and this we infer from the fact that a conjunction of the circumstances necessary to constitute a sin, the sin against the Holy Ghost, can but rarely occur. But final impenitency is by no means a rare thing.

The unpardonable nature of this sin does not arise out of any want of efficacy in the blood of Christ to atone for guilt, or any limit that exists in the freeness and largeness of God's grace—but out of the fact that it excludes the conditions of pardon, which are repentance and faith. "It is impossible to renew them again unto repentance." God has established a certain order in the universe, within and according to which he operates; to go beyond that order is to work a miracle: so he has established a certain order in the economy of redemption, within and according to which he puts forth his grace; the sin against the Holy Ghost puts a man, as it were, beyond the limits of that order, and therefore beyond the reach of grace. Grace must stretch itself, so to speak, beyond the original design of the glorious God-head in devising the scheme of redemption, in order to lay hold of him who has committed this sin. In the economy of redemption God the Son has been set forth as the Mediator, on the ground of whose atoning sacrifice sinners who have broken the law may approach, and be reconciled to God, the Father, the giver and upholder of law; God the Spirit has been purchased, and sent forth to enlighten the understanding, convince of sin and misery, and to lead to God the Son, the only Mediator between God and man. If the sinner despise the offered reconciliation through Christ the Mediator, there is the Holy Spirit to illuminate and convince; but if he does despite to the Spirit of grace, he places himself beyond the reach of mercy; there remaineth only "a certain fearful

looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries."

There is a sorrow for sin which worketh death, and a godly sorrow which is unto life, to which the apostle alludes when he says, "it is impossible to renew them again unto *repentance*." This godly sorrow implies not only a sinner, as its capable subject, and a gracious supernatural influence, as its efficient cause; but ordinarily an instrumentality, which, under the gospel, is the cross of Christ. In other words, the cross of Christ is the grand centre of motives and inducements to repentance. These three things must co-exist, in order to a godly sorrow for sin. But he who commits the sin against the Holy Ghost, while he still remains a capable subject, places himself in such a moral attitude to the instrumental and the efficient cause, as to cut himself off from the motives and inducements of the one, and the influences of the other. He has dipped his soul in a stygian pool, and rendered it invulnerable to all the weapons in the spiritual armory of God.

It is an interesting question, can this sin be committed now? The age in which the particular cases which have been considered occurred, was an age of miracles; and the sin must have been committed in every instance against their objective light. This circumstance has given rise to the opinion, that the unpardonable sin was confined exclusively to the apostolical age.* It seems evident, however, that the question does not turn upon the particular kind of evidence which accompanies the truth, but upon the circumstance that the truth be presented with such objective light—no matter in what way, whether by a miracle, or by reasoning—as to produce a certain degree of internal illumination; can the Holy Spirit, then, bring the soul face to face with the truth, by moral evidence, as well as by that derived from a supernatural physical operation? Can he now, and in any age, convince the mind to that degree that it shall regard and embrace the gospel, if not as a fit and adequate, yet as a pleasant and useful good, and bring itself gladly under obligation to do many things for its sake under this view? Beyond question, if

* This seems to have been the opinion of Baxter. See *Practical Works*, volume 2, page 332, et infra. London edition, 1845.

the Spirit of God can illuminate the mind to the degree of persuasion, which is the highest point of illumination, without a miraculous work, he can do it to *any degree* whatever lower in the scale. But, if great objective light, accompanied by internal conviction, be one condition necessary to the commission of the unpardonable sin, and if this be not peculiar to an age of miracles, but to every age, then so far forth as this is concerned, this sin may be committed now, as it was in the apostolic age.

Moreover, it is evident that men may become as malignantly depraved, and conceive as bitter a hatred to the truth of God in one age as in another, and that under circumstances favorable only to the growth of good in their natures. And that men under the dominion of their malignant enmity to God and the truth, may be induced to sin with a high hand against the light of inward conviction, and that, as a consequence of their sin, their enmity may assume the permanent form of a set and deadly opposition to the doctrines, ordinances, and institutions of Christianity, cannot, we think, be denied. The annals of the Church exhibit deplorable cases of total and final apostasy from the truth, attended by such marks and circumstances as leave little doubt on the mind, that the unfortunate apostates did involve themselves in the guilt of this fearful crime; and he who is acquainted with the history of French, English, and German infidelity, and considers the malignant spirit of enmity against the truth of God, that it breathes its utter contempt of persons and things most sacred and venerable, and the wanton and horrid blasphemies which constitute its familiar dialect, cannot but fear that he who becomes thoroughly imbued with it, under certain circumstances, has sinned beyond all hope of pardon.

Extreme caution should be used in the discussion of this subject, in applying the marks and circumstances of the unpardonable sin to the case of individuals. We may lawfully say, what is the sin against the Holy Ghost; but we may not lawfully say that such and such a man has committed it. We may, in other words, discuss the subject in the abstract, but not in the concrete. The sin is described in the Word, in all its marks and circumstances; yet it should be remembered that external marks are not

infallible indications of internal states ; and as the gift of discerning spirits has long since been withdrawn from the Church, no mere man has a right to infer the existence of the internal conditions of this sin, in a given individual, from external marks or evidences.

In conclusion, let it be remembered that the commission of this sin draws after it a total hardening of the heart ; and therefore, in the words of Fuller, "No person, let his crimes have been what they may, *if he be grieved at heart* for having committed them, and sincerely ask forgiveness in the name of Christ, needs to fear that he shall be rejected. Such grief is itself a proof that he has not committed the sin against the Holy Spirit, because it is a mark of that sin to be accompanied with a hard, and impenitent heart. Such characters may feel the remorse of a Cain, a Saul, or a Judas, but a tear of godly sorrow never dropped from their eyes."

ARTICLE V.

MERCANTILE MORALS;

Or, Thoughts for Young Men entering Mercantile Life. By WILLIAM HOWARD VAN DOREN, Pastor of the Second Reformed Dutch Church of Piermont, N. J. New York: Charles Scribner, 145 Nassau Street. 1852.

The preface to this neat volume states that "the object of the author has been to prepare a volume which might be placed by every parent or employer in the hands of each young man, as he enters mercantile life." Its character will be sufficiently indicated by its table of contents. According to this, the subjects treated are as follows:—"Wealth not the chief end of life;" "Mercantile morality;" "The young merchant in danger;" "The young Merchant's guide;" "The young merchant in society;" "Unsuccessful merchandise, or Sabbath desecration;" "The young merchant vending ardent spirits;" "The

young merchant a skeptic;" "The young merchant a novel-reader;" "Young man at the theatre." These various subjects are handled with ability and fidelity; the style is neat, and the language well chosen; illustrations from history, science, and real life, are liberally used; and the whole volume forms a valuable contribution to the literature, in this day so bountifully provided for the young men of our country.

We believe that such topics as are discussed in this volume, and which are often represented in the form of discourses from the sacred desk, do not lie outside of the appropriate sphere of the Christian minister. And if any man thinks that he violates the proper decorum of religious discourse by dwelling upon such subjects, we fear that he has but partial or erroneous views of the nature of religion, or the extent and comprehensiveness of her teachings. There is a class of persons who seem to think that whenever any subject but those belonging to the essential truths and doctrines of the Christian system, or the dogmas and technicalities of theological science, is introduced into the pulpit, it is a violation of propriety, deserving of severe animadversion. But we cannot be satisfied that this is a just view of the matter; nay we are fully convinced of its gross injustice. Religion is as much adapted to exalt and embellish the earthly, as the heavenly, life. It sustains a most important relation to all man's earthly pursuits and interests; teaches him the spirit of the relations of life; fits him to discharge all his duties to himself, to the three great departments of human society—the family, the State, and the Church; and finally ripens him, after he has faithfully served his generation by the will of God, for the loftier life of the better world.

Such being the nature and influence of religion, who shall limit the appropriate sphere of the religious teacher? If there be an individual in the world who can, with the greatest propriety, use the language of the ancient poet, "I am a man, and nothing that concerns men can be indifferent to me," that individual is the Christian minister. There is no man on earth so bound to be interested in what all men are doing. It is his great life-work to show men that religion, or the highest life of the soul, has to do with all the varied interests and pursuits of men; that

there is no avocation in which a man *ought* to engage, in which religion cannot aid him; that Christianity has most intimate and important relations to agriculture, to commerce, to professional and artistic pursuits, to political economy, and the investigations of science; in fine, to everything in which man is interested and engaged, on the busy crowded stage of human existence. The great hope of the religious teacher lies in his addressing men not always in masses, but often in classes; an endeavoring to show each class that religion has a special adaptedness to them, and that they will be the better of her presence and her aid. Does any man think that the interest of the minister in his hearers clusters only around the Sabbath, and the sanctuary where it is his province and privilege to discourse to them on the themes of religion? Does he think that when the Sabbath has departed, and its holy quiet given place to the hum of business, that then the minister of religion is to seclude himself entirely within the study, and find no sphere of interest and of labor, as a Christian teacher, in the busy world? Oh, no! There is not a store on all the streets, there is not a warehouse in the city, there is not a scene of life and activity all through the noisy and dusty week of labor, in which he feels not a personal interest. We had almost said there is not a dray that passes through the streets, there is not a whirling spindle in the factory, there is not a vessel at the wharves, that does not admonish him of his duty as a Christian teacher, and of the intimate relation which Christianity sustains to all the varied and engrossing pursuits of life.

Let it not be said, then, that in calling attention to the dangers and duties of men of business, the preacher is travelling out of his proper sphere as a religious teacher. It has been well said that there is great danger that the pulpit, by excluding such topics from its consideration, may encourage the idea that there are no moral aspects or features about business, or politics, or fashion, and that religion has nothing to do with them. But, "if the pulpit be the expounder of man's duty, and his whole duty," then surely it becomes not only advisable but imperative, that the peculiar temptations that surround the different classes of men should be the object of its notice and warn-

ing ; and that it should endeavor to stimulate them to the faithful discharge of their peculiar duties and obligations.

Under the influence of these considerations, we desire to address our readers on a subject suggested by the volume referred to at the head of this article, and that subject is, "the dangers and duties of men of business." And by men of business we wish to be understood as referring particularly to such as are occupied in trade and commerce. The great characteristic of our nation is that we are a *working people*. Go where you will, throughout the length and the breadth of our land, you will hear the ceaseless hum of industry, and see the proofs of our devotion to business. And we are likewise a trading people. A better illustration of the remark of Adam Smith, that "there is a certain propensity in human nature, to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another," could not be furnished, than is presented by our whole country. It comes, then, a matter of first rate importance, to ascertain the moral aspects and tendencies of commercial life, and endeavor to settle the moral principles by which its operations are to be controlled.

I. The first danger to which we would allude, as one to which men of business are exposed, is ignorance or forgetfulness of the fact that *business has any moral aspect, or great moral end, whatever*. Let the question be asked of the great crowd of laboring men, What is the end, the ultimate purpose of your toil ? and the answer would be, *support, or acquisition of property*. This, indeed, seems to be the only end of all their toils and cares. But this we hold to be a mistaken view. Had mere sustenance been the only end of labor, it could have been acquired in a simpler and easier manner than by trade and commerce. The vast animal creation know nothing of trade or business, yet they gain their support, and have all that is requisite for their comfort. In order to ascertain what the true end of business is, we must ask, what is the true end of life ? For what was man made and endowed with such splendid and wonderful physical and moral machinery ? The examination of that machinery shows that it was designed to be kept ever in operation. Labor is evidently God's great ordinance for the race, but it is not the *end* for which the race was made. The factory

is built, and the machinery adjusted that it may be in working condition ; but the revolution of the wheel, the whirling of the spindle, and the action of the loom, are not *the end*. So life with man has an ultimate purpose beyond *mere living*. The business of life has an end beyond mere acquisition. Oh ! it is a degrading thought, that man was endowed with such magnificent powers, and sent into this world to expend those powers in unremitting labor to scrape up a portion of coin, that has no intrinsic value, and can only minister to the grosser wants of man. The great end of labor, of business in all its varied departments, is the moral elevation of man. He was made that he might reflect in the brightest manner the image of God ; and as he was made to be a laboring man, so we must conclude that in labor he was to find some of the elements of a virtuous character, something that would make him God-like, and fit him for association and communion with God, both in this world and the world to come. The teachings of the Bible, and of every religious creed, confirm this truth, and tell us that business has a moral end and influence. They speak of life as a season of probation, a school of discipline, of intellectual and moral education, of training for a higher and holier life. The lessons of this school are many ; its discipline is varied ; trial, toil, care, business, all these are a part of the great system of instruction in the school of life. If the various occupations of men be designed by God, they cannot be designed without a purpose to be accomplished by them ; and the wisdom and the goodness of the Creator alike demand that we connect with these his appointments for man, the accomplishment of the worthiest and noblest ends.

But again. We are taught by the very nature of business itself, that it has a moral end and tendency. For, though there are many who say of traffic that its influence is only to make men selfish, and trickish, and grasping, and corrupt ; though it is contrasted by man very unfavorably in its moral tendencies with agriculture or the mechanic arts ; yet we firmly believe that just the opposite may be true. We doubt not that there are many men who do become mean, and extortionate, and deceitful in the prosecution of business, but we are not at all certain

that this is to be charged to the account of trade itself. They might have been of like character in any other pursuit, as agriculturists or mechanics. We believe that the very loftiest virtues, the most honorable traits of character, may be successfully cultivated in the walks of trade, and that there may often be a peculiar adaptedness in the nature of business to produce this result. A man of honesty of soul, a man of a keen sense of honor and undeviating integrity of purpose, a man of real dignity and nobleness of spirit, could not enter a school whose discipline was more fitted constantly to call for the manifestation of those traits of character, and for their high cultivation, than the school of traffic. The very fact that a man is constantly called upon to balance the claims of different parties, of whom himself is one, that a conflict between different rights and interests is always pressing upon him, calling for the nicest scrutiny and the most determined moral effort, the fact that he may be often tempted to look only at one side, and consider only his own selfish interests, all this proves that there is a moral discipline in business, and that its legitimate, ultimate end and tendency should be to foster and strengthen all that is honest, and upright, and noble, in human character. Says a distinguished writer,* on this subject, "I look upon business as one vast scene of moral action. The thousand wheels of commerce, with all their swift and complicated revolutions, I regard as an immense moral machinery. Meanness and cunning may lurk amidst it, but it was not designed for that degradation. That must be a noble scene of action, where conscience is felt to be a law. And it is felt to be a law of business; its very violations prove it such. It is enthroned sovereign of the plan; disobedience and disloyalty give attestation to it. Nothing is too holy to connect with it. There is a temple in one of the cities of Europe, through which is the very passage to the market-place; and those who pass there often rest their burthens to turn aside and kneel at the altar of prayer. So were it meet that all men should enter upon their daily business. The temple of Mammon should be the temple of God. The

* Rev. Dr. Dewey, from whom the writer has derived valuable aid in this essay.

gates of trade should be as the entrance to the sanctuary of conscience. There is an eye of witnessing and searching scrutiny fixed upon every one of its doings. The presence of that All-seeing One, not confined, as some may imagine, to the silent church, or the solitary grove, the presence of God, I think it not too solemn to say, is in every counting-room and ware-house of the busy mart, and ought to make it 'holy ground.'

But how many business men are there who take this elevated view of their daily avocations? How many are there who regard the end of business as anything beyond the sustenance of their earthly life, or the acquisition of a certain amount of silver and gold, which, when it is attained, is to relieve them of the drudgery of toil, and purchase for them all imaginable enjoyment. This is the great mistake to which business men are liable—a forgetfulness of the moral relations of business. And one most unhappy yet legitimate influence of this mistake, is most distinctly visible. It makes the life of business men a perfect thralldom. It presses most unrelentingly into the service of Mammon, all the energies, faculties and affections of men; it makes toil a drudgery, and inspires the man to sacrifice everything else to business, during the best portion of his life, that he may then retire from the strife and enjoy his accumulated gains. No man in business lives in the present, but the future; he is looking forward to the day when he may retire, and live without labor—live only for enjoyment. Enjoyment in the present is a thing not to be thought of; social happiness, the cultivation of his intellectual nature, the enriching of the mind with useful and interesting knowledge, the development and refinement of the moral sensibilities—all this is sacrificed to business, and is to be attended to when its great end, a future, is secured. But when at last the end is gained, when the point is reached, what has the man acquired? He is worth a hundred thousand dollars. He is an old man, perhaps prematurely old. He has no taste for literary enjoyment, for the repose of domestic life, for the fine arts, for quiet, rational enjoyment, because all his days have been spent in the whirl of business, in the crowded city, and there has been no suitable training to fit him to enjoy any other life. His moral tastes and sus-

ceptibilities are blunted and vitiated ; for never having had any idea that there was any moral end in business, he has not cultivated these, and though he has been a hard working man for the greater part of his life, yet he has not really attained one great end of toil. He cannot even enjoy the money he has accumulated, for it has been gained by close economy and calculation, and the making of nice points in his dealings with others, and has grown by little and little, so that it has formed the habit of parsimonious computation and restricted expenditure, which will remain and become fixed for life, when the necessity for their exercise no longer exists. Now, we say no great end of business has been attained by that man. It has not fostered and strengthened the manly virtues ; it has not subjected his moral nature to a healthful discipline ; it has not fitted him for dignified retirement, or useful and honorable leisure ; it has not even furnished him with the faculty of properly using and enjoying the money for which he has paid the best and brightest years of his life.

II. Another danger to which business men are peculiarly exposed, is to be regardless of the application of the principles of morality and benevolence to the details of traffic ; or, in other words, they are in danger of a supreme and criminal selfishness in their business transactions. We do not intend to advocate any romantic or Utopian scheme for conducting the business of life, when we say that the rule laid down by our Saviour, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you," should be a fundamental principle in worldly business. This is a general principle, and we only advocate its adoption as such. Its application to specific cases is to be decided with a sound practical wisdom, according to the circumstances of those cases. For instance, a man may wish that another should sell him a piece of property at one half its value. This wish is itself unreasonable and wrong, and it would not bind the man to sell his own property on the same terms. If a man chooses, from any motive, to sell another goods at a price below their value, he has no right to demand or expect that he shall do the same in return. The principle which we advocate is, that in the mutual dealings each shall practice that honor and honesty which he would wish to see displayed by the

other. Now there are many business men who make "the common law" their standard and rule of duty in their business transactions, and are satisfied with that amount of honesty which it requires. But the ablest and most candid expounders of the law will tell you that its decisions are sometimes in conflict with equity and strict moral principle; and this is perhaps inseparable from any system of human law. It is a general system—providing general rules, and laying down broad principles for the mass of men. "But general rules must sometimes bear hard upon individuals; the very law which secures justice in a thousand cases, may, and perhaps must, from the very nature of human affairs and relationships, do injustice in one." So the men who are guided in all their business transactions only by the common law, must not be confident that they are always practising moral honesty because they practise legal honesty. Law may permit things in trade which conscience will forbid, and the verdict of an earthly court be reversed by the tribunal of God!

We are far from asserting that all men must be put upon a level in business, and that superior sagacity, prudence, and industry ought not to be rewarded. Knowledge obtained by close study of the laws of trade, the resources of a community, the state of the world, is as much a part of a man's own capital as his money, and he has a perfect right to avail himself of it in conducting his business. For instance, suppose that a merchant by close study of the aspects of the times, and the well established principles of trade, has become satisfied that a certain staple article will be in very much more than ordinary demand at a certain time. He makes his plans accordingly, invests his capital, and increases largely his stock of the article. When the time arrives he finds his calculations were correct, and the price of the article being increased by the scarcity, of course he makes a considerable profit. Now, the question is, not whether he has done anything inconsistent with legal honesty, with common law—there is, of course, no question at all about that—but, has he done anything inconsistent with the principles of morality and benevolence. We think not. Foresight and judgement, and close attention to the principles of trade, and know-

ledge acquired by fair and honest attention and investigation, are worthy of a premium ; and the man is not bound by any principle of morality that we are acquainted with, to scatter the information which he has thus acquired among his less industrious and enterprising neighbors. If he had made an error in his calculations, or made a mistake in his judgement of the signs of the times, he would have suffered loss, and must have borne it as he best could ; and he is equally entitled to the fruits of his diligence and sagacity, which are a legitimate and important part of the capital of every business man.

But now suppose a different case. A merchant has a piece of goods which is unsound and defective—but the unsoundness is not apparent. The buyer asks no questions—relies on his own judgement, and is apparently satisfied by an inspection of the article that it is what he wants.

He therefore purchases it, at a price equivalent to the value of the article in a sound condition. The seller has done nothing contrary to the rules of legal honesty. If the buyer had asked him with regard to the defect in the goods, then legal honesty would have compelled him to answer according to the facts in the case, and convicted him of dishonesty if he had concealed the defect. But the buyer asking no questions, but professing himself satisfied with the goods, he is not bound to volunteer information which was not asked ; the buyer stands on his own ground, and he on his. Is he an honest man ? No ! Why ? Because he has violated the fundamental principle of trade, which is that an equivalent is to be rendered for the thing received ; and in this case no such equivalent was rendered. It was the duty of the seller to have informed the buyer of the defect in the article, and then have sold it at a reduced price, or lost its sale entirely at the option of the buyer.

Now, a man is entitled to take advantage of his own skill, sagacity, or industry in his business, for these are really his own, honestly acquired, and a valuable part of his capital ; and further, by the general cultivation of these qualities, society itself would be elevated and improved. It would be neither right nor expedient to reduce the wise and the ignorant, the shrewd and the simple, the enterprising and the sluggard, to the same level. But while this

is true, yet no man has any right to take advantage of the necessities of another, to buy from him his property at a price below its value, or to sell him his goods because he must have them, at a price above their value. The great danger is in supposing that all is fair in trade; in making legal honesty the only standard of duty, and in yielding to a spirit of supreme and criminal selfishness, which regards only its own profit, heedless whether it bestows a fair equivalent in return for that which it receives.

III. Another danger to which men of business are exposed, is the *temptation to speculation*. This is especially true of our own country. We are naturally a speculating people. We like to do things in a hurry—to go, we were about to say, *by steam*; but that does not satisfy us now—*nothing less than lightning* will do. A new country, too, whose resources are but partially developed, and into which myriads of population are swarming—where the popular mind is active, enquiring, and constantly on the lookout for some new thing, affords facilities and temptations to speculators which are not found in older, more densely populated, and inert communities.

It is true that there is a sense in which all business partakes of the character of speculation. No man engages in it but with the expectation of profit. He buys to sell again at an advance; and this advance is the reward of his labor and shrewdness in conducting his business. But regular, healthy business, such as the wants of society require, and such as they will sustain, is a very different thing from a rash and adventurous spirit of wild speculation, which trusts to fortunate hits and lucky chances, rather than industry and prudence. There seems to be about once in so many years a speculating epidemic prevailing in our country, and infecting all classes. The most visionary schemes are entered into, the steady gains of regular industry are despised, and young beginners in commercial life aspire to go far beyond their predecessors in the boldness of their enterprises and the magnificence of their projects. Then men expect to make fortunes in a day, or by some lucky turn of the wheel; and the old-fashioned notions of thrift, and industry, and patience, are entirely exploded. In proportion to the magnificence of the schemes for acquisition, are the habits of expenditure; for

he that is accustomed to contemplate the golden visions of the speculator will not be likely to feel the importance of economy in his daily expenses. Like any other gambler, one fortunate throw, or lucky deal, will pay all scores and leave a handsome balance.

Now, speculation of this sort cannot be *honest*. It is not morally honest to engage in enterprises greater than we can control, and which must depend rather upon fortunate chances than certain and reliable calculations. But this is just what the speculator is ever doing. If he only risked his own capital, the disastrous results would not be so extensively ruinous, though the principle would not be affected; but connected as a community of business men are—"woven together like threads in a fabric"—one man can hardly ruin himself without injuring others. Speculators often have friends whom they have induced to aid them in their schemes, and when the crash comes, these must pay dearly for their friendly assistance. This is what makes speculation *dishonest*, and a speculator but another sort of gambler. Indeed, we see no difference in the gambler on the stock exchange, or the cotton market, and the gambler at the whist or faro-table. One plays with cards, the other with property. Both have discarded the legitimate course of business, both calculate upon chances, both burn with feverish excitement, often both madly stake their all upon a single cast without a scruple, and both often in their ruin involve the blighted hopes and broken hearts of kindred and friends.

No man can be a speculator and attain to the moral end of business. There is none of that discipline of the character which regular honest labor and foresight is adapted to furnish. A man who has pursued an honest calling, in an honest, straight-forward way, and has thus acquired a fortune, is worthy of respect, not for the wealth he has gained—for that in itself cannot claim respect—but because we may be certain that he possesses valuable traits of character, that have been cultivated and made strong by his attention to business. But the rapid, exciting, and uncertain game of speculation can exert little of this wholesome discipline upon the character. It makes men visionary; it warps the judgment; it deadens the moral sensibilities; it sears the conscience; it enthrones wealth su-

premely in his soul, and makes him the bond-slave of avarice.

IV. Another danger to which men of business are exposed, is *to over-estimate wealth*.

A man engaged in active business, and forgetting its ultimate end, is likely to fasten all his attention and regards upon the immediate end. Beholding not the real object of the varied avocations of life, a disciplined character, an elevated and purified moral nature, and a training for a higher and holier life, he will consider that acquisition is the grand object of endeavor, and come to place an unnatural, yea, an idolatrous estimate upon property. It is wonderful how "an insane and insatiable passion for accumulation" can seize upon the human mind, sway and control its energies, put the strangling cord on its holier aspirations, prostitute its intensest affections, and bring down a being, made only a little lower than the angels, to grovel in the dust before the shrine of Mammon. Oh! there is a deep meaning in that description of avarice which you find in the Bible,—“The love of money is the root of all evil.” What a fruitful growth springs from that root! To what act of meanness, to what miserable trick and piece of low cunning, to what a beggary of all the nobler endowments of the soul, to what acts of crime and villainy, has it not tempted men! And even where it does not induce man to turn aside from the paths of honesty, yet how it claims the sacrifice of every moment of time, every faculty of mind, every energy of body! How it makes a man toil and sweat, and wear out life's brightest years! How it takes him from social enjoyment, makes him a stranger at his own fireside, and in every scene of rational recreation; how it beggars his intellect, refusing to allow him to commune with the gifted minds of the past or present; and last, how it too often destroys his soul and makes him an everlasting bankrupt!

This is the great danger of men of traffic. *Money* is ever before them, as the great object of all their schemes and toils; and they come to think that it is the end, and not the means, the great end of life, and not the means of living well.

It has been well said that “a man is not heart-rich because he is purse-rich.” There are many things which

money can buy—but a man may have them all, and yet be poor. Does it do anything for the spend-thrift? He lavishes it with reckless prodigality upon worthless baubles; he scatters it freely among heartless parasites, who regard him as the vulture does the carcass—something to feed on; he drives with headlong speed through all the rounds of pleasure, and ends in weariness and disgust; until, his fortune squandered, his constitution ruined, his temper soured, his heart eaten out as with a canker, he is left like the swallow in the winter to shiver and starve, with none to pity, to help or to mourn.

What does wealth do, on the other hand for the miser? It dries up every fountain of kindly feeling in his nature; it withers every green thing in his heart; it withdraws him from the sweet influences and charities of social life; makes him suspicious and morose, and as snappish as a starved cur over his meagre bone. It extinguishes the generous glow of soul from the eye, and lights up there the fires of cunning and rapacity. It puts out the light of love, or pity, or benevolent regard for others; it shuts him out of the companionship of the noble and the lovely, and sends him through life a withered and sapless trunk, yielding no fruit, sheltering no traveller beneath its shade, only a deformity on the fair face of nature, unlovely to look upon, and unwept when seen no more. A miser! a crawling, disgusting reptile in a mine of God, is his type and emblem!*

Set not your heart on wealth as an end. It has no intrinsic value. What can gold do for you, that you should love it so well? Mould it into an image like man, and place it before you. It is a dumb, dead, passionless thing. Speak to it, it answers not. Look upon it with affection's fondest glances, no answering glance comes back to move and melt your soul. Clasp it to your heart in a passionate embrace, you feel no returning pressure. What is such a dead thing worth to you? If you were on a desert island, with nothing but that golden image by your side, what a poverty would be yours! How you would loathe its brightness, and curse in bitterness of soul its mocking splendors! We are not railing at wealth, honorably

* Rev. H. W. Beecher.

gained, and properly used. Thus gained and used, it is a blessing. "Taste seeks it, because by it may be had whatever is beautiful, or refining, or instructive. Love seeks it, to give to its object all that can minister to its improvement and enjoyment; and benevolence seeks it, to make it messenger of pity and relief to the children of want and sorrow; and religion seeks it, to give to men the knowledge of unfailing treasures, and a saviour from eternal poverty and ruin." But we speak of that mad devotion to gold, which regards wealth always as a blessing, and poverty always as a curse. This is not so. There is a wealth—a proud, pampered, surfeited, selfish abundance, which is ever a curse; and then there is an industrious, contented, independant, serene, useful poverty, that is a blessing. This is no howling wilderness. "If a serene age finds you in such poverty, it is such a wilderness as that in which God led his chosen people, and on which He rained every day a heavenly manna."

When a man begins to labor for wealth as the great end, then his spiritual degradation begins. When he begins to feel that he *must* have wealth—that he cannot be respectable, nor useful, nor happy, without riches—when he exalts this above character, manly virtues, well-disciplined faculties, and a consciousness of worth; oh, then, the terrible fact that the divine image has been blotted out from man becomes fearfully apparent, and he sinks to the low level of a mere earthly creature. Was it for this he was made so wonderful and glorious a being? Were the resources of Omnipotence, and the deep stores of Infinite wisdom and love, taxed to send forth into the world a being who should be the noblest work of God, to spend the untold treasures of his intellectual and moral nature in scraping up a little heap of coin, and then lying down and wallowing in the glittering dust? Poverty! what if you be poor? Can poverty rob you of the birth-right of a man? Can it blot out your mind, extinguish your soul, take the sunshine from your path, hush the harmonies of creation, rob the lily of its beauty, the rose of its perfume? Can it shut you out from usefulness, aye, from honor? Let the men who have made the deepest marks upon the human race, and whose laurels grow greener when the diadems of kings are in the dust, answer and tell you what poverty

has done. Let some poor astronomer, despised and reviled, all whose worldly wealth was his telescope, but who revealed splendid worlds and systems all radiant with light and beauty, to the wondering gaze of coming generations; let a wandering sailor-boy, whose noble spirit of enterprise, and perseverance against the mightiest obstacles, added a magnificent continent to the known and civilized world; let a humble monk, who, in his student-life, begged his bread from door to door, but who broke down a mighty fabric of superstition and spiritual despotism, and brought light and freedom to millions of benighted and imprisoned minds; let poets, and painters, and sculptors, who have exalted the aspirations and refined the tastes, and given a nobler impulse to the spirit-life of men, but who labored in poverty and obscurity—let such as these bid you not fear poverty, or think that if you have not wealth you cannot be a true man, a blessing and an ornament to your race! “What if you be poor! You may still walk through the world in freedom and in joy; you may still tread the glorious path of virtue. You may still win the bright prize of immortality. You may still achieve purposes on earth that constitute all the glory of earth, and ends in heaven that constitute all the glory of heaven.”* You may reach the noblest end of your being, for time and for eternity, without the aid of wealth.

Then let not men think that the great end of their earthly endeavors should be to amass a fortune. It is idle thus to think, because in the nature of things great wealth cannot be the lot of the many. Let them not imagine that riches can be the best inheritance they can leave their children. Alas! in too many cases it has been a curse. Often the expectation of wealth has ruined a young man, and its possession only put the finishing stroke to the work of destruction. If by your devotion to business you put it out of your power to give that personal attention to the mental and moral culture of your children, which God has connected with parental duty, it will be but a poor recompense that you leave them wealth, which they know not how to use, and which will only accelerate that work of ruin which your neglect began. Oh! we would that

* Dewey.

some benignant power would break the spell which wealth has cast upon the human soul ; that the tinsel and the glare might be stripped from this glittering idol ; that men might see that it is not a God ! that noble minds and generous hearts should not be sacrificed at its shrine so constantly ; that men should not sell the noblest things about a man for that which is dug out of the bowels of the earth ; and with a folly more egregious than that of the first-born of the ancient patriarch, barter their birth-right to spiritual and eternal glories, for a mess of pottage served in a dish of gold !

Here, in fine, is the greatest danger of the man of business—that his devotion to it will cost him his soul. Religion, like everything else, is to be put off till the goal is reached, till the prize is won. Conscience may sometimes raise a note of warning ; the truth of God may for a moment arrest his attention ; sickness or sorrow may break in upon the charmed circle in which he ever moves—but all these cannot turn him away from his great end. When that is gained, then he will think of his spiritual interests. How hopeless the prospect before that man ! In the first place, not one in a hundred business-men are ever able to retire and live upon their gains. The great mass must toil on, and toil on, as long as life lasts, and then sink exhausted in the grave, without even being remembered as of the rich and prosperous in the commercial world. Then the period of retirement never comes as early with men as they hope and expect ; and when it does come, it brings its own cares with it, and the man is now perhaps as much troubled to secure his profits as he was to accumulate them. He has passed then the hopeful period of life, as far as religion is concerned ; his habits are fixed ; he is surrounded with the unfriendly influences of unsanctified wealth, and his case is almost hopeless. “Wo unto you that are rich,” saith the voice of Holy Scripture, “for ye have received your consolation.” “Wo unto you that are full, for ye shall hunger.” What kind of hunger is that wealth cannot feed ? The hunger of the mind, the starvation of the soul—that bitter, ceaseless poverty, whose gnawings will be like “*a worm that never dies—a fire that never shall be quenched.*”

Let men remember, then, that business is not necessari-

ly contracting and corrupting ; that its pursuit is not calculated always to make men selfish and grasping. Let them remember that it has a high moral end and noble purpose ; that it may be a school of lofty virtues and manly character ; that the spirit of honor and benevolence is not inconsistent with its pursuit ; that wild speculation is but a perversion of its legitimate design, and that acquisition, wealth, is not its great end. If they take not this elevated view of business, its influence upon them will be a demoralizing, degrading influence. If they consider it but a scramble for gold, a contest of cunning, and selfishness, and sordid avarice ; if they regard only the filling of their coffers while they prosecute its details, and are unmindful of the emptying of their souls ; let them be assured that the great end of business will not be secured by them ; they will win no lofty moral prizes in that school of life. They may be successful in the attainment of the end which they have proposed to themselves, but on the balance sheet of eternity they will find that they have done losing business. They will find on the one side a fortune—call it a *million* ! possessed—we cannot say enjoyed—for a few short years ; on the other a life of toil, of weariness, of care, a *beggared mind, a ruined soul*. And this is a hopeless and eternal bankruptcy !

ARTICLE VI.

NECROLOGY.

REV. JOHN SIMPSON.

The subject of this brief sketch, although not distinguished by any one trait of character more prominent than the rest, was yet fully possessed of that piety, and those noble qualities and virtues, which entitle him to a place in the memory of succeeding generations.

Mr. Simpson was born in the State of New Jersey, in the year 1740. His parents were of Irish descent—strict

Presbyterians—noted for their piety and the observance of religious duties. His early years were thus blessed with their guardianship, whose influence, in this forming period of life, was felt even down to old age. His religious training, therefore, was strictly in compliance with the old Presbyterian rule, or mode, of training up children. His father endowed him with an English education, in common with the other children. After obtaining this, his great desire was to advance further, and accomplish, if possible, a classical education. This he gradually accomplished by teaching, and thus procured the means to advance by his own effort.

In the year 1765 he entered Princeton College. Some time during this year he married Miss Mary Remer, a young lady for whom he had for some time previous formed a fond and endearing attachment. But this event by no means impeded the progress of his studies. Having taken a thorough course, he graduated with high honors in 1768. Without delay he immediately entered upon the study of divinity, under the care of a private minister, (there being then no Theological Seminaries,) with whom he remained some two years. In the year 1770 he was licensed* to preach, by the Presbytery, at or near East Town, N. J., where he commenced and continued preaching for some two years. In 1772 he removed his family, then consisting of his wife and three children, to Philadelphia. There he left them, and set out immediately in search of a new home—trusting in Providence to direct his steps to a destination where he might be most useful. He journeyed South, occasionally preaching on his way, until he reached the neighborhood of upper and lower Fishing Creek (afterward called Richardson) congregations. Here he was induced to stop, in Chester county, S. C., (now Chester district.) These Churches had been previously organized by the Rev. William Richardson, who had preceded him in the arduous labors of disseminating gospel light in that wild and sparsely settled county. Here Mr. S. continued to preach for nearly a year. Becoming attached to that people, and pleased with the country, he determined to make that his future home. Accordingly, he returned

* By the Presbytery of New Brunswick.

back to Philadelphia, and immediately moved his family there. He left Philadelphia on or about the 20th of Sept. 1773, and arrived at Fishing Creek on the 26th of November following,—being about seven weeks on the route.

Immediately on his arrival, he took charge of the two churches, then known as upper and lower Fishing Creek; preaching one half of his time to each, during the first year. During which time, his humble and zealous labors were blessed with the addition of many to the Church, in hopeful conversion.

On the 6th of April, 1774, he was ordained* at Poplar Tent church, North Carolina. Soon after this, his connection with lower Fishing Creek was dissolved.† He took charge, then, partly of Bethesda church, near Col. Bratton's, in York county, some ten miles from upper Fishing Creek,—dividing his time between those two churches, over which he presided for upwards of sixteen years, occasionally preaching at other churches in aid of neighboring ministers.

The first elders, ruling in upper Fishing Creek, (the congregation where Mr. S. lived,) were Samuel Neely, John Latta, and Robt. Lusk. The most active of these was the first named elder. He was distinguished for his piety, and the deep interest he manifested in the welfare of the church,—never tiring, but always active in promoting its interests in some way. In a word, they were all undoubtedly "good men and true." During these sixteen years, universal peace and harmony prevailed, with the exception of the following circumstances which occasionally created some little feeling,—and all growing out of that well-known *instinct* in man, if I may so term it, of following in the wake of the fathers. "As our fathers did, so do we." It will not be amiss, perhaps, to mention some of these incidents.

* By Orange Presbytery. From this Presbytery he was present as a member at the Synod of New-York and Philadelphia, which met in Philadelphia, May 18, 1774.

† The tradition of the old people is that he continued to preach at Lower Fishing Creek, if not as Pastor, at least as a supply, until the Revolution. (See the Memoir of Jane Boyd.—Mrs. Ellet's Women of the Revolution.) A portion of this congregation took the Tory side, and when other denominations came, they joined the Baptist and Methodist churches, thus leaving it a weakened church.

When Mr. S. first settled at Fishing Creek, and for some time after he commenced preaching there, the congregation were accustomed to use Rouse's old version, and none other, in singing. It was not very long, however, until he proposed to introduce Watts' hymns. This was met with almost universal opposition. It created a general excitement and panic through the whole congregation—all clinging to the old version, and looking upon Watts as they would upon an enemy in their midst, designed to lead them astray. Hence, during his stay with that people, of some eighteen years, Mr. S. only succeeded in using Watts half the day.

Another fact peculiar to that people, was their strong adherence to what was then called the "*twelve old tunes*." About the time of the introduction of Watts' Hymns, an attempt was made to introduce some *new* tunes. This was also strongly opposed by the greater part of the congregation—all rallying around the "*old twelve*," among which were Old Hundred, Dublin, Isle of White, London, Mear, Bangor, and others of that class making the twelve. So strong were their prejudices against any others being used, that numbers frequently left the house when a *new tune* was attempted to be sung. But, after a time, the congregation gradually gave in to it, until all opposition ceased, and other tunes were used at pleasure.

It was also customary, among other things, to "line out" only one line at a time in singing. The attempt to change this custom also met with strong opposition, and was not finally overcome during Mr. S's. stay there.

Singing the different parts of the music was also objected to for a long time, but this gradually crept in until but few opposed it. These were some, or it might be said all, the difficulties Mr. S. had to contend with during his stay with that people. Except these, all was peace and harmony.

The order in which the communion was conducted by the Churches in that day, was briefly as follows: First, The Sabbath preceding communion Sabbath was appointed and observed as "preparation Sabbath;" a preparation sermon was preached in view of the approaching communion. The Thursday preceding was observed with fasting, humiliation, and prayer by all the Church. A neigh-

boring minister was always called to aid on these occasions, who generally preached the forenoon sermon on Saturday. On Saturday afternoon, candidates for admission into the Church were examined and received, publicly avowing their faith in Christ, and their adherence to the doctrines laid down in the "Westminster Confession of Faith." "Tokens" were then given to all Church-members who intended communing on next day. This rule was always strictly observed. These "tokens" (being pieces of copper) were used to prevent imposition, and were evidences of the right of communion by those who held them. They were collected again by the elders immediately after communicants had taken their seats around the table, and before the commencement of the table service.

On Sabbath morning the "*action sermon*" was preached by the pastor, who also, at the close of the sermon, then introduced the table service, by briefly explaining its nature, etc., and who were invited to come and partake. The pastor also conducted the service at the first table—the assisting minister the second, who, with some remarks to the congregation, then closed the service. On Sabbath afternoon, sermon by the aiding minister. The Monday succeeding the Sabbath was then observed as thanksgiving day. The congregation again met—a sermon for the occasion was preached by the aiding minister, who was followed by the pastor in an appropriate and feeling address to Christians, which closed the meeting. These communions were held twice a year.

The neighboring minister, whose services Mr. S. generally procured on these occasions, was the Rev. Mr. Alexander,* of Turkey Creek congregation, on Broad River,—a man of great power in the pulpit, overwhelming in argument, eloquent in speech, having the happy faculty of chaining his audience down, in noiseless and earnest attention, while he spoke.

In the observance of all his pastoral duties, Mr. Simpson was very strict, never neglecting them for any trivial cause. It was an invariable rule with him to visit every

* See letter of Alexander to Simpson, and other letters of Alexander to the Presbytery.

family and member of his Church during the year, as a pastor. Having supplied the adult portion of the families with certain written questions, his second visit would then be to examine the adults upon these questions, and also upon experimental religion, etc. To the children, he gave catechetical instruction, in the longer and shorter catechism, with brief explanations. For these examinations he appointed regular places of meeting, in certain neighborhoods, where all convenient to the place would meet, and where all were examined. This religious training of the children was continually urged upon the parents, who faithfully enforced the rule, in training their children in the way they should go, etc., all which manifestly resulted in their adherence to those truths, which in their old age they have not departed from,—for there are many living evidences who can now trace back to their early training, the ground-work of their present faith. They were then early taught to respect and observe the Sabbath day, and keep it holy; no recreations, running about, and idling on that day. They had not then the blessings of a Sunday-school—but *parents then did their duty, wherein, now they leave their duties to be performed by the Sunday-school teacher!* Well might we exclaim “*O tempora!*”

As to his manner of preparing for the pulpit, his usual mode in reference to his sermons was, never to write them, but make notes containing the heads of his subject, and these were mostly in short-hand. From these briefs, or heads, he generally preached about an hour. His custom was to preach in the forenoon and lecture in the afternoon. His sermons were mostly doctrinal, full of divinity, practically and clearly illustrated, pungent and impressive—so that his subject was generally carried home to the heart of the hearer. His manner of speaking was easy and pleasing. He was fluent in speech—yet his tone was solemn and deeply impressive, his voice clear and strong, his pronunciation and words distinct and well-timed. At times, when warmed with his subject, he would break out with feeling bursts of eloquence, which, like an electric shock, never failed to move the hearts of his hearers. His ministerial labors were generally blessed in the conversion of many under his preaching. His labors, in

short, seemed never to be in vain. His faith was strong. He was, physically, a strong, healthy man, about five feet six inches in height, stoutly built, having a constitution, mental and physical, just suitable for the arduous duties of the day in which he lived. In personal intercourse he was always agreeable, but by no means disposed to be very talkative,—not often given to joking or fun, but more inclined to be serious and quiet,—yet at times he would freely participate in quite jovial conversation. He was a kind and indulgent father, and an affectionate and tender husband. Peace held its banner over all his house-hold in undisturbed quietude.

During a portion of the time of which we have spoken, it will be remembered that the people were deeply engaged in the Revolutionary struggle.* As Mr. S. was a zealous Christian, in this struggle for liberty he proved himself to be no less a devoted patriot; nor was he a small sharer in the sufferings and privations of a camp life, and in the loss of property. It was his misfortune to share largely in both of these. Though the enemy had threatened him, and sought to inflict their vengeance upon him, yet dauntless and fearlessly did he march on in the van, encouraging and urging his fellows to hasten to meet their common enemy on the battle-field. He was in several conflicts and skirmishes with the enemy. In some of these contests he was regarded as the leader and adviser. "He was with the band of heroes who so signally defeated the enemy at Beckhamville and Mobley's." This was some time in 1780.†

In the campaign of 1780 Mr. S. was with General Sumpter, who, after having taken a strong redoubt on the Wateree, the day previous to the battle of Camden, and on the next day, hearing of the fatal result of that battle, instantly began his retreat from that quarter, and after a rapid march, in a hot summer day, came to the Catawba Ford. Believing that he was then safe in his retreat, General Sumpter here halted, and allowed his men to rest awhile during the heat of the day, for it was then about twelve o'clock.

* See Memoir of Jane Boyd.—"Women of the Revolution," vol. 3, p. 217.

† See Memoir of Susannah Smart.—Ibid.

Tarleton having heard of Sumpter's retreat, immediately set out in pursuit; making a forced march, he came up with Sumpter, and found his men altogether unprepared—no sentinels out, a great part of the men asleep, all lying about separate from their guns, their horses all unsaddled. Mr. Simpson had placed his gun at the side of a tree, and at this moment was busily engaged in mending his bridle. He had taken the bridle off, and was standing by the side of his favorite mare when the alarm was given that the enemy were upon them. Roused from their slumber by this alarm, they attempted resistance—but there was such a fearful panic and confusion among the men, that but one company succeeded in forming, under command of Capt. John Maffit. He rallied his men, and, together with other parts of companies, made a desperate resistance; but seeing that so great was the confusion that but few could be brought to bear upon the enemy, the struggle was but short. About half of the men were captured, numbering upwards of three hundred. They lost one hundred and fifty, killed and wounded; the balance dispersed, but few getting their horses. All their stores were taken, and also the British Captains recovered whom they had taken previously.

In this struggle, Mr. Simpson narrowly escaped being taken prisoner. The retreat was anything but in order; each man escaped as he could. Mr. S. fortunately got hold of his mare, mounted her without bridle or saddle, and by striking her on the side of the head, gave her the direction he wished to go. She instantly started at almost her utmost speed, in company with no one. Running a short distance, he came to a brush-fence made around a turnip-patch; but scarcely halting at all, his noble animal leaped the fence, ran through the patch, cleared the other side, and made her way to a public road a short distance beyond. As she was about taking that, he discovered two British soldiers coming up the road, armed with guns, who called on him to stop and surrender; but his spirited animal, having the *reins of government in her own hands*, heeded not the command, but instantly, upon a slight touch on the side of her head, sprang across the road, and was soon lost from the British, in the thick foliage, and running on a short dis-

tance further, he came to a branch: here his mare came to a gradual halt, and in crossing the branch, a short distance beyond, in the bushes, he was suddenly alarmed, but was soon agreeably relieved by meeting two of his fellow soldiers, who had likewise escaped thus far. Here they held a consultation, the result of which was their determination to return home, as there was no possible chance then, for the forces thus scattered to re-assemble at any point: yet it was more dangerous for them at home than in the army, particularly to Mr. S., as the enemy had sworn vengeance against the Presbyterian clergy in that section.

Mr. S. remained but a short time at home, when he again sallied out into some parts of North Carolina, with some detachments. The enemy, from their first approach to that part of the State, declared their avowed determination to punish Mr. S., and they were known to make oft and diligent search for him. They visited his church on the Sabbath, hoping to find him there; and had it so happened, they would have been met with a bitter rebuke, for the congregations then worshipped with their arms beside them, or stacked at the door.

On one occasion, the 11th of June, 1780, on a bright Sabbath morning, the enemy moved upon the church of Mr. S., expecting to find him and his congregation there: but they were disappointed. Providence had otherwise directed his steps. The church was but a short distance from the dwelling of Mr. S. They then marched to the house. Mrs. S., seeing their approach, retired from the house with her four children, and concealed herself in the orchard, back of the house. "They rifled the house of everything valuable, took out four feather-beds and ripped them open in the yard, and gathering up all the clothing and other articles that they fancied, they finally set fire to the house, which was soon burned down.* They also set fire to Mr. S's study, containing a valuable library of books, and important manuscripts. These were all consumed, except what was saved by Mrs. S., who ran up after the enemy left, and took out two aprons full—all she could save. In doing this, she was very much burned,

* See Memoir of Jane Boyd.—*Women of the Revolution*, vol. iii. p. 217.

and came near losing her life." She also succeeded in saving enough feathers to make one bed. She then went with her children to a neighboring house, where she remained until after her confinement, that day four weeks. On her recovery, she went back to her own home, and took up her residence in a small out-house that escaped the fire. Here, with her five children, and a certain Miss Neely, she contrived to live, assisted much by the devoted people of her husband's charge. Having procured some cloth, out of which to make clothing for her little ones, (for they had not a change left them by the enemy,) she had cut out their garments, and was proceeding to make them up, when a company of tories came along and robbed her of these. Upon her complaining, however, to the leader of the party, they were ordered to be given up. Some of this gang were dressed in Mr. Simpson's clothes. They would exultingly strut before her, and ask her if they were not better looking men than her husband! at the same time telling her that they would some day make her a present of her husband's scalp. In this distressed situation, she awaited her husband's return.

This was indeed a sad picture for him to look upon, on his return home. Although he might have been returning with the glad tidings of peace and the triumphs of victory, yet, what horror must have seized him on suddenly beholding his ruined, his desolated home! But oh! how thankful to find his much-loved family safe. Faith and hope bore him up, and carried him safely over all these tempestuous billows. His heart was still buoyant with the spirit of perseverance, and he continued to preach successfully. It was not long after this event when peace was declared. His houses were re-built, and he was again comfortably fixed with his family at home, and at peace with the enemy.

Mr. S. was a true patriot, ever zealous in his country's cause. From the time the people in that part of the country took up arms he continued in the service, until peace was declared.

After peace was restored, Mr. S. commenced collecting together his scattered flock, and administering to them the bread of life. For several years he continued to preach at Fishing Creek. In the spring of 1791, he received a call

to Pendleton district, S. C., which was accepted; and in April of that year, he moved to Pendleton, and took charge of Roberts and Goodhope churches. He settled on the Savannah river, on a place called the Cave tract, just below the junction of Seneca and Toogalo. This property descended to his youngest son, David, who occupied it until his death, about a year ago, and it is still the abode of the widow and a portion of the family.

These two churches (Roberts and Goodhope,) were already organized before Mr. S. took charge of them. Here he continued to preach until he finished his labors, and entered into that rest where none can molest him more. He died in October, 1807, having ministered to that people about sixteen years, and laboured in all, about thirty-seven years. The churches last under his charge were also attended with great blessing and prosperity.—He still continued in the observance of the same rules in regard to his pastoral visitings as at Fishing Creek.

The last sermon that Mr. S. preached was to the Goodhope congregation, on the last Sabbath in October, 1807. His text was from Psalms, 32 : 6—first clause of the verse, "For this shall every one that is godly pray unto thee, in a time when thou mayst be found." The Monday following, he was taken suddenly ill, with an attack of gravel. For about twenty-four hours, his sufferings were excruciating and painful, almost beyond endurance. But after the first paroxysm, he became easier, and thus lingered, without any very excessive pain, for about three months, and then resigned himself into the arms of death, without a struggle. He was calm and sensible to the last. He was fully aware of his approaching dissolution, and in view of this, talked to his family and friends who were around his bed-side, and bade them all farewell as quietly as though he was merely starting on a journey, expecting to return. His weakness toward the last forbade his talking much that could be heard. He bade adieu and died aged sixty-eight years, leaving those he left behind to exclaim—"let my last end be like his." He was interred at Roberts burying ground. His funeral sermon was preached by Rev. Moses Waddel, at Goodhope, from the text, "Let me die the death of the righteous," &c.; and on the next Sabbath, by Rev. Mr. Brown, at Roberts church, from the text, "Mark the

perfect man, and behold the upright, for the last end of that man is peace." A stone was reared to mark the spot where he lies, simply bearing his name, birth and death, with date of each.

One other characteristic in regard to Mr. S., perhaps it would be well to mention here. In the latter part of his life, he became a great *revivalist*. He was in the midst of those remarkable revivals that prevailed in that day.—He attended, with his family, all the camp-meetings within his reach. The first camp-meeting held in S. Carolina was on Tiger river, about seventy miles distant from his home. He attended this, notwithstanding the distance. It was a most extraordinary meeting. There seemed to be a most signal out-pouring of the Spirit among the people, who were there from a distance of more than fifty miles around. There were between seven and eight hundred wagons and carriages on the ground. The circumference of the camp-ground was about a mile. Two stands for preaching were erected and occupied at the same time, as one could not supply the hearers. The tents were made chiefly of brush,—here and there a cloth one. There were about sixteen Presbyterian ministers, and as many Methodist and Baptist together, in attendance. The excitement was unusually great, and in many cases singularly strange. Some appeared to be suddenly stricken down as dead, and would thus remain for hours, in a kind of comatose state: others lying prostrate, were differently affected and wrought upon,—some shouting, and all more or less affected. The whole woods seemed from morning till night, for a great distance around the encampment, to be vocal with praises and prayer. Numbers were happily converted, and still more under deep conviction. In all these meetings, Mr. Simpson took an active part in carrying on this great work. Many other meetings of like character might be mentioned. Mr. S. never seemed happier than when in their midst.

In 1811, about four years after the death of Mr. S., his widow followed him to the grave, aged about fifty-eight* years. Her tomb-stone simply bore her name, age, and the date of her birth and death. She led a life of piety and true

* Here 58 must be a mistake—it must be 68. See marriage, in the year 1765.

Christian benevolence. She took it upon herself to begin early in the instruction of her children in the catechisms, and indoctrinating them in all the truths of the Bible.—Every Sabbath, they all attended regularly to her pious instruction. While on her death-bed, she was calm and resigned. Among her last words were that she was willing to go, and her only regret was that she could not see her youngest son settled in life. He was then unsettled. She further remarked that she had often thought and entertained fears that she could never be resigned to death. The thought was terrible and frightful to her. “But now,” said she, “I am resigned. I have no fear of death. All has vanished. Death comes with none of its hideousness, its horrors, its stings. No, it has no sting, but comes like a friend to provide me a happier home. All is peace. I await my time.” Religion was all her theme and delight during her sickness.

Her maiden name was Mary Remer. Her father died when she was but a child. Her mother afterwards married Christopher Strait, under whose kind parentage she was reared, until she married Mr. Simpson, with whom she lived in peace and love, till death called them apart.

They had seven sons and one daughter. Their names were as follows: John, James, Leonard, Jane, William, Allen, Archibald and David. James was the eldest, David the youngest. Allen died in infancy. The others all grew up, married, and lived to a good old age. Only three are now living, Leonard, Archibald and Jane. They all became members of the church early in life, before their marriages, and thus lived orderly pious lives, demonstrating the truth—as they were trained in youth, so they lived in old age.

ARTICLE VII.

MORMONISM.*

Exploration and Survey of the Valley of the Great Salt Lake of Utah; by HOWARD STANSBURY, &c. Chapter VII: 8 vo. pp. 487. Lippincott & Grambo. Phil. 1852.

History of the Mormons, or Latter-day Saints; with Memoirs of the Life and Death of Joseph Smith, the American Mahomet. Illustrated: 12 mo., pp. 399. Derby & Miller, Auburn, N. Y., 1852.

The Mormons, or Latter-day Saints, in the Valley of the Great Salt Lake: a history of their rise and progress, peculiar doctrines, present condition and prospects, derived from personal observation, during a residence among them; by Lieut. J. W. GUNNISON, of the Topographical Engineers. 12 mo., pp. 168. Lippincott & Grambo, Phil., 1852.

One of the most striking and significant events of the present century, is the rise and spread of Mormonism. All the chapters of its changeful history possess the interest of the most stirring romance. The incidents thicken so fast, the plot becomes so complex, and withal, the developements are so vast and unexpected, that we hold our breath in continual surprise, in threading our way through the narrative of this singular delusion.

The world has long been familiar with Heresiarchs who have gone off upon some perversion of Christian doctrine: but the schools they have established claim still a connection with the Church out of whose bosom they spring; and the leprous taint has not unfrequently extended from the branch and defiled the trunk. But since the sixth century, no original impostor had arisen, claiming

* Read as a Lecture before the Mercantile Library Association of Charleston, Jan. 26, 1853; and now published at their request, with only such verbal alterations as adapt it to the Review.

immediate inspiration from God, and establishing a new dispensation of truth. To make this novelty more startling, it was reserved for this age, and for this country, to give birth to the new Prophet: an age advanced beyond all others in the natural sciences, by which imposture may be detected; and a country having the most thoroughly practical population upon the globe. We may, in the sequel, perhaps, find in these very circumstances, which excite our wonder, the elements from which to work out the solution of this great social and religious problem.— But at the first glance, it strikes one with astonishment that in the middle of the nineteenth century, and in this enlightened, Christian land, so clumsy an imposture should be attempted and succeed. That an obscure and illiterate man, without position or character even in his own humble circle, should make the stupendous claim of inspiration from God; should travesty the sacred and antique dialect of the Bible, and foist his wretched compositions upon the world, with all the sanction of a new revelation; and that unauthenticated by any signs or wonders, such as have always attested a divine Herald, he should be accepted upon his own naked testimony as a true prophet,—these are statements we must receive, however antecedently improbable, simply because they are facts of contemporaneous history. It may not surprise us that this upstart religion, excommunicating the whole Christian church in one sweeping anathema, and superseding her canonical writings with its own tripping inspiration, should suffer violence and persecution. But after enduring protracted horrors, such as only the religious sentiment can outlive, that the miserable refugees should assemble, at a concerted signal, across a thousand miles of pathless desert, and in three short revolving seasons, should plant fields, erect mills, establish schools, build cities, and institute all the arts of civilized life,—in a word, that they should lay the foundation of a new empire, and with one hand upon the articles of confederation, should with the other be almost knocking for admission into this family of States: these are achievements over-topping the fictions of Eastern romance; at least, resembling more the gorgeous dreams of Arabian fancy, than the sober facts of real life. But the cap-stone of this wonderful history, the climax of its mar-

vels, is, that in a religion not old to wear a beard, and in an empire not yet out of swaddling clothes, we should be presented with the only American State-church, and witness an effort partially successful to re-produce the Asiatic type of civilization.

We have thus sketched the contour of Mormonism, and sought to place the reader at a point from which he may take in, at one view, both its pretensions and its achievements, in order, if possible, to abate his merriment when we announce it as the theme of the present article. Perhaps in uncasing this stupendous fraud, the moralist, the divine, the statesman, and the political economist, may each find, in his own department, material for profound speculation.

It is never easy to form a correct estimate of religious impostors. The deceit and falsehood which mark their course, seem scarcely consistent with the religious sentiment that must underlie the character. The great controversy, for example, whether Mohammed was a fanatic or an impostor, proceeds upon the supposed incompatibility of the two; yet, their co-existence is needed to solve the facts of the case. We cannot explain the origin of a religious imposture, without supposing the religious element to be awakened, however it may be afterwards debauched and misdirected. The history of error abundantly shows that the most vicious principles will often mingle with the religious instincts of men, who are driven under this double impulse into the most riotous excesses. The original exciting cause may be slight enough; but the hallucination once entertained of miraculous correspondence with Heaven, an unscrupulous or ignorant conscience will not long hesitate at fraud in accomplishing the holy mission; and when success shall have consecrated the cheat, the impostor becomes fully ensnared in his own lie, and easily credits to supernatural revelation the suggestions of his own fancy. Joseph Smith, the founder of the Mormon sect, is dogmatically pronounced an impostor by thousands who do not stop to inquire how far he may also have been an enthusiast; or to solve the query whether it be possible to control the religious convictions of our fellow men, without a previous excitation of our own religious nature. The

biography of this remarkable person opens with the account of his deep spiritual distress during an exciting religious revival through which he passed while still a youth. Perplexed in his choice between conflicting sects and creeds, he was for a time in that state of indecision in which multitudes vibrate between superstition and skepticism. While perhaps upon the verge of infidelity, he swung to the opposite pole, and conceived the project of founding a church, whose comprehensive creed should harmonize all sects, and swallow up dissent: and this lively suggestion of his own mind, a heated imagination may easily have coined into a vision of God. Seven years however elapse, before this bold conception embodies itself in a detailed scheme. While "the vision tarries," the nascent Prophet relapses, if the story be true, into the vagrant habits of his early life, which show him to be constitutionally of a deeply superstitious turn. By the aid of seer-stones and hazel-rods, he had gained no small reputation as a money-digger. Certainly, if he failed to track the secret veins of silver, he did not fail to sound the depths of human credulity. At the end of seven years, he is prepared to enter upon prophetic functions, and announces a new revelation, whose origin forms a curious record in the annals of literary forgery. A disabled clergyman, Mr. Spalding, residing in Ohio, amused the heavy hours occasioned by chronic disease, and indulged a creative fancy in penning a historical romance, entitled "the Manuscript found." Seizing on the familiar idea that the North American Indians are lineal descendants of the lost ten tribes of Israel, it purported to trace those tribes from the time when history loses them, and to describe their settlement on this continent, their division into existing clans, with their wars and mode of living. As the fiction was bold and lively, it was read in successive portions by the author's friends, as rapidly as he composed. His premature death prevented its publication; and it lay for many years amongst dusty papers, almost forgotten. By what legerdemain it came into the hands of Joseph Smith, none but he could disclose, while it was his interest to conceal. Too many witnesses, however, attest the substantial identity of the published book of Mormon with

this manuscript, to admit a doubt of the plagiarism: and the mysterious disappearance of the document from the family archives, affords presumption of the theft.

When the mind is quickened by enthusiasm, the slightest incidents become tributary to the one idea which fills and masters it. The romance of Mr. Spalding gave to Smith the key-note of his imposture. The golden plates which he professed to dig by divine direction from the hill-side at Cumorrah, taught that Christ, after his ascension into Heaven again, descended and planted his Church among the lost tribes of Israel on this continent—that these having forfeited his favour by their apostacy, they were given up to be destroyed by their enemies,—and that by the last of their prophets, these records were deposited in the earth, to be brought forth in the fulness of time by a Gentile. The favoured restorer of these ancient oracles is the Mormon Prophet, who is divinely taught to translate the same, and to restore the suspended animation of this long-lost church. The first proselytes to this new faith were the different members of his father's family; who, however, did not render the service of two individuals, Pratt and Rigdon, who were the next converts. With the assistance of these, especially of the latter, the organization of the sect is further matured, and the new doctrines extensively promulgated. A temporary gathering of the early converts is made at Kirtland, in Ohio; though, from the beginning, the policy seems to have been to settle his colony upon the frontiers of civilization. It would be the repetition of a familiar tale to recite their settlement in Missouri, or to detail the violence which drove them to find a refuge in Illinois. The building of their city, Nauvoo, and the erection of a magnificent temple,—the murder of their prophet, while under the sacred guardianship of the law, by a perfidious mob—their expulsion from Nauvoo—the virtual confiscation of their property—the destruction of their temple—the report of all this has long since come to every ear. The death of Smith at this juncture was not, perhaps, injurious to the Mormon interest. It set the seal of martyrdom to a system which to many might otherwise have been only a crazy superstition; it released the prophet himself from the dizzy height to which he had climbed—and which none after him was

expected to reach—and it made room for the ascendancy of a broader and more practical mind in Brigham Young, the new President. Their successive expulsions from Missouri and Illinois sufficiently proved, what might indeed have been demonstrated *a priori*, the impracticability of two communities, organically different in their social structure, living peaceably intermingled. Emigration to a country where they should altogether escape the pressure of a surrounding population, was now an established necessity. Never was an emigration better planned or conducted. Explorers bring back an account of the great Salt Lake Valley, in Utah, the locality precisely suited for the “manifest destiny” before them. Situated midway between the Mississippi and the great Pacific, they would be far enough removed from both, yet sufficiently nigh to connect their fortunes with the States that must eventually skirt either ocean. A fertile territory, capable, when artificially irrigated, and under perfect culture, of sustaining a population of four thousand to a square mile, and large enough to embrace a million of souls, invites their entrance. This valley, too, like that of the Abyssinian Prince, is insulated at every point of the compass—if not by walls of rock, at least by inhospitable, arid deserts, and untimbered slopes—which might repress the advancing tide of settlers, and leave the saints without restraint to work out their high mission. From the moment that emigration to this chosen spot was decided on, the deepest practical wisdom marks all their movements, disclosing the presiding genius of a master mind. A party of pioneers is first sent forward to occupy some portion of the waste land westward of the States, with instructions to put in a crop which might sustain the larger body soon to take up the line of march. The same wise precaution was used the following season, before arriving at their new home, when the emigrants found a harvest waiting for their sickles, the fruit of the toils of a similar advance-guard. At once, a city is symmetrically laid out, a site selected for the temple, a bowery erected for temporary worship, fields measured off, and put under cultivation, furnaces put in blast, mills built upon water courses, canals dug for the circulation of water, and the whole industry of a tried and hardy people supervised by one controlling

mind. The effect of this concentrated and regulated labor is told in the stupendous results already hinted—all danger of famine is warded off, and a sufficient store provided for the saints who should obey the bugle-call of their chieftain, bidding them from afar to this land of promise. A chain of settlements is marked out, and cities founded, as stepping-stones to the Pacific coast; a Provisional government is constituted, and Utah distinctly recognised as a territory in the halls of Congress.

This rude outline of their fortunes and progress will perhaps suffice to fix the reader's interest upon this people, and prepare the way for such reflections as we may be able to submit.

The first fact which arrests the attention of one who looks into the details of this imposture, is the close parallel between the Mormon and the Arabian prophet. The resemblance, indeed, is so obvious that, in common parlance, Smith is designated as "the American Mahomet;" though this title may be assigned only upon the general ground that both sought to found a new religion, and substantially by the same method; both feigned to be inspired, and both palmed upon the world a new revelation from heaven. It would subserve no useful end to trace the minute coincidences between the two; but we cannot, perhaps, better exhibit the Mormon system than by running the parallel in some of the more prominent points.

I. *Mormonism and Mohammedism are both clumsy attempts to reconcile and unite conflicting creeds.* This idea is the seed from which the two religions unquestionably germinated. It has been already stated that Smith conceived his project immediately after his religious convictions were powerfully awakened, and when he was sorely puzzled to make his election between churches, which perhaps indecently canvassed for his favor. When the angel announced to him that there was no true Church upon earth, it was probably only the skeptical doubt of his own mind putting on a fanatical disguise. The religious element was not, however, to be extinguished thus, by placing it in the exhausted receiver of a negative infidelity. His very superstition drove him to fill the "aching void" with a faith of some sort; and his inventive genius sought to compound existing systems, and to frame a

Church which should present attractions to every sect. He evidently jars as slightly against the branches of the Christian Church, by which he was surrounded, as was consistent with the exclusive claims arrogated to his own. The mission of Christ is not denied. On the contrary, predictions were produced from the Nephitic records, in which the Messiah is announced by name, as distinctly as was the Persian Cyrus by Isaiah of old. The Church, as established in the Apostolic age, is admitted to be pure, but alleged to have so changed God's covenant, and corrupted his ordinances, as to be now wholly apostate. The Bible is recognised as "the foundation book"—only charged with interpolations which the Mormon seer was commissioned to detect. Its authority is not absolutely impugned, but succeeding revelations must be admitted to an equal share of its supremacy. More particular deference is shown to it, in glossing certain passages of the prophetic writings, especially of Ezekiel, to lend support to the new revelation. Some of its peculiar doctrines, as the Millennium, and the Resurrection, are incorporated into his creed, though the former is pushed to the utmost extravagance of Millenarian speculation, and the latter undertakes to define what are the properties of the spiritual body. The sacraments of the New Testament, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are received, and the former practised according to the views of the most rigid immersionists, as well as securing infallibly the remission of sins. The evangelical terms, faith, repentance, obedience, atonement, forgiveness, are freely employed, though for the most part in an obscure and mystical sense.

In another section will be exhibited the clear recognition of the Jewish Economy. Indeed, the effort is most apparent to fuse the first and second dispensations into one, and to present Mormonism as the amalgam of the two. As a symbol of this, the spirits of Moses and Elias, as representatives of the one, and the spirits of Peter, James and John, as representatives of the other, lent the sanction of their presence at his baptism, and covered the necessary irregularity of receiving it at the hands of the Neophyte, Cowdery. This eclectic system takes a wider range, and smacks with the flavor of almost every Pagan superstition and mystical school upon earth. Not wishing

to anticipate what will be more appropriately noticed in another connection, it is sufficient here to glance at the Gnostic dogma of æons in the Mormon "Principles of Element," or matter—the Pantheism which, beginning with making God a man, very consistently ends with making man a God—and the Persian idea of transmigration of souls in accomplishing their probation. A simple reference to these heterogeneous opinions suffices to show that Mormonism is truly an "Olla Podrida" of all the religions and superstitions upon the globe.

Let us now turn back the shadow upon the dial-plate of time at least twelve hundred years, and share the meditations of the prophet of the sixth century, in his lonely cave on Mt. Hera. He looks forth upon the tribes of Arabia, whom a haughty spirit of independence, nourished through centuries of personal and civil freedom, had made the free-thinkers of their day. Some, wedded to the ancient Sabian idolatry, did homage to the hosts of heaven, or to the angels and their images; others bowed with Magian reverence before fire as the appropriate symbol of the Deity. Every pious fraud must have its secret foundation in some religious idea; and Mohammed was enough in contact with a purer faith, to seize the truth of God's essential unity, against which all these systems impinged. To his bold, reflecting mind, this fundamental truth loomed up with a grandeur which frowned awfully upon the paltry superstitions of the idolater. His soul may have caught fire, as the thought flashed upon him to reclaim these wretched Polytheists to the great platform of all Natural and Revealed Religion, the existence of one supreme and spiritual God. If, on the other hand, he turned from the idolatries of the Pagan, the dissensions and corruptions of Christianity were little less repulsive. The mystery of iniquity, predicted in Apostolic times, had already commenced to work; and in the sixth century, the concurrent testimony of all historians represents the worship of saints and images as carried already to the highest pitch—and it is easy to see how a Pagan mind, looking at Christianity through this medium, should misconceive even the doctrine of the Trinity, as contravening the essential unity of the Divine nature. Not only so, the heresies and conflicts of this period were so loud and bitter, fomented by bishops

and emperors, and anathemas rung so fierce from councils, as naturally to bewilder a mind not indoctrinated to perceive the shades of difference in theological opinion. This, then, was doubtless the religious germ of the Arabian imposture. In the language of a learned writer, quoted in Sale's Preliminary Discourse, "the general design of the Koran seems to be to unite the professors of the three different religions then followed in the populous country of Arabia, who, for the most part, lived promiscuously, and wandered without guides, the far greater number being idolaters, and the rest Jews and Christians mostly of erroneous and heterodox belief, in the worship of one eternal, invisible God.

In all religions, true or false, there is one reigning idea, the nucleus about which the different parts may crystallize, in regular logical process. In the Mohammedan scheme the dominant pretension is that of "replanting the only true and ancient religion professed by Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and all the prophets." The supreme idea in the Mormon imposture seems to be the restoration of the Church to its ancient apostolic powers—the gift of faith, discerning of spirits, prophecy, revelation, visions, healings, tongues, interpretation of tongues—and the recovery of certain lost ordinances, such as the Priesthood with its sacrifices, and the laying on of hands with the gift of the Holy Ghost. The Arabian, like the American prophet, recognised the mission of Moses and of Christ, and compiled largely from the Christian and Jewish Scriptures in framing his own revelation. Moses need not leave his seat, nor Christ his throne, if only Mohammed be admitted to their company, and he crowned as the last of the prophets.

II. The second feature of resemblance between the two systems is, that *Judaism is assumed as mainly the basis of both*. Mohammed began his career with sentiments of high consideration for the Jews; though his disappointment in gaining them as proselytes, through the proverbial tenacity of their faith, eventually converted this regard into rancour. It is possible that the heart of the Ishmaelite may have softened towards the children of Abraham, as both recognised in their flesh the seal of an early brotherhood. The Jews too, whom the wild freedom of Ara-

bia had nourished into consequence, were the great confessors of that sublime truth which now filled the reason and the fancy of the reformer. Judaism thus unquestionably furnished the ground-doctrine of the Koran, and gave to Islamism its rallying cry. Mohammed displayed great wisdom in restricting his doctrinal articles within so narrow a compass. Only the thorny doctrine of absolute predestination was likely to entice to metaphysical discussion; and it did give ample exercise to the dialectic skill of future doctors. Easy credence was given to the simple and fundamental postulate of the divine unity, while the practical devotions of the Moslem were included in the four particulars of prayer, fasting, alms and pilgrimages. In all of these a remarkable resemblance is traced to Jewish institutions, though it must be confessed to the institutions of Rabbinical, much more than of primitive, Judaism. Five times a day the Muezzim sound the hours of prayer, when the Musselman bows with the same posture of adoration towards Mecca, as the Jew towards the Holy City. The purifications of the one, performed with scrupulous exactness, find their type in the ritual ablutions of the other. The legal alms, being an exact per centage of all the Mohammedan calls his own, bear a close affinity to the tithes anciently paid into the hands of Levi. A similar distinction of meats, and the same prohibition of usury, occur in both religions. The same superstitious value attached to excessive fasting, which met our Saviour's rebuke among the Jews, marks this religious duty as prescribed by Mohammed. The pilgrimage to Mecca, though a relic of old Arabian Paganism, may, perhaps, have been sanctioned in the impostor's mind, by the solemn assemblages of Israel in the temple, at their great feasts. It would be tedious to follow the parallel in the Mohammedan notions of heaven, and their doctrine of angels. Any one at all curious on this point, may easily find guides who will conduct him through vast collections of Jewish and Moslem legends, the analogy between the two being apparent at every step in the comparison.

Mormonism is a far more servile imitation of Judaism, as it incorporates even those peculiar features which the introduction of Christianity rendered obsolete. It was a bold stroke of policy to reconstruct the old Jewish plat-

form, as the basis of the new imposture. By connecting the North American Indians with the ancient Israel of God, and inventing a history for them so full of dignity and privilege as the Book of Mormon disclosed, he hoped to flatter the pride of this simple people, who might be thought easily persuaded to welcome their ancient, honorable, resuscitated Church. On the other hand, the Mormon apostles take sufficient care that so handsome a compliment to Judaism shall not escape the notice of the Rabbies, the world over—an act of reverence that should subdue the prejudices of this hitherto invincible sect. Meanwhile, all Christendom was to be won by the distinct testimony borne to the Messiahship of Jesus, and the revival of those supernatural gifts which graced the Church in Apostolic days.

The most prominent feature of Judaism, the Priesthood of Aaron, is transferred to this new dispensation, and is curiously coupled with the higher priesthood of Melchisedek. It is distinctly held that a priesthood is essential to the being of a Church; and one writer distinctly implies that upon the completion of their temple, animal sacrifices are to be renewed for the daily sins of the people. Tithes are paid, as of old—the proselyte giving one tenth of his entire substance, and ever after a tithe of his labor, time and income, accumulating a fund for the advancement of public interests. The temple built at Nauvoo, with its baptistic laver, resting upon twelve oxen elaborately carved of marble, sought to emulate the glory and splendor of Solomon's. Their travels, painfully accomplished through the desert to their western home, find a prototype in the Exode from Egypt, and the long journey of the Israelites, through the wilderness, to the land of promise. The literal gathering of the scattered Jews to Palestine, and the re-establishment of the ancient ritual in its splendor—their conversion by the glorious manifestation of Jesus in the heavens—the assemblage of the latter-day saints in the American Zion—the re-marriage of continents and islands as at the creation, and the casting up of a highway on the united earth, between the two Jerusalems—their being caught up to heaven, while the earth shall be purged by fire, to descend and remain forever on the new earth—all these doctrines, firmly believed, abundant-

ly indicate the leaven of Judaism pervading the New Church creed, and confirm the position before taken, that Judaism forms the chief basis of the Mormon Church.

III. *A third parallelism is found in the claim urged by both, to progressive Revelation.* Mohammed taught that "God, in divers ages of the world, gave revelations of his will in writing to several prophets"—to Adam, Seth, Enoch, Abraham, Moses, David, Jesus, and himself. He being the last, prophecy is henceforth sealed up, and no further revelations are to be expected. Those which were made to him came in parcels as exigencies arose—and if one contradicted another, the first was considered abrogated. The canon was complete at his death, and none of the Caliphs who succeeded him ventured to assume his prophetic mantle, or to re-open personal correspondence with the Deity.

The claims of Smith are vastly more extravagant, and *development* is represented as the peculiar glory of the latter-day Church. He did not, like his Arabian prototype, prudently seal the prophetic roll at his own death; but left the sacred gift as the perpetual inheritance of the saints. "New revelation," says Orson Pratt, one of the Mormon Apostles, "is the very life and soul of the religion of Heaven," and without it "there is an end to the very existence of the Church of Christ on earth; there is an end to salvation in the celestial kingdom." Revelations are necessary to the calling of officers, to instruction in the nature of their duties—necessary to the conveyance of consolation or reproof—to escape from judgments—and to the entire edification of the saints. The sufficiency of all past revelations for the guidance of the Church is stoutly denied. In accordance with these views, Smith, like Mohammed, to the end of his career extricated himself from all dilemmas by a new disclosure of the Divine will. His successor, Brigham Young, with the shrewdness which marks his whole administration, is extremely chary of these prophetic announcements. Not enjoying the prestige, with Smith, of having opened this correspondence with Deity, he prudently excuses the sluggishness of his own vaticinations, upon the plea that the revelations of the first prophet have cut out work for several years ahead. The practical judgement of the first President would

doubtless close altogether this door to fanaticism, if it were possible to contravene the will of the prophet. But a secret, controlling Providence is manifest in Smith's leaving that fatal gift, by which this gross imposture shall be made finally to convict and stultify itself.

IV. *A still more obvious resemblance is found in the sensual element introduced into both.* It needs few words to establish this charge against the Arabian imposture. The world knows that Mohammed practised, and that the Koran sanctions, polygamy; yet it should be always borne in mind that this social enormity existed before his day, and prevailed generally throughout the East. All that is fairly chargeable upon Islamism, is, that it *sanc-tioned* a plurality of wives. So far from originating it, Mohammed recognised it as a permanent feature of Eastern society, and rather restricted than expanded the privilege to his followers. It was not lawful to exceed a given number, though by special favor his own harem was enlarged to the extent of his desires. From the charge, however, of ministering to the appetites, by providing a sensual Paradise for the faithful after death, he cannot so easily be acquitted. Delightful fruits, exquisite wines, the richest apparel, a profusion of rubies and pearls, sumptuous abodes, black-eyed maidens, and above all, perpetual youth giving zest to enjoyments which no indulgence can blunt; all these form, not the language of parable figuring the inconceivable spiritual blessedness of the faithful, but with offensive literalness, they minutely address every sense and appetite, both of body and of soul. The influence of these sensual rewards, upon the warm blood and quick fancy of oriental nations, can scarcely be measured; especially when obtained upon the easy condition of perfect devotion to the Prophet of Allah.

It was denied that polygamy formed one of the features of Mormonism, as long as the infant sect was thought unable to sustain the shock of public indignation. A Church, whose boast is development, may be expected to put forth new traits, when the credulity of its devotees will warrant the disclosure. But whether the spiritual-wife system is a new revelation, or whether it was one of the esoteric doctrines from the beginning, it is now avowed and defended as an integral part of the scheme. No feature of

this new dispensation appears so curious or adventurous, as this attempt to disturb and to change the organic law upon which all society with us is constructed. If there be one exponent of Christian civilization, it is the position of woman in the domestic and social circle. For ages her melancholy doom was either to toil as a drudge for an insolent master, or, what was scarcely less repugnant to her nature, to be the passive instrument of his pleasures. During that middle age which marks the transition to modern civilization, she was sported as a toy; but the veil of seclusion was not yet drawn, nor did she walk with man, his friend and equal, in the open paths of life. But where the Bible blesses the marriage vow, it founds upon the union of a single pair the constitution of a happy family. The woman walks hand in hand with her lawful spouse, the sole mistress of his heart, sharing his sorrow and his joy; they breast together the fortunes of life, and even in death are still united in the affectionate remembrance of grateful descendants. Mormonism impudently strives to reproduce the Asiatic type of civilization. It scoffs at the deference which the Christian world pays to the female sex, and stigmatizes it as "Gentile gallantry;" it teaches that no woman can gain admission into the Heavenly Kingdom, but through the introduction of her husband; it "seals," to use its own cant phrase, as many wives to one man as he may wish to maintain, and graduates a man's rank in the celestial Paradise by the largeness of his retinue. Like Mohammed, the Mormon advocate pleads the example of ancient patriarchs—but more gross than he, no restriction is placed upon this secret sealing, but the ability to render a suitable provision for the multiplied households.

V. *The last comparison which we shall institute relates to the union of civil and ecclesiastical power, in the two systems.* To elaborate the proof of this in regard to the religion of Islam, would be to trifle with the patience, if not with the intelligence, of the reader. After his flight to Medina, Mohammed own his mission to be the propagation of the new faith by fire and sword. Drawing into precedent the exterminating wars of Israel with the devoted inhabitants of Canaan, "there is no God but Allah" was transformed from the peaceful symbol of religious

devotees into the battle-cry of an armed soldiery. Before his death, nearly all the tribes of Arabia had sent embassies of allegiance to the conqueror of Mecca, and idolatry had given place to the deism of the Koran. The Caliphs who succeeded to the enterprise were men born to empire, possessed of rare courage, and inspired with the patience and self-denial which belong to religious zeal. The campaigns, planned with wonderful forecast, were conducted with the precipitate intrepidity characteristic of fanaticism. In the reign of Omar—we cite from Gibbon—ten years saw thirty-six thousand cities or castles dismantled, four thousand churches or temples demolished, and fourteen hundred mosques erected. Within a century after the Hegira, the young moon which lighted the exile in his solitary flight, filled to a glorious orb; and the Crescent waved in triumph over the plains of Syria, the steppes of Persia, the sands of Africa, and the fertile deltas of Egypt. The desolating flood of conquest swept on, and, washing the Pillars of Hercules, passed from Asia into Europe, soon covered the Spanish Peninsula, and finally broke its fury at the foot of the Pyrennees, when the hardy German race first breasted the mighty surge.

The Koran is not only the corner-stone of the Saracen Empire, but its precepts constitute the fundamental part of the civil law. The Caliph, as successor of Mohammed, which the term indicates, unites in his person the royal and sacerdotal functions. No higher evidence can be demanded of a Church-state than the union of the crosier with the sceptre, the monarch and the priest.

In Mormonism the civil power is much more built into the ecclesiastical; nor is there the least inclination to blink the union of the two. As the whole religion and polity emanated from Joseph Smith, he was, during life, the head of all power, and gave laws with the authority of a dictator. The hierarchy of the latter-day Church is very complex. It consists of a Presidency supported by a cabinet of counsellors, called the High Council of the Twelve. Next is the travelling Apostolic College of the Twelve, after the New Testament model, who are witnesses to Jew and Gentile, over all the world; then the Seventy, with a whole army of priests, elders, bishops, teachers, deacons, &c.,—each order constituting a court,

the higher having appellate jurisdiction over the lower. The cope-stone of the entire structure is the Presidency of the High Priesthood. He disburses the public fund accumulated from the payment of tithes; his permission in every case of "sealing" gains him access as a confidential adviser into every household; and the new revelations dispensed from heaven enable him always to speak with "the nod and sanction of a God." It is hard to see how more absolute power could be vested in any ruler. And the wonderful results attained in the Salt Lake Valley, in the short space of three years, are in evidence that the influence and power thus vested have been practically exerted, and that the Presidency of Brigham Young does not exist alone upon parchment.

In tracing this parallel, we are far from wishing to degrade Mohammed to the intellectual or moral level of Joseph Smith. He was unquestionably cast in a far nobler mould, and, impostor as he was, never descended to the pitiful forgery of his modern rival. Bold, and even vicious, as his religion was, it was still in advance of the idolatry which it supplanted. So far as he reclaimed his countrymen from polytheism to the recognition of the invisible and spiritual God, he was indisputably a reformer; and full of puerilities as the Koran may be, it never drivels in the contemptible blasphemy of the "Book of Mormon." As a statesman, too, he pushed his country forward, and gave a dignity to her name, such as she never before enjoyed. He found the tribes of Arabia rudely independent and dissociated; he gave them a bond of union, and founded a compact and powerful empire, whose history is illustrated with deeds of prowess equal to any recorded in the annals of the most romantic chivalry. Viewed either as a religious or political movement, Mohammedism was a step in advance of the past; one stage, at least so far as Arabia was concerned, in the mighty march of the race of man. Mormonism, on the contrary, is an open apostacy from the highest type of civilization to that which is beastly—a rejection of the most spiritual religion in favor of that which is most gross and material—a bold step, taken backward, in defiance of all the lessons of history, and in the face of a people the most intelligent and free upon the globe.

It is time now to shift the scene, and to present Mormonism in its relations to the present, as well as in its resemblance to the past. All those enterprises which combine numbers in their execution may be taken as exponents of the age in which they occur. However they may be, in their origin, the mintage of a single brain, yet the elective affinity, by which they attract adherents on every side, must express some trait of the time.

1. Mormonism, for example, has *borrowed from Christianity its aggressive feature*, and sends its missionaries likewise to gather proselytes from all parts of the earth. Christianity is the first system of religion that sought to propagate itself by the labors of evangelists travelling or residing in foreign countries. Judaism was a stationary system. Planted in the centre of the old world, its light gleamed far and wide into the surrounding darkness. Through its transparent symbols it held up the truth to the gaze of the nations ; but it went forth upon no mission of propagation, and was anchored by its ordinances and ritual to the land of Palestine. In like manner, the various systems of Polytheism were local, and animated with no spirit of propagandism. Each country had its own divinities ; and as a miserable substitute for one, supreme omnipresent being, the number of local deities was so multiplied that Polytheism was likely to break down of its weight. So far from excluding the Gods of a conquered territory, conquest only served to enlarge the boundaries of idolatry ; until, as in the Pantheon at Rome, thousands of divinities were assembled in friendly embrace, representatives of the diversified worship of mankind. But Christianity came forth, with her commission written on her brow by her Divine founder : "Go into all the world, and disciple all nations." This makes her essentially an aggressive body—carrying her faith by peaceful and persuasive means to every quarter of the globe. Her history is, to a large extent, the record of her missionary labors ; and those who breathe most largely her spirit, are most earnest in seeking the fulfilment of this her great commission.

This feature, hitherto characteristic only of the Christian religion, has been engrafted upon the Mormon superstition ; and no fitter illustration can be afforded of the despotic power of their rulers than is afforded by the man-

ner in which the missionaries are sent forth. Upon three days' notice, often, they are called by the will of their superiors to leave their business and their families, and to go forth without purse or scrip, ignorant even of the languages which they are to use, trusting to Providence for their support. With a craftiness, as well as with a despotism, worthy of Ignatius Loyola, the most ambitious and inquisitive of the sect are chosen for this work; who are not only flattered into superior devotion by this signal mark of confidence, but are confirmed the more in the Mormon faith as they are compelled to defend it, and find abundant labors in which to expend the superfluous energy which it might not be so easy to check at home. It is already the boast of Mormonism, that brief and troubled as its history has been, there are few prominent countries in which its Gospel has not been proclaimed. In Germany, Italy, France, Norway, Russia, and the Pacific Isles; in England, Scotland, Wales, and throughout the entire length of this great confederacy; it professes already to number its proselytes by thousands, through the labors of their evangelists, who are continually swelling the ranks, and augmenting the resources of the great Zion in the West.

It was not long since suggested to us by an intelligent gentleman, that the rise of such an imposture as Mormonism, characterized by such an active propagandism, was proof of the weakness of the religious sentiment on the part of our people. Precisely the reverse of this appears the conclusion which should be reached. It is because the religious convictions of our people are so earnest, and the Christianity of our day is so aggressive, that it is burdened by such a religious fraud. A living writer in our own State, whose name is the synonyme of historic lore, has said: "There is no great working idea in history—no impulse which passes on through whole masses, like a heaving wave over the sea, that has not its own caricature and distorted reflection along with it."* No religious movement, for example, was ever more earnest than the Reformation in the sixteenth century, and no movement

* Dr. F. Lieber's address to the Graduating Class of the S. C. College of 1851.

was ever more marked by the grimaces of fanaticism, or travestied by the vagaries of enthusiasts. With this principle in view, it may not be risking much to say, that no age since that of the Apostles, could have given birth to such an imposture, marked by so much of missionary zeal, as the age which is most remarkable for the propagation of the Christian faith over the earth. Mormonism, in its propagandism, is truly an exponent of this age of Christian missions.

2. A second feature of the Mormon scheme, reflecting in a measure the age which gives it birth, is, *the refined communism lurking under its social structure, and the effort to build up its power by means of emigration*. When the ambition of Mohammed enlarged from that of a reformer to the founder of an empire, he resorted to the only policy which, in those times, could avail him. The sword alone could open the path to glory and to power; and in all the empires of those rude and warlike ages, every stone was cemented with human blood. Mohammed, in becoming a military chieftain, simply yielded to the spirit of his countrymen; and Joseph Smith, equally unconscious of the controlling influence of public sentiment, unwittingly becomes the exponent of his age. Colonization takes now the place of conquest. The spirit of adventure, which once clad the knight errant in his steel armor, now pushes the emigrant forth to drive his plough through the broad acres of waste territory which every where on this continent invite his entrance. The tide of emigration continually pouring from the older settlements, soon peoples the wilderness, which begins to blossom under the husbandman. Thus, State after State is added to the Confederation, with a rapidity which attests the truth that empires are now built of colonies; the plough and the loom having supplanted the sword and the battle-axe. It has been already stated that the first developement of the Mormon scheme contemplated the founding of a colony, embracing all the converts to the new faith. Joseph Smith did not, it is true, cast his eye beyond the borders of civilization; which is shown from the tenacity with which the sect clung to their early settlements in Missouri and Illinois. But in every location, the same social organization is preserved; and perhaps a more skilful and re-

fixed species of communism was never projected. The rock upon which socialism usually splits, is the entire denial of individual property. The destruction of this great principle of cohesion disintegrates society, and causes it speedily to fall apart. Joseph Smith has adroitly adjusted these opposite poles of individualism and communism, so that they reciprocally act. A tenth of all property, of time, of labor and of income, is paid into the general treasury, and is expended upon such works as the public interest may demand. Labor is a cardinal virtue of the system; and a drone is driven from the hive by the pressure of universal contempt. While a strict general supervision is exercised over the industry of all, room is granted to individual enterprise by the recognition of individual possessions. The most alluring rewards are held out to the proselytes, particularly to those of the old world. The offer of land for a sum that will cover the cost of surveying and recording, is a powerful inducement to the peasants of Europe; who are accustomed to look upon the owners of the soil as a superior class, into whose privileges they can scarcely hope to be admitted. This will serve to explain in part the success of Mormon missionaries in England and Wales; where the converts are reputed as being many thousands, waiting their opportunity to remove to the Canaan in the far west, which their fancy has painted. No part of this scheme displays greater practical wisdom than the formation of a colony in a country where land may be had for the settling; and the call made upon the laborers, colliers, mechanics, and factory slaves of over-crowded Europe to swarm to the new hive. It was no rude device too, while the temporal advantages are such as to attract adventurers in an age of emigration, to exact such a per centage as should maintain the community; as should bring the whole labor of all under a measure of control; and make each citizen a share-holder in the public wealth.

3. To a philosophic observer, probably the most striking feature of Mormonism, is, *the attempt to realize the conception of a Theo-democratic government.* It is a mistaken supposition that the ground-doctrine of every imposture is necessarily false; it is, on the contrary, oftentimes sublimely true. Indeed, it is this basis of truth which gives

to imposture its formal character,⁶—that specious appearance by which it is able to deceive. Fanaticism looks through a dense medium of prejudice and passion, and confounds the distorted image of truth with truth itself; and totally miscarries in the attempt to embody the speculative truth in a practical and tangible system. The fundamental postulate, for example, of the Fifth-Monarchy men in the 17th century, that God is the true Governor of nations, and the best administration is that which most perfectly conforms with the Divine will, is one of the most unquestionable and sublime truths ever enunciated. But no sooner did they attempt to apply this doctrine to actual life, and to realize the abstract idea in some concrete form, than the grossest fanaticism disclosed itself. The State must be entirely merged into the Church, the magistracy destroyed, the validity of human laws denied; and wholly mistaking the nature of spiritual liberty, they made it to consist in the possession of an inward spirit, wholly irresponsible to civil tribunals. The climax of fanaticism was reached, when they assumed to be the vicegerents of the Deity, and mistook their own lawless desires for “the inspiration of the Almighty.”

The doctrine of a Theocracy is nothing new in the history of opinions. Indeed, the Mormons claim to stand in the same relations to God, as the Israelites under Moses. The civil jurisdiction is in the hands of church officers, from the inferior justice of the peace up to the governor.—The Justice is a bishop of a ward in a city, or of a precinct in the country; the Judges on the bench are constituted from the High-Priests, from the Seventies, or from the Apostolic college; and the highest functionary of the State is the President of the Church, who rules by virtue of his prophetic functions as the seer of the Lord.* It is the revival of theocracy in our country which excites the wonder of the curious. And who can say, but it may be the reaction of mind against the avowed and boasted atheism of our own government? In the effort to put an eternal divorce between church and state, we seem to have fallen upon the other extreme. There is in our constitution a studied silence as to the providence and government

* Gunnison's History of the Mormons, pp. 24, 25.

of God. We do not mean to affirm that Joseph Smith ever reasoned upon this singular defect in our political constitution, and that he brought forward his theocratic doctrine in formal rebuke and opposition to it. There are currents and counter-currents in the opinions of men, the ebb and flow of which may be sufficiently apparent, while their reciprocal influence and inter-action may be wholly concealed. Without taking the shape of a logical statement, the religious sentiment may feel this want of recognition of the Supreme Ruler. If, at a future day, these theocratic pretensions of Mormonism should give trouble to our government, serious persons will scarcely be able to avoid the reflection that somewhat of rebuke, if not of retribution, is intended for practically ignoring the existence and control of Almighty God.

But the impress of the age is most visible in the union of democracy with theocracy; a combination scarcely conceivable, except by minds trained in the political schools of this country. It is very singular that governments the most absolute and despotic are often administered in the most democratic spirit. Strong affinities may exist between rulers and subjects, when the class of the former is continually recruited from the ranks of the latter. In the Mormon scheme, the complexity of its polity and the number of offices open many doors for the admission and elevation of ambitious men: and the absence of hereditary rule prevents that wide interval of rank and intercourse, which obtains in all countries where the government is not elective. The democratic spirit thus pervades a Hierarchy, which, in its essential constitution, is an unlimited despotism. It is, however, an odd application of the democratic principle, which could not have been dreamed of, except in this democratic age and country, that by the vote of his peers a man should be designated to the office of a seer; and thenceforward obeyed with absolute submission, as the oracle by which the decrees of Heaven are infallibly conveyed.

4. Mormonism has been already represented as a relapse into the old civilization of Asia, by the re-introduction of Polygamy, and the consequent depression of the softer sex. We should not omit to notice the bold effort to *invigorate that stiff, inert civilization, by infusing the spirit of*

modern progress. Without wandering at will in the enticing field of comparison between ancient and modern civilization, the terms just employed express the distinguishing traits of the two. The former was stationary, the latter is progressive: the one stereotyped, presenting at all times the same leaden aspect, dull, monotonous and stiff; the other, ever-changing, its elements in perpetual ferment, and marked by new developments as the result of the ceaseless struggle. In Mormonism, we discover at least three influences which made Asiatic civilization so inert and uniform. The first of these is the degradation of woman; for degraded she is, the moment she sinks from the side of man as his friend and equal, and takes the veil of seclusion in the harem of a master, the minister of his pleasures. Mormonism stamps the brand of social inferiority upon her, by merging her, even in the estimation of the Deity, in the person of her husband, and giving her no other consideration save (to use their own scant language,) as she "raises up a holy seed to the Lord."—Thus, by a single stroke of the pen, does Mormonism throw back half the race into a position from which it is impossible to ascend: and to retard the intellectual and moral advancement of those who are constituted by nature the educators of mankind, all history shows is but to lock the wheels of social progress.

The second influence at work in the Mormon scheme, repressing its civilization, is, the merging of the individual into the system; making him, as one quaintly expresses it, only a single spoke in a great wheel; of no individual value, save as he is a component part of a great whole.—We need not pause to show how clear a trait this is of ancient civilization,—the glory and the liberty of the State were the glory and liberty of the citizen: but he had no existence, even in his own thoughts, independent of the commonwealth. We have only now to examine the complex polity of the Mormon government, to see how the ties are multiplied, which bind together the units of society. We have only cursorily to read the history of the sect, to discover how the glory of the Latter-day Church is the attracting power holding each atom to its place in the great orb.

The third element of fixity in Mormon society, is its

theocratic government. In all the past, wherever theocracy prevails, society is benumbed as by the electric touch of the torpedo. It necessarily draws the line of caste between the People and the Priests,—the subject and the ruler. It moulds all classes and ranks after the same artificial type; it represses all those counter-influences which ruffle the face of society, and prevent stagnation; and over-awes investigation necessary to progress, by parading always before the mind its own Heavenly sanctions. "A certain portion of truth," says Mr. Guizot on this point, "is doled out to each, but no one is permitted to help himself,—immobility is the character of its moral life; and to this condition are fallen most of the populations of Asia, in which theocratic government restrains the advance of man." In Mormonism, this influence is rendered more intense by its claim of progressive revelation. Not content with crowning itself with the awful majesty of a Divine origin, it asserts the high gift of perpetual intercourse with the Deity. With all the avenues of private judgement and personal discovery of truth thus effectually closed, the miserable victims of this pious fraud, "*obedientia fracti animi et abjecti et arbitrio carentis suo*," yield in passive submission to the assumptions of a crafty Priesthood, or to the stronger will of a single tyrant.

On the other hand, Mormonism has striven to engraft upon this stationary and inert civilization of antiquity the progress which so peculiarly distinguishes this age of discovery. The most liberal arrangements are made for education. Besides the primary schools under public control and inspection, the outline has already been drawn of a thorough University course. All branches of knowledge are to be taught; all living spoken languages are to be studied; the natural sciences are to be diligently prosecuted; practical astronomy, engineering, mechanics, the science of agriculture,—in short, all that can be learnt, whether for the purpose of ornament or use, are to be embraced in the extensive curriculum of study. A new feature of the system is the institution of a Parents' school for heads of families; so that at no point in life is education necessarily arrested. Even here, however, the fanaticism of the sect breaks forth. Scientific revelations from Heaven are to be enjoyed, no less than religious: and by

this means, as complete a revolution is to be accomplished in the one kingdom as in the other. A new theory of astronomy has already been announced; and the Newtonian theories of gravitation, attraction and repulsion, are already said to be overthrown. In these efforts to suborn and corrupt science into a lying witness for their religion, we see a visible impress of the age upon the system. Here then is Mormonism under a double set of influences: the one setting it to spin and hum, like a boy's top, forever on the same spot; the other sending it forward upon a career of improvement to which there is no goal. Which shall finally be in the ascendant, their Prophet has not told us. Philosophers say that the harmony of the material universe is due to the antagonism of forces; and the adjustment being the product of Divine wisdom, may never be disturbed. But in a system which man has contrived, this harmony cannot always be preserved. Certainly there are warring elements in the Mormon imposture, which must produce a dreadful catastrophe, whenever the balance shall once be destroyed.

5. The last peculiarity in Mormonism which we shall now mention is *its transcendentalism*; though, to exhibit this trait fully, would require a minute analysis of its whole philosophy. As Smith never received a scholastic education, and never enjoyed leisure for general reading, this feature of his system would be utterly unaccountable, if it were not for the silent and insensible diffusion of knowledge and opinion. Those speculations, which can be originated only by minds of the highest order, percolate through others of far inferior grade; until at length the lowest stratum becomes saturated with opinions, the source and compass of which are but little known and appreciated. There are, in the Mormon belief, two self-existent principles: to one of which is assigned the name of intelligence; and to the other, the name of element, or matter. The origin of the universe is thus explained: in the far eternity, two elementary particles of matter consulted together and compared intelligences,—these called in a third atom, and united in one will, became the first power. From this intelligence, a God was begotten. This lays a foundation for one of the prime articles of their creed in regard to God, that he is not "a spirit without body, parts

or passions;" but on the contrary, that he is material, having both body and parts. "It is impossible," says their chief theologian, Orson Pratt, "to show the least difference between the idea represented by *nothing*, and the idea represented by that which is unextended, indivisible, and without parts, having no relation to space or time." Having established this identity of definition, he adds, "therefore an immaterial God is a deified Nothing, and all his worshippers are atheistical idolaters." He presents six definitions, in exposition of his idea of nothing: "Space is magnitude susceptible of division: a point is the negation of space, or the zero where it begins and ends. Duration is time susceptible of division,—an instant is the negative, or zero of duration. Matter is that which occupies space, between any two instants, is susceptible of division and of removal. Nothing is the negative of space, of duration and of matter, and is the zero of all existence." We give this as a specimen of the transcendental reasoning of this school. "In thus identifying the Deity," says the writer from whom these extracts are taken, "with nothing, an instant and a point, the Mormon has reached a conception of the most abstract being, and has made an affirmation of which an Euclid or a Hegel might be proud"—"of being in itself, which is the basis, the boundary, the origin, and the terminus of all; at once the zero of all existence, and the plenum,—and has reached the leading postulate of Hegel, that '*being and nothing is the same.*'"^{*} The reader will not, of course, call upon us to explain anything of all this: how, then, should it be transcendental? It is enough that we call upon him to observe how extremes meet: this untaught school of fanatics in the wilds and fastnesses of the Rocky mountains joining hands with the most unintelligible school of German metaphysicians.

But, if God be material, and was generated, there is no reason why he should not advance from lower to higher degrees of perfection. The reader is perhaps prepared to learn next that God, the Father, like Christ, was once a man upon the earth,—that he died and rose again,—that he worked out his kingdom, and advanced so far in his

^{*} Illustrated His. of the Mormons, pp. 372-374.

faith, intelligence and power, as to become, in comparison with us, the Infinite.* Further, if the Deity was generated, it does not shock us to learn that human souls were not made, but begotten; and that by the same obedience and faith, they too will advance to higher perfection, and at least possess the same dominion, property, power and glory, now enjoyed by the Deity, whose dominion will be proportionally increased: all which sounds very much like the development theory of a certain modern metaphysico-religious school, only a little run mad.

Let us, however, go back for a moment to the seed of all these transcendental notions, the eternal existence of atoms which come together and compare intelligences; and we are thrown again upon the old whimsical theory that the earth is a great animal, endued with life;—only Mormonism goes beyond this in absurdity, and makes it capable of knowledge; and “the earth itself, even its minerals and metals, and all creation is alive.”

The transcendental spirit of this strange system is also seen in their idea of faith, which they consider an attribute of God as well as of men. It is “the will, the principle of action, in all intelligent beings, exercised for acquiring glory and accomplishing holy works.” In the Deity no less than in the creature, it is “the great governing principle, which has power, dominion and authority over all things.”

The next and last peculiar doctrine which I shall adduce, not only illustrates the transcendental tendencies of this superstition, but also the adroitness with which its founder addresses it to the strongest affections and holiest sentiments of the human heart. Starting with the postulate that things earthly are modelled after the pattern of things celestial, he connects closely the two worlds. As long as the probationary state shall continue on earth, there is a corresponding probation afforded to spirits in the other world. Upon this is founded their doctrine and practice of baptism for the dead. The living become proxies for the dead,—are baptized and fulfil all righteousness in their stead. These are hereby admitted to salvation, and are added to the house-hold of the surety at his

* Gunnison: Part i.—Chap. 4.

resurrection, augmenting his train. Naturally, from this view of probation in the spirit-world, flows the doctrine of Metempsychosis, almost in the old Brahminical sense. As the souls begotten of God had originally the choice to remain as they were, or to take a material body, and ascend by obedience to greater glory and power; so, if they fail in the first probation, the soul takes a lower tabernacle, pays the forfeit for its offences, and retraces its steps to celestial glory. It is needless to show how this doctrine takes possession of the sympathies of the soul, at that moment when the rupture of earthly ties causes the heart to bleed, and the remembrance of the dead is a holy exercise of the soul.

We need not enlarge these remarks. Enough has been said to show that Mormonism, not content with the transcendentalisms of its own age, has adopted all the strange dreams of the mystics in past ages. We have the ancient Hindoo myth respecting God and the universe, almost literally re-produced; the gnostic theory of emanations is given us in the generation of human souls; the Pythagorean dogma of transmigration is presented almost without modification; while the sympathy of living and departed spirits, and the attendance of one upon the other, is but the wild notion which underlies the spirit-rappings of the present day. It is, in short, a strange composition of all the pantheism and mysticism in all periods of the world, with a strong tincture of the peculiar metaphysics of the age which gave it birth.

It would not be wholly uninteresting now to scrutinize the tortuous lines in the palm of this coarse imposture, and prognosticate its future. But, apart from the peril that attends all predictions, we are warned by the pages we have already blotted, not to enter upon any new line of thought. We cannot fail to glean, from the rapid survey which this article has taken, the elements of decay which must eventually work its overthrow. The liberal course of education which they are projecting cannot but open the eyes of the inquiring to the extravagance of their superstitions: and the effort to corrupt science, and to push their frauds into the kingdom of nature, must tumble the whole crazy enterprize to the ground. The weakening, too, of family ties, is in reality drawing away the very

foundations and under-pinning of social order. History, when challenged, can give no other testimony in regard to polygamy than that it is a forcing-bed of vice. What institution could Satan himself devise, a surer nursery of crime, than a numerous house-hold, whose members are not held together by ties of natural affection, but rather estranged by the most fierce and consuming jealousies known to the human heart? Then consider the heterogeneous character of the population swarming to this great western hive, from the dark lanes, and crowded factories, and filthy collieries of the old world,—the sewerage and drainings of European population. For a time, an outward pressure will hold those elements in contact; but no sooner shall the difficulties be overcome which attend the subjugation of a new country, than the centrifugal force will be disclosed, and we shall see only the “disjecta membra” of this now rising empire. The consolidation of power in the hands of the Presidency and Priesthood, and the vast accumulation of wealth under their control, cannot but corrupt the government. The absence, too, of all constitutional checks to their power, and the fanatical pretensions to the Divine favour, will render the tyranny at last, only the more insolent and oppressive. It has only to become intolerable, and the day of revolution is at hand.

To these explosive elements within the system, add the immensely powerful influence of this great Republic, in assimilating all the parts, however extreme, over which it obtains control. In this most remarkable and auspicious power, lies the only hope of our government, in its rapidly expanding jurisdiction. The statement was made in the preceding number of this Review, that the United States, with their territories and dependencies, cover an area twice as large as that of the Roman empire, in its palmyest days, under Trajan and the Antonines: and it may assist us to apprehend the vastness of our territorial area, to know that now the United States own not less than one billion, three hundred and eighty-seven million, five hundred and thirty-four thousand acres of public land, to be thrown into market and in some way disposed of. The unwieldy bulk of the Roman empire was one of the many causes of its dissolution; but then Rome gained its empire

by conquest, and held its distant possessions by the strong hand of military occupancy and rule. America, on the contrary, gains her empire by emigration and colonization. New States form with a swelling population, and at once take on a republican government, assimilated to the great model which is before them, and very soon are incorporated into the same. The strength of this moral influence cannot be measured, as it moulds all the communities which organize over the entire continent. Mormonism will soon feel the pressure of this influence upon either side—as soon as States shall form upon the Pacific coast—and insensibly will she catch the spirit, and take the forms of truly republican institutions.

We cannot cast our gaze beyond the Rocky Mountains, and scrutinize the face of society collecting upon our extreme western coast, without a measure of anxiety for the unfolding future. Our country is certainly entering upon one of the grandest experiments it has ever been called to undertake, and is passing through the severest crisis it has ever been made to know. We cannot fail to observe the singular coincidence, that while a bold attempt is made by Anglo-Saxons themselves to reproduce the old civilization of Asia, and while a community has actually been founded upon that basis, a strong and copious tide of really Asiatic population has been pouring into our California territory. Take, as an estimate the fact that within three months of the past year seventeen thousand emigrants from China have sailed from three of her ports, most of whom are discharged upon our coast. What is to be the issue of this commingling of races on this continent? In the language of an American Senator* on the floor of Congress, "the reunion of the two civilizations which, having parted on the plains of Asia four thousand years ago, and having travelled ever afterwards in opposite directions around the world, now meet again on the coasts and islands of the Pacific ocean." Will the issue be in accordance with the fond prediction of the same Senator, "the equalization of the condition of society, and the restoration of the unity of the human family?" Time alone can declare—but we cannot be insensible to the momentous crisis which is be-

* Mr. Seward.

fore us, nor be indifferent, as we see the elasticity of our government subjected to severer tests than its framers ever dreamed. If it shall succeed, by its immense moral power, in moulding and casting to its own shape and form that stubborn civilization of past centuries, which it now touches so closely, it will discover a life which the history of four thousand years denies of every other government—and republicanism will come forth, amidst the acclamations of the world, to receive the chaplet of triumph, which shall forever adorn her brow.

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Pastoral Theology: or the Theory of the Evangelical Ministry.* By A. VINET, Translated and Edited by THOMAS H. SKINNER, D. D., Professor of Pastoral Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of New York; with Notes and an additional chapter by the Translator. 12 mo. pp. 387. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.

The highest proof of interest in a book is that it compels a second reading—the current sweeping the reader on too swiftly for him to pause upon single passages, or to weigh fully the statements which are put forth. Few reflecting persons will peruse this volume without at least marking many brilliant and pregnant paragraphs to which they may recur. We mention as a feature of this work, but not in this instance a defect, its fragmentary character—due partly to the writer's vivacity, which gleams like a ray of the sun from topic to topic—but more fully explained by the fact that the book is really a fasciculus of notes, carefully prepared by the author as the basis of his instructions in the Academy of Lausanne. Perhaps the subjects of Pastoral Theology are better illustrated by these brief but suggestive touches of a philosophical mind, than by elaborate and artificial

disquisition. That offensive minuteness which dissects the pastor's work in its smallest details—that digest of dry rules which robs it of all its freedom, and running its wires through all the joints and articulations of his work, makes the pastor less an actor than an automaton—are both successfully avoided. The great principles which should regulate an evangelical ministry are stated in the pointed, apophthegmatic style, peculiar to the best French writers, and which, with other excellencies, has perhaps contributed to associate the name of A. Vinet with that of Blaise Pascal. The circle of topics embraced in this volume is, however, complete, and the references in the margin show that the literature of this department has been fully mastered. Dr. Skinner has done good service in placing this treatise in the hands of English readers; and the clergyman who will peruse the sections on “the difficulties of the evangelical ministry,” “the signs of a true call,” and “the care of souls applied to individuals,” will not regret his outlay in the purchase of the volume.

2. *Female Piety: or the Young Woman's Friend and Guide through life to immortality.* By JOHN ANGELL JAMES, author of “*the Anxious Inquirer*,” “*Christian Professor*,” “*Young Man's Friend*,” &c. 16 mo., pp. 450. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1853.

This work belongs to that class of practical writings, for which the author is so widely and favorably known. It consists of a series of twelve monthly discourses, first delivered from the pulpit, and now presented in the same form to a larger audience through the press. Some of the topics discussed are timely in this age of female conventions; and if fanatics and radicals did not form the most hopeless class of fools, whom it were useless even to “bray in a mortar with a pestle,” we would recommend the third of these discourses, on Woman's Mission, to those petticoat reformers brawling in their Jacobin Clubs about Woman's Rights. Could these noisy tom-boys hush their clatter long enough to hear this grave pastor in one short sentence, “Wo-

man's position and mission is summed up in two words—humility and love,—they might retire to the modest seclusion of their homes. It were well, if they could attain to that “consciousness of subordination without any sense of degradation,” which we think the author truly represents as pervading the female sex, “an instinct confirmed by reason;” “a law of nature written on her heart, coinciding with the law of God, written on the page of revelation.”

Beautiful portraiture of Scripture female characters, such as Rebecca, Mary and Martha, of Bethany, are interspersed throughout the volume, illustrating its more didactic portions.

-
3. *The Diplomacy of the Revolution: an Historical Study.*
By WILLIAM HENRY TRESCOTT. 12 mo. pp. 169. New York: Appleton & Co. 1853.

We have read with much interest this little volume, which we were induced to take up not only from the intrinsic importance of the subject, but because it is the production of a compatriot, who we are glad to know, has recently been honored with the appointment of Secretary of Legation to the Court of St. James. In commencing what the author modestly terms “an historical essay,” he first vindicates the study of diplomatic correspondence, as forming an important part of the material of national history. He then characterizes the distinguishing principles of European diplomacy, at the period of the American Revolution; notes the influence which this event exerted upon all the powers of Europe, in their respective positions; sketches briefly but clearly the negotiations with France, with Spain, and with Holland—and concludes by tracing the diplomatic steps by which England herself came to recognise the great fact of American Independence.

We have always thought the current American histories particularly barren and defective on these topics; the foreign work

of Botta being the only one which even professes to treat them with any distinctness. There was a gap to be filled; and we are glad that Mr. Trescott has perceived it, and that with such diligent research in the highest sources of information, he has been able to supplement the deficiency. We hope that this admirable little volume is only the first-fruits of contributions he has yet to make to our national literature.

4. *The complete works of SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE. With an Introductory Essay upon his Theological and Philosophical opinions. Edited by Professor SHEDD. In seven volumes. 12 mo., vols. 1 and 2, pp. 484 and 551. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.*

This is presented as the first complete edition of Coleridge's works. Did the Harpers imitate the German style in getting up these volumes, as a symbol of the German cast of metaphysics to be found within? The first of these volumes contains "the aids to Reflection" and "the Statesman's Manual," together with Dr. Marsh's Preliminary Essay, preceded by the general introductory criticism of Professor Shedd, the editor. The second volume embraces the essays, styled "the Friend."

It is too late in the day to pass the writings of Coleridge under review. No modern author has been more sternly arraigned before the bar of public criticism, or has assigned to him a more unchallenged position as one of the great lights of his age. He has exerted too mighty an influence upon the literature and philosophy of the day not to have earned for himself a shelf in every well appointed library. Beyond this claim to regard upon the ground of historic justice, Coleridge's writings possess a psychological interest above any author we can name. Most works give only the matured, concrete results of the author's studies; but the writings of Coleridge give the history of his mind, and conduct us through his processes of thought, while yet in their forming state. Contradictory as he thus condemns himself to appear,

and transcendental as many of his views must seem to sober, English minds, it is a worthy study to trace the action of a great mind working its way to profound results. Coleridge certainly has the merit of a great and original thinker; and his productions, whether or not they satisfy with their teachings, at least stimulate thought on the part of the reader. Upon every ground therefore, we are happy to see this handsome and uniform collection of his writings given to the public. We shall look with interest for the remaining five volumes of the series.

5. *On the Lessons in Proverbs; being the substance of Lectures delivered to Young Men's Societies at Portsmouth and elsewhere.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, B. D., author of "*the Study of Words,*" etc. 12 mo., pp. 140. New York: Redfield. 1853.

Archdeacon Trench is a scholar even in his sports—touching nothing that he does not adorn—exhibiting the same finish and accuracy in his lighter productions which mark his graver. The antiquarian turn which impelled him to "*the Study of Words*" finds scope now in "*the Lessons of Proverbs*;" and the quaintness of the theme, quickened by the freshness of his own taste, imparts a relish to the book. We were most interested in the second lecture, designed to illustrate the remark of Lord Bacon's, that "the genius, wit, and spirit of a nation, are discovered in its proverbs." By comparison of Spanish, Italian, Egyptian, as well as Grecian, Roman and English proverbs, he shows "the innermost heart of every nation speaks out to us." In the three last lectures upon the poetry, wit and wisdom, the morality, and the theology of proverbs, the author's discriminating comments open oftentimes a hidden meaning which superficial thinkers would never detect. It is an interesting fact upon which the author largely insists, that amidst all the duplicity and selfishness of mankind, the immutable distinctions of morality are preserved and imbedded in the proverbial utterances of the race

—the universal mind and heart of man declaring, often to their own ridicule and shame, for truth, and virtue, and justice.

-
6. *A Stranger Here; the Memorial of one to whom to live was Christ, and to die gain.* By the Rev. HORATIUS BONAR, *Kelso*. 18 mo., pp. 411. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1853.

A lively sketch of a young female, of great artlessness yet earnestness of character, who at first threw all her soul into the gaieties of the world, and afterwards with even greater intense-ness into the service of Christ. The peculiar merits of this biography are the simplicity which pervades the correspondence and conversation of this pious young woman, and the dramatic style in which the biographer continually presents. It is not a succession of tableaux in which the heroine appears in motionless attitude—but moving up and down, breathing out an active and ardent piety, in language always naive and characteristic.

-
7. *Letters on Clerical Manners and Habits; addressed to a Student in the Theological Seminary, at Princeton, N. J.* By SAMUEL MILLER, D. D. A new edition revised. 12 mo., pp. 384.

8. *Letters from a Father to his Sons in College.* By SAMUEL MILLER, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. 12 mo., pp. 240. Presbyterian Board of Publication.

We hail with pleasure the re-print, by the Board of Publication, of these valuable letters of Dr. Miller. The letters on Clerical Manners were first published in 1827, and were read with much profit by those for whom they were especially prepared, and by others who had entered upon the duties of the min-

istry. The wise counsels they contain are equally valuable and necessary now. The Letters to Sons in College are also marked by that delicacy of taste and good judgement for which the venerable author was so much distinguished. They should be put by parents into the hands of their sons, whom with trembling solicitude they are committing to the discipline and perils of College life. They will suggest those counsels which are so much needed in that critical period when they leave the parental roof, and enter, with their passions strong and their experience limited, upon the severe trial of principle and virtue to which they are subjected.

-
9. *Historic Certainty relative to Napoleon Buonaparte, and Historic Certainty respecting the Early History of America.* New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 18mo., pp. 184. 1853.

The ingenious author of this little book, understood to be Archbishop Whately, has applied the principles of historic evidence lately deduced by Hume in his Essay on Miracles, and by Strauss in the case of Jesus, to the case of Napoleon Buonaparte. He contends with all the plausibility of the Mythic interpreters, and the entire sceptical school, against the reality of the existence of Napoleon, and the wonderful stories which are told of his victories and his defeats. The whole is accompanied with the ordinary apparatus of learned notes which corresponding arguments against the truth of Scripture, by the modern sceptics of the last century exhibit. The last portion of the book, "*Historic Certainty respecting the Early History of America*," by the Rev. John A. Newlight, Philadelphia," &c., is significantly dedicated to Dr. W. M. Leberecht De Wette, Dr. D. F. Strauss, and A. R. W. Newman. The book furnishes amusing proof that if the principles upon which these authors attack the historic truth of the Bible are right, Napoleon Buonaparte is but a mythic personage, and never existed. The same line of argument has been taken up by Casuar to prove the non-existence of Martin Luther, and by Schmucker to show that William Shakspeare is but a myth.