

**THE**  
**SOUTHERN**  
**PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:**

**CONDUCTED BY**

**AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS**

**IN**

**COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.**

---

**VOLUME VIII.—MCCCCLV.**

---

**COLUMBIA, S. C.**  
**PRINTED BY I. C. MORGAN.**  
**1855.**

AMR  
758

BX  
8901  
S688  
v.8

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

---

NUMBER I.

Article.	Page.
I. Report of a Conference by the Presbytery of Charleston, on the subject of "The Organization, Instruction and Discipline of the Coloured People,".....	1
II. The Unjust Steward,.....	18
III. Religion and Mathematics,.....	27
IV. On the Trinity.—The objections of unreasonableness, contradiction, and the human origin of the word Trinity,.....	54
V. The Poetical Element of the Bible,.....	91
VI. The Authority of Ecclesiastical Rulers,.....	112
VII. Necrology.—Memoir of Rev. James Edmonds,..... Biographical sketch of Maj. John James,	134 141
VIII. Critical Notices,.....	150
1. Views of the Holy Trinity, Doctrinal and Experimental.	
2. The Premium Essay on the Characteristics and Laws of Prophetic Symbols.	

---

NUMBER II.

I. The Doctrine of the Trinity, Practical and Fundamental,.....	153
II. The Living Baptized for the Dead,.....	181
III. The Phases of Society,.....	193

<b>Article.</b>	<b>Page.</b>
IV. The Lunar World,.....	218
V. The Authority of Ecclesiastical Rulers,.....	231
VI. Eloquence,.....	261
VII. Duties of Masters,.....	266
VIII. Life of Archibald Alexander, D. D.....	283
IX. Critical Notices, .....	300
1. Types of Mankind.	
2. Daniel: A Model for Young Men.	
3. Ministering Children: A Tale dedicated to Childhood.	
4. A Manual of Missions: or Sketches of the Foreign Mis- of the Presbyterian Church.	
5. A Notice of the "Types of Mankind."	

---

NUMBER III.

I. Objections to the Doctrine of the Trinity from the Uni- ty of God, as taught in Scripture, answered,.....	305
II. The Psalter of the Virgin Mary,.....	328
III. The Power of Moral Habit, as it affects the power of Faith,.....	335
IV. The Romish Controversy, its present aspect, and the duty of the Church with reference to it,.....	355
V. God's Rest, our Rest,.....	382
VI. Early History of Presbyterianism in South Carolina, .	393
VII. The General Assembly of 1854,.....	411
VIII. Critical Notices, .....	454
1. Life and Epistles of St. Paul.	
2. A South Side View of Slavery: or Three Months at the South.	
3. Synonymes of the New Testament.	
4. The Faithful Mother's Reward.	
5. The Youth's Visitor.	
6. Primary English Grammar, introductory to the Man- ual of the English Language.	
7. Letters of the Madiai, and Visits to their Prisons.	

*Contents.*

v.

<b>Article.</b>	<b>Page.</b>
8. The Captives of Abb's Valley: a Legend of Frontier Life.	
9. The Justified Believer: his Security, Conflicts, and Triumph.	
10. Memoir of the Rev. Joseph W. Barr.	
11. The History of Peter Thomson: The Premium,—The Dying Sheep,—and The Bible the Best Book.	
12. The Baby: Good and Bad Luck,—The Golden Image, and the Star.	
13. Anne Bell: The Hated Task—The Red Berries, &c.	
14. The Pictorial Second Book.	
15. Scripture Natural History.	
16. Witnesses for Christ: or, The Poet—The Hero, &c.	
17. Why will ye Die? An Expostulation with Self-Destructors.	
18. The Story of Nineveh,—Its Greatness and Ruins.	
19. J. H. and his Nurse, and the Child's Prayer.	
20. Devotional Poetry, or Hymns for the Closet, &c.	
21. Thoughts on the Resurrection of the Body.	
22. The Waldenses: Sketches of the Evangelical Christians of the Valleys of Piedmont.	
23. Defence of Denominational Education.	
24. A Review of the Doctrines of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church, &c.	
25. The Influence of Missions on People and Nations.	
26. Study, the only Sure Means of Ultimate Success.	

---

NUMBER IV.

I. The Divinity of Christ,.....	461
II. International Copy-Right Law,.....	489
III. The Early Conversion of Children,.....	497
IV. Bledsoe's Theodicy,.....	516
V. On Elohim as a Title of God, and as Implying a Plurality in the Godhead, .....	545
VI. The Nature and Origin of the Pagan Doctrine of Triads, or a Trinity,.....	560



<b>Article.</b>	<b>Page.</b>
VII. <b>Ambition Rebuked, or Self-abasement and Self-denial the necessary conditions of Greatness in Christ's Kingdom, . . . . .</b>	580
VIII. <b>Critical Notices, . . . . .</b>	598
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. True Practice of Religion : from the Dutch "Shorter Doctrine of Practice," of the Rev. Ewaldus Kist, D.D.</li> <li>2. Hall's Bronchitis and Kindred Disenses.</li> <li>3. Lord's Characteristics and Laws of Figurative Language.</li> <li>4. Koeppen's World in the Middle Ages.</li> <li>5. Coleman's Historical Text Book and Atlas of Biblical Geography.</li> <li>6. Kurtz's Manual of Sacred History.</li> <li>7. Vinet's History of French Literature in the Eighteenth Century.</li> <li>8. J. Pye Smith's First Lines of Christian Theology.</li> <li>9. Leila Ada, the Jewish Convert.</li> <li>10. What is Calvinism? or the Confession of Faith in Harmony with the Bible and Common Sense.</li> <li>11. Adams' South Side View of Slavery, or Three Months at the South. Second edition.</li> <li>12. Trench's English, Past and Present.</li> <li>13. The Remains of the Rev. Richard Cecil.</li> <li>14. The Faithful Mother's Reward.</li> <li>15. Moral and Religious Anecdotes.</li> <li>16. Devotional Poetry, or Hymns for the Closet and the Social Meeting.</li> <li>17. Sabbath-day Readings.</li> <li>18. The Youth's Visitor.</li> <li>19. The Blind Man and the Pedlar.</li> <li>20. White Lies and Little Oaths.</li> <li>21. The Rose-bud, and other Stories.</li> <li>22. The Words of Jesus.</li> <li>23. Presbyterian Tracts.</li> <li>24. Paul's Argument for Home Missions.</li> <li>25. The Rights of the Pulpit, and Perils of Freedom.</li> <li>26. A Letter of Inquiry to Ministers of the Gospel of all denominations, on Slavery.</li> <li>27. God's Way in the Deep.</li> <li>28. A Sermon, delivered before the Brainard Evangelical Society, of La Fayette College, Easton, Pa.</li> </ol>	

29. A Discourse, delivered on Thanksgiving Day, in the Leacock Presbyterian Church, Lancaster Co., Pa.
30. The Attainments of Men in Secular and Religious Knowledge, Contrasted.
31. Fifty Years a Pastor.
32. Proceedings of the Union Missionary Convention, held in New York, May, 1854.
33. Continuation of the Review of "Nott and Gliddon's Types of Mankind."
34. Patience Essential to Success.
35. The Shadow and Sorrow of Savannah.
36. The Inauguration of the Rev. John McLean, D. D., as President of the College of New Jersey, June, 1854.
37. Our Slaves should have the Bible.
38. Report of the Committee of the Board of Regents on the Distribution of the Income of the Smithsonian Fund, &c.
39. Civil and Religious Toleration.
40. The Temporal Power of the Pope Dangerous to the Religious and Civil Liberties of the American Republic.
41. Address to the Ministers, Elders and People of the Presbytery of Baltimore on Systematic Beneficence.
42. Semi-Centennial Celebration of South Carolina College.

# SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER I.

---

JULY, MDCCLIV.

---

## ARTICLE I.

REPORT OF A CONFERENCE BY PRESBYTERY, ON THE SUBJECT OF "THE ORGANIZATION, INSTRUCTION AND DISCIPLINE OF THE COLOURED PEOPLE."\*

At the last meeting of Presbytery the subject of the evangelization of the coloured people was discussed in conference, under the several heads of organization, instruction and discipline. The present report is the result of a motion, by which a committee was appointed to embody the views presented, and the various intelligence furnished during that conference.

The question of the segregation of the blacks from the whites in public worship, was not at that time considered, simply because the policy of Presbytery in that matter had already been settled and openly adopted. It has been the almost universal practice of our ministers for many years, to convene the coloured people into separate congregations and dispense to them instruction suited to their exigencies: and at the meeting of this Presbytery at Barnwell, in April, 1847, a formal sanction was afforded to this practice by the extension of its approval and patronage to a scheme contemplating the establishment of a separate congregation of the blacks of the 2d Presbyterian Church in Charleston.

The reasons for the collection of the coloured people

\* This article is an abstract of a conference had in the Presbytery of Charleston, on the methods to be pursued for the religious instruction of our coloured population. It embraces no authorized deliverance of that ecclesiastical body on this subject, but gives the individual views of the speakers, some of whom have large experience in the matters discussed.

into distinct congregations have been ably stated by Rev. J. B. Adger, in a sermon preached in Charleston, May 9th, 1847, and by Rev. Dr. Thornwell, in a critical notice of this discourse, published shortly after its delivery, in the Southern Presbyterian Review. The want of room in all our church edifices, the necessity of a style of instruction adapted to the capacities and attainments of the coloured population, and their destitute and neglected condition under the pressure of powerful temptations, constitute cogent arguments in favour of the erection of separate congregations for their benefit. It cannot be denied that there are great advantages resulting from the union of masters and servants in the solemn offices of religion,—advantages secured by the conviction produced by this association, of a common origin, a common relation to God, and a common interest in the great scheme of redemption through the blood of Christ. “But the question,” as has been observed, “was soon found to be partial separation or a partial diffusion of the Gospel among the slaves, and an enlarged philanthropy prevailed over sentiment.” It ought to be kept in mind that this separation into distinct congregations does not amount to a compulsory or total exclusion of the servants from access to the churches in which their masters worship. They are at liberty to associate with them in worship whenever they will, while these edifices and religious services, intended especially for their benefit, are standing invitations to those among them for whose welfare no man cares, to participate in the blessings provided by the Gospel. It is also to be remembered that a complete separation cannot, and in fact, does not, take place under this plan, inasmuch as it contemplates the presence of some persons, a measure indeed, made necessary by our civil statutes. As, therefore, servants are not debarred from worshipping at pleasure, with their masters; as it is expected that in all their assemblages, white persons should be present, and as these congregations are served by white ministers, themselves responsible to ecclesiastical courts representing respectively, large sections of the community, it is next to impossible that a *class worship*,—as is frequently objected,—should be the result of the enforcement of

this scheme, or that it should tend to foster feelings of insubordination, and to aggravate the prejudices of caste, by connecting them with the institutions of religion.

1. The topic first in order in the conference, was the best method of organizing the coloured people, so as to secure their spiritual welfare. This subject did not assume the form of a discussion as to the constitutionality of organizing them into distinct churches, containing within themselves, the elements of self-government. It was, however, *assumed* that such organizations would be unconstitutional, and the opinion was advanced that it was a principle recognised, even in the ancient church, that no slave could be allowed to sustain the position of a church-officer, whatever progress he might have made in godliness, and in Christian knowledge. His social position was regarded as a disqualification for the exercise of the functions of government as well in the church as in the State. It is obvious, that even were it constitutional to elevate the slave to office in the church, the introduction of such a measure would scarcely be practicable. The want of social sympathy between the two races, the horror of any step which looks to their amalgamation, and the establishment of ecclesiastical relations between them utterly inconsistent with their social habits, which such a measure implies, constitute difficulties which cannot be removed, and the removal of which, even were it possible, it would not be expedient to effect.

At this stage of the discussion, a question was suggested as to the propriety of permitting informal organizations among the coloured members of the church, and of recognising in any way, officers elected by themselves. On the one hand, if such privileges were granted, the danger arises of their arrogating rights which do not belong to them, and of choosing, through lack of judgment, incompetent spiritual advisers. On the other, if not granted, too rigid a system might be adopted, the effect of which might be to impair the interest of the blacks in our communion, and to drive them into other denominations in which greater license and more immunities are enjoyed.

On this point the following views were presented by one of the members of Presbytery :

“The Scriptures (and our book of discipline,) distinctly recognise all parts of the church as co-labourers. They provide duties and religious enterprizes for both officers and members, and it is impossible to keep a church alive on any other terms, but the providing common objects, not only of interest, but of effort, because the only self-sustaining interest is the active. But our Book of Discipline does not recognise the coloured members as a distinct class, because when it was made their numbers were not sufficient to give the question importance. Now, Providence constrains us to take it up, and the only thing we can do is to affix to the code we have, the dispositions we need, and, as in heathen lands, keep the power in the hands of intelligence, but distribute the duties to all according to their ability.”

The speaker “next entered on the subject of the arrangements necessary to the proper care of the large coloured congregations which belong to our country churches, and referred to his own parish, to show what difficulties in the way of miles and multitudes had to be met. These people need not only instruction and discipline, but especially that third thing which cannot be put under either of these heads—*supervision*. They need to feel that there is an eye upon them always; like children they must be guarded continually, to preserve them from bad habits, bad associates, and systematic temptation. They need a referee upon questions and differences that arise among themselves, a counsellor in perplexity, a friend to warn and rebuke in those smaller matters, which are not open to discipline, but prepare the way for it. Now, it would be an immense benefit, if the masters and their families, would undertake a larger part of this work, if they would use their great personal influence to impress prudence, morality, and piety upon them. And it is a happy thing to be able to say, as we can, that there is progress on this point: more masters care for their people’s souls in this way, than perhaps, ever before. Responsibility ought to lie upon them; it must and will lie upon them for their servants’ intelligence and good character, and no department of family

religion needs more urgency than this. But it would be very hurtful to establish a church relation between master and servant, or constitute the owner a church-officer for his people; and you cannot, if you would, for fifty reasons, of which this one is enough, that only a small proportion of masters are connected with our church. While, therefore, we would have the personal moral influence of the master as great and good as possible, it is out of the question to employ them as the agency of the church.

Can the Pastors and sessions meet this want? The same remarks apply to the session (who are masters, of course,) as to the masters generally. Can the Pastor? Suppose a Parish to be of such size that several lines of road in it are from 15 to 20 miles in length,—that from the most central point you can attain, there are rides of 10, 12, 14 miles to the extreme points, that 40 or 50 plantations are found within it, and a population of 2000 or 2500, among whom 400 church-members are distributed, ranging from thirty on a plantation down to one: Can one man oversee, instruct, visit and discipline the whole, besides writing his sermon or two every week, and performing pastoral duty for the white congregation? No doubt, employing a missionary, if you could get him, would help the matter greatly; and such men should be sought by inquiry and by prayer, that these wastes may be built up. But notice first that a missionary visiting a plantation once a month, a fortnight or even a week, is exercising very little of that supervisory care we have seen to be necessary. He spends his hour or two in exhorting, catechizing, praying with the sick, instructing candidates, rebuking known backsliders, &c.; how shall he add to all this the “giving an eye” to the church members generally? How much supervision can he really bestow? But, secondly, every pastor and missionary knows that one of his greatest difficulties lies in the *moral and spiritual uncongeniality of the two races*. This results in unconquerable reserve towards the white pastors generally, and provokes a most deplorable insincerity as well as reticence in the people.

“From all which it follows,” he concluded, “that you must employ the most intelligent and generally respect-

ed men of colour, as the pastor's assistants. Different minds will portion out their duties differently, and the distribution may be safely left with each church.

The arrangement which he preferred as the result of a short experience is: 1st, to have a 'leader' or 'watchman,' on every plantation; 2d, to have two or three 'helpers' not so locally attached, to assist and supervise the 'leaders;' 3d, to form all these into a class, teach them and receive their regular reports. The object of the first is to get the necessary supervision, and also by making a considerable number of leaders to prevent much pride of office; that of the second is, to give them the best possible advisers of their own sort, and to secure a better knowledge of them and their behaviour, than could otherwise be attained. The third needs no explanation."

The Pastor of the Walterborough Church, whose long experience and matured judgment entitle his opinion to be received with great respect, remarked that "he had introduced and continued the system of 'watchmen,' as an important ingredient in the religious management of the coloured population in our churches, and that he considered *that*, or something analogous to it, as indispensable to the successful culture of this department of labour, at any rate in our country churches." The Pastor of the Edisto Island Church observed, "that in his congregation they had no regularly authorized leaders or watchmen, but expected that the older members on a plantation should exercise a kind of supervision over the younger." On this plan the older members on each plantation sustain, virtually, the position of watchmen; the principal difference between them and those already alluded to, being, that they are not formally appointed and recognised as agents responsible for the discharge of a function to which they have been individually designated, and that it is not required of them at stated periods, to render a report to the pastor or missionary, of the state of those over whom they exercise supervision.

The question of the appointment of watchmen, was at one time, considered by the session of Wilton Church. They were inclined to regard such an appointment as attended with hazard, on account of the difficulty of secu-



ring intelligent and trust-worthy men, and not feeling prepared at the time, to adopt the measure, deemed it expedient as a substitute, to request owners to report any cases of delinquency on the part of their servants who were members of the church. Information, too, they supposed, could be obtained by the pastor in his visits, by inquiries addressed to masters in relation to the conduct of their servants. This plan, however, is attended with serious defects. The masters themselves might not be connected with the congregation, and if they were, might not be disposed to inform a session of the misconduct of their servants; and the impression would be produced upon the minds of the servants themselves, that they are under a sort of espionage from their masters, which would engender feelings of bitterness and jealousy, where confidence and cordiality should exist.

The plan adopted in the Anson-street congregation is, to have several watchmen, to each of whom a book is given, containing the names of a certain section of the membership over whom he is expected to exercise a sort of watch. They are required at stated periods, to meet the minister and return their reports of those thus assigned in part, to their care,—to give notice of any who may have been guilty of misdemeanors, which would make it proper, either that they should be admonished or disciplined, and to give information of any who may be sick, and who may need the charity of the congregation. To meet these last mentioned cases, a collection is taken up at every weekly prayer meeting and distributed to each as his necessities may demand. In this point of view, the watchmen may be regarded as sustaining somewhat the position of an informal Board of Deacons, assisting the missionary in the care of the poor and needy members of the church; a duty which can but inadequately be discharged by the Board of white Deacons attached to the parent church. It may be incidentally mentioned, that although these weekly collections are made up of driblets, they are found to meet the expenses induced by the necessities of the congregation. In this connection, the interesting fact may be stated, that since the establishment of this enterprize, voluntary societies which had previously existed, having for their

end, provision for the wants of the sick and needy, have, in a measure, been relinquished, and the church itself, made the organ for the collection and distribution of a charity fund.

On the whole, in view of the fact that there is, from the nature of the case, a want of free and unreserved communication in spiritual matters between the two races, that there are times when, and situations in which the blacks are inaccessible by the whites, and that their circumstances and conduct can only be intimately known by men of their own colour,—it appeared to be the general judgment of Presbytery that a class of functionaries should be chosen from among themselves, whose office it shall be to assist the pastor or missionary in the discharge of those duties which he cannot with propriety or efficiency perform in person. These watchmen or assistants, (by whatever name they may be called,) might be appointed in such numbers, and distributed in such relations to the body of the members, as to the sessions and missionaries might seem advisable.

It deserves to be considered, whether the sessions of the churches, or in the absence of organized churches, the missionaries should not take the appointment of these men entirely into their own hands. The most godly and intelligent members of the coloured congregation might be consulted as to the best persons to be employed in this work, but their appointment should be reserved for the sessions and missionaries. Thus weak, ambitious, and designing men would, in a measure, be prevented from attaining influence in a congregation, and the watchmen be led to feel that they act not independently, but in direct subordination to authority, and under responsibility for the manner in which they fulfil the important trust committed to them.

II. The topic of *Instruction* came next in order, in the conference, and its consideration naturally arranged itself under the questions: who should be the *organs*, and what the *mode*, of the instruction which should be imparted to the coloured people?

1. On the first of these points, it was urged “that no one from abroad can understand the relation of master and slave, can rightly know what the Scriptures teach

on this subject, or appreciate the nice relations and duties of the Christian master and Christian servant. None but those who are masters can rightly instruct the servant."

It was also contended, "that it has been regarded a disqualification for ordination—and rightly so regarded—if a man was himself, a slave. It was so in the ancient church. [Coleman *Anc. Christianity*, pp. 207.] If a servant was prepared for ordination, it could not take place but after an act of manumission. The slave cannot be employed to instruct the slave, except in subordination to other teachers, themselves having the authority and interests of freemen." This sprung the question, how far the coloured people themselves, and especially the watchmen, should be permitted to take part in religious services? Should they be allowed to read and explain the Scriptures and exhort their brethren, at meetings held for their instruction? Upon this point, the following views were presented. Our religious feelings meet their full and legitimate scope alone through the gratification and development of our *social* constitution; and as it is a well known fact, that the coloured race is eminently distinguished by strong social impulses, as well as by the possession of a large share of the religious instincts of our nature, it would be unwise to impose too severe restrictions upon the exercise of these propensities. Accustomed, moreover, to feel the pressure of authority in the ordinary duties of life, they naturally expect to find somewhat more liberty in those relations which are strictly of a religious character, and will, consequently, seek those communions in which such an expectation is not disappointed. Under certain conditions and limitations therefore, they should be allowed to meet and gratify their social impulses in the exercises of religious worship, in praise, prayer, and mutual exhortation. At the same time it should never be forgotten, that provided these restrictions are just and moderate, they should be observed with firmness, lest a temperate and regulated religious liberty should degenerate into a licentiousness in worship, the prevention of which, our church has ever sought to effect; and which, when con-  
nived at, too frequently perverts the services of religion

into a poisonous aliment, maddening the spirits and producing spasms of nervous excitement, where "peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" should be the result. Especially should municipal regulations and the laws of the State, be observed with care; thus will we, while attempting to compass the highest religious well-being of the slave, commend ourselves to the community in which we live, as the lovers of law and order.

2. In regard to the second point, the *mode* of instruction, what was said assumed the form of a detailed account by the respective members of Presbytery, of the plan actually employed by each, as well as a discussion as to the method which should be adopted. It may be interesting to note these details as they were furnished.

The Pastor of the Walterborough Church made the following remarks: "That when a student at Andover, he was greatly interested and encouraged by the perusal of a document,—so much interested as to record it in his memorandum book, for future use, which mentioned the fact that in some of the Parishes of Ireland, at that time, destitute of churches—of public worship, and almost of the Scriptures, a band of devout Christians formed into a kind of society, went out in little groups, gathering together the poor, illiterate, ungodly, to read to them the Scriptures, and to pray and sing with them; and that the effort was by a gracious, covenant-keeping God, crowned with most signal success. He then based upon this interesting fact, the great importance, in the way of religious instruction, of the simple, solemn reading of the Word of God; and stated it as his sober conviction, that even if nothing more than this were done in the way of communicating Divine knowledge to the coloured people, it would, with the blessing of God, issue in untold good. He stated, that in his own experience, he could testify to as fixed and solemn attention to the devout reading of the Scriptures as to the preached Word, and expressed the apprehension that this mode of instruction, is not adequately regarded by those who have the management and instruction of the coloured race.

He then continued to say that if in the Providence of God, he should be laid aside from the ordinary and higher duties of the ministry, yet should retain the abil-

ity to go and read the Holy Scriptures to, and pray and sing with, the coloured people, he would delight to spend the remainder of his brief, mortal existence, in such employment; and that, being incapable of doing more than that, he would consider his life as not altogether useless, confident that the Lord would graciously accept and measurably bless even that partial effort to do good. His mode of instructing the coloured people, he proceeded to state, was, together with such catechetical information as he was able to give, to take up the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and explain and enforce them in as simple a manner as he could, employing such familiar illustrations as the subject would admit, and as were calculated to strike the minds and touch the consciences of the hearers; and that he had found the exposition of the Parables and the historical parts of the New Testament to afford matter of great interest to the audience.

To that people, too, as a class amenable to authority and to penalties in case of disobedience, and conscious of such accountability and its results, he remarked, the presentation of the very solemn matters connected with the bar of God, can hardly be too gravely or too frequently pressed; it is good to take them often up, with all their dread responsibilities upon them, to the judgment-seat of Christ, and make them *feel*, if possible, their condition as prisoners for solemn trial."

The Pastor of the Edisto Island Church, spoke to the following effect: "That almost at the commencement of his ministry he had adopted the plan of preaching to the coloured people attending at the church of which he had charge, apart from the white portion of the congregation. Those applying for church-membership, were particularly instructed and catechized, the doctrines and duties of religion being explained in the most simple language he could employ. From the time he took charge of his church he had pursued the following course: as soon as the whites of the congregation had retired, he began a regular service for the coloured persons, consisting of reading and explaining the Scriptures, (principally the New Testament,) prayer, and singing. Frequently the psalm or hymn was explained before it

was sung, and their attention called to the importance of feeling, as well as understanding what they sung. He observed their countenances closely, and if they appeared not to comprehend his meaning, he repeated the idea in plainer language, with some familiar illustration. The applicants for membership, have been regularly assembled about one hour before the morning service, and orally taught, catechized from Jones' catechism, to which, he added questions of a practical and experimental nature. This course was continued for a year or longer, until satisfaction as to their state, views, and knowledge, was obtained.

At the commencement of the above course, a certificate of character, and permission from the owner to be instructed, was required. When any were about to be propounded to the session for admission, another certificate was required, stating (as far as the owner knew, and was willing to declare,) whether the applicant's conduct and character were such as appeared to be consistent with those of a Christian. The candidates for membership and the members also, have been encouraged to visit the minister at his house, for instruction or advice, whenever it could be done without a violation of the rules of the plantation."

These narratives may serve as specimens to some extent, of the sort of work which has heretofore, been performed by the Pastors of our churches, apart from the duties which are demanded by the care of the white congregations. It will be observed, that besides preaching and other religious services, particular attention has been paid to *catechetical instruction*, especially of candidates for admission into the church.

But, in addition to these labours of love in behalf of the slave, some of the Pastors of our country churches have been in the habit of going round to the plantations in regular rotation, and there preaching the Gospel and catechizing old and young. This plan is attended with fatigue and exposure, as we have known some ministers after the labours of the Sabbath, to be kept out on account of the distances to be travelled, until a late hour of the night; but it is also accompanied with peculiar advantages to the coloured people. By this means, the

aged and infirm who are unable to reach the church, receive at their own doors, the precious consolations of the Gospel; the children are collected and instructed, and as the white families almost always attend these meetings, the relation between master and servant is rendered more tender by association at home, in the services of a common religion.

The accomplishment of the ends proposed by such a plan must, however, be necessarily imperfect on account of the multiplicity of duties, and duties too, of no ordinary hardship, which are thus made to devolve on a single man. Hence the obvious necessity for the missionary exclusively devoted to this department of labour; and would that all our planters would adopt the course, generously pursued by not a few, of concentrating their means, in order to secure the services of men for this work, in every community. The church at large, too, in prosecuting the great purposes of Domestic Missions, might do well to consider whether a fund should not be raised to assist in the support of such men throughout all her bounds. It is a subject well worth the attention of our Presbyteries. The Methodist Church has long acted on this plan, and no just reason can be urged why our own church should not institute a similar scheme of Missionary enterprise in the coloured field. We cannot but be persuaded that if such effort be made, the requisite labourers will not be wanting. Let the church be faithful in prayer to the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers into *His* harvest, and the waiving grain will not long remain unreaped. It is not intended by these remarks to disparage the past exertions of our church; in a great measure "she hath done what she could," and, considering the number of her ministers, *nobly* done it; but it cannot be denied that a more effective scheme of Missionary operations than that which now exists, is needed to meet our growing light and increasing responsibilities. In this connection, the fact has been mentioned by the Pastor of the John's Island Church, and we hail it as an indication of an interest in this subject which is beginning to be felt,—that the requisite amount for the support of a Missionary to the blacks, within the bounds of his congregation, has already been cheerfully

subscribed, and that they have been able to secure the services of an efficient labourer for this work.

There is one other important aspect in which this subject was considered; and that is, the duty and responsibility of masters and their families, in regard to the instruction of their servants at home. In reference to this point, it was observed, "that the arrangements of the Patriarchal period of the church were clothed with a Divine sanction; and when, as here, the state of society nearly approaches to that, the spirit of these arrangements ought to prevail; that as these households were trained in a knowledge of religion under the supervision of the master, and the master was held responsible, so should it be now. The Pastor is settled over *congregations of families*, and as he strives to secure the religious education of children with the aid of parents, so should he, when it can be done, by the aid of religious masters. He should stimulate them to the putting forth of direct effort, wherever possible; should reinforce their influence by and with his, and also, aim to *supply their lack of service*. It appears to be practicable for the church to train up its servants for God as it trains up its children for God; it ought to aim at this; if she set about it earnestly she might accomplish it; if it were done in the faithfulness of Abraham, domestic slavery would have fewer enemies, as it would be freed from almost all its ills, and attended with much of good to its subjects. It is the only way in which we can *protect and rightly train our own children*, when we also train for God that larger family, in the centre of which they and we are placed." Doubtless, much might be accomplished in this work if the Christian members of each family would but do their duty. Let the mistress, as is often done, collect the children on Sabbath and catechize them, where access cannot be had to public religious services; let the servants be assembled, a hymn sung, a portion of Scripture and a plain sermon be read, and God will bless the almoners of so precious a charity. Much, too, depends under God, on Pastors. If it would be injudicious too frequently to insist on these points from the pulpit, let them in their pastoral visits address inquiries to Christian masters in regard to the measures which



they have adopted for the religious training of their servants. It is a matter of devout thanksgiving to God, that long established prejudices on this subject are disappearing; and that believing masters are gradually coming up to their duty, in respect to the religious instruction of their servants at home.

III. The third and last branch of the subject, was the exercise of discipline in relation to the coloured people.

The opinion was expressed that the same general rules should be observed in this department of church control in reference to the coloured members as in reference to the white; but at the same time, great embarrassment was felt as to a question arising out of the contingency attending the continuance of the marriage relation.

The difficulty is simply this. The law of God acknowledges infidelity to the marriage covenant as the only justifiable cause of the dissolution of the contract. But slaves are sometimes separated by other causes which lie beyond their control. The question is, what order shall be taken by our sessions in regard to cases in which a new marriage is contracted after such compulsory separation? Abstractly, it is one which cannot easily be decided, and great embarrassment was very generally confessed by the members of Presbytery in reference to the subject. Several, however, expressed their judgment of the course which it is expedient to pursue. It was remarked by one, "that in view of the difficulties encompassing the subject, he had come to the conclusion that each minister must, necessarily, act according to his own sense of duty in each case, exercising all his wisdom and discretion with prayer to God for Divine direction." Another observed, "that in his church, parties who had been subjected by authority which they could not control, to a separation which appeared to be final, were regarded in the same light as if they had been separated by death, and were allowed to contract a fresh marriage. Such cases, however," he said, "seldom occurred in the community of which he was a member."

By another the subject was presented in a somewhat different aspect. "The Methodists and some of our-

selves," said he, "have wisely decided that such a separation as the shipping a husband, or wife, or otherwise hopelessly parting them, is a *divorce by the State*, because done under State law and by powers it confers.

The church, therefore, should recognise the remaining party as in a state of widowhood, and permit another marriage. On the other hand, partings for a short distance, and where they can meet at brief intervals and regularly, cannot affect matrimonial obligations. Between these two lie the difficult cases, and these must be judged on their merits. If they could meet once a fortnight, or even once a month, they should be held to their vows and taught to consider it a cross to be patiently borne, a test of social and Christian faithfulness. But if they could not meet oftener than once in six months or a year, with no rational prospect of improvement, he would think he served the cause of morality and family happiness by recognising them as divorced; but then, he would put the party who remained under his pastoral care, on a probation, to save the church from reproach for laxness and weak facility."

It appeared thus to be the judgment of some minds that a compulsory separation is tantamount to a separation by death, and of others, to a divorce by the State; in either hypothesis, leaving the parties free to contract a second marriage. Upon these suppositions, however, it may be asked in what the difficulty as to the exercise of discipline, lies? If either theory be correct, the only point which may present some embarrassment, is merely to determine the fact whether the nature of the separation in each particular case, would warrant its being assigned to one or the other of these categories. That being ascertained, no further perplexity exists. It only remains to regard a second marriage as valid.

It is questionable whether the real difficulty is met by this method of dealing with the subject. Are these theories themselves, in accordance with Scripture? Has even the State a right to dissolve the marriage relation on any other ground than the one specified by Christ? The hypothesis has been advanced that the necessity to which the slave is subjected, by virtue of the providential constitution under which he lives, may place him

under the general operation of the rule by which polygamy was sanctioned in the ancient saints. But the question still returns, is it right to grant a dispensation from the strict construction of the New Testament rule? May it not be that the church ignores the solemn sanctions of marriage imposed under the new Dispensation, and winks at the violation of the Saviour's solemn injunction, "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder?" The Committee would take leave to suggest that there is one way in which the difficulties that environ this subject may to some extent, and gradually, be removed; and that is by enforcing on *Masters* themselves, the obligation to adhere more rigidly to the Saviour's command, and refrain from separating their married servants, except in cases of criminal offence which would justly subject the offending party to a legal sentence involving separation. In such cases, the servant would be precisely in the position of any criminal who, by disobedience to law, exposes himself to severance from his family. In such cases too, the innocent party must be content to bear the separation as a providential discipline. Whatever may be the difficulties in the case of the slave—and they are great—the *duty of Masters* is clear. Let that duty by Pastors in their private intercourse with their people, and especially by our *church courts*, be insisted on temperately and affectionately, but at the same time, firmly and perseveringly, and we may hope for the gradual removal of the difficulties which now create so much perplexity in the exercise of discipline. True, all masters are not Christian masters, and the influence of the church can be directly exerted only on the latter. But could the conduct of professing Christians be made what it should be in the premises, an indirect impression would be exerted on the minds of others, and in the process of time the whole community might be leavened, and a powerful public sentiment established, which would render instances of the forcible separation of husband and wife comparatively rare.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE UNJUST STEWARD.

Luke xvi : 1, 12 verses.

No one of the parables of our Lord has presented greater difficulties to the general reader of the Scriptures. Neither has any met with a greater variety of interpretations. It has particularly perplexed that class of interpreters who delight in particularizing, making every incident mentioned in the parable represent some distinct truth. "In this," says Calvin, we perceive that they philosophize foolishly, who in the parables scrupulously follow out (excutiunt) all the parts." Such are compelled to say who is represented by the rich man—who by the steward—who by the debtors? Also, what the accusation teaches—what the reckoning—what the altering of the accounts—what the commendation? Many of these interpretations are extremely fanciful, and often they indicate great ingenuity in their authors. Our object however, is not to give a history of opinions, but rather to present to the reader the true interpretation of this parable.

In attempting to do this we shall aim not at originality, but at a brief statement and vindication of what appears to be the design of our Saviour in the use of the passage before us.

We believe that the doctrine of the parable is, that we should so use the gifts which God has committed to us, as to secure our own everlasting welfare, or, if this appear too general, that we should use our temporal possessions, which we hold as stewards of God, so that when we die we may have friends in Heaven who shall welcome us to their habitations. "The sum of this parable is, that we should act humanely and kindly towards our fellows, so that when we come before the tribunal of God we may receive the fruit of our liberality."

It is to be observed, that this parable is spoken to His disciples. In the preceding chapter we have three, all

of which were spoken to the Pharisees, and whose design was to vindicate his own conduct. "*The Pharisees and Scribes murmured saying, this man receiveth sinners and eateth with them, and he spake this parable unto them saying.*" Then follow three parables in which his own conduct is most triumphantly vindicated, and the murmurers placed in a most unenviable light. Having finished these, the historian adds, *And he said unto his disciples.* The audience was the same; but he now ceased to direct his conversation to the Pharisees, and turned to his disciples, thus indicating that what was to follow was for their especial direction.

The case drawn is that of a man who finds himself in a position desirable in itself; but he is soon to leave it. He has been *accused unto his Lord*, and he has said, *Give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayest be no longer steward.* He looks immediately to the period which is to succeed his dismissal. He asks, *What shall I do, for my Lord taketh away from me the stewardship. I cannot dig. To beg I am ashamed?* He has no wealth of his own. He has never been accustomed to labor. He cannot consent to become a beggar. His case is truly perplexing. He quickly falls upon a device. He resolves so to use the time allowed him for rendering his accounts, and to take such advantage of his position, as to make the debtors of his Lord his own obliged friends, *So that when I am put out of the stewardship they may receive me into their houses.* He then proceeded to call up the different debtors—how many we know not—gave them back their bills, (or notes of obligation,) and permitted them to return new ones. Instead of *one hundred measures of oil*, one gave his note for *fifty*. Instead of an hundred measures of wheat, another gave his note for eighty. The conclusion of the matter seems to have been, that the steward was removed, and afterwards entertained at the expense of the debtors of his Lord.

These facts afterwards came to the ears of the rich man, and (he, the rich man, not Christ.) *The Lord commended the unjust steward because he had acted (wisely,) prudently.* The translation of this record we regard as very unfortunate. The terms wisdom, wise,

and wisely, are so repeatedly and unqualifiedly used in the sacred Scriptures in a good sense, that the English reader is always perplexed at the application of the term *wise* to the conduct of the unjust steward. He acted with *worldly prudence*, with policy and cunning, and it was for these qualities that his former lord commended him. "*For,*" adds the Saviour, "*the children of this world,*" by whom he means, those who live for the world, and are ruled by its unholy precepts and maxims, *are wiser*, more prudent; study more closely the means adapted to secure the end, and use them more diligently *in their generation*, or perhaps towards their generation,—towards those upon whom their success depends—than the *children of the light*. Men of the world show more energy, skill, and consistency in the pursuit of their chosen ends, than *the children of the light*, the regenerate, do in the securing of heavenly rewards.

Then follows the application. *Make to yourselves friends of—*by means of—*the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail, die, or surrender your stewardship, they, the friends, may receive you into everlasting habitations.* *The mammon of unrighteousness* is the same thing as *unrighteous mammon*.—Verse 11. Many pious readers have here, been greatly perplexed, because they supposed that, by unrighteous mammon was meant gain unlawfully gotten, and that Christ inculcated the use of unlawful acquisitions to further our eternal happiness. The enemies of Christianity, in searching for proof that the religion of Jesus encouraged vice, have rung the changes upon this passage again and again. Romanists too, have countenanced the idea that eleemosynary gifts at the end of life, would make atonement for years of transgression. None of these ideas, however, are really countenanced by the text. Christ never encouraged fraud, and God says, I hate robbery for burnt offering. Unlawfully gotten gain is to be *given back* to its real owners, if possible! So did Zaccheus, the Publican. We believe, and it is a significant and pregnant thought, that Christ uses the expressions *mammon of unrighteousness* and *unrighteous mammon*, just as he does the deceitfulness of riches, and as applicable to all earthly possessions. "He calls them the mammon of

unrighteousness, because he wishes to render them suspected to us, since they for the most part, involve their possessions in iniquity. And although they are not evil in themselves, still they are rarely acquired without fraud or violence, or other immoral acts. They are rarely possessed without pride, luxury, and other depraved affections, and the force of the exhortation is in this, that Christ urges us to use these things, so often the source of evil, for ensuring to ourselves the Divine favor."

The remainder of the passage is an argument urging faithfulness in the use of our temporal gifts, first by the application of a common maxim to the matter in hand. *He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also, in much, and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also, in much. If then, we prove ourselves unfaithful in the use of the least, the (unrighteous mammon,) who will commit unto us true riches or heavenly habitations?*

*And if we have not been faithful in that which is another's, (God's,) the gifts which have been committed to us as stewards, who shall give us that which is our own, that is, the blessings of Heaven which will be finally and permanently bestowed?*

The point of the parable we make to be this, that Christ inculcates the prudent, faithful, liberal use of our earthly possessions, to the end that when we are called upon to leave these, we may have friends in Heaven who will joyfully welcome us to partake of their everlasting blessings.

We are aware that this interpretation is embarrassed with several difficulties, to the consideration, and as far as we are able, the removal of these, we now invite the attention of the reader:

1. Many persons find great difficulty in the fact, that in the wicked conduct of the steward is found an example for the imitation of the saints.

Here we remark, that in drawing his parables, Christ took pictures from real life, not wholly good, but in which there were always mingled shades of good and evil. In each parable there is some grand doctrine illustrated, and the particular application of the parable is indicated by the context, or by the explanation of its

Divine author. There may be some quality in an evil course of conduct, which those who are in the pursuit of good ends may emulate,—for example,—energy, determination, perseverance, or patience. Just as in the parable of the “Hidden Treasure,” Christ says, “The kingdom of Heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field, which, when a man hath found he hideth, and for joy thereof, goeth and selleth all that he hath and buyeth that field.” What we are to learn here is, that the kingdom of Heaven is to be sought with all earnestness, at every sacrifice. The honesty of the man is not presented for our consideration, but his anxiety to possess the field; his willingness to make every sacrifice to attain it. He doubtless did wrong in concealing from the owner the fact that the treasure was hidden there, but this fact but heightens our view of his eagerness to possess it. As that man sought an earthly possession with energy, promptness, and by surrendering all his previous possessions, let us so esteem and so pursue the kingdom of Heaven. The festive scene at the return of the prodigal son does not teach that dancing is right, or that they dance in Heaven, but it is a part of the description of real life in the east, and indicates the joy of the family at the return of the son. So, here it is not the duplicity or injustice of the steward, *but his prudence*. He saw the difficulties of his position, he lived for the world; he was regardless of right; the question with him was, “how shall I avoid the suffering which will follow my removal from office?” He solved the question, and acted promptly. He secured the end. Like him we are stewards. Like him we are soon to surrender our places. Let us look to the future; let us ask what we shall do when our Lord takes away the stewardship? Let us have resources beyond that point. Like him, let us have friends to whom we may look, and on whom we dare depend. Let us make to ourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when we fail they may receive us. Those friends are not secured by wickedness, but by goodness. By faithfulness in that which is least, in the unrighteous mammon, we shall receive the true riches. By the honest and upright use of what has been lent for a time, (*another's*), we may hope to ob-



tain what *is our own*, in the sense that it shall be perpetual.

2. Another, and perhaps a greater difficulty, is the apparent countenance to the doctrine that Heaven may be purchased by money, which is found in this place.

In reference to this, we remark in the first place, that the difficulty is not with our interpretation, but attaches inseparably to the passage. Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail they may receive you into their houses.

There is no fair interpretation of the parable and its application, which does not leave us to grapple with this difficulty. How is it to be met? Is it intended to establish the doctrine of justification by the merit of works, or are we to look upon this as contradicting those passages which teach us that salvation is by grace? We answer, there are two classes of passages in the Bible, each having reference to the great question of salvation, but to different aspects of that question. The questions are, what is the ground of justification? What is the character of those who are justified?

The just shall live by faith. By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified.

“Whosoever believeth on me hath everlasting life.” In reference to the method of salvation, it is clear as the noonday sun that we are saved by grace through faith.

Still, in reference to the character of the saved, the Scriptures no less clearly teach, that their conduct is a matter of infinite importance, and has direct connexion with their eternal state.

The great design of God in the gift of his Son, was to redeem us from iniquity, and purify unto himself, a peculiar people, zealous of good works. The Saints are created unto good works, that they should walk in them. Holiness is salvation. We approach the New Jerusalem as we become like its inhabitants.

Again, obedience is not only the end to which we are called, but it is proof of our justification. Hence, when the Psalmist declares who are the “blessed,” he describes not the ground of their acceptance or religion in its vital principle, but in its external manifestation. “Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the

law of the Lord. Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners." And Christ says, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for theirs is the kingdom of God."

Still further, we remark, that the works of the Saints will be brought into judgment, and these will be the measure of their happiness. Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting. See also, the parable of the talents.

Once more we add, so numerous and so strong are the passages which show the connection between our conduct here and our happiness hereafter, that if they were taken by themselves they would teach that there is a procuring merit in works, especially in works of benevolence. "Blessed is the man that hath mercy on the poor. He that giveth to a disciple a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple, shall not lose a disciple's reward. Go sell all that thou hast and give unto the poor and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven. Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy. Come ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was a hungered and ye gave me meat; I was athirst and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in, naked and ye clothed me, for "inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye did it unto me."

These passages are the counterparts of that on which we are commenting, and when we consider it in connexion with them, and remember that it is spoken to the "Disciples," those who acknowledge Christ as the Saviour, we conclude that to "make friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness" is, *first*, to "evidence our discipleship by our present faithfulness; and second, to honour Christ in the person of his saints, so that we may be welcomed to Heaven by both him and them, saying, come ye blessed of my Father.

3. The sense which we have aimed to establish may be objected to, on the ground that it seems to encourage selfishness. The doctrine is, that we use our present ad-

vantages to secure our highest everlasting welfare. Our answer is, that this is the selfishness everywhere inculcated in the sacred Scriptures. Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy him forever, and this is secured by one and the same course of conduct. The confusion of ideas here, arises out of the nature of a stewardship. In earthly affairs, the steward is bound to consider the interest of his lord. In the parable the guilt of the steward was, in violating his lord's rights,—his prudence in providing for his own. Their interests were not identical, and though "wise," he was unjust. But, in our case, there is no such division of interests. Our stewardship is of such a nature, that our Lord is most honoured when our own interests are best secured, and we do not incur his guilt when we emulate his prudence. The wisdom of the Divine economy is still further illustrated when we consider that our own ultimate happiness is intimately connected with our seeking the friendship of others. The highest policy is the most extended benevolence. The liberal soul is made fat, and they that water others, are themselves watered.

"This above all, to thine own self be true,  
And it must follow as the night the day;  
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

"It is more blessed to give than to receive."

Religion thus comes in to bind mankind together in one universal brotherhood.

We have gone too far now, to enter upon a discussion of the metaphysical question here involved, *i. e.*, whether the essence of virtue is that we lose sight of our own happiness. The Bible teaches otherwise, and while it condemns all those acts of selfishness into which men are led by the deceitfulness of riches, and the love of unrighteous mammon, it teaches that uprightness, benevolence, love, will not only be remembered in the present high enjoyment of those who cultivate these feelings, but that we shall reap in eternity the benefits of a faithful use of our Lord's money.

The fatherhood of God; the brotherhood of men, is the great idea of the Gospel.

4. The last point on which we shall remark is, the

question who are the friends that are to receive us into their eternal habitations. We have made them the persons for whose benefit we have used our possessions. Some have said God, and Christ, and the Angels, who look with favor upon our benevolent deeds, and who alone, have habitations into which to receive us.

This destroys the unity of the parable. It was to the persons for whose benefit he conferred his lord's goods, that the unjust steward looked for a reception into their houses, and it seems to us, *that the friends* whom we are to make by means of the mammon of unrighteousness, are our brethren in tribulation. Many of the saints whom we have it in our power to bless, will go before us. They will enter into the everlasting habitations. These will be "their own." And it is a pleasing thought that they will *receive*, not by authority, but by permission, and with joyful welcome, those that follow after. *In my Father's house are many mansions.* There is room in Heaven for all that shall come, and we believe that the friendships of earth shall not be forgotten there.

When the Christian pilgrim comes to the end of his journey he stands on the confines of two worlds, in each of which, he has friends. The friends of earth stand round him, they minister to the suffering body, they weep around the dying bed, they wrap the cold and stiffened body in its shroud of white, and deposit it in the grave. Meanwhile the spirit has launched away. In an instant it finds itself in new society. The loved and the lost are there. Happy spirits beckon him upward, and as the returning brother is welcomed and greeted at home, so the stranger from earth finds himself at home in Heaven. The Pastor there meets the lambs of his flock; the Missionary those whom he has gathered from among the heathen, and every one who has used in faithfulness his earthly stewardship, will find he has there, some friends to welcome him to their everlasting habitations.

## ARTICLE III.

## RELIGION AND MATHEMATICS.

'Tis a popular error that Scientific studies tend to scepticism; that the mathematician, accustomed to receive only demonstrated truths, cannot readily exercise simple faith in matters of religion. There would be some sense in the objection, so often and so confidently put forth against mathematics, if faith and credulity were synonymous terms, and if the Romish dogma were true that "Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion." But how foolish is the clamor against Science, if enlightened faith must be based upon the conviction of the understanding, and if the evidences of Christianity are supported by precisely the same sort of reasoning that Euclid employs in demonstrating geometrical propositions.

We trust to be able to show that the study of mathematics is an important auxiliary to a sound faith and manly piety. This is our position, and to establish it we will lay down several independent propositions.

1st. The reasoning employed by writers on the Evidences of Christianity, is essentially mathematical, and can be best understood and best appreciated by the mathematician.

Paley reasons in precisely the same way to prove the existence of a God, that Euclid does to show that two rectangles having the same base or equal bases are to each other as their altitudes. Paley does not attempt to prove directly the truth of his proposition; but he shows the innumerable absurdities and inconsistencies which surround the contrary hypothesis. Euclid, in like manner, attempts no direct proof, but demonstrates that the supposition of the rectangles not being to each other as their altitudes, leads to a gross absurdity. The argument of Paley was used long before the Christian era, and is as old as the Science of Geometry itself. We once heard a gentleman, who had occupied some of the most prominent positions in our Republic, say that the argument of Paley was not convincing to his mind. But he was as ignorant of the elementary principles of Geometry as

any rejected applicant for the honors and dignity of the Freshman Class in College. We do not believe that there is a mathematician living, who will not admit that the reasoning of Paley is perfect.

Leslie's "Short Method with the Deists" is as fine a specimen of mathematical demonstration as is to be found in any language. The veriest Tyro in Geometry knows that the reasoning is identical with that employed on the banks of the Nile, hundreds of years before the Star of the East rested over the manger in Bethlehem. The most thorough man of science, with whom the writer has any acquaintance, was converted from scepticism by reading "Keith on the Prophecies"; and he assigned as a reason for being convinced by this book of the truth of Christianity, that the arguments were purely mathematical in their character, and that, as a mathematician, he could neither gainsay nor deny them. One of the most successful writers on the Evidences of Christianity that Europe has produced, is Olinthus Gregory, L. L. D., F. R. S., &c. Robert Hall said of him that "he united the highest attainments of science with the humility of the Christian." The argumentation of such a man is of course terse and mathematical, and is not the clearness and admirable method of his book due in great measure to the habit of close and accurate thinking, induced by his scientific studies? A cadet at West Point was led to read Gregory's Evidences because the writer was also the author of a Treatise of Mechanics, which was then a text book in the Academy. The student of mathematics was convinced by the reasoning of a mathematician, and his troubled conscience gave him no rest until he found pardon and peace in the blood of the Cross. That cadet is now an Evangelical Bishop of the Episcopal Church. Facts are stubborn things; they will not bend to adapt themselves to silly speculations. The two instances just given, of the conviction wrought in the understanding of two mathematicians by close mathematical arguments, are in themselves sufficient to outweigh all the empty theories in the world upon the baneful effects of scientific studies. The *Horæ Paulinæ* of Paley is a mathematical gem; a fine specimen of the kind of logic which geometers call the *reductio ad*

*absurdum.* He shows that there are so many incidental, and as it were accidental, coincidences and confirmatory passages, in the writings of St. Paul, of the truth of the Acts of the Apostles, that 'tis far more absurd to suppose that the Epistles and Acts are the joint productions of impostors, than to believe the wonderful story of the Cross, and God's strange love to guilty man. There is not a mathematician upon earth, who will not acknowledge the force of Paley's argument, but the mere man of letters cannot appreciate it, or feel its power.

It has been our privilege to have had access to many of the standard writers on the Evidences of Christianity, and the reasoning in all is precisely the same as that employed in Geometry. A ripe scholar has said that this brief summary might be made of all that had been written in support of the truth of the religion of Jesus: "the writers of the New Testament were either deluded men, bad men, or good men. They were not deluded men, for the miracles they professed to have witnessed were of such a character as to admit of no illusion of the senses. They were not the tricks of the juggler. A juggler could not have walked upon a troubled sea and calmed its angry waves. A juggler could not have raised the dead and opened the eyes of the blind. The first hypothesis must then be rejected. 2dly. They were not bad men, for bad men never contended for holiness, justice, purity and truth, and sealed their doctrines with their blood. The second hypothesis must also be rejected. The third hypothesis is then established by the negation of the other two. The Apostles, then, were good men, and their testimony must be received." Exactly thus reasons Legendre, to show that if two angles of a triangle be unequal, the side opposite the greater angle will be greater than the side opposite the other angle; for the side opposite the greater angle must be equal to, less, or greater than the side opposite the less angle.—The first two suppositions are shown to be impossible, therefore the third is established to be correct. A little learning is a dangerous thing. The poor buffoon, Thomas Paine, probably knew the difference between a straight line and an angle, and in his scurrilous attacks upon Christianity, affected great veneration for the de-

monstrations of Euclid, and pretended to employ geometrical reasoning in his foul essays. But Bishop Watson exposed the sciolism of the creature, and demonstrated to the world that the obscene wretch knew more of vulgarity than of Euclid.

2d. The peculiar habit of thinking, induced by mathematical studies, is favourable to the reception, without cavil or gainsaying, of the incomprehensible doctrine of the Christian religion.

The mathematician is accustomed to acquiesce in any conclusion, to which he is legitimately led, by his scientific investigations; whether that conclusion conflict with his previous opinions, or even, apparently, with the evidence of his senses. The simple question with the man of science is, "have I reasoned correctly from correct data?"—satisfied, on these two points, he unhesitatingly accepts the result as true, though he may not be able to understand it in all its bearings and relations. Thus, he believes as firmly as in his own existence, that two columns of water, having the same base and the same altitude, will exert the same pressure upon that base, and lift equal weights; though a pint cup be capable of containing one column, and the bed of the Pacific be too small for the other. The thing seems absurd and impossible, but he has no doubt of the truth of the paradoxical conclusion to which he has been led, because he knows that he *has reasoned correctly from admitted facts*.

Nor is his belief merely speculative, accepting the conclusion as undoubtedly true, though mysterious and incomprehensible, he has gone to work and constructed a machine, (Bramah's Press,) which, in the hands of the greatest Engineer of his age, was used at the Menai Straits in raising masses of iron, far exceeding in weight the heaviest stones in the pyramid of Cheops. 'Tis impossible for any man, not absolutely an Atheist, to become entangled in the meshes of Deism, Pantheism and other forms of Infidelity, who will manifest in the search after Eternal truth, the spirit, which, as we have just seen, is exhibited by the philosopher in his mathematical investigations. Let his data be, the existence of a God, and the necessity of a revelation of God's will and character to his rational creatures; reasoning mathe-



matically upon these premises, he will be convinced that the Bible is that revelation; then, if he acts as the mathematician, he will receive the whole as true, though there be many things that he cannot understand, many that are contrary to his preconceived notions, and some even that seem impossible.

We showed in our first proposition, that the Mathematician must abandon his own principles and mode of reasoning, before he can become an Atheist; because the existence of a God has been again and again demonstrated in a strictly mathematical manner. Our second proposition establishes that the Mathematician can only reject the Bible, by being grossly inconsistent with himself, and by doing violence to his peculiar habit of thought. It follows, then, that the man of true science, of all men in the world, ought to be the least liable to fall into scepticism. We will show hereafter, that the facts agree with this conclusion, and that in every age of the Church, since the man of Calvary cried "it is finished," upon the cross, the profoundest mathematicians have been his most humble and devoted followers. It can not be otherwise: the difficulties of the Bible, which prove stumbling blocks in the path of the *belles-lettres* scholar, are no impediments to the faith of the devotee of science. He has become accustomed to them in his daily pursuits, he has learned to reject false reasoning, but, at the same time, not to be startled by strange and even incomprehensible conclusions.

Our position is not a novel one: our views are not new. Dugald Stewart said thirty years ago, "Mathematicians have been led to acquiesce in conclusions which appear ludicrous to men of different habits." Let us examine some of these conclusions, to which the great metaphysician alludes, and see whether the mathematician can, with any sort of consistency, throw away the word of God because of its incomprehensible doctrines.

The time was, when sciolists attacked Newton's Doctrine of Fluxions, the Calculus of Leibnitz; but now, even that most impudent class have not the hardihood and effrontery to say a word against that great invention, which, says Herschel, "enables the mathematician

to think in another language, and to arrive in a moment at results, that can only be reached by any other process after years of painful investigation." The truth of the Calculus none now doubts, but who can comprehend some of its teachings? An infinite area, enclosed between a straight line and a curve, whose equation is  $y^2 = \frac{1}{x}$ , is shown by the method of quadratures to be equal to a square whose surface is 2. The finite equal to the infinite! Does the mathematician reject the conclusion because he cannot understand it? Not at all. Does he throw away his Treatise on Fluxions and pronounce the whole false? Not at all. How then, can he, with any sort of propriety, reject the Bible, because he cannot understand the doctrine of the Trinity, or the Divinity of the lowly Nazarene?

Again. Newton regarded all lines, whether straight or curved, as having been generated by the motion of a flowing point. Thus, to illustrate his meaning, a point, moving or flowing with the condition of being in the same plane and always at the same distance from another point, will generate the circumference of a circle. He also considered lines, straight and curved, as the generatrices of surfaces, and surfaces, in their turn, the generatrices of solids. The point, then, is the source of all lines, surfaces and solids; the flowing point generates all geometrical bodies. This was Newton's theory, and he made it the basis of the Doctrines of Fluxions and Fluents, so called from this very fact. Now, a geometrical point is an ideal thing, "it has neither length nor breadth, but position only." So, then, an immaterial thing is the ultimate source of all geometrical magnitudes!

When Euclid was asked by Ptolemy, King of Egypt, if the science of geometry might not be made easier, he replied, "there is no royal road to geometry."

There was no royal road then, but more than fifteen hundred years after Euclid, Francis Vieta found in Algebraic Analysis a royal road to Geometry which even the weakest king may walk in. He showed that the most difficult problems of Geometry could be solved by a few simple operations upon an equation. Analytical Geometry became a science, and has claimed the admi-

ration of the greatest mathematicians for more than five centuries. But do not some of its conclusions appear absurd? Parallel lines, and none but parallel lines, are shown to meet in infinity; the asymptote is not parallel to, yet it meets the hyperbola in infinity. The Hyperbolic spiral is generated by a point, which starts in infinity and eternally approaches toward another point, every moment becoming nearer and yet never reaching it. The shorter the supplemental chord of the eclipse is made, the greater becomes the angle between it and the transverse axis, and finally when the chord is reduced to a point, the angle becomes equal to ninety degrees. Then the angle between a point and a straight line is a right angle! How absurd! But who, so silly as to abandon Analytical Geometry, because of its incomprehensible truths? At every step in mechanics, astronomy, and the higher mathematics, the scientific scholar meets with results which appear absurd, irreconcilable and impossible. Still his faith in science is not shaken, his devotion is not weakened. How is it possible then, for him to reject the Bible, because of its mysteries? 'Tis nonsense to suppose it. True science never yet made one sceptic. Love of sin has made thousands. If Laplace and a few other mathematicians were infidels, 'twas not because of their scientific attainments, but because their corrupt hearts hated the Book that taught, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

3d. Mathematical studies sober the fancy, and tend to repress wild, foolish and extravagant speculations.

Next to the aversion of the corrupt heart to holiness and truth, the greatest enemy with which Christianity has had to contend, since its first promulgation by the Son of God, has undoubtedly been the speculations of Philosophers, "falsely so called." Speculation has slain its thousands, and love of sin its tens of thousands. The philosopher *first* makes his theory about the age of the world, the unity of the human race, the moral right of involuntary servitude, etc., and *then* examines his Bible, to see whether its infallible teachings accord with his silly vagaries. Finding nothing in its holy pages to pamper, and everything to rebuke, the wild riotings of his imagination, he rejects God's inestimable word, ra-

ther than abandon his worthless theory. It was so in the days of the Apostle, and he raised his warning voice against "the opposition of science falsely so called,"—it is so now, it will always be so. Thus the sickly sentimentality of the abolitionist leads him to fancy that God created all men free and equal, and finding that he cannot bend and twist the plain instructions of the Bible to harmonize with his notions, he throws away that which ought to be "a lamp to his feet and a light to his path," as the "device of men's hands." The anti-slavery men of the North are, accordingly, infidel in heart, speech and behaviour. The mathematician pursues an entirely different course from that adopted by the weak, drivelling dreamer. The former does not, like the latter, begin with his theory, and bend facts to suit that theory, but starting with a few well-established or self-evident truths, he reasons logically upon them, and then accepts the conclusion, to which he is led, as unquestionably true, though it may be strange and incomprehensible, and even contrary to his expectations. The latter may be capable of reasoning upon the same premises, but he will not believe in the truth of the result, unless it agree with his pre-formed theory. The abolitionist, the speculative inquirer, will admit that there is no flaw in the argument by which the Bible is proved to be the Word of God, but he will not receive it as such, because some of its teachings are plainly in opposition to his preconceived fancies. The true man of science, unless his understanding is darkened by sin, cannot be led astray by speculation. He will say to the man in the clouds, "Sir, your theory is beautiful, charming, enchanting, but how did you construct it? by what train of thought did you arrive at it? where are your data?" We have heard of a good old elder, in the county of Rockbridge, who said, "I am not afraid of the New-light Preachers, I try all their sermons by the Shorter Catechism, and write *Mene: Tekel: Upharsin*, upon those that do not agree with it." Though we belong to the school of blue-stocking Presbyterians, we think that the venerable deacon might have gone further and brought all suspected doctrines to the test of the Scriptures of truth. At any rate, he had his guide. So it is with the mathematician. He brings

all speculation to the test of the data, and of the reasoning upon that data. Not a fragment, not a shred, of an infidel theory will be left, after passing through so fiery an ordeal. No wonder that Rousseau hated mathematics, and that in writing against science, he infused into his style some of that bitterness, which his colleague, Voltaire, poured out in his celebrated circular to the infidels of France, ending in these words, "spare no pains, leave no effort untried to crush the wretch." [It is scarcely necessary to say that the wretch alluded to, was he, who lived a life of suffering, and died a death of shame to save guilty man from a world of endless woe.] Rousseau well knew that his sneers at Christianity could have no weight with a well-trained mathematician, accustomed to deal in arguments, and that his crude, ill-digested, ever-shifting theories, upon the relations of the creature to the Creator, however they might please the idealist, could make no impression upon the man of science, who had long relied upon judgment rather than fancy. Nor was Rousseau wrong. All the world knows that the heaviest blow infidelity has ever received, was inflicted by the inductive philosophy of Bacon, a man as preëminent in mathematical attainments as in the other departments of knowledge. And what is the inductive philosophy, but the application of mathematical reasoning to any subject under investigation? An eminent British Essayist has said that for centuries previous to the Baconian era, the world made but little progress in true knowledge. 'Twas a period of doubt, conjecture, scepticism, infidelity; the human mind was tossed upon a troubled sea of visionary speculation. More advances have been made in the arts and sciences, and in all that conduces to the well-being of man, in a quarter of a century, since the general adoption of the inductive philosophy, than were made for hundreds of years before.

We do not wish to be misunderstood. We are far from thinking or maintaining that mathematicians alone apply the inductive method of reasoning, and we are still farther from supposing that all, who have not had their fancy crushed out by the tread-mill of mathematics, are disposed to speculative inquiry. But we do contend

that men, who are accustomed to receive only demonstrated truths, are not liable to be misled by a fanciful theory, and that men, whose pursuits call for the exercise of the reasoning faculties only, are not apt to give the reins to imagination. Thus mathematicians are rarely capable of producing, or even of relishing poetry. Since the world was made, there never was an epic produced by one of the class; and Playfair, we believe, was the only man of science for three centuries, who could write a sonnet to a lady's eyes. Now, if it be true that the imagination of the mathematician is in abeyance to the reasoning faculties, and if an excess of imagination be unfavorable to religion, it follows that mathematical studies tend to promote rational piety. None will question that mathematicians have but little imagination. We then only have to examine the effects of letting loose the reins of the fancy.

Iræneus tells us in so many words, that the great Gnostic heresy, in the primitive ages of the church, was the natural fruit of letting the imagination run riot, and that their doctrine of *eons*, spiritual emanations, was the offspring of a diseased fancy. Bishop Watson, in his reply to Gibbon, says, in speaking of modern infidels, "they are all miserable copiers of their brethren of antiquity; and neither Morgan, nor Tindal, nor Bolingbroke, nor Voltaire have been able to produce a single new objection not advanced by the Gnostics." Now, if Iræneus and the Bishop are right, the unchecked fancy has been the source of most of the heresy and scepticism in the world. They are high authority, and here we might rest the matter, but a few more facts will strengthen our position. Hume, says his biographer, was led by his fondness for speculation, and his love of applause, to attempt the subversion of all that the Christian holds sacred. He doubted everything, and then doubted whether he doubted. And thus he floundered in the meshes of speculative philosophy, till death and the realities of eternity solved all his doubts. Bishop Berkely wrote an essay against mathematics, and a treatise on mental science. And what has the world gained by the teachings of the hater of mathematics? Why, it has been taught

that all is spirit, and that there is no matter in the universe.

“When Bishop Berkely said ‘there was no matter,’  
‘Twas no matter what he said.”

But there is this much matter in his foolery. It shows what a dangerous thing an unrestrained imagination is, when it can make even a learned prelate rave like a maniac. Lord Monboddo was deficient in mathematical attainments, but eminent as a Greek scholar and metaphysician. He believed that man was but an elevated species of monkey, an improved edition of the orang outang. Had the theorist been a better mathematician, he would have known that the converse of a proposition is often true, when the direct proposition is false. That though monkeys never rub off their tails and attain to the dignity of the lords of creation, yet the ingenious speculator, and thousands of others like him, have put on the airs and grimaces of the ape, and degraded themselves to the level of the baboon. Other theorists, equally as wise as Lord Monboddo, have supposed that a man was a compound of the whole animal creation, and that the predominance of any one animal determined the character of the individual. Thus the mean man has the dog in excess, the rude man too much bear, the slovenly man too much hog, &c., &c.; thus too, old maids have invariably, either the lamb or the viper, out of all proportion to other ingredients in their composition.

Such have been the follies, into which the greatest intellects of the world have fallen, when they let their fancy go unchecked. Ought we not to be thankful that there is a class of men, in whom, reason always sways the imagination? Are they not, of all men in the world, the least liable to fall into scepticism, and most apt to relish the sober teachings of the word of God?

4th. Mathematical studies give the mind something certain to rest upon, while other studies lead it into a labyrinth of perplexity, bewilderment and confusion.

The mathematician deals in certainties. There is no doubt, no mystery, no ambiguity, no variation, in the great principles which govern him; he feels that they

are under the immediate control of Him, with whom "there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Uncertainty belongs to everything else, history, philology, metaphysics, geology, chemistry, etc.; "the trail of the serpent is over them all," the father of lies has tarnished everything bright and beautiful about them. But the spirit of immutable truth presides over all the investigations of the devotee of science. He can arrive at the same great results, not only by a hundred independent routes, but by a thousand by-paths. Thus, there are more than a hundred direct demonstrations of the square upon the hypotenuse, and yet the truth of the theorem may be made to appear as a consequence of innumerable other propositions in geometry. It can be deduced, for instance, from the properties of similar triangles, and from the area of a triangle in terms of its sides. So, too, the truth that the two tangent lines, which can be drawn to a circle from a point without, are equal in length, may be shown also from the relation of secants to their external segments, or from the relation of a tangent to the whole secant and its external segment. Likewise, the measure of the surface of a sphere may be deduced from that of a zone, and the measure of a solid sphere from that of the spheric segment. Similar remarks may be made of every proposition in Euclid or Legendre. But not only do mathematical truths admit of innumerable direct and indirect demonstrations, in the particular branch to which they appropriately belong; they are moreover confirmed and verified by every other branch of the science. Thus, in arithmetic, the product of two numbers, whose sum is fixed, may be shown to be the greatest possible, when the numbers are equal. Suppose the sum of the numbers to be 10, the numbers themselves may be 1 and 9, 2 and 8, 3 and 7, 4 and 6, or 5 and 5; and it will be seen that the product of 5 by 5 is greater than the product of either of the other sets. The same truth is more rigorously demonstrated in Algebra; it has been elegantly proved by Hutton in his *Isoperimetrical Geometry*, and by Newton in his *Maxima and Minima*, and has been used by Vauban in determining the proper form for field and permanent fortifications. Some 250 years ago,



Cavallieri, an Italian, discovered that the sum of the squares, of all the numbers between 0 and H inclusive, could be truly expressed by

$$\frac{2 H^3 + 3 H^2 + H}{6}.$$

Suppose, for example, we wish to find the sum of the squares between 0 and 4 inclusive, make  $H=4$  in the above expression, and you will find the sum equal to 30, which agrees with the fact. Here is a simple application of the formula in arithmetic, but it has been used by algebraists in the solution of their most difficult problems, and by geometricians in the determination of the measures of all known surfaces and solids. The formula, too, in all probability, suggested to Newton the beautiful principles of the calculus. Here is something stable to rest upon. The seal of truth has been set to the expression of Cavallieri. It has been tried a thousand times in arithmetic, algebra, geometry and calculus, and been found to give true results. Does it work by blind chance, or does it obey Him who changes not? Again: Euclid, Pappus, Archimedes, and other ancient geometricians, determined the measures of most of the geometrical bodies. Newton's method of quadratures and cubatures gives identically the same measures, but the process, by which they are found, differs in toto, not only in elegance but in ease. Subsequent to the discovery of Newton, the centro-baryc method was introduced, and was found to give the well-known measures in a moment.

An elementary demonstration in algebra establishes that a quantity changes its sign in passing through zero and infinity. This truth appears on almost every page of algebra, is of frequent application in geometry, is verified by the algebraic analysis of Vieta, and is constantly acknowledged in natural philosophy and astronomy. But the most beautiful illustration of it is in optics, where it is shown by experiment as well as theory. An object placed on the prolongation of the radius of curvature of a convex reflector, will give an image between the reflector and centre of curvature; advance the

object towards the reflector, the image will recede from it, and when the object reaches the principal focus, the image will disappear into infinity. Continue to advance the object towards the reflector, the image will return and be seen on the other side, and is erect now, whereas it was inverted before. It has passed through infinity and changed its sign and character.

For the last 150 years, the calculus has been used, among other things, to demonstrate propositions which had been proved during the space of 100 years previous, by the method of indivisibles, and this method itself, took the place of the method of exhaustions, that had been used for 2,000 years. The results obtained by the three methods are precisely the same. How often has the thought occurred to ourselves, and surely to every student of mathematics, that the great truths of science, which have been demonstrated in so many different ways, during so many ages, have remained invariable, because established by Him with whom "one day is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day." There is but one step between faith in the laws and faith in Him who established those laws. Well was it said, "the undevout Astronomer is mad." Well may it be said, the undevout mathematician is a sin-hardened fool. Surely the study of science, upon which God has stamped his own unchangeable character, must fill the mind with reverence for the being "who is, and was, and is to come." The soul of the heathen geometrician was elevated as he contemplated the grandeur of his subject, the certainty of its results, and the uniformity of its laws, and turning from his fabled Isis and Osiris, he exclaimed in devout rapture, "God works by geometry." There is something so sublime in the certainty of science, that the mind of the student will be almost unconsciously divested of its proneness to doubt and scepticism, and be lifted up in reverential admiration of the Great Unknown, who has said of himself, "I change not." How implicit must have been the confidence of Halley, in the unchanging nature of the laws of science as regulated by this unchangeable Being, when he predicted the return of his comet in 75 years, though the hand that traced the calculation of its elements would

be dust and ashes long before that period. Le Verrier had the same confidence when he wrote from Paris to a friend in Berlin to turn his telescope to a particular part of the Heavens, and there he would find a planet 3000 millions of miles from the earth, which no mortal eye had seen, but which he knew to be there *from the calculations of his closet*.

Surely it is the supreme of folly to say that the man is prone to unbelief, whose daily studies promote confidence and trust. As well may it be said that the child will be prone to falsehood, who has been brought up in an atmosphere of truth. All the world knows that the reverse is the case, that lying parents have lying children. So too, the studies that are surrounded with contradiction and uncertainty promote doubt, scepticism, and infidelity. Let us examine these studies, and see what effect they leave upon the mind.

*History.* Herodotus, the oldest Greek historian, has been called the father of history, and also called the father of lies. Tacitus, the most eminent Latin historian, received from Tertullian the appellation, "Mendaciorum Loquacissimus," (the most babbling of liars.) Seven cities claimed to be the birth-place of Homer, and many deny that Homer ever lived. For two centuries, the world believed that Shakspeare stole deer from the park of Sir Thomas Lucy, but the whole story has lately been discredited. The Pictorial History of England represents "Bloody Mary" as a fiend incarnate; Lingard, the Catholic historian, depicts her as an angel of light. Macaulay describes William Penn as a monster, the Quaker writes as inferior only to Paul in courage, constancy and purity. Robertson rejected as fables the histories of the elegant De Solis, the stout old Bernal Diaz, and the graphic Cavligero; Prescott has literally transcribed the same histories in his Conquest of Mexico. The Naval histories of Cooper and James agree in but two particulars, in the name of the vessels engaged, and in the names of their commanders. They disagree in regard to the size of the vessels, the rate of their guns, the number of killed and wounded, the mode of conducting the engagement, &c. The Napoleon of Las Casas has not a shade of character in common with

the Napoleon of Walter Scott. When the American army entered the Mexican Capitol, they found from the Mexican records, that the Americans had been badly beaten everywhere. The common people could not understand why it was that "Los Yankees" would not stay whipped. These facts are sufficient to show that the study of history must impair confidence in human testimony. Doubt is like "the letting out of great waters," its devastation is at first slight, then greater and greater until it overwhelms all that is lovely beneath its surging waves. Doubt about history, and you are prepared to doubt the testimony of the Evangelists. Suspect one man, and you will be ready to be suspicious of all men.

*Philology—Grammar.* What a vast field of doubt opens before us here. What contradictory folios about the force of a Greek particle and the root of a Latin word. How infinite the translations of the same passage, and how much learned quibbling about its hidden meaning. We have arbitrary rules of writing and pronunciation to-day, which will be rescinded to-morrow. Change, doubt, and uncertainty beset the poor scholar on every side. Death, with its awful terrors, cannot, at its approach, divest him of his perplexity. "I die," said the learned grammarian, but doubting whether he had expressed himself correctly, he immediately added, "or am dying." We will describe you, grammarians and linguists, in the language of an old writer, as men "doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, &c."

*Metaphysics*, with its mist and fogs, has enveloped in its murky folds a multitude of the gentlemen of doubt and scepticism, Hume, Adam Smith, Chubb, Bolingbroke, Descartes, &c. &c. Wisely did the Scotchman say, "when the party, who hear, dinna ken what the party who speak mean, and when the party, who speak, dinna ken what they mean themselves; that is *Metaphysics*."

*Geology*, had its Wernerian and Huttonian theories, and now has its internal heat and its chemical theories. These to-morrow are to give way to others equally as wise and equally as transient. A science that is "wise above that which is written," may yet give way to Moses and the Prophets.

*Chemistry.* That which is learned to-day must be unlearned to-morrow. The theory of material particles of light has given place to the theory of undulations, which nobody understands. The two theories of light have still their advocates and partizans. Electricity has been explained in divers and sundry different ways, all equally satisfactory to the explainers.

We conclude, then, that though a knowledge of history and languages be essential to the scholar, and even to the refined and polished gentleman, and though metaphysicians be necessary to impart acumen and vigor to the mind, and though it be impossible to understand the phenomena of nature without acquaintance with chemistry; yet the study of none of these can have the same religious tendency as the study of the only thing which resembles the Creator, in truthfulness and unchangeableness.

We have now given four substantial reasons to prove that mathematical studies are well calculated to promote a sound faith and rational piety: 1st. That mathematicians are more familiar than other men, with the kind of reasoning employed in demonstrating the existence of a God, and in establishing the great truth that the Scriptures are the word of God, and that, as a consequence of this familiarity, they are better prepared to appreciate this peculiar kind of reasoning: 2d. That mathematicians, continually meeting with incomprehensible and apparently impossible facts in their investigations, would not be so likely as other men to reject the Bible, because of its mysteries, and because its teachings conflicted with pre-conceived notions: 3rd. That mathematicians were not apt to give the reins to the fancy, and to indulge in that extravagant speculation, which has made so many infidels, fools and madmen: 4th. That the implicit confidence of the mathematician in the truth of all his results, is favourable to unwavering faith, and well calculated to remove doubt and distrust, the sure fore-runners of scepticism and despair. To these four propositions, which we endeavoured to establish by facts and arguments, we will add a fifth, without however intending to discuss it, because its truth will be universally admit-

ted. 'Tis this : a profound knowledge of mathematics always produces a spirit of modesty and humility, eminently adapted to receive the doctrines of the lowly Nazarene. This cannot be otherwise. The mathematician feels every day the limit of his power. He has done a little, but the infinite remains untouched ; he has thrown up his little mole-hill, but it is at the foot of the mighty Alps. For three centuries the world has made no advances in the solution of equations. No general rules are known for solving an equation above the fourth degree. Numerical equations of high degrees can be solved in particular cases, but we have arrived no nearer a general solution than did Tartaglia and Cardan, in the sixteenth century. The softest Freshman can propose an equation that the greatest mathematician living cannot solve. How, then, can the Algebraist be proud of his powers ? The geometrician must be equally humble. The trisection of an angle, the duplication of a cube, the quadrature of the circle, are problems which have been tried again and again for more than two thousand years. Robert Simson was probably the greatest geometrician the world has ever produced, but any stupid boy, who had just taken in the conception of an angle, could have proposed to him a problem which his geometry could not reach. Mere smatterers in science may be vain and conceited, but the profound scholar has been too often baffled and foiled in his efforts to feel otherwise than humble. Thus Newton said, "that when he compared his attainments with what yet remained to be learned, he felt like a child picking up pebbles on the sea-shore, with the vast ocean of truth before him." Laplace, when congratulated upon his vast stores of knowledge, replied, "what I know is little, what I do not know is immense." John Bernouilli was more honoured and flattered than any sovereign in Europe, and yet he had the modest simplicity that old writers tell us used to be the characteristic of children. Compare the humility of these men and that of all eminent mathematicians with the insolence of Voltaire, the vanity of Rousseau, the arrogance of Gibbon, the conceit of Hume, the coxcombr of Byron, Bulwer, etc. The feeling with literary gentlemen

is too often "we are the people, and wisdom shall die with us." And this feeling they are by no means careful to conceal.

We will now leave our five propositions to fall by their weakness, or stand by their strength, and come to *the indebtedness of religion to science*. The observed acceleration of the moon in its orbit, led the infidels of France to conclude that this satellite would eventually strike the earth, and supposing that there was a like acceleration throughout the solar system, they inferred that all the planets would eventually precipitate themselves on the central mass of the sun. They therefore most sapiently reasoned that either the heavens and earth are the result of chance, or that their great Architect could not control their movements. A child can see the falsity of their logic, but infidels are not remarkable for sense. A poet has embalmed their folly in most exquisite verse :

Roll on, ye stars, exult in youthful prime,  
 Mark with bright curves the printless steps of time ;  
 Near and more near your beamy cars approach,  
 And lessening orbs on lessening orbs encroach.  
 Flowers of the sky! ye too to age must yield,  
 Frail as your silken sisters of the field!  
 Star after star from Heaven's high arch shall rush,  
 Suns sink on suns and systems systems crush ;  
*Headlong, extinct, to one dark centre fall,*  
*And death and night and chaos mingle all ;*  
 Till o'er the wreck, emerging from the storm,  
 Immortal Nature lifts her changeful form ;  
 Mounts from her funeral pyre on wings of flame,  
 And soars and shines another and the same."

Laplace, however, showed by astronomical calculations, that the acceleration was merely periodic, that this noble funeral dirge is uncalled for, and that we may all go quietly to bed any night, without dread of being wakened by the man in the moon knocking at our doors. The infidels were sorely vexed with Laplace, but every true Christian will thank God that science enables him to say with the Psalmist, "How manifold are thy works, Lord God Almighty, *in wisdom hast thou made them all.*"

Again. Christianity has nothing to fear from sound reasoning upon sound premises : everything to fear from

false conclusions drawn from admitted facts, and from just conclusions deduced from false premises. But we are indebted to the geometry of Egypt for the whole science of Logic. Aristotle is the Father of the logic of the schools of the present day. He was for twenty years the pupil of Plato, the greatest mathematician of his age, who always began his instructions with mathematics, because he called it "the purgative of the soul that cleansed it from error, and restored it to the natural exercise of those faculties, in which just thinking consists." How apt a scholar Aristotle was under the great mathematician, we may judge by his frequent allusions to geometrical reasoning, and by his system itself, which is strictly mathematical. Thus his *dilemma* was in common use among the geometricians of his day, it is in constant use now in geometry, and always will be used: his syllogism too, was employed by the mathematicians on the banks of the Nile, hundreds of years before he was born. Every one knows that the syllogism is to be met with everywhere in every treatise on geometry, and Leibnitz tells us that he had seen two books, in which the theorems of the first six books of Euclid were demonstrated by the syllogism. Two Schools of Logic preceded the Aristotelian, the School of Pythagoras, and the School of Thales. Both of these last philosophers made geometry the basis of their systems, because they "were learned in all the learning of the Egyptians." Many an unsophisticated Freshman has wished that Pythagoras had confined himself to his Logic, and had let alone the square upon the hypotenuse.

The *inductive philosophy*, which has crushed infidelity, as the strong man crushes the loathsome reptile beneath his feet, is ascribed by some to Lord Verulam, and by others to Aristotle. Take either hypothesis that you please, a mathematician is still the author of it.

The *theory of probabilities*, invented by the French mathematicians, and employed by them in determining the chances of games of hazard, the value of testimony in courts of laws, the reliability of statistical facts, the present worth of annuities, etc., has had a higher and nobler application in the hands of the Christian philosopher, Olinthus Gregory, and of other pious men, who



have shown the thousands of chances against the concurrent meeting in the person of Jesus Christ, of the nineteen circumstances predicted of the Messiah, without the special interference of Him "who rules in the armies of Heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth." They have also applied the same theory to numerous prophecies, and shown that the chances against their fulfilment were so great, that even the soft-headed Atheist can scarcely have effrontery enough to deny the miraculous interposition of God.

*Mechanical Philosophy* demonstrates on almost every page that "the Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth; by understanding hath he established the heavens."—The poor, ignorant Atheist thinks, or at least says, that the planets began to revolve in their orbits by chance.—But *Mechanical* philosophy teaches that curvilinear motion is due to an original projectile, as well as incessant force: yea, the very point, at which each shining orb was struck when hurled into boundless space, has been exactly determined. The chance of the Atheist must then have had "a mighty hand and an outstretched arm," thus to have projected with amazing velocity, bodies of such enormous and almost inconceivable magnitude.

An elementary demonstration in *Mechanics*, shows that the centre of gravity is independent of the *intensity* and *direction* of the gravitating forces. Were it not independent of the first, ships could not navigate the ocean, because the slightest deviation from the parallel of latitude upon which they ballasted, would capsize them; were it not independent of the second, we could not change the position of our bodies without being liable to fall. 'Twas long a desideratum with mechanicians to know the solid angle of greatest strength. MacLaurin demonstrated by the Differential Calculus that this was the angle under which bees built their cells.—Where did they get their science? Again, we learn from *Mechanics* that an increase of velocity in the motion of the earth upon its axis, would be accompanied by such a loss of weight on our part, that a translation to the upper regions of the air would not be improbable on any gusty day. Human Kites would be as common as Da-

guerreotype pictures. Who has ordered all things with such consummate skill and wisdom as we are thus taught prevails throughout all nature?

*Astronomy* opened the gates of Ispahan and Teheran to the Missionary Henry Martin. The Persian mathematicians treated with deference and respect a man superior to themselves in the study, which was their special boast and pride. They could not answer him too, when he showed them that their Prophet was ignorant of the nature and laws of the heavenly bodies. Astronomy has always secured the Missionary a welcome from the Moslem, the Pagan and the worshipper of the Lama. May not that sublime science, which enables a worm of the dust to measure, as with a line, the bright worlds that encircle the Throne of the Eternal, be a chosen instrument in his hand for elevating lost and ruined men from their low and degraded condition, "to shine as stars in the firmament forever and forever?"

We have proved that the mathematician could not become an infidel without abandoning his usual mode of reasoning, and without being grossly false to the principles which he employs in all his scientific investigations. We have also shown that mathematical science has contributed much towards confounding Atheism, and establishing the claims of the religion of Jesus to be from God. We now propose to close the subject with an array of names of the profoundest mathematicians, who have also been the most humble and devoted followers of the Lamb of God.

The Latin Fathers, Augustine, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, &c., were "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and must have been thoroughly imbued with a knowledge of mathematics; for in the Egyptian school in which they were taught, Geometry was made the basis of all instruction. A treatise on Geometry, by Augustine, was for centuries the only text-book on that subject in all Europe. Origen tinged his religion with the mathematical philosophy of Plato.

The four greatest mathematicians of modern times, Newton, Leibnitz, Euler and John Bernouilli, were eminent for their Christian faith and piety. We place Newton first, because all men agree that the inscription on

his monument is just, "*Qui genus humanum ingenio superavit.*" The poet is scarcely thought to be extravagant when he says—

"Nature and Nature's laws lay hid in night,  
God said, 'let Newton be,' and all was light."

The precocious youth, whose brilliant intellect cannot receive the sober truths of Revelation, and whose sense of right is so great that he is constrained to admire himself because others will not do him justice, will probably be surprised to learn that Newton said he "found more marks of authenticity in the Bible than in any other book whatever;" and that he actually wrote a commentary upon Daniel and the Apocalypse. Leibnitz, who shared with Newton the glory of the discovery of the differential calculus, was distinguished for his manly piety. "I am not worthy," says Gibbon, "to praise the mathematician; but his name is connected with all the problems and discoveries of his times, the masters of the art were his rivals or his pupils, and if he borrowed from Newton the sublime Method of Fluxions, Leibnitz was at least, the Prometheus who imparted to mankind the sacred fire which he stole from the gods." He accomplished more than any human being ever did before. Historian, philologist, grammarian, chemist, theologian, he manifested "by a thousand passages in his writings, his profound respect for religion and morality, and he crowned his glorious life by giving in his *Theodicæ* the support of his influence to ideas the most sublime, and at the same time, the most necessary to the welfare of humanity." Surely, the bar-room wit, who sneers at the great truths of the Bible "as old women's fables," has some reason to be startled at learning that the mighty mind of Leibnitz acknowledged that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

John Bernouilli, the mightiest of a race of giants, linguist, chemist, mathematician, mechanician, physician, "he touched the whole circle of the sciences, and adorned them all." Though an humble follower of the Man of Calvary, his wonderful attainments extorted even from Voltaire the tribute

Il a fait l'honneur de la Suisse  
Et celui de l'humanité.

We have long revered John Bernoulli, and have long admired his acumen and penetration, though it must be acknowledged that he had not the sagacity of the Anti-Bible Conventionists of Boston to discover that "the lamp which God from Heaven to Earth let down," is of human workmanship.

"Euler" says Condorcet, "was one of those men whose genius was equally capable of the greatest efforts and of the most continued labor; who multiplied his productions beyond what might be expected of human strength, and who, notwithstanding, was original in each; whose head was always occupied and his mind always calm." That Euler had profound reverence for the Bible may be judged from the fact, that he at one time studied divinity with the intention of glorifying God in the ministry of his Son. Euler, however, was somewhat old fashioned in his reverence for the Bible; he lived prior to the era of Theodore Parker, Wendell Phillips, *et id omne genus*, and had not the illumination of the lights of the Tabernacle.

Sir Henry Saville, an eminent Christian and mathematician, established early in the 17th century, a chair of geometry and a chair of astronomy in Oxford. It is probably not generally known that the latter chair has been mostly filled by distinguished Clergymen. Among these, we may mention Dr. Robertson, Dr. Bernard, Seth Ward, afterwards Bishop of Exeter, and Dr. Wallis. The latter is well known to every mathematician; the English claim for him that he first proved, what Archimedes suspected, the property of the centre of gravity. Many of the Professors at Cambridge, who have occupied scientific chairs, have also been Clergymen. Among these, Bishop Watson, whose replies to Gibbon and Paine are models of genteel exhortation. Whiston, the successor of Newton, for many years a preacher. Archdeacon Vince, so well known as an astronomer and mechanic, etc. Again, we have among scientific theologians, John Wilkins, Bishop of Chester, the brother-in-law of Oliver Cromwell, and founder of the Royal Society. Dr. Robert Smith, Master of Trinity College, Isaac Barrow, also Master of Trinity, a voluminous writer on theology, and profound mathematician. Robt.

Boyle, Scientific Professor in Eton, the author of the well known saying that "the Bible is among other books as the diamond among ores." Boerhave said of him, that "without Robert Boyle, we would have known nothing of nature." Dr. James Bradley, who resigned his pastoral charge to become Savillian Professor of Astronomy in Oxford. The aberration of the fixed stars was first noticed by him. Horsley, Bishop of St. Asaphs, the annihilator of the Socinian Priestly, also editor of the works of Newton. Dr. Abraham Rees, the celebrated author of the Encyclopedia, forty years a preacher, and long Professor of Mathematics in Hoxton. Doctor Isaac Milner, President of Queen's College, Professor of Mathematics and Dean of Carlisle. John Flamsteed, first Astronomer Royal, to whom Astronomy is more indebted than to any other man who ever lived, since he founded the Observatory at Greenwich, and first taught Astronomers how to systematise their labors. He was, for many years, a preacher, and we trust a good man, though Newton did call him a puppy. Sir John Leslie, theologian, traveller, chemist, linguist, natural philosopher, geometrician, he seemed to acquire every species of knowledge with equal facility, and to impart his attainments with an elegance commensurate to the case of their acquisition.

Robert Simson, we have been accustomed to regard as the great geometrician of the last three centuries. His restoration of the Porisms of Euclid, from a single hint in Pappus, has been often spoken of as the finest effort ever made by genius. He was educated for the church, and was a devout believer in the Bible, though like other gentlemen and ladies, he became very cross and ill-grained in his old age. John Robison was also educated for the church. "His piety," says his biographer, "was ardent and unostentatious, like that of the immortal Newton, whose memory he cherished with peculiar veneration." He was for more than thirty years Professor of Mathematics in the University of Edinburg.

William Barlow, the well known author of Theory of Numbers, was distinguished as a preacher and mathematician.

Blaise Pascal. We find him in the very meridian of

his glory as an Astronomer, laying aside his Transit and his Equatorial to proclaim the everlasting truths of the Gospel. Everybody knows how much his Provincial letters contributed to destroy the power of Jesuitism. There is more sense in a single paragraph of his "Thoughts" than in four mortal columns of a frothy Congressional speech.

To these we might add the names of Henry Martyn, who was treated with so much deference in Shiraz, because of his scientific attainments; of Dr. Dwight, Dr. Chalmers, Thomas Dick, and a host of other Clergymen, almost as much distinguished for their mathematical knowledge as for their piety.

We have a brilliant array of lay-men too. And first we place John Locke. His mathematics was equal to the task of revising the Principia of Newton in manuscript. Possibly some infidel, who has taken off ignorance, "the badge of all his tribe," may have heard of Locke. We will tell him then, how the philosopher died. He advised Lady Masham, who sat by his death-bed, to regard this life as only a preparation for a better. He then asked her to read the Psalms to him; she read until he felt the death-struggle approaching, when he motioned her to desist and "fell asleep in Jesus."

James Ferguson, the Astronomer, we believe, was also a layman. Infidelity is always changing its ground; when driven from one position it takes up another. In the time of Ferguson, the sceptics contended that the darkness at the death of our Saviour was merely an eclipse, but he carried his astronomical calculations back to that period, and proved that this could not have been so in the land of Judea.

Bishop Berkely was the first Spiritual Rapper. The Fox women of Syracuse are not entitled to the honor of the invention of a new science. As far back as 1730, the wise prelate taught that everything is spirit, even the bread and meat that we eat; so, like the Frenchman in the play who had been talking prose forty years without knowing it, the world had been living on ethereal food, ambrosia, the diet of the gods, for near six thousand years, without even suspecting it, until the Bishop enlightened their ignorance. MacLaurin, in his reply to

Berkeley's *Essay against Mathematics*, showed how science might materially aid in Natural Theology by proving, among other things, that the cells of bees are constructed upon mathematical principles. The mitred priest despised mathematics, but the bees did not. MacLaurin was the son of a Clergyman of Scotland, and had all the reverence of the Scotch for the Bible and the Shorter Catechism.

Sturm, the author of the celebrated demonstration that bears his name, is also, if we mistake not, the author of "Reflexions," which contains more valuable matter on a single page than is to be found in whole folios of stuff about Greek particles and Latin roots. The study of languages began at the Tower of Babel, (confusion,) and confusion has been written on all the efforts of the Linguists since. We leave it to their discriminating philology to decide whether the word *babble* has not its root in that same Tower of Babel.

Time will fail us to speak of Playfair, whose genius was almost universal, and whose conversational powers were said to be superior to any in Europe; of DeLisle, the Parisian, the friend of Newton, "whose piety was unaffected, whose morals were pure, and whose integrity was undeviating." Of Matthew Stewart, D. D., for more than fifty years Professor of Mathematics in the University of Glasgow. Of Dugald Stewart, his son and successor. Of James Beattie, the celebrated author of the *Essay on Truth*, equally acquainted with the philosophy of matter and of mind. Simple and modest, though living retired, he yet sought a deeper retirement, like the bird of his own beautiful song, that

"Breaks from the rustling boughs,  
And down the lone vale sails away  
To more profound repose."

## ARTICLE IV.

## ON THE TRINITY.

*The objections of unreasonableness, contradiction, and the human origin of the word Trinity.*

The object of our previous articles\* has been to determine the true nature, office, capacity, limits and condition of human reason, especially in reference to God's unity and nature. Our views will be found admirably sustained in a discourse by Bishop Butler,—the immortal author of the *Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion*,—upon the ignorance of man.

After illustrating the position that “the wisest and most knowing” cannot, any more than the most ignorant, comprehend the nature of any causes, or any essences of things, and much less the Being, attributes or ways of God, he shews that difficulties in speculation, and limitations to our knowledge, are as much a part of our present state of probation and discipline as difficulties in practice. He goes on to remark, that “to expect a distinct comprehensive view of the whole subject of religion, and especially of God, clear of difficulties and objections, is to forget our nature and condition, neither of which admit of such knowledge, with respect to any science whatever. And to inquire with this expectation, is not to inquire as a man, but as one of another order of creatures.”

“Knowledge” adds this deep master of human thought, is not our proper happiness.” Men of deep research and curious inquiry, should just be put in mind, not to mistake what they are doing. For it is evident that there is another mark set up for us to aim at;—another end appointed us to direct our lives to;—another end which the most knowing may fail of, and the most ignorant arrive at. The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed, belong unto

\* On the Province of Reason, and its incapacity to determine the nature and mode of existence of God.



us, and to our children, forever, that we may do all the words of this law, which reflection of Moses, put in general terms, is, that the only knowledge, which is of any avail to us, is that which teaches us our duty, or assists us in the discharge of it."

All morals, however,—and all duty,—have reference to law, to a law giver, and to the sanctions by which his laws are enforced. "To know the true God" truly, and the way of salvation He has devised and declared—this "is eternal life." And as it has been most clearly shewn, that by all our searchings we can find out nothing certainly of God's nature or will, "in the deepest humility, let us prostrate our souls before the word of His testimony, that we may implicitly hear, believe, and obey, all that the Lord our God shall say unto us."

The Scriptures, we have affirmed, do not teach what some men would now call the only reasonable doctrine of God's nature, namely, that He is absolutely, personally, and metaphysically, ONE, so as to be incapable of being in any sense THREE, AND YET ONE. On the contrary, they teach, as we affirm, that as the nature of God must be infinitely different and distinct, from what our finite capacities can comprehend, or our human language and analogies express, that the Divine essence or nature is common to the Father, Son and Spirit, who are, nevertheless, relatively distinct, and distinguished from each other. These three are one Being, in such a sense that they are all included in the idea of God, so that it is impious to say there are three Gods. These three persons, however, are distinct, not only in *name*, but in incommunicable *properties*, so that it is equally impious to say that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are not each, and equally, God. In reference to each other there are internal, as well as economical differences, founded upon their personal relations, offices and distinctions, but these differences consist only in personal properties, and not in their substance, or Godhead, which is one.

The sum of what is revealed in Scripture on this subject is, that God is one; that this one God, is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that the Father is the father of the Son; and the Son, the son of the Father; and the

Holy Ghost, the spirit of the Father and the Son; and that, in respect of this, their mutual relation, they are distinct from each other.

“Moreover,” says Dr. Owen, “whatever is so revealed in the Scripture, is no less true and Divine, as to whatever necessarily followeth thereon, than it is, as unto that which is principally revealed and directly expressed. Hence it follows, that when the Scripture revealeth the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to be one God, seeing it necessarily and unavoidably follows thereon that they are one in essence, wherein alone it is possible they can be one; and three in their distinct subsistences, wherein alone it is possible they can be three; this is no less of Divine Revelation, than the first principle from whence these things follow.”\*

This doctrine is pronounced so contrary to reason as not to be credible, “even if it were not once, nor twice, but very frequently and most expressly written in the Scripture.”† But from what we have seen, it is most unreasonable for human reason to say what is credible in reference to God’s nature, which is infinitely above and beyond its comprehension, and of whose mode of existence we can know and express as little as we can about how and why he began to exist at all.

Let it be granted, then, that the doctrine of the Trinity is, by its very nature, inconceivable by the human mind. Is it therefore to be rejected? Mr. Mill lays it down as logically true, that “it is absurd to reject a proposition as impossible on no other ground than its inconceivableness.”

“I cannot but wonder that so much stress should be laid on the circumstance of inconceivableness, when there is ample experience to show that our capacity or incapaci-

\* Owen’s Works, vol. x: pp. 469, 471, 472.

† See Smalcus in Abaddie, p. 254. The writers whom Stillingfleet opposed in his work on the Trinity say: “We deny the Articles of the new Christianity, or the Athanasian religion, not because they are mysterious, or because we do not comprehend them; we deny them because we do comprehend them; we have a clear and distinct perception, that they are not mysterious, but contradictions, impossibilities, and pure nonsense.—We have our reason in vain, and all science and certainty would be destroyed, if we could not distinguish between mysteries and contradictions.”—See Stillingfleet on the Trinity, page 7, &c.

ty of conceiving a thing has very little to do with the possibility of the thing in itself; but is, in truth, very much an affair of accident, and depends on the past history and habits of our own minds. \* \* \* \* When we have often seen and thought of two things together, and have never, in any one instance, either seen or thought of them separately, there is, by the primary law of association, an increasing difficulty, which may, in the end, become insuperable, if conceiving the two things apart. \* \* \* There are remarkable instances of this in the history of science: instances in which the most instructed men rejected as impossible, because inconceivable, things which their posterity, by earlier practice and longer perseverance in the attempt, found it quite easy to conceive, and which everybody now knows to be true.”\*

We must consider an inference, logically drawn from established and admitted premises, to be true, even though the thing thus proved true be inconceivable.—For, what is to be understood by the terms inconceivable and conceivable, impossible and possible? If all our knowledge is originally derived from experience, then are these notions derived from our experience. The one class means things at variance with our experience, and the other, things not at variance with our experience.—Clearly, unless we possess fundamental ideas, or can gain a knowledge of things in themselves, no logical process can give to the notion, *impossible*, any larger meaning than this. But if, at any time, the inability of men to conceive the negation of a given proposition simply proves that their experience, up to that time, has, without exception, confirmed such proposition; then, when they assert that its untruth is impossible, they really assert no more than when they assert that its negation is inconceivable. If, subsequently, it turn out that the proposition *is* untruth; and if it be therefore argued that men should not have held its untruth impossible because inconceivable, we reply, that to say this, is to condemn the use of the word impossible altogether. If the inconceivability of a thing be considered insufficient warrant for asserting its impossibility, it is implied that there

\* *System of Logic*, pp. 265, 266.

can exist a sufficient warrant; but such warrant, whatever its kind, must be originally derived from experience; and if further experience may invalidate the warrant of inconceivableness, further experience may invalidate *any* warrant on which we assert impossibility. Therefore, we should call nothing impossible.

In this sense, therefore, the inconceivableness of any theory which is above and beyond our present possible experience, is no test of its truth. In respect to all things beyond the measure of our faculties and consequent range of experience, inconceivableness must ever remain, as Sir William Hamilton affirms, an inapplicable test.\*

We might also ask, whose reason is thus offended?—Not that of Bishop Butler, or of Lord Bacon, or of the great mass of Christians,—(not to name classic and heathen minds, including Plato,)—from the beginning until now. These have all contended that this was a doctrine in itself considered, neither reasonable nor unreasonable, nor one on which reason can pronounce any judgment whatever. The subject of the proposition is beyond the comprehension of reason. And yet the only terms in which we can speak of God, are drawn from finite beings, finite relations, and finite modes of existence. And hence reason has no premises from which it can deduce a positive conclusion. The whole matter is infinitely above and beyond reason. It is not true, therefore, that this doctrine of the Trinity is contrary to reason, if we understand by this term the general reason of men, for we shall find that the doctrine, in some form, has entered into all the ancient religions of mankind.

Neither is this objection true, if we are to judge of what is reasonable by the reason of Christians, since this doctrine has from the beginning been almost universally believed by every branch of the Christian Church. Neither is it true, that this doctrine is contrary to the reason of modern Christians since the Reformed Churches, with entire unanimity, introduced this doctrine into their creeds, and thousands of the most acute and able

\* See Art. on the Universal Postulate, in Westminster Rev., Oct. 1858, p. 276.

minds have found the doctrine in no way, *contrary* to reason, but a doctrine of which reason can know and judge nothing beyond the testimony brought before it in the revelation of God. In other words, this subject can only be known and determined by positive revelation.\*

On all subjects on which it alone can give evidence, the testimony of God is the highest reason, and outweighs all possible objection and cavil, since these are all based upon the absurdity that finite can comprehend that which is infinite and infinitely incomprehensible and beyond our capacity to understand. Because in a finite nature such as ours, the same spirit cannot be three and yet one, therefore, it is argued God's nature, which is infinitely above, beyond, and different from, and cannot be one, and yet in sound sense three. Such reasoning is absurd, foolish, and contradictory. This

\* In truth, says Mr. Faber, nothing can be more childishly unphilosophical and illogical, than the too common anti-trinitarian practice, of starting abstract objections to the bare nature of the doctrine itself, and of pretending to decide, by the wholly inapplicable argument *a priori*, the pure historical question of *FACT*, *whether the doctrine of the Trinity is or is not a doctrine of Christianity?* This is the fatal paralogism which runs for instance, through Dr. Channing's Discourse on *The Superior tendency of Unitarianism to form an elevated religious character.*

He reasons abstractedly, against the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity, from his own distorted arbitrary statement of its alleged moral and intellectual tendency: and from a rapid view of this caricatured portrait, he determines, through the dangerous *argumentum a priori*, and in language which I have absolutely shuddered to read; that such a doctrine *cannot* form a part of sincere Christianity.

Now, even to omit the gross sophism of arguing from a gratuitous statement of *his own* which would offensively exhibit Trinitarianism as alike *absurd* and *immoral*; what can be a greater paralogism, than the *PRINCIPLE* upon which the whole of Dr. Channing's discourse is constructed!

1. The question is a simple historical question of *FACT*; the question, namely: *Whether the doctrine of the Trinity, with the dependent doctrine of Christ's essential deity, was taught by the Apostles, and is propounded in Scripture.*

2. Yet this palpably *mere* question of *FACT*, which, like all other *similar* questions, can only be determined by *evidence*, Dr. Channing actually professes to determine by *the application of abstract a priori reasoning.*

3. Thus, in *former* days, did misplaced ingenuity determine in the negative the question of *fact*; whether the Copernican system be true, and whether men exist in the supposed paradoxical condition of antipodes: and thus, in the *present* day, does a more eloquent, than logical, American Divine, similarly determine in the negative, the question of *fact*; Whether the doctrine of the Trinity, with the dependent doctrine of Christ's true Godhead, was taught by the Apostles and is propounded in Scripture.—*On the Apost. of Trinitarianism, vol. 1, pp. 289, 290.*

doctrine is, indeed, like many others, above reason, but not contrary to it, since upon it reason can determine nothing.

Such is plainly the teaching of Scripture. "The Scripture\* tells us indeed, that the 'spirit of a man which is in him knows the things of a man.' A man's spirit, by natural reason may judge of natural things. 'But the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God.'—1 Cor. ii: 11. So that what we know of these things, we must receive upon the revelation of the Spirit of God merely, if the Apostle may be believed. And it is *given* unto men to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God. To some, and not to others; and unless it be so given them, they cannot know them. In particular, none can know the Father, unless the Son reveal him. Nor will, or doth, or can, flesh and blood reveal, or understand Jesus Christ to be the Son of the living God, unless the Father reveal him, and instruct us in the truth of it.—Matt. 16, 18. The way to come to the acknowledgement of these things, is that described by the Apostle.—Eph. iii: 14-19. 'For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in Heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints,' &c. As also, (Col. ii: 2, 3,) 'That ye might come unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ; in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. It is by faith and prayer, and through the revelation of God, that we may come to the acknowledgment of these things; and not by the carnal reasonings of men of corrupt minds.'

Shall foolish, weak, short-sighted man  
Beyond the angels go,  
The great Almighty God explain,  
Or to perfection know!

\* Owen's Works, vol. 10, pp. 509, 510.

His attributes divinely soar  
 Above the creature's sight,  
 And prostrate seraphim adore  
 The glorious Infinite.

Jehovah's everlasting days!  
 They cannot numbered be;  
 Incomprehensible the space  
 Of thine immensity!

Thy wisdom's depths by reason's line  
 In vain we strive to sound,  
 Or stretch our labouring thought t'assign  
 Omnipotence a bound.

The brightness of thy glory leaves  
 Description far below;  
 Nor man's, nor angel's heart conceives  
 How deep thy mercies flow.

But it is further said, that the doctrine of the Trinity is, in itself, *contradictory*, and therefore, to be rejected, since to say that three are one and one is three is absurd. This however, is just what is not said. The word trinity from two Latin words, signifies a unity that is three-fold in its unity—a three that are one in their trinity, that is, a TRI-UNITY. It defines not three disunited persons united in one *name*, or in community of *counsel*, but the union of three persons in one essence, so as to be really and truly one, and yet, in a manner incomprehensible, to us, truly and really three. Mr. Locke says, “in my whole essay there is not anything like an objection against the Trinity.”\* There is manifestly no contradiction in the term trinity, because it does not affirm that three are one and that one is three, but that in the infinite and incomprehensible Jehovah there is a unity so inconceivably different and distinct from the union of finite human natures,—of which alone we know anything,—as to admit of three persons, hypostases or modes of subsistence, in the one ever-blessed Godhead. The very term trinity therefore, which means a TRI-UNITY, obviates the objection made against the doctrine, that it is contradictory, since it does not imply that God is one in the same sense in which he is three, or three in the same sense in which he is one, but three in a sense

See on the alleged Unitarianism of Locke, &c., Note A, at end of the article.

different from, and reconcilable with, that in which he is one, and one in a sense different from, and reconcilable with that in which he is three. WHAT that sense is, or HOW God is what he is thus said to be, the doctrine does not affirm, nor does any man dare to explain. And that it implies any contradiction in the essential nature of the Divine being, no man can dare to affirm without presumption and impiety, since this would imply an actual knowledge of what that nature in its essence and mode of existence is.

When the late Daniel Webster, (whose capacity to determine what is and is not contradictory to reason no one will call in question,) was told by a friend coming out of church, that he did not know how any reasonable man could believe in the Trinity, therefore, that three is one and one three, "Ah, sir," replied Mr. Webster, "we do not understand the arithmetic of Heaven." This great mind was moved also to record his name at the foot of a dying declaration that while he could not in the flesh see God or understand the arithmetic of Heaven, he nevertheless, understood the fact attested of himself by God, and that he believed therefore, on "God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost," and now we would hope his faith is turned into knowledge, and he unites in ascribing glory and honour unto God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Mr. Boswell once said to Dr. Johnson, "Would not the same objection lie against the Trinity as against transubstantiation?" "Yes," said he, "if you take three and one in the same sense. If you do so, to be sure you cannot believe it. But the three persons *in* the Godhead are three in one sense and one in another; [three in person or hypostases and one in nature, one in the unity of the spirit,] we cannot tell how, and that is the mystery."\*

The apparent verbal contradictions in the language employed to express the personal distinctiveness, and the Divine unity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, arise from the inapplicableness of words denoting human thoughts, to that which transcends all human thought. There is nothing in man's perceptions, con-

\* Johnson's tour to the Hebrides, by Boswell, p. 90.



sciousness, or formal logical definitions, to supply him with intelligible terms that can ever be more than an approximation towards the exact and full truth of the unity of God. For this reason, theology cannot become a strictly logical science; language is too imperfect, too low a vehicle, to become the exponent of its higher truths.\*

This, in reality, is the foundation on which philosophical objections to the doctrine of the Trinity, are founded. Thus Dr. Dewey asserts the impossibility of conceiving of the persons of the Trinity as any other than three distinct beings. And why? "When," says he, "we speak of unity in a being, we mean that he is self-conscious." He thus frames to himself a definition of what constitutes a being which suits his own purpose, omitting what is most essential to our idea of being, namely, that *substance* or essence, and those properties by which it is known and distinguished by us, and then bases his objection to a Scriptural fact upon his own defective theory.†

While, however, it is impossible, as has been said, to give any positive exposition of what is implied in the doctrine of a trinity of the Divine nature, the human mind is capable of showing that the doctrine is not inconsistent with our present experience and knowledge, however immeasurably it may be above them.

But not only is this doctrine not unreasonable, absurd or contradictory, it might be argued that it is most reasonable.

"There appear to be," says Dr. Pye Smith, "very reasonable grounds for supposing that this doctrine, or some other resembling it, would be a necessary deduction from the fact of the ABSOLUTE PERFECTION of the Divine nature. The notion of Supreme and Infinite Perfection cannot but include EVERY POSSIBLE excellency, or,

\* Augustine strongly felt, as he has majestically expressed, the ineffableness of this great mystery cum ergo quaeritur quid tria, vel quid tres, conferimus nos ad inveniendum aliquod speciale vel generale nomen quo complectamur haec tria, neque occurrit animo, quia excedit, supereminentia divinitatis usitati eloquii facultatem. Verius enim cogitatur Deus quam dicitur, et verius est quam cogitatur.—*Stowell on the Work of the Spirit.*

† See the *New Englander* for 1848, pp. 673-5.

in other words, every attribute of being which is not of the nature of defect. It must be premised that creation had a beginning. At whatever point that beginning may have been, whatever multiples of ages, imagination or hypothesis can fix upon to carry that point backwards, the point will stand somewhere. *Before* that position, therefore a *duration without beginning* must have elapsed. Through that period, infinite on one part, it is incontrovertible that nothing can have existed except the Glorious Deity. But, if the unity of the Divine nature be such a property as excludes every kind of plurality, the properties of *active life*, *tendency to diffusion*, and reciprocity of intellectual and moral enjoyment, (which are perfections of being,) must have been through that duration, in the state of *absolute quiescence*. It seems to follow that *from eternity* down to a certain point in duration, some perfections were wanting in the Deity. The Divine Mind stood in an immense solitariness. The infinitely active life, which is a necessary property of the Supreme Spirit, was from eternity inactive. No species of communication existed. There was no development of intellectual and moral good, though in a subject in which that good has been necessarily, infinitely, and from eternity inherent. I feel the awful ground on which I have advanced, in putting these suppositions; and I would humbly beseech the Divine Majesty to pity and pardon me, if I am guilty of any presumption. I am, also, fully attentive to the attribute of ALL-SUFFICIENCY as a necessary property of the Blessed and Adorable Nature. But when I have given every consideration of which I am capable to this most profound of subjects, I cannot but perceive it as a strong, and even invincible deduction of reason, that the denial of such a plurality in the Infinite Essence as shall admit of a development from eternity of the ever active life and a communion from eternity in infinite good, is a denial to the Supreme Nature of something which is *essential* to absolute and Infinite Perfection.

I add, therefore, that, whatever improper use may have been made of the terms by impious familiarity, and whatever ridicule may have been cast upon them by profane opposition, the venerable confessions of antiquity

appear to me to be entirely accordant with careful reasoning and with Scriptural authority;—that *the one Lord Jesus Christ is the only Begotten of the Father, before all ages; and that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father, equal to the Father and the Son in eternity, majesty, glory, and all perfection.*”\*

“Own, then, man  
The image of his Maker—grant that God  
Possesses all perfections he has given,  
And in the Deity there needs must be  
Some glorious attributes, that correspond  
With those peculiar faculties in us,  
Call'd social ones; I speak not of the bonds  
Of finite passion,—but the inherent power  
To make a promise, a command express,  
And witness bear.

That God this power possesses  
We need not wander far for evidence.  
Let nature be our witness. He who form'd  
The eye must see; and He whose mandate call'd  
Creation forth, most surely can command;  
Or all the beauties that our eyes behold,  
When turning fondly on the earth's fair face,—  
Or piercing far into immensity,  
To gaze delighted on its spangling orbs,—  
Nay, we ourselves, had no existence known.  
But if on naught except created things  
Those great perfections can be exercised,  
They cannot be eternal or immense;  
And as, before creation's natal hour,  
They never could be exercised at all,  
Not only are those attributes themselves  
Contingent, but the Godhead must possess  
Peculiar powers which once he did not hold;  
And the firm grasp of mutability  
Thus seems to enclose the Uncreated One,  
The great, Unchang'd, Immutable, Supreme.  
But, turn we to the converse side and own  
That, like the rest of His inherences,  
These too are infinite—we then are led  
(To find them an unbounded exercise)  
To some unlimited created thing,  
Another independent Deity,  
Or a distinctness of hypostases  
In the great Essence Incarnate;—(the first  
And second of which three hypotheses

\* See his Testimony to the Messiah, vol. 3, pp. 420, 421. See also, *Howe's Works*, vol. 4, pp. 320, 321, where, in his calm inquiry on the subject of the Trinity, he has these observations.—See Note B., at the end of this article.

We have before exploded:) and behold  
 The Trinity in Unity again  
 Stand forth in glory to the enquiring eye.  
 Nor does the Deity's perfection yield  
 An evidence less sure. For this seems plain,—  
 (And here with deepest reverence I speak,)  
 If God exists in Unity alone,  
 According to the wandering sceptic's dreams,  
 He cannot in perfection know himself;  
 He cannot fully exercise his power,  
 His wisdom, goodness, purity, or love,  
 According to their nature; nor can hold  
 Those social faculties he gave mankind.  
 Nor is perfection of existence found  
 In him, for that, undoubtedly, must rest  
 (Since nought beside can grasp its every mode,)  
 In union and distinctness. Wherefore, then,  
 Sons of a blind philosophy, maintain  
 This perilous position! Wherefore shackle  
 God's active, energetic attributes  
 In all their operations, till as well  
 We might suppose a paralyz'd old man,  
 Whose limbs had long forgot their native use,  
 Complete in power, or deem an idiot sane,  
 As think perfection can in *him* inhere—  
 When Trinity in Unity displays  
 Perfection's beauty; reconciles in full  
 Whate'er appeared to jar, and Nature's voice  
 With that of Revelation sweetly joins  
 In one harmonious song of lasting praise."  
 "But to return \* \* \* \* \* If in operation  
 Of moral excellence alone are found  
 (Where hope is banish'd by fruition full,)  
 The fruits of happiness; and Deity  
 Be to himself a fountain—spring of bliss,  
 Ineffable, eternal, underiv'd;  
 Where then does fond enquiry lead the mind?  
 Oh! talk not of presumption! tell me not  
 It is but limiting the Deity  
 To say that bliss, as it inheres in him,  
 Must flow from sources consonant with ours,  
 While Revelation's voice attests the truth  
 Which Reason here would urge. "Thou loved'st me,"  
 Hear the Redeemer's sacred lips exclaim,  
 "Before the world's foundations." Here he points  
 To God's eternal source of happiness,  
 And shews it was not mere inactive rest.  
 And well may Reason, with a voice like His  
 Corroborating its conclusions, say,  
 "As happiness is only to be found  
 (Where hope's bright visions can no entrance gain,)  
 In exercise of moral excellence—  
 And no plurality of Gods can be—  
 Then either God exists in modes distinct,  
 Or was, before an object yet was form'd

On whom to exercise his attributes,  
 Eternally devoid of perfect bliss."  
 "As then the happiness of God must be  
 Complete, above all height, beneath all depth,  
 Immense, eternal, and immutable,  
 He needs must have some object, infinite,  
 Co-equal, co-eternal, with Himself,  
 United, yet distinct, on whom to pour  
 The o'erflowing fulness of his attributes;  
 Which leads us to the same eternal truth  
 We now so long have been contending for."

A very short and able letter on this subject, will be found also, in the posthumous works of the celebrated John Wallis, D. D., Savilian Professor of Geometry, in Oxford, and Chaplain to King Charles II., who undertakes to show from mathematical as well as other sciences, that there is no inconsistency or impossibility that what in our regard is three may in another regard be one," and that though these illustrations "even from finite beings, do not adequately agree with this of the sacred Trinity, yet there is enough in them to show that there is no such inconsistency as is pretended, in believing that the three persons may truly be so distinguished as that one be not the other, and yet all but one God."\*

"It is true," he added, † "that not any, nor all of these instances, nor any of those given by other learned men, do adequately express the distinction and unity of the *Persons* in the *sacred Trinity*; for neither hath God distinctly declared it unto us, nor are we able fully to comprehend it, nor is it necessary for us to know. Shall we, therefore, say, things *cannot be*, when God says they *are*, only because we know not *how*? If God say, "The Word was God," and "the Word was made Flesh," shall we say, Not so, only because we cannot tell *how*? It is safer to say, It is; WHEN GOD SAYS IT IS, though we know not how it is: especially when there are so many instances in nature, to show it not to be impossible or inconsistent with reason. The thing is sufficiently revealed to those who are willing to be taught and receive the truth in the love of it."

Others however, have dared to go even further than

\* *Sermons and Memoirs*, London, 1791. † *Ib.*

the *removal* of any objections to the possibility or reasonableness of the doctrine of the Trinity, and have conceived that by a chain of abstract *a priori* reasoning similar to Dr. Clarke's celebrated demonstration of the being and attributes of God, they can even demonstrate its truth and necessity. Such is the work of the Rev. Jas. Kidd, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Aberdeen, entitled "An Essay on the Doctrine of the Trinity, attempting to prove it by Reason and Demonstration founded upon duration and space, and upon some of the Divine perfections, some of the powers of the human soul, the language of Scripture and tradition among all nations."

Of the success of Mr. Kidd's argument, several eminent men have expressed favourable opinions, and it was listened to in lectures by Mr. Belsham and Mr. Broadbent with frankness and great candour, though both Unitarians. The argument, however, is too severely metaphysical ever to be popular, and while such discourses may *strengthen* conviction, they never can *originate* our belief in a doctrine which nothing but Revelation can authoritatively teach and command.\*

The learned and judicious Stillingfleet has written a very able work in vindication of the Trinity, especially

\* See also, for some ingenious reasoning, "The Great Physician," by John Gardner, M. D., of London. London, 1843. The arguments of Professor Kidd have been presented to some extent, in a poetical form, in a Poem of very considerable ability and poetic spirit,—an elaborate philosophical poem, indeed, "The Deity," a Poem, in Twelve Books, by Thos. Ragg, with an introduction by Isaac Taylor. 2d Edition, London, 1834:

"Thy nature now, Almighty One, I sing!  
And as thou dost exist would thee portray.  
In confutation of deistic dreams,  
Shewing by Reason's light thou art TRI-UNE.  
Come then, celestial Spirit Increate!  
Shed thine own self upon me, as ere while  
Thou, like a flood of love, cam'st rushing down  
And fill'dst the chosen ones in Palestine,  
And thou, my harp, resume thy sweetest tones;  
That Poesy may spread o'er Reason's page  
A loveliness it otherwise could not gain,  
Pleasing the fancy as it feeds the mind,  
While TRINITY IN UNITY, display'd  
Without the aid of Scripture plainly shews  
The God of Scripture is the Living God."

against the objections of its unreasonableness,\* from which we make a quotation.

“It is strange boldness in men,” says Bishop Stillingfleet, “to talk of contradictions in things above their reach. Hath God not revealed to us that he created all things; and is it not reasonable for us to believe this, unless we are able to comprehend the manner of doing it? Hath not God plainly revealed that there shall be a resurrection from the dead? And must we think it unreasonable to believe it, till we are able to comprehend all the changes of the particles of matter from the creation to the general resurrection? If nothing is to be believed but what may be comprehended, the very being of God must be rejected, and all his unsearchable perfections. If we believe the attributes of God to be infinite how can we comprehend them? We are strangely puzzled in plain ordinary finite things; but it is madness to pretend to comprehend what is infinite; and yet, if the perfections of God be not infinite, they cannot belong to him.

“Let those who presume to say that there is a contradiction in the Trinity, try their imaginations about God’s eternity, not merely how he should be from himself, but how God should co-exist with all the differences of times, and yet there be no succession in his own being; and they will, perhaps, concur with me in thinking that there is no greater difficulty in the conception of the Trinity than there is of eternity. For three to be one is a contradiction in numbers; but whether an infinite nature can communicate itself to three different substances, without such a division as is among created beings, must not be determined by bare numbers, but by the absolute perfections of the Divine nature: which must be owned to be above our comprehension.”

The justly celebrated and admired John Howe has, among his works, a short treatise on this subject, entitled “*A calm Discourse of the Trinity in the Godhead,*” in which there is a very lucid and satisfactory exposition of the perfect consistency of this doctrine with the conceptions of the human mind, and of the impossibility of

\* London, 1697.

finding in it anything either absurd or contradictory\* to our reason, and to the constitution of our compound nature, or to our present knowledge of what is possible, though beyond our comprehension.

Another work has not long since been published on the doctrine of Triads,† of which it has been said, "This is decidedly the most original work which has appeared for some time." The design of the author is to illustrate the doctrine of a Divine Trinity, by tracing a triplicity of character, not only in Scripture, but in every part of the natural and moral world. The mass of evidence which he has gathered together is truly astonishing, and exhibits, not only vast labour, pursued with untiring patience, but likewise a familiar acquaintance with the languages and literature, both of ancient and modern times. His great aim, throughout the whole of his remarkable work, has been the discovery and advancement of truth, of which he feels himself the influence and value. All is subservient to this; and therefore while he displays great ingenuity and much keenness of perception, he never suffers himself to be influenced by mere fancy. He demonstrates the existence of a triform impression on the human mind, as exemplified in the singular frequency of the tertian form of expression in speaking and writing, and in our ideas of superstition, law, majesty and dominion; he shows the same impression as prevailing in the physical world, in the theology of the heathen, and throughout the Scripture, as well in its facts as in its mode of expression.

From what has been advanced, it will be seen that the doctrine of the Trinity is, not only not contradictory to reason and to the invisible things of God, which are clearly seen in all his works and ways, but that it is in consonance with the eternal power and Godhead as manifested in our own wonderful constitution,‡ and as displayed in all his works and ways.

\* The reader will do well to consult this Treatise, particularly § ii.-xii., pp. 307-11.

† In the Albion, which contained large extracts from it, many others have supposed that traces of this doctrine are imprinted on all the works of God.—Baxter's Works, vol. 2, pp. 14, 15, Fol. Ed. Cheyne's Phil. Princ. of Revealed Religion, pp. 99, 113. Owen's Works, vol. 10.

‡ See Howe, as above.



But it is further objected that the very term Trinity, is of human origin, and is not Scriptural, and that, therefore, the doctrine itself, is unwarranted by the Word of God. But this objection comes with a very ill grace indeed, from those who claim so much for the office and power of reason. For all that is proper and competent to reason, and essential to the progress and improvement of knowledge we earnestly contend, since it is both our *right* and *duty* to know all that we have the means of knowing, as well as to be willing to be ignorant where knowledge is withheld. Now, the analogy between Natural and Revealed Religion, which is found to exist in so many essential particulars, is equally striking, as it regards the form in which truth is placed before the human mind in each of these departments of knowledge. Revelation, like nature, presents a vast collection of particular facts, not arranged scientifically, but apparently without any order, symmetry, or system. As in nature every fact or object is single, and found, as it would seem to the ignorant and uninformed, in apparent isolation or disunion; so have the inspired writers delivered their sublimest doctrines in popular language in an incidental isolated form, or in connection with some history or precept, and “have abstained,—as much as it was possible to abstain,—from a philosophical or metaphysical phraseology.” In nature, and in Revelation also, it is found that the earliest formations were the most simple, and adapted to a lower condition in the one case of animal, and in the other of mental and spiritual development, until both were at length, brought to that finished state which was best adapted to the whole of man’s earthly history and necessities. This being the case, reason has the same office and duty to discharge in reference, both to nature and revelation. *First*, the facts or truths as they actually and certainly exist must be discovered, and then they must be arranged, classified, and systematized, in order that from them may be deduced general truths and comprehensive systems of knowledge. Otherwise, the human mind would know nothing of the natural world but particular facts, and as it regards revelation, instead of being, as the Apostle says, “perfect,” that is, able to comprehend the more

recondite and spiritual mysteries of the Christian faith, we should still be but "babes in Christ," acquainted only with the first, or elementary principles of religion, and never able to arrive at the full measure of the stature of perfect men in Christ Jesus."

In both nature and revelation, therefore, the facts or truths being known with sufficient certainty, "the processes of comparison, deduction, analysis, and combination, by which alone, we can form comprehensive systems of knowledge, cannot be carried on with convenience and perspicuity, without the use of general terms."\*

The propriety, therefore, of using such general terms to express our knowledge of the particular facts or truths of Scripture, which we have classified and arranged, "rests upon the same foundation as the use of general terms in all scientific investigations, namely, that they are abbreviations of language, and serve as instruments of thought." "The proper consideration is, whether the objects and facts for which they are used as a compendious notation, are not asserted and implied in the Scriptures."†

If, therefore, we find not the *word* TRINITY in Scripture, yet, if we do find in Scripture what amounts to a clear proof of the TRUTH that word expresses;—if it is proved by Scripture that God is in essence, that is, nature or Godhead, only ONE, and that he will not give his glory to another,—and if the Son as begotten, and the Spirit as proceeding,—are, nevertheless, both declared to be really and truly God,—then it follows by the inevitable necessity of intuitive reason, that these three persons are severally God, and yet that God is one,—that is, that GOD IS A TRINITY. The facts being found in Scripture, the human reason must stultify itself, refuse to follow out its own intuitive and necessary conclusion from the premises;—and contrary to its right, office, and duty, in reference to all other truth, and especially as we have seen in reference to revealed truth, refuse to employ a general term for its own convenience, as an instrument of thought, and as a medium of instruction.‡

\* Smith, iii, p. 421. † *Ib.*

‡ See Owen's Works, vol. 10, pp. 471, 472, 503, 504, and 511.

And who are they who would dethrone and silence reason, in this her legitimate and proper office? The very persons who would insist upon our adopting the term *Unity*, which is not Scriptural, and not only the *term* unity, but this *term* with a metaphysical explanation of the meaning, requiring us to believe that the infinite Jehovah, the ever existing and uncreated source of all being, is such an one as his own finite creatures, and that he, therefore, is, and can be only an absolute and personal unity; and all this, as we maintain and believe, in plain and palpable contrariety to the facts found in revelation? How many other terms also, such as omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, do they and we employ in presenting in what is believed a convenient and general form, the individual, isolated, and unsystematised statements of Scripture, in reference to God and man, time and eternity, doctrine and duty.

It would, therefore, be just and proper to deny the doctrine of the divine ubiquity or omnipresence, and many other truths, because the terms by which they are described are not found in Scripture, as to deny that of the Trinity because the *term* Trinity, is not found in Scripture. If this doctrine is not directly, positively, and in explicit definition declared in Scripture, this is equally true of other fundamental articles of religion, admitted by Jew and Christian, such as the being of God, the existence of angels, the resurrection of the dead, and future retribution, which, though evidently derived from the inspired penmen, and now invariably received among the professors of Judaism, do not, in the volumes of holy writ, appear in the form of plain propositions, as, that God is, that angels exist, that the dead shall be raised again, and, that men shall be rewarded according to their actions; but being frequently intimated and assumed, posterity is satisfied, that, with the ancient Hebrews, they formed a very essential and prominent part of their theological system.\*

We have no zeal for the *term* Trinity any more than for the terms person, unity of God, omnipresence, &c.,

\* See Oxlee's *Christian Doctrines, Explained on Jewish Dunc.*, vol i, pp. 33, 34, on the objection to the term God-man, or theanthropos. See *Burgess' Tracts*, pp. lxiv.-lxvi.

if any other can as well, or better, express the ideas of which these are the conventional signs. We contend, not for *terms*, but for the doctrines expressed by the terms, and which are, in each case, no more than conclusions drawn by the irresistible power of human reason from the premises found in Scripture. But the opposition, it would seem, is not to this necessary, not to say, legitimate employment of human reason, in generalizing for its own use the particular facts contained in Scripture. The whole outcry is against any party doing this but they who reject as impossible and contradictory the doctrine of the Trinity, and therefore, oppose the term by which it is propounded. The facts from which this doctrine is deduced may be indisputably found in Scripture, and the term does nothing more than state in one word, what these facts do in many words. *We*, however, must not employ the word, however simply expressive of the facts. But *they* are at perfect liberty to employ the term unity, which is not found in Scripture, and to attach to it a meaning contrary to that of tri-unity, and which is not warranted but opposed by Scripture, which even as speaking of God's unity employs language which necessarily implies a plurality in the one Divine nature or Godhead. And just so it is, that they condemn also, all controversy on our part, FOR the truth, and all criticism that would maintain and support it, while they are to be permitted to controvert AGAINST the truth, and to force constructions upon the Bible which will make it mean anything they wish it to, only that which they or their pride of reason think it ought to mean.\*

The discoveries of revelation remained in the church in statements very near to their original simplicity, and free from any metaphysical distinctions until,† “by the perpetual cavils of gainsayers, and the difficulties which they have raised, later teachers, in the assertion of the same doctrines, have been reduced to the unpleasing necessity of availing themselves of the greater precision of a less familiar language.”

“As to their (the Arians,) complaints, says Athana-

\* See Paul's Refutation of Arianism, pp. 19 and 41.

† Horsley's Tracts, p. 358.

sus,\* the great champion of orthodoxy in the fourth century, and who suffered the loss of all things for his bold fidelity to the truth, "It was they who began with their impious expressions,  $\epsilon\omicron\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\ \omicron\nu\sigma\tau\omega\nu$  and  $\epsilon\omicron\ \eta\nu\ \omega\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\ \eta\nu$ ,† which are not Scripture; and now they make it a charge, that they are detected by means of non-scriptural terms, which have been reverently adopted." The last remark, says Mr. Newman, is important; for until the time of Arius, even those traditional statements of the Catholic doctrine, which were more explicit than Scripture, had not taken the shape of formulæ. It was the Arian defined propositions of the  $\epsilon\grave{\xi}$ ,  $\sigma\upsilon\kappa\ \omicron\nu\sigma\tau\omega\nu$ , made out of nothing, and the like, which called for their imposition.‡

The term Trinity is found in the Greek language  $\tau\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma$ , in the Latin *trinitas*, and as it is admitted in Oriental languages.§ And if this word is not found in the Hebrew language we have seen, and shall further see, that in stating the doctrine of the Unity of God, the Hebrew writers on many occasions, and from the very opening of the Bible, use plural and triple forms of language which, necessarily, imply in their very statement, a trinity or trinity.

The assertion of Dr. Beard and others, that the term trinity was not used by the early Christians, is contrary to existing proof. The word *trias*, in Greek, or *Trinity*, in Latin, was, originally employed, not to signify the number three absolutely and simply, but the thing thus described as being in one aspect of it, a trinity, and in

\* Athan. Ep. ad Afros, 5, 6.

† "That which was made of things not existing," and "that which once was not."

‡ See Newman's History of the Arians of the 4th Century, p. 252, London, 1838. It would appear from Aulus Gellius, that *trias* in Greek, as *ternio* in Latin, signified the number three; and if we speak of the cube or square, or any other power of three, we should not say *trion*, but *tes triados*. The word is also, frequently used by Philo Judæus, in his work on the creation, where he speculates upon the number of days in a manner very similar to that followed by Theophilus. The passage in A. Gellius might lead us to think, that Pythagoras had made use of the term *trias*, and his peculiar theory concerning numbers led him to pay particular regard to the number three. The word, also, occurs in one of those spurious oracles, which have been ascribed to Zoroaster and the Persian Magi.—(Burton, p. 35.)

§ Dr. Beard's Artistic and Hist. Ill. of the Trinity, pp. 59-61.

another aspect, a unity. This distinction was found in the very form of Christian baptism, in the doxology and benediction, and in several triple forms of Scriptural expression, and in the whole teaching of the Old and New Testaments, respecting the supreme deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and at the same time, concerning the unity of the Divine nature. The belief in these three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as one God, was made a primary article in the earliest creeds, embodied in what is called the Apostles' creed, and in all the creeds of the Eastern Churches. The true doctrine of the primitive Church may also be learned from published apologies for the Christian faith, viz: those of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras and Tertullian, which have been handed down to our time in a perfect state. The doctrine held by the primitive Church may be learned also, from other writings of the second century, viz: the genuine production of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Theophilus of Antioch, Tatian, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Tertullian; also from the fragments of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, and of Hegesippus, in Eusebius; from the epistle of Polycarp of Smyrna, to the Phillipians; from the supposed epistle of Barnabas; from the writings ascribed to Ignatius, and also from Pliny's letter to Trajan, and from the Philotrapis of Lucian.\*

The result of long and laboured controversy, and of the most elaborate and critical examination of these writings cannot, we think, leave any impartial reader in doubt, as to the belief of the *doctrine* of the Trinity by the primitive Christians. The *term* trinity, however, was not at first employed because, as has been said, controversy had not required its introduction.

Justin Martyr, who was born according to different computations from the year A. D. 89 to A. D. 103, and was beheaded at Rome, A. D. 165, in a Confession of Faith, found among his works,—a work whose genuineness is doubted, indeed, by many, but admitted by all to be of his age or near it,† uses the term trinity, (τριας) very clearly.

\* φιλοτραπισ.

† See an article in the *Biblical Repertory* for January, 1858.

Theophilus, A. D. 180, undoubtedly employs the term trinity (τριας,) in the following passage:\* “In like manner also, the three days, which preceded the luminaries, are types of the Trinity, of God and his Word, and his Wisdom.” It is not necessary to attempt to explain this typical allusion; and the reader is, perhaps aware, that the term wisdom was applied by the fathers to the second and third persons of the Trinity, though more frequently to the second.

It is plain, that in the present instance the term wisdom is applied to the Holy Ghost, as Bishop Bull has shown it to have been by Irenæus, Origen, and others.

This much, at least, is evident, that Theophilus must have considered some resemblance, if not equality, to have existed between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or he would not have included them in the same type: and who would venture in any sense, to speak of a trinity of beings, if one of the three was God, and the other two were created.

The next writer, who uses the word in the ecclesiastical sense, is Clement of Alexandria, who flourished a few years later than Theophilus. Like many of the fathers, he supposed Plato to have had a Trinity in view, when he wrote that obscure passage in his second letter to Dionysius. Upon which Clement observes, “I understand this in no other way, than as containing mention of the blessed Trinity: for the third thing is the Holy Ghost, and the Son is the Second.” Hippolytus, in a fragment of one of his works, speaks of “the knowledge of the blessed Trinity;” and in another, after reciting the form of words used at baptism, he adds, “For by this Trinity the Father is glorified.” Origen also, very frequently made use of the term.

Methodius, in his Symposium, made use of the word *trias*, *trinity*, and though we may condemn him for seeing an illusion to the Trinity in the sacrifice offered by Abraham, (Gen. xv: 9,) it is plain from the passage, that the word was in general use in his day. But there is another passage in the same work, which shows still more clearly, that, not only the name, but the doctrine

\* Ad Autolyceum, lib. 2, c. 15, in Dr. Burton's Testim. to the Trinity, p. 34.

of the Trinity was well understood in those days. Having compared the stars, which are mentioned in Rev. ii: 4, to the heretics, he adds in the same allegorical strain which was then too common, "Hence they are called a third part of the stars, as being in error concerning one of the numbers of the Trinity; at one time, concerning that of the Father, as Sabellius, who said that the Omnipotent himself suffered; at another time, concerning that of the Son, as Artemas, and they who say that he existed in appearance only; and at another time concerning that of the Spirit, as the Ebionites, who contend that the prophets spoke of their own impulse."\*

Tertullian, A. D. 200, frequently uses the term trinity, and also, the term *person*, in their modern theological sense. This he did, both before and after adopting the opinions of Montanus, which, however, did not affect this doctrine.† Cyprian, and Novatian also, employs the term trinity; and Origen very frequently.‡

Lucian, a heathen writer, who was a contemporary of Athenagoras, has a remarkable passage in his dialogue called *Philopatris*.

The speakers in this dialogue are Critias and Triephton, the former an heathen, the latter a Christian, and when Critias has offered to swear by different heathen deities, each of which, is objected to by Triephton, he asks, "By whom then shall I swear? to which Triephton makes the following reply, the first words of which are a quotation from Homer:

"By the great God, immortal, in the Heavens;"

The Son of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from the Father, one out of three and three out of one, [*unum*, one substance; not *unus*, one person:]

"Consider these thy Jove, be this thy God."

Critias then ridicules this arithmetical oath, and says, "I cannot tell what you mean by saying that one is three, and three are one."

There can be no doubt, that when this dialogue was

\* Dr. Burton's *Anti Nicene Testim. to the Trinity*, p. 351.

† See numerous passages with the original, given by Dr. Burton, pp. 60-84, 82, 88.

‡ See Do.



written, it was commonly known to the heathen, that the Christians believed the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, though in one sense three, in another sense to be one: and if the dialogue was written by Lucian, who lived in the latter part of the second century, it would be one of the strongest testimonies remaining to the doctrine of the Trinity. This was acknowledged by Socinus, who says in one of his works, "that he had never read anything which gave greater proof of a worship of the Trinity being then received among Christians, than the passage which is brought from the dialogue entitled *Philopatris*, and which is reckoned among the works of Lucian.\*

The two following fragments are preserved by Basil. In the first of them it is necessary to remember that the term *υποστασις* hypostasis, was sometimes used for the nature or essence of the Deity; sometimes for a person, *i. e.* for the substantial individuality of the three persons in the Godhead. The Sabellians declined saying in the latter sense of the term, that there were three hypostases; and wished to argue, that such an expression implied three distinct unconnected Beings. Dionysius observes, "Though they may say, that the hypostases, by being three, are divided, still they are three, though it may not suit these persons to say so; or else let them altogether deny the Divine Trinity." We may infer from this remark, that the word Trinity was in common use before the Sabellian controversy began; and Dionysius assumes it as an undisputed point, that in some sense or other there was a Trinity in the Godhead. The Sabellians probably denied, that the word *τριας* implied three *υποστασεις* or distinctly existing persons; but the history of Dionysius and his writings, leaves no doubt as to the body of believers maintaining this opinion.†

In the liturgy ascribed to St. James and used in the Church of Antioch, it is distinctly affirmed *τριας εις Θεος*

\* Bishop Bull believed it to be genuine, and Fabricius was inclined to do the same. Some have ascribed it to a writer older than the time of Lucian; others to one of the same age; and others to much later periods. I need only refer the reader to discussions of the subject by Dodwell, Blondell, Lardner, &c.

† Burton, p. 124.

*the Trinity is one God*, and it speaks also, of “the holy, adorable, and co-essential Trinity.” The term Trinity was employed in the Synod of Alexandria, A. D. 317, and from that time came into common and familiar use, and is described, by Zacharias, Bishop of Mitylene, as “the uncreated, eternal, and consubstantial Trinity, the first and blessed nature and fountain of all things, itself the true ens” or source of all being. In the council of Ephesus it is described as “the Trinity consubstantial above all substance, invisible, incomprehensible, inseparable, immutable, simple and undivided, and uncompounded, without dimension, eternal, incorporeal, without quality, without quantity, whose is honor and glory, and Deity infinitely good.”\*

I will only farther remark, in connection with this objection, in the words of Calvin,† “If they call every word exotic, which cannot be found in the Scriptures in so many syllables, they impose on us a law which is very unreasonable, and which condemns all interpretation, but what is composed of detached texts of Scripture connected together.”

The fathers often accuse themselves and blame the enemies of the truth for making it necessary to use terms liable to perversion. Thus‡ “Hilary accuses the heretics of a great crime, in constraining him, by their wickedness, to expose to the danger of human language those things which ought to be confined within the religion of the mind; plainly avowing, that this is to do things unlawful, to express things inexpressible, to assume things not conceded. A little after, he largely excuses himself for his boldness in bringing forward new terms; for when he has used the names Father, Son, and Spirit; he immediately adds, that whatever is sought farther, is beyond the signification of language, beyond the reach of our senses, beyond the conception of our understanding. And in another place, he pronounces, that happy were the Bishops of Gaul, who had neither composed, nor received, nor even known, any other confession but that ancient and very simple one, which had been received in all the churches from the days of the

\* See Suiceri Thesaurus sat nomine *τριάς*.

† Institutes, Book i, ch. 18, § 8, &c. ‡ Calvin's Institutes, p. 99.

Apostles. Very simple is the excuse of Augustine, that this word, trinity, was extorted by necessity, on account of the poverty of human language on so great a subject, not for the sake of expressing what God is, but to avoid passing it over in total silence, that the Father, Son, and Spirit are three."

"If, then, the words have not been rashly invented, we should beware lest we be convicted of fastidious temerity in rejecting them. I could wish them indeed, to be buried in oblivion, provided this faith were universally received, that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, are the one God; and that, nevertheless, the Son is not the Father, nor the Spirit the Son, but that they are distinguished from each other by some peculiar property. "I am not so rigidly precise as to be fond of contending for mere words." "Let us also learn, however, to beware, since we have to oppose the Arians on one side, and the Sabellians on the other, lest while they take offence at both these parties being deprived of all opportunity of evasion, they cause some suspicion that they are themselves the disciples either of Arius, or of Sabellius. Arius confesses "that Christ is God," but maintains also, "that he was created and had a beginning." He acknowledges that Christ is "one with the Father," but secretly whispers in the ears of his disciples, that he is "united to him," like the rest of the faithful, though by a singular privilege." Say that he is consubstantial, you tear off the mask from the hypocrite, and yet you add nothing to the Scriptures. Sabellius asserts, "that the names Father, Son, and Spirit, are expressive of no distinction in the Godhead." Say that they are three, and he will exclaim, that you are talking of "three Gods." Say "that in the one essence of God there is a trinity of Persons," and you will, at once, express what the Scriptures declare, and will restrain such frivolous loquacity." Calvin adds, "But I have found, by long and frequent experience, that those who pertinaciously contend about words, cherish some latent poison."

Let us, then, recognise the necessity and importance of the term, trinity. Names are things. And so long therefore, as the doctrine taught by this word is assailed and denied, we have no alternative. Nor could the

facts, proved, as we shall show, from Scripture, be probably expressed in a simpler form than in saying, that the God who is one and who is yet God as Father, as Son, and as Holy Ghost, is a TRINITY.

“Ineffable, all-powerful God, all free,  
 Thou only liv'st, and each thing lives by thee;  
 No joy, no, nor perfection to thee came  
 By the contriving of this world's great fame:  
 Ere sun, moon, stars, began their restless race,  
 Ere painted was with light Heaven's pure face,  
 Ere air had clouds, ere clouds wept down their show'ra,  
 Ere sea embraced earth, ere earth bare flow'ra,  
 Thou happy liv'dst, world nought to thee supply'd,  
 All in thyself, thyself thou satisfy'd;  
 Of good no splendor shadow doth appear,  
 No age-worn track, which shin'd in thee most clear  
 Perfection's sum, prime cause of every cause,  
 Midst, end, beginning where all good doth pause.  
 Hence of thy substance, differing in nought,  
 Thou in eternity thy Son forth brought;  
 The only birth of thy unchanging mind,  
 Thine image, pattern-like that ever shin'd;  
 Light out of light, begotten not by will,  
 But nature, all and that same essence still  
 Which thou thyself, for thou dost nought possess  
 Which he hath not, in aught nor is he less  
 Than he his great begetter; of this light,  
 Eternal, double kindled was thy spright  
 Eternally, who is with thee, the same  
 All-holy gift, Ambassador, knot, Flame:  
 Most sacred Triad, O most holy One!  
 Unprocreate Father, ever procreate Son,  
 Ghost breath'd from both, you were, are still, shall be,  
 (Most blessed) Three in One, and One in Three,  
 Incomprehensible by reachless height,  
 And unperceived by excessive light.  
 So in our souls three and yet one are still,  
 The understanding, memory and will;  
 So (though unlike) the planet of the days,  
 So soon as he was made, begat his rays,  
 Which are his offspring, and from both was hurl'd  
 The rosy light which consoles the world,  
 And none prevent another: so the spring,  
 The well head, and the stream which they forth bring  
 Are but one self same essence, nor in aught  
 Do differ, save in order; and our thought  
 No chime of time discerns in them to fall  
 But three distinctly 'bide one essence all.  
 But these express not thee: who can declare  
 Thy being? men and angels dazzled are.  
 Who would this Eden force with wit or sense,  
 A cherubim shall find to bar him thence.

O! King, whose greatness none can comprehend,  
 Whose boundless goodness doth to all extend;  
 Light of all beauty, Ocean without ground,  
 That standing, flowest; giving dost abound;  
 Rich Palace, and In-dweller, ever blest,  
 Never not working, ever yet in rest;  
 What wit cannot conceive, words say of thee,  
 Here, where we, but as in a mirror see,  
 Shadows of shadows, atoms of thy might,  
 Still only-eyed when staring on thy light;  
 Grant, that, released from this earthly jail,  
 And freed from clouds, which here our knowledge veil  
 In Heaven's high temples where thy praises ring,  
 In sweeter notes I may hear angels sing.

[*Drummond of Hawthornden. Hymn to the Fairest Faire.*

---

NOTE A.

*The alleged Unitarianism of Locke, Newton, Milton, Clarke, Watts, and Grotius.*

Although Unitarians claim pre-eminent honour because they base their opinions on reason alone, yet none are more anxious than they to sustain and patronize them by the authority of great names.

Mr. Locke's Essay was believed by some to lead inferentially to the rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity; and therefore, say Unitarians, Mr. Locke was a Unitarian. But in his elaborate and extended letters to Bishop Stillingfleet, Mr. Locke repudiates the charge, and proves that, as no such consequence was intended by him to be deduced from his Philosophy, so, in fact, no such consequence does, or can fairly be considered to follow from it. In his vindication of himself, Mr. Locke occupies nearly as much room as his entire essay, and as he was a bold and open expounder of his views, we may conclude that he had not adopted sentiments contrary to the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. That he held such views, he solemnly denied, in *words*, and by his subscription to the Articles of the Church of England and communion at her altars. He acknowledged the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction for sins, and in his last moments he thanked God "for the love shewn to man in justifying him by faith in Jesus Christ, and in particular for having called him to the knowledge of that Divine Saviour."<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> See the statement of his literary friend, who lived with him until death, in Works, vol. ix: p. 173, 8vo ed. See also numerous passages in proof of his anti-Socinian views in Hales on the Trinity, vol. i: p. 275, 276, and in Bishop Burges's Tracts on the Divinity of Christ, p. 211, &c.

Giving a reason why Christ was not a mortal man, Locke uses this language: "Being the Son of God, he was immortal, like God, his Father." Now, to be immortal, with respect only to the future, is to be immortal like the angels, or the human soul; but to be immortal like God, his Father, is "to have neither beginning of days nor end of life," as St. Paul says of the Son of God, that is to be eternal and uncreated. To be immortal, then, like God, his Father, is to be immortal through his divine Sonship, that is, because he is of the same nature with his Father, or by consubstantiality of nature.

Sir Isaac Newton, in a letter to James Pearce, says, "Your letter a little surprised me, to find myself supposed to be a Socinian or Unitarian. I never was, nor am now, under the least temptation of such doctrines." "I hope you will do me the favour to be one of the examiners of my papers: till which time, you will do kindly to stop so false a report."\*

In his work against the genuineness of the passage in 1 John, Sir Isaac remarks, †—"It is no article of Faith, no point of discipline, nothing but a criticism concerning a text of Scripture, that I am going to write about." But he says, clearly enough, that he was not a Socinian. For, speaking of the passage in Cyprian's works, in which he asserts the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, he says, "The Socinians here deal too injuriously with Cyprian, while they would have this place corrupted,—these places being, in my opinion, genuine." The two passages of Cyprian are the following: "Si templum Dei factus est, quare ejus Dei? Si Creatoris; non potuit, quia in eum non credidit: Si Christi: nec ejus fieri potuit templum, qui negat Dominum Christum: Si Spiritus Sancti; quum tres unum sint, quomodo placatus ei esse potuit, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est? Dicit Dominus Ego et Pater unum sumus: et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est: Et Hi Tres Unum Sunt." No one can doubt Cyprian's belief of the doctrine of the Trinity. And when we connect Newton's censure of the Socinians, with his conviction of the genuineness of these Trinitarian passages of Cyprian,—with the absence of all objection to the doctrine of the Trinity in his letter to Le Clerc,—and his adherence to the Church of England,—what can be reasonably inferred, but that he was not only a decided Anti-Socinian, but a believer of the established doctrines of the Church? There is one passage in his Letter to LeClerc, which strongly marks the mind of a believer in the Trinity. "In the Eastern nations, and for a long time in the Western, *The Faith* subsisted without this verse, (1 John v: 7,) and it is rather dangerous to Religion to make it now lean on a bruised reed." *The Faith*, he says, once subsisted without this verse; that is the faith, of which this verse now makes, or is supposed to make, a part or evidence; namely, Faith in the Holy Trinity. This Faith, he says, was prior to, and independent of, the verse. Faith, then, in the Holy Trinity, is called by *The Faith*, or the primitive Christian Faith. Again, he says, "It is rather a danger to Religion to make it lean on a bruised reed." By religion (the Christian Religion,) here also must be meant Faith in the Holy Trinity; for the general truth of Christianity cannot be said to lean on this verse; nor any other doctrine, but the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The language, therefore, of this passage, evidently comes from one, who considered the Christian religion, the Faith, and Faith in the Holy Trinity, as synonymous terms.

Dr. Clarke is another authority claimed by Unitarians. But, while inclined to modify the doctrine of the Trinity, Dr. Clarke believed that "with this first and supreme cause, or Father of all things, there has existed from the beginning, a second divine Person, which is the Word or Son."

"With the Father and the Son there has existed, from the beginning, a third Divine Person, which is the Spirit of the Father and the Son."

By existing from the beginning, Dr. Clarke does not mean, as the Unitarians do, from the beginning of the Gospel dispensation, but speaking of the Son existing "before all worlds," and "without any limitation of time," that is, from eternity; and so of the Holy Spirit.

\* This letter is quoted by Mr. Belsham in his *Calm Inquiry*, p. 474.

† See Burges's *Tracts*, pp. 197-222.

"After the accomplishing of man's redemption, by his sufferings and death on the Cross, for the sins of the world, our Lord (says Dr. Clarke,) is described in Scripture as invested with distinct worship in his own person, and receiving prayers (adoration, in the 3d edition,) and thanksgiving from his Church." As proofs of such worship, Dr. Clarke refers to a variety of texts, which mention his disciples worshipping him, honouring him as well as the Father, baptizing in his name, angels worshipping him, every knee bowing at his name, calling upon his name, invoking him in prayer, and praying for grace, peace, blessing, direction, assistance and comfort from him.

The Chevalier De Ramsay, who was witness to the last sentiments of Dr. Clarke, assures us that he very much repented having published his work on the Trinity.—[See Whitaker's Origin of Arianism, pp. 456-470.] And in a paper presented to the Upper House, he formally and solemnly declared his opinion to be, "that the Son of God was eternally begotten, by the eternally incomprehensible power and will of the Father; and that the Holy Spirit was likewise eternally derived from the Father, by and through the Son, according to the eternal, incomprehensible power and will of the Father."

Another eminent man, claimed as an Unitarian, is Grotius. Grotius has, however, given indisputable proof of his anti-Socinianism. This we might establish by showing that he admits the words of Thomas, "My Lord, and my God," to be an acknowledgment of Christ's Divinity; that he follows the usual interpretation of John i: 1-14, making Christ the incarnate Word, and the Creator of the World, &c.

In the year 1617, he published his *Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi adversus Faustum Socinum*. The friendly correspondence which he afterwards carried on with Crellius, excited some doubts of his orthodoxy. To repel these doubts, he prefixed to an edition of his tract *De Satisfactione Christi*, in 1638, (one and twenty years after its first publication,) a Letter to G. J. Vossius, in which he confirms his former sentiments on the subject of Atonement, by an appeal to his Annotations on the Bible, and to his tract *De Jure Belli et Pacis*; and asserts his belief in the Trinity. In his treatise *De Veritate Religionis Christianæ L. V.*, he vindicates Christians from the charge of worshipping three Gods against the Jews on their own principles, and from their own writings; to which treatise he refers in his Letter to Vossius: *Triados probationem in eo libro directe aggressus non sum, memor ejus quod a viro magno socero tuo audiverem, peccasse Resseum, &c. Illud addam, si quis meam de summa Trinitate sententiam scire cupiat, reperiturum, quod satis sit in Poematis nuper editis. Amplior explicatio in notis reservanda est.* Poetry is the natural language of religion, Sacer interpresque Deorum.

Another name most unwarrantably claimed as in his last days favouring Unitarianism, is Dr. Watts. For this bold and daring sacrilege and profanation of a good man's name, there is, as I have shewn elsewhere, no manner of proof.\*

The great Milton is another authority on which Unitarianism delights to rest with confidence. Milton, during his life, held communion as far as he did commune, only with those who believed in the doctrine of the Trinity. He has published the boldest prayer to the Triune God in the English language. He was universally regarded as a Trinitarian during life, and since his death, until the year 1823, when the posthumous work

\* In two Articles published in the different Periodicals. See also *Milner's Life of Watts*.

on Christian doctrine attributed to him, was discovered. Of the authenticity of this work, very serious doubts may be entertained, both on the ground of its internal style, which is in perfect contrast to Milton's prose works, and of deficient external evidence. The very fact that Milton, who was a martyr to his free and bold expression of opinion, and a leading controversialist, should not have published this treatise, but have left it to the chances of destruction, is, in itself, strong proof against its authenticity.

But granting that this work is Milton's production, it may have been, for all we can tell, the work of his yet unsettled and wayward youth, whose sentiments he lived afterwards to correct.

But it is, after all, only in one point, and to a certain extent, that this treatise opposes the views of Trinitarian Evangelical Christians. On the subjects of man's fall, depravity, guilt and ruin,—of the covenants, both of works and grace,—of original sin, and its imputation to all mankind,—of regeneration, repentance, justification, sanctification, adoption, perseverance, election, predestination, assurance, atonement, and the prophetic, sacerdotal and kingly offices of Christ,—in short, on all that enters into, defines, and constitutes the system of evangelical, orthodox Christianity, this treatise is evangelical, and *in direct antagonism* to the system of Unitarianism, from which it is as far removed as Heaven from earth.

Against Socinian views of the inspiration and authority of Scripture, and of the nature of Christ and the Holy Spirit, this treatise wages *open and avowed* conflict.

Equally opposed is the teaching of this work on the subject of the Trinity, to the views of any body of Unitarians now existing.

The author does not believe in a Tri-unity of three persons in one God-head, but in three distinct and separate beings, each of whom is God, and possessed of all divine attributes, prerogatives, powers and worship. The Son, however, was created or generated by the Father, and is inferior to Him, and the Spirit, who was also created, is inferior to both.

The Son received from the Father both "the name and nature of Deity," (vol. i., p. 126, Boston ed.)—"coequality with the Father." (p. 193.) In becoming man, therefore, the Son "emptied himself of that form of God in which he had previously existed,"—(p. 193.) The Father "imparts his glory to the Son,"—(p. 192.) The Son possesses self-existence, (p. 177,) omnipresence, (p. 178,) omniscience, (p. 179,) omnipotence, (p. 180,) though not absolutely, or independently, of the Father.

"When the Son is said to be the first born of every creature, and the beginning of the creation of God," nothing can be more evident than that God, of his own will, created, or generated, or produced, the Son, before all things, endued with the Divine nature, as in the fulness of time he miraculously begat him in his human nature of the Virgin Mary. The generation of the Divine nature is described by no one with more sublimity and copiousness than by the Apostle to the Hebrews, (i., 2, 3,) whom he appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, &c. It must be understood from this, that God imparted to the Son as much as he pleased of the Divine nature,—nay, of the Divine substance itself.

This point also appears certain, notwithstanding the arguments of some of the moderns to the contrary, that the Son existed in the beginning, under the name of the *logos*, or word, and was the first of the whole creation, by whom afterwards all other things were made, both in Heaven and earth. John i., 1-3, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word



was with God, and the Word was God." &c. : xvii., 5, "And now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."—Col. i., 15, 18. Pages 112, 106.

These extracts are made from the chapter on the Son of God, which is published by Unitarians as a tract. But there is another full chapter "of Christ as a Redeemer," [ch. xiv.,] which Unitarians have not published in connexion with the other, and thus give to their readers a very imperfect and false view of the doctrines of this work. In this chapter, Milton says [p. 383,] "Redemption is that act whereby Christ, being sent in the fulness of time, redeemed all believers at the price of his own blood, by his own voluntary act, conformably to the eternal counsel and grace of God, the Father."

Again, page 386: "Two points are to be considered in relation to Christ's character as Redeemer: his nature and office. His nature is twofold—Divine and human."

Again, page 388: "With regard to Christ's Divine nature, the reader is referred to what was proved in a former chapter concerning the Son of God; from whence it follows, that He, by whom all things were made, both in Heaven and earth, even the angels themselves,—He who in the beginning was the Word, and God with God, and although not supreme, yet the first born of every creature, must necessarily have existed previous to his incarnation, whatever subtleties may have been invented to evade this conclusion by those who contend for the merely human nature of Christ.

"This incarnation of Christ, whereby he, being God, took upon him the human nature, and was made flesh, without thereby ceasing to be numerically the same as before, is generally considered by theologians as next to the Trinity in Unity, the greatest mystery of our religion."

Again, pages 392-3: "There is, then, in Christ, a mutual hypostatic union of two natures, that is to say, of two essences, of two substances, and consequently of two persons; nor does this union prevent the respective properties of each from remaining individually distinct. That the fact is so, is sufficiently certain; the mode of union is unknown to us; and it is best to be ignorant of what God wills should remain unknown."

"How much better is it [p. 393,] for us to know merely that the Son of God, our Mediator, was made flesh, that he is called both God and man, and is such in reality; which is expressed in Greek by the single and appropriate term, Θεανθρωπος.

Page 397: "It sometimes happens, on the other hand, that what properly belongs to the compound nature of Christ, is attributed to one of his natures only, [1 Tim. 2, 5,] one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." Now he is not mediator, inasmuch as he is man, but inasmuch as he is Θεανθρωπος."

The mediatorial office of Christ is that whereby, at the special appointment of God the Father, he voluntarily performed, and continues to perform, on behalf of man, whatever is requisite for obtaining reconciliation with God and eternal salvation.—Page 400.

"Christ's sacerdotal office is that whereby he once offered himself to God the Father as a sacrifice for sinners, and has always made, and still continues to make intercession for us."

"The humiliation of Christ is that state in which, under his character of God-man he voluntarily submitted himself to the Divine justice, as well in life as in death, for the purpose of undergoing all things requisite to accomplish our redemption."—Page 410.

The satisfaction of Christ is the complete reparation made by him in his two-fold capacity of God and man, by the fulfilment of the law, and payment of the required price for all mankind.—Page 417.

The effect of Christ's satisfaction is sufficient to produce the reconciliation of God the Father with man.—Page 426.

It will be now, we think, abundantly evident that, however much the work differs from the orthodox faith on the subject of the Trinity, it differs on the same subject quite as much, and indeed far more, from the Unitarian theory, while on all other points it coincides with the evangelical system, and is diametrically opposite to that of Unitarian.

To the names mentioned as being claimed by Unitarians, as authorities in favour of their opinions, several others of less celebrity might be mentioned.\* Enough has been said to prove, 1. That Unitarianism is ever ready to avail itself of the authority of great names, however slender, or even suicidal may be the evidence. 2. That, like Popery, it waits for death to prevent the opportunity of immediate and direct denial, in order to create and perpetuate rumours of an alleged change of opinions.

---

NOTE B.

*How on the Social Nature of God.*

“Upon the whole, let such a union be conceived in the being of God, with such a distinction, and one would think (though the complexions of men's minds do strangely and unaccountably differ,) the absolute perfection of the Deity, and especially, the perfect felicity thereof, should be much the more apprehensible with us. When we consider the most delicious society which would hence ensue, among the so entirely consentient Father, Son and Spirit, with whom there is so perfect rectitude, everlasting harmony, mutual complacency, unto highest delectation; according to our way of conceiving things, who are taught by our own nature, (which also, hath in it the Divine image,) to reckon no enjoyment pleasant, without the association of some other with us (herein; we for our parts, cannot but hereby have in our minds, a more gustful idea of a blessed state, than we can conceive in mere eternal solitude.

God speaks to us as men, and will not blame us for conceiving things so infinitely above us, according to the capacity of our natures; provided, we do not assume to ourselves to be a measure for our own conceptions of him; further than as he is himself pleased to warrant, and direct us herein. Some likeness we may (taught by himself,) apprehend between him and us, but with infinite (not inequality only, but) unlikeness. And for this case of delectation in society, we must suppose an immense difference between him an all-sufficient, self-sufficient Being, comprehending in himself the infinite fulness of whatsoever is most excellent and delectable and ourselves, who have in us, but a very minute portion of being, goodness, or felicity, and whom he hath made to stand much in need of one another, and most of all of him.

But, when looking into ourselves, we find there is in us a disposition, often upon no necessity, but sometimes, from some sort of benignity of temper, unto conversation with others; we have no reason, when other things concur, and do fairly induce, and lead our thoughts this way, to

\* See Heber's Bampton Lectures, pp. 120, 121.

apprehend any incongruity in supposing he may have some distinct object of the same sort of propension in his own most perfect being too, and therewith such a propension itself also.

As to what concerns ourselves, the observation is not altogether unapposite, what Cicero treating of friendship, discourses of perpetual solitude, "that the affectation of it must signify the worst of ill-humor, and the most savage nature in the world. And supposing one of so sour and morose a humor as to shun and hate the conversation of men, he would not endure it, to be without some one or other to whom he might discharge the virulency of that his malignant humor. Or that supposing such a thing could happen, that God should take a man quite out of the society of men, and place him in absolute solitude, supplied with the abundance of whatsoever nature could covet besides; who, saith he, is so made of iron, as to endure that kind of life?" And he introduces Architas Tarentinus, reported to speak to this purpose, "that if one could ascend into Heaven, behold the frame of the world, and the beauty of every star, his admiration would be unpleasant to him alone, which would be most delicious, if he had some one to whom to express his sense of the whole."

We are not, I say, strictly to measure God by ourselves in this; further than as he himself prompts and leads us. But, if we so form our conception of Divine bliss, as not to exclude from it somewhat, whereof that delight in society, which we find in ourselves may be an imperfect, faint resemblance; it seems not altogether disagreeable to what the Scriptures also teach us to conceive concerning him, when they bring in the eternal wisdom, saying, as one distinct from the prime Author and Parent of all things, then was I by him, as one brought up with him, and daily his delight.—Prov. viii: 80.

For the same import are many passages of the Fathers: "If," says Athenagoras, "on account of your surpassing intellect, you wish to learn what the Son means; in a few words I will tell you. He is the first offspring of the Father, but not as anything created, for God is from the beginning, and being an eternal mind, he himself had within himself the Word, being eternally comprehensive of the Word. The Holy Spirit likewise, acting efficaciously in those who prophecy, we assert to be an emanation from God, flowing from him and returning to him, as a ray of the sun. Who then, might not well think it strange, that we, who declare God the Father, and God the Son, and the Holy Spirit, showing both their power in unity and their distinction in order, should yet be called Atheists."

The argument of Athenagoras is this, God's personal Word is the Reason of God. But God is eternally rational, or eternally comprehensive of Reason. Therefore, the Word or Reason of God is eternal also.

The play upon the terms *λογος* and *λογικος* in their Greek acceptation cannot be preserved in an English version.

There is a parallel passage of Athanasius, which may serve to elucidate this of Athenagoras. Athan. Orat. ii. Cont. Arian. Oper. vol. i. p. 154. Commel 1600.

The *αλογος* of Athanasius is evidently the opposite to the *λογικος* of Athenagoras.

Tertullian has imitated in Latin, the same form of phraseology and the same peculiar line of argument.

Ante omnia enim Deus erat solus, ipse sibi et mundus et locus et omnia: solus autem, quia nihil extrinsecus praeter illum. Caeterum ne tunc quidem solus; habitat enim secum, quam habet in semetipso, Rationem suam scilicet. Rationalis [Athenagoræ *λογικος*] enim Deus; et Ratio

in ipso prius: et ita ab ipso omnia. Quæ Ratio sensus ipsius est, hanc Græci *λογον* dicunt. Tertul. adv. Prax. § 3. Oper. p. 407.

The whole argument is founded upon the double sense of the term *λογος* which imports either Verbum or Ratio. On this double sense, Athenagoras and others of the old Fathers delighted to play. As the Father is eternally *λογικος* his *λογος* they argued must be eternal also.

Tres dirigens, Patrem et Filium et spiritum sanctum: tres autem non statu, sed gradu; nec substantia, sed forma: nec potestate sed specie: unius autem substantiæ et unius status.\*

The same argument for, and view of, the Trinity, is embodied in one of the ancient hymns of the church, as found in the *Thesaurus Hymnologicus* Tom. i, p. 276.

In maiestatis solio,  
Tres sedent in triclinio,  
Nam non est consolatio  
Perfecta solitario.

Aeternæ mentis oculo,  
Quando pater inflectitur  
In lucis suæ speculo,  
Imago par exprimitur.

Imaginis consortium,  
Nativus præ exitus,  
Consorsque spirans gaudium  
Ingenitus et genitus.

Hoc gaudium est spiritus  
Quo patri natus jungitur,  
Et unum bonum funditus  
In his tribus concluditur.

In tribus est simplicitas,  
Quos non distinguit qualitas,  
Non obstat tribus unitas,  
Quos ampliat immensitas.

Per solam vim originis,  
Communio fit nuninis,  
Nativo ductu germinis,  
Votivique spiraminis.

Ingenito et genito, etc.

\* Faber's *Apost. of Trinit.* vol. ii, pp. 240.

## ARTICLE V.

## • THE POETICAL ELEMENT OF THE BIBLE

The Bible is a book of history, of laws, of moral and didactic precepts, of biographical narratives, of personal memoirs, and of epistles, some of which are addressed to churches, and some to individuals. A large portion of it is of pure poetry, and the poetical element runs through the whole, like a thread of gold. Now, we do not think that sufficient prominence has been given to this particular element, to this remarkable peculiarity, to this distinctive characteristic of Divine revelation; and we do think that it affords a separate and a very impressive argument for the Divine origin and authority of the Bible; that it is in entire accordance with what we might expect to find in a Divine revelation, from a consideration of the analogy of nature, the perfections of God, and the spiritual economy of man. We cannot help thinking also, that the consequences flowing from the practical recognition of this peculiar element of the Bible, are of the very highest importance, as infallibly indicating the method by which Divine truth may find readiest access to the minds of men in general, and be most effectually impressed upon them.

God has made two revelations of himself to man. The one in nature, the other in Scripture. The one partial, the other complete. In the one he has proclaimed his eternal power and Godhead. In the other he has manifested all his attributes in their highest forms. We might expect *a priori*, that the two revelations proceeding from the same being, and addressed to the same being, would have some things in common; that while each should be especially adapted to its proper object, they would bear the marks of a common origin. The external, visible universe, once a paradise, now too often a prison and a tomb, is still glorious to behold. It still hath objects and aspects of surpassing loveliness. Above or below, by day or by night, in the blaze of the nocturnal sky, lighted up with "living sapphires," and in the first, faint flush of the new-born day, in the level

•

rays of the sun as it lingers on the verge of the horizon, in the ruddy glow of evening, when his descending disk has sunk below the mountains and the ocean, above all, in the rainbow, bright token of peace and good, we discern this loveliness. "Very beautiful it is in the brightness thereof; it circleth the heavens, like a glorious girdle, and the hands of the Most High, have bended it." We discern it in the manifold beauties of the earth, looked upon in early spring, when the winter is past, the rain is over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth, the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land; or amid the glowing and gorgeous splendors of summer when the pastures are clothed with flocks, the valleys are covered over with corn; or in brown October, of all months perhaps, the sweetest, when the leaf sere and spotted, but still bright, hangs loosely from its stem; and in the yellow sunshine, there is a certain accordance with the fading leaf, and a gentle touch and tone of not unwelcome melancholy, in the aspect of the earth, soothing, it may be, and dear

\*\*\*\*\* "To an eye,  
That hath kept watch o'er man's mortality."—

to a heart that has often brooded, not in bitterness, but in love and sadness, over his own mortal lot, the mysteries which beset the spirit here. And winter, too, hath a glory of its own, not merely when the cold, bright sun shines on the snow-clad earth, and glittering icicles hang like brilliants on every bough, but when mingled hail and snow come hurtling from the darkened sky.

Now, what we find in nature, we might expect to find in Scripture. If the glory of God is mirrored in the shining stream and in the bending skies, in the hues and harmonies of evening, in the purpling east at day-break; if these show forth the manifold wisdom, power, and love of the Creator of all things; if nature, which is the creature of God; if light, which is the garment of God, be so glorious; if this material universe, the outer court of Jehovah's temple, be so garnished with stars and garlanded with flowers, analogy would surely lead us to anticipate a kindred glory in the Word of God which is the holy of holies, the immediate dwelling-place

of his life-giving Spirit, the more exact and express image of his glory. If the day be his, the night also his, if he hath prepared the light and the sun, if the heavens be the work of his fingers,\* if he hath ordained the moon and the stars,—the Bible a work of God, diviner still, as undefiled by the sin of apostate man, should be brighter than the starry heavens, purer than the crystal lymph, sweeter than the flowers of Spring.

An examination of the spiritual constitution of man would also, lead us to expect that a revelation addressed to him from God, should have the poetical element. A Divine revelation should recognise the nature of man in all its integrity and furnish its appropriate object and aliment for every faculty. It should be suited to all the exercises, to all the wants and to all the manifestations of the soul, if it would satisfy its cravings and heal its diseases. To the understanding it should offer absolute truth. To the conscience, a law of moral duty commensurate with the perfections of God. To the affections, an object of infinite loveliness and glory. For the taste, the æsthetical faculty of the soul, it should surely make an appropriate provision in objects of beauty addressed and adapted to itself. The main design of a revelation from God, would, of course, be not to gratify taste, but to instruct the understanding, to illuminate and control the conscience, to sanctify and attract the affections. But, instead of obstructing this primary purpose, a revelation which should not ignore, but embody the poetical element, universal and destructible as it is, in the heart of man, would greatly advance it. The Law given on Sinai is to this day not less revered because inevitably associated in every mind with the awful descent of Jehovah on the mount, with the sound of the trumpet and the voice of words, with the terrors of the multitude, with the ministry of angels, and with the majesty of God. As this outer and material universe is exquisitely adapted to the bodily constitution of man, as there is a natural fitness in the organization of the eye, the instru-

\* Hence the heavens, as adorned with the moon and stars, are said to be the work "of God's fingers," that is, not only those which were powerfully made, but also *curiously wrought and adorned* by the Spirit of God.—Owen on the Spirit, vol. iii, p. 97, Carter's edition.

ment of vision, and in light, the medium of vision, in the ear, the organ of hearing, and in sound, the object of hearing, in all the members of the body, to their proper objects and functions, so there is a like and a not less wonderful correspondence, between the faculties of the soul and that supernatural revelation of his truth, his grace, and his glory, which God has addressed to it. There is no power or passion, no taste or sentiment, no instinct or aspiration of the soul of man, for which God has not made an adequate provision, to which he has not addressed an appropriate appeal. If, in the revelation, which he has given us, he has revealed truth to instruct the understanding and authority to control the conscience, he has exhibited beauty to delight the imagination and taste. Had this element of the revelation been wanting, the revelation had been incomplete and imperfect, it had been neither so worthy of God nor so suitable to us. The Bible is to be contemplated with reference to God, the being from whom it emanates, and man, the being to whom it is addressed. In its communications concerning God, it conveys conceptions, every way worthy of the Supreme Being, in themselves infinitely transcending the thoughts of man, and yet, when revealed in perfect accordance with the highest aspirations of the human spirit, and the clearest deductions of most enlarged and enlightened reason. The views of the Divine nature and government which it unfolds are, moreover, peculiar to itself. They are invariably found where the Bible is found, and nowhere else. When once clearly announced and apprehended, they are perceived to be, both sublime and true, suitable alike to the soul and to God; but they are such as fallen man, unaided, uninspired, alone could never have originated. They evidently come from afar. They descend from above. Like that spiritual and saving regeneration of which our Saviour spake, these truths are all transcendental, Divine, *αυωθεν*. Another marvellous peculiarity about these revelations, so far as they relate to God is, that the wiser and the better men become, the more exalted and precious do they appear. Just as the spiritual vision is purged and strengthened, the spiritual objects revealed to its contemplation, expand and brighten. Man



never can outgrow the revelations of God. These revelations never can become old, never can be out of date. As in themselves, they are endowed with immortal youth, so they are arrayed in a vesture of undecaying beauty. The word of God is invested with an authority, which is felt to be imperative and eternal. It speaks to the men of this generation in the same kingly tone with which it spake to the first man to whom it came. The sun shines not less brightly now than when its morning beam first enote the land and sea; so the rays of Divine truth have a fresh and perpetual glory. Schools of philosophy, "falsely so called," spring up, live through their appointed day and then disappear to be heard of no more. Systems of false religion overspread continents, endure, it may be, for centuries, and are then exposed and exploded never to be restored again. The world is continually outgrowing its false faiths, but the truths of Divine revelation, concerning God, never grow old, never pass away, never sink into contempt as man gets wiser; but dilate before his eyes, as he approaches nearer to them, like some majestic mountain that seemed but a small speck in the distance, but on a near approach "swells vast to heaven;" or, like the visible horizon, seemingly a narrow circle, but seek to touch it, to compass it, and you find it ever-spreading, ever-receding, inaccessible, incommensurable. This is true of the Bible in what it reveals concerning God.\*

Now, it is just as marvellous, after its kind, considered as a revelation addressed to man. He, who made the human soul, made the Bible that is meant for it, and they are mutually adapted. They fit into each other as the key to the lock, as the empty reservoir to the water that is to fill it, as the ear to sound, as the eye to light. Had God been what he is, and man been different, then

\* On the limitation of our knowledge, and on the nature of our knowledge concerning God, see Discussions on Philosophy, &c., by Sir W. Hamilton. On the Philosophy of the Unconditioned, in reference to Cousin's *Infito—Absolute*. This article of Hamilton presents, perhaps, the most fundamental view of the subject to be found in the whole compass of literature—an article in which the last conclusions of the most learned philosophy appear to be in entire harmony with the first principles of the doctrine of Christ.—John i: 18; v: 37; Job xi: 7-12; Pa. 1: 7-16; cxxxiv: 1-12.

the revelations addressed to man had been different from what they are. Had man possessed some of the attributes which he has and wanted others, then the revelation which God has made to man, had recognised those attributes, and had lacked elements which it now possesses, but which in those altered circumstances, would have been superfluous. Had man possessed a moral and intellectual nature only, then would God have revealed all the moral truth which now exercises the understanding and appeals to the moral sense. But he would have revealed it in other forms, and he would have revealed it alone. The revelation would have been perfect, because it would have fully answered the conditions of the case, it would have been entirely worthy of the holiness and truth of God, and entirely adapted to the nature of man. But it would have been another sort of man from us. Such a revelation would suit our nature perfectly, so far as it was a revelation of moral truth, but it would not suit us altogether, because of the missing element of beauty, the object and the delight of taste.

Now, just suppose that this faculty is an essential part of the constitution of man, and that God is about to address to him a revelation which is to be worthy of God and commensurate with the wants, the faculties, and the susceptibilities of man. It is evident that the old provision will no longer answer, a new element must be added. There must be, not only truth for the understanding and authority for the conscience, but there must be something addressed and adapted to the æsthetical faculty—taste. Otherwise, the revelation were incomplete. It might speak of the perfections, the purposes and the operations of God just as it does now, but still there would be a most unexpected, inexplicable, appalling *hiatus*. This revelation is perfect, so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. It has a missing element. It is, therefore, not in keeping with that other revelation of himself, which God has given us, in the creation. When we inspect what purports to be a revelation from God to man we have a right to look for, to ask for something to correspond with the stars of Heaven and the flowers of earth.

In contemplating so mutilated and defective a revela-

tion, we should feel the same embarrassment that we should experience if we were to leave out of view, some indispensable condition of the question in the attempt to solve an algebraic problem. Now, just let the poetical element be restored to the Scriptures, and you will see at a glance, how complete they become, how consistent with their author and design, how consonant with the soul of man, how correspondent with all the attributes and works of God!

Then the two revelations of nature and Scripture, receive and reflect mutual light. Then the music of nature's many and sweet voices, finds a responsive echo in inspired Scripture. Then the innumerable beauties of earth and sky, of flower and tree, of streamlet and hill, of gems and precious stones, are reflected from the faithful mirror of the later and fuller revelation. Then the melodious murmurs of the waterfall, and the soft green of the sward in spring-time, are recognised and reproduced in Scripture. Then our common earth is clothed with a radiance coming down out of Heaven. Then the beauties of nature are linked with the holiest sensibilities of the human soul, and consecrated by the inspired portraiture of the Divine Spirit. Then the voice of nature gathers significance and sacredness from the revelations of grace. Then the whole earth is in some sense, at once a teacher and a temple. Then the innocent lamb and the faithful shepherd may recall to mind him who was both the Lamb of God and the Shepherd of Israel. Then the seed which falls from the choice hand of the sower, may bring to memory the good word of our God, that springeth up and beareth fruit, some sixty fold, some thirty fold, and some an hundred. Then the soft falling showers and the gentle dews of evening may remind us of the grace of God that bringeth salvation. The glories of an earthly crown may suggest the hope of one that fadeth not away, and the golden fruits which grow beside the living streams of earth, may then be associated in imagination and desire, with the river of the water of life, and the tree whose leaves are for the healing of the nations.

We have seen what the analogy of nature might lead us to expect; we have seen what the spiritual constitution.

tion of man might lead us to desire in a revelation from God. Let us examine the Scriptures to ascertain whether or not they accord with the analogy of nature and answer to the desire of the heart. On examination, we find that no other book in the world can compare or compete with the Bible, either in the profusion, or in the perfection, of its poetry. And this will strike us all the more forcibly, when we reflect that the design of the Bible was not primarily, to please, but to instruct mankind, and that the larger part of it is not poetical in form—that it is a book of laws, of history, of prudential maxims and moral precepts. It is true, that we have poetry in all its departments, and in all its varieties. Almost all of the prophecies are poetical, not only in substance but in form, thus verifying the intimate relation between the poet and prophet, as conceived of by classic antiquity; the words *προφητης* and *vates*, standing indifferently for either or both, in their respective languages. Even in those cases in which the discourse had been all along in plain prose, so soon as what is distinctively prophetic begins, the writer or speaker rises at once to the highest strains of the most majestic poetry; of which, we have a signal instance in the dying benedictions of the patriarch Jacob. One thing remarkable about the Bible is, that it should be so poetical, even in translation, and should really seem to suffer less from translation than most other poetry. In general, just as a work is delicate and exquisite in style, is the difficulty of transfusing its peculiar fragrance and flavor into another tongue; like those fruits which, to be tasted in all their sweetness, must be eaten in the soil on which they grow, or like the flowers which bloomed in Paradise, of which Eve says,

“That never will in other climate grow.”

We know how impossible it is to translate the subtle harmonies of Homer and Sophocles—the airy and exquisite fancies of Shakespeare, suspended, like dew-drops, on the gossamer threads of the most delicate diction—the words being to the thought, not what the sheath is to the sword, but fitting and flesh-coloured like a glove. We know how intransmissible into another

tongue are the grand harmonies of Milton, the thoughts moving on the words, like his own description of heaven's gates "on golden hinges turning." These writers we know, do suffer, must suffer from any attempt to translate them. The very pronunciation of the Hebrew words is now irrecoverably lost. No man pretends to know what it was with anything approaching certainty.\* How much greater then, must have been the majesty and sweetness of David's lyrics—how much more impetuous and splendid the volume of "rapt Isaiah's fire?—when the Hebrew words were fitly uttered and their effect heightened by all the foreign aids of instrumental harmony.† The prevailing and distinctive characteristics of Hebrew poetry are majesty and tenderness. The subjects of Hebrew poetry are the noblest in themselves, and of most universal and enduring interest to the human family. There is, therefore, a general resemblance in all the inspired poets, but not on that account is there less diversity of genius and style, of imagery and association, than we discern among the poets of Greece, or of England. As in the primitive productions of the Creator's hand, the utmost diversity was united with the utmost excellence, as everything was beautiful with a beauty after its own kind, so in the poetical writers of the Bible. There are the tender elegies of Jeremiah, when he lamented the downfall of his country and the captivity of his people. There is the lofty and solemn plaint of David when he mourned, with generous grief, for Saul and Jonathan, and the passionate outcry of his mighty heart, swelling with anguish at the untimely end of his son Absalom, undutiful and ungodly, but, therefore, sorrowed for with an agony only the more bitter, the more piercing, the more desperate! Then we have the superhuman sublimities of Isaiah, peculiarly the prophet of the Holy One of Israel. Then we have the lovely and lone youth, whose voice was like some pleasant instrument,—harp-like in its tender sadness,—who was with the captives by the river of

\* Calmet's Dictionary—Article, Poetry of the Hebrews.

† It is probable that the Hebrew loses less in being translated into the English, than into most other modern languages. See on this subject, some very striking observations in the Spectator, No. 405.

Chebar, whose visions were so mystical and so grand, so full of shadowy imagery and of solemn truth!

As no other book bears the same relation to the heart of man which the Bible does, so no other book bears the same relation to the outer universe. It over-canopies the material world like the sky, and pours its hallowed light over all the scenes and provinces and processes of nature. Every uninspired writer is partial, provincial. The sacred writers alone, are Catholic and all-embracing. It is said that the topography of Homer is so exact, that the Greek mariner may now steer his course along the shore, around the isles of the *Ægean*, by his immortal chart. The cliffs of Dover will endure as long in Shakespeare's verse, as on their native site; and

"The banks and braes and streams around  
The castle of Montgomery,"

will evermore be welcome to the eye and dear to the heart of every patriot Scot. But these are all limited to a nation. The poetry of the Bible is the poetry of the world and of the race. It not only sets before us the holy and beautiful city, alike in her pride and in her desolation, when like the mystical Babylon she said in her heart, I sit a queen and shall see no sorrow, and when she sat solitary and had become as a widow, when "crowned with her tiara of proud towers," and when her Temple was profaned and prostrate, when the Roman eagles flapped their ill-omened wings over her, and the plough-share of ruin passed through her. It not only exhibits the fair daughters of Jerusalem when they gathered in mystic and holy dance around the ark of God returning in triumph to its resting place, but when they hung their harps on the willows beside the rivers of Babylon, unwilling to awake their chords of sweetness in a strange land and at a tyrant's bidding. It not only celebrates national deeds and confers a sacred immortality on national topics and places and persons, on Bethlehem, where the infant Redeemer was born, on Nazareth, where he passed his early youth, on Capernaum, on Chorazin, and on Bethsaida, where so many mighty works were done, on Bethany, the dwelling-place of Lazarus and his sisters, Mary and Martha, on those

weeping women that followed him to Calvary where he died, and to the grove where they laid him; but it casts its broad and beautiful mantle over all lands. Under its canopy of brightness all nations are gathered and glorified. It tells of the primal creation of all things, of the first rising of Vesperus, "that led the starry hosts" of that period, in the fathomless, but unforgotten and glorious past, when the music of the spheres first broke in holy gladness on the listening ear of angels and of God.

This subject may be looked at from another point of view. Abstract the poetical element from Scripture and you eviscerate the whole. Such is the native constitution of the human mind that the efficacy of that moral truth, which is addressed to the understanding, and that moral authority which is exerted over the conscience, is greatly aided by the poetical element of the Bible. Lord Byron, who knew wherein his great strength lay, as well as Samson, says of himself, "description is my *forte*." The power of graphic and moving description is the test and the triumph of the true poet. Take away the poetical element from the Bible and you exchange a description of God, as sitting upon the circle of the heavens, riding upon the wings of the wind, weighing the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance, for a definition of God, as omnipotent, omnipresent, &c. Now, of all books in the world, of the same compass, the Bible has fewest definitions and most descriptions, for it is not a book of exact science, and it is entirely adapted to human nature. Think what wild work you would make by ignoring or abolishing the poetical element of the Bible.\* You convert the most picturesque and poetical book in existence into a record as dry and didactic as a merchant's ledger. You annihilate almost all, certainly by far the greater part, of the discourses of him who spake as man never spake. You destroy at once, almost every prophecy, whether of the Old Testament or the New, every fragment of the book of Psalms, the most varied and beautiful, the most precious and perfect book

\* We are glad to see the view of the importance of this element of Scripture taken above, sustained by the high authority of the late Dr. Chalmers.—See his correspondence by Dr. Hanna, letter 269, p. 319.

of prayer in all the world. You leave, it may be, a chapter and a half of the book of Job, the most majestic poem in any land or tongue. You cast away as a worthless thing the greater part of the Apocalypse of St. John described by Milton as "the majestic image of a high and stately tragedy, shutting up and intermingling her solemn scenes and acts with a seven-fold chorus of hal-lalujahs and harping symphonies." You extinguish the earliest light of the morning stars, and silence the sweetest music of the sons of God. Better, far better, that some demon-vandal should rob the material heavens of their glory, pluck each "bright, particular star," from its place in the firmament, and with the breath of his mouth slay every blade of grass, and every opening flower; dry up the diamond dew-drop, and annihilate at once every object that garnishes the heavens and glorifies the earth.

Of the many corollaries flowing from the proposition which we have been seeking to establish, our space will allow us to point out only two or three of the highest practical importance. It is plain, in the first place, that the literary beauties of the Bible should commend it to the study of all who aspire to purity and elegance of taste. Dr. Johnson advises those who wish to form a good English style, to give their days and nights to the study of Addison. With how much more propriety, may we urge those who wish to acquaint themselves with the highest forms of thought and speech "under heaven, among men," to give their days and nights to the study of the Bible. This, our book, has done more to sow the seeds of moral goodness in the hearts of men, to invigorate, to expand, to purge and to exalt the purely intellectual faculty, than all other books of all other literatures put together. That which prevents many men of cultivated taste from entering on the diligent and delighted study of the Bible, is its awful holiness and the personal consciousness of sin. The atmosphere of Scripture is to them like the air of the highest mountains, pure, sublime, but rare and difficult to breathe in. Rightly interpreted, it is an involuntary tribute which such men never pay to the peculiar holiness of this book



when they shun it. The Bible itself, tells us, the time is coming when holiness to the Lord shall be written on the bells of the horses. This signet of the king of glory is visibly impressed upon every page of Scripture, and is at once, a sign and seal of its divinity. When a sympathy with the holiness of God, has been created in the soul, then what before constituted a barrier to the perusal of Scripture is converted into a specific and superlative attraction. Holiness, the attribute of God, which casts a lustre on every other, which consecrates every other which is spoken of in Scripture as the beauty of God, is the all-pervading and reigning element of the Bible. It diffuses a calm and equable glory over all the parts of inspired Scripture, and other books "do then show likest" the Book of God, as they embody and exhibit his supernal attribute. As a man improves in purity of heart, not only will the Scriptures be to him more glorious and more dear, but his appreciation even of external nature, will become more exalted and more intense. He will see more in the world and in man. The earth and sky, the mountains and the meadows, the growing corn, the broad rock, the bright waters, "the shells on the sea-shore and the wild flowers, the murmur of the unreposing brooks,"—all lovely sights and sounds, —the common face of man, "the star-light smile of children," will then put on for him a new and more excellent glory. The two worlds of nature and Scripture now divorced and divergent, will then be brought near, and each will have a conservation and a charm unknown before; because in every object that he sees in each, he can now recognise the memorial and the pledge of his heavenly Father's love. And now, when he ascends those mountain-tops, where erst it was so hard to breathe, he finds himself in an atmosphere to which he is "native and endued;" which is now to him, no longer rare and difficult, but congenial and delightful, and he says with the exulting spirit in Comus,

Now I fly  
To those happy climes that lie  
Where day never shuts his eye,  
Up in the broad fields of the sky;  
There I suck the liquid air.

Then turning to men grovelling in the valley far below, we hear him say invitingly to them

Mortals that would follow me,  
Love virtue; she alone is free,  
She can teach ye how to climb  
Higher than the sphery chime;  
Or if virtue feeble were,  
Heaven itself would stoop to her.

As men grow better, much of the poetry which is now admired and studied will be deservedly despised and neglected, and that only will be honoured which partakes of the prevailing character of the poetry of the Bible, which unites the highest poetical and the highest moral excellence.

It is plain, in the second place, that the imagination has a legitimate office to perform, and that fiction is a lawful form of composition. What at once suggests and supplies a defence of the office and use of the imagination in literature, is, that the only book which God has given to man directly from himself, employs and appeals to it—that those parts of that book which are most devotional are most imaginative—that the minds of the prophets are most poetical when most raised and agitated with pious sensibility—that they hardly ever touch upon the person, glory, or kingdom of the Messiah, without instinctively and spontaneously breaking forth into song—that the parables of our Saviour himself, which were his most characteristic form of teaching,\* which convey truth, most sacred, most precious, most practical, are imaginative in structure, and fictitious in form; in one word, that from the opening chapters of Genesis, in which we have an account of the first creation of Heaven and earth, to the closing chapters of the Apocalypse, in which we have an account of the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness; the practical and imaginative element appears everywhere and reigns supreme.

\* For some very original and important observations on our Lord's peculiar method of imparting instruction, the reader is referred to a most masterly disquisition on the internal evidences in the University Lectures, by Dr. R. J. Breckenridge, a discourse which will be regarded by every candid judge, as a permanent and very valuable contribution to an exceedingly important and difficult branch of Theological science.

If fiction has been employed to seduce and corrupt, to insinuate fatal poison with the more deadly effect, because not professedly a moral teacher; if the writings of many of the most popular novelists, in various languages, have been stained with sensuality, what shall we say of the professed teachers of moral wisdom? Have they borne themselves so meekly, so purely, so unblameably in their high office, as to make the charge of abuse and perversion, peculiarly applicable to those writers who mainly exercise and appeal to the imagination? What shall we say of the grave philosophers of Germany and France, of Fichte, of Schelling, of Kant, and of Hegel, of Cousin and Comte, of the metaphysics of Shaftesbury, of Hobbes, and of Hume, of Hume's History of England, and Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire? When we think soberly of what men have done in the gravest and highest departments of human thought, to mislead, to betray, to enslave, to corrupt and imbrute their fellow-men, in history, in political science, in physical speculations, in intellectual and moral philosophy, and most of all and worse than all, in Theology, and there see them single out fiction for proscription and shame, we feel inclined in all sadness of spirit, to say to them as Falstaff said to Prince Hal, "Banish Bardolph, banish Peto, banish Paine, but for sweet Jack Falstaff, kind Jack Falstaff, true Jack Falstaff, valiant Jack Falstaff, and therefore, more valiant, being as he is, old Jack Falstaff, banish not him thy Harry's company, banish plump Jack and banish all the world."

We have seen that the Bible uses fiction largely as the vehicle of truth. The habit of condemning fiction as fiction, of condemning it by wholesale and in the gross, of condemning it without discrimination, without exception and without mercy, which prevails so largely in religious circles, we cannot but regard as alike irrational and unscriptural. These extreme views have to a lamentable extent, been identified with true piety. The repudiation of them has been and still is, looked upon as indicating a latitudinarian tendency. The truth is, that the man who defends and sanctions fiction as an allowable form of literary composition is, even now, re-

garded by many, as indifferent to the highest interests of morals and religion. We boldly retort the charge. We carry the war into Africa. We affirm that the impiety in the matter is with those who condemn as essentially evil, or of essentially evil tendency, a form of composition, which was not only used in Scripture, but abounds in Scripture, which was not only used by Christ, but was characteristic of Christ. The greatest and largest truths are most fitly conveyed in the form of fiction, which bears the same relation to a specific, historical statement, however exact, which algebra bears to arithmetic. The one is particular and limited, the other is general and comprehensive. The highest and noblest truth will always exhibit itself in the forms of poetry and fiction.\*

We are not apologizing for a polluted, fictitious literature. We loathe it. "'Tis the object of our implacable disgust." We earnestly warn the young especially, not to read any work in any form of composition and under any pretext whatever, which is likely to sully the purity or to sap the strength of their moral principles. We only protest against proscribing any legitimate and delightful form of literary composition. We would only distinguish between the use and abuse of a thing. All that we mean to contend for is, that there is nothing inherently, essentially, invariably evil in fictitious composition. We condemn bad fictions and approve good.

"The very head and front of our offending  
Hath this extent, no more."

We condemn bad fictions, not because they are fictions, but because they are bad; not even because they are bad fictions, but because they are bad things; not because of their form, but because of their spirit. The capital error of those with whom we are dealing is, that they condemn the form when they should condemn the spirit of fiction. A pure mind, in whatever form it may appear, whatever garment it may wear, will still be pure, and the spirit will glorify the form, as the shining forth of our Saviour's divinity on Tabor transfigured his

\* There is more profound and universal truth in Hamlet, than in any equal portion of any professed historian.

human body. A depraved mind, on the contrary, whatever the form of its manifestation, whether in philosophy or fiction, in history or poetry, will show its depravity. Solomon tells us that it is of the very essence of folly, that it shall proclaim itself, that it is the badge and the business of a fool to say to every one that he is a fool. And a greater than Solomon has said, how can ye being evil, speak good things, for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh? A good man out of the good treasure of his heart, bringeth forth good things, and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth evil things. These words exhaust the philosophy of the subject, so far as the moral bearing of literary fiction is concerned. But the use of the imagination is not merely capable of vindication as legitimate. It has, as we have already hinted, a positive and an exceedingly important function to perform for the instruction and delight of mankind. Thierry,\* a French historian at once popular and profound, remarks, that the domestic life and usages of England, at the period just succeeding the Norman Conquest, are not only more vividly, but more faithfully portrayed in *Ivanhoe*, than in any authentic history. The inner and spiritual life of England is more perfectly reflected in Shakspeare's historical plays than in the elaborate works of Hume and Lingard; than it is anywhere indeed, unless we except the Gothic and chivalrous chronicles of Sir John Froissart, which are scarcely more authentic and less fanciful than Shakspeare's plays, although he professes to relate what, for the most part, was subjected to his own faithful eyes, or was confided to him at first hand, by eye or ear-witnesses. Niebuhr, who has turned so many long accredited historical facts into airy nothings,

"Like fairy gifts fading away,"

assuredly does not give so beautiful and life-like, nor probably so true a picture of early Rome as Livy, whose authority he has done so much to discredit. There is a large part of history, perhaps the most instructive, unquestionably the most charming, for a knowledge of

\* *Historical Works*. Essay 8th, on the Conquest of England, by the Normans, *apropos* of the *Novel* of *Ivanhoe*.

which, we must be entirely indebted to imaginative writers. We learn, incomparably, more of the ordinary and real life of Athens from the ribald plays of Aristophanes and from the tragic dramatists, than from Herodotus and Thucydides. To be either useful or entertaining, history must not disdain to employ and address the imagination. The third chapter of Macaulay's recent and splendid history of England, is confessedly, drawn from various sources—scattered notices of the times contained in such works as the *Spectator*, the most popular plays and ballads and the like. It is, accordingly, the most instructive and delightful chapter of the most popular historical work of our day.

It is evident, in the third place, that imaginative sensibility is peculiarly important to the interpreter of the Bible, to the minister of the Gospel. We have seen that of all books, the Bible is most thoroughly pervaded by the poetical element; that it abounds more than any other in the most daring, animated, and sublime figures of poetry. No one, therefore, whatever his piety and learning, can bring out its full meaning without the imaginative sensibility which will enable him to recognise, to appreciate, to enjoy, and to unfold this great element of God's revelation to mankind. We have seen the most exquisite creations of fancy illumined by the Eternal Spirit, rudely crushed in the hands of "strong-minded" expositors, like fairy frost-work under the hammer of Thor, or a delicate flower beneath the unconscious heels of an iron-shod war-horse. On account of the predominance of the poetical element, much of the Scripture must remain a dead letter, a sealed book, to a large class of interpreters. They do not bring to the exposition of the book, the requisite taste and imagination. They may be men of eminent logical ability and thorough doctrinal and philological knowledge, but these cannot do the proper work of the imagination. They are indispensable in their place, but they were never designed for this particular service. It is the knight of the sleeping Leopard with his coat of linked mail, with plated gauntlet, and a steel breast-plate—his weighty charge burdened with accoutrements scarcely less massive and unwieldy, on the hot sands of Syria, where better a light-armed

and half-naked Saladin on his nimble Arab'ian steed. It is the Feast of Roses, to which the battle-axe is brought as a carving-knife, and the massy shield used as a trencher.

This delicacy of taste, this dramatic faculty of entering into the circumstances and characters of the scene, and so rendering them "in form and moving, express and admirable,"—this telescopic glance that brings near the distant past,—this divine energy that breathes into the dead of a thousand years the life of to-day, may seem even a dangerous gift, at enmity with sober, safe, sterling, common sense. But they are, in fact, intimately allied. The danger of rejecting or perverting important doctrinal truth, through an excess or abuse of poetical sensibility is, other things being equal, not greater surely, than the opposite peril of making non-sense, or, what is worse, heresy, of Divine truth, by mistaking figures of speech for literal propositions. The greatest errors in the history of Theology have, directly, sprung from confounding poetic figures with literal verities. Of this disastrous confusion, the idolatrous dogma of transubstantiation is a memorable instance.

In Scripture there are a multitude of passages, perfectly plain to him that understandeth and perfectly dark to all others; and their transparency or obscurity, depends altogether, on the proper interpretation of figurative language. Of all the Old Testament, that part is most figurative which, in type or symbol, in prophetic song or saying, shadows forth the promised branch of Jesse's stem. Of all the New Testament, the most figurative are the recorded discourses of our blessed Lord. The prophecies of Isaiah, Zachariah, and other holy men of old, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, touching the person, the kingdom, the government and glory of the Messiah, and the relations which he should sustain toward his church, especially as they are bodied forth in the song of Solomon, are all in the highest style of poetic imagery. The parables of Christ are figurative throughout, and can be adequately interpreted by no man, whatever his logic and learning, who is void of poetic and imaginative sensibility. This may help to explain the fact, that preaching, even by good

men of respectable parts and education, so little attracts the public. It will not do to reply that the public feel little interest in the truths presented. This is a very common and convenient answer indeed, and it may seem almost profane to expose it. But how are we to explain the prodigious popularity of men who confessedly preach the whole counsel of God, but who have been favoured by nature with poetical fancy, and are not ashamed or afraid to use it.

Speaking of the ordinary ministrations of the English clergy, Sidney Smith says that "an adventurous preacher is afraid of violating the ancient tranquillity of the pulpit, and the audience are apt to consider the man who fatigues them less than usual, as a trifier or charlatan." It is, notwithstanding, a fact remarkable and undeniable, that in all ages, the men who have preached the glorious truths of Divine revelation in a style most in keeping with the imaginative and figurative structure of the Bible itself, have had most immediate popularity and most permanent usefulness. It may suffice to mention three men "in three different ages born," of entirely different genius, and surrounded by utterly unlike circumstances, alike only in the highly poetical cast of their minds, and in the vast power which they wielded during life, and are likely to wield through all generations.

The first is Chrysostom, the Golden Mouth, the glory and the idol, first of Antioch, afterwards of Constantinople. It is of him that Gibbon, no partial critic, thus writes: "The monuments of that eloquence which was admired near twenty years at Antioch and Constantinople, have been carefully preserved, and the possession of near one thousand sermons of homilies, has authorized the critics of succeeding times to appreciate the genuine merit of Chrysostom. They unanimously attribute to the Christian orator, the free command of an elegant and copious language, the judgment to conceal the advantages which he derived from the knowledge of rhetoric and philosophy, an inexhaustible fund of metaphors and similitudes of ideas and images to vary and illustrate the most familiar topics, the happy art of engaging the passions in the service of virtue, and of ex-



posing the folly as well the turpitude of vice, with the truth and spirit of a dramatic representation.\* In point of learning, Chrysostom could not compete with Origen or Jerome; in point of piety, he was, in all probability, not a whit superior to many of the less celebrated Church Fathers. What then makes him, by the common confession of all critics of all generations, the peerless Christian orator? What, but his strong imaginative sensibility?

Our second instance is Jeremy Taylor, who has been fitly called the English Chrysostom, whose dirge-like melodies float upon the ear, with a music akin to that of the night-wind as it sweeps in solemn murmurs through some vast Cathedral aisle. In Taylor's Sermons, there is more of the highest poetry, both of thought and diction, than in many a lofty and lauded epic. Bishop Taylor, who has been likewise called the Shakspeare of Theology, is peculiarly the favorite of poets, of men like Talfourd and Coleridge. He is associated with Milton in the thoughts of men, and in the literature of his country. Why is this? Because, as Coleridge justly says, no human being ever possessed more sensibility for objects of beauty and tenderness.

Our third instance is that of Dr. Chalmers, whose imperial imagination, informed by science, and animated by the purest piety, soared aloft among the sublimest of the starry heavens and stooped to "the huts where poor men lie," and who, added to the well-earned reputation of the most popular preacher which Scotland has ever produced, all the high trophies of diversified and brilliant scholarship, of lofty science, of far-sighted and far-reaching statesmanship, of large-hearted philanthropy, and of humble piety in his family, and among his friends. His was a heart that in the midst of the world's applauses

"The lowliest duties on itself did lay."

Now, we confess, that with all his brilliant endowments

\*The curious reader may be amused at the singular coincidence of this learned criticism of Gibbon on Chrysostom, with that of the Worshipful Walter Shandy on Yorick's Sermon, "I like the sermon well, replied my father, 'tis dramatic, and there is something in that way of writing, when skilfully managed, which catches the attention."

of imagination and sensibility, he could not have been the preacher that he was, without his profound scientific training, his logical power, his rare common sense, his genial humility, above all, his heartfelt piety. But what we contend for is, that he might have been just as scientific, as logical, as benevolent and pious as he was, and yet he would not have been the orator that he was, without his strong imaginative sensibility.

Nor in the presentation of our argument, should it be forgotten that the most popular and useful religious book in the English language, probably the most popular and useful book ever written by man, in any language,—the *Pilgrim's Progress*,—a book equally welcome to the philosopher, the poet, the theologian, the Christian and the child, is nothing but one continued figure from the beginning to the end. This book is more made on the Bible model, it is more deeply tinged with its peculiar poetic spirit, and tinted with its heavenly hues; its figures are more purely Scriptural than any other volume of any uninspired man. It is enough to add, that of all religious books, it is most easily understood and most indelibly impressed, most poetical in its spirit, and yet, most practical in the character of its teachings. Of all uninspired books, the *Pilgrim's Progress* is most like the Bible in style, in structure, in spirit and in sentiment. It is the genuine product of the Word of God in conscious contact with the simple, but profound and poetic soul of John Bunyan. It is a faithful record of his religious life, under the action of the truth and spirit of the Bible.

---

#### THE AUTHORITY OF ECCLESIASTICAL RULERS.

1. "The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America," contains a passage which we have long admired, for the clearness with which it asserts the great principle on which every ecclesiastical question must be determined:

"That all church power, whether exercised by the

body in general, or in the way of representation by delegated authority, is only ministerial and declarative; *that is to say*, that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners; that no church judicatory ought to pretend to make laws, to bind the conscience in virtue of their own authority; and that all their decisions should be founded upon the revealed will of God. Now, though it will easily be admitted, that all synods and councils may err, through the frailty inseparable from humanity; yet there is much greater danger from the usurped claim of making laws, than from the right of judging upon laws already made, and common to all who profess the gospel; although this right, as necessity requires in the present state, be lodged with fallible men."

To this passage we entreat the earnest attention of every reader,—especially every Presbyterian reader.—None, we presume, can fail to observe that it resolves all the official power of ecclesiastical rulers into "the right of judging upon laws already made" by Christ. If this doctrine be correct, it follows that all ecclesiastical offices not instituted by Christ are unlawful,—that every claim to ecclesiastical office must be tested by an impartial application of the law of Christ to facts existing in the case of the claimant,—and that no man may do officially in the church of Christ, any act which cannot be proved from Scripture to be legitimately connected with his office.

Before proceeding to other topics, it will be proper to exhibit (though with great brevity,) the evidence—at least a part of the evidence,—by which this doctrine is supported. Here we notice,

1. *The Relation of the Church to Christ.*—He is her Head. Her members, *as such*, "are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." The same persons, it is true, sustain other relations, and in those relations are, like other men, subject to human authority. But their character, as members of the church, is identical with their character as members of Christ; and to suppose that *in that* character they may be rightfully subjected to human authority as such, is an absurdity, little, if at all, less monstrous than to suppose that their exalted

Head owes subjection to human authority. To Him it belongs to determine what shall be the mutual relations subsisting between his own members, and what the duties corresponding with these relations; and it is inconsistent with the honour due to Him, to imagine that any authority distinct from his own can have any lawful application to the subject.

She is his kingdom. Membership is formed by baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and inspiration has taught us to describe the same transaction by the equivalent phrases "*baptism into Christ*," and "*baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus*." The inference from these facts must be obvious to every one who remembers the sense uniformly attached by the sacred writers to baptism into a person, or in his name: We are made members of the church by being brought under a covenant obligation to the evangelical service of the triune Jehovah,—that is, by being brought under a covenant obligation to the service of Christ. No obligation distinct from this—no obligation to anything, in any other view than as a part of the service of our God and Saviour, is implied in the relation, or can by any possibility grow out of it. Every member of the church is, *as such*, a servant of Christ.—*On the ground of that relation*, he may not do anything, whether as an officer, or as a private member, which is not an act of service to Christ, or for any other reason than that it is a part of his service. But the service of Christ includes all that Christ has commanded, and nothing else. It follows that there can be no lawful ecclesiastical act, and especially no lawful exercise of ecclesiastical authority, which cannot be proved to be required by the law of Christ.

2. *The nature of the official relation of ecclesiastical rulers to the Church, and the end for which that relation subsists.*

On these points, the teachings of the word of God are clear and perspicuous. Concerning our Redeemer, we are told, "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." \* \* \* "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the

perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.—(Eph. iv., 8, and 11-13.) The very highest ecclesiastical officers were a gift from Christ to his Church: certainly, then, he never gave her to them. He gave them to her “for the work of the ministry”—that they might minister to her; surely, then, he did not intend that she should be subject to their will and pleasure. He gave them to her, because their ministry was among the means by which she was to be edified and perfected, strengthened in faith, and advanced in the knowledge of her glorious Head; surely, they could have no right to direct their official acts to any end not of his appointment, or to consult their own inclinations as to the nature of the services which they should render.

We next turn to Heb. xiii., 17, “Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.”

The reason for obedience and submission to ecclesiastical rulers is here declared to be, that they watch for our souls; of course, the end to be sought by obedience is the salvation of the soul. Now, can it be needful to this end, that we obey any command which rests on no higher authority than that of man? To answer in the affirmative, is to claim for ecclesiastical rulers the power to establish new terms of salvation.

### 3. *The sacredness which attaches to every legitimate exercise of ecclesiastical authority.*

Twice is our Redeemer recorded to have made the solemn declaration, “Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven;” (Matt. xvi. 19, and Matt. xviii., 18;) and in the latter instance, the connexion plainly shows that the declaration is intended to apply to the discipline of the church in all ages. Surely it will not be asserted, that God thus ratifies acts which originate in no higher source than the will of man. To

excommunicate one, is “*to deliver him unto Satan.*” It would be palpably absurd to imagine that Christ has left it to the wisdom or caprice of mortals to define the boundary between his kingdom and the dominions of the Prince of Darkness. When about to expel the incestuous person, the Corinthians were to be gathered together, *with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ.*” That is, they were to exert, in strictness of speech, no authority of their own. They were to be simply the instrument, the medium through which the Lord Jesus would exert this authority, and declare his sentence.

Other passages of Scripture exhibit the same principle in a more general form: “*Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me.*” “*He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.*”—(John xiii: 20, Luke x: 16.) It can hardly be necessary to inquire, whether these declarations can be supposed to apply to any other acts, than those which are done strictly in obedience to the Lord Jesus. But, perhaps it will be said, they apply only to acts done by inspired men. We reply, the only consideration which connects sacredness with the official acts of inspired men is their accordance with the will of Christ. As to uninspired men, the accordance of their acts with his will, we readily admit, cannot be proved so easily, nor in precisely the same manner; but supposing this ascertained, the consideration to which the former owe their sacredness, applies with precisely equal force to the latter. The Scriptures contain not a hint of a legitimate and proper exercise of ecclesiastical authority to which the sacredness asserted in these pages does not belong; and a text already quoted (Heb. xiii: 17,) is in point to show that such a thing is impossible.

4. *Apostolic example.*—When “the apostles, and elders, and brethren,” decided the celebrated question about circumcision, (Acts xx,) they pointed out the authority on which their decision rested: “*It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.*” Paul expressly disclaimed personal authority in religious matters over those who had been converted through his ministry; and when ap-

proaching a subject on which he had no message from God to deliver, was careful to state that he merely gave his judgment, as one that had obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful.—(See 2 Cor. i: 24, and 1 Cor. vii: 25.) Not a single example of an opposite kind is recorded in the New Testament for our imitation; *one* is recorded, however, for a very different purpose.—(See 3 John 9 and 10.)

5. *Inspired warnings against ecclesiastical usurpation, on the one hand: and submission to it, on the other.* Elders are exhorted, “feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; **NEITHER AS BEING LORDS OVER GOD’S HERITAGE**, but being ensamples to the flock.”—(1 Peter v: 2 and 3.) Here, elders are reminded that they are not lords over the church, and solemnly forbidden to do anything that might imply a claim to that character. The reason of the prohibition is very clearly intimated—that the church is God’s heritage; and every claim advanced by a creature to dominion over her, is an invasion of his prerogative. Elders must show obedience to God in all their official acts, as well as in their private conduct; and thus they will be “ensamples to the flock.”

Let us next examine Matt. xiii: 8, 12. “But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your Father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in Heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.” This passage, as the context shows, relates to the affairs of the church, not of civil life. So far as the church is concerned, all her members are brethren; no superiority is to be sought or acknowledged, but that which consists in humble and self-denying service. We have no Father but God; no Master but Christ. Nothing is to be believed on any other evidence than that Christ has declared it; nothing done for any other reason than that God commands it. A man does not exalt himself above his brethren, when he merely

communicates to them what the Lord has commanded him to communicate, or does for them what the Lord has commanded him to do; but *he* cannot be acquitted of this charge, who requires them to believe the mere dictates of his own understanding, or to do the mere dictates of his own will. From this passage, therefore, it is evident that no mortal has any rightful authority in the church, in any other sense than this, that the *Head of the church* may be pleased to exercise *His* authority through him. Accordingly, we are taught in other portions of the Word of God, that in religious affairs,—and the government of the church can lawfully have nothing to do with any but religious affairs,—a merely human origin is a decisive ground of condemnation against every thing of which it can be truly affirmed. “In vain do they worship me, *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.*” “Why are ye subject to ordinances, (touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using,) *after the commandments and doctrines of men?*”

In maintaining what we conceive to be the radical principle of ecclesiastical polity, we are anxious to be correctly understood. We are far from demanding an *explicit warrant* for every official act. We know, indirect proof may be as decisive as direct. Every duty includes all the necessary and proper means of performance; but it would be unreasonable to expect that he who enjoins the duty would give, in every instance, a full and minute enumeration of the means. A general precept must, necessarily, include a variety of particular acts. Inspiration has authorized us to describe the duty of certain officers by the phrase *to govern the church*. Concerning some acts, we can readily decide, by merely considering their nature, that they are acts of ecclesiastical government. Let it be shown that an act of this kind must be done, and unless we can find authority for making it an exception to the general rule, its nature decides who must do it. In order that the law of Christ may be executed, it must be applied to existing circumstances; and this often requires a knowledge of many other things besides the law. Hence ecclesiastical rulers must decide many questions authori-



tatively in behalf of the church. In every such case, the members of the church are bound to *submit* to the decision, even though they may think it erroneous, provided they can do so without committing sin, or omitting duty. The reason is, that while every duty must be performed, and every sin avoided, we must not attempt to decide for ourselves any matter which God has appointed others to decide for us; nor in this case, are we responsible for the decision that may be given. But our doctrine is, that ecclesiastical officers are not to be submitted to, in the exercise of powers which God has not given them,—that they may not decide any matter which it cannot be shown from Scripture that it belonged to them to decide,—nor do officially any act which cannot be proved from Scripture to belong to their office. Of course, it is acknowledged that they may properly avail themselves of the confidence of the church, which they must be presumed to enjoy, for the purpose of giving judicious and pious advice. To give such advice to those to whom we have reason to think it will be acceptable and useful, involves no claim to authority. It is merely the exercise of a common right of humanity.

II. The word of God contains no *formal* specification of the powers of ecclesiastical rulers. It describes them as *governments*, and *those that have the rule over you*, and defines their duty by the phrase *to take care of the church of God*; and if, in interpreting these expressions, we pay due attention to the nature of the church, and to the warnings against ecclesiastical usurpation already noticed, we shall be led to correct views of the whole subject.

It is true, the church, while she exists on earth, must unavoidably be concerned, to some extent, in secular matters. Hence, there are some services, the need of which, is common to her with every other organized and public body. Accordingly, deacons are appointed to render these services; but deacons are not rulers.

The whole duty of the church is to serve Christ, to do his will. This remark applies equally to her officers and her private members. Holiness, as a moral attribute, belongs only to persons in their individual capacity. It can be truly ascribed to a public body on no other

ground than that of its existence in the individuals composing the public body. The usefulness of public religion consists solely in its subserviency to personal religion. Ecclesiastical rulers, therefore, have no power for any other purpose than to secure obedience to Christ from individuals; and all that can be officially done by mortals for this purpose is comprehended in teaching and discipline. You may proclaim the character, offices, work, and law of Christ—all the truth that God has been pleased to reveal for the sanctification and salvation of men: you may inflict on the violators of his law such censures as his word prescribes. But when you have done these things, there is nothing more to be done officially. Prayer and a holy example are all the remaining means adapted to the end, and within the reach of creatures, who have no direct control over the heart.

It is readily admitted, that to teach is not an act of rule. But there are various acts of rule which must be done, in order that instruction may be duly communicated. Suitable persons must be invested with the office of the gospel ministry; of course, due inquiry must be made as to the qualifications of candidates; and whatever is needed to be done by public authority, must be done by ecclesiastical officers, for securing to aspirants to that sacred office the advantage of suitable training. To designate ministers to their respective fields of labor, and to hold them responsible for their official conduct, are acts which must be done; and in their own nature they are acts of ecclesiastical rule.

Moreover, the duties of a public religious instructor include all that is included in conducting the public worship of God. Indeed, it is here, principally, his duties are to be performed. The sacraments are divinely appointed modes of exhibiting the leading truths of the gospel, by the aid of symbols. Prayer and praise, we admit, are not, in themselves considered, acts of either teaching or learning. But to lead others in these exercises, is an act of teaching, and to be led by another, an act of learning. Now, in connexion with the public worship of God, there are necessarily, a variety of particular circumstances, about which a common understanding on the part of those who are to unite in it is in-

dispensable, but which are variable in their nature, and which God has left to be determined by Christian discretion in conformity with the *general principles* of his word. Of course, the determination of these is included in the duty of ruling the church.

For reasons formerly assigned, we believe there is an extensive class of human beings who, according to the will of Christ, are entitled to be regarded as members of the church, while they are not to be regarded as regenerate persons, nor admitted to the Lord's table. The reception of the sacred supper is a means of instruction, not applicable indiscriminately, to all hearers of the gospel, nor even to all members of the church. To judge of the qualifications of applicants is, therefore, a duty necessarily included in ruling the church, and in the department of ecclesiastical government we are now considering, that which consists in providing for the due communication of religious instruction.

Here we offer a remark to which the special attention of our readers is earnestly solicited. *The authority of ecclesiastical rulers, in reference to the ministry, comprehends the whole of their official power for the propagation of the gospel.* They may direct the *variable circumstances* of public worship. They may make such distinctions as the word of God authorizes, in view of the knowledge and apparent religious state of the worshippers. They may induct men into the office of the gospel ministry, and may appoint such previous training and trial as, in the exercise of a sound Christian discretion, they may deem pre-requisite. They have, and must exercise a limited authority over ministers in their official character. But whatever, not included in this enumeration, is to be done for the religious instruction of men, rests on grounds entirely distinct from *their* appointment. Once admit that the public worship of God is a duty of the church as a visible and organized society; and that the minister of the gospel is an ecclesiastical officer, to whom pertains the duty of ruling, in common with other officers, with the additional duty of giving religious instruction, and for that purpose conducting the public worship of God, and it is too obvious to require argument, that the duty of ruling the church compre-

hends all the particulars now specified. But neither in this way, nor in any other, can it be proved from the New Testament, that the duty of ruling the church, as committed to mortals, implies the exercise of any official authority for the propagation of the gospel, of which the immediate subject is not either the ministry, or the public worship of God, which ministers are appointed to conduct.

It will, probably, be asked whether, in consistency with this doctrine, we can approve the Presbyterian practice of licensing persons to preach the gospel as candidates for the holy ministry. Unquestionably. Such persons are not appointed to do anything not included in the functions of the ministry. Their case differs from the case of ministers in these respects only, that their appointment is temporary, because intended for trial, and extends to only a part of the duties of the ministry. Now, that the Scriptures contain no explicit mention of such a limited and temporary appointment, is readily admitted; but we maintain that it is an appropriate mode of performing a duty which they do enjoin. They require that a bishop be *not a novice*, that he be *a faithful man, and able to teach others also*. To those intrusted with the power of ordination, they address the solemn admonition, *Lay hands suddenly on no man*. Thus it is evident, that candidates for the sacred office must be tried, not only as to their knowledge and piety, but as to their aptness to teach. And it is for this purpose they are licensed to preach. This mode of trial is certainly relevant. It imposes no unreasonable burden. It interferes with no man's rights; nor do we perceive that, employed merely for the purpose here specified, it involves anything inconsistent, with either the spirit or letter of any portion of the word of God. And since God has been pleased to enjoin the duty of trying candidates, but not to point out the precise mode of trial, these considerations afford an ample vindication. Let it be distinctly observed that, in this case, no authority is exercised which does not relate to the ministry, and no means are used for the propagation of the gospel, distinct from those which it is the official duty of ministers to employ.

We are prepared to have it objected that we limit the agency of the church to a narrow sphere. This would be true, were there no higher authority in the church than that of created office-bearers. But be it remembered, the reverse is true. Immanuel is her Head. Immanuel is her Lord. The duties of her officers, and the duties of her private members are alike prescribed by Him. Shall we say, then, that she is concerned in an act, because it is done under the authority of her created rulers; but that she is not concerned in an act done by a private member, simply in obedience to the will of Christ? What is this but to deny that private persons have anything directly to do—are under any direct responsibility, or owe any direct subjection to the Lord Jesus as Head of the church? The agency of the church comprehends the whole agency of every member, so far as it has relation to the honor and authority of the Redeemer; and to decide what portion of her agency is to be exerted by human rulers or under their official direction, the only appeal is to his word.

The truths of the gospel are not secrets. There are various relations, not ecclesiastical in their nature,—that of parent, for example,—which bring along with them an obligation to impart religious instruction. The duties of these relations ecclesiastical officers are to point out and enforce, on the general principle, that they are to point out and enforce all the duties that God has enjoined. Every man ought to use all the proper means at his command for the diffusion of religious knowledge, and every means is proper, which is really adapted to the end, provided it involves no neglect or violation of the duties of his station, and no invasion of the rights or prerogatives of others. There may be those who condemn all efforts for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, made voluntarily by private individuals, whether singly, or conjointly. But assuredly, the Bible does not sanction such indiscriminate condemnation. It declares that the church—not merely her ministers, and other office-bearers,—but *the church is the pillar and the ground of the truth*; and requires all her members to *hold forth the word of life*.

Of course, we do not plead for any unauthorized as-

sumption of ministerial functions. The minister is, *by ecclesiastical office*, a teacher of religion. He claims to have been called of God to that office. This claim has been duly examined on behalf of the church, and found to be supported by proper evidence. He is a teacher of the church. When she meets to worship, and to receive instruction, it is his duty to teach her, and to lead her devotions. He sustains the office of teacher to her members severally. On her behalf, he is appointed likewise to impart religious instruction to those who, as yet, are not members, with a view to their becoming so. Every man has a right to apply to him for this purpose; and if the application is made seriously, respectfully, and in proper time and place, he is bound to pay it all suitable attention. This is not a personal favor, but a duty of his office. The layman is in very different circumstances. To teach the truths of revelation to certain individuals may be his duty, on the ground of certain relations which are not of an ecclesiastical character; but if he teaches them to others, it must be merely in the exercise of a right common to every man, to tell what he knows to whom he will, on every subject on which secrecy is not obligatory. To mention a parallel case: The State may establish a Professorship of Law. No man not duly appointed, may attempt to fulfil any of the duties of that Professorship; but it by no means follows that any man is forbidden to express his opinion on any question of law, on any suitable occasion.

Let our position be distinctly understood. It is evident from the Word of God, that religious instruction must be given officially, by men ecclesiastically appointed, and set apart to the work; and we have ample means of determining what are the peculiar duties of the office. On the other hand, it is equally evident, that not only ecclesiastical officers, but Christians, without distinction, must let their light shine,—must hold forth the word of life,—must exhort one another,—must be the light of the world,—and while the general duty is enjoined, the Scriptures contain no minute enumeration of the means of performance. It will probably be admitted (by all, at least, who are likely to take an interest in this discussion,) that for the purpose here specified, much must be

done by individuals without reference to any other authority than that of the Lord Jesus, much about which they are no more to wait for an appointment from created rulers of the church, than they are to wait for such an appointment to search the Scriptures, or to pray in secret. These things lie within the appropriate province of individual piety; and ecclesiastical rulers have to do with them, in no other way than as they have to do with every branch of practical religion. Now, the question is, what are the proper limits of this field of action? We reply, it includes every proper effort to bring men to the knowledge of the truth, which is not included in the peculiar functions of the gospel ministry. Within the limits thus defined, ecclesiastical rulers as such have no more rightful power to appoint and control, than over the devotions of the closet. The proof is easy: As has been shown already, all their claims to authority must either be made good from the law of Christ, or rejected as usurpations. *Now, while the New Testament abundantly declares the authority of church government in relation to the ministry, it contains not the most remote hint or implication of the extension of that power to any mode of making known saving truth which is not ministerial in its nature.* This, indeed, is little, if anything more than saying, that *we have no authority to introduce new offices into the church; and that Christ has given her no teaching officers except ministers.*

Let us turn to the other class of duties. Those who are appointed to rule and take care of the church, must exercise discipline on violators of the law of Christ. Of course, this has exclusive reference to members of the church. So common sense teaches, and the word of God decides. "For what have I to do," says Paul, "to judge them also that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? But these that are without God judgeth. Therefore, put away from among yourselves that wicked person." From this passage it is evident that, in some cases, the offender must be utterly cut off from the communion of the church; but this is the highest penalty she may inflict, in any case whatsoever. Of course, a power to receive persons into the church is pre-supposed. Moreover, there must be power to do

whatever is needful for the suitable and convenient performance of these duties. Churches, for example, must be organized. In some instances, one congregation must be divided into two or more; in others two or more congregations united into one. Charges of disorderly conduct, preferred against members of the church, must be investigated. For this purpose, witnesses must be cited and examined, and their testimony duly considered. Ministers must be held amenable to discipline, in reference to their official, as well as their personal conduct, especially in reference to the doctrines they teach. As a transfer of ecclesiastical relations frequently becomes necessary, there must, of course, be a power to certify to the ecclesiastical standing of the person concerned; and this bears just the same relation to discipline as the power to receive persons into the church.

Every public society ought to afford to all whom it may concern, ample means of information as to the principles on which she is organized, and the rules by which she is governed. Without this, it is manifest, the ends of discipline cannot be secured. In the present state of the nominally Christian world, no particular church can perform this duty by merely referring us to the Bible. For there are a variety of subjects on which a common understanding is essential to the harmony of a particular church, but in reference to which the Bible is differently interpreted by different public bodies, equally professing subjection to its authority. Every church, therefore, ought to have such a document as we are accustomed to describe by the phrase, A WRITTEN CONSTITUTION. And the adoption of such a Constitution is a very high exercise of the power to rule. For just the same reason, such questions of principle, as may at any time arise, affecting the church as a public society, ought to be decided by her rulers in her behalf.

But there may sometimes arise difficulties of a different kind. Questions of which the immediate subject is neither doctrine, discipline, nor order, may agitate a church, disturb her harmony, and even threaten her dissolution. It may be manifest that neither official teaching nor discipline can remove the evil, and yet that it must be removed by the public authority of the



church. That authority, then, ought to be executed. The principle is that of self-preservation. And the power exercised we shall describe as *the power of visitation*.

The ministry is not the only office in the church; and it is too obvious to require argument, that whenever any ecclesiastical office is to be conferred, there is some thing to be done by some person or persons already in office. The remark is intended as a general one; whether any exception is to be made in favour of extreme cases, is a question on which, at present, we express no opinion.

We are now prepared to state our doctrine in general terms. *The rightful authority of ecclesiastical rulers extends to the ministry, public worship, and the discipline of the church, to every thing connected with these, so far as it is of such a nature as to require the intervention of created rulers, and to nothing else, otherwise than in virtue of its connexion with these.*

Hitherto we have confined our attention to the general truth, that the church is the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ; from which we have sought to deduce an answer to the question, what is it to rule and take care of her? Our conclusion will be either confirmed or disproved, by an examination of those portions of the word of God which describe more particularly the duties of ecclesiastical rulers.

The circumstances in which the office of deacon originated, and the purposes for which it was instituted, may be learned from Acts vi. All other ecclesiastical officers, whether ordinary or extraordinary, are elders. This title is given to apostles. "*The elders which are among you,*" says Peter, "*I exhort, WHO AM ALSO AN ELDER.*" On the other hand, it is given to men who are not preachers.—"*Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, ESPECIALLY THEY WHO LABOUR IN WORD AND DOCTRINE.*"

From this latter text it is evident, that the whole duty of the eldership consists in ruling and teaching: the elders are divided into two classes; to rule is the function common to them all, and the only official duty of one class; while the other class are charged with the additional duty of labouring in word and doctrine. For the sake of convenience, we are accustomed to describe

the one class as *ruling elders*, (though, in strictness of speech, this title is applicable to both;) and the other as *ministers*, or *preaching elders*. Whatever, then, is included in official teaching, as distinguished from ruling, belongs to ministers only. Whatever is included in ruling, as distinguished from teaching, belongs to all the elders, both those who preach, and those who do not; and should ordinarily be transacted in an assembly of elders. As has been remarked already, the administration of the sacraments is an act of teaching, and therefore belongs exclusively to preaching elders; but to judge of the qualifications of candidates for sealing ordinances, is an act of ruling; and, therefore, belongs to both preaching and ruling elders. It is true that, in the New Testament, there are recorded instances of the admission of persons to baptism by a single officer; but in every such case, it was an extraordinary and inspired officer, appointed to plant and organize churches, and prepare them for a settled course of action. It is not at all surprising that such an officer should have power to do acts which might not be done in a settled state of the church, by any single person who was merely an ordinary and uninspired officer. The same explanation applies to every other instance in which it can be shown that an inspired man did *singly* an act which, according to the doctrine just stated, ought ordinarily to be done by two or more officers *jointly*.

After the remarks just made, it will not be necessary to cite particular texts in reference to the agency of elders in receiving persons to membership in the church. Every person tolerably acquainted with the New Testament will at once recollect such passages. Of certificates of ecclesiastical standing, we have examples in the cases of Apollos and Phebe.—(See Acts xviii., 27, and Rom. xvi., 1.) Of discipline for immorality, in the case of the incestuous person at Corinth; and for heresy, in the cases of Hymeneus and Alexander.—(See 1 Cor. v., 13, and 1 Tim. i., 20.)

As to investiture with ecclesiastical office, we have examples of their agency in the ordination of ministers, of elders, (both preaching and ruling, manifestly,) and deacons.—(See 1 Timothy, iv., 14; Acts xiv., 23; Acts

vi. 6.) And as to their supervision of the training of candidates for the ministry, 2 Tim. ii., 2, is decisive.— Their agency in designating ministers to their respective fields of labour is very strongly exhibited in Acts xiii., 1-3. That the Holy Ghost had called Barnabas and Saul to the work on which they were now about to enter, was well known, both to themselves and their brethren. Yet even in their case, it was needful that before entering on the work, they should be formally set apart to it, by a public ecclesiastical act. Extraordinary and notorious as their call was, it did not supercede the necessity of honoring the order which God had established in his church.

We mentioned a power to settle questions of principle in which the church as a public society is concerned. The evident necessity of such a power is, of itself, sufficient evidence that it belongs to those who are appointed to take care of the church of God. And the decision of the question about circumcision, (Acts xv.,) affords a very clear example of its exercise. It is true, the decision was dictated by the Holy Ghost. There is not, however, a shadow of evidence that inspiration was required as a qualification for a seat in that assembly; but much to the contrary. To mention no other proof, we know there were men who sat there simply as elders; and *that* office certainly did not imply inspiration. Moreover, had the sole object been to obtain an inspired decision of the question at issue, a sentence uttered by any one apostle would have been sufficient; and any possible doubt as to its authority could easily have been removed by miracles wrought in its confirmation. Why then, this public meeting and this formal discussion? There is but one answer. It pleased the Holy Ghost to exhibit a pattern to be imitated whenever a similar case should occur.

Here is sufficient authority for the adoption of what we are accustomed to call a written ecclesiastical constitution. Such a constitution is simply a collection of such decisions, authoritatively adopted for the guidance of future ecclesiastical action. We must remark here, that it is easy to carry the exercise of this power too far. There are many religious questions in which the church

is not concerned in the sense intended. A man's adopting one side or the other will not render his piety doubtful, nor lead to a violation of the rights of another, nor incapacitate him for the faithful and edifying performance of his ecclesiastical duties. With such questions the government of the church ought not to meddle. The rule is, let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind, and follow the things that make for peace.—(See Rom. xiv.)

We turn now to the power of visitation. An example of its exercise is recorded in Acts vi. A dispute arose between two numerous classes of people, broadly distinguished from one another already. The immediate subject was not strictly, of a religious nature, no *principle* was in question. It related directly to the distribution of alms. Still the whole church was concerned. Her harmony was disturbed; and, as we may reasonably suppose, an open rupture threatened. Hence the apostles interposed, and prescribed a remedy. It was, indeed, one that could not have been lawfully applied, had it not been prescribed by inspiration; for it involved the introduction of a new office into the church. In this respect, a similar case can never occur. But it is evident cases may occur, and do occur, resembling this in all those points on which depended the need for the authoritative interposition of ecclesiastical officers; and in every such case, this example is a sufficient warrant for such interposition.

This enumeration of particulars is probably sufficient. The Word of God, it has been shown, distinctly connects a variety of authoritative acts with the eldership; and those who admit these, will not be apt to object to anything formerly mentioned as included in ruling and taking care of the church of God.

But is not our doctrine objectionable for an opposite reason? Do the ministry, public worship, and church discipline cover the whole ground of church government? Does it not extend to some other things, for other reasons than their connexion with these? If any man affirms it, he is bound to prove his assertion; and this, we are confident cannot be done. Let the radical principle be borne in mind. *No man can lawfully do,*

*in virtue of ecclesiastical office, any act which it cannot be proved from Scripture, that Christ has connected with his office.* And under the guidance of this principle, let every act of church government mentioned or implied in Scripture, be examined with the strictest scrutiny. The result will be found to accord entirely with the position we have taken. If there is any exception, we may expect to find it, either in the first epistle to Timothy, or in the epistle to Titus. This expectation is fully justified by the circumstances in which these epistles were written, and the special purposes for which they were intended.

The first epistle to Timothy was intended to direct him in a very important work, which he had undertaken at Paul's request. A prominent part of the work is described in the phrase, "that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine;" but from other portions of the epistle, it is evident that this was by no means the whole. He was to correct such evils as already existed in the Church of Ephesus, take measures for preventing further evils with which she was threatened, and to do whatever it might be needful for him to do, to bring her to a healthy and orderly condition. As an extraordinary officer, he possessed all the authority that he could possibly find any reasonable occasion to exercise, in fulfilling this special and extensive commission; and the epistle before us was intended to afford him the necessary instructions, including, of course, such as related to the ordinary work of the ministry. What then, were his instructions? The epistle contains a prescription for his health, and some brief exhortations to exemplary conduct, and diligence in cultivating knowledge and piety. These, of course, have no bearing on our subject. The epistle, then, contains six chapters. The first, fourth, and sixth relate to the doctrines and duties to be inculcated, special reference being had to the maintaining of the purity of the gospel, in opposition to false teachers; the second to the order which must be preserved in the worship of God; the third to the qualifications of bishops, (or elders,) and deacons; the fifth to ecclesiastical censures, to ordination, and to the distribution of alms, or the duties of deacons. This last,

it will be observed, is entirely distinct from government, and pertains to a different office. But, whoever considers the extraordinary nature of work assigned to Timothy, will not be surprised that instructions as to the qualifications and duties of deacons were addressed to him. No part of this epistle, it is now evident, implies any greater authority for ecclesiastical rulers, than we have already deduced from the nature of the church.

Let us examine the Epistle to Titus. Titus, like Timothy, was an extraordinary officer, who, at Paul's request, had undertaken to complete the organization of certain churches, and to bring them to an orderly, regular and settled course of action. "For this cause left I thee in Crete," says the apostle, "that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." And this epistle was intended to give him the necessary instructions for his own work. The epistle contains three chapters. The first relates to the qualifications of elders, the second and most of the third to the doctrines and duties to be inculcated (specially in opposition to false teachers;) we have next a few words on the discipline of the church; and the epistle closes with some matters of a personal nature. It will be observed that no ecclesiastical matter is treated of in this epistle, which is not treated of in the epistle to Timothy, already examined, a fact of no little importance in determining what are the subjects with which the church, as a visible and organized society, has to do.

Thus we have examined those portions of the word of God which treat of ecclesiastical affairs, professedly and at large. We have found that they clearly recognize the power of ruling the church to the extent previously specified, but afford no warrant for extending it further. Now, add to this, the numerous texts already noticed to which the same remark applies, and the argument deduced from the nature of the church; and, we imagine, the candid reader will think that we might safely stop here; the point is established, unless some passage of Scripture can be produced, which we have not yet noticed, and which clearly extends the power in question beyond the limits we have assigned: meanwhile the pre-

sumption against the existence of such a passage is violent.

But we have more to say. It has been shown that the power to rule is clearly recognized in the word of God, and that ecclesiastical rulers are solemnly warned against attempting to exercise any greater power than Christ has connected with their office. Of course, there must be some sure method of determining the extent of their legitimate authority. Now, what is that method? We have in Scripture no formal definition of their powers, and it would be clearly irrelevant to argue from the authority held by ecclesiastical officers under the former dispensation. We mean to say, that no office under the Christian dispensation is identical with the priesthood under the Mosaic dispensation. An appeal to the nature of the church is evidently relevant; and that appeal we have made. For further light we now go to the apostolic commission. It will be admitted, no doubt, that no mortal has any rightful power for the government of the church, which the apostles did not possess; and it seems equally clear, that they held no power for that purpose, which was not derived from their commission. Hence, so far as church government is concerned, no man can lawfully claim any authority not fairly deducible from that commission. It runs thus: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." This commission is to remain in force "unto the end of the world;" of course, it was not intended to be confined to the apostles or to inspired men. It contains not a word on the subject of church government; hence it can convey the power to rule, so far only as its exercise can be shown to be necessary and proper, as a means of performing the duties specified. The gospel must be proclaimed, in order that men may become disciples; when properly qualified, they must be admitted by baptism into the visible relation of disciples; and, in that character, they must be taught to observe all things that Christ has commanded. These things must be done

officially; and they are all the duties specified in the commission. In connexion with these duties, there are various authoritative acts, which must be done by mortals, unless direct communications are to be constantly received from Heaven. Various things must be done bearing direct relation to the office itself; as, for example, inducting men into it. There is need for arrangement in reference to various matters connected with their teaching; such, for example, as relate to the public worship of God. An authoritative answer, favourable or the reverse, must be given to every one who applies for admission to the visible relation of a disciple. Those who sustain that relation must be subject to discipline, so far as that shall be needful to the end for which the relation was formed,—that they may learn to observe all things that Christ has commanded. To each and all of these subjects the principle is, of course, applicable, that every duty includes all the necessary and proper means of its performance. The degree of authority here described, is clearly and irresistibly implied in the commission itself; and to common sense we appeal for the correctness of the assertion, no greater power to rule can be legitimately derived from it.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### NECROLOGY.

A BRIEF MEMOIR OF THE REV. JAMES EDMONDS, OF CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.

The Rev. James Edmonds was born in the city of London, in or about the year 1720, and died in the city of Charleston, S. Carolina, in April, 1793, aged 73 years. It has often been a matter of regret and surprise to the writer, as well no doubt to others of the present generation, that so little has been left on record of the lives and characters of those eminent men, especially the



Pastors of the Presbyterian Church of our country, who have long since gone, as it is confidently hoped, to their resting places on high, and their memories left to perish in oblivion. Whether this lamentable occurrence may have arisen from a mere indifference on the part of their ministerial brethren, or false delicacy, in those whose special duty it was, it would at this time, be unavailing to inquire. The writer might here introduce a long list of names of those who have lived in his day, such as Drs. Hollingshead, Keith, Flinn, Palmer, Stephenson, John Brown, R. W. James, &c., of neither of whom he has yet seen any satisfactory account, and whose memoirs, as he thinks, would enhance the value of any well-written Church History of our country: still, it is to be hoped, that this may not be the fate or destiny of all, but that some noble effort, like that of the Synod of So. Carolina, as I have been informed, will yet be made to rescue from oblivion the memories of some of those worthies who still live in the remembrance and affection of their co-labourers of the present day. Among those who have long since gone, as it is sincerely to be hoped, to their eternal rest on high, the writer would willingly, endeavor to revive, though in his feeble and imperfect way, the memory of that eminent servant of the Most High, whose name stands at the head of this brief article, with whom he was well acquainted in his early life, he being for several years an inmate in his father's family, and where all loved him. To what particular denomination Mr. Edmonds was attached in England, is not certainly known, but it is most probable, to that of the independent Church. On reference to the valuable History of South Carolina, by the venerable Dr. David Ramsay, vol. ii., page 29, it will be seen that he became the Pastor of the Independent or Congregational Church, in Charleston, S. C., December 15th, 1754, and resigned his Pastorship of the same, about the year 1767, but from what cause it is not stated. But from that period, it is believed he retired into the interior part of the State, for the purpose of establishing or organizing new churches in vacant places, as in Williamsburg, Indian Town, Pee Dee, Jeffries' Creek, &c.; and in riding about as a missionary, literally doing all the good he could in the

cause of his blessed Master. If it should be inquired how, in a state of such indigence he could travel as he did it may be answered that he received as a gift from that, noble-hearted and generous friend, Major John James, of revolutionary memory, a fine riding-horse, supposed to be worth at least, \$100, and from the writer's father, a valuable servant boy, as a waiter, and a horse, to attend the worthy old gentleman in some of his tours. This servant is still living in the neighborhood of the writer, and though now far advanced in years, could, no doubt, yet relate many interesting incidents of their travels. When not engaged in these tours, he spent the greater part of his time to the great satisfaction of the family, in the mansion of the writer's father, or in that of his worthy friend and benefactor, Major James, and always found kind friends wherever he went. It has been stated to the writer that he married a Miss Broughton, of Goose Creek, near Charleston, and by her he had one daughter, but by some difference with one of his wife's brothers about the property, he gave it all back, and hence was the cause of his poverty in after-life. It is believed his said daughter was, afterwards raised by the worthy Patriarch of Charleston. After losing his eye-sight, about the year 1790, he removed to the hospitable mansion of his worthy friend, Mr. Josiah Smith, in Charleston, and remained in that mansion until he died in 1793. Mr. Edmonds was, in person, rather above the ordinary size of men, weighing probably, over 200 lbs., had a full face and heavy eyebrows, yet he was polite, affable, dignified, and more loquacious than usual for one at his age. His manner of preaching was plain, solemn, and unostentatious. His sermons were short but practical, and altogether extempore. After the entire demolition\* of the venerable church edifice in 1786, near Kingstree, by the descendants of the original founders of the same, or by the party opposed to the late emigrants from Ireland, there being no other suitable building for public worship, Mr. Edmonds occasionally occupied for that purpose, Mr. Witherspoon's barn. To show the great respect and esteem

\* A pretty full account of this extraordinary event may be seen in the writer's Church History, lately written.

in which this good man was held by the writer's family, an elder brother and sister, each gave his name in baptism to one of their sons. From the year 1789 or 1790, when Mr. Edmonds became blind, it is believed, he removed to Charleston, and remained as a guest, in the mansion of his worthy and generous friend, Mr. Josiah Smith, until his death. Whether he ever preached after he lost his eye-sight is not recollected by the writer. The last affecting interview which they had was in October, 1792, when the writer was on his journey, via Charleston, to Princeton College, where he acted as amanuensis to his venerable friend and preceptor, one day in every week, during the years 1793 and '94, and had the honor of graduating in the last class under that eminent man, the Rev. Dr. Witherspoon, then also completely blind, who, notwithstanding, still preached once a month or oftener, in his usual solemn, and impressive manner. Dr. W. died 15th Nov. 1794. Though much more might be added of the character of this worthy gentleman, Mr. Edmonds, and as respects the organization of the different churches, Williamsburg, Indian Town, Pee Dee, Jeffries Creek, &c., the writer will close this brief sketch with a remarkable, yet authentic incident, which occurred a year or two before his death, but while he was in a state of entire blindness. There was established in the City of Charleston, and in some of the adjacent Parishes or Congregations, a society for the benefit and support of disabled ministers of the gospel, and of their widows and orphans, of the Independent Church, consisting of fifty members or upwards, of which number Mr. Edmonds had always been one; and according to a standing rule of the society, every member had to pay one guinea or one pound sterling, annually, hence the fund soon became considerable, so that from the interest or annual proceeds, the society could easily carry out one of its principal objects. At one of their anniversaries, and the last that Mr. E. it is believed, was permitted to attend, not unmindful of his annual contribution, he went with his guinea in his pocket, and when he was called upon for his contribution, poor and blind, as he was, he cheerfully paid it, and extraordinary to relate, it was the last cent of money he could command; nor did he know

where he could get the next, except from the charity of some of his worthy and pious friends; yet, recollecting that his annual contribution might be called for, he had carefully kept this guinea in his pocket for that particular occasion. As soon as he had retired from the church to return to his lodging, a gentleman proposed, as the funds were ample, that the society should vote Mr. Edmonds eighty guineas annually, during life, whereupon, the venerable Mr. Smith opposed the motion, on the ground that he never had, and never expected to charge Mr. Edmonds or his daughter, (then a young lady grown,) anything for their board or lodgings, on the contrary considered it a favor and privilege to have such guests in his family. It being then suggested, that Mr. Edmonds was well known for great benevolence, especially, for his gratuitous distribution of good books, when in his power, the resolution was unanimously adopted, and two of the members appointed to wait upon him at his lodgings, and bear him the welcome intelligence; and when they entered his chamber, calm and alone, they made the important communication, whereupon the good man burst into tears of joy and gratitude, lifting up his hand and declaring that the contribution paid was the last guinea he could command, but his trust in God was firm and unwavering.

J. R. WITHERSPOON.

Greensboro', Alabama, Sept. 22, 1851.

P. S. This occurrence was stated to me by one of the gentlemen who waited upon Mr. Edmonds.

---

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

The earliest knowledge we have of Mr. Edmonds as a preacher is, that he was officiating as a Licentiate, at or near Cainhoy, about 12 or 15 miles from Charleston, on the Wando River, Dec. 9, 1753. At this time he was engaged by certain members of what is now called the Circular Church, in Charleston, as "a Lecturer," for six months. The engagement was renewed by the congregation for the ensuing six months. Again, Dec. 15, 1754, the engage-

ment was continued, but Mr. Edmonds was requested to apply to the neighbouring congregational ministers for ordination. They also, by resolution, elected him Pastor. In the records of the Circular Church, Feb. 12, 1757, he is called the Presbyterian Minister of the Congregational Church. Rev. William Hutson was his colleague in the Pastorship in said church from Feb. 13, 1757, to April 11, 1761, when he died.

Mr. Edmonds had two children, one of whom died in earliest infancy. Mr. Hutson's Register of Births, Deaths and Marriages, has the following entries: "Sept. 24, 1756, baptized George, son of Rev. James and Anna Edmonds." "Sept. 28, buried George, son of Rev. Jas. and Anna Edmonds." "Nov. 24, 1759, baptized Mary, daughter of Jas. and Anna Edmonds." She was living in 1815, when Dr. Ramsay published his history of this church, and was for many years, a pensioner upon the funds of the Clergy Society. In 1767 he assists Josiah Smith and Mr. Zubly in the ordination of John Thomas, sent out by Dr. Gibbons and Dr. Conder from England. After his resignation, about A. D. 1767, of his charge in this church, he is said to have removed to a church at New Port, in Georgia, and afterwards to have done much good as an itinerant, in many parts of Georgia and South and North Carolina.

Mr. Edmonds had been received a member of Orange Presbytery previous to May, 1774, (Records of the Presbyterian Church, p. 451,) and attended as a member of the Synod of Philadelphia and New York, held in Philadelphia, in that year. He also was present at the Sessions in May 1783, 1784, as a member of Orange Presbytery. In 1771 the congregation of the Circular Church asks occasional preaching from Mr. E. In 1777, March 17, he preached to the congregation announcing to them the death of Mr. Tennent. In the old account books of the church, notice is given of payments for 6 Sabbaths between January and April, at £15 per Sabbath, £90. Again, between this date and 15th of Nov., 9 Sabbaths, at £20, £180. In 1779, between the 6th of July and the 8th of March, 9 Sabbaths, £180. Even during the excited times of the Revolution, he was engaged in the ministry as he had opportunity.

“The bombardment of Charleston commenced on the 12th of April 1780. In part of the interval, between its announcement and the surrender of the town, on the 12th of May following, the Rev. Mr. Edmonds performed divine service in the church to a few worshippers, mostly women and invalids; for the men were, by night and day, on the lines. While he was engaged in this duty, a bomb shell fell in the church yard: the worshippers instantly dispersed and retired to their usual places of abode. Divine service was wholly intermitted from that day for the two years and eight months which followed.”

The Resolution of the Synod of the Carolinas for the division of the Presbytery of Orange, was read on the motion of Mr Edmonds, in a meeting of said Presbytery, held October 5, 1784. By this resolution, Messrs. Jos. Alexander, Francis Cummings, James Edmonds, John Harris, Thos. Reese, John Simpson, and Thomas Hill, were formed into a Presbytery, to be called the Presbytery of South Carolina, to meet at Waxhaw Church, on the 12th of April, 1785, at which the Rev. James Edmonds was to preside. He was present at this meeting, and opened it with a sermon from Matt. v: 14; was present at a *pro re nata* meeting at Bethel, May 22, 1785, and preached the ordination sermon of Robert Finley, from Psalms cxxxii: 16. Again, at a meeting held at Col. Reid's for the ordination of Robert Hall, July 26, 27. At Mrs. Pettigrew's July 28, 29, for the ordination of Robert Mecklin, whose ordination sermon he preached from 2 Tim. ii: 15. At Jackson's Creek, Oct. 11, 1785, where he opened Presbytery as Moderator, with a sermon from Mark xvi: 20. The Presbytery of South Carolina was bounded north by the N. Carolina line, but extended indefinitely southward. Mr. Edmonds was appointed to preach by these two Presbyteries, at Fairfield, Little River, Indian Town and Hopewell. Again, Oct. 12, 1786, appointed to preach at Hopewell, and to administer the Lord's Supper at Indian Town. Attended Presbytery at Catholic Church, April 10, 1787. Appointed to supply at Pacolet and elsewhere, at discretion. Present at an adjourned meeting of Presbytery at Bullock's Creek, Oct. 1787. At intermediate Sessions, Dec. 11, 1787. At Bethel, on which occasion

Messrs. Davis and McCulloch were licensed. At Duncan's Creek, Oct. 14, 1788. Ordered to supply at Williamsburg, Indian Town, Hopewell, P. D. and Indian, each one Sabbath. Preached the ordination sermon of John Newton, the Rev. Francis Cumming giving the charge; "and Mr. Newton was solemnly set apart to the exercise of the whole work of the gospel ministry, by *fasting*, prayer, and the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. Mr. Newton was received by Messrs. Park and Gilham, in the name of the people who called him in Georgia." Present at meeting at Bullock's Creek, Oct. 13, 1789; chosen Moderator; appointed to supply one Sabbath at Waxhaw. Present at Presbytery, Bethesda, Sept. 28, 1790. Appointed to preside at the ordination of Mr. Stephenson, at Williamsburg, to take place on the first Wednesday in December. Subsequently to this, for several years, his name appears among the absentees, and is mentioned last in the records of Presbytery, April 8, 1794. Thus Mr. Edmonds appears through life, till incapacitated by physical infirmity, to have been a laborious and useful minister, and to have performed good service in laying the foundations of Zion, and strengthening the things which were ready to die, in the early periods of our Southern Church. H.

---

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF MAJOR JOHN JAMES, AN UN-  
DAUNTED PATRIOT AND SOLDIER OF THE REVOLUTION.

The subject of this memoir was born in Ireland, in the early part of the year 1732,\* and was the oldest son of William James, an officer who had served King William in his wars in Ireland against King James II. From this circumstance originated the name of Williamsburgh, which is now one of the Districts of South Carolina. William James, with his family and several of his neighbors in Ireland, emigrated to that District near the close of the year 1732. They assisted in making the

\*April 12th, A. D. 1732, Family Record of Wm. James, in his own handwriting.—H.

first settlements in that new, and then uninhabited section of country, and in honor of King William gave his name also, to a village laid out on the east side of Black River. The village is now called Kingstree, from a large white Pine Tree, as was supposed, which grew immediately on the east bank of the river, and was reserved, as all white pines were, in the old grants of land, for the use of the king, and hence the name of the village has been since called the Kingstree, and that of Williamsburg transferred to the District. To this place Maj. James was brought, when an infant, by his parents, in the fall of the year 1732. Of his early history, but little is now known by the writer,\* except that he and his compatriots, some of whose names will hereafter be given as conspicuous actors in the American Revolution, appear to have been trained up to defend and love their country. Their opportunities for acquiring anything more than a common English education in those days, as is well known, were slender indeed, but for obtaining religious instruction were very ample. He was not only brought up under the care and example of his pious parents, but under an eminent Presbyterian Minister, the Rev. John Rae, who officiated as the Pastor of the original Church of Williamsburgh, from the year 1743 to 1761, inclusive, and whose labors during that period were greatly blessed. At the commencement of the Revolutionary war, in 1775, Major James, being then forty-three years old, had acquired a competent portion, both of property, and of military reputation, having been a Captain of the Williamsburgh Militia, under King George III. Disapproving of the measures of the British government, he resigned his royal commission, but was soon after reinstated by a popular vote of the District in his former command. In the year 1776, he marched with his company, to the defence of Charleston. In 1779, he was with General Moultrie on his retreat before General Prevost, and commanded 120 Riflemen in the skirmish at, or near Tulifing Bridge. When Charleston was besieged in May, 1780, Major James marched to its defence, but Governor John Rutledge or-

\* The first recollections of young James were of a stockade fort, and of war between the first settlers and the natives.—H.



dered him back to embody and train the country militia. The town having surrendered to the British, he was appointed by a public meeting of the citizens of Williamsburgh, to wait on some of the conquerors, and to enquire of them and ascertain what terms they would give. Under this appointment Major James repaired to Georgetown, being the nearest British post, which was then under the command of one Captain Ardesoif. Attired as a plain backwoodsman, James obtained an interview with Ardesoif, and in plain and prompt terms, entered at once upon the business of his mission. But when he demanded of Ardesoif the meaning of the British proclamation, offering freedom and protection to all who would acknowledge their allegiance to the British Crown, and asked upon what terms the submission of the citizens must be made, he was peremptorily informed "that the submission must be unconditional." To an enquiry whether the inhabitants were to be allowed to remain upon their plantations, he was answered in the negative :

"His majesty, said Ardesoif, "offers you a free pardon, of which you are undeserving, for you all ought to be hanged ; but it is only on condition that you take up arms in his cause." James, whom we may well suppose to have felt indignant at the tone and language in which he was addressed, very coolly replied, that "the people whom he came to *represent*, would scarcely submit on such conditions." The republican language of the worthy Major could not but provoke the representative of His Royal Majesty. The word *represent*, in particular, smote hardly on his ears ; something too, in the cool, contemptuous manner of the Major may have contributed to his vexation. "*Represent*," he exclaimed, in a fury, "you d—d rebel, if you dare speak to me in such language, I will have you hung up at the yard arm." Ardesoif, it must be known, was a sea-captain. The ship which he commanded lay then, in the neighbouring river, the Sampit. He used only an habitual form of speech when he threatened the "yard arm," instead of the tree. Major James gave him no time to make the correction. He was entirely weaponless, and Ardesoif wore a sword, but the inequality in the moment of his

anger, was unfelt' by the high-spirited citizen. Suddenly rising, he seized upon the chair on which he had been sitting, and with it, instantly floored the insolent subordinate at a blow.\* Then hurrying forth, without giving his enemy time to recover, he mounted his horse and made his escape to the woods before pursuit could be attempted. His people were soon assembled to hear his story. The exactions of the British, and the spirit which this gallant officer had displayed in resenting the insolence of Ardesoif, at once aroused their own. Required to take the field, it did not need a moment to decide "under which king." The result of their deliberations was the formation of the distinguished corps known in the latter period of the Revolutionary war, by the name of Marion's Brigade. Four Captains were chosen for as many companies. These were, Captains Wm. McCottry, Henry Mouzon, John James, (of the Lake,) a cousin of Major James, and John McCauley. These were all under the immediate command of Major James. He instantly put them in motion, and after some successful skirmishes against small parties of British and Tories, he advanced one of the four companies, McCottry's, to the pass of Lynch's Creek, at Witherspoon's Ferry. Here McCottry heard of Col. Tarlton's crossing the Santee at Lenuid's Ferry, and of his arrival at the plantation of Gavin Witherspoon, near the lower bridge on Black River. Here Maj. James determined to encounter him, and with all the means in his power to arrest his career through Williamsburgh, and his onward march to Camden. This movement was about the 20th or 25th July, 1780. Tarleton had been apprised of the gatherings of the people of Williamsburgh, under James, and at the head of some 200 or 250 well mounted cavalry, was pressing forward with the hope of surprising or meeting James at, or near the Kingtree. James, with as much solicitude to meet Tarleton and give him battle, advanced with his whole force, being probably, somewhat greater than Tarleton's, or about 300 men, chiefly undisciplined; and having arrived within five miles of Kingtree, he

\* "He suddenly seized the chair in which he was seated, brandished it in the face of the Captain, and making his retreat good," &c.—Judge James' Life of Marion, p 42.—H.

first despatched an active and intrepid young man, Henry Durant, as a spy, to examine narrowly, Tarleton's force and position, while he lay at the plantation of Gavin Witherspoon, near the lower bridge. Durant having very unexpectedly met Tarleton and his legion, who had just crossed at the lower bridge, on their route to Camden, and near the plantation of Robert Witherspoon, (the writer's father,) he, Durant, as may well be supposed, became panic-struck, suddenly wheeled his noble steed, on the back track, and being closely pursued by some twenty or more of Tarleton's best cavalry, for three-fourths of a mile, made a very narrow escape for his life, by leaving his horse, leaping a high and substantial fence, and running on foot, almost with the speed of a hunted stag, across Mr. R. Witherspoon's corn field, then well covered with pea-vines and a heavy crop of corn in the roasting-ear state, Durant having in that way, eluded the pursuit of the enemy. Tarleton rode up to the piazza steps of Mr. R. Witherspoon's house, demanding to know the name of the spy, and the object of his mission, as well as the particular position and force of Major James, (then only five miles distant,) whom he expressed, or affected a strong desire to meet. When informed by Mr. Witherspoon of James' proximity, and his expected arrival in the course of a few hours, Tarleton's purpose was suddenly changed, and instead of his great desire to meet his opponent in open combat, he felt himself compelled to proceed forthwith with his well-mounted legion, to the relief of Lord Rawdon, at Camden, nor did he allow himself scarcely a moment's delay as he passed through Kingstree, being still within five miles of James' encampment. It may be remarked here, that Tarleton was then accompanied by the notorious Elias Ball, of Wambaw, as aid or guide, who embarked for England at the close of the war, and his large estate being afterwards confiscated by the Legislature of his own State, the British Government settled upon him, a large pension during life, \$20 or \$25,000, as a reward for his active services and influence in their unrighteous cause. It may also be here stated, that Tarleton's legion of well-mounted cavalry, consisted then, of about two hundred and fifty men, and James' corps of

about one hundred more, *i. e.*, from three to four hundred mounted militia, chiefly riflemen, both undaunted and expert marksmen. The writer will be excused for speaking here of himself, by remarking, that though then, scarcely six years and five months old, (July 1780,) he still retains a distinct recollection of Durant's flight and extraordinary escape, and of Tarleton's interview with his father, especially of Tarleton's brandishing his sword over the head of the venerable patriot, and threatening to hew him down, if Durant was found in his house. The writer has, also, a clear recollection of seeing Durant as he passed through, or across the corn field, in front of the mansion, at his utmost speed, on his way to the river, without calling to tell the appalling news. This impressive scene forms, as he believes, one of the earliest reminiscences of the writer's life, being now in his 73d year. But to proceed with the narrative. It will be recollected, that as Durant did not return to make his report, and James being still anxious and fully prepared to encounter his high-spirited enemy, despatched one of his intrepid officers, Capt. Wm. McCottry, at the head of seventy of his expert riflemen, in the afternoon of the same day, to watch Tarleton's movements. To McCottry's great disappointment, as well as that of his gallant commander, Tarleton had passed suddenly through Kingstree, some hours before McCottry reached the place, and was too far ahead to be overtaken by James, clearly evincing a desire or design to avoid the intended or expected combat.

Tarleton, on his route up Black River, and ten miles above Kingstree, burned the mansion of the patriot Mouzon, one of Major James' Captains. The next account which was had of Tarleton, was his arrival at the house of Mr. James Bradley, in Salem, (thirty miles above Kingstree,) on the next day, where, by a stratagem, he made a prisoner of that stern and influential patriot, and after forcibly conveying him to Camden, had this worthy gentleman closely confined in the loathesome jail of that place, and loaded for the space of seven months, with heavy bars of iron around his legs, the swarthy sears of which were visible to the day of his death, as were often seen by the writer when a lad at

the Latin Academy in Salem, and an inmate in Mr. Bradley's family. «The British while in Camden, frequently had this worthy man conveyed to the gallows to witness the execution of some of his countrymen, and though frequently offered his freedom on condition of swearing allegiance to his Britanic Majesty, Mr. Bradley would as often fearlessly refuse; nor would they suffer his worthy lady to visit him while in prison. Major James, in that cruel and desultory warfare, which was waged against the people of Williamsburgh by the British under Watson and Wemyss, and other marauding parties of tories, suffered severely, being reduced at one time, from easy circumstances in life, almost to poverty, having had his comfortable mansion and furniture burned, and nearly all of his moveable property, either destroyed or carried off. But with his accustomed firmness, he still bore up under all these misfortunes, and was willing to devote, not only all of his possessions, but life itself, if necessary, for the good of his country. After General Greene, as Commander-in-Chief, had superseded Gen. Marion, Major James continued to serve under the former, and fought with him at the battle of Eutaw, and it is believed, that no corps of Green's army fought with more determined bravery than that of Maj. James. It will be proper to mention here, that besides the officers before noticed, viz: McCottry, Mouzon, (Lake) James, and McCauley, of Santee, who, at first, formed James' corps, there were several others who soon afterwards joined, viz: Captains Gavin Witherspoon and his brother John of Pedee, Thomas Potts, of Black River, Daniel Conyers, of Salem, Jas. Witherspoon, of Kingstree, (the writer's brother,) John James, the son of the Major, &c., some of whom joined this distinguished corps after Gen. Marion assumed the command, about the middle of August, 1780. The Colonels who were at one time or other attached to this celebrated corps, were Peter and Hugh Horry, Postel, Giles, and Erwin, of Pee Dee, &c. It would, perhaps, not be extravagant to say, that no brigade of the same number of men and officers, were ever formed during the Revolutionary war, that was composed of braver, more enlightened, and more patriotic soldiers, than that of Marion, in a word,

“they were hard to beat.” The writer, who was personally acquainted and related to that brave and patriotic soldier, Major John James, would gladly extend this brief narrative, in some further reminiscences of his military services, and daring exploits, as in the hard fought battle at Quimby, and skirmishes at Black Mingo, Little Pee Dee, Georgetown, Lower Bridge on Black River, with the British Colonel, Watson, and more particularly at Wambaw Bridge, where, by a close pursuit of two British Dragoons, this intrepid man, weighing upwards of 200 pounds, was obliged to leap on horse-back, a chasm of that bridge of at least twelve or fifteen feet wide, and as high above the water. Some of his men, forgetting that he was still in the rear, had thrown off twelve or fifteen of the plank into the deep stream below, leaving all in the rear to cross over on the string pieces of the bridge. The writer has since seen this noted place, situated a few miles from, and south of the Santee River. The narrative of this worthy and most excellent man, will be continued in another number, embracing his *civil* and *religious* character, his age, family, usefulness in the Church of Indian Town, in which he acted as a prominent elder, his death, &c.

---

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE.

The sequel to the preceding history has not been found among the papers of Dr. Witherspoon. Whether he ever executed his purpose of writing it, is unknown. Major James died January 29, 1791, and was interred in the church yard at Indian Town. He was one of the first elders of that church, and held this office before the war of the Revolution. Probably the style of piety as manifested in himself and others, in connection with the church, was less staid and sober than in these days, is regarded as fitting those who represent the Christian name. When the first settlers located themselves in the country, all around was wild and savage; they dwelt at first, as we have seen the Irish in our own day, in rude houses of earth, or in “*shanties*.” Gradually they erect-

ed better dwellings, yet it was but slowly that the free and somewhat jovial life of the woodsman was laid aside. The forests abounded in game, and resounded with the crack of the rifle. Much of life was spent on horseback, and in hunting. And when the people met together, the men would now try the speed of their horses in the race, and now engage with the fairer portion of society in the merry dance; nor had the day of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks yet come, nor was it so very disgraceful to make merry with ones' friends, and to reach that point when the worse wine could be set forth safely, the men having well drunk. The times of that ignorance many a one winked at. Nor would we be surprised to learn that the brave soldier and good elder, sometimes was present and participated in those scenes. Stock was wild, and if a horse was wanted, one was caught from the woods, mounted and made to obey the rein. In feats of horsemanship the young men delighted, and to ride the fleetest horse and subdue the most ungovernable, was a point of emulation. There was not wanting to Maj. James some spice of humour. The belief in ghosts was common, and the spirit-world was not thought so separate as since it has been thought, from this our world of flesh and blood. Major James had as little dread of these imaginary beings, as he had of the enemy on the field of battle. On one occasion he was driven into the session house to escape the fury of a storm. Taking his saddle from his horse, he lay down to rest, and, using the saddle as a pillow, fell asleep. Night came on, and a neighbour entered to enjoy the same friendly shelter. In moving about, he stumbled over him unawares, and took to his heels in pale affright. James aroused, uttered a loud and terrific cry, which gave new speed to the trembling fugitive. Out of this rather *material* incident, a new ghost-story was now set on foot, which filled the neighbourhood with alarm, and continued current till the secret transpired, to the great mortification of the terrified neighbour. On another occasion, Maj. James, passing his father's grave one night, saw what appeared to be a white sheet, hanging over the cedar head-board which marked the spot. He supposed it placed there by design to inspire terror. He deter-

mined to see what it was. As he drew near he saw bare feet beneath the sheet, and soon a female form started up. It appeared that she had been engaged at her private devotions, and belonged to a company of "movers," who had sought the church yard as their camp for the night. She besought him not to disturb her, and he, remonstrating with her for such exposure of herself, induced her to seek shelter within the walls of the church. Major James was universally respected. He was under six feet in height, with full breast, broad shoulders, weighing about 200, commanding in his look and gait, so as to attract attention in a crowd of men. He was in the battle of Eutaw, was at Snow Island with Marion, and held a seat in the first Legislative body, to which he was elected shortly after the battle of Eutaw.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Views of the Holy Trinity: Doctrinal and Experimental.*  
Charleston: JOHN RUSSELL, 256 King Street. 1853.

This book deserves a much more extended and elaborate notice than we are able to give of it now. It is in the form of a letter, divided into two general parts, each of which is again subdivided into chapters. The first part is occupied with what, in the title, are called Doctrinal, the second, with Experimental, views of the Trinity. It is the second part which constitutes the principal charm of the book. It is a rich repository of Christian experience, and though we are aware that many, who profess to take the Scriptures as their guide, will turn from such exercises as the writer describes with incredulity and disgust, will even denounce them as fanatical and absurd, we confess that we have recognized in them nothing but the genuine operations of the spirit of grace. That the persons of the Trinity should be manifested to the consciousness of believers, that they should have communion with



the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, that they should know them in the distinction of their persons as well as in the unity of the Godhead, seems to us as plain as that a Trinity exists. All admit that we must know and have fellowship with Jesus Christ as a Person. It is impossible to recognize him in his offices without recognizing the Father who appointed him to his work, and whose glory he came to vindicate and declare. All admit that a supernatural illumination is required, in order that we may discern the beauty and loveliness of the Saviour, and yet how can this illumination be imparted without some impressions of its source? There is certainly nothing absurd in the supposition that one person may converse with another. If the Father is a person, he can converse with man, if the Son is a person, he can converse with man, if the Holy Ghost is a person, he can converse with man. But conversation implies a consciousness of the personal existence in the mind of each party, of the other. There can be no such thing as communion with the Holy Ghost without feeling him to be a person. Without it, there may be influences exerted, and effects produced by him, but this is very different from fellowship. We do not hesitate, therefore, to record our firm conviction of the truth of the fundamental principle which these views are designed to illustrate. The exercises seem to us to be sound, consistent and scriptural. We commend the book to the attention of our readers, and those who have not attained to such exalted experiences of grace, we would affectionately exhort to give all diligence to make their calling and election sure. The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him. No spirit is more dangerous than that of Festus, which brands with the stigma of enthusiasm or madness the very words of truth and soberness. Such is the deplorable skepticism, especially among those who claim to be more intelligent than their neighbours, upon the whole subject of Divine manifestations, that many are afraid to expect them, others despise them, and multitudes, like the disciples of the Baptist at Ephesus, have hardly heard that there be a Holy Ghost. For our own part, we much prefer a little extravagance, anything, indeed, which shall indicate the warmth and activity of life, to that frozen, ice-bound stiffness, which, in the mis-

rable solecism of mortals, is denominated propriety. Far better to be crazy with Paul than staid and sober with Festus.

---

2. *The Premium Essay on the Characteristics and Laws of Prophetic Symbols.* By the Rev. EDWARD WINTHROP, A. M., Rector of St. Paul's Church, Norwalk, Ohio. New York: Published by FRANKLIN KNIGHT, 140 Nassau Street. 1854.

This book has been put into our hands too late to receive the attention it deserves. In the year 1851, a circular was issued by the Editor of the Literary and Theological Journal, at New York, proposing three premiums, one of four, one of two, and another of one hundred dollars, to be awarded to the authors of the best Dissertations on the subject embraced in this Essay. The persons selected to pronounce upon the Essays, were Bishop McIlvaine, Dr. McGill, and Dr. Forsyth. But one premium was awarded, and that to the author of the Dissertation before us. The circumstances under which his book is published give rise to a presumption of merit. The subject is full of interest, and though we are not prepared to adopt the results, which in the hands of Mr. Lord, the laws of symbols have been made to yield, we cannot but admit, that he has thrown much light upon the interpretation of the prophecies. He has given us an instrument of incalculable importance. His speculations upon symbols and the figured language of the Scriptures, constitute a most valuable contribution to the department of Hermeneutics.

# SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER II.

---

OCTOBER, MDCCCLIV.

---

## ARTICLE I.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY, NOT THEORETICAL OR SPECULATIVE, BUT PRACTICAL IN ITS NATURE, AND FUNDAMENTAL IN ITS IMPORTANCE.

In our previous article on the doctrine of the Trinity, we laid it down that this was a question plainly above and beyond the capacity and limits of the human mind, and altogether incomprehensible, undiscoverable, and indeterminable, by the human reason. It is purely a question of revelation; and the only proper inquiry respecting it is, whether, how far, and for what purposes, it is revealed. To say it is impossible for God to exist as a Trinity in Unity, is, therefore, contrary to reason; which has no premises from whence to conclude one way or the other: and to say, that the doctrine of the Trinity is contradictory, is to contradict the very term Trinity itself, which affirms that in God there is a unity of such an infinite and unfathomable nature, as to admit and require a trinity, and a trinity which can only co-exist in a unity.

“When,” says Milton, whom Unitarians so proudly and yet so deceitfully appeal to as a Unitarian, in the posthumous work on Christian Doctrine attributed to him,\* “when we speak of knowing God, it must be understood with reference to the imperfect comprehension of man; for to know God as he really is, far transcends the powers of man’s thoughts, much more of his percep-

\* Vol. i., page 19, Treatise on Christian Doctrine, supposing this to be Milton’s

tion." "Our safest way," he adds,\* "is to form in our minds such a conception of God, as shall correspond with his own delineation and representation of himself in the sacred writings. For, granting that both in the literal and figurative descriptions of God, he is exhibited, not as he really is, but in such a manner as may be in the scope of our comprehensions, yet we ought to entertain such a conception of him, as he, in condescending to accommodate himself to our capacities, has shown that he desires we should conceive. For it is on this very account that he has lowered himself to our level, lest in our flights above the reach of human understanding, and beyond the written word of Scripture, we should be tempted to indulge in vague cogitations and subtleties."

"Solicit not thy thoughts with matters hid:  
 Leave them to God above; him serve and fear.  
 \* \* \* \* \* Heaven is for thee too high,  
 To know what passes there; so, lowly wise,  
 Think only, what concerns thee, and thy being;  
 Dream not of other worlds, what creatures there  
 Live, in what state, condition, or degree."

"We may be sure," adds Milton, "that sufficient care has been taken that the Holy Scriptures should *contain nothing* unsuitable to the character or dignity of God, and that God should say nothing of himself which could derogate from his own majesty." "To speak summarily, God either is, or is not, such as he represents himself to be. If he be really such, why should we think otherwise of him? If he be not such, on what authority do we say what *God* has not said?"†

If then, the triune nature of the divine Unity of the Godhead is the doctrine of Scripture, the term Trinity is, undoubtedly, necessary to express it so long as there is opposition made to the doctrine itself. And if the doctrine is not found in Scripture, then both the doctrine and the term should be rejected. And hence we were led to expose the unreasonableness of objections levelled against the word "trinity," a term which is only designed to express in *one* word, the doctrine which would

\* Vol. i, p. 20. † Vol. i, p. 25.

otherwise, and that constantly, require many words for its expression.

But it is further objected that this doctrine, even if true, is not of practical importance,—that it is merely speculative, theoretical and theological,—and that it ought not therefore, to be represented as of fundamental importance, and its rejection as heretical and dangerous. This objection, if valid, would certainly be a clear justification of silence on our part, and of objection on the part of its opponents. But how are we to know what is practical, and fundamentally important in revealed religion? Not assuredly by our opinion of it, or by the opinion of any other man, or of any set of men, or of human reason in any form; and for this simple reason, that the system of revealed truth is revealed *only* because it is that about which *human* reason could discover, understand, and judge nothing, except so far as it is revealed. He who reveals the truth must therefore, reveal also, the relative importance of the truth in its bearing upon God's glory and man's salvation, the only ends for which a revelation was given at all.

The importance of any truth in the Bible must, then, be ascertained not by the opinion man forms of it, but from its own nature,—and from the place it holds in the chain of Scriptural principles, promises, precepts, worship and experience. The relation in which any truth stands to God as a Saviour, and to man as a sinner,—to Heaven as lost and to be regained,—to hell endangered,—and to death inevitable—this will stamp it as of primary, or as only of relative importance.

Now, it is very evident, that I may have little knowledge of any truth, or have erroneous conception of it, or misconceive its supreme importance, while another person may have full knowledge and adequate conceptions of it. And in such a case it is not only *lawful* for that individual, but it is surely his *duty*, to use all proper means to convince me and to convert me to the knowledge and enjoyment of a truth which he knows, by experience, to be very precious to his own soul. This is what we are required to do by the spirit of natural charity, and also, by Divine precept, which enjoins upon

us that "in meekness we should instruct those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.

Truths, which even Unitarians acknowledge to be of primary and fundamental importance, are, nevertheless, matters of controversy between Christians and Jews, and between Christians and infidels. The denial of these truths cannot, therefore, be attributed to any want of practical importance in them, nor to the want of sufficient evidence in the revelation made of them; but to a culpable condition of the minds of those who reject them, and who as the Scriptures declare, "are blinded through unbelief."

Neither does the importance of a doctrine depend upon the degree of certainty with which, to our own mind, it may seem to be proved.

Whatever may be my individual opinion of any doctrine, either as to its certainty or its importance, affects not its reality. Its certainty depends on the fact that it is proved by sufficient evidence to be delivered in the word of God; and its importance, upon its own intrinsic character and the relation in which it stands to other doctrines, and to the duty which we owe to God and to ourselves; and hence it follows that a man through ignorance, or prejudice, or partial examination, may regard as doubtful or unimportant, a doctrine which is nevertheless taught clearly, and which is of the most vital importance.

To those, therefore, to whom the doctrine is thus clear and fundamental, its reception and advocacy assume a character of paramount necessity. It will be held by such with unyielding tenacity; and it will be urged by them upon others with a zeal and earnestness which are neither the result of vanity, pride, uncharitable contempt, or any disposition to intolerance, but which sprung solely from the very necessity of christian fidelity and love.

But, it is alleged, that a man who rejects as untrue, opinions which we consider both true and essential to salvation, and who does so in sincerity of heart, cannot be blameable. Now, undoubtedly, sincerity and per-

sonal conviction are both necessary to make even an opinion in itself right, to be right and valuable to me, since to use the words of Dryden :\*

“If others in the same glass better see,  
’Tis for themselves they look, but not for me,  
For my salvation must its doom receive,  
Not from what others, but what I believe.

Or, as another poet has expressed it,

Who with another’s eye can read,  
Or worship by another’s creed?  
Trusting thy grace, we form our own,  
And bow to thy commands alone.

But, it is also true, that a man’s perfect sincerity of heart in holding any opinion free from any sinful bias and prejudice of mind, is what he himself, from the very nature of the case, is incapable of avouching, and what no human being can determine for him. God alone can judge the real character and condition of a heart which is “deceitful above all things.”

All-seeing God! ’tis thine to know  
The springs whence wrong opinions flow:  
To judge, from principles within,  
When frailty errs, and when we sin.

And since it is common for all who hold dangerous errors to claim sincerity in doing so, it is only when we have the testimony of God’s Word and Spirit, “witnessing with ours,” that we can safely rejoice in “the testimony of a good conscience.” In other words, our hearts must be judged by the Scriptures, and not the Scriptures by our hearts.

Besides, we may be *sincere* and yet ignorant, uninformed, and so blinded by prejudice as to be incapable of “receiving the truth in the love of it;” and while Christ as God, “knows how to have compassion on the ignorant and those that are out of the way,” yet our ignorance cannot make that truth unimportant, which is vital, nor that error venial which is “damnable.”

Now, the doctrine of the Trinity must either be a “damnable heresy,” or the wilful rejection of it must be

\* Vol. I., p. 404.

so. It lies at the foundation of our religion. It shapes our conceptions of the God we are to worship, and the worship with which we are to approach him. It makes God absolutely and personally one, or necessarily Triune. It makes the Son and the Holy Ghost either attributes, or creatures, or, on the other hand, very God of very God, co-equal persons in a triune Jehovah. It makes these persons in the Godhead either finite or infinite, created or uncreated, necessary or contingent, supreme or subordinate, objects of present worship, or only objects of reverential regard for past services. If the Son and the Holy Ghost are not God in unity with the Father, it must be blasphemous and highly displeasing both to him and to them, to worship them as such. And if, on the other hand, they are really divine, and co-equal with the Father, then, whatever we may say of them, however in *words* we may exalt and praise them, if we withhold from them our prayers and worship as God, we rob them of their highest excellence and glory. The doctrine of the Trinity, therefore, determines the object of our worship. Abandon the doctrine of the Trinity, which presents as the object of our worship an infinite, eternal, omnipotent, and omnipresent Being, in existence, nature, or Godhead one, and yet subsisting (in a way unintelligible to finite minds and not necessary to be understood,) in three persons as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and what is the object to be worshipped by us? Do Unitarians know any more than we do what God is, or what God possibly can be? Can they define what is the unity of God? Can they possibly reconcile with their notions of the Divine unity the entire representation made in Scripture of God, and of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost? Or, have they any one theory of the supreme object of worship to present to our acceptance as that on which they are themselves agreed?\*

A large body of those ranked among Unitarians at the present time, rejecting the authority of Scripture as an infallible guide to our knowledge of God, abandon also any definite or personal object of worship. Others, again, regard Christ as a Divine being, as in

\* See Note A, at end of the article.



some sense God, and as such to be worshipped. And as the former party are pantheistic atheists, the latter are as certainly Dualists, since in reality they worship, not ONE God, but two Gods. Christ they regard as having been exalted to the honor and dignity of a God, not, indeed, so as to be either one with, or equal to the supreme God. But, still, he is *deus verus*, truly Divine and only second and subordinate to the Father, by whom he was created and from whom he received all that he possesses. Socinus therefore, regarded as a calumny the imputation of not believing Christ to be true God, and as such entitled to be worshipped with Divine honor. He denominates Christ *true God*, and other Unitarians of his day, speak of Christ as *deus eximius*, the *most exalted* or *eminent* God, and not to acknowledge him as a true God is, says Smalcus, to renounce the Christian religion. Though not the supreme God, Christ, as Milton teaches, or the author of the Work on Christian Doctrine lately discovered and ascribed to him, is God by appointment, by office, by communicated Divine power, wisdom, goodness, and authority,—*deus factus non natus*.\* Such of the Unitarians as hold this opinion, which all the ancient Arians did, instead of believing in one God, believe, undoubtedly, in two Gods, and “one who is God by nature, and the other by grace, one supreme and another inferior, one greater and the other lesser, one elder and eternal, and the other junior and modern,” the one necessarily God and the other Divine only arbitrarily, contingently, and by the will of the other. According to this opinion, there might be a true God without the Godhead, a Divine person who is the object of worship, without a Divine nature,—all the attributes of Deity without that essence in which alone they can inhere,—a finite creature might become capable of infinite perfections, and what is *peculiar* to God may be made the property of a creature, who may receive what cannot be bestowed, and participate of what is incommunicable.

Such are the absurdities to which the rejection of the

\* See other authorities given by Dr. Edwards in his *Preservativ Agt. Socinianism*, part 1, pp. 9, 10, and *Waterland*, vol. i., part 2, and Index to it.

doctrine of the Trinity of persons in one supreme Godhead, has led many, in modern, as well as in ancient times. And where the Holy Spirit is regarded, as by the ancient Arians he was considered, as a Divine person equally, though in an inferior degree, with the Son, these absurdities are increased by the multiplication of three Gods, a doctrine which some have even boldly avowed and defended.\*

“I do not pretend,” says Waterland,† “that you Unitarians, are Tritheists, in every sense; but I do affirm that you are Tritheists in the same sense that the Pagans are called Polytheists, and in the Scripture sense of the word God, as explained and contended for by yourselves. One Divine person is, with you, equivalent to one God; and two, to two Gods, and three, to three Gods; the case is plain; the consequences unavoidable. For one supreme and two inferior Gods, is your avowed doctrine, and certainly, the asserting three Gods, whether co-ordinate or otherwise, is Tritheism; against the first commandment, and against the whole tenor of Scripture and the principles of the primitive church. It is, to me, an instance of the ill-effects of vain philosophy, and shows how the “disputer of this world” may get the better of the Christian; when men appear so much afraid of an imaginary error that in any sense, even in Deity, there can be one nature and three subsistences in that nature, in metaphysics, and to avoid it, run into a real one, alike condemned by Scripture and antiquity.”‡

But this theory of two, or three Gods, one supreme and the others created, is not only as has been seen, absurd. It is plainly idolatrous, since divine worship, according to Scripture, can be given to that one divine nature or Godhead, to which appertains all divine perfections, and not to a factitious, fictitious, and finite being. It might be further shown, that the abandonment of the doctrine of the Trinity, has led to the perversion of every attribute of God, as portrayed in Scripture, and that on this account also, the Trinitarian and the Unitarian

\* See proof in Edwards, as above.

† Works, Vol. i, pp. 238, 241, who also gives and writes against the advocates of this opinion.

‡ See Note B, at end of this article.

systems conduct us to an object of worship essentially different and distinct. As Trinitarians interpret Scripture, God is infinite, while Unitarians say he is finite. Our God is omnipresent, theirs limited and confined to a certain place; our God is immutable, theirs is liable to change. Our God is naturally just, theirs contingently so: Our God is governor of the world, taking care, oversight of, and interest in, human affairs; theirs like the Deity of Epicurus, sits at ease in the enjoyment of his own happiness, leaving the world to the conduct of chance, and men to the guidance of that which is equally uncertain, their own giddy and unstable passions; neither giving them laws for the regulation of their actions, nor assigning any punishment for the violation of his laws. Our God is omniscient, theirs ignorant of future and contingent events. Our God is without parts or passions, theirs compounded of the one, and liable to the other; even to those which argue the greatest weakness and infirmity, and which some even of the philosophers, thought inconsistent with the bravery and resolution of a wise and virtuous man. It will, therefore, appear, we think, very evident, that the object of their worship and ours is different, and this will as clearly prove that the Religions represented by\* the Trinitarian and Unitarian systems are also different.

But the doctrine of the Trinity affects also the *manner* of our worship,—whether it shall be through the intercession and merits of a Mediator, and by the guidance and assistance of a Holy Spirit helping our infirmities, or, directly and in our own name,—whether we shall approach God, looking for acceptance through the work and righteousness of a vicarious and Divine Redeemer, and a Divine Sanctifier, or through works of repentance, prayer and praise, which our own hands and hearts have wrought. This doctrine affects therefore, every duty comprised in our obedience to God, and every hope of finding salvation at the hands of a God infinitely holy to condemn sin, infinitely just to punish it, and who will render to every man according to the deeds done in the

\* See Edwards on Socinianism, pp. 68, 69. See also, proof to the same effect, in Smith's Testimony to the Messiah, vol. i, pp. 140-146, given as Note B.

body, whether they have been good or evil. It comes home therefore, to "the business and bosom" of every man, and affects every inquiry pertaining to his everlasting welfare.

The triune God in covenant for man's salvation is the basis and the only foundation laid in Zion for the restoration and re-union of fallen man with his offended God. And it is only through Christ any man can "have access by one Spirit unto the Father."

The whole scheme of revelation centres on the interposition of Christ for the salvation of men. The law was but the preparation for the Gospel, "the school-master to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith." The ceremonies and sacrifices of the law were typical of, and superseded by, the sacrifice of Christ, and the more spiritual and exalted system of Christian faith and Christian perfection. "The spirit of prophecy was to bear testimony to Jesus." "God," says St. Paul, "who, at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers by his prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also, he made the worlds, who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."

The whole efficacy of redemption is also, ascribed to the eternal existence and intercession of the Redeemer: "Christ, says the Apostle, "is able to save them to the uttermost who come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." And again, "Now once in the end of the world, hath he, (even Christ,) appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and to them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

Nor is this the teaching of the Apostle Paul, only; it is the teaching also, of the other Apostles.\* Now, it is

\* See Acts iv, 9-12; John iv, 14; Jude, 18-21.

impossible to believe that this efficacy of redemption, and this universal and exclusive power over the salvation of man, should be ascribed to one who was, as many Unitarians teach, a mere man, who had no existence himself before his human birth, and as all Unitarians must believe, has no agency or influence on his followers, subsequent to the hour of his ascension. Neither is it conceivable that by the whole teaching of Scripture, our acceptance with God and salvation from his wrath and curse should be made to depend upon the agency of a being who was himself, a creature like ourselves. No: is only reconcileable with the idea of Christ being not ONLY MAN, BUT GOD; God manifest in the flesh, who, having formed man after his own image, when that image was defaced by sin, came to restore it; who, having created man for happiness and immortality, when that immortality and happiness were forfeited by disobedience, came to rescue the works of his own hands from hopeless misery and eternal death. This only can render such power, and glory, and dominion, as the Scriptures ascribe to Christ, consistent with the dictates of reason and the feelings of piety. This only can account for that great degree of gratitude and exultation, of confidence and obedience, which the Scriptures declare are due to the Redeemer; affections of which it is impossible to conceive any being should be the legitimate object, in such a degree and to such an extent, except God himself.\* With what earnestness of affection, and what assurance of his full power to relieve, does Christ encourage the contrite soul; "Come unto me all ye that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest:" and again, "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost:" And above all, at his last solemn converse with his Apostles, to prepare them for his sufferings, with what confidence does he assure them of their final triumph and their eternal happiness; with what exuberance of affection and mercy does he provide for the salvation of every true believer in every climate and

\* John xiv: 1; Matt. xxiii: 9, 10; Matt. xi: 27; Luke xii: 8, 9; Matt. x: 15; Matt. xviii: 6; Matt. xxviii: 18 to 20; Mark xvi: 16; John xi: 25, 26; Luke iv: 18.

period of the globe?\* Thus do we find the Apostles and Evangelists regarding their Lord with gratitude so fervent, submission of the heart so profound, confidence so unbounded, obedience so prompt and universal, as prove they looked up to him as God all-powerful, all-merciful, all-faithful, and all-wise.† Can any words express more strongly the Apostle's estimation of the supreme importance of the Redeemer's interposition, his total dependence for salvation upon faith in Christ, and his anxiety that every other human being should look for salvation only to the same source‡ than those contained in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans? And how triumphantly does he exult in the certain salvation of those who, being sanctified and purified by such faith, receive all the benefits which result from the redemption Christ has wrought: "What, (he asks,) shall we say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, shall he not with him also, freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."

The Apostle's mind, thus filled and exalted, by contemplating the blessings of redemption, and the character of our Redeemer, breaks forth into a strain of gratitude the most fervent, and confidence the most joyful and triumphant, that ever glowed within the breast of man.§

With all the Apostles, "*Christ is, as it were, all in all.*" They long to quit the world, and be with Christ. Faith in him is their glory, his example their guide, his word their law, his favour their highest hope, his coming their perpetual theme, his sentence the determination of their eternal destiny. Through him, they look for ac-

\* John, xiv: 2, 3, also 13, 14; xii: 32; John, xvi: 33; xvii: 20.

† Philippians, ii: 3 to 11; 2 Corin., viii: 3, 9; Philippians, iii: 7, 8, 9.

‡ Romans viii: 31 to 39.

§ Rom. viii: 31 to end, and see also, 2 James, i: 7, 8; 1 Peter, i: 7 to 12; 1 Peter iii: 22; 2 Peter iv: 14; 2 Peter, i: 1 to 11; iii: 18; 1 John, v: iii: 1 to 6.

ceptance of their prayers, justification before God, aid in trials, consolation in sorrow, support in death, acquittal in judgment, and bliss in Heaven, and to him their obedience is most total and unreserved: "casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringeth into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." On a review of all the testimonies of Scripture let me ask, says Dr. Graves, is it conceivable, that the Apostles could have thus associated Christ with God, as united with him in being the object of such gratitude, such faith, such hope, such triumph; as being the agent united with God in this great work of redemption; and yet have believed, that this Christ was a mere man, "who had no existence before his human birth," "no influence after his death;" whose sufferings in the cause of truth, and whose labours in diffusing it, have been equalled by so many other men, even by some of the Apostles themselves? No, certainly; nothing could have existed or justified such feelings, if Christ had not been of Divine dignity; his sufferings unparalleled in their condescension and their efficacy, and, in a word, if he had not been the Son of God, who was united with the Eternal Father, as Creator and Lord of the universe, the sole author and giver of everlasting life. On this supposition, all the Apostle's feelings are natural, just, and rational: on any other, they are visionary and extravagant; nay, even impious and idolatrous.

On the Socinian scheme, then, it appears, that the last and most perfect part of Divine revelation,—which, in every other view, refines and exalts our ideas of the Divinity; teaches us to worship him in spirit and in truth; trains men to the most pure and perfect virtue, and at once inculcates and exemplifies the most heartfelt and ennobling piety;—would, notwithstanding, *discover an opposite tendency in this leading point, the object of our religious affections*; would, as to these, altogether lower and debase the religious principle, and, in total repugnance to every former revelation, teach men to look up,

\* Discourse on the Trinity, from which, we have condensed the previous argument.

as to the bestower of every important blessing, even redemption from eternal misery, not to the great and supreme eternal Father alone, but also to another being who is not God, (as is affirmed,) yet concerning whom we are taught, "that he is the only-begotten Son of God;" "by whom alone we can know God," "or come to God,"—the mediator and intercessor with God for man, by whom we obtain remission of our sins;—"that he is the way and the truth, the life and light of the world;" who is entitled to our most fervent gratitude, our perfect confidence, our unreserved submission;—by faith in whom "we are turned from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan unto God;"—who is "to appear with the holy angels, on the throne of Divine glory, at the last great day of final judgment, to call from the grave the whole human race, to try the secrets of all hearts, and by his sentence fix the eternal doom of every human being."

On the contrary, the view of the incarnation and divinity of Christ," at once truly God and truly man," the second person in the glorious Trinity, which the Trinitarian doctrine imparts, is most harmoniously connected with the statement which the apostolic writings exhibit of the grand scheme of redemption; of the feelings excited by the view of this scheme, of the affections with which believers should regard the Redeemer, and the honor which is due to him: For does it not instantly follow, that faith and obedience, gratitude and adoration, in the very highest degree, are his unquestionable right? If the penitent soul is certain that the same Jesus, who died for his sins, has also risen for his justification; if he is fully assured, that he is not only Man but God, this faith removes that intolerable burden which presses down the humbled sinner's soul, the load of irrevocable and unpardoned guilt, and calms that terror which would embitter to the heart every thought of the Divinity, the terror of unsatisfied justice, which ought not to remit punishment. Despondence is banished, hope revived, repentance encouraged, exertion animated, devotion kindled, and the heart drawn to God by the warmest gratitude, and the most attractive mercy.

Looking to Jesus, we behold in the Divine Lawgiver,



our unalterable steady friend. In the Divine Judge we behold our all-merciful Redeemer. As man we are sure of his sympathy, as God we are sure of his power; and from both united, we look for our eternal deliverance. The immense gulf, which appeared to divide the creature from his God, is closed, and we are assured of access to the throne of grace, where our Redeemer sits, to hold out the golden sceptre of mercy, that we may touch and live. We are assured our prayers will be heard, for he who is ever present and ever watchful, and "knoweth what we ought to pray for," will assist our prayers. Whatsoever "we ask of him, not doubting, we shall receive." "And wheresoever two or three are gathered together is his name, there is he in the midst of them."

Thus strip the Redeemer of his Divinity, and the whole Gospel scheme would be doubt and darkness, inconsistency and confusion. Admit him to be God and Man, and that Gospel exhibits an object of faith and gratitude, admirably adapted to all the affections and powers, all the wants and weaknesses of human nature; admirably promotive of our reformation and sanctification of our advancement in love to man and love to God, and of the improvement of all the means of grace, the accomplishment of all our hopes of glory.

The argument we have thus pursued in reference to Christ as the second person in the adorable Trinity, and as the meritorious ground and ever-living medium of our acceptance with God and of all spiritual and everlasting good, might also be developed, and with equal force, respecting the absolute necessity of the Holy Spirit in order to secure the regeneration, sanctification and comfort of believers.

The doctrine of the Trinity, therefore, affects every truth in the Bible which bears on man's salvation,—the nature, person and work of a Redeemer,—the necessity, nature and way of acceptance with God,—the nature of regeneration, repentance, justification, sanctification and redemption, the principle and motive of all acceptable obedience,—of holiness and hope in life,—of peace and comfort in death, and of everlasting life beyond the grave. It affects also, the nature and necessity of prayer, preaching, and the other means of grace, of the

church and its ordinances, and of living, loving and experimental piety. In short, compared with the truths which the Bible understood, as Trinitarians interpret it, discloses, all other knowledge is vain and worthless; and compared with the hopes it inspires, all other hopes are cold and comfortless.

“The doctrine of the Trinity therefore, is, and must be, a truth of supreme and practical importance. The simple statement of it is—as Dr. Wardlaw remarks—enough to show that it must rank as a *first principle*;—an article of prime importance; a foundation stone in the temple of truth; a star of the very first magnitude in the hemisphere of Christian doctrine. For my own part, I believe it to be even more than this; a kind of central Sun, around which the whole system of Christianity, in all its glory, and in all its harmony, revolves.

“It is very obvious, therefore, that two systems, of which the sentiments, on subjects such as these, are in direct opposition, cannot, with any propriety, be confounded together under one common name. That both should be Christianity is impossible; else Christianity is a term which distinguishes nothing. Viewing the matter abstractly, and without affirming, for the present, what is truth and what is error, this, I think, I may with confidence affirm, that to call schemes so opposite in all their great leading articles by a common appellation, is more absurd, than it would be to confound together those two irreconcilable theories of astronomy, of which the one places the Earth, and the other the Sun, in the centre of the planetary system.” They are, in truth, *essentially different religions*. For, if opposite views as to the *object of worship*, the *groundhope for eternity*, the *rule of faith and duty*, and the *principles and motives of true obedience*; if opposite views as to these do not constitute different religions, we may, without much difficulty, discover some principle of union and identity amongst all religions whatever; we may realize the doctrine of Pope’s universal prayer; and extend the right hand of fellowship to the worshippers at the Mosque, and to the votaries of Brama. “I unfeignedly account the doctrine of the Trinity,” says Richard Baxter, “the sum and kernel of the Christian religion.”

What other conclusion can be drawn from that final, authoritative commission given by Christ as the Divine Head of the Church, when about to ascend to that glory which he had with the Father from before the foundation of the world? The evidences and effects of his Divine power had been everywhere displayed. As Head of the Church, ALL power in Heaven and Earth were given unto him. And in the exercise of that power we find Christ making an express profession of faith in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the doctrinal foundation of the Church of God which he had purchased with his own blood, and the form of initiation into its membership.—(Matt. xxviii: 16.)

The very learned Bishop Bull,\* in his elaborate work on proof of the fact that the Church of God in the earliest ages considered it essential to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, observes, that his antagonist Episcopius admitted, that the most ancient creed used in the administration of baptism, from the very times of the Apostles, was this—"I believe in God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost;" according to the form prescribed by Jesus himself. Episcopius, it is true, wished to weaken the force of the inference from this form, but the "Bishop in answer, shows that in this creed, brief as it was, the true divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is so distinctly asserted, that in so short a form of words, it was scarcely possible it could be more clearly expressed; for first, it is plain, that in this form, "I believe in God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit," the word God is referred in common to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, a fact which is still more evident in the original Greek than in the translation. It is most certain that the ancients thus understood this brief confession. † For instance, Tertullian expounding the common faith of Christians, with respect to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, affirms, "The Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and each is God." Cyprian also, in his epistle to Jubajanus, thus argues against the Baptism of Hereticks: "If one can

\* *Judicium Eocl. Cath. Ch. iv.*

† This we shall have occasion afterwards to prove.

be baptized by Hereticks, he can obtain the remission of sins; if the remission of sins, he is sanctified and become a temple of God. "I ask, of what God? if of the Creator, it cannot be, for he has not believed on him: if of Christ, how can he be the temple of Christ, who denies that Christ is God? if of the Holy Spirit, since the three are one, how can the Holy Spirit be propitious to him, who is the enemy either of the Father or the Son?" The attentive reader will here also observe, that Cyprian most expressly teaches, that a belief of the real Godhead of our Lord Christ was altogether necessary to salvation, since he declares that "he cannot become the temple of God;" which is the same thing as to say, he cannot be saved who denies that Christ is God. "And to me, continues this learned prelate, it appears, that in these few words, "I believe in God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost," this great truth, even that the Son and Holy Spirit are one God with the Father, is more clearly expressed than in some more full creeds, which were afterwards introduced, in which other additions being made to the words: "I believe in God the Father," and also after the mention of the Son, without repeating the word God in the clauses concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit, it might seem, and did seem to some, that the title God belonged to the Father alone, plainly contrary to the intention and opinion of those who formed these more enlarged creeds. Secondly, in this form, the Son, as well as the Holy Spirit, are united with the Father as partners of his dominion, and sharers of that faith, honor, worship, and obedience, which the person to be baptized vows and promises, and which he who believes can belong to a mere man, or to any creature, must be conceived totally ignorant of what it is which constitutes the horrible guilt of idolatry."

But, in addition to the truth of this great doctrine, this divine commission of our Saviour makes evident what is too often unattended to, and what we now wish to illustrate, the direct practical tendency of the doctrine of the Trinity, since it is connected by him with that scheme of instruction which "teaches men to observe and do all things whatsoever he had commanded." Beyond any reasonable doubt or controversy, the grand peculiar doc-

trine of the Christian Revelation is here declared to be the existence of Three Persons in the Divine essence, forming together the one Godhead, the exclusive object of our adoration and obedience; and in the Divine dispensations towards man, and especially in the grand scheme of redemption, contributing each their distinct parts, which supply distinct grounds of gratitude and reverence to each of these divine persons. This great truth is, therefore, put forward by the founder of our holy religion, the author and finisher of our faith, not as an obscure and unconnected dogma, which may be rejected because mysterious, or disregarded as unessential, but as the great confession of faith, indispensably required from all who seek admission into his church on earth, or hope to be received as his followers in Heaven.

Is it not also evident, from the constant, affectionate, and fervent repetition of this promise in the form of a benediction by the Apostles, that this great truth of the divinity of our Redeemer, and his union with God the Father, is not merely a speculative dogma, necessary indeed, to our entrance into the Church of Christ by baptism, but which may be afterwards neglected, or forgotten; but, that as with the holy apostle, so with us, it should be ever uppermost in our recollection, as a source of faith and hope, of gratitude and love, and adoration to those divine persons, equally united in the Majesty of the Godhead, and also equally united in the work of our salvation? How awful then, is the danger of rejecting those peculiar doctrines of the gospel, which some men think unimportant, because, as they suppose, they have no necessary connexion with the truths or the duties of what they term the religion of reason and nature, and to which exclusively they would confine their regard.

Let no man, therefore, affirm, that the doctrine of the Trinity is merely an abstract dogma, a mode of faith, which has no bearing on practical religion. It is far more scriptural to believe that the practical knowledge and belief of this doctrine, and of the separate office of each person in the Godhead, is necessary for eternal life. "For," says the Apostle, "it is THROUGH CHRIST we both have access BY ONE SPIRIT UNTO THE FATHER." "Through

Christ we are reconciled to God." "No man, says Christ, cometh unto the Father but by me. I am the way." "There is but one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." "And this is eternal life, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." But to know Christ as God manifest in the flesh; as a living, loving and all-sufficient Saviour,—to be united to him, as our vital Head, so that our life may be hid with Christ in God,—we must be assisted and taught by the Holy Ghost. "It is the Spirit who searcheth all things, even the deep things of God." It is he that worketh in us "to will and to do." The preparations of the heart are from him. "No man can call Jesus *Lord* but by the Holy Ghost," and it is "the Spirit, who helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what to pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered." And "as many as are thus led by the Spirit," through the Son unto the Father, "are the sons of God," for through Christ we have access by one Spirit unto the Father.

But some man may say, that after all, we cannot comprehend this doctrine, nor know anything with certainty about it. This objection, however, is founded upon the evident mistake of confounding the doctrine with that which the doctrine teaches—the *fact*, that there is a triune God with the comprehension of the essence and mode of existence of this trinity,—the abstract term by which we express what is revealed to us of God, with the nature of that incomprehensible trinity, which exists in the one ever-blessed Godhead,—and the clear enunciation of the doctrine in Scripture with a clear understanding of all that it implies.\*

*How* God exists—what is God's nature—and how God can be three and yet one—*this* we cannot comprehend, because God's nature cannot possibly be revealed to us as it is in itself. In this respect, however, not only the tri-unity, but all that relates to God, is both ineffable and incomprehensible,—all that relates to the self-existence, eternity, omnipresence, omnipotence and omni-

\* See Note A, at end of this article, from Waterland's Works, vol. v., pp. 18-17.

science of God, to his holiness, justice, goodness and mercy, and to all these in combination of harmony with each other. In this respect, also, all that is supernatural is high and inconceivable to us. And of the essence and mode of existence and operation of every object in nature, we are as really ignorant as we are of the Divine essence.

While, therefore, it is true of God, that his nature is incomprehensible, this is not any more true of the trinity of God, than it is of the existence and attributes of God. We know nothing of any of these as they are in their own nature. But we can, and do know certainly and infallibly all that is revealed to us by God, concerning himself in his word. We do know certainly, that God best understood how, and in what language, to convey us to that knowledge of himself as it relates to his nature and attributes, which was comprehensible by us, and which might become the proper foundation for our faith, humility, adoration and pious resignation. We do know assuredly, that God cannot mistake, and that he cannot deceive, or lead us into mistake. In causing "holy men of God, therefore, to speak as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," we must be, and we are, perfectly sure, that God caused the best language to be employed in speaking of himself, which could be done. And when we properly understand that language, and attach to it all the meaning, and only that meaning which it conveys to us, we are sure that our understanding of what God is in his nature and perfections, is certainly and infallibly correct, although, of necessity, it is still very imperfect and far short of what God really is, and of what is understood of him by angels and by the spirits of just men made perfect, who now "see him as he is."

The manner of the existence of the Trinity is, then, we admit, a mystery; but that God is in nature only one, and in persons three, is a reality, a fact of whose certainty we are assured by God himself in his own word. The **case** is exactly the same with every attribute of God. "The manner of their existence is above comprehension," as is stated even by Dr. Clarke,\* and yet their ex-

\* Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 99.

istence and reality is, he allows, demonstrable. In like manner, again to use Dr. Clarke's illustration,\* "though the manner of the Son's derivation is above comprehension," the reality of it is strictly demonstrable. Omnipresence is a mystery, the modus, or manner of which, is beyond our comprehension, but which, as an actual attribute of the Deity, is certain. The incarnation of the Son of God, whatever may have been his previous dignity, is incomprehensible, and yet the fact is believed to be indisputable by all who regard Christ as having existed previous to his appearance upon earth. The simplicity, the self-existence, and the eternity of God are incomprehensible, and yet they are demonstrable facts.

It is, therefore, only in accordance with our invariable beliefs of supernatural truths, when we affirm, that while the existence of three persons, each God, and yet together, only one God, inasmuch as they have but one common essence or nature, is an incomprehensible mystery, the fact that God does thus exist is certain, clear and intelligible. And let it be again and again enforced upon our attention that in all such truths it is only **THE FACT** that is revealed, and only **THE FACT** that we are required to believe. Scripture neither gives, nor requires, any accurate philosophical notions of any one of God's attributes, or of any one supernatural truth. All such metaphysical difficulties are avoided and even repudiated by Scripture, as appertaining neither to what is taught, nor to what is to be believed, nor to what is to be done by us. The existence in one godhead of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and their several relations to us in the work of salvation, is all that in Scripture we are taught or required to believe, and the reluctance of human pride to acquiesce in this simple teaching, and its vain attempt to bring the nature of God within our comprehension, is the fruitful source of Unitarianism, and of every other error on the subject of the Deity.

Let it then be borne in mind, that what, as creatures, we cannot comprehend is **THE NATURE, ESSENCE and MODE**

\* Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 99.



of OPERATION of all that is supernatural and divine ; but that we can, and do know certainly and infallibly whatever God is pleased to reveal to us on those subjects, in his word. And if, therefore, the doctrine of the Trinity is taught in the Bible, then we can both know and understand this doctrine as clearly and as fully as any other doctrine in reference to any other supernatural and divine truth, and as clearly as we do the certain existence of eternal objects, of whose nature and essence we are, nevertheless, supremely ignorant.

This will show the very serious error of those who think that no advantage can arise from discussing and controverting objections to the doctrine of the Trinity. God has purposely arranged the Scriptures so as to make inquiry, discussion and controversy, necessary to come to the full and perfect knowledge of the truth. Rational and scriptural investigation are the appointed means, both for ascertaining, establishing and propagating, the truth ; and the employment of those means in maintaining and defending the doctrine of the Trinity, God has often and in an especial manner, blessed and made effectual to the renewal of his church, the restoration of those who had fallen away from the truth, and the upbuilding and extension of his kingdom. This truth I might illustrate from every age of the church, and from every country, both in ancient and modern times. The life and energy, and spirituality of the church, have ever been found connected with the vital, practical belief of the doctrine of the Trinity and its kindred tenets, while coldness, worldliness and decay, have ever been found *leading to the abandonment, or following from the abandonment*, of these doctrines. This is true, also, of individual Christians, as may be seen in the experience of Newton and Cowper, of Thomas Scott, and of Chalmers. This is equally true of churches, as may be seen in the history of the churches in England, in Scotland, in Ireland, and in New England ; in all of which, the renewal of a living and active Christianity is to be distinctly traced to the restoration, after much dissension and controversy, of the doctrines of the Trinity, and its associated evangelical Christianity. And it is only necessary for any church to allow these doctrines to be kept out

of the pulpit, and to assume that they are already sufficiently and securely held, to give the enemy all the opportunity he desires to sow tares, which will ere long spring up and choke the good seed, and overspread the garden of the Lord with the weeds of putrefaction and decay.

The following hymns of the Ancient Church, will illustrate the practical nature of the doctrine of the Trinity:

*Matins.*

Thrice holy God, of wondrous might,  
O Trinity of love divine,  
To thee belongs unclouded light,  
And everlasting joys are thine.

About thy throne dark clouds abound,  
About thee shine such dazzling rays  
That angels, as they stand around  
Are fain to tremble as they gaze.

Thy new-born people, gracious Lord,  
Confess thee in thine own great name;  
By hope they taste the rich reward,  
Which faith already dares to claim.

Father, may we thy laws fulfil,  
Blest Son, may we thy precepts learn;  
And thou, blest Spirit, guide our will,  
Our feet unto thy pathway turn.

Yea Father, may thy will be done,  
And may we thus thy name adore,  
Together with thy blessed Son,  
And Holy Ghost for evermore.

*Amen.**Evensong.*

O Thou who dwellest bright on high,  
Thou ever-blessed Trinity!  
Thee we confess, in thee believe,  
To thee with pious heart we cleave.

O Father, by thy saints adored,  
O Son of God, our blessed Lord,  
O Holy Spirit who dost join,  
Father and Son with love divine.

We see the Father in the Son,  
 And with the Father Christ is one:  
 All three one blessed truth approve,  
 All three compose one holy love.

To God the Father, God the Son,  
 And Holy Ghost, be glory done;  
 One God Almighty,—we adore,  
 With heart and voice for evermore.\*

—  
*Matins.*

Thou ever blessed triune light,  
 And Thou, great God, the highest might,  
 Now that the setting sun departs,  
 Shed ye your light upon our hearts.

To you, each morn our voices rise,  
 Each eve we praise, when daylight dies;  
 Oh! let such praises still ascend  
 Till time himself shall find an end.

Praise be to God, who is in Heaven!  
 Praise to his blessed Son be given!  
 Thee, Holy Spirit we implore!  
 Be with us and evermore!

—  
*From the Evensong.*

Praise, honour, glory, worship, be  
 Unto the blest Almighty Three!  
 Praise to the Sire, who rules above,  
 Praise to the virgin-nurtur'd Son,

Who bath for us salvation won;  
 Praise to that Holy Spirit's love,  
 Through whose blest teaching we adore  
 The triune God, for evermore.†

Glory to God the Trinity,  
 Whose name has mysteries unknown;  
 In essence One, in persons Three;  
 A social nature, yet alone.

When all our noblest powers are joined  
 The honours of thy name to praise,  
 Thy glories overmatch our mind,  
 And angels faint beneath the praise.

\* Hymns of Primitive Church, by Chandler, pp. 92-94.

† From "Hymnarium Anglicanum," or, "Hymns of the Ancient Anglican Church," pp. 47, 50.

## NOTE A.

Waterland (vol. 1, part 2, p. 157,) gives the following positions of some or other of the Arians in respect of the Son :

1. Not consubstantial with God the Father.
2. Not co-eternal, however begotten before all ages, or without any known limitation of time.
3. Of a distinct inferior nature, however otherwise perfectly like the Father.
4. Not strictly and essentially God, but partaking of the Father's Divinity.
5. A creature of the Father's, however unlike to the rest of the creatures, or superior to them.
6. Not like the Father, but in nature and substance like other creatures.
7. Made in time: there having been a time when he was not, made of nothing.
8. Far inferior to the Father in knowledge, power and perfections.
9. Mutable in his nature, as a creature, though unchangeable by decree.
10. Dependent on the good pleasure of the Father for his past, present, and future being.
11. Not knowing the Father perfectly, nor himself; his knowledge being that of a creature, and therefore, finite.
12. Made a little before the world was made; and for the sake of those that should be after him.

These are the Arian principles, brought down as low as they well can go. Arius, the author and founder of the sect, seems to have gone through all those steps at the first, and indeed, all of them, except the last, hang together, and are but the necessary consequences of each other. Those that stopped in the midway, or sooner, might be more pious and modest, but less consistent men. . . . The nine last particulars were, for some time, and by the Arians in general, waived, dropped, not insisted on, (as being too gross to take,) or else artfully insinuated only, under specious and plausible expressions. The first they all owned and insisted the most upon, having many pretences to urge against consubstantiality, either name or thing. The second and third they divided upon, as to the way of expression; some speaking their minds plainly, others with more reserve; not so much denying the co-eternity, as forbearing to affirm it. This was the method which the Arians took to propagate their heresy. We do not wonder if they were often forced to make use of collusions, equivocations, and double entendres; for, being obliged, for fear of offence, to use Catholic words, though without a Catholic meaning; and to maintain their main principle, without seeming to maintain its necessary consequences, (nay, seeming to deny and respect them,) it could not be otherwise. And not only the Catholics frequently complain of those smooth gentlemen, but some even of their own party, could not endure such shuffling; thinking it became honest and sincere men, either to speak out, or to say nothing. Of this kind were Aetius and Eunomius, with their followers, called Anomæans and Exoucontii, being indeed, no other, in respect to the Son's divinity, than such as Arius was at first; and speaking almost as plainly and bluntly as he did. After the disguises and softening, and colourings, had been carried on so long, till all men of sense saw plainly, that it was high time to leave off trifling, and to come from words to things; and that there was no medium, but either to settle into orthodoxy, or, to sit down with the pure Arians and Anomæans, (if they

would determine anything, and be sincere and consistent men,) some choose the former and some the latter, according as they more inclined to one way or the other. There is certainly no medium betwixt orthodoxy and Arianism, (for \*Semi-Arianism, if so understood, is perfect nonsense and contradiction,) there being no medium between God and creature, between unmade and made. Men may conceal their sentiments, suppress consequences and speak their minds but by halves; and so one Arian may be more cautious, or more artful than another; but, in truth and reality, every man that disowns the consubstantiality, rightly understood, is as much an Arian as Eunomius or Aetius, or any of the ancient Arians were, or, even as Arius himself, excepting only some few particulars, which were not his standing and settled opinions.

---

NOTE B.

"The Son is supposed a creature of the Father's. Now, if his being of, or from, the Father, in this sense, makes him one God with the Father, it will follow that angels, or *men*, or, even things inanimate, are one God with the Father also. Indeed, to do you justice, you do not so much as pretend, that unity of principle, or anything else, can make him one God with the Father; which is enough to show how very widely you differ from the ancients, in the main point of all. They thought it necessary to assert that Father and Son were both, one God. So Irenæus, Athanasius, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Lactantius, and even Eusebius himself, after some debates upon it, as may appear from the testimonies before referred to; and of the Post-Nicene Catholic writers, in general, every body knows how they contended for it. The thought that the divinity of the Son could not be otherwise secured, and Polytheism at the same time avoided, than by asserting Father and Son to be one God; and they thought right. But what do you do! or how can you contrive to clear your scheme? We ask if the Son be God, as well as the Father! You say, yea. How then, we ask, is there but one God! Your answer is, the Father is *suprema*, and, therefore, he, singly, is the one God. This is taking away what you gave us before, and retracting what you asserted of the Son. If supremacy only makes a person God, the Son is no God, upon your principles; or, if he is God notwithstanding, then Father and Son are two Gods. Turn this over as often as you please, you will find it impossible to extricate yourself from it. You can say only this; that you do not admit two supreme Gods. This is very true, no more did the Pagan Polytheists, nor the idolatrous Samaritans, nor others condemned in Scripture for Polytheism."

The allegation made by Unitarians therefore, that this doctrine is absurd and contradictory, is founded on ignorance and presumption. It is also suicidal, since all such objections apply with equal, if not greater, force to the Unitarian hypothesis. The existence of God as an omnipotent, omnipresent, and yet spiritual being, involves every difficulty and every apparent contradiction imputed to the doctrine of the Trinity, and

\*Semi-Arianus, et Semi-Deus, et Semi-creatura perinde monstra et portenta sunt, quæ sani et pii omnes merito exhorrent.—Bull. D. F., p. 284.

is just as far beyond the utmost capacity of human reason. Difficulties insurmountable to human reason inhere in the very nature of the subject; and such difficulties therefore, must be one characteristic of a divine revelation and pre-eminently, as it relates to the nature of God and his mode of existence. Besides, to use the words of Bishop Horaley, "hath the Arian hypothesis no difficulty, when it ascribes both the first formation and the perpetual government of the universe, not to the Deity, but to an inferior being? Can any power or wisdom less than supreme, be a sufficient ground for the trust we are required to place in Providence? Make the wisdom and the power of our ruler what you please; still, upon the Arian principle, it is the wisdom and the power of the creature. Where then, will be the certainty that the evil which we find in the world, hath not crept in through some imperfections in the original contrivance, or in the present management? Since every intellect below the first, may be liable to error, and any power, short of the supreme, may be inadequate to purposes of a certain magnitude. But if evil may have thus crept in, what assurance can we have that it will ever be extirpated? In the Socinian scheme, is it no difficulty that the capacity of a mere man or of any created being, should contain that wisdom by which God made the universe? Whatever is meant by *the Word* in St. John's gospel, it is the same Word of which the Evangelist says, that "all things were made by it," and that it "was itself made flesh." If this Word be the divine attribute Wisdom, then that attribute, in the degree which was equal to the formation of the universe, in this view of the Scripture doctrine, was conveyed entire into the mind of a mere man, the son of a Jewish carpenter. A much greater difficulty, in my apprehension, than any that is to be found in the Catholic faith.

The Unitarian hypothesis implies also, that the Son was born before all times, yet is not eternal; not a creature, yet not God; of God's substance, yet not of the same substance; and his exact and perfect resemblance in all things, yet not a second Deity—a creed really involving those contradictions in terms of which the orthodox are wrongfully accused. It cannot escape from one of two conclusions—"either the establishment of a sort of polytheism or as the more practical alternative, that of the mere humanity of Christ; i. e. either the superstition of paganism, or the virtual atheism of philosophy. It confesses our Lord to be God, yet at the same time infinitely distant from the perfections of the One Eternal cause. Here, at once, a *ditheism* is acknowledged. But Athanasius pushes on the admission to that of an unlimited polytheism. "If," he says, "the Son were an object of worship for his transcendent glory, then every subordinate being is bound to worship his superior." But so repulsive is the notion of a secondary God, both to reason, and much more to Christianity, that the real tendency of Arianism lay towards the sole remaining alternative, the humanitarian scheme.\*"

The Arian creed, if considered in all its bearings and deductions, will, perhaps, appear much less rational and philosophical than has been sometimes asserted. It has been described as a simpler and less mystical hypothesis than that of the Trinitarians, and yet it requires us to apply the same term, God, to two beings who differ as widely from each other as the Creator and his creature. It requires us to speak of Christ as the

\* See Newman's History of Arians of the Fourth Century, pp. 220, 221, 246-248.

*begotten Son of God*, though he only differs from all other creatures by having preceded them in the order of time. It requires us to believe of this Created Being, that he was himself, employed in creating the world; and to invest him with every attribute of Deity, except that of having existed from all eternity. If we contrast these notions with the creed of the Trinitarians, they will be found to present still greater difficulties to our faculties of comprehension.\*

---

## ARTICLE II.

**"ELSE WHAT SHALL THEY DO WHICH ARE BAPTIZED FOR THE DEAD, IF THE DEAD RISE NOT AT ALL? WHY ARE THEY THEN BAPTIZED FOR THE DEAD?"—1 Cor. 15: 29.†**

This is one of the most difficult passages in St. Paul's epistles. It has given abundant employment to the speculative and curious. Its explanations have been almost as various as its interpreters are numerous. Each construction has been defended more or less ingeniously, and in a manner satisfactory to the author. Many inquirers into St. Paul's meaning change their own opinions respecting it, as soon as they read some new commentator; while others are only confirmed in their own views by opposition, and set themselves at once to refute whatever conflicts with their own expositions. In the meanwhile, this passage has been anxiously expounded. Scarcely any explanation of it has been generally adopted,—none has gained for itself a catholic character, and settled deep in the convictions of the universal church. It has, consequently, been regarded as uncertain, if not almost useless; and Christians at large, when they privately read this portion of God's word, or when they

\* *Burton's Testimonies of the Fathers to the Trinity*, page 4.

† This article, as the reader perceives, is presented in the form of a sermon. It is from the pen of the Rev. J. H. Fowles, recently deceased, one of the most Evangelical and useful ministers of the Episcopal Church, in Philadelphia, and for many years a resident of this State. It has a special interest attaching to it, as being one of the last discourses delivered to the people of his charge; and thus giving point to his exposition of this difficult passage. As the author has passed away from earth, we have not felt at liberty to alter in any degree, the form of his discourse; although being designed for a congregation, it differs from the usual form of Review articles.—*Eps. S. P. Rev.*

hear it in the church, or at the burial of the dead, derive no more instruction from it, than they would from a letter that is sealed. Under these circumstances, it may seem presumptuous to attempt to solve what some are disposed to consider almost a divine enigma; or to endeavor to turn to use what has been generally regarded as unprofitable, and left untouched. But in our manner of handling the text, we shall endeavor to avoid any such imputation. We shall treat every explanation of it, which is consistent with the analogy of faith, with the most charitable consideration; nay, every such explanation will be included in, and enforced by, that which we adopt. May we not hope, therefore, that some benefit will be conferred, if you become simply convinced, that the text is susceptible of interpretations, which have been regarded as satisfactory by many learned and pious men, and that it is mere creature infirmity which prevents all from perceiving the true meaning of the Holy Ghost? Would not a still greater good be reached if we are able to point out to you the real intention of the Spirit of God in this scripture, and some of the lessons which he here designed to teach? It is with such hopes and objects, that we invite you to enter into an examination of our text. "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" It may seem almost superfluous, and yet, perhaps, it is worth while to remark, that by the phrase, "What shall they do?" St. Paul designed to ask, *what benefit will they receive?* It is a common colloquial expression to which this meaning is attached. Let a merchant, for instance, tell us of the golden harvest he expects to reap by sending a cargo of goods to a certain port, where they are now selling at a high price. Nothing would be more natural than for us to ask him, but what will you do, that is, what profit will you make if the vessel should be wrecked; or, if before its arrival, the price of those goods should fall? That this is, moreover, what the apostle meant, is made plain by the context, where, in one of the series of questions which he puts, in order to prove the same point, he asks, "If after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead



rise not?" So that the meaning of our text is, obviously, "What advantage will it be to those who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?" And now, before explaining what baptism for the dead means, let us inquire *what was the object of our apostle in asking the question which we find in our text?* In reply to this we say, that it is evident, that our whole chapter was intended to convince the Corinthians, that there would be a future resurrection of the disciples of Christ from the dead. There had sprung up some at Corinth, as we are told in the 12th verse, who maintained that there was to be "no resurrection of the dead." It was to root out this radical herey, that our apostle penned the entire 15th chapter of his epistle. His declarations and reasonings on this point, are pursued to the close of the 23d verse, where he says, "Christ is the first fruits of the resurrection, "afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." Having thus alluded, however, to the second advent of our Lord, St. Paul saw fit to encourage the mind of the weary believer with the prospect of that undisturbed and eternal reign of peace which should be ushered in when Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom should cease, and the sceptre of the universe should be delivered up to the Triune Father of Heaven, who would never permit any enemy to harass or injure his people, but govern in such a way that he himself would be "all in all." Here the apostle resumes the thread of his discourse, and upon the supposition that those who had died in Christ should not hereafter be raised, asks, in the words of our text, "Else what shall they do," (what benefit will they enjoy) "who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?" We see, then, that the text was designed as an argument in favor of the resurrection of the dead at the last day. Having thus determined the object of St. Paul, in asking the question before us, we are prepared to exclude as unworthy our attention any explanation of that baptism for the dead to which he refers, which has not an immediate and obvious bearing on the future rising of the bodies of all those who have died in the Christian faith. But even within this limit, there are various plausible interpretations of the passage, which claim

some notice, if it be only for the venerable names by which they have been adopted.

When, we ask, therefore, "*Who are they who were baptized for the dead?*" we would reply, first, that they are at fault who suppose that the apostle has reference here, to those who, they affirm, were baptized *over* the dead bodies of saints, or upon their graves. It is, indeed, freely admitted, that the word in the original, which is translated in our version "for," very frequently means "over;" yet it has also, the signification which our Bible here affixes to it. And, it may well be asked, "what proof is there that any such custom as that of being baptized *over* the dead, or at their tombs, obtained in the days of the apostles? There is no Scriptural statement which would support such a supposition; there is no divine precept which would require such a practice. The supposition then, that any were baptized over the dead bodies of their friends, is a mere hypothesis, invented in order to afford a plausible foundation for an unnecessary explanation of St. Paul's words. Let it then, be concluded that our translators have done well in rendering the expression not *over*, but *for* the dead. But, you will at once perceive, how ambiguous the word "for," itself is, in this connexion. Thus, it is common to say, that such a person was wounded in battle and left *for* dead, that is, he was considered *as* dead; or, it may be said, that such a soldier was taken into the ranks *for* the one who was killed, that is, *in his stead*. It has even been attempted to attach the first of these meanings to the Greek word which is here translated in our Bibles "for," but this, it is scarcely, if at all capable of. Hence, we cannot agree with those who suppose that St. Paul alluded in our text to such as deferred their baptism until the close of their lives, and until they lay on their death beds, and who then received the ordinance *as if* they were dead. Besides, the forcing of the word, which such an interpretation would require, it might be asked, what proof is there, that there was any such postponement of baptism until the dying hour took place, in the time of Paul? Is it not well known that this postponement originated in a subsequent age, and that it sprung

from an exaggerated and superstitious view of the effects of the sacrament, as though the mere outward rite would cleanse all its subjects from their sins, and render them fit, just after its celebration, to be admitted into the ranks of the holy, and the presence of God? Would St. Paul have alluded to such a perversion of an ordinance of Christ, unless it were to censure it? Would he have drawn an argument in favor of the great doctrine of the resurrection, from the views and practice of such errorists? But, again, some imagine that the apostle here refers to those who were baptized, not for themselves, but *in the name or stead of some dead believer*, who had been prevented by the face of Providential circumstances from receiving baptism in his own person. But this absurd practice originated in a subsequent and uninspired age. It sprung from unauthorised views of the absolute and invariable necessity of baptism, in order to salvation. It implied the possibility of the condition of the soul being changed in a future state, and of God's accepting obedience to one of his commands by a creature proxy. Surely, St. Paul would have countenanced no such extravagancies.

Before stating, however, what we conceive to be the real meaning of St. Paul, we will mention another explanation of the passage which we are far from altogether rejecting; to which indeed, we only object, because it does not exhaust the intention of the Holy Ghost; and because, if it be regarded as the sole, or primary signification of the passage, it would require us to wrest the word in the original, as we have already explained. Our explanation will imply all that is embraced in this. Some then, would understand the apostle in our text, as teaching that the very administration of baptism signified both the death and the resurrection of its subject,—that, when we were plunged under the water, or buried in baptism, it implied that we should be overwhelmed with trouble and finally fall victims to death; but that as we emerged from the water in the sacrament, just so we should be finally raised from the grave. The force of the apostle's question, according to these interpreters, is, "What benefit will baptism confer on those who receive it, if they do not, by this ordinance, imply that

they will finally be raised from the dead, but simply signify that they will die?" Why are they, then, baptized for the dead, or as those who are appointed to suffering and death, if they do not believe that they will be raised again? Thus, our Lord, when he had foretold his own sufferings and death, and resurrection, asked the sons of Zebedee, "Are you able to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" and when they said that they were able, replied, "Ye shall indeed, drink of my cup and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with." So, too, St. Paul, although with another object, asks in his epistle to the Romans, "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, and if we have been planted together into the likeness of his death, we shall be also, in the likeness of his resurrection." Now, we freely admit, that so much to the purpose would the question of St. Paul in our text be, if thus understood, so fully in accordance would its teaching be with the intention of baptism, with all revealed doctrine and Christian experience, that we would be disposed to rest satisfied with it, if it did not appear to twist the meaning of the Greek word into "as," which it will scarcely bear. The force of the passage would then be,—the very initiatory rite of the Christian Church undeniably teaches death; all who are baptized acknowledge themselves to be resigned to death; but what benefit would they gain if they merely expressed by the ordinance this melancholy fact; should they not at the same time, and by the same act show, that they believed there would be a resurrection? Surely, our blessed faith, not only teaches death and ruin, but life and salvation. This reasoning would have been much to the point in hand; but the word which St. Paul uses in the original, seems fatal to this understanding,—it means not baptized *as* dead, but *instead* of the dead. There is, then, another explanation, which embraces this and even more. Let us now briefly point it out. It seems, then, to us, that the question in our text suggested itself to St. Paul's mind, from a brief survey of the whole state of Christ's Church, on the earth, and from the utter inconsistency of that here-

sy which had sprung up among the Corinthians, and which denied the resurrection of the dead, with the facts that were continually occurring before our eyes. Every day, and every hour then, disease assailed some of the many followers of Christ, and laid them prostrate on the bed of death. Those, on whose lives and efforts the very existence and progress of the Lord's cause seemed to depend, were thus continually being swept away. From whom could the ranks, which were so thinned, be recruited? As the children of this world witnessed the course of labor and suffering, which believers led, thus terminating in death,—what was there attractive in its character? What was there which could induce them to offer themselves to fill up the gaps which death was continually making in the Christian host? “What shall they do,”—what benefit could they propose to themselves, “who were baptized for,” or instead of, “the dead,” and took their places, “if the dead rise not at all?” What but the conviction, that those who had died in Christ would hereafter be rescued from their graves, could operate on the minds of the living, to persuade them to come forward and make a public profession of the same faith which the dead had entertained; to be baptized in their stead, to fill up their vacant places in the church, and to discharge their duties? How senseless would be that sacrament, by which men professed their belief in Christ, and were introduced into the visible church, if it were supposed that all the predecessors in this faith had met with so cruel a disappointment, as to have their hopes buried with their bodies under ground? Take away the hope of the resurrection, and none would be found so foolish as to put their necks under the Christian yoke; none would be baptized;—the places of the Christian dead would never be filled up, and the Church would soon become extinct. You thus see, brethren, the force of our apostle's reasoning in the text. It reduced the very existence of Christ's Church on the earth, into an absurdity, into an impossibility, unless it were founded upon the hope of the resurrection from the dead. But while this explanation thus clothes his argument with an irresistible power, how fully is it

in accordance, moreover, with the immediate context! He had just declared, that if, in this life, only believers had hope in Christ, they were of all men most miserable,—they had convinced themselves of the emptiness and sinfulness of worldly enjoyments,—by self-denial, they were perpetually carrying on a most trying warfare with their spiritual foes and with wicked men; and was the final and eternal close of this arduous career to be in the grave; to which all, sinners and saints, were alike tending? “Why,” upon this supposition, he asks, did he and all his fellow-disciples who lived with him in that persecuting age, stand “in jeopardy every hour?” He could indeed, take the most solemn oath, that the life which he constantly led was equivalent to a daily death. At one time he had even been thrown into a den of beasts at Ephesus, and stood in imminent danger of being torn in pieces. He expected soon and certainly to die. What advantage would this martyr’s life and death be to him? If the dead were not to rise, he might as well enjoy himself in just as spiritually a senseless and beastly manner as the unbelievers around him. His motto might well be, “let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die,” and death will be the last of our history and experience. If such were the state of the case, St. Paul argues, that the Christian religion would appear repulsive in all ages. It would soon die out. None would be found to take the place of the dead. For “what should they do,” what advantage would they derive, or even hope for, “who were baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?” And now, beloved, the remark which we found upon this exposition of our text is, *in what an interesting and instructive light does it present baptism, or the appointed mode of professing the Christian faith?* In that solemn act, if performed with enlightened views and with a right spirit, we stand not alone; we form one of “the noble army of martyrs;” we are “baptized for,” or instead of “the dead,” we are to *endure their sufferings, discharge their duties, share in their hopes and triumphs.* Look at our baptism in each of these three points of view. It shows first, that we are

to *endure the sufferings* of the saints who have died and gone before. As there is but one Lord and one faith, so there is but one baptism. By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body. Every member of Christ's mystical body, together with its head, is baptized in the same water. With the sons of Zebedee, the least and most unseemly of the Christian communion, as he becomes united to it in the appointed way, professes that, in the strength of God, he is able to be baptized with the baptism with which Christ was baptized. Nor must it be concealed, that this is a baptism of suffering and death. We are brought by it into a fellowship with Christ's sufferings. His life, even in its darkest aspect, is a pattern of ours. "He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." He had no place of rest on earth. He endured the contradiction of sinners against himself. He passed through a season of agony in the garden, and of desertion on the cross. He humbled himself even to death. His body was laid in the grave. Which of his people, too, have not been made to drink of the same cup? which has not been substantially tempted in all points, like as Christ? Nay, been called to a warfare, to which our Lord himself, was a stranger; for he was without sin; but in them there has been a continual and strong lusting of the flesh against the Spirit; so that they have all been forced to cry out, "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" An effectual voice has always accompanied them in their progress through life, saying, "Arise and depart; for this is not thy rest." They have all met with open adversaries and false brethren; they have had to encounter fightings without and fears within. In the midst of all, too, they have been sometimes sensibly forsaken from on high; they have had often even to look upward and cry out, "Verily, thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the Saviour." Nor have they been exempted from the pains of the last hour; but they have been called to pass through the valley of the shadow of death. All this the Christian convert has been well taught. With full knowledge of the nature of his calling he yet comes forward and is baptized into the death of Christ.

He is baptized for the dead,—taking their place, to suffer as they have done,—like them, to meet the last enemy, and to fall with them into the grave.

How solemn is the act of professing Christ? It is a baptism unto suffering and death. But, in the second place, we are baptized to *discharge the duties of the dead*. It is not without an object, that a generation of God's children is always preserved in the church militant. The Son himself, when manifest in the flesh, performed his part. He "fulfilled all righteousness;" he kept the words which had been given to him; and he thus glorified the name of his Father on the earth. Jesus, too, taught his disciples that they were a city set on an hill; and required of them to let their light shine, that so the name of their Father in Heaven might be glorified. Nor has there ever been a generation in which God has not had his representatives in this fallen world, for this express purpose. Even in the darkest periods, and when the Elijahs of the church have feared and complained that they were left alone, God has had his remnant of seven thousand, who had never bowed the knee to Baal, but were obeying and gloryfying him in their several important, although it may be, private spheres. As one is taken, another is raised up in his place. As the waves of time, teeming with life, have broken on the shores of death and eternity, others have risen behind, and followed in their course. In each of these countless generations, the followers of Christ have performed their part, presenting that portion and phase of God's eternal purposes of grace which were to be developed in their day, and in their progress hastening forward the consummation of the whole. When they disappear others are baptized in their stead; and the living, not the dead, praise their God. How solemn, then, is every baptism for the dead! The responsibility of God's glory, in the generation of its subject, is made to rest on him. Burning and shining lights have sunk beneath the horizon,—shall the world, so far as he is concerned, grope on in darkness, and God's glory be obscured? Shall not the parent, or eminent Christian friend, who has entered on his rest, still continue to live and



shine in him? All that Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the holy men of old did, in their day, now devolves on the generation of which he forms a part; nay, all that Jesus did in the days of his flesh, there will be none to imitate and exemplify, if he and his Christian contemporaries should prove faithless. Oh! beloved, it involves unmeasured responsibilities to be baptized for the dead!

But lastly, true baptism *introduces us to a share in all the hopes and triumphs of the Christian dead.* "What shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Oh! even Jesus himself was cheered and supported, while undergoing his baptism of suffering and death by the hope of resurrection. In his meditations and conversations he always coupled the two; and we are told that he, "for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame." When the Scriptural martyrs, too, were offered "deliverance" by their persecutors, on the renunciation of their faith, we are told that they accepted it not, "that they might obtain a better resurrection." Even so, beloved, you were baptized for the dead, not because you wished to participate in their toils and conflicts, and sufferings, and death; but because you firmly believed that they were now blessed and resting from their labors, and that even their flesh was only slumbering in the ground until the last sound of the trumpet;—it was because you expected to share with them in their present rewards and prospects. Keep then the resurrection continually in view, you who have been baptized for the dead. It is only when you think of this, in the wilderness of Canaan, that you will not be tempted to go back to Egypt; only when you rejoice in this hope of the heavenly kingdom that you will be patient in the tribulation through which you are passing into it; only when you compare the sufferings of the present time with the glory that shall be revealed, that you will reckon them as of no importance; only when you are sustained with the prospect of being planted in the likeness of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, that you will not be depressed, while you are planted in the likeness of his death. When

those who have been baptized for the dead remember that the dead shall rise, how easy is it for them to comply with the exhortation, and to join in the song :

“Let saints below his praises sing,  
With those to glory gone;  
For all the servants of our king  
In earth and Heaven are one.

One family, we live in him,  
One church above, beneath;  
Though now we're parted by the stream,  
The narrow stream of death.

One army of the living God,  
To his commands we bow;  
Part of the host have crossed the flood,  
And part are crossing now.

Ten thousand to their home  
This solemn moment fly;  
And we are to the margin come,  
And soon expect to die.

Dear Saviour, be our constant guide,  
Then, when the word is given,  
Bid the cold waves of death divide,  
And land us safe in Heaven.”

But, we cannot close without the melancholy consciousness that there are some here, who are laboring under the curse of natural death,—who have never as yet been spiritually baptized for the Christian dead,—some who will die in Adam, but who have never been planted in the likeness of Christ's death, and consequently, have no prospect of being planted in the likeness of his resurrection. Oh! are you willing to be so senseless and hopeless in the view of death, and, finally, to die like the brutes that perish? Let the certainty and blessedness of the rising of the Christian dead persuade you, beloved, to be baptized in their stead, both in your bodies and in your sports. Though you will then enter on new and trying conflicts, and labors, and tribulations, yet you will be inspired with new joys and hopes. You will be joined in one fellowship with the saints who have gone before. You will be able to unite with the whole estate of Christ's Church militant in “blessing God's

holy name, for all those his servants, who have departed this life in his faith and fear; beseeching him to give you grace so to follow their good examples, that with them you may be partakers of his heavenly kingdom.”

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE PHASES OF SOCIETY.

Words and sentiments are frequently uttered by busy, bustling, active people, without that consideration and foresight, which should characterise intellectual beings. We live, and move, and have our being, among others; and scarcely know, or care, what influences are operating in our mutual relations as man to man, as fellow-citizens, as subjects of a great moral government, or again, in the subordinate relations, of the different avocations and classes which diversify the association of individuals with each other.

As society exists at the present day, there is such a diversity of interest, arising from the various modes of living, and the different employments of men, that few care to know much beyond their own sphere of operations; and the consequence is, that society, like one vast complicated machine, made up of many associated parts, moves on with little more acquaintance among the different divisions that pertain to it, than belongs to the parts of an automaton. Or, even when a knowledge of these relations is present, it is distorted by so many prejudices, arising from selfishness and jealousy, that no sympathy of action attends it.

The elements of which society consists, may be divided into moral, political, social and domestic. The situation of man as an immortal and responsible creature is the most comprehensive, as it is the most important relation, in which he can be viewed, and as his eternal destiny depends upon his conduct in this world, we would expect to find an important influence attending this feature of his character.

All principle, all virtue, all honour, as respects those around him, is the result of man's moral character. If we undertake to conceive of an individual who enters upon life without that sentiment of obligation to Divine authority which constitute this character, we must see at once, how little dependance there is for the fulfilment of the duties that may devolve upon him. Justice is founded always in right, and right must have truth as a bulwark, and all truth must emanate from moral law.

Where then could we expect equity to spring from in such a character as we have supposed. The cant phrases, humanity, philanthropy, benevolence, etc., will not account for the conduct of men as members of a community,—neither can policy or utility be suborned to meet the demands of the case. Such things may serve a temporary end, may meet the emergency of an occasion, but they will not reach the life-time necessities of mankind. We must have some all-engrossing, over-reaching principle, which will apply to all grades and conditions of our race, and be available to every diversity of circumstances. Such is that fundamental doctrine of Christianity which teaches the moral accountability of man. To undertake to delineate the workings of this prime element of properly constituted society, would lead into all the minute features of our association with one another, and we could never suppose a case which would not be satisfactorily disposed of in accordance with it. But as we will have occasion, in descanting upon the subordinate influences, to refer to this as the test of all good, we will be content at present, with considering it as the philosopher's stone which brightens and enhances every feature of man's character. We will simply look to this as a bow of promise, which is ever available to meet the wants of frail human creatures, and instead of attempting to exhaust its resources, we will draw upon the rich and precious stores as occasion may require.

The political aspect of society is the next in extent of application, as it is next in importance. When we have discharged our duty to God, our country should be the consideration of most consequence; and the discharge of our duties to the government of the country is strictly

in keeping, and flows naturally from our duty to that higher authority of which we have spoken. Those things which pertain to duties of the citizen make the politics of a people, and we cannot disconnect the political characteristics of a nation from the character of the ruling power. With us, politics has a consequence which, in despotic or monarchical governments, is not observed. The people, in their aggregate voice, constituting the ruling power, their views and feelings, their words and actions, go to make up the political sentiment of the nation. What a powerful impulse then, must be given to society by the prevailing politics! Every ramification of the scattered millions of our citizens is stirred by the approaches of the election periods. Every hamlet, as well as every palace, is moved by the reports from our Congressional Assembly. Every heart leaps with joy or throbs with pain, as weal or woe betides our land. So it is to-day. So it has been through the past, and so it will continue to be for years to come.

With such a pervading influence, we would, of course, look for a modification of society, in accordance with the opinions that held precedence, and the many incidental changes connected with the workings of party strife.

It is even so, to an extent, that at times threatens to break asunder the nearest and tenderest ties of life; and were it not that experience has taught us that order comes out of chaos and confusion, we might sometimes conclude that our fair and growing Republic was doomed to a short existence. But the shock passes and leaves all the parts undisturbed in their beautiful adaptation to the comfort and happiness of our citizens.

To particularise somewhat, the inquiry might not be fruitless as to the manner in which a community is affected by political agitations. So far as the excitement leads to investigation, it is, no doubt, calculated to improve, by imparting a knowledge of the principles of government, and inducing a respect for law and order. But, when partizan feeling causes the embittering of one portion towards another, and thus leads to means for success, which are not compatible with the best interests of the country at large, then evil must necessari-

ly follow. Under such circumstances, moral principle is forgotten, and a blind fanaticism hurries men to the enactment of the most atrocious offences against their fellows, and the most absurd violations of their duty as citizens. Corruption of the worst kind has ever attended political controversy, and has shown itself in every circle from the most dignified and honourable post in life, down to the vagabond loafer, who strolls the public street to beg or steal his bread.

Men of talent and high position, make tools of weaker vessels, and thus carry on a system of bribery and low chicanery, which they disdain to engage in publicly. The influence thus extended to the inferior is two-fold in its evil tendency,—the thing itself is familiarized, and it carries with it the force of a prominent example. The one who moves the whole is responsible, and yet maintains a high position. If such could have a just award meted out to them, it would have more effect towards remedying the evil, than any homily upon the abstract principle can ever effect; and we trust the day will come, when the intelligent and upright will scrutinize more closely the conduct of those who aspire to be foremost in directing the councils of State, and look to merit as the essential recommendation for distinction.

Then, instead of ransacking the annals of by-gone ages for scandal, the politician might have a more laudable and praiseworthy vocation, in reviewing the honest and patriotic enterprises, which marked the career of the statesman. Then too, we would expect to see the face of society brighten up, and instead of an election season tending to stupify and debase the community, it would be the source of improvement in head and heart to every citizen of the land. Instead of the bacchanalian revelry, which characterizes the political assemblies of the present day, we would find sober thought and profound reflection to mark the deliberation of such meetings. Make men think, and you make them better citizens, for wherever reason holds control, things are viewed in their true importance, and are not likely to be abandoned when slight opposition is to be encountered. After attentive examination and mature reflection, the truth is most frequently brought forth; and in the states-

man, a clear head should be accompanied by a pure heart, and true devotion to the welfare of his country. Should he suffer an overweening regard for his personal popularity to influence his conduct, no other qualification could fit him for a place so responsible as that of a representative.

How few, alas! look to anything but self-aggrandizement in aspiring to a place in our Legislative Assemblies. Compare the politician as he is, with what the statesman should be, and few, very few, could claim the high distinction of merit. Our politicians are little more than squabbling, quibbling, gulling demagogues, ready to say anything, or do anything, to advance themselves, without reference to the great interests of the nation. On the other hand, the statesman must be a patriot, and an honest man. He must be independent in spirit, true to himself and to his country, candid and free in giving his opinions, well informed as to State policy, and willing to listen to suggestions from those alike informed. Generous to others, at the same time commanding their respect by firmness and decision, and withal faithful to his own convictions of right. Where, in the throng of aspirants for political preferment, is such to be found? We look in vain. The very character which is demanded would ensure defeat. Society must undergo a radical change before we see this matter as it should be. Worth must be more highly appreciated. Sincerity and truthfulness must be of more consequence in the estimation of the people generally. In one word, we must outlive the influences which have surrounded us, and still operate to a great extent, throughout the community, tending to corrupt the very foundations of character.

The political regime under which a people live modifies the development of intellect and feeling, and thus effects their relations to each other. All authority which does not emanate from the choice of the people, must have force to support it, and in proportion as it is arbitrary, the greater must be the power required. Consequently, in a despotism, a large standing army is an indispensable adherent to the one who would be obeyed, and in a limited monarchy, and in an oligarchy the same expedient to some extent is necessary.

Under such a state of things the sway over the bodies and minds of men is such as to stifle thought and action, and to prevent that development of character, which would result, were greater freedom allowed. In our Republican government, however, the same embarrassment is not presented. The number requisite for a standing military organization is very small in proportion to the extent of territory, and the population rally around this nucleus as citizen soldiers, when it becomes necessary to meet a foreign foe or to defend our own rights. The sanction of authority is the will of the governed, and instead of a large standing army to enforce obedience, it becomes the duty of every good citizen to acquiesce himself, and assist in the control of the refractory. All are brought to participate in the management of the affairs of State in the exercise of the elective franchise, and so far as practicable, in framing and executing the laws of the land; and we must look to the reciprocal workings of the different elements of this complex arrangement, to judge properly of its influence on society. There are no humiliating distinctions recognized in our government policy, but every individual is alike entitled to posts of honor, profit, or trust, if competent and worthy to discharge the duties. This equality of rights begets an equality of feeling, which is manifested in the intercourse with one another. The differences of patricians and plebians, nobles and peasants, barons and serfs, are not known amongst us, and if one would be superior to another, his aspirations must be seconded by his good deeds, or he will fail of his end. In nothing does the influence of this equality of feeling show itself more strikingly, than the aversion manifested on the part of our native population to act the part of servants, however needy they may be; while poor foreigners, from monarchical governments, readily accept the most menial posts, and go at the bidding of those who employ them, even more submissively than our negroes. So much is this recognized, that a family wishing a white servant, never thinks of applying to one who has been raised in our country, but searches for one of German, Irish, or French extraction,—yea, and even boasted England furnishes subjects, who are more ready to



act as servants than the poor and needy of our own people. In no way can this be explained, but from the tone of feeling induced by the different forms of government under which they have been reared. The one has been accustomed to dictation and control, the other to think, speak, and act, in accordance with his own judgment and feelings. The one has always been a slave; the other has never been otherwise than free. So it is, that however poor you may find one amongst us, there is too much pride to acknowledge the mastery of another.

There is a difference also, between the natives of this country, and those who come in from foreign kingdoms, in the greater propensity to begging which is manifested by the latter. A feeling of self-reliance on the part of our citizens, which is creditable to the country, will lead them to any resort for a living in preference to begging, and if an individual requires assistance, it has to be tendered with the greatest delicacy to secure its reception. The majority would suffer for the comforts of life in preference to receiving them gratuitously at the hands of others, and many would starve before they would beg. We know there are some exceptions to this position, but the general tone of feeling which pervades society in this country is that of independence of the assistance of others. And yet, when a favor is bestowed upon one of our citizens, there is, generally, a more grateful appreciation manifested, than by foreigners who are constantly looking to others for material aid. Assistance is usually prized in an inverse ratio to the disposition to seek it; and as foreigners are more prone to ask assistance, they are less apt to feel thankful for anything which may be done for them. We would not include in this allegation, all who come to our shores from the domain of kings; for some of our foreign population are as industrious, high-minded, and honourable men and women, as any who have been cradled in the nest of the Eagle, or who have been swaddled amidst the folds of the star-spangled Banner. Such have shown themselves superior to the circumstances of their nativity, and have sought this land of freedom as more congenial to their spirits. All hail to the generous, true-hearted foreigner, whose feelings are in unison with our own. Not only

should we afford a home to such, but we should extend a hearty God-speed in all the affairs of life. But, while there are some of this praiseworthy class, there are many more, who come amongst us with all the feelings of dependence and servile debasement which is contrasted above, with the independence and noble bearing of our American citizens. The most plausible explanation of this difference, is the greater liberty of person which is allowed under our government. Its salutary influence is manifested in the advancement of our people in all that pertains to their happiness, and any restraint which is felt by the individual is calculated to elevate his thoughts and refine his feelings.

And again, we hold that a comparison of our Republican form of government with other forms of government, will reveal that we are more exempted from theft than monarchical or despotic dominions. Rapine and plunder are common wherever the exactions on the people are very great. The more that is kept from them, the stronger is the inclination and the practical tendency to appropriate that which does not belong to them. If the right of private property is not respected by the ruler, it is not apt to be regarded by the subject; and the consequence is, that each practices reclamation on his fellows without scruple. But with us, it is far different. Every individual feels secure in his possessions, and contributes so much, of his own free will, towards the maintenance of the various branches of the government. He feels, that the amount of taxation is decided upon by him, in common with others of the nation, and he is satisfied to appropriate such a quota annually to this object. Further than this, no power is exercised over his property, and he has the undisputed right, to use it in such way as will be most advantageous to his interest. Each, and all, having this right of property vested in themselves, there is no cause to complain, and no inducement to purloin from others. It is not to be expected that all theft is obviated thus, for there will be persons in all society, who are too lazy, or too mean, to depend on their own resources, and seek an easier mode of acquiring the means of living by robbing others. But such bear a small proportion to the population of the country, and

cannot be considered an index of society. The prevalent feeling amongst our people, is that of security; and the circumstances which lead to theft are to be looked for elsewhere than in the influence of our government policy. The openness and exposure of property everywhere in this country, shows the freedom from depredations, and at the same time perhaps, lessens the tendency in some measure to commit theft. In this, as in other matters, the difficulty of the acquisition enhances it; and where there is something to risk the attempt is more apt to be made. The very fact of placing a strict watch over any article creates a presumption of its being desirable; and we really believe those who are known to guard their premises most closely are most liable to suffer from thieves. To suspect a neighbour of being a rogue is the most ready mode of making him one. Believe him honest and he will not be likely to forfeit your good opinion. In this particular, we are satisfied there is a great error with some in managing servants, and many a faithful domestic has been spoiled by being charged with theft, where there was no proof to convict, and where indeed, the offence has not been committed. The more a servant is trusted, the more freedom of access that is given to every place where attention is requisite, the greater is the responsibility felt personally, and the more reliable is the honesty of the servant. But if the lock-up system is practised usually, and happens to be once neglected, then the temptation to steal comes with all its force. Hence, in those governments where the privileges of the subject are restricted, there is more tendency to this vice than in our land of liberty. Every one amongst us looks upon his fellow as honest, and acts accordingly in his intercourse with those around him.—The consequence is, a mutual fostering of good faith among our people, which is a far greater security for property than bars and bolts, or locks and keys.

There is a point connected with the freedom from restraint in this country, which requires great circumspection on the part of our citizens, in their aggregate capacity, namely, the tendency to latitudinarianism in thought and word. The influence of a mob, (by which term, we understand "a disorderly assembly, in an ex-

cited state of feeling,") may be directed with equal force against error or right. The components are not necessarily of vicious character, and indeed, we sometimes find intelligent and high-minded men lending their authority to such proceedings. Mr. Madison remarked, "had every Athenian citizen been a Socrates, every Athenian assembly would still have been a mob;" and what was true of that ancient Republic should be guarded against in the present day.

An assembly of persons without law or order, although not viciously disposed, is a fearful spectacle in our Republican America, because they acknowledge no restraint upon their conduct, and may at any moment be directed in the wrong path. While the cause of truth and justice is upheld, we can scarcely approve the means employed; and when opposed, we have sufficient to condemn in the result, as well as the reckless rudeness of the proceeding. The begging of the question, the assumption of right which characterizes such bodies, is the worst feature that enters into their constitution, as no force of reason or acuteness of logic, can be brought to bear against their licentious acts. A kind of spiritual delusion renders them irresponsible to all the ordinary appeals of common sense, judgment, or discretion, and they go headlong to the gratification of their proclivities. Legality is forgotten, order is discarded, and for the time being, the supreme authority, to will and to do, belongs to the assembled mass. There may be a special enactment by the law of the land for the suppression of the evil which is combated, but it is no longer considered a sufficient guarantee. There may be an officer whose business it is to enforce this law, but he is supplanted. There may be a police and militia force sufficient to meet the exigency of the case, but volunteers come forward to assume their duties, and take the danger and responsibility of enforcing their lofty sentiments of courage and honour. Such acts may be performed under the mask of friends of good order, and with a claim to the authority of a higher-law doctrine, but the spirit which actuates is not calculated to promote peace; and instead of ascending, must seek refuge in a lower law than any well-constituted govern-

ment should tolerate. Any self-constituted guardian of the public weal, is to be viewed with suspicion. A claim to exercise this authority, delegated by no formal act of the people or State, is nothing short of usurpation, and the enactment is the worst species of despotism springing from anarchy. If the thing claimed be just in itself, and be demanded in an improper manner, or by improper persons, it cannot be granted with propriety, and it may fairly be classed with the illegal requisitions. But when an unjust demand is supported by such improper means, it involves a turpitude which is entirely inconsistent with the republican principle, and should be stigmatized by every high-minded citizen. The idea of a mass of men actuated by some strong impulse of feeling, undertaking to be the arbiters of truth and justice, is preposterous, to say the least of it. Passion never can ascertain the merits of a controversy, and generally leads to rash action. That decision and resolve, which results from mature consideration, is laudable and much to be sought after; but the foregone conclusion of recklessness, which confers pertinacity of purpose on the mob, is always to be deprecated. A set of persons, who pre-determine to view matters in a given aspect and no other, are little else than monomaniacs, and deserve not the high distinction of rational beings. Their course is wanting in honesty also, as they refuse to hear or to see the true condition of things around them. Hence, they unconsciously come to occupy the position of fools and knaves. These are terms which few would be content to have applied to their individual acts, and yet many lay themselves liable to such a stigma, in their association with one another, in the capacity of would-be regulators of the public morals. In reference to the outrage of revolutionists, who are striving to break down the strong arm of oppression on the part of ill-gotten power, we have nothing to say at present. We allude to such as under a well-constituted government, take the reins into their own hands, and undertake to carry out their views of policy and propriety, at the expense of every thing sacred to humanity and justice. There are two periods of national existence, marked by such demonstrations,—the early or forming era, when system

has not yet been established, and the past perfect state (if we may so style it,) of development. The former is the gross outbreak of untutored impulse. The latter is the delusive ebullition of overwrought fancy. Either may lead to the most revolting deeds; and what one would do with the lash and torture the other would effect by distorting public sentiment, by crushing denunciations and by galling invectives. As the idiot and the maniac are each bereft of reason, so these two classes of disturbers of the peace are in different ways, without the rational principle to direct their proceedings. In the advanced condition of society, in these United States, we have much to dread from a tendency to the fanatical enthusiasm of over-excitement; and we would beg to suggest a few points for the study of others, who are better qualified to enlarge upon them and to apply them to the machinery of society. This is an age of associations, and if the energies and impulses of the people are not directed in a proper channel, we observe improper objects engage their eager heads and hearts, and hence the importance of thoroughly comprehending this feature of society.

Why is it that so many isms and societies, and fellowships, and orders, have sprung up over the land? Why is it that our people must quit the enjoyment of home and friends, to engage in some hazardous enterprise with a band of desperadoes? Why is it that our country is kept in turmoil and agitation, by party feuds and dissension? All, all, spring from the deep-rooted principle of association, which the Creator has implanted in man. The great law of his natural existence is society, fellowship, union; and it is but a perversion of this natural element, which leads to the unfavourable results adverted to; and the only feasible plan to obviate this tendency to vice, is to incorporate, as part and parcel of the government, a wide extended, and completely ramified system of association, so as to make every citizen subserve a purpose in the great economy of our republic. This, to some extent, is the case at present; but evidently, not so completely as the character of our people requires. Every individual should feel that he exerts an influence, and has a part to act in the great drama that

is progressing. There should be such an organization throughout the entire country, as to impress every one with the fact, that he is an integral portion of the governing power. Each State should be conformed to the general plan, and interlock with others, so as to move on harmoniously as one grand machine. Every district and county should be a unit, and fit in with the cogs of a wheel which is moved by the great lever, association. We do not intend to convey the idea, that this desideratum would be accomplished by bestowing the elections of the chief officers of the nation upon the masses. So far from it, that we consider the machinery would be at once deranged thereby; and it would be like a silly attempt to move the massive stones of a mill, by multiplying flutter-wheels, instead of increasing the power by the intermediate cog-wheels and gearing. No, let us dovetail and incorporate one part of the machinery of government upon another, and thus, as it were, by a system of pulleys, gain a power and force, which isolated efforts could never effect. Make it the interest and gratification of every citizen, to advance in his sphere of duty; and thus eventually, all will work for the general good, and all will be alike rewarded by national prosperity. Let each man be the guardian of his fellow, and thus check any proclivity to wrong. A general personal responsibility, would thus be developed, which would operate more favourably than any statute enforced by dictatorial authority. We are satisfied that every human being, worthy the name of man, feels more content in self-control, than when the same thing is done under the influence and authority of another; and the nearer a government approaches the point of self-government, the nearer is it to the standard of nature and common sense.

Our Republic is founded in great and holy principles. It takes man's capacity for self-government, as its basis, and the cardinal elements of the plan are perhaps, nearly perfect. But many differences of opinion have modified the practical details, and there is much yet to be accomplished, before we can present to the world a harmonious whole. It is to the attainment of such an end, that we here direct the attention of statesmen, and urge

upon them the diffusion of the law-making and law-abiding elements, by the principle of association, in the most intimate and confidential relation, among the people. As an exemplification of our meaning, we would adduce the discipline of some military schools, where it is not only the duty, but the choice, and pride, of each, to uphold the honor of the institution by taking cognizance of any misdemeanor on the part of any member of the school, and bringing the culprit to justice by a court of his fellows. Such is not the character of the government, which would be adapted to a nation; yet it serves to illustrate the manner, in which a plan might be made to work, if correctly devised. Some diverticulum is needed in this bustling, progressive age, to keep men from running into vicious associations and alliances. We require a mob-antidote, and we must think that a more complete system of patrol and police, would be attended with a good effect. Every citizen should frown upon lawless gatherings, even professing to have the common good in view, and attempting to suppress a general vice. Such manifestations prove the necessity for a legal supervision on the part of the people over themselves, and must eventually induce a greater diffusion of legal resources among the masses.\*

\* The subjoined paragraphs from the New York Times, have come to our notice since the above was penned:

"Within seventy-five years there have been several changes of sentiment in this country, that are worthy of consideration, as tending to show what causes are at work in our midst. Few of them have been so general as to deserve the name of national. But yet they have been sufficiently marked to be classed among the phenomena of our existence. There are so many loose ideas among us on the subject of "Progress;" there is so little attention given to the philosophy of our History, that we could not engage in more profitable reflections than those which concern the fluctuations of opinion among us.

"Fifty years since, the sober mind of this country feared the expansion of popular liberty. There was a powerful leaning towards a strong Government, as necessary to restrain human passions and prevent all excesses. Outside of law men were not to be trusted, and no confidence was had in those great regulative forces of selfish interests and social ties, that have now risen into a commanding position among the conservative safeguards of our institutions. The ruling idea was Government, and everything was tributary to it. Men universally accepted the theory of self-government. But that self-government was to have a prodigious organic force. It was to be as strong as possible. To be salutary and effective, it must be distrustful of human nature, and manage it by means of ener-



The social element of society comes in to be considered next, and although it might appear a work of supererogation to delineate a feature, which is so intimately associated with the very idea of society, yet it is not always predominant, and enters in various forms into the assemblage of mankind.

An idea of society, without sociality, may be drawn from the quaker meeting, where silence rules the hour; and many fashionable gatherings have a stiffness and monotony about them, which is entirely inconsistent with social feeling. And again, there is a garulous propensity manifested on some occasions, giving vent to gossip and scandal, which is no part of sociability.

We are accustomed to regard society as the embodiment of a cast, in tone of feeling and conduct, of certain persons; and we accordingly speak of the lower order of society, good society, the best society, etc., thus expressing the particular grade of the clique or set of persons. These distinctions are artificial of course, and the lines of demarcation not very correctly drawn, but they are understood and recognized by mankind, and accordingly we are not responsible for their correspondence to the characters of different persons. In fact, we would prefer to consider society as the aggregate of all these classes for the present, and bring these distinctions into view under the next head, as the result of domestic influence.

The social enjoyment of the refined and cultivated is greatly different from that of rustic, uncultivated persons; and yet, a feeling pervades the breast of each, which is nearly allied. Suppose a group of literary associates to be in a room adjoining a boat's crew or a set of rail road workers, and that each company spend the evening in good humour. Which would manifest the most social feeling? Which would derive the most gratification? We think the latter might have the best of it thus far, and yet perhaps, not be edified or instructed for any

getic oversight. A little experience demonstrated the folly of such opinions, and it was clearly shown that the trustworthiness of the people was a grander truth as well as a more reliable fact than our Revolutionary Fathers had imagined. Our advancements had proved one thing, viz: that the action of the people has always been healthier and better than that of the Government, and that our prosperity is due much more to them than to our official authorities.

useful end. There was a higher, nobler object in view with those of cultivated intellect; and while each, perhaps, had his own peculiar satisfaction, in discussing some favorite topic, that community of feeling, which would be entitled to the name social, was not enjoyed by them. Although together, it was a somewhat selfish gratification. They may have pursued different channels of thought, and thus improved the knowledge of each other, but they could not sympathize in feeling, as the untutored labourers would do. The ground on which the latter meet is familiar alike to all, and they have nothing to restrain their intercourse with one another. Not that freedom of thought and expression are inconsistent with literary attainments; but we most frequently observe it in those that have not been trained in schools and colleges, and consequently among such, there is more sociability manifested.

In the idea of social, is included that of confidence and freedom, with a disposition to please, and if an intimacy exist among persons characterized by these things, we would call such a social party. The simple fact of throwing people together, does not make them social; so far from it, that the greatest formality and restraint, frequently, are observed in a company of persons. The derivation of the word social, implies a companion, which certainly means something more than the mere presence of another person. It conveys the idea of fellowship, and sympathy, such as can exist alone between bosom friends. Whether mankind are generally more disposed to be social, than isolated, has been questioned by some little-souled beings. But whether we reason *a priori* from the mental constitution of man; or take the *a posteriori* mode of investigation, from the developments of every day life around us, we must conclude that a unison of feeling pervades the human race, and that a social existence is necessary for their comfort and enjoyment.

Here then, is the point from which the influence of the social element of society is to be viewed,—as a great pervading principle, rendering one portion of the race but the counterpart of all other. Sociality is as necessary to society, as affection is to a family, and must be

mingled with all its phases. In our casual meetings, in our daily business, we must be sociable, or there is no enjoyment of life. Note the ascetic, misanthropic individual, who only occasionally comes forth from his retirement, and he seems like an incubus, upon those with whom he may be present. If he has not a heart to feel with others, he had better live the recluse completely, and not damp the genial glow of feeling with those who would be social.

The great social element, which pervades our race, is manifested in the cliques of select friends, in the evening party, in the promiscuous assembly, and in fact in every department of life it stands forth conspicuous. Even our tradesmen and merchants find it to their mutual interest to associate together in their business capacity. Schools, colleges, and philanthropic organizations are the result of the same feeling, and thus we see a great result growing out of this social feeling among mankind. In fact, the best argument for free trade among nations, is founded in that state of things which makes it to the advantage of every portion of the world to be on a social relation. We see one nation producing articles that are consumed by another, and the second returning something which is needed by the first. Thus, by an interchange of commodities each is benefited, and enjoys comforts which it could not, by depending on its own resources. The same result attends the intercourse of individuals, and we find them contributing to the gratification and well-being of one another, by an interchange of feelings and opinions, as well as more substantial favours. It is, therefore, conducive to the prosperity and happiness of our race, to enjoy the friendly intercourse of one another; and although we would not go to the extreme of communism, there is no doubt but mankind should be recognised as one vast brotherhood. While the right of property, and family distinctions, should be recognised, there should exist as much social intercourse as circumstances permit. There should be a humanity (if I may use the expression,) pervading all the ranks of life, and high or low, rich or poor, each should cultivate this sentiment towards his fellow man. We occasionally see a character that bears the same relation to his

fellow beings, as the beast of prey does to other animals. He is a Cain in the world, every man's hand being turned against him, and his against every man. He thinks of nothing but what will cause pain and distress. He could laugh at the tears of innocence,—he could mock the wail of despair. It is not with any view to render himself more happy, but for the demoniac wish to witness the misery of others, that he pursues his dread career. We need not say that such a person has no place in social existence; and if there is any society suited to receive him, it must be such as Milton has depicted in Pandemonium. If the world contained any considerable proportion of such creatures, there could not be such a thing as society among mankind. As it is, a taint is extended from them, in all directions; and very few come in contact with the depraved character, without being contaminated. A youth who has been correctly trained, may resist this monster of vice; but the unsuspecting and unguarded, will most likely be led astray, by associating with such a person. A pleasing manner is often assumed to entice the unwary, and it is only when habit has rendered the minor faults familiar, that iniquities of a deeper grade are suggested. Watch the gradual process by which a set of rowdies attach others to their ranks. Watch the steps of one, who day after day, frequents the haunts of dissipation, and you will understand how the vicious avail themselves of the social element of our nature, to draw others along with them.

Thus, we observe that this prevailing feature of society is made conducive to evil, as well as good, results. There are many who will go into vicious indulgence with others, that would not engage in it alone. And yet we find occasionally, one such as the individual above alluded to, who aspires to be "prince of devils," and caring not for company, goes on in malignant loneliness to perpetrate his wicked purposes. For the latter, we can have no charity. For the former we must feel some compassion, as they have fallen under the perverted influence of a natural feeling.

How far the social tendency leads to vice in society is an interesting inquiry, and I would briefly allude to some of its developments.

The bar-room spree, the gambling club, the ball-room dissipation, and the out-door mob, all are fostered by this principle. The exciting influence of company is felt by every one, and the predominant vein of feeling is, of course, rendered more intense by the coöperation of others, in evil, as well as good objects. Thus we see how persons are seduced from their rectitude of purpose, to engage with others in all sorts of vicious indulgence. If a man is disposed to be bad, he will be worse by being associated with others of a like disposition. Indeed, the spirit which is manifested on many occasions where a number act together, could not operate with a few,—the reckless fury of an outraged mass of men, such as constitutes a mob, is not seen to spring forth from one or a few who may be subjected to similar grievances. No, the riot is a social disorder, and must have numbers associated, to produce its uproarious developments. We do not refer to the tumult and noise simply, which would be proportionate to the extent of a mob, but to the acts of lawless vulgarity and rudeness, which is remarked in connection with such masses of men. And, we affirm, that such are the result of association. The same individuals would not do, or perhaps, have a disposition to do such things, were they not thus thrown into a social intercourse with one another, under an excited state of mind and feelings.

The same principle, which, when properly directed, gives an undaunted bearing to the army of soldiers, will, when misguided, lead men to the most atrocious violations of law and order. A like feeling, begets like conduct, and all are borne on with an impetuosity which reason or law cannot control. It is a weakness of man's nature, to be swayed by those around him. An act, or a word, or even a look, will sometimes be sufficient on the part of an individual, to induce another to change his preconceived plan of operations. How potent then, must an expression of opinion by a body of persons be, in forming the sentiments of others! Yes, there is a mighty moving power in the embodied will of a mass of men. It carries with it a faith which no argument can arrest, and impresses a conviction which no disbelief can gainsay. Thus men are blindly led to espouse a

cause whose claims have not been duly examined, and once the die is cast, they seek for props to support their cause, and find them in the views and feelings of those associated with them. They see nothing, they hear nothing but encouragement in that cause, and soon get to rest satisfied with themselves and all around them.

Such is the philosophy of the social principle, and such in the extreme is fanaticism. But it is a great pervading element of society, and is as necessary, under proper conditions, for success in any great enterprise undertaken by a number of men, as it is hurtful among the masses, without any restraint. We might illustrate the working of this principle in all the organizations of the present day, and so far as they effect the tone of society generally, it would come within the scope of this paper. Some of the philanthropic movements which have advanced with rapid strides, owe their progress to the circumstance of association, more perhaps, than to a conviction of the importance of the ends to be attained. A few, it is true, look to the consequence, but by far the greater number go into the measure because others are engaged in the enterprise. This is not as it should be, yet it is as it has been, and always will be, while men associate impulse with principle, and consider their obligations to their fellow men as equivalent, or of paramount importance, to their obligations to their God.

If there was more independence of thought and action, more self-determination, we might see better results from the operation of the social feeling among mankind. It would then give efficacy to virtuous resolves, and lead to the accomplishment of noble objects. Mind and feeling should go together, and when either operates without a proper coöperation of the other, we perceive a want of uniqueness and harmony in the character. How dreadfully serious is the contemplation of a gigantic intellect, under the sway of a perverted moral sentiment! How cold and forbidding is the calm, calculating thinker, who knows not an emotion of joy or sorrow! And again, on the other hand, how appalling is the view of an individual, who is incapable of controlling the turbulent passions of his nature! Fierce anger and bitter hate, know not the restraint of reason. The impulse

of the moment has no check in sober, second thought; and is indulged perhaps, to the injury of others, and to the after regret of the subject. It is in such a nature as the last that the social feeling "runs riot;" and reckless of consequences, persons make the most of the present for the indulgence of their propensities.

If such should advocate just measures, they would be enthusiastic. If otherwise, we would have an exemplification of "zeal without discretion," and in proportion to the number, would the result be disastrous.

The phases of society which result from domestic relations, remain to be considered, and come in very naturally after the social element.

What qualified the intercourse of mankind with one another, as a race, has been alluded to; and now, what pertains to their association as the family around the hearthstone of home, must be investigated.

Here is the very ground-work of all society; habits, manners, principles, all spring from the family fireside. The character before the world may be fictitious, but the developments of every-day life at home, give a true insight to the principles of the individual. If the individual is what he should be, the two will harmonize, and we can infer from knowing a man in public, what to expect of him in private; and, on the other hand, from an acquaintance with his daily life, we can anticipate what his career in public stations may be. There is no more beautiful object of contemplation than to behold a modest, virtuous, and generous-hearted man, drawn from the retirement of his home, to illustrate before his fellow men the integrity and nobleness of his character as a patriot and as a man. It is to those men who have received wholesome instruction from their fathers and mothers, that we are to look for the characteristics which are fitted for society. The rowdy or the dandy may play his part in the fashionable saloon, but when he comes to associate with the substantial people of the land, he is found wanting in the requisites of the true gentleman. Mannerism does not constitute the fitness for society. The veriest scamp in the universe, may far outstrip the purest and most high-toned gentleman, in the display of drawing-room accomplishments. The address may be

exquisite, many pretty speeches may be made, and any amount of hair worn about the mouth, without giving the person any claim to be recognised as a gentleman, or as a member of good society. We know, that here we are touching upon delicate ground, and that many, who have no other qualities to recommend them, are received among polite people, and even may be held to be of the *elite*. But their circle is not our standard of gentility. We would wipe off this scum of creation, and view something of more solidity. Instead of this parrot, jackanape tribe, we would introduce the true-hearted, clear-headed, strong-handed phalanx of men, who have learned uprightness and truth in their own dear native homes, and claim for them the genuine badge of aristocracy. Take one of those ratan, brass-buttoned fellows, and compare him with a substantial, well-informed farmer or mechanic, and even with all the ostentatious vanity of the former, the latter will most probably display a greater amount of knowledge and a nicer sense of propriety, in his deportment towards others. The one never looks upon himself as others see him; the other is constantly practising those sterling virtues which will secure the confidence and regard of those around him, while he does not transcend their appreciation by his own estimation of himself. We would not have men to place a humiliating estimate upon themselves; yet, it is incumbent upon one who claims position in society, to show some qualification for the place; and mere name, or blood, or wealth, or fine address, cannot impart such a fitness. There must be some excellence of character, such as virtue, integrity, generosity, or some commanding talent of intellect, which may interest and instruct others, to entitle an individual to any distinction among his fellows. We may find one, who is hail-fellow-well-met with every body, who thinks not, and cares not, for anything, beyond the present moment. He will enjoy the company of any who will be familiar; and he will advocate any doctrine which may be popular. The social principle has overrun all the virtues of a domestic character, and instead of sincerity, we find dissimulation; instead of firmness and decision, we find that vacillating disregard of promises or appointments which



marks the creature of circumstances. Such is the demagogue of the social circle. He is weak and powerless when a crisis for action is presented. Having been used to move in a current, over which he exercised no control, he can bring no oar to assist him in guarding against the rocks and quicksands which may lie in his course. But give us one who has had a different basis of character, and has cultivated a habit of self-reliance, in thought, word, and deed, and what a difference do we observe in his career! With a manly and independent bearing, he may still be modest and unassuming. He can appreciate others, while he feels an assurance within himself that will impart energy to every act of his life. Such a person will have an influence upon those around him, and will be recognised as one of the constituents of society. Such are the men who shape and mould the age in which they live. Such are the men that are produced under a proper influence, within the domestic circle. Those cardinal traits of character, which are impressed by the immediate associations of the family, do more, and work a more lasting effect, in life, than any other features of the man. Such characteristics are so prominent, that we can in many instances, refer an individual to his source, by a very superficial acquaintance with his personal peculiarities. His manners, his opinions, etc., are in accordance with those of father, brother, or friend, as it may be, with whom he is constantly associated. There must be a mutual action and re-action of one upon another, which tends to assimilate character. The higher-toned mind will, by its superior influence, have more effect in elevating the lower, than this inferior being will have in detracting from the more exalted; consequently, it behoves the weak to seek the assistance of the strong, the depraved that of the virtuous, and the stupid that of the clear-headed, if they would advance in attainments. But there is, doubtless, much in the interchange of sentiments between those of equal mental capacity, which will elevate the feelings and advance the knowledge of each. As two unhewn stones are polished by rubbing together, so two minds that are in a great measure uncultivated, will be improved by oft-repeated contact.

The most favourable situation for this contact is in the family, and we therefore, most frequently observe this influence among those who are thus associated. A group, of like feelings and tastes, being thrown with other groups, respectively alike, but each differing from the other, goes to make up the general caste of society, and, of course, modify the developments which are there observed. The same kind of mutual re-actions must ensue here, that we have before alluded to, and the same kind of result in bringing about an equilibrium is observed. One family influences another family, throughout the whole community, and as intelligence and refinement preponderate in the individual families, they will prevail throughout society at large.

Having adverted to the constituent elements of society, and the modifications springing from various influences, it is only necessary to allude briefly, to the great aims and ends of all our intercourse with one another. In the broadest acceptation, our aim may be said to be happiness or enjoyment; and when it is determined to what extent this is attained, the end of the whole matter is reached. But there are so many different tastes to be gratified, that no standard of happiness, considered in reference to our present existence, can be applicable to any considerable portion of the human race. Each looks to his association with his fellows, as conducive in one way or another to his own views of enjoyment, and as promoting his happiness. Success in business or pecuniary interest is the great aim of many; to have the praise and homage of those around them absorbs the whole thoughts of others; and a meagre portion of the race are actuated by a desire to promote the comfort and well-being of their fellows, and to do good in any and every way that is available. The life of each is spent in assiduous efforts to consummate their respective objects; and every measure which is proposed is viewed in reference to this end, and acted upon or declined as it seems conducive or untoward to the purpose. The business-man sees no attraction in anything which cannot be made subsidiary, directly, or remotely, to his interest. The aspirant for fame has no relish for scenes in which he cannot have a place in the picture. And the

true-hearted, self-sacrificing philanthropist is not satisfied unless he sees some other reaping the rewards and benefits of his exertions. So it is throughout all the details of the multifarious phases of society, and we have sometimes seriously doubted whether the noblest and purest acts of man's hands were not influenced to some extent, by motives very foreign to the deed, and having self-interest at the bottom. If we divest a human being of the heart-embalming influence of God's love, we cannot conceive any other power which can secure him from the control of a deep-rooted and instinctive disposition of selfishness. This may be masked in various forms so as to conceal its revolting features, and the individual may appear clever and generous to others, while he looks beyond to the reflected benefit to himself. Self-love is innate to man, and however much others may claim our regard, this principle remains; and we, ourselves, feel that personal gratification is the end of that consideration for the other individual. This may perhaps, appear a humiliating view of man's character, but it is implanted in us for noble and holy purposes, and is the main-spring of piety and religion. If man was destitute of this principle of self-love, he could not appreciate the great obligation which he owes to Christ as his Redeemer; and while he sends forth his gratitude for this Divine love and condescension towards him as a sinner, it cannot be separated from the consciousness of the benefits that accrue to him.

Such then, we hold to be the great pervading and wide-spreading motive with the human race, in all their actions; and the more it is looked into, the stronger influence will it appear to exercise over our conduct in life. Personal ease, comfort, enjoyment, yea happiness, are sought in one way or another by all, and actuate them in their associations with their fellows. They may undertake tasks the most arduous, they may dare to do the most hazardous exploits, they may go adverse to their inclination and suffer debasement and punishment for the time being; but overreaching all this, there is a bright bow of hope which promises future benefits and immunities. Is this not the experience of the world over? Who ever suffered for the sake of suffering? And yet,

how many have voluntarily undergone privations that some supposed good might be secured? We take it then, to be the aim of society to promote individual happiness; and this is no doubt accomplished in proportion to the general enjoyment of the race. Each finds a satisfaction in the gratification of others, and thus the selfish feeling conduces to the happiness of the whole.

But is the desired result attained generally, by society? Does the end answer to the aim in most instances? Look at the young and vigorous, striving and anxious about the future. Look at the veteran who has nearly closed his career, and hear his regret for the past and his cares for the present, and well may we doubt whether the desired goal is ever reached in this world. The point is never reached at which man learns to be contented with his lot in life. All the various scenes and circumstances which surround man in this world, are not calculated to confer entire happiness upon him, and the final cause of this is to direct attention to another existence and to other sources of enjoyment. The salvation of our immortal souls, is the prime object of life; and that should be considered the best society, which is most conducive to this great end. Although man finds much in communion with his fellow beings to please and interest him, yet it is only in looking to God and Heaven that he can feel the cravings of his soul satisfied, and only in the society of angels that he can be completely and eternally happy.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE LUNAR WORLD.

That the various members of our planetary system are the abodes of sentient and intellectual existence, and that the so-called fixed stars are suns to *other* systems of habitable worlds, has long been a favorite hypothesis. For the last two centuries the greatest names, both in philosophy and theology, have been numbered among

its advocates. Quite recently, however, a work\* maintaining opposite views,—a work which, though anonymous, is generally attributed to one of the most distinguished of living authors,—has made its appearance in Great Britain. This essay has already called forth a reply† from the celebrated Sir David Brewster, an enthusiastic advocate of the doctrine of a plurality of worlds. It is not our present purpose to follow these authors through the entire range of their interesting discussions. We propose to examine the question in regard merely to our own satellite, the nearest of all the heavenly bodies, and consequently, that with which we are best acquainted. Instead, however, of confining our attention to the single inquiry whether our neighbouring orb is a habitable globe, we may take the occasion for a somewhat more general consideration of lunar phenomena.

The moon's horizontal parallax at her mean distance from the earth, is rather less than a degree; or, more accurately, it is fifty-seven minutes and three seconds. The corresponding distance is about 238,000 miles, or sixty times the radius of the earth. Her apparent diameter at mean distance is thirty-one minutes and twenty seconds; whence her true diameter is found to be 2160 miles, or rather more than one fourth that of the earth. Her surface, therefore, contains about fifteen millions of square miles, which is equal to the area of the American continent. Her volume is to that of the earth as *one to forty-nine*.

The mass of our satellite has been estimated by different methods. 1. Having the relative distances of the sun and moon, and knowing their comparative influence in raising the tides of the ocean, their relative masses are readily determined. This was the method employed by Newton,‡ but owing to the imperfection of his data his result was erroneous. In the same way Laplace, at a later period, found the mass to be one seventy-fifth of that of the earth. On some accounts, however,

\* *Of the Plurality of Worlds.* An Essay. London: J. W. Parker & Son, 1853. 8 vo. p. 280.

† *More Worlds than one, the creed of the Philosopher and the Hope of the Christian.* By Sir David Brewster, K. H., D. C. L., F. R. S., &c. &c. N. York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1854. p. 265.

‡ *Principia*, B. III., Prop. 37, Cor. 4.

this method is not altogether trust-worthy. 2. The moon's attraction on the earth produces a sensible change in the sun's longitude, the amount of which must indicate the disturbing mass. In other words, our satellite does not, in point of fact, revolve round the centre of the earth: the two bodies revolve round their common centre of gravity. This deviation of our planet's orbit from the regular elliptical form, must evidently cause a corresponding displacement of the sun; since the *apparent* position of the latter in the ecliptic, depends upon the *true* place of the earth in its orbit. The mass of our satellite, deduced from its effect in thus changing the sun's apparent place, corresponds very nearly with that found by the former method. Other modes of calculation have given slightly different results. According to the recent determination of Peters and Schidloffsky, the mass of the moon is to that of the earth as 1 to 81. The corresponding density (.618,) is rather more than one-half of the mean density of the earth. The force of attraction at her surface, is less than one-sixth that at the surface of our planet.

For the first few evenings after the appearance of the new moon, the unenlightened portion of the surface is often distinctly visible. This phenomenon, it is now universally conceded, cannot be produced, as the ancients imagined, by any native light of the moon herself. It admits, however, of an easy and obvious explanation. When the moon is between the sun and the earth, her dark hemisphere is in the direction of the primary. But at the same time, the whole illuminated surface of the earth is turned towards the satellite; and, as the *moonlight increases* to us, the *earth-light decreases* for the moon, and *vice versa*. Now, the surface of the earth being thirteen times greater than that of the moon, the dark portion of the lunar disk receives a sufficiency of *earth-light* to render it visible by a secondary reflection.

The moon's rotation on her axis is completed in a period precisely equal to that of her orbital revolution. Hence the lunar day and night are each about two weeks in length. The continued exposure of the surface to the sun for a period of fourteen days must produce a consid-

erable elevation of temperature; greater, it has been supposed, than that of boiling water. During the long nights, however, the cold will become intense in a corresponding degree. It is worthy of remark, moreover, that the lunar hemisphere next the earth is never involved in total darkness; the light which it receives from the earth, when turned away from the sun, being very much greater than what we receive from the full moon. To the inhabitants of our neighboring orb—admitting the existence of such beings—the earth will present a magnificent appearance. It does not rise or set, or change its apparent place in the heavens; but maintains invariably the same position. At the centre of the moon's disk, the earth is in the zenith; from any point in the margin, the primary would always be seen in the horizon; and, generally, its attitude and position would depend upon the latitude and longitude of the point of observation.

We have said that the earth performs the same office to one of the lunar hemispheres, that the moon does to the earth. While, however, the enlightened part of the moon's surface, as seen from the earth, is *increasing*, that of the earth, as seen from the moon, is *decreasing*, and *vice versa*. There is also, another striking point of contrast: while our satellite has always the same side turned towards the primary, the earth presents *all* parts of *its* surface to the moon fourteen times during one lunar night. The changes of appearance, thus constantly exhibited, would be perfectly manifest to unassisted vision. As land and water reflect light unequally—a greater proportion of the incident rays being absorbed by the latter—the outlines of our continents, islands, oceans, seas and lakes would be clearly distinguishable. Again, as the moon's axis is nearly perpendicular to the plane of the ecliptic, her surface, even if covered with vegetation, would exhibit no change of color or appearance corresponding to the alterations of summer and winter. On the other hand, when viewed from our satellite, the variety of aspect presented by the earth in consequence of the change of seasons would be strikingly apparent. In spring, the general appearance of vegetation, and in autumn, its gradual decay, would un-

doubtedly be noticed. But probably the most remarkable changes would be produced by the sudden appearance or disappearance of snow over extensive districts. The reflected sunlight from a snow-covered surface would be extremely brilliant. Finally, the clouds and vapors of our atmosphere would be a source of sudden and frequent variation in the aspect of the earth, as seen by the lunarians.

But *has* the moon inhabitants? This is the main point at present, under consideration; and although her mass, density, and surface attraction, her position with respect to the sun, her various motions, etc., have all a more or less obvious bearing upon the question, we must be chiefly guided in our judgment by her physical constitution as revealed by the telescope. All parts of the lunar disk, we very readily perceive, have not the same degree of brightness. This want of uniformity was at one time accounted for, by supposing the bright parts to be land, and the dark, water. At present, however, the so-called seas are regarded as extensive flats, or low grounds, so constituted as to absorb a large proportion of the solar rays. When viewed with powerful instruments they are found to contain numerous elevations and depressions, presenting an appearance analogous to that of a generally level country diversified with moderate inequalities. They include also, within their limits, a considerable number of craters or circular pits, exhibiting decisive indications of ancient volcanic activity. The brighter districts are rugged and mountainous, and indeed the whole visible hemisphere has an extremely desolate aspect. Although the diameter of the earth is nearly four times that of her satellite, the mountain elevations of the latter are nearly equal to those of the former. The cup-shaped cavities—which cover a great part of the surface—are very different in appearance from volcanoes on the earth. The largest are from fifty to one hundred and fifty miles in diameter, and some are from three to four miles deep. Selenographers have designated the lunar mountains by the names of distinguished astronomers and philosophers. One of the most remarkable is that called Tycho, situated in the southern hemisphere. The best measurements make its



diameter fifty-five miles, and its depth rather more than three. The centre of this frightful abyss is marked by a conical mountain, rising to an elevation of some five thousand feet. We also observe, diverging from Tycho, a remarkable system of *rays*, or luminous streaks, the explanation of which has greatly perplexed astronomers. They originate near the verge of the crater and extend in every direction, spreading over at least one fourth of the moon's disk. They have a peculiar silvery color, and reflect light better than other parts of the surface. Various conjectures have been entertained in regard to their nature. For some time they were supposed to be lava streams from the central crater; but as superior telescopes have shown that they pass alike over hills and valleys, and sometimes even over abrupt elevations, this opinion is now generally considered untenable. Perhaps the most probable hypothesis is that advocated in a recent work of the distinguished Dr. Nichol. "Those rays of Tycho," he maintains, "are CRACKS or FISSURES filled up by matter from the moon's interior,—matter apparently similar to that constituting the rocks environing Tycho, and found likewise at the bottom of its chasm; but they result from *some mighty force*, in whose history the mere process of filling up is only a minute incident,—a FORCE whose seat is clearly at the point towards which they converge, viz: Tycho itself; *the force*, viz: *which blew out or otherwise originated that stupendous crater*. And if so, how fearful the convulsion! No gradual operation—no final sum of countless successive shocks—but *sudden* as terrific, driving from the surface of the moon the thousands of cubic miles of rock that once occupied the cavern of Tycho, and shivering to that marvellous extent the body of our satellite." Two other mountains, Copernicus and Kepler, are the centres of similar systems of rays. The crater of the former is fifty-six miles in diameter; of the latter, twenty-two; the depth of each being about two miles. They are both situated about eight or nine degrees north of the equator.

The craters we have named, though on some accounts the most interesting, are by no means the largest in compass. Professor Mädler has measured five—all in

the southern hemisphere—whose diameters vary from one hundred and thirteen to one hundred and forty-nine miles.

Although, as has been stated, the greater part of the lunar surface is covered with these annular cavities, there is no decisive evidence of present volcanic activity. Such appearances, however, undoubtedly justify the inference that at some remote epoch in the past history of our satellite, its crust has been agitated and shattered by upheaving, eruptive forces; compared with which, the similar agencies in our own planet, at least those in operation during the historical period, sink into insignificance.

While it is universally admitted that *nearly* all lunar volcanoes are entirely extinct, an appearance observed by several astronomers has been regarded as *probably* indicative of igneous action. We refer to the frequent visibility of the mountain Aristarchus, when remote from the enlightened hemisphere. It has been noticed by Cassini, Sir William Herschel, Capt. Kater, Capt. Smyth, and others; having been detected, in at least two instances, by the naked eye. Sir William Herschel ascribed the appearance to volcanic eruptions. It must be remarked, however, that the phenomenon is generally witnessed either shortly after or before new moon, when the light reflected from the earth is very nearly a maximum. There is probably some peculiarity in the summit of Aristarchus, in consequence of which it reflects more *earth-light* than other portions of the disk, and hence appears as a luminous spot. Astronomers of the present day seem generally inclined to adopt this explanation. Capt. Smyth, however, considers the question still doubtful, and insists, moreover, that if Herschel's opinion should be found correct, the fact must be decisive as to the existence of a lunar atmosphere. He remarks: "In reasoning upon inaccessible objects, we can only proceed by analogy, and argue onwards from what we know; and since, on the earth, fire cannot be maintained without air, we are justified in making the same assumptions respecting the moon. If De la Hire, Rochon, Bode, Olbers, and other Phlegreans, be right in their conjectures, as to the actual existence of volcanic

fires in our satellite, then is the contested point of the existence of a lunar atmosphere settled.”\* In regard to this question, it may be proper to remark that oxygen—the principle in our atmosphere by which igneous action is sustained—is one of the constituents of innumerable compounds in the form of solids,—some of which, in the process of decomposition, furnish a sufficiency of the element to support their own combustion.

In contemplating these striking characteristics of the moon's surface—the vast dimensions of its craters, the traces of igneous action over the whole visible hemisphere, and the apparent absence of organization,—it is natural to inquire what is their physical import? Has our satellite solidified from a state of igneous fusion, and have the other members of the planetary system undergone a similar process? If so, is the moon comparatively *younger* than the earth, and are the remains of ancient craters, analogous to those of the moon, still to be found upon our own globe? Of the *active* terrestrial volcanoes, perhaps Kilauea, in Hawaii, presents, in its distinctive features, the most striking resemblance to those of our satellite. It has an immense pit-like crater—somewhat elliptical in form—the greatest diameter of which is three and a half miles, and the depth about one thousand feet. The bottom is a plane of lava, the greater part of which has solidified; in some places, however, it is entirely fluid, and in a state of active ebullition. Barren Island in the Bay of Bengal, and the island of Santorini in the Grecian Archipelago, are regarded by geologists as the remains of immense volcanic craters. In regard to the origin of the peculiar configuration of coral islands, Sir Charles Lyell remarks: “The circular or oval forms of the numerous coral isles of the Pacific, with the lagoons in their centre, naturally suggest the idea that they are nothing more than the crests of submarine volcanoes, having the rims and bottoms of their craters overgrown by coral. This opinion is strengthened by the conical form of the submarine mountain, and the steep angle at which it plunges on all sides into the surrounding ocean. It is also well known that the

\* *Cycle of Celestial Objects*, vol. i, p. 127.

Pacific is a great theatre of volcanic action, and every island, yet examined in the wide region termed Eastern Oceanica, consists either of volcanic rocks or coral limestones."\* If this view be correct, may we not have, in the appearance of the moon, a representation of the surface of our own planet at a very remote period? and though our satellite be not at present inhabitable, may it not be that the same creative power which reduced the earth's primeval wastes to beauty, harmony, and order, will yet crown our neighboring orb with life and organization? The supposition that the epoch of the earth's solidification is more remote than that of the moon's, is not, as has been urged, necessarily inconsistent with the nebular cosmogony. "This hypothesis," says an able writer, "requires that the moon should have been thrown off long before the earth had contracted to its present dimensions." It is not to be forgotten however, that *when thrown off*, it was in the form of a vaporous ring, of the same circumference with the present lunar orbit. How long it may have revolved as an unbroken annulus, we are unable to determine. But, even after a rupture had occurred, might not the matter composing the ring be longer in collecting about a single nucleus, than the central mass in contracting to the present dimensions of the earth? Such, at least, appears to be the most natural conclusion. However this may have been, it must be borne in mind that the earth, on account of its superior magnitude, would require a much longer period than the moon, to cool down from a state of igneous fluidity. The latter, therefore, *may* be farther advanced in its physical history than the former. That such is the case is now maintained by several astronomers. Mr. Nasmyth, of Manchester, England, who has devoted much time and attention to observations on the lunar surface, remarks as follows.† "Having, in my travels, seen the actual results of volcanic action, extinct and active, I think I can comprehend what I observe on the moon, and trace the analogy where it is applicable, and where it is not, in respect to similar evidences in the moon. To give you all my reasons, would exceed

\* Principles of Geology, First American Edition, vol. ii., p. 176.

† Letter to the Rev. Mr. Crampton, dated November 5, 1858.

the limits of your patience and my present opportunity; but I may convey to you one of my most definite and strong convictions, in a few words, namely, *that I do not believe there is one of the countless thousands of volcanoes, whose craters bespatter the lunar surface, in action, or has been in action for thousands of ages past.* I am vain enough to think I have got the right view of the true nature of volcanic action; and it is a view which close observation of the phenomenon, in all its phases, has impressed on me; namely, *that volcanic action is an expiring phenomenon*, having for its cause and source great cosmical principles, quite independent from any mere chemical action; and, in that view, I consider molten lava, and the heat of volcanic action, to be nothing less than the residue of that igneous state through which *all* planets have passed, in their cosmical history, from the earliest moments of their creation to the present time. And, in this view, if our globe be permitted to exist, in its present condition, for ages to come, volcanic action as an active phenomenon will dwindle away, and finally cease to exist,—the solid crust of the earth so increasing in thickness as to prevent the issue of any of the yet remaining molten matter from its interior.

“The moon, from its small mass, and proportionally great surface, must have cooled down vastly more rapidly than the earth; and all have been dead, tranquil, and silent, for countless ages, ere we had passed over our rampant volcanic era, of which our most tremendous modern volcanoes are but mole-hills in comparison. Look at Antrim, and the north-west of Scotland,—the remains of vast successive sheets of lava! belched forth from age to age, even in a comparatively recent geological period,—*i. e.*, *after* the chalk formation! it was well and benevolently ordained that man should not be called forth ere all this dread period was past and over. In my opinion, no changes whatever are in progress in the moon,—*no water, no atmosphere;* therefore, *no soil, no vegetation, and no inhabitants.*”

The question as to the existence of a lunar atmosphere has been much discussed. Cassini's assertion, referred

to by Sir David Brewster,\* in regard to the change produced in the figure of Jupiter, Saturn, and some of the fixed stars, when they approached the moon's limb, are not confirmed by the recent and more trustworthy observations of Nasmyth, and others, made with superior instruments. The celebrated Schroeter thought his observations indicated the existence of such an envelope; he even claimed to have measured the altitude of the denser or lower stratum, and also the utmost limit at which the superior portion has density sufficient to effect sensibly the light of the fixed stars. The former he fixed at one third of a mile; the latter at about one mile and one third, or considerably less than the elevation of some of the lunar mountains. On the other hand, certain phenomena noticed by Sir William Herschel during the solar eclipse of September 5th, 1793, led the latter to an entirely opposite conclusion. Subsequent observations have thrown still further discredit on Schroeter's inferences; and at the present time the weight of authority is *against* the existence of a lunar atmosphere. The mode of testing this interesting question, has been often explained. It is well known that a ray of light, in passing from one medium to another of different density, is refracted, or bent out of its course; and that an object is always seen in the last direction in which the light from it enters the eye. Owing to this cause, the heavenly bodies are actually visible when some minutes below the horizon. Again, as the moon frequently eclipses the fixed stars which lie along her path, it is evident that in case she is surrounded by an atmosphere like that of the earth, the light of the stars must be refracted in passing through it. The effect of such refraction would be to shorten the time of occultation. The difference between the calculated and observed period of obscuration would, of course, depend on the density and extent of the refracting medium. Indeed, with a certain degree of density no occultation of the fixed stars by the moon could take place. Now, it is found that at the moment of contact with the moon's edge, the light of

\* *More Worlds than One*, p. 112.

a star is not perceptibly bent from its rectilinear course. It is demonstrable, therefore, that if our satellite has an atmosphere, *its density cannot be greater than that of the air in what is termed the exhausted receiver of an air-pump.*

In regard to the habitability of our satellite, Sir David Brewster remarks as follows: "We cannot discover with the telescope any traces of living beings, or any monuments of their hands, though we hope it will be done with some magnificent telescope which may yet be constructed."\* Again: "The moon certainly has neither clouds nor seas; but this is no reason why she may not have an atmosphere, and a precipitation of moisture upon her surface, sufficient for the support of vegetable life. The moon may have streams, or even rivers, that lose themselves, as some of our own do, either in the dry ground, or in subterranean cavities. There may be springs too, and wells sufficient for the use of man; and yet the evaporation from the water thus diffused, may be insufficient for the formation of clouds, and consequently, for the production of rain. The air may be charged to such a small extent with aqueous vapor, that it descends only in gentle dew, to be absorbed by vegetation, and again returned to the atmosphere. Even in our own planet there are regions of some extent where rain never falls, and where the aqueous vapor in the atmosphere descends only in refreshing dew."†

The question in regard to the existence of an atmosphere has been already disposed of. We will now briefly examine Dr. Brewster's assertion that there may be "streams or even rivers" in the moon, and that "there may be springs too, and wells sufficient for the use of man." It is well known that the temperature at which water boils, depends upon the pressure of the superincumbent atmosphere. As this pressure is gradually removed in the receiver of an air-pump, the point of ebullition is proportionally lowered; when the exhaustion is rendered as complete as possible, water boils at a temperature of seventy-five degrees, or more than twenty degrees *below blood-heat*; even at much lower degrees of

\* *More Worlds than One*, p. 30. † *Ib.*, p. 108.

temperature it evaporates with great rapidity. *The permanent existence of water, or any similar liquid on the lunar surface is, therefore, evidently impossible.* In regard to the statement that "the air may be charged to such a small extent with aqueous vapor, that it descends only in gentle dew," etc., we need only remark that the extent of the vaporous atmosphere would be limited by the quantity of fluid to be evaporated; and as to the descent of such vapor in dew, etc., the author, of course, can only mean that this occurs on the hemisphere turned away from the sun. How could vegetation be sustained during the two weeks of cloudless, fierce, unmitigated sunshine? All moisture would be exhaled from the soil, from plants, and even from animal bodies.

To the question, therefore, whether the moon is inhabited, we can only reply, if so, it is by *breathless, bloodless, moistureless* beings, the mode of whose existence we cannot possibly comprehend. If asked, was it created solely for the benefit of our world, we are compelled to acknowledge our inability to answer. It may have been the abode of animated existence long before man was placed upon our planet; or, for aught we know, it may hereafter be fitted for the residence of rational and intelligent inhabitants. This, however, can be nothing more than idle and profitless speculation.

The adaptation of the mass and distance of our satellite to the physical constitution of the earth, is a striking evidence that the arrangement was adjusted by an intelligent, designing Cause. The moon's mean distance from the centre of our planet, is equal to sixty terrestrial radii; while, with a single exception, the distances of all other known secondaries are less than thirty times the radius of their respective primaries. That of the first satellite of Saturn, expressed in equatorial radii of the planet, is no more than 3.36. Had a similar relationship obtained in regard to the distance of the moon, her attractive influence on the waters of the ocean would have been many times greater than at present, and, as a necessary consequence, the tides must have overflowed many parts of the earth's surface. Had her distance, like that of the first satellite of Jupiter, been equal to



*sis* radii of the primary, her power of attraction would have been one hundred times greater than that which she actually exerts. In such case, immense tidal waves, hundreds of feet in height, would have swept over the surface of the planet, rendering it unfit for the residence of man.

---

ARTICLE V.

THE AUTHORITY OF ECCLESIASTICAL RULERS.

[CONTINUED.\*]

Every duty includes the necessary and proper means of performance. The authority of ecclesiastical rulers in reference to the public worship of God, is included in their authority in reference to the ministry of the gospel.

With these explanations, we maintain, *that the power to govern the church, as committed to the eldership, relates to the ministry, and to discipline, and to nothing else.*

In support of this doctrine, we have already appealed to the word of God. No *evidence* really applicable to the subject, can be derived from any other source. Still, it is an interesting question, both to ourselves and to many of our readers, how far the views exhibited are in accordance with the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. On that inquiry we now enter.

In the Form of Government, Chap. ii, Sect. 4., we find the following definition:

“A particular church consists of a number of professing Christians, with their offspring, voluntarily associated together for divine worship and godly living, agreeably to the Holy Scriptures; and submitting to a certain form of government.”

The powers of government are necessarily limited by the ends for which the society exists. Hence, as a

\* This article follows as the sequel of one published in the preceding number of the Review. The author alone is responsible for the conclusions to which he has arrived.—*Eds. S. P. REVIEW.*

church exists "for divine worship and godly living," her rulers can have no rightful authority beyond what is needful for these purposes. Here, then, our doctrine is irresistibly implied.

Chap. viii., treats "*of Church Government and the several kinds of Judicatories.*" It contains two actions, of which the first relates to the several kinds of judicatories. The second is as follows :

"These assemblies ought not to possess any civil jurisdiction, nor to inflict any civil penalties. Their power is wholly moral or spiritual, and that only ministerial and declarative. They possess the right of requiring obedience to the laws of Christ, and of excluding the disobedient and disorderly from the privileges of the church. To give efficiency, however, to this necessary and scriptural authority, they possess the powers requisite for obtaining evidence and inflicting censures. They can call before them any offender against the order and government of the church ; they can require members of their own society to appear and give testimony in the cause ; but the highest punishment to which their authority extends, is to exclude the contumacious and impenitent from the congregation of believers."

This is evidently intended for a general description, including all the lawful powers of church government. Now, let it be observed that, with a single exception, all the affirmative clauses relate exclusively to discipline and the means necessary for exercising discipline. "They possess the right of requiring obedience to the laws of Christ"—this is the excepted clause. This comprehends, not only discipline, but proper means for securing to the people instruction as to the laws of Christ. It comprehends, therefore, their authority in reference to the ministry. But does it comprehend authority in reference to any means of religious instruction distinct from ministerial functions ? This is the only question that can be asked ; and the answer is easy. The powers of the several judicatories are particularly defined in the succeeding chapters ; but we find not a word about those powers extending to other means of religious instruction. We know there are relations, not ecclesiastical in their nature, that of parent, for example, which involve an

obligation to afford religious instruction ; and the duties of those relations constitute a part of the law of Christ, to which ecclesiastical rulers are to require obedience. But it is one thing, to censure a man for the manifest neglect of the duties of his station ; and it is another, to place him in a new relation by ecclesiastical authority.

In chapter ix., sec. 6, the duties of Session are pointed out :

“The Church session is charged with maintaining the spiritual government of the congregation ; for which purpose, they have power to inquire into the knowledge and Christian conduct of members of the church ; to call before them offenders and witnesses, being members of their own congregation, and to introduce other witnesses where it may be necessary to bring the process to issue, and where they can be procured to attend ; to receive members into the church ; to admonish, to rebuke, to suspend or exclude from the sacraments those who are found to deserve censure ; to concert the best measures for promoting the spiritual interests of the congregation ; and to appoint delegates to the higher judicatories of the church.”

Should the reader find difficulty in understanding the proposition that the session has power “to enquire into the *knowledge* of members of the church,” let him examine the Directory for Worship, chap. ix.

*To concert the best measures for promoting the spiritual interests of the congregation.*—This is the only remaining clause that can for a moment be thought to be inconsistent with our theory. It shall be considered hereafter.

The powers of Presbytery are thus defined :

“The Presbytery has power to receive and issue appeals from church sessions ; and references brought before them in an orderly manner ; to examine and license candidates for the holy ministry ; to ordain, install, remove, and judge ministers ; to examine and approve or censure the records of church sessions ; to resolve questions of doctrine or discipline seriously and reasonably proposed ; to condemn erroneous opinions which injure the purity or peace of the church ; to visit particular churches for the purpose of inquiring into their

state, and redressing the evils that may have arisen in them; to unite or divide congregations, at the request of the people, or to form or receive new congregations, and in general to order whatever relates to the spiritual welfare of the churches under their care.”—Chap. x., Sec. 8.

Here are several particulars relative to the power of Presbytery over the church session: these will create no difficulty as to our present subject. A variety of particular powers was formerly shown to be comprehended in our definition of the authority of ecclesiastical rulers. A full enumeration, however, was not attempted; the whole design was to exemplify the mode of applying our general proposition. Let the remarks then offered, be compared with the passage just quoted, and but little will remain to be explained. We dwelt somewhat at large on the power of visitation—the power to *visit particular churches, etc.*,—and shall only add at present, that the principal class of cases to which this constitutional provision is applicable, is described in Form of Government, chapter xvii.; at least, while that chapter remains in the Constitution, this clause can never be shown to imply any thing inconsistent with the doctrine which limits the authority of ecclesiastical rulers to such matters as relate to the ministry of the gospel, and the discipline of the church.

There is but one other clause on which it will be needful for us to make any remarks—“*in general to order whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under their care.*” The meaning will be sufficiently obvious, if we attend to the texts of Scripture appealed to in support of the proposition. They are the following: Eph. vi., 18: “Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints.” Phil. iv., 6: “Be careful for nothing: but in every thing by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God.” These passages, it will be observed, contain not a syllable about ecclesiastical rulers, or their authority. How, then, do they sustain the proposition with which they are here connected? Thus: They inculcate the general duty of prayer, or the wor-

ship of God,—public worship, of course, included. . And if public worship is to be celebrated, there are some things necessary to be done by public authority, that it may be celebrated in a convenient, orderly and edifying manner : these, it is evident from the nature of the case, must be done by ecclesiastical authority. Such are the things meant by the phrase, *whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the church, under their care.*” Accordingly, it stands in immediate connection with an enumeration of some of the things intended, and in support of which, the same texts of Scripture are appealed to,—“*to unite or divide congregations, at the request of the people, or to form or receive new congregations.*”

In a similar manner we understand the power of the church, session, *to concert the best measures for promoting the spiritual interests of the congregation.*” they must employ suitable means to secure the due celebration of the worship of God. For, as no passage of Scripture is appealed to in connexion with this specification, its striking similarity to the one just examined is sufficient proof that it rests on the same texts, and must therefore be understood in the same manner.

It can hardly be necessary to repeat that, according to the constitution, ecclesiastical rulers have no rightful authority beyond what can be proved from Scripture to have been committed to them by the Lord Jesus. Moreover, no intelligent Presbyterian ever thinks of appealing to Scripture for the distinction between the Presbytery, the Synod, and the General Assembly. That *distinction* rests solely on considerations of convenience and expediency; and the powers of these several kinds of judicatories are to be established by the same texts. Connected with the chapter on the Synod is the following note: “As the proofs already adduced in favour of a Presbyterian Assembly in the government of the church, are equally valid in support of a Synodical Assembly, it is unnecessary to repeat the Scriptures to which reference has been made under chap. x, or to add any other.” With that on the General Assembly, the following: “The radical principles of Presbyterian Church government and discipline are: that the several different con-

gregations of believers, taken collectively, constitute one church of Christ, called emphatically *the church*;—that a larger part of *the church*, or a representation of it, should govern a smaller, or determine matters of controversy which arise therein;—that in like manner, a representation of the whole should govern and determine in regard to every part, and to all the parts united; that is, that *a majority shall govern*: and consequently, that appeals may be carried from lower to higher judicatories, till they be finally decided by the collected wisdom and united voice of the *whole church*. For these principles and this procedure, the example of the apostles, and the practice of the primitive church, is considered as authority. See Acts xv., to the 29th verse; and the proofs adduced under the last three chapters.” Accordingly, the powers of the General Assembly (like those of the Synod,) are enumerated, without references to the texts by which they are believed to be supported. Hence, resting on the same principles, and on the same passages of Scripture with the powers of the Session and the Presbytery, they do not require to be separately examined.

The rightful authority of ecclesiastical rulers relates to the discipline of the church; to the ministry of the Gospel, including the public worship of God; and to nothing else. This, we think, was formerly shown to be the doctrine of Scripture. We have now seen that it is the doctrine of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church—irresistibly implied in the definition of a particular church—irresistibly implied in the comprehensive definition of the powers of ecclesiastical judicatories. We have seen, too, that it is strictly adhered to in defining the powers of the Session and of the Presbytery; and if anything inconsistent with it is claimed for either the Synod or the General Assembly,—which, however, we are confident, is not the case,—such a fact can be rationally accounted for only on the supposition of mistake or inadvertence. We say, then, to every minister in our connexion, whether the argument *which we have adduced* from Scripture be conclusive or inconclusive, you are already committed to the doctrine we have laboured to establish. It is the doctrine of that form of government of which you have solemnly and publicly declared

your approbation; and from its very nature it must constitute one of the most important features of any system of ecclesiastical government of which it forms a part.

III. It now remains to indicate some of the applications of the principles already asserted.

1. *They exhibit, as we conceive, the proper distinction between ecclesiastical and voluntary action in benevolent enterprizes.* We adopt this phraseology—*ecclesiastical and voluntary*—in accordance with common usage, without intending to commit ourselves to its accuracy. An enterprise is said to be conducted ecclesiastically, when it is conducted by the rulers of the church, *officially*; that is, on the ground of their authority to rule the church; hence it seems to follow, that no member of any church committed to their care, can be regarded as unconcerned in, or unconnected with, such an enterprise. Connexion with it, more or less intimate, is implied in the very fact of being a member of the church. A voluntary enterprise is one with which no one is in any way connected, except in virtue of his own consent to be so; those who direct its affairs do so, because they have been designated to that particular service, and not on the general ground that they are rulers in the church of God.

That ecclesiastical rulers may not claim any authority which Christ has not connected with their office—that they must use all necessary and proper means for performing the duties to which he has appointed them—and that, without a warrant from Christ, no man may control, trammel, or in any way interfere with them in the performance of their official duties, are truths equally obvious and unquestionable. They all flow directly from the supremacy of Christ in his church.

Now, according to the law of Christ, there is no public authority committed to mortals, for, judging of any man's qualifications for the office of the Gospel ministry, or of any question pertaining to his induction into the sacred office, except the official authority of ecclesiastical rulers. Hence it follows, that *whatever ought to be publicly done on the subject of ministerial education, ought to be done ecclesiastically.*

We beg to be distinctly understood. We are not ques-

tioning any man's right to appropriate his own funds in such manner as he may think expedient. Matters stand thus: It is evident that the Lord does not select all his ministers from any one class in society. Many are called, who are poor in this world. Hence the need of some public and extensive provision for those who need pecuniary assistance in pursuing the requisite courses of preparatory study. The magnitude and importance of the work ought to secure the coöperation of every member and every friend of the church. In nearly every case, it is impossible for the donor to select the person on whose education his contribution shall be expended, or even to know who he is. The motive must be, not kindness to the individual, but love to the church,—a desire to use suitable means for the increase of the ministry. A power of selection, then, must be lodged somewhere; and it cannot possibly be lodged either with the contributors severally, or with them all, collectively. This power, it will be seen, involves a very solemn responsibility. Moreover, it necessarily carries along with it extensive authority over the students aided; as disobedience on their part may, at any time, be punished by the withdrawal of the assistance on which they depend.

Now, if any such system ought to be adopted,—if the power here described ought to be exercised at all,—it ought to be held inseparable from the power of ordination. It ought to be lodged with the rulers of the church, or nowhere. The object is not bounty to individuals. It is to provide a ministry for the church. It relates directly to the highest and most sacred of ecclesiastical offices. The subject is purely ecclesiastical. It concerns the church *in her organized capacity*. Power over it is necessarily ecclesiastical power. To say that it can be rightfully exercised by any body of men having no power to rule the church of God, is an absurdity. And on the other hand, a general commission to rule and take care of the church of God, must cover this subject, unless some special and satisfactory ground of exception can be found.

The power of ordination derives its significance and importance from this, that it is a power to judge of the qualifications of those who aspire to the ministerial of-



fi ce,—to judge in behalf of the church,—to judge authoritatively,—to judge in the name of the Lord Jesus. None, it is evident, should attempt to exert any authority in this matter, who cannot show a warrant from the Lord Jesus for doing so. Equally certain is it, that no voluntary society has such a warrant. It may be composed exclusively of persons who are members of the church—of persons who are officers in the church—still, a voluntary society is not an ecclesiastical body, and, therefore, can have no right to do ecclesiastical acts. If it may rightfully claim authority to do anything towards determining who shall be ministers, we know not how that authority is to be limited, or why it may not ordain men to the ministry.

The conclusion is not avoided by saying, that the society does not judge of a man's fitness to be invested with the ministerial office; but only of his fitness to be trained for it. No Presbyterian imagines that it is either necessary or proper, in ordinary cases, that a man should complete his course of preparatory study, before being taken under the care of Presbytery as a candidate for the ministry. From the moment of his introduction to Presbytery, till his course of study is completed, the Presbytery necessarily judges of his fitness to be trained for the ministerial office; nor can any reason be assigned why it should be held proper for him to be taken under the care of an educational society as an expectant of the ministry, sooner than he may be taken under the care of Presbytery in the same character. He who, in the specific character of an expectant of the ministerial office, is supported, in whole or in part, by the public funds of the church, is, so far as this subject is concerned at least, a candidate for the ministry; and to place a man in that relation, is as obviously an exercise of ecclesiastical power, as to ordain him. The power of the eldership to judge of his qualifications for the ministerial office, includes the power to judge of his qualifications to be trained for that office, whenever a public decision of this latter question is called for.

A voluntary society for ministerial education, it is obvious, may greatly trammel Presbytery in the exercise of her undoubted powers,—may accept candidates

whom she would reject,—may reject those whom she would regard as the most promising,—may give to those under her care directions which Presbytery cannot approve, and make compliance a condition of the continuance of her assistance. If Presbytery will not yield, the results must be the disappointment of the hopes of the church as to the increase of the ministry, and the virtual perversion of the funds designed for ministerial education.

Let us not be told that, if the officers of the society are suitable men, these results are not to be apprehended? No man is fit to be entrusted with unwarrantable authority in the Church of Christ. Checks of the kind here contemplated are, certainly, unwarranted by the word of God; accordingly, they are utterly unknown to every ecclesiastical constitution with which we are acquainted. But unless something of this sort is intended, we can conceive of no reason why the general care of ministerial education should be committed to voluntary societies, rather than to ecclesiastical rulers in their official capacity.

If the views already exhibited are correct, *the work of missions, both foreign and domestic, ought to be ecclesiastically conducted.* We have already had occasion to notice an inspired precedent, which we deem absolutely decisive of this question. The Divine appointment of Saul and Barnabas to the work in which they were about to engage, was indubitable and notorious. No case of the sort has since occurred, in which the official interposition of church rulers might so plausibly have been pronounced superfluous and improper. But the Holy Ghost said to the assembled prophets and teachers, "*Separate me, Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them.*" And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, *they sent them away.*"

But let us contemplate this subject in the light of general principles. For the purposes of the present discussion, it may be assumed, that he who goes forth to preach the gospel where, as yet, it is unknown, and to plant churches where none previously existed, does not go as a private person. He is to do something beyond

the exercise of those common rights which belong to him merely as a man. He goes as an ecclesiastical officer—goes for the purpose of doing official acts. Now, why is the intervention of ecclesiastical authority necessary in constituting the *Pastoral* relation? Why is a Pastor ecclesiastically responsible in his official capacity? The only reason is, that his office is ecclesiastical in its nature. And this reason, we now see, applies just as strongly to the Missionary as to the Pastor. If a voluntary society may designate a Missionary to a particular field of labour, it is impossible to assign a reason why she may not install a Pastor over a particular congregation. We speak of ministers who are to exercise their ministry, either in heathen lands, or in other regions hitherto destitute of the public means of grace. Their respective fields of labour must be assigned; they must receive proper instructions as to their work; a general supervision must be exercised over their official proceedings. If these are not acts of ecclesiastical authority, there are no conceivable acts to which that phrase is applicable. Now, to claim ecclesiastical authority for a voluntary society, is an absurdity too glaring for refutation. To the church in her organized capacity, such a society, no matter who may be her members, is a foreign body. What possible right, then, can such a society have to hold church officers responsible, or in any way interfere with them, in their official capacity?

We here repeat what we conceive to be the great first principle of ecclesiastical polity. Since the Lord Jesus is sole Head and King of the church, no mortal can rightfully claim or exercise any ecclesiastical authority, without a warrant from him. Apply this principle to the present question, and the conclusion is alike obvious and irresistible.

It may be proper to add that the views here expressed are in full accordance with the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church.—See Form of Government, chap. xviii.

The ground on which we plead for ecclesiastical action on the subjects of Missions and Ministerial Education, let it be observed, is that these subjects relate to the Gospel ministry; they call for the exercise of author-

ity in reference to the sacred office; and such authority is necessarily ecclesiastical in its own nature. Now, we decidedly object to the ecclesiastical control of any enterprise of general benevolence, to which the same consideration does not apply. It has been shown, we think, that the rightful authority of ecclesiastical government extends to discipline, to the ministry of the word, (including public worship,) and to nothing else. Ecclesiastical discipline is confined to members of the church; and is in its own nature inapplicable to the class of subjects now in view. It follows that *in endeavoring to reach and profit those who are without, church rulers can use no power, except the power which Christ has committed to them in reference to the ministry.*

Within the last few years, zealous efforts have been made in the Presbyterian Church, in this country, to establish schools, academies and colleges, under the control of ecclesiastical judicatories, the end sought being, not *ministerial*, but *general* education. As part of the same system, provision has been made for educating, under the pecuniary patronage of an ecclesiastical Board, persons who have no expectation of becoming ministers, and who are not even professors of religion; a Miscellaneous and Teacher's Department has been instituted.

Now, if we are right in our views of the limits within which the rightful exercise of ecclesiastical authority is confined, this whole system is evidently wrong. In this instance, ecclesiastical authority is extended beyond public worship, the ministry of the Gospel, and the discipline of the church; nor is the extension justified by any obvious relation of the subject to these matters; it is not so much as claimed to be a necessary and proper means to these ends.

But whatever may be thought of our views on the topic just alluded to, all who are interested in the present question will, no doubt, admit that Christ is the sole foundation of ecclesiastical authority. The system, therefore, must be condemned, unless it can be shown that he has committed the control of such institutions as we are accustomed to denominate schools, academies, and colleges, to the office-bearers of his church, in their official capacity. We insist that this be shown; and we

beg the reader to observe, that the question relates directly to the *officers*,—the *rulers* of the church. Any general representation of the rights and duties of the church—whether accurate or inaccurate—will be totally irrelevant, unless it can be shown, on some acknowledged principle of Scripture or common sense, to imply a specific duty for the *rulers* of the church. That duty is, to control schools, academies, and colleges. It must be shown that the control of such institutions is included in the duty of *governing the church*; for, we think, it will be admitted that ecclesiastical rulers, as such, have no authority to govern anything else.

A further view of this subject is suggested by the following remarks. They are from the pen of the late Rev. Dr. Miller. And, we presume, their correctness will not be disputed among intelligent Presbyterians:

“The church has no power to control, even her own members, *in any other concerns than those which relate to their moral and spiritual interests*. She has no right to interfere with their political opinions; with their domestic relations; or with any department of their secular pursuits. As long as they infringe no law of Christ’s kingdom, it is no part of her sacred trust to call in question or censure their course. It cannot be too frequently repeated, or too constantly remembered that Christ’s kingdom is not of this world, and can never authorize its rulers to be ‘judges and dividers’ in the temporal concerns of men. Yet, if a member of a Christian Church, in the course of his political conflicts, or his professional avocations, be visibly and palpably chargeable with a departure from purity, either in faith or practice, it is incumbent on the church to call him to an account; not for his political partialities, or his secular employments, but solely for his moral delinquency.”\*

*The church, then, “has no right to interfere with any department of the secular pursuits,” even of her own members.* Now, when one is teaching or learning grammar, arithmetic, geography, etc., is he, or is he not, engaged in a secular pursuit? We think there can be very little difficulty in answering the question; and an affirm-

\* See Spruce Street Lectures, pp. 191, 192.

ative answer leads directly to the conclusion we are endeavoring to maintain.

It may be alleged, that this objection applies to the ecclesiastical control of *ministerial* education, at least during its earlier stages. The reply is easy: We advocate such control, so far only as it is a necessary and proper means of exercising, with due freedom, the power of ordination. Let a similar and equally decisive plea be urged in favor of the ecclesiastical control of general education, and we will yield our objection.

The advocates of the new system are certainly under obligation to prove, that the institutions in question are, or ought to be, religious, as distinguished from secular, in their own nature and primary design. But the proposition admits of no proof, and is directly contradicted by the common sense of mankind. Reasons entirely satisfactory may readily be assigned, for introducing religious exercises and religious instruction; but when a parent sends his son to an ordinary day-school, an academy, or a college, the end immediately and primarily in view, uniformly is, the improvement of that son in human learning; and the course of study adopted in all such institutions will be found to accord with this remark.

It has never yet been proved from Scripture, nor do we think it ever will be proved, that every distinctively religious exercise or enterprise ought to be under the official supervision and control of ecclesiastical rulers,—or that no religious instruction can be lawfully given without such supervision and control. But suppose this proved, would it justify the interference of ecclesiastical rulers with the other exercises and interests of schools and colleges? As well might it be argued that, because *Congress* needs a Chaplain, therefore, the members of *Congress* ought to be ecclesiastically appointed.

In reading what has been urged in favor of the system now under consideration, we have sometimes been much perplexed. \* We have met with propositions and trains of reasoning, which we could understand in no other sense than as decrying the distinction between scientific and religious truth. Such a sentiment we are extremely unwilling to impute to fathers and brethren,

whose piety and general wisdom command our unfeigned veneration. It leads to the radical error of Romanism, a denial of the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a guide in our religious faith; for certain it is, that the Bible does not contain a system of either chemistry or mathematics. If there is, indeed, no ground for this distinction, then, an error in natural science is, of course, a heresy in religion; and to the prevalence of this very principle, as one of the chief causes, do we ascribe the darkness and corruption of the middle ages.

But we cannot suppose the writers alluded to mean less than this; that the truths of religion and those of human science are so intimately connected, that he who would teach the former effectively, must necessarily teach the latter, and teach them in their whole extent.\*

Suppose an absolute necessity that both classes of truths be taught to the same persons. This would not be sufficient to justify the system we are examining; because it is a matter of daily experience, that different wants of the same person are supplied by different instruments and agents. A necessity must be shown that these two classes of truths be taught *by* the same persons, and under the same authority. On this principle, then, every pastor is bound to give his congregation a full course of instruction in natural science; and, indeed, in every department of human knowledge; he cannot neglect it, and yet teach the people to observe what Christ has commanded. Our Saviour did not *thus* teach either his apostles or the multitude; nor did the apostles, or any other class of inspired men so teach their hearers. We oppose to the theory, therefore, the dictates of common sense, and the example of all inspired teachers of religion, and of the Saviour himself.

This remark suggests another. The advocates of ecclesiastical education are accustomed to appeal with great confidence to the apostolic commission.—(Matt. xxiii: 19, 20.) Now, on the face of the passage two things are obvious: first, that the things commanded to be taught are the truths, not of science, but of religion,—“*all things whatsoever I have commanded you,*”—see

\* See, for example, Dr. Hodge's *Missionary Sermon*.

cond, that this commission relates no more to the young than to the aged,—“*teach all nations.*” Either of these considerations is sufficient to demonstrate the utter irrelevancy of the appeal. But as this text is very often misapplied, we beg leave to pursue the subject a little further. By good and necessary inference, it imposes extensive and important duties, on every member of the church; and indeed, on every hearer of the Gospel. This is readily admitted; but our present inquiry respects its direct meaning, and not the inferences which flow from it. The duties here specified, then, are official duties,—the teaching here enjoined is official ministerial teaching, and no other. To prove this, it is sufficient to observe, that the same persons who are here commanded to teach, are likewise commanded to baptize,—a circumstance which the most careless reader of the words can hardly overlook. If, then, the church, in her organized capacity, is here commanded to teach; the church, in her organized capacity, must baptize. If every member of the church is here commanded to teach, then every member of the church must baptize. If the school-master is here commanded to teach; then, the school-master must baptize. And, if to baptize is an official duty of the ministry, so likewise is the teaching here commanded.

We are often told, that education properly includes much more than instruction in the various departments of human learning. The remark is unquestionably just; but, as connected with the present subject, it is grievously misapplied. Omitting other considerations that might be mentioned, we content ourselves with observing, that inspiration has never described any part of the official duty of church rulers, by the word *education*, or by any term of like import. It enjoins the duty of *bringing up children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*, on parents, not on the elders of the church. Ecclesiastical officers, of course, must enforce this duty, as they must enforce the observance of all that Christ has commanded; but this is a very different matter from substituting themselves for the persons to whom the command is addressed.

What are the *duties* of an office, is one question; what



are the rules of prudence, as applicable to the *manner of performing* those duties, is quite another. With this explanation, which the reader is requested not to forget, we maintain that, according to the law of Christ, the elders of the church owe no duties to the young, which they do not owe to the old; none to children, which they do not owe to their parents. Those services, as rendered to children and youth, may properly be termed a part of *education*,—this term being applied in its more extensive and appropriate signification,—but this is no part of the reason why they are to be rendered. The elders are required *to feed the flock of God—to feed his sheep, and to feed his lambs*. Their duty towards both classes is the same. As to the *manner* of performing it, much regard ought to be had to the variety of age, character, and circumstances; but these varieties affect neither the nature of the duty, nor the end for which it must be performed. During childhood and early youth, the pursuit of human learning is ordinarily the chief secular employment,—an employment as strictly secular as any of those lawful and useful professions which are pursued by older persons; for if it is true that every department of human knowledge bears relation to the *truths* of religion, it is equally true that every department of human action bears relation to the *duties* of religion. It follows that for the elders of the church to claim the official control of the secular studies of childhood and youth, is just as unwarrantable, as for them to claim a like control over the secular employments of manhood. Any general principle which would justify the former, would equally justify the latter.

Perhaps the most popular plea for the system is based on the allegation that religion is not duly taught in State institutions. If the fact be so, the remedy is accordingly obvious. Our civil rulers have never forbidden *voluntary* action on the subject of education. The plea, however, assumes a necessity for the interposition of government, either civil or ecclesiastical; and it is urged that, since the rulers of the State are doing their work in a manner which is defective or objectionable, the rulers of the church ought to take their place. To this mode of reasoning we decidedly object. If once admit-

ted, where will its application end? Suppose our civil rulers shall take it into their heads to abolish capital punishment; why may not our ecclesiastical rulers put murderers to death? On the other hand, why may not civil magistrates ordain men to the gospel ministry, should they discover any fault in the manner in which the ordaining power is exercised by elders? In no conceivable circumstances, as we maintain, may civil rulers, as such, attempt to perform any of the functions of ecclesiastical government; or ecclesiastical rulers, as such, attempt to perform any of the functions of civil government. The Lord Jesus is sole Head and King of the Church. He has limited the authority of her created rulers. Beyond that limit, they have no right to go; and within that limit, civil government can rightfully have nothing to do. Set aside this principle, and Church and State are not only united, but confounded. If, then, the Lord Jesus has given to the officers of His Church a commission to manage the general interests of education, the plea is quite idle. You might as well urge a similar plea in favour of ordination to the ministry by ecclesiastical authority. In either case, you assume a false and absurd principle, for the purpose of supporting a correct conclusion. But, if Christ has not given such a commission to the officers of his Church, the system can admit of no effectual vindication, while the Church is acknowledged to be his kingdom.

Let us apply our principles to another enterprise. It is readily admitted that ecclesiastical rulers ought to use the press, so far as that affords facilities for the convenient and effective performance of the appropriate duties of their office. But are they, in their official character, as rulers of the Church of Christ, called to *the general work* of providing a religious literature,—the *general duty* of supplying the people with religious books?

With certain explanations, which our readers cannot have forgotten, we have attempted to show that the rightful powers of ecclesiastical government extend to nothing but the ministry of the word, and the discipline of the Church. If this be admitted, it decides the question; and further inquiry is unnecessary. But probably many of our readers are not prepared to make this admission.

Let us, then, apply a principle not likely to be disputed among American Presbyterians. *The Church being the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, her created rulers can have no rightful authority which he has not delegated to them.* Now, has he given them this authority? That he has not done so *expressly*, is certain. Is it, then, included in a more comprehensive authority which he has conferred,—a necessary and proper means of fulfilling any duty that he has connected with their office?

So far as we are informed, the affirmative rests solely on the following argument. The Lord Jesus has given to his Church a commission to propagate the gospel; of course, she must use all necessary and proper means for that purpose; and the use of the religious press is such a means.

Now, in what sense are we to understand the first proposition,—that *the Lord Jesus has given to His Church a commission to propagate the Gospel?* It may mean that he has made it the duty of every member of the Church,—of every one of his followers, to *hold forth the word of life*; and for this purpose, to employ all suitable means, so far as they are consistent with the duties of his station, and within the limits of his ability and opportunities. If this be the meaning, it is true, but irrelevant. It surely will not be asserted that obedience to Christ consists exclusively in submission to the eldership; that nothing commanded by *Him* is to be done, except at *their* bidding, and under their official control. The question relates to the rulers of the Church; and, therefore, to make the proposition pertinent, it must be understood as applied to them, *in their official character*: or, (which amounts to the same thing,) as applied to the Church in her organized capacity, and asserting a duty of her government; that is, which she is to perform *through her rulers*.

Is it meant, simply, that the government of the Church is charged with extensive and important duties, intended for the propagation of the Gospel? This, likewise, is true; but, if nothing more is meant, the argument is lost. From this general statement, it does not necessarily follow that the *provision of a religious literature* is

one of *those duties*. And this is the precise thing to be proved.

Of all the senses of which the proposition is susceptible, there is but one, therefore, that, if admitted, will support the intended conclusion. It is, that the Lord Jesus has not only enjoined on the government of his Church certain duties to be done for the promotion of the Gospel, but the *general duty of propagating it*; in other words, that ecclesiastical rulers have such a commission as will authorize them to employ, officially, means adapted to this end, even though there be nothing but this adaptation to connect them with the government of the Church. Now, we expressly deny the existence of such a commission. The only passage we have ever known appealed to in proof of it, is the apostolic commission, (Matt. xxviii : 19, 20,) on which we have already remarked.

Unless, then, the plan under review admits of some better defence than has yet come to our knowledge, its rejection is required by the due recognition of the Lord Jesus, as sole Head and King of his Church.

What that defence will be, we cannot foretell. But, to be effectual, it must establish two propositions.

First. *That the provision of a religious literature is, by Divine appointment, a function of ecclesiastical office.* Now, we have never read a sentence in the word of God which, we imagined, could, by any possibility, suggest this idea to a mind in which it did not previously exist. For the due supply of books adapted to the general purposes of religious instruction, we rely on the operation of a principle already mentioned,—the obligation which binds every man to labour, according to his ability, for the advancement of the cause of Christ. It seems, however, to be one of the clearest dictates of common sense, that there must always be a distinction between official and non-official acts; otherwise the word *office* would have no meaning. If, then, to issue books for the general purpose just indicated, be a function of ecclesiastical office, no man can lawfully do it, except in the character of an ecclesiastical officer. Hence, so far as religious books are concerned, the freedom of the press must be given up.

Second. *That it belongs to the department of ruling, as distinguished from the department of teaching.* On Presbyterian principles, these two duties—ruling and teaching—both belong to the eldership, and, taken together, make up all the duties of the eldership; but the distinction between them is broadly marked, and ought never to be overlooked. There are two classes of elders: to teach, is the principal official duty of one class; and to rule, the only official duty of the other. Every minister is invested with the whole official power of teaching; so that no exercise of this function can possibly require the presence of more officers than one. On the other hand, every act of ruling must be done in an *assembly* of elders; and in every such assembly, elders who are not ministers have a right to sit as members.—Hence, if the publication of religious books be an act of official teaching, it belongs to ministers only; and it belongs to them *severally*; the union of two or more, in any one act of publication, cannot possibly elevate or improve the ecclesiastical character of that act; and the ecclesiastical appointment of a Board of Publication is an anomaly—an irregularity, just as monstrous as the ecclesiastical appointment of a Board of Preaching.

It must be proved, then, that the publication of religious books is an act of ruling, as distinguished from an act of teaching; otherwise, the proof of the former proposition will establish simply this conclusion,—that the right to publish religious books belongs to every minister, and to no man who is not a minister.

Now, so far as we can judge from the nature of the case, it might as well be said that preaching is an act of ruling, and not of teaching, as that the act we are considering is so. In both cases, the end immediately in view, is religious instruction; in reference to neither, as designed for this end, is there any distinction between those who are members of the Church, and those who are not. The instruction is addressed just as much to the latter class, as to the former. Why one should be referred to the function of teaching, and the other to the function of ruling, it is impossible to conjecture. If it can be shown that this singular classification rests on Divine authority, we yield, of course; but nothing short

of this can shield it from the charge of glaring absurdity.

To the importance of a sound religious literature, we are by no means insensible. The regular trade has done much towards supplying such a literature; and, we trust, will yet do much more. The same is true of those voluntary instances in which Christians of different denominations are associated. But we clearly see the need of something more. We do not hesitate to say—it is, indeed, one of our strongest convictions,—that, *in addition to these*, we ought to have denominational institutions; but, though denominational, they should not be ecclesiastical. They should be denominational, in this sense only,—that each should be at perfect liberty to publish on all religious subjects, whether controverted, or uncontroverted; and it would be unreasonable to expect Christians of different denominations to unite in sustaining the same institution, on this principle.

We say, they ought not to be *ecclesiastical*. But here we beg to be distinctly understood. The question we have in view, is a question of principle,—the question of rights. We are not at all disposed to contend about mere names and forms; nor would we lay great stress on a mere question of convenience or expediency. What we contend for, is simply this: that no man ought to be held to be connected with, or concerned in, an institution formed for the purpose here contemplated, otherwise than in virtue of his own consent, freely given; and that such consent is not implied in the fact of being a member, deacon, ruling elder, or minister, in the church.—Every man must be permitted to decide for himself, with what publishing institutions he will be connected, and what books, pamphlets, or papers he will read, write, publish, or circulate, whether singly, or in voluntary association with others. These are matters to which the authority of ecclesiastical rulers does not extend. This last remark is to be understood, of course, in a sense consistent with the general principle that every member of the church is amenable to ecclesiastical discipline for any palpable violation of the law of Christ of which he may be guilty. With only this obvious limitation, we say, the law of Christ gives to ecclesiastical rulers no

authority in matters of this kind. It gives them no authority to act for the church—none to bind the church, in such matters. Hence, for them to assume it, is to act “*as being lord’s over God’s heritage.*” The most careful study of the Constitution would never suggest to any man the idea, that to become a member or an office-bearer in the Presbyterian Church would involve a surrender of his right to judge for himself in these matters. Hence, every office-bearer, and every member does still retain that right.\*

Ecclesiastical government, then, must seek the profit of those who are not members of the church, through the ministry only; of those who are, through discipline and the ministry. Voluntary societies may not presume to determine any man’s relation to the visible church, or to exercise any authority over ministers of the Gospel in their official character, or to intermeddle with the question, who shall be invested with the sacred office, or to authorize a layman to do ministerial acts. But while they do none of these things, they cannot be justly charged with encroaching on the prerogatives of the church.

2. The principles which we have asserted have important applications to *ecclesiastical action on pecuniary matters.*

Some Presbyteries require annual reports as to the payment of Pastor’s salaries. Without recurring to views already expressed, a single consideration will suffice to show that this is unauthorized and improper.

A Pastor’s salary, when due but unpaid, is simply a debt; the pastor is the creditor, and has the same right that other creditors have, to indulge his debtors, or voluntarily relinquish his claim. Such is the obvious dictate of reason; and such is the unequivocal doctrine of the word of God. Nowhere in Scripture is the right of the minister to receive a temporal support from his hearers, more strongly asserted than in 1 Cor. ix.; but the right is assert-

\* The writer has, what seem to him, strong reasons for believing that the Presbyterian Board of Publication rests on principles the opposite of those here advocated. If, on this point, he is in error, he would rejoice to be convinced; as nothing more would be necessary, to make him a devoted friend of that institution.

ed merely as introductory to the statement that, while labouring at Corinth, Paul felt it to be a duty to waive that right. "I have used none of these things: neither have I written these things, that it should be so done unto me: for it were better for me to die, than that any man should make my glorying void."—See also, 2 Cor. xi., 7-10.; 1 Thess. ii., 9, and 2 Thess. iii., 7-9. This doctrine being established, it follows that Presbytery has no more right to institute, unasked, an inquiry into the pecuniary relations subsisting between a pastor and his congregation, than to institute an investigation of any other case of debt subsisting among members of the church. Universally, if a creditor chooses not to enforce his claim, no third party has a right to interfere.

If it be said that Paul was not a Pastor, we admit it, but no pastor has a higher right to receive a support from his congregation, than he declares himself to have to receive it from the Corinthians, while labouring among them. We shall probably be reminded of the promises made by every congregation in our connexion, at the installation of a pastor. Our reply is ready. If the requirement of that promise is not consistent with the teachings of Scripture, it is wrong; and one wrong step will not justify another. If it is in accordance with the word of God—and such we believe to be the fact—then, it is perfectly consistent with the principle for which Scriptural authority has just been adduced.

According to a recent arrangement, the amounts contributed in the several congregations to congregational purposes, are to be reported annually. The several Church Sessions are to report to their respective Presbyteries, and the Presbyteries to the General Assembly. Now, let it be remembered, according to the Constitution, the official powers and duties of elders, and, of course, of the several courts of elders,—relate solely to the spiritual affairs of the church. The care of the temporal affairs of a congregation, belongs to the deacons. We do not say that they never are managed, in fact, by elders; or that such an arrangement is always improper. The language of the Constitution is, "To them, (the deacons,) also, may properly be committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church." But we



do say, there is no authority whatever for regarding the management of them as strictly Sessional business; and the elders are under no constitutional obligation to know more about them than the private members of the church. Admit, then, the right to demand a report on the subject, the demand ought to be made, not of the Session, but of the deacons. This view, it will be observed, applies just as strongly to the measure last considered, as the one now under review.

But we deny that the Assembly has power to make such a demand. The fact that her functions are purely spiritual, we deem decisive of this point. But this is not all. The union of many congregations under a common government, according to the Presbyterian system, relates solely to things spiritual. No man serves more congregations than one, in the character of deacon. Every congregation is independent, so far as its temporal affairs are concerned. Money is contributed for congregational purposes,—is it, in any sense, intrusted to the care of the General Assembly? A large proportion of it is expended on houses of worship; does the Assembly determine the proportion? Are those houses of worship under her control? Are they the property of the denomination at large? Assuredly not. The secular affairs of every congregation are as exclusively its own, as the secular affairs of any member of the church, or of any citizen of the United States, are his own. It follows that the General Assembly has no more right to demand an account of the sums contributed to congregational purposes, than to demand a statement of the income and expenses of every member of the church.

The demand purports to be made in the exercise of a power to rule the church? For what purpose is it made? Is it intended to make the information which may be thus obtained the ground of legislative action? We presume not. What then? We have heard but one answer to this question: It is, that the Presbyterian Church may have due credit for her wealth and liberality. As to the former particular, we observe, that wealth is not one of the elements of Christian character; and therefore it constitutes no part of the glory of a Christian church. As to the latter, our Saviour has express-

ly forbidden us to do anything whatsoever for the purpose of securing a reputation for pecuniary liberality.— See Matt. vi., 1-4. This is, in itself, decisive; but if it is any part of the design to secure larger contributions by means of the increased publicity thus given to such matters, the case is still stronger; here is a direct appeal to a bad motive,—a motive which the Gospel expressly forbids and condemns.

We know the sums contributed to the several Boards of the church, are reported and published. This we deem proper, as a means of preserving the necessary co-intelligence between those Boards and their contributors. All concerned ought to be able to ascertain whether the sums contributed reach their destination. All concerned ought to have the means of comparing the operations of these Boards with the amount of funds placed at their command. But no such consideration applies to the case now before us.

Some of our ecclesiastical judicatories have enacted or enjoined, that contributions to the several Boards of the church, shall be annually solicited in all their congregations; and that all pastors shall stately give account of their diligence in this matter. We deem this measure *peculiarly* objectionable, so far as it refers to the Board of Publication. It assumes that office in the church necessarily implies connexion with that institution; and thus invades the right of private judgment as to the merits of religious books. But we object to it in all its applications.

We object to it, because it is an attempt to connect new duties with the pastoral office. Since the Lord Jesus is sole King and Head of the church, it follows that the duties of the ministry, including those of the pastoral relation, are such only as he has appointed. Every attempt made by mortals to increase, diminish, or alter them, is an invasion of his prerogative. Now, supposing a person already invested with the sacred office, all the authority which this principle will permit church courts to exercise over him, *directly on the ground of that office*, may be summed up in two things: The first is to judge him in reference to any palpable violation or neglect of ministerial duty, with which he may be charged; the

second, to order such circumstances of his ministerial labors,—the place, for example,—as, *from their nature*, require to be authoritatively decided by mortals. Accordingly, the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church defines the powers of Presbytery, as they relate *directly* to ministers, thus: “To ordain, install, remove, and judge ministers.” Now, it will readily be admitted that, according to the law of Christ, every pastor is bound to inculcate all the parts of practical Christianity, of which pecuniary liberality is one; but it surely does not follow, that he is bound to discuss the claims of every particular object of beneficence. He is bound, for example, to inculcate the duty of charity to the poor; but he is not bound to present the case of every particular pauper.

The essential question, then, is, whether, according to the word of God, the pastoral office includes an agency for what are denominated ecclesiastical Boards. This, it is presumed, will not be affirmed; but to deny it, is to admit that the measure in question connects a new duty with the office; which, as we have seen, mortals have no right to do.

We present another objection. Neither membership nor office in the Presbyterian Church, commits one to any opinion as to the merits of the Boards. No expression of approbation is demanded as a condition of either ordination or installation; nor is avowed disapprobation a ground of ecclesiastical censure. Here, then, is an attempt to create an ecclesiastical obligation to advocate what there is no ecclesiastical obligation to approve. The demand of advocacy is not suspended on the approbation of the party concerned. Now, what is this but saying, in effect, you shall plead for these institutions, whether you approve them or not? The measure, we are sure, would never have been adopted in any of our judicatories,—the proposition would never have been introduced, had it been viewed in this light.

This differs widely from the practice which has long prevailed, of appointing a minister to preach before an ecclesiastical Body, in behalf of some benevolent enterprise. These appointments are never made without the consent,—fairly presumed, at least,—of the person appointed. If he disapproves the cause, he can decline

that appointment. Here, then, we have nothing more than an arrangement made by consent of parties.

We would never think of opposing a *recommendation* of annual collections in aid of the Boards of the church. But a mere recommendation is neither an injunction nor an enactment. A pastor may act as an agent for benevolent institutions; nor is this objectionable, provided it prove no obstruction to his activity or usefulness as a minister; but of the fulfilment of this condition, he must be permitted to judge for himself. But the two relations, though they may both be sustained by the same person, are distinct in their nature; and that distinction must not be confounded. The office of pastor cannot be made to include, or imply, the office of agent for the collection of funds.

Against the whole class of measures now under review, there lies, we think, one objection that ought to be decisive. Each of them involves the exercise of an authority which cannot be shown to have been committed by the Lord Jesus to the elders of his church. With only the limitations which have been indicated, we entertain a very ardent attachment to the Boards of the Presbyterian Church. We are anxious to see a great increase of the liberality of the members and friends of the church, in sustaining enterprises of religious benevolence. But the unauthorized extension of church power, we are sure, is not among the means by which that desirable end ought to be sought.

Our views as to the proper limits of ecclesiastical authority, have now been explained, we trust, with sufficient clearness. After much earnest attention devoted to the subject, those views seem to us to be abundantly supported by the word of God, and in full accordance with the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. We are deeply conscious of our own fallibility; and on this subject, especially, we are anxious to bring our present views to the test of thorough discussion. Of angry controversy our abhorrence is ineffable. We desire that the matter may be investigated, in the spirit of fairness, candour, and Christian love.

Of one thing we are sure: the members of our ecclesiastical judicatories are incapable of intentional usur-

pation; nor is there one of them known to us, to whom we are not prepared to apply this remark, with unhesitating confidence; and if what seem to us to be their errors are really such, they are errors which every considerate man is prepared to find associated with the highest degrees of wisdom and goodness known in the present state. If, as we believe, there is a strong tendency to the undue extension of church power, the fact is not difficult of explanation.

The proper extent of that power, is a subject which has been but little studied. A few years ago, the tendency was just the opposite of that which now exists. Voluntary societies—and even mixed societies—conducted our missionary operations, and selected the persons who were to be educated for the ministry at the public expense of the church. This system was found to be attended with serious evils; but it was not duly considered that the work intrusted to those Societies bore an intimate relation to ecclesiastical affairs, and that the same remark does not apply equally to all voluntary associations formed for moral and religious purposes. Nor was it duly considered that, in those Societies, different denominations were united,—a circumstance by no means essential to their character as *voluntary* associations. These distinctions being overlooked, the result was, a violent and indiscriminating prejudice against voluntary associations as such; and, of course, a disposition to place under the management of church courts every enterprise connected with the spiritual or moral improvement of men. Now, this necessarily implies a strong, though unintentional and unconscious, tendency to the undue extension of church power. Its increase, under such a system, will, of course, keep pace with the multiplication of enterprises of pious benevolence.

Further, the supposed *necessity* for placing all religious efforts under the control of church courts, naturally suggests a presumption that there must be a Divine warrant for such an arrangement; and, when this expectation is confident, anything that can be made to assume the appearance of its fulfilment, will readily be received as satisfactory. It is not surprising, therefore, that satisfaction should be obtained without difficulty. And now,

church courts, ecclesiastical rulers, in their official capacity, are invested with a mysterious and awful importance. The agency of the church is the great instrument which God is pleased to employ for the accomplishment of his purpose of mercy to a ruined race; and *their* agency is not only the most important part of the agency of the church,—it now appears to be the portion of it to which all the rest is made directly subservient by a Divine appointment; and declarations which are true of the church are, without scrutiny, transferred to them. It is too obvious to require proof, that whatever tends to increase the relative extent of that portion of the agency of the church which is assigned to her rulers, tends likewise to increase the power of those rulers over the church. Extensive power is indispensable to a government charged with extensive duties. In confirmation of these views, it may be observed, that many seem to regard whatever is subjected to the control of church courts, as invested, by that circumstance, with a mysterious sacredness,—*it is under the control of the church!* And he who questions the competency of ecclesiastical authority to any purpose to which it is proposed to apply it, need not wonder should his love to the church be thought doubtful.

We adopt a different system. Recognizing the Lord Jesus as sole Head of the church, so far as we do his will, and so far only, do we consider ourselves as performing our duty as members of the church. Confident that his word defines, with all needful perspicuity, the offices he has instituted, we insist on adhering to its decision. We would resist, with equal firmness, every invasion of the rightful prerogatives of ecclesiastical rulers, and every extension of their authority beyond the limit which he has assigned. The prosperity of the church for which we pray, consists in the prevalence of truth and holiness. Nor can we join in the indiscriminate condemnation of voluntary societies. Every human being, we believe, is of right free from the authority of every other, in all matters in which an obligation to subjection cannot be proved. Ascertain that an enterprise, good in itself, does not fall within the appropriate sphere of governmental action, and you ascertain that it

belongs of right to the department of voluntary action,—no matter whether it admits of being accomplished by a single individual, or demands the coöperation of millions. And, so far as we have been able to learn, the Scriptures contain not an intimation, that no effort may be made for the salvation of souls, except at the bidding of church courts.

---

#### ARTICLE VI.

##### ELOQUENCE.

The following brief, but appropriate address on Eloquence, was pronounced by his Excellency, Herschel V. Johnson, Governor of Georgia, at the recent commencement of Oglethorpe University in that State, on awarding the annual prizes for excellence in Elocution.

##### *Young Gentlemen of the Sophomore Class:*

It devolves upon me to present to the two successful competitors for distinction in elocution, these appropriate prizes. The duty is both pleasant and painful. It is pleasant to be the organ to express the unqualified approbation, with which the committee of award witnessed the performance of the entire class. Your ease of manner, your gracefulness of gesture, your distinctness of articulation, and your propriety of emphasis, won their unanimous commendation. It is painful to distinguish, where it is so difficult to detect differences in excellence. It is not designed however, by this merited compliment, to announce that you are perfect orators, but rather to encourage you to strive for that eminence of which your present attainment is the prophecy.

Eloquence is a noble art. If it is true, that all science, government and human institutions are subordinate to the Christian system, and that their perfection consists in their conformity to its spirit and doctrines, then Eloquence is not only dignified by the sanction of Divinity, but its mission is commensurate with the interests

and necessities of mankind. The establishment and propagation of Christianity, with all the profusion of its concomitant blessings, so far as depends upon human instrumentality, is mainly a tribute to the power of Eloquence. Next to the grand test of experiment, its great author seems to have staked its success upon *preaching*. "Go ye into all the world and *preach* the Gospel," is the broad commission which honours Eloquence and designates its most exalted field of operation.

The successful competitor at the Olympic pentathlon was crowned with Olive. His return home was greeted with the hosannas of the people and he was drawn in a chariot, like a triumphant warrior. Breaches in the wall were made for his entrance into his native city, and his exploits were embalmed in the beautiful odes of Pindar. If so small a reward stimulated the highest ambition of Grecian youth, strengthened their courage and virtue, and was esteemed more valuable than unbounded treasure, what estimate should we not place upon triumph, in a contest for superiority, in the exalted art of eloquence! How sublime are its achievements, when compared with the victories of the Olympia! Paul a prisoner, charged with sedition, by the power of his eloquence, as he reasoned "of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come," made the cruel hearted Felix tremble upon his throne. Demosthenes roused the Athenians against the crafty and treacherous Macedonian; Cicero shook the Forum, at Rome, in defence of Cluentius, as he rolled his volleys of indignant thunder upon the guilty heads of Salsia and Oppianicus; Henry made the world tremble, as with the throes of an earthquake, when he denounced the tyranny of George III., and inspired his hesitating compatriots with the sublime resolve of "liberty or death."

What then, is this magic power of eloquence? Demosthenes said, it is "*delivery*,"—delivery first, second and last. Perfect delivery consists in distinctness of enunciation, gracefulness and appropriateness of gesture and correctness of emphasis, pause and tone. This description of eloquence is sufficient for mere panegyric, for anniversaries and for all occasions, on which it is the object of the orator to please the fancy, rather than con-



vince the judgment, or excite his auditory to action. Here he exhibits simply the skill of the artist. His Eloquence rolls in honied accent, like the melody of a choral anthem, delighting the senses and diffusing through the soul calm serenity, chastened pleasure or exhilarating joy. It may be majestic; but it is the majesty of the gentle wind, as it loiters along, gathering sweetness from every blossom of the valley and discoursing romantic minstrelsy, as it toys with the branches of the forest, or of the beautiful river that never overflows its flowery banks, and, without rapid or cataract, glides smoothly to the bosom of the ocean.

If asked what are the first, second and third requisites of true Eloquence, I would answer, *knowledge, faith and zeal*,—or perfect mastery of the theme, perfect confidence in the justice and importance of the cause, and intense earnestness in its prosecution. Art may enable the speaker to display finished gracefulness, in gesture and attitude, and faultless propriety in emphasis, pause and tone. These constitute merely the *form* of true Eloquence, but it is beauty without life,—body without soul. Power's statue of Calhoun has the size, the features and the dignity, without the intellect of the great statesman. It is but the conception of the Artist *fixed* in cold, stiff, speechless marble. The form of Eloquence must be warmed by the heart and illumined by the flashes of Promethean fire. Then it can kindle the passion, move the sympathies, subdue the will, subvert thrones, petrify the heart, rouse the multitude to the phrenzy of the tempest and light up the flame of freedom and religion.

Eloquence in its loftiest exhibition contemplates practical results—the action of the audience in the execution of the speaker's purposes. Hence, to convince the judgment, familiar with his theme, the armory of his argument is history, philosophy and the boundless elements of nature. Though he stammer through a halting exordium, and seem to be weighed down by the pressure of his undertaking, yet sustained by confidence in his cause and zeal for its success, he rises with the grandeur of his theme, gathers inspiration from the array of unbidden illustrations that throngs his triumphant march, his imagination corruscates with sublime and majestic image-

ry, and his lip, as if touched with seraphic fire, pours forth his 'thoughts that breathe in words that burn.' As if charged with electricity, he seems the personification of living eloquence. His form erect, his eye flashing the fire of his soul, his action dignified and self-poised, his utterance grand and impressive, his mesmerized audience sympathize with his every emotion, and are bound in captivity to his potent will. Now with magic skill he touches the springs of feeling, and the flowing tear responds to the melting pathos of his overpowering persuasion. Then he turns upon his adversary with a lip of scorn, and glance of indignation, and makes him quail beneath the lash of sarcasm and comic ridicule. Now, to relieve his audience from physical fatigue or mental tension, he throws in the pointed anecdote, and convulses them with laughter. Then, returning to his work, like a giant refreshed by repose, he carries by storm the last entrenchment of his antagonist, and witnesses the evidences of his triumph in the plaudits of the transported multitude. This is not the gentle zephyr that dallies among the tendrils of the clustering ivy; it is the uplifted tempest, levelling the forest and shaking the eternal hills in its march. It is not the gliding rivulet that pauses to kiss every flower that blooms upon its banks. It is the raging torrent that sweeps away every barrier in its course, and plunging over towering crags to boiling depths below, agitates the wilderness with the thunder of the cataract.

But, young gentlemen, true eloquence is not the offspring of the schools. It is the child of Heaven. It has its seat in the soul. Art may cultivate, polish, and refine it; but cannot assign it a Procrustean bed,—cannot bind it by inflexible laws. It refuses restraint; it is superior to the studied attitudes and measured gestures of the schools. It respects the landmarks of instruction, but like the fire-fly, it moves in the light of its own coruscations, and it generates the heat that warms it into potential life and motion. You find it in the Senate and in the Forum, in the pulpit and at the hustings,—indeed, upon every arena where men are to be persuaded to action,—and yet every model differs from all others, and is marked by characteristic peculiarities that give it in-

dividuality and originality. Hence, whilst the rules of art are to be patiently studied, as well as the best models among the dead and the living, yet a servile adherence to the one, or imitation of the other, is fatal to true eloquence. Every man's style of oratory must be his own—it must be his natural delivery and manner, *improved* by art, but animated by native inherent passion. Earnestness is contagious; he who feels deeply will certainly arouse the feelings of his audience; and when he loses sight of himself in the inspiration of his theme, his glowing ideas give birth to language, his passion moulds the features and muscles of the face, lights up the eye, directs the attitude and gesture, and modulates the voice.

Eloquence may be employed for bad purposes. The words of the wicked man are like the arrows of Alcestis; they take fire as they fly, and pierce the heart to wither and wound. Hence, some have objected to its cultivation as an art. But its abuse is no argument against its legitimate use. Its proper end is the vindication of truth, patriotism and religion; and its prostitution by the vicious, is no reason why the good should not exert its loftiest powers to persuade men to practice these ennobling virtues. (Hence, as earnestness on the part of the orator, is indispensable to the production of the highest effect, he must cherish in his own heart the excellencies which he would inculcate and enforce. A speaker can be fired with zeal for truth, patriotism and religion, only in the degree that he feels within himself a conviction of their value and importance.) Then, young gentlemen, if to the artistic graces of delivery you would unite that deep passion which is the soul of true eloquence, preserve your hearts pure from vice, your minds free from error, and cultivate the noblest sentiments by the practice of the noblest virtues. Then your sensibilities will be quick, your sympathies warm and tender, and your impulses exalted and benevolent. Be good as well as eloquent; then you will be pillars in society, and benefactors of your race, and the halo that shall encircle your names will gather lustre with the lapse of time; and the verse that shall embalm them, adapted to notes of heavenly melody, will wake the harpetrings of every succeeding age.

## ARTICLE VII.

## DUTIES OF MASTERS.\*

The incidental relations of Master, growing out of the presence and servitude among us, of the black race, has been to many Southern Christians, one fixed and familiar from childhood, and in the providence of God, may so continue as long as we are in this life. The duties arising out of it, also, are of the most weighty character. The subject, therefore, becomes one of the most important, that can claim the attention of the Southern Church. In it are involved the interests of three millions of dependent people, the prosperity and happiness of that large section of our country, characterized by the presence of the slave, and the innocence or guilt, in the discharge or dereliction of duty, of the thousands who are bound up in this institution. The destiny of the negro race, for wise ends, some of which we can now see, has been bound on to our own; we are constituted their guardians, their teachers, their civilizers. A large portion of our duties as a people, and as individuals, grow out of this trust. We cannot be indifferent to a subject, involving so many responsibilities, and would be inexcusable, did we permit the violence of noisy fanatics on either extreme, to deter us from its consideration and discussion.

There has been, unfortunately, thrown about the subject a delicacy and reserve, which it does not naturally nor properly possess; and therefore, it has not received the attention from those immediately concerned in it, which, from its magnitude, it deserves. In one portion of the union, there is a class of factionists, who are continually disgorge hearts of bitterness and malignity, denouncing with every opprobrious epithet of their corrupt vocabulary, all who are connected with this insti-

\* The substance of this article, was originally delivered in a discourse upon the Fifth Commandment, in a Southern pulpit. Its original preparation for popular discussion, will explain its shape, and also, the reference to the views of a gentleman, understood to be one of the Editors of the Review.

tution, or identified with this section of our confederacy. On the other hand, there is a class, who, repelling with intemperate zeal the charges and designs of these fanatics, oppose the discussion of the subject, and all efforts for the improvement of those, who are the unfortunate occasion of its vituperation and strife. The public mind excited and feverish, and rendered unnaturally and morbidly sensitive by such distempered discussions, good men have been deterred from speaking out boldly, upon the duties we owe to this race. Our duty evidently is, as we stand amid the spray and foam from the meeting of these streams, calmly, dispassionately and conscientiously to consider the whole subject. The subject, as an important department of Christian duty, must not be taken out of the hands of the ministry. If judicious men, if worthy at all to stand in the pulpit, they should be allowed to speak frankly and plainly upon it. A distinguished friend of both the South and the black race, says of one branch of it: "I would recommend to the friends of religious instruction, not to mix it up with questions touching the civil condition of the negroes, (1 Tim. vi: 1-8,) nor turn aside from the main work, to combat incidental evils. Time is wasted, the great cause is retarded and prejudiced. Believe in God—in his providence—in the power of his truth and grace—and go forward. We are to lead this people unto life eternal, through the knowledge of Jesus Christ our Lord. This is the will of God—this is our duty—the great duty of the Southern church.\*

Our course at this time is, throwing aside all the difficult and exciting questions with which the subject is embarrassed, and setting up no defence of the slaveholder, except as far as is involved in the establishment of the duties set forth, but regarding the institution as a matter of fact already existing among us, with which we are connected, to consider our duty growing out of it.

I. It will aid the master in determining many of his duties, and indeed the whole treatment of the slave, to consider and understand closely, the extent and true na-

\* Suggestions on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes, by C. C. Jones, D. D.

ture of the property he has in his fellow-being. The extent of that property, is simply a claim to his services. No other right of the slave is alienated, other than that to his own labour. There is no owning by the master, of the *corpus* and the *anima*. He has no such property in his slave, as he has in the ox or the swine. His soul, his head, his limbs, his heart, still belong to the slave, subject to this one restriction, of service due to another. He has a right to life, to livelihood, to happiness, to marriage, to religion,—to everything consistent with the service he is obligated to render. With the means to secure a livelihood and religion, he has a right to be supplied out of the proceeds of his labor. Every relation in human society imposes some restraint upon personal liberty. The child possesses liberty within the parents' will.

The individual, in becoming a citizen, parts with a certain amount of personal liberty for the general good. He is free, with the restriction of the claim of the State upon him. The slave is a human being, with only the obligation of service to another. This is a fundamental distinction with writers in the defensive upon this subject. "The property of man in man," says Dr. Thornwell, "a fiction to which even the imagination cannot give consistency, is the miserable cant of those, who would storm by prejudice what they cannot demolish by argument. We do not even pretend, that the organs of the body can be said strictly to belong to another. The limbs and members of my servant are not mine, but his,—they are not tools and instruments which I can sport with at pleasure; but the sacred possession of a human being, which cannot be invaded without the authority of law, and for the use of which he can never be divested of his responsibility to God."

"Whatever control the master has over the person of the slave, is subsidiary to this right to his labor; what he sells, is not the man, but the property in his services."\*

"But the gentleman tells us," says Dr. N. L. Rice,† "that the master owns the *man*, not only the body but

\* Rights and Duties of Masters, p. 24. † Debate on Slavery, p. 32, 33.

the *soul*, and that he sells the soul; what use let me ask, does the master make, or what use can he make of the slave, but to claim his labour,—his services?" "By slaveholding then, I understand the claim of the master to the services of the slave with the corresponding obligation of the master," &c.

"When therefore," says a writer in the *Princeton Review*,\* "it is said that one man is the property of another, it can only mean that the one has a right to use the other as a man, but not as a brute, or as a thing. He has no right to treat him, as he may lawfully treat his ox, or a tree. He can convert his person to no use, to which a human being may not, by the laws of God and nature, be properly applied. When this idea of property comes to be analyzed, it is found to be nothing more than a claim of service, either for life, or for a term of years. This claim is transferable, and is of the nature of property, and is consequently, liable for the debts of the owner, and subject to his disposal by will, or otherwise."

"It is true slaves are property," says the Supreme Court of Georgia,† "and by the act of 10th of May, 1770, are declared to be personal chattels in the hands of their owners, and are alienable; but it does not thence follow, that they are mere things, horses, as was contended in argument. This property, or personal chattel, consists in *the right of governing the slave*, subject to such restraints as the Legislature may impose on the master, *and of enjoying his perpetual and involuntary service*. The law has never yet ceased to consider slaves, though thus subject to the government and service of the master, as human beings, subject to its protection, and bound to obey its requirements." According to Paley's celebrated definition, slavery is "an obligation to labor for the benefit of the master, without the contract or consent of the servant."‡

This view, taken by the master, of the nature and extent of his property in him, elevates his slave from the

\* Review of "Slavery, by W. E. Channing," 1836.

† The Judges in Convention, forming the highest judicial tribunal in the State; in the case of the State *vs* Philpot.

‡ *Moral Philosophy*, Book iii: Chapter 5.

place to which he is too often degraded, and places him before him, an immortal being, and a fellow-creature vested with sacred rights. The only claim he has upon him, is for his service; when that is tendered, the obligation is discharged. Included necessarily in the right of service, is the right to enforce it,—to compel obedience to reasonable commands; and if need be, to enforce it with correction; just as the State may enforce its claim upon the citizen, and the parent his claim upon the child. The master may enforce a proper respect of manner, and a regard for morals. Discipline beyond this, is to be condemned, not only because it is a lack of benevolence, but because it is a violation of sacred right. The master has a right to the service of the slave; the slave has all other rights, consistent with this and with the laws of society. It is the bounden duty of the master, to respect those rights, and as the claim he holds upon his slave is so large a portion of that usually esteemed by men, to endeavor to promote his happiness, in the enjoyment of all other rights, remaining and pertaining to him.—(Col. iv: 1.)

II. This relation is to be regarded as belonging to the family, coming under the same general policy and benevolent discipline, regulating the other family relations. It is not so intimate or tender, as that of husband and wife, or parent and child, but the obligations growing out of it, are not less sacred; and while not appealing with the same power to the affections, there is yet that mutual dependence, that permanence, constancy, and intimacy of association, that require its admission within this pale of hallowed ties. Upon an examination of the word of God, and of the arguments outside of Bible history, by which slavery is usually defended, we believe that only in this light, is it capable of defence. To deprive a human being of so important a right, which leaves him in utter dependence for a worldly provision, and for the security of all his other rights, without throwing over him the protection of the family, cannot be justified upon any grounds. The complexity and multiplicity of the engagements of men, demanding a division of labour, may require this character in the family to perform the humbler and more menial labor; but the



moment the relation is placed upon any other ground, than that of convenience and mutual benefit, or withdrawn from the pale of family ties, you erect a pure despotism, no more capable of defence than the serfdom of Russia, which binds the boor perpetually to the soil, subject to the disposal of the crown, or some petty despot; and not so easily defended, as the vassalage of feudal times, which secured to the serving class protection, so valuable in a barbaric age.

Among the servants of the Hebrews, were three classes. The first, were those rendering voluntary service, and receiving wages, or hired servants.\* The second class were those sold for pauperism,† or debt,‡ or crime,§ or children sold by parents,|| or Hebrews ransomed from gentile masters,\*\* and serving without wages for a term of years. These were Hebrews, and always were restored to freedom at the jubilee; so that in no case, could they serve longer than six years.†† The third class, were bondmen, or slaves, held in perpetual servitude. These were bought of the heathen nations around,‡‡ or captives taken in war,§§ and could not be Hebrews,|| except in a case definitely stated of the voluntary abandonment of freedom.\*\*\*

Now, this last class became identified with the family, passed under the same laws and discipline with its other members, were circumcised just as the children of the master; thus, by virtue of their connection with the family, introduced into the Jewish Church.††† These bondmen, observe, were heathen; but we find no such requisition or provision for heathen *hired servants*; and it is clear that some of their hired servants were heathen.‡‡‡ The number of these bondmen held by the patriarchs was very great; and now the number of such servants owned by a single individual, may be large; and in a country where slavery is established, from their multiplication, or the diminution of the personal wants of the family, they may not be literally within the bounds of the family; still the relation was, and must be, predica-

\* Deut. xxiv: 14, 15. † Lev. xxv: 39, 40. ‡ 2 Kings, iv: 1. § Ex. xxii: 3. || Ex. xxi: 7. \*\* Lev. xxv: 47-54. †† Ex. xxi: 2. †† Lev. xxv: 44-46. §§ Deut. xx: 14. ||| Lev. xxv: 42. \*\*\* Ex. xxi: 5, 6. ††† Gen. xvii: 12, 13. ‡‡‡ Deut. xxiv: 14.

ted upon the idea of the family; and when these servants are removed from the person of the master, it must be regarded as a separation of the family.

In the New Testament, the grouping together in several places, of the relations of the family, including those of master and servant, is remarkable and in confirmation of this view of these relations. As in Colossians iii: 18-22, and iv: 1: "Wives submit yourselves unto your husbands. . . . Husbands love your wives. . . . Children obey your parents in all things. . . . Fathers provoke not your children to anger. . . . Servants obey in all things your masters according to the flesh. . . . Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal."

If these views are correct, and they seem to be fair inferences from these passages of Scripture, then it elevates the slave still higher. Not only does he stand before the intelligent master an immortal fellow-being, clothed with rights of the most sacred character, but he is a member of his family; in virtue of the paramount claim upon him, entitled to its protection, provision, sympathy and whatever of general benevolence and kindness prevails towards its other members; ever, however, with a due reference to his position. He is the lowest member, but still a member. And we verily believe, that so long as he discharges his obligation faithfully, next to the great primary relations of the family, his is the great claim on earth upon the master.

III. Upon these two considerations, a third naturally arises, that it is the duty of masters, by all proper and lawful means, to seek to promote the welfare of this class of our fellow-beings, and to secure to them the greatest amount of happiness their condition will admit. We do not know but that with the conscientious performance of the master's duty, they may be made just as happy a class as any other; for if they have peculiar trials, they escape many of the cares that harass our minds; but this only renders the injunction the more important. Our principle should be, *amelioration*,—the softening down of the harsher features in their condition, and the removal of all unnecessary evils. As we look upon the institution as it exists in our midst, we would be blind

not to perceive that there are evils connected with it, to the blacks. There are evils connected with all the relations of life, that of husband and wife, parent and child, apprentice and master; and from its very nature, this is more liable to abuse than any other. But most of the evils of slavery among us, are not inseparable from the relation. A faithful discharge of this general duty, may remove many of them.

There are several ways in which we are to aid in the advancement of the happiness of the slave race. We are to do it, by a proper performance of duty to those in our own families,—providing them with suitable apartments, clothing, food and fuel; affording them sufficient relaxation; respecting their relations among themselves; instructing them; striving to elevate their moral character; and stimulating them by kindness. We are to do it by lending our influence to form a just and healthy public sentiment, that will bear down any, who may treat their slaves with indecency, or inhumanity. We are to do it, by upholding strict church discipline upon all members, who grossly neglect or violate their duty to their slaves. And we are to do it, by aiding to secure the passage of laws, for the protection of blacks, against masters who have no regard for public sentiment. There has been an evident advance upon this subject, in the last few years. Masters generally, are more mindful of the comfort and happiness of their slaves. There is a much sounder, juster public sentiment, respecting the exercise of many of the legal rights of masters. The slave is more protected by law from cruelty, in most of the slaveholding States. In one respect, his privileges have been curtailed in many of the States, by the cruel work of abolitionists, in the circulation of their incendiary publications. To protect the blacks and the whites, against these, laws have been enacted, prohibiting the learning of slaves to read; and even these in some of the States exist only upon the statute book, a mere dead letter. Upon the whole, there has been an advance in legislation, rendering the condition of this portion of our population, more easy and comfortable. But a great deal remains yet to be done. We say it with candor and sincerity. Let us not be swerved from our duty by

the cries and vituperation of fanatics, but let us think and act like Christian men, sensible of our obligations. Our duty as Southern Christians, is to press forward in this work of amelioration,—establishing upon a firmer basis, the happiness of this people, and relieving them from the evils not necessary, or inseparable from their condition as slaves.

IV. The peculiarity of the marriage relation among the slaves, as the most prolific source of the evils of their present condition, claims the especial consideration of the Christian master. It is urged by abolitionists, that slavery necessarily and *per se*, vitiates and destroys marriage, or renders it impossible. We quote from Mr. Blanchard, as representing their views and reasoning upon this subject. "Slavery, adjudges slaves unmarried, and incapable of marriage. It holds the slave pair in separation, ready to be sold apart. He (his opponent Dr. Rice,) tells us, but they are vain words, that the husband and wife are not separated in slavery, unless the master chooses to part them. But if I come to own a man and his wife, are they not already separated so far as the nuptial tie bound them, and ready to be sold apart whenever I will to sell them? Suppose I sell the woman, and the purchaser goes to get her: has he anything to do but to lead her off? Is there anything to be done to separate her from her husband? Obviously nothing. She ceased, by the theory of slavery, to be her husband's *wife*, when she became my *woman*. The property principle is stronger in law and practice, than the marriage principle, and prevails over it." The error of this reasoning, is found in a gross neglect of the distinction between the absurd form of words, "property of man in man," and property in his services, and in an unwarranted abrasion of a right, because it is trampled upon, or not defined by law. No man can have any other claim upon his slave and his wife, than for their service; and the right of permanent marriage relation belongs to them, and is contemplated by the institution, in any benevolent or just view of it, though it be not respected by a ruffian, or, protected by legislative enactment. We need not say to any just or pure-minded man that the slaves are married—married in the sight

of high heaven, and in the esteem of good men,—where with the rites of religion, they have pledged their truth or fidelity. We freely confess, however, that there is an evil, in that the legal definitions of slavery, and of the rights and duties of masters, in the acts of our legislatures, and the utterances of our courts, do not conform perfectly to the true nature of the institution, as recognised by the virtuous and the good; and, also, in that these higher and more benevolent views, founded in natural justice, do not prevail among all the holders of slaves. Whilst this reasoning of abolitionists is false, it is sufficient to suggest to us, that there is a real evil upon which it is founded, and that we are very much at fault upon this head. The marriage relation of the blacks, is not sufficiently respected by blacks themselves, or by the whites; nor is it sufficiently protected by the law of the land. Its binding, permanent obligation, the majority of slaves do not comprehend. They feel a freedom to change their relations at will, or at least with every change of residence. The result of this is, a very low standard of morality among them. Three fourths of our cases of church discipline among them arise from this source. For the proof of this, we may appeal to the sessional records of any church, which has a considerable coloured membership. It is very evident that a reform is needed. This reform must commence with individuals and families. We must respect, ourselves, their marriage relations,—encourage them to form them,—make sacrifices to keep them united,—and encourage them to seek the sanction and solemnities of our holy religion in their marriages. Duty will also carry us further, to seek, as far as practical, to keep together their children. A just public sentiment is forming, and, to a limited extent, already exists, that will not tolerate the man, who, for considerations of a mere pecuniary nature, tears asunder those bound together by the most sacred of earthly ties,—who sets a few dollars against the happiness and sacred right of two human beings. This public sentiment we are to encourage and promote, by all judicious means. The church, as an organization, has a work to do in this reform. It must look closely to the relations of all this class, in their communion. Its

ministers must perform for them, as for their other parishioners, the marriage service, and baptize their children, as they baptize the children of the whites. But there are many unfortunately in our land, who have the control of the happiness of human beings, who cannot appreciate high moral considerations, who are indurated not to fear public sentiment, and who cannot be reached by the church. To protect against such masters, the authority of the State is required. We believe that a law prohibiting the separation of husband and wife, except for crime, by a greater distance than five or ten miles, would secure the best interests of the master as well as the slave, and would be sustained by public sentiment, in most or all of the States of the South. It might have the effect to embarrass this kind of property under certain circumstances, and for the time; it would result, however, in the division of servants more according to families; and by the increased happiness and morality of the slaves, would more than compensate the masters. A gratifying evidence of the advance of public sentiment upon this subject, is furnished in the recommendation by the Governor of Alabama, in his last annual message to the legislature, of the passage of more stringent laws to prevent the separation of mothers from children under ten years of age, and to secure the permanence of the relation of husband and wife.\* We trust the time is not distant, when in every State in which this institution exists, the permanence of the marriage relation among slaves, will be a matter not of caprice, not merely resting upon the benevolence or the moral sense of the master,—but a matter of law.

V. But our greatest and most difficult duty, growing out of our relations to this people, is to supply them with the proper religious instruction. Simple benevolence would establish this duty. God has brought the heathen to our very door. Did we sustain no relation to them, we could not turn away from them; humanity would cry aloud against us: but sustaining the relation we do, this has become, not a matter of benevolence, but

\* With the legislation of the State of Alabama, the writer is not familiar; he is not informed as to the action upon this recommendation.

of justice. We owe it to this people to give them the Gospel; they have bought it by their labour, which, given to us, leaves them without the means of procuring it. It is the great palliative of their condition, considered with reference to their removal from their native, heathen soil, that they have, by the change, come into possession of the knowledge of the true religion. It is our duty to see that they receive the full measure of this benefit, so far as respects the enjoyment of the means of grace. How are we to supply them with suitable religious instruction, is a question of magnitude, which is proposed for our solution. A portion of the answer is plain and easy; but there are problems of great difficulty in the complete determination of the question.

It is the duty of heads of families to provide for the instruction of domestics in their homes. This should be done by reading to them the Scriptures, with simple comments and explanations, and the use of some easy catechism. Especially should the domestics be gathered in at family prayer; and the service should ever have a reference to them. If their number is large, they should still be provided for. Any one who can keep near him, more servants than can be accommodated in a single apartment of the house, is able to construct a room for the purpose. The Sabbath school, in regions where it is practicable, is an important means in supplying this instruction. This agency is practicable, especially in towns and villages, and in communities where planters are resident with their slaves. But, unfortunately, in some sections where the blacks are congregated in greatest numbers, there is an absence of those capable of instructing them. May we not hope, that the time is approaching, when a sufficient knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, to instruct in a school on the Sabbath, those whose labours he superintends during the week, will be deemed by the enlightened planter, a necessary qualification in the manager of slaves?

But the preaching of the Gospel, has been ordained by the Head of the Church, and the Author of salvation, to be the great instrumentality in the religious instruction, and the conversion of men. With this means of grace, therefore, it is our bounden duty to supply this people,

The preaching we give them, should be something more than the noisy, and often unintelligible harangues, they hear from those of their own colour. To leave them to such, would be to leave the blind to be led by the blind. It is rarely that one is found among them at all qualified to be a religious instructor to others. Their very ignorance demands a greater intelligence, to discriminate and adapt communications to their capacities. Besides, they do not entertain for one of their own colour the respect or veneration that will render his ministrations useful to any great extent, and especially, that will qualify him for administering discipline authoritatively.— The general dependance of the race, is exhibited in their turning to the whites for authority in religious, as well as in temporal matters. “The parasite has clung to the wall of adamant.” However the aspiring ones among them may feel, the masses look upon the white man as their natural religious teacher; and if he will go to them, with a simplicity that brings him to a level with their comprehension, in places where they are not embarrassed by the presence of their superiors, and with services in which they are capable of engaging, they will gather around him with interest and affection. The best mode of securing to them intelligent preaching, is a subject deserving the earnest consideration of the church.— Among the modes adopted, there is one which is being abandoned in many of our towns and cities, of providing them seats in the house with the whites. Against this, there lies the very serious objection, that the preaching and other services in our churches, is not adapted to their mental organization or measure of intelligence.— They require a simplicity of preaching, which it is the prerogative of only a high order of genius to combine with an elevation and finish, necessary to retain an intelligent congregation in the present day. Singing is a part of Divine worship, in which, when adapted to them, they engage with great delight: but we are refining the thing away to such a degree, that even the intelligent worshipper, with a book in his hand, is unable to take part in, or appreciate it. What devotion can the poor unlettered negro find in it? The language even of our prayers, is generally so far above them, they are unable



to engage in this part of the service intelligently. This incongeniality of our services, mainly, with the restraining influence of the presence of the whites, the operation of the social feeling in drawing them to congregations of their own colour, and the desire for a worship, some part of which may be performed by themselves, has driven them away from our churches. So, if deemed the most effective and appropriate means of furnishing them preaching, this would not now be practicable.—After relinquishing this, and the hope of supplying them with adequate preaching by those of their own colour, the only method left us, is to follow them to their separate place of worship, with the white preacher. There let them find the gratification of their strong social feeling, and let all the services be ordered with reference to them alone. Let the subjects of preaching be of the simplest and most practical character, and the simplest, yet most striking illustrations be studied. Let prominence be given to exposition of Scripture, and to singing, for which they have a passion, and the finest natural taste. Let whatever talent any of them may possess for exhortation, or public prayer, be drawn out in informal and social meetings. Let their taste be consulted, in all non-essential things pertaining to the congregation, the mode of conducting the devotion in singing,—with or without a choir,—the arrangement and improvement of the house, and all matters about which they may manifest feeling or interest. Give them the feeling of property in the house and all its services,—a home feeling that, with many clustering associations, will bind them to their place of worship.

The mode of ecclesiastical organization proper to be adopted among this people, that will secure efficiency and preserve the features of our church government, presents an interesting and important but difficult question, for solution by our Southern Church. There are three general plans, which have claims to our consideration. The white pastor and a separate worship for the blacks enter into each of them. The first, is that now generally adopted in our churches, of including the colored communicants under the same organization with the whites, committing the oversight of both congrega-

tions, to the same bench of elders. The church will, no doubt, but slowly, if ever, relinquish this plan. And yet, it evidently lacks efficiency, without the addition of a class of inofficial functionaries from among the blacks. The expression by its committee, of the general sense of the Presbytery of Charleston, elicited by a conference of its members on this subject, at its late meeting,\* correctly sets forth the difficulty to be obviated, and the necessity of this addition. "On the whole, in view of the fact that there is, from the nature of the case, a want of free and unreserved communication in spiritual matters between the two races, that there are times when, and situations in which, the blacks are inaccessible by the whites, and that their circumstances and conduct can only be intimately known by men of their own color,—it appeared to be the general judgment of Presbytery, that a class of functionaries should be chosen from among themselves, whose office it shall be, to assist the pastor or missionary in the discharge of those duties, which he cannot with propriety or efficiency perform in person."

Those who have had experience with congregations of coloured people, know how to appreciate the difficulty and the necessity here expressed. The difficulty can no doubt be in some degree removed, by adopting this measure, which seems to have met the approval of the greater portion, and the more experienced members of Presbytery. But this difficulty removed, there are others, though not of as formidable nature. Is it not found to be the case, that the care of a single congregation, especially if it be a large one, is amply sufficient for one session? And then, there are many more cases of discipline in a coloured congregation proportionately to number, than in a white congregation. The demands upon the time of a session in order to the proper government of the blacks where they are numerous, are far greater than are made in attention to the other interests of the church. Perhaps, if all our sessions were what they should be, all these interests could be properly attended to. But where we are aiming at practical re-

\* Reported in the last No. of the Review.

sults, in a matter as difficult as that of preserving order and discipline among this people, we must make large allowance for difficulties in the way of the efficiency of Sessions. The difficulty of bringing men together, who are engaged closely in different avocations, and of receiving that amount of attention requisite for this double work, together with the strong probability that if any interests are to be neglected they will be those of the coloured portion of the congregation, are sufficient perhaps to indicate the propriety of the division of this labor. If the Session be enlarged, so as to be able to assign this portion of the duties to a committee, the responsibility and the action are not at last removed from the Session as a whole; and to make this enlargement, it may be necessary to introduce men into the Session, who would not be acceptable elders to the white communicants, although entirely competent for the latter duties alone; or the body may be so much enlarged, as to interfere with its efficiency. In addition to this, it is worth while to consider the influence upon the blacks, of the feeling that they are a mere attachment to another congregation, without being, in point of fact, a part of it, and the lack of that interest which the feeling that an officer or a thing is one's own, generally inspires. Notwithstanding these difficulties, it may be found by the wisdom of the church, that the present organization, with the selection of watchmen or leaders to assist the pastor and session, is upon the whole, the best.

The second plan of organization, is to create separate churches of blacks with ordained elders of their own colour. A proposition was made to the Synod of Georgia, at its session in Savannah two years since, and by that body discussed and rejected, to authorize the formation of such a church in a missionary region, remote from any Presbyterian congregation. The evils of this plan, are too obvious to require of us any extended notice of them,—the want of judgment which characterizes the blacks,—their lack of intelligence,—their inconstancy, and easy elation upon promotion to authority,—the embarrassment from the want of harmony between the relations it would create, and their social and civil condition,—and the real impossibility of a slave's perform-

ing, all the functions of a ruling elder. These must be at once decisive.

The third plan, which seems to us to promise the greatest degree of efficiency, with the fewest difficulties, and perfect harmony with our system of government, is to organize the blacks with judicious and active whites as elders, into separate churches, regularly connected with Presbytery. It would contribute greatly to the efficiency of this plan, also, though it is adapted to the production of a much stronger bond of union between the coloured people and their Session than can exist under the first, to add the watchmen. Let this Session be composed of men, not only judicious but devoted, who will at least, by turns, attend the meetings of their charge. The church thus constituted, might be placed under the pastoral care of the minister of the white congregation, if all the services of a minister could not be secured. The advantages of this plan would be—the deeper interest and greater sense of responsibility, on the part of the eldership, from the more specific duty imposed upon them,—an undivided attention to bestow upon the affairs of the church,—a larger personal knowledge of the wants of the congregation,—a stronger sympathy between the elders and people,—more freedom on the part of the blacks, to communicate with the Session,—and a direct representation of this portion of our population, in our church courts. The last consideration, we regard one of great importance. The presence of elders representing coloured congregations, would be an interesting and valuable element in our Presbyteries and Synods, and would secure attention to the spiritual interests of this large and dependent class of our people. Their religious instruction, is already beginning to receive much attention from our Presbyteries, but how much would our interest in them be heightened, and how much less likely to forget our duty, if we had their representatives sitting in our midst, and standing upon the floor, urging their claims! This is a subject which should share largely our attention as courts of the church. Next to the conversion to God, of the freemen of this country, our brethren according to the flesh, the enlightenment and salvation of the black race among us, and in our

very homes, is the highest and most important end, to which our thoughts and labors can be directed. Judged irrespective of the magnitude of the objects, perhaps the blacks have the greatest claims upon us. They are dependent upon us; they are without the intelligence or the means of supplying themselves with the Gospel. And viewing the relation as one of reciprocal advantage, of the duties arising on our side, it certainly seems this one of giving them the Gospel, should have great prominence, and be esteemed especially sacred.

The whole subject of our duty to this people, is one of vast importance. A solemn and fearful responsibility is imposed upon us, through the relation we sustain to them. Their happiness and their salvation, are largely committed to us. At the great tribunal, the bar of God, we have to account for our trust. The subject deserves to be studied in all its bearings, and to be discussed freely and prayerfully.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

THE LIFE OF ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, D. D.,

*First Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey.* By JAMES W. ALEXANDER, D. D.  
*Third Thousand.* 700 pp., 8vo. CHARLES SCRIBNER.  
*New York: 1854.*

This biography of one of the greatest and best divines of our land, will be found, we think, especially to the pious reader, one of the most suggestive, as well as profitable issues from the press of the age. It deserves more than a passing notice.

To the laggard Christian, this record of an active, useful life, will read a humiliating lesson: whilst to those who are striving to follow the "faith and patience" of the saints who have gone before them, the perusal of this book will prove a powerfully stimulating exercise.

Follow the life of the subject from his childhood to his touching death-bed scene in his eightieth year. He was born of comparatively humble, though respectable parentage, in a new settlement in the valley of Virginia, of Scotch-Irish lineage, on the 17th of April, 1772. See him in his youth, hunting his father's straying cattle,—taught in childhood by two "redemptioners" in succession, one of whom was bought in Baltimore as a transported convict by his father, and employed as the best teacher available for the neighbourhood; being somewhat acquainted with Latin and Greek. See the little fellow encountering a dangerous flood in crossing a stream on his way to a store to procure a penknife for the "master" to mend the pens of the scholars. See him in his attempts to cultivate the "queue," the almost necessary appendage at that time for boys as well as for men; and from the thinness of his hair gaining the nick-name among his school-fellows, of "My Lord Pig-tail." With such anecdotes he delighted to entertain his children.

Follow up the history of this man of God, until he occupies the commanding and dignified position of religious instructor of more than eighteen hundred candidates for the Christian ministry. At the age of seventeen he engaged himself as tutor in a private family. At the age of nineteen, with diffidence and timidity, and great misgiving, he entered upon the sacred profession of the ministry. We then follow him through various stages of a missionary; the youthful President of Hampden Sidney College; Pastor of several large and interesting country churches in Virginia; Pastor of a church in Philadelphia; Professor for nearly forty years in the Theological Seminary at Princeton: and then find him an octogenarian in full vigor of mind, and with better health than in youth or middle life, calmly surveying the past and the future. From this point he could look back upon a life uncommonly protracted, and to pursuits the most solemn that man ever undertakes. From the pulpit,—from the Theological Professor's Chair,—from the press in all its forms, quarterly, monthly, weekly, daily; in the religious and secular column; and in all parts of the land,—and from the printed volume, trans-

lated and circulated through various nations and continents,—he had often spoken to his fellow-men on topics of immeasurable import.

In this biography we pursue its subject in early life through scenes of deep spiritual darkness and doubt,—struggling after light and religious comfort,—and then we see him gradually mellowing into a piety intelligent and happy,—until in old age it assumed a positive joyousness, and gilded with calm and lofty grandeur the close of a glorious life. The mode in which the intellect of this great man was developed and stored, is no less interesting. He began life with a limited education, having in the school of his judicious and beloved teacher, the Rev. William Graham, gained a pretty thorough knowledge of the rudiments of learning,—of Latin and Greek,—and to some extent of Natural Philosophy and Mental Philosophy, with other sciences. After studying theology with his favourite teacher, Mr. Graham, and exercising his gifts in prayer and exhortation, he entered upon the work of the ministry. Such was his insatiable thirst for knowledge, and his love of books, that he searched every private library and every stray volume that fell in his way. His capacity for receiving knowledge, and his eagerness to know all that could be of value to him on every subject, made him an apt scholar, and secured for him surprisingly rapid and varied acquisitions, wherever he happened to pause,—so that it was a matter of astonishment, to those who subsequently knew him intimately, to hear him speak of the books he had casually met. After an interval of forty or fifty years, he would tell the time and place, when and where he had only once in his life met a particular work. He would refer to a striking idea that he had met for the first time, in a particular part of the book,—almost referring to the very page on which it might be found,—and would then in a few sentences give you the character of the book, with its virtues and errors,—beginning, middle, and end.

During his scholastic training, arrangements were made at one time, to send him to Princeton College. The plan was arrested by the state of his health, and finally abandoned under the advice of friends. It is a

doubtful question, perhaps, whether in his peculiar case, the regular college course would have increased his ultimate influence and learning. He had that unyielding perseverance and eager desire for knowledge, which overcame obstacles that proved insuperable to ordinary intellects. He had more to struggle against than those who have the common facilities of books and College Professors provided to their hand, but he had the energy that could surmount the obstacles in his way. He had a good foundation laid in the judicious training in the school and the theological class of his beloved preceptor, Mr. Graham, who was a graduate of Princeton, and a man of vigorous intellect and extended acquirements,—and he could improve where others would have failed;—although he never saw a Hebrew Bible until he had been for some time in the ministry, he made himself a good Hebrew scholar,—whilst many a one goes from a Theological Seminary who never improves the knowledge of Hebrew there learned.

It certainly affords no valid argument against Colleges and Theological Seminaries that some men become learned who never enjoyed their advantages,—and some never improve these advantages when enjoyed. For, ordinarily, men will become intelligent or remain ignorant, according to the facilities provided for them in youth, whilst every rule has its exceptions.

The book before us is the production of the eldest son of the venerable man of whom it treats. And if the author was honored in having such a father for his subject, the father was also favored in leaving such a son behind him to record his life.

The author, in his preface, intimates his doubts of the fitness of a son as a biographer, and expresses his fears lest he may be found making overstatements of character. In his own case, at least, he has illustrated the groundlessness of his apprehensions. He dwells mainly on facts, and manifests great candor and caution, and the most consummate delicacy, whilst there is very obvious throughout the work a latent enthusiasm, the absence of which we would have regarded as a defect. We think that no stranger, on a review of the facts, will prefer the charge of exaggeration, whilst the numerous



personal friends and acquaintances of old Dr. Alexander would have been disappointed had less been said.

We consider this biography as in no respect inferior, and in some particulars superior, to Dr. Hanna's admirable life of his father-in-law, Dr. Chalmers.

This book illustrates truthfully and strikingly the manners and customs of the times, gives pleasant contemporaneous history and biography, and particularly of the Presbyterian clergy of the day. We particularly refer to the sketches of such men—and there were giants in those days—as Witherspoon, Rodgers, Nisbet, Woodhull, McWhorter, Tenant, Miller, Ashbell Green, the Smiths, Hoge, Rice, Speece, and a host of others whose names are identified with the history and progress of the church. We have an account of the various phases of the religious developments of the day, and of the excellencies and defects of the revivals in Virginia. Dr. Alexander's two first visits to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, at Philadelphia,—first as a youthful elder, and afterwards a clerical delegate,—are narrated by himself in a most entertaining manner. We have also, from his own pen, his tour through New England in his early life, giving graphic sketches of the character of the people and their religious views, with their leading ministers, such as Doctors Strong, Emons, Hopkins, &c., all of whom he had the best opportunity to see and know. His sermons on that tour attracted great attention; and the number of conversions that resulted from his preaching, is truly surprising, as the facts were revealed to him, many of them long years after his return. Travelling with his eyes and ears open, and his mind fully awake to the scenes that transpired during his visit, he brought back with him a wonderful fund of information, such as only a most enquiring, discriminating, and active mind could gain.

His early struggles on the subject of the validity of Infant Baptism, as narrated by himself in the 9th chapter of the book, will be perused as one of the most curious, and to many readers one of its most interesting portions.

During his youthful ministry, he fell into doubts as to the Scripture authority for the ordinance, and informed

his parishoners that he could not conscientiously any longer baptize their children. They yielded to his scruples, knowing him to be honest in his convictions of duty, and believing that after so candid and able an investigation as his strong mind could bring to the subject, he would be lead to results mutually satisfactory. He devoted much of the time of one year to a laborious examination of all that he could find written on both sides of the question, and a pains-taking review of all the arguments. He determined to follow the evidence faithfully to whatever conclusion it might lead, and addressed himself with the utmost intensity to the question. On one occasion, he was so intent on a train of reasoning he was pursuing, that he spent the whole night without sleep. "Two considerations" he informs us, up to this time, "kept him from joining the Baptists. The first was that the universal prevalence of infant baptism, as early as the 4th and 5th centuries, was unaccountable on the supposition that no such practice existed in the times of the Apostles. The other was, that if the Baptists are right, they are the only Christian church on earth, and all other denominations are out of the visible church. Besides, I could not see how they could ever obtain a valid baptism."

On a thorough examination of the early Fathers and Councils, he traced the universal usage of infant baptism to a period, between which and the times of the Apostles, he satisfied himself that it was absolutely impossible that the usage could have been interpolated, and especially, without a shred of notice to be found of the change. The historical argument seemed to him invincible. This prepared him to examine the Scripture argument, free from the *bias that had taken possession of his mind* against the doctrine. The argument from the analogy of circumcision with baptism he found complete. He derived much additional aid in his investigations, from a volume of Dr. Hammond, on infant baptism, which, at this date, fell in his way. But the process and force of the arguments which influenced his mind, can be appreciated fully only by a perusal of his own narrative.

In relation to the mode of baptism he held it to be a

dispute about a very trivial matter. He considered the *element* of water, and not the *mode* of its application, the emblem to be regarded. Baptism is not, like the Lord's Supper, set forth in Scripture as a commemorative ordinance. It never refers in Scripture to the burial and resurrection of Christ, but to the remission of sins.

Even if it could be demonstrated, he maintains, that John and the Apostles baptized by immersion, we should be no more obliged to use this mode than the Baptists feel obliged to use unleavened bread at the Lord's Supper, and although no other kind of bread was used at the Passover, and consequently at the first institution of the Lord's Supper. It is not the *kind* of bread in which the emblematic meaning is found, but the "*breaking*" of bread, setting forth the mangling of the body of Christ. Baptists do not recline on couches, as the Saviour and his disciples did at the institution of the ordinance of the Supper; and yet there is as much reason here for a rigid conformity to the undisputed original mode, as to any particular mode in the application of water in the other sacrament. "But," he adds, "we have conceded too much. So far is it from being true, that all baptisms mentioned in the New Testament were by a total immersion of the body, it cannot be proved that this was the mode in a single instance."

We were somewhat disappointed in not finding, in the biography, a greater extent and variety of correspondence with his old pupils. Many letters, we doubt not, might have been secured, of great practical value in reply to enquiries propounded to him. In difficulties, they naturally turned to him for counsel, and his advice was entertained with the profoundest reverence. There are, however, many passages in the work containing counsels and suggestions of great value, on a variety of subjects of practical concern. To unemployed young ministers, who, to the disgrace of their profession, are ever hanging about our city churches as candidates, and unwilling to accept of a country charge, we recommend the following: "There is a very wrong opinion frequently entertained of congregations in such a place as this (a city;) as if all the members were well informed people. The truth is, there is much less religious knowledge among

the bulk of the people here than in the country. Multitudes grow up with very little knowledge of the doctrines of religion; and many, after they are grown, join themselves to a congregation by taking pews, who were never instructed at all. These require very plain preaching, and when they become serious, need to be taught the very first principles of the doctrine of Christ." "Some congregations, it is true, require men of the best learning and talents, but many others demand preaching of the plainest kind, and less learning and polish than almost any country congregation, however remote."—Pages 283, 285. Speaking of the pastoral relation and duties, we have the following sentiments, "In my opinion no situation is so desirable for a preacher as a pastoral charge; and no man called to the ministry ought to relinquish it for any other business, unless there be an evident prospect of greater usefulness; or some physical disqualification for the work. When a man alleges that he cannot visit, or perform other parochial duties for which he has bodily strength, it is just as if a servant should pretend that he cannot do the work for which he was employed. A minister of Jesus Christ must divest himself of fastidiousness, and exercise self-denial in the performance of his duties. In regard however, to what is duty, (in the matter of personal visits,) every man must judge independently for himself, and not be governed by the whims of well-disposed, but weak, women. In a large city, preparation for the pulpit is the main thing; and except in cases of illness, comparatively little good is accomplished by running from house to house. The preacher who ably fills the pulpit will, on the whole, get along very well. The course in such a place as Baltimore would be, first, to prepare for his pulpit exercises on the Sabbath; next, he should be attentive to Bible classes, Sunday schools, and catechising; and should visit the sick. And as to visiting, he should appropriate certain portions of time, and conscientiously perform what appertains to that time. His calls ought to be very short, except in special cases. It is poor economy for a man to exhaust his strength in talking to one at a time, when he has an opportunity to say the same thing to hundreds or thousands."—Page 515. In connection with

this extract we would refer to an amusing account given (p. 169,) by Dr. Alexander of one of his first essays with an elder at pastoral visitation. He was compelled to spend the whole day with one family, before he could get rid of their pressing hospitality. He adopted the method, as no progress could be made in this way, of preaching in private houses in different parts of his charge. But even here, he found a burdensome display of hospitality, for "the old Virginians never count the cost of dinners, even when they give very little for the support of the Gospel." And here is the crying sin of many a Christian man, who greatly contracts his capacity for beneficence by his sumptuous way of living.

In other extracts from his correspondence and other writings, we have weighty counsels and cautions in relation to the nature and proper management of a true revival,—the danger of too sudden an admission of new converts into the church,—the evils of receiving young children to the communion. With regard to the religious instruction of children, however, he is very emphatic in pressing its claims. He writes, "I have a favorite notion that this is a rich uncultivated missionary field. There should be a class of preachers for children alone. If I were a young man, I would, God willing, choose that field."—Page 533. And again, "Sermons suited to children can be preached. I have tried it over and over, and I never had an audience more attentive, or who better understood my meaning. I delight in such discourses, and if I had health and leisure, would have one every week. Perhaps I shall, as it is."—Pages 534, 535. In connection with the discussion of the proper mode of addressing children, and the faults of certain speakers in this particular, he adds a remark which is of general application in relation to public speaking, "Another dear old brother screams at the top of an astounding voice, and they gaze in stupid wonder. Too much noise drives away thought. No man can have any variety of ideas, nor any connected train, beneath the deafening roar of a cataract." This reminds us of the anecdote of the old Georgia Baptist Preacher, who, when remonstrated with for being a calmer speaker in old age than in early life, replied: "When I was

a young man, I thought it was the thunder that killed, but I have since found that the killing belongs to the lightning."

Dr. Alexander was a sagacious observer of the times and the tendencies of things. He long ago predicted that abolitionism would run into infidelity, and he lived to see it fulfilled. He also predicted (which may Heaven forbid,) that abolitionism would one day rend this fair Union.

Though a rigidly temperate man, he never took an active part in the movements of the day on that subject; for which he subjected himself to the severest censures. He feared the associations would be abused to the injury of evangelical religion. And he lived to see many imprudent leaders in the temperance cause abusing the Christian church as a defective organization, far inferior in value to the temperance platform. He lived to hear men, occupying the Christian pulpit on the Sabbath day with harangues that substituted one form of external morals as an all-sufficient substitute for the preaching of Christ and him crucified.

Dr. Alexander's position, as the first theological instructor of the first Seminary instituted on the continent by the Presbyterian church, was one of peculiar responsibility and difficulty. At a time of unsettled and changing theological opinions in many parts of the land, and of a restless love of change and innovation, as to the proper modes of promoting the cause of religion, his students often represented every type of the fluctuating opinions afloat all over the land. Many of them being young men of great smartness, and who were the centre of admiration of some local circle, as having borne away the honours of their Alma-Mater, were full of the rashness of inexperience, and the overweening arrogance that often attaches to the flush of success. They thought they could instruct their teachers, and pressed the claims of their new discoveries of truth.

It required consummate discretion, prudence, and firmness, to control and mould such materials in the right way. Dr. Alexander was the very man for such an exigency,—and the church will never be able fully to appreciate what he has done for her in giving the

right bias to the hearts and minds of many of the young candidates who were to minister at her altars. He seemed to have an intuitive knowledge of character. He could read the human heart more thoroughly than any man we have ever known. To the arrogant youth he knew how to administer a withering rebuke, that seemed to modify his whole tone and character. To the modest, he was kind. To the timid and desponding, he had always an encouraging word. One of his old pupils has informed us, since beginning this article, that his own case illustrates the wisdom of Dr. Alexander's mode of treatment. He exhibited a vain desire, when in the Seminary, to oppose common and received opinions, and to adopt new and fanciful views, in all the themes his Professor gave him to write on. By this he hoped to attract the attention of Dr. Alexander, and to give him trouble. The Doctor passed by the exercises without a solitary comment, rebuking only by assigning him afterwards topics connected with dry facts and duties; and by treating his speculations with contempt, brought him to self-humiliation.

The searching appeals of the Professor to the hearts of the young men at the *conferences* on Sabbath afternoons, when they met their teachers to discuss some great practical or experimental religious truth or duty, will never be forgotten, as they have been instrumental in saving many a young candidate from self-deception, and leading him to a deep and thorough searching of his heart. Of all men we have ever met, he seemed to have the most intimate knowledge of the human character. There were three books he had closely, for a long time, and intimately, studied,—the first throwing a flood of light on the other two. They were the *Bible, his own heart, and his fellow men*, as their personal conduct, and history, and biography, depicted them. Hence, he was perhaps, the most skilful experimental preacher our country has produced.

Dr. Alexander had a peculiar mode of giving personal and private counsel. When consulted in relation to a course of duty, he seldom gave positive advice; but presented such a flood of light under the various suppositions and conditions that the case afforded, that you

went away with a judgment sufficiently enlightened to decide for yourself as to the course to be pursued.

His Introductory Lectures, which in turn with his fellow Professors, he delivered at the opening of the scholastic terms of the Seminary, abounded with the richest thought, and the sagest counsels. We give a brief extract from the bare outline of one of these lectures, delivered in 1818:

“Never forget the importance of the great object you have in view. Let your trust and hope be strongly fixed on God. Habitually consider the weakness of the human understanding; yet, depend on your own faculties, rather than on those of other men. Learn to use your own understanding. Search for truth without a slavish regard for human authority. Think for yourselves, and expect to make progress rather by following out your own thoughts, than by borrowing those of other men.— It is not intended to undervalue the literary labours of the wise. In many things our knowledge must necessarily be derived from books; and on every subject we may gain important assistance from good treatises, commentaries and sermons. But if we accustom ourselves merely to follow the reflections of other men, we shall never attain a respectable proficiency in knowledge.— We may, indeed, accumulate ideas. We may fill our memory with stores of learning, and may know what every distinguished author has said on any subject.— But this might almost as profitably be laid up in common place books or libraries. Granting that every subject has been investigated more fully by others, those thoughts and opinions which are the fruit of our own mental exertions are more profitable to us, than those of other, and even superior minds; for every mind is like a mint, which has its own peculiar stamp. What we think out for ourselves, is, by the very process, interwoven with our other thoughts, and intimately incorporated into our own system. That peculiarity which ideas receive by passing, in the manner now described, through any mind, is what is called *originality*; and how much this single quality adds to the interest which we take in any discourse, spoken or written, is known to every one. At first, we are ready to suppose we can make no pro-



gress in the pursuit of truth by the mere exercise of our own faculties, and are, therefore, deterred from the endeavour. But this is a mistake which, in every instance, experience would correct, if we could only be persuaded to make the attempt. All we have to do is to fix the attention on the subject, and revolve in our minds the ideas we already possess. The difference between men, as to powers of investigation, is perhaps chiefly in the capacity for fixing the attention closely," &c.

Among his writings, which are numerous, able and timely, we would direct attention particularly to the following: Evidences of Christianity; Religious Experience; Canon of the Old and New Testament; Practical Sermons; Outlines of Moral Science, and History of Colonization of Western Africa.

He was a man of strong and vigorous intellect—of symmetrical and compact mind—of the soundest and most healthful judgment. His knowledge was various and extensive, and on those subjects to which his attention was particularly addressed, profound. He made himself conversant with the exact sciences, and kept up wonderfully with the scientific and literary progress of the age. He was familiar with the best English classics, and has been surpassed by few in a felicitous, fluent, and easy use of the purest idiomatic Saxon English.—The very simplicity of his style causes the reader to overlook its beauties. He was a living illustration of his own beautiful figure, in which he compares style to window-glass. That which is without a flaw or stain, lets in the light without our perceiving the medium through which it is conveyed. He conceived so lucidly, and expressed himself so clearly, that he often cheated his hearer into a profound thought by making it look common-place.

He has been charged with deficiency of imagination. Portions of his writings, as well as his descriptive appeals in speaking, when he gave the rein to his full powers, redeem him from this charge.

He was deeply read in mental and moral science, indispensable branches of study for the theologian, and of vast importance to every public speaker.

Dr. Alexander was an orator in the best sense of the

word. To the mental capacity and endowments of which we have spoken, he added, in an eminent degree, what we consider the two grand requisites of the orator, so far as delivery is concerned, viz: *naturalness* and *earnestness*. He was a perfect child in his unaffected simplicity of manner, and was incapable of acting a part. He had, by nature, an ardent temperament, and his devoted piety had imparted a deeper intensity to his natural feelings.

The power of his oratory, in his best days, has often been illustrated. We may mention an instance or two. One is related by a native of Virginia, who subsequently became a Judge in Georgia. He went to hear him in company with a skeptical lawyer, who was on his guard against religious appeals. The text was, "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear." The orator depicted, in vivid terms, the trials, temptations, infirmities and falls of the Christian, and conducted him through great difficulties to his rest. He then depicted, in glowing language, the dangers to which the sinner was exposed, having infinitely more than all the besetments of the Christian to drag him downward, and no power of resistance to stop his headlong course. The skeptic sat fixed, motionless, and breathless, under the strains of the speaker. When the orator said, "And now, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" the spell-bound hearer, rising involuntarily with every muscle strung, with a violent gesture, and in a voice audible to all near, replied, "*inevitably damned.*" He seemed to remain lost to his situation, until his friend pulled him by the skirt of his coat, and recalled him to himself and his embarrassing situation. We have heard of a charity sermon preached by Dr. Alexander, in New Brunswick, N. J., in which he dwelt upon the character of Dorcas. Whilst he was describing a benevolent woman approaching the door of the sick and afflicted, and gently lifting the latch, the whole congregation looked round to see the visitor enter.

We well remember the last sermon we ever heard him preach. He had gone down to Philadelphia, on a Saturday during the sessions of the General Assembly, and it was announced that he would preach for Dr. Board-

man on Sabbath morning. Many of his old pupils who were delegates, and engaged to preach in various churches, might have been seen running in all directions to be released from their engagements, that they might once more enjoy the luxury of hearing their beloved instructor. Some fifty persons might have been seen mingling with the audience. The text was, "Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults." As the "old man eloquent" opened the secret chambers of the human heart, and unravelled and exposed the impurity and wickedness of human conduct, we felt as though our heart was turned inside out. And as we cast our eye over the large crowd that sat entranced under the eloquent strains, we imagined we saw depicted on every countenance, just what we felt,—a sense of utter worthlessness and vileness. We all seemed to be sitting there like a company of condemned criminals.

Dr. Alexander was a beautiful model of a laborious preacher, even to old age. On almost every Sabbath, he might be found occupying some pulpit,—either aiding in some revival, or supplying some destitute church, or pleading the claims of some great Christian charity. His conduct, in this respect, speaks loudly to many professors in Theological Seminaries, who spend too many silent Sabbaths for their own good, as ministers of the gospel, and the influence of their example on the candidates under their care.

The devout piety, with an entire freedom from cant, and the lovely domestic traits of the subject of this biography, have been beautifully and truthfully depicted by the author.

His modesty and humility were rare qualities for so great a man. Said a gentleman to us, a few years ago, having enjoyed an interview with Dr. Alexander, "I have been conversing with the first truly great man I have ever met, who seems never to have found out that he is more than an ordinary man." It is a rare mark of true modesty that he never alluded to himself in his Inaugural Address at Princeton,—and that his own children never once heard him allude to the honours conferred on him,—such as his election as President of the State College of Georgia, &c.

His greatest deficiency was considered to consist in a want of polish of manners. And yet, his beautiful simplicity gave a raciness and a freshness to his intercourse with friends, that no mere refinement of manners could have atoned for. This defect, however, was abundantly supplied, so far as his theological students were concerned, in his revered colleague, Dr. Miller, the most finished specimen of a true Christian gentleman we have ever met,—whose profound research in Church History, and able treatises on Church Polity, united to his devoted and exemplary piety, made him a fit associate for his beloved fellow Professor. And here we may remark, that the church seems to have been directed in the good providence of God to the two very men, the fittest in all her ranks, for the arduous and responsible posts assigned to them, as the first Professors in her Seminary.

Among the touching and tender incidents connected with the eminently happy and Christian death of Dr. Alexander, we must allude to the simple fact of his presenting to Dr. Hodge, his successor in the chair of Systematic Theology, the white bone walking stick, carved and presented to him by the Sandwich Island chief, and adding with a smile, "You must leave this to your successor in office, that it may be handed down as a kind of symbol of orthodoxy." May that memorial ever remain, as a standing protest against all future invasions of heresy. Would that Cotton Mather had left some such remembrancer, to rebuke his degenerate Unitarian successors in Harvard College.

Dr. Alexander was a thorough Presbyterian by conviction, as to articles of faith, and polity,—but he was no part of a bigot. He had those elevated, capacious, and unselfish views, that could do ample justice to all men, opinions, or measures, that possessed real merit.

On a full view of his life and labours,—which should be a study, to all young ministers especially,—we are drawn irresistibly to the conclusion, that he was the greatest blessing of all the men God ever gave to the American church. And let his example be followed, and his memory be held in grateful and lasting remembrance.

Among the crowd of reflections which the perusal of

this work has suggested to our minds, we cannot forbear the mention of two.

The one is the influence which a pious, intelligent, and industrious man exerts upon his race. If we could detect moral influences by the eye or outward sense, as we do those in the natural world,—for instance, the effects of wholesome or poisonous food;—of a gunpowder explosion; of a miasmatic pool, or a disinfecting agent,—we should feel that it was a solemn thing to live. We should more diligently appreciate and heed the Divine injunctions, “Let not your good deeds be evil spoken of,”—“avoid the appearance of evil,”—“be not partaker of other men’s sins,”—“let your light shine.” And not only the influence of example but of opinions would be deeply pondered. Truth is a powerful weapon. Error of opinion is not only like poisoning the food one eats, but like adulterating the medicine one uses. The very remedy may kill the soul.

The other reflection is the influence of races, as well as of individuals. Dr. Alexander was of Scotch-Irish blood and training. He and his father before him,—and probably a line of ancestors in long progression,—were thoroughly taught the Westminster Catechism, that strong breast-work against the assaults of error. The race that has accomplished most for all the solid and substantial interests of this nation, are the descendants of the Scotch and Scotch-Irish emigrants to this land. They settled largely in New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North and South Carolina, and subsequently in Georgia, Kentucky, and to a limited extent in all parts of the country. Wherever you find a Scotch or Scotch-Irish settlement, you find an intelligent community,—the friends of law and order, and enlightenment,—appealing to the Bible as the supreme authority, and therefore sturdy advocates of the rights of conscience. They are eminently free from the fanaticism, and false philosophy, and pseudo-philanthropy, and new-fangled opinions which agitate other communities. And if this union is saved, it must be from a combination of these conservative materials against the ultraisms which press upon us on all hands, and which seem to be hopelessly irreconcilable.

We owe a debt of gratitude to the reformers of Germany and Holland. We have been aided in no small degree by that noble race the French Huguenots. We are largely indebted to the English Puritans—but there is something sadly defective in the character of the descendants of the Pilgrim fathers, which mingles great evils with the good, and which is now developing weaknesses and tendencies to declension painful to contemplate.

It was of this Scottish stock that the Mecklenburg Convention was formed. Dr. Witherspoon, a member of the Conventions that framed our National Constitution and the Constitution of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and a man of large and controlling influence in both bodies, was a Scotchman. The nation is, to an extent not yet considered, indebted to that source for her Divines, and scholars, and teachers, and patriots and substantial citizens, and intelligent, active and public-spirited Christians. Among her men of mark in the civil department, Daniel Webster was of Scotch blood, and Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun were born of Presbyterian Scotch-Irish parents.

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Types of Mankind: dedicated to the memory of SAMUEL GEORGE MORTON, M. D., (late President of the Academy of Natural Sciences at Philadelphia,) and illustrated by contributions from Professor L. AGASSIZ, L. L. D.; W. USHER, M. D., and Professor H. S. PATTERSON, M. D. By J. C. NOTT, M. D., and GEORGE R. GLIDDON, Philadelphia: LIPPINCOTT, GRAMBO & Co. 1854: pp. 738, 4 to.*

This is a volume of great pretensions. Its execution as to typography and variety of illustration is creditable to the American press. It certainly exhibits throughout a zeal worthy of a

better cause. It sets out to prove that "God hath" *not* "made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," that Eve is not "the mother of all living," and "that men were created in *nations*, and not in a single pair. The work professes to be a *scientific* work. It cannot abide the book of Genesis. "Viewed as a narrative inspired by the Most High, its conceits" [the conceits of the book of Genesis,] "are pitiful, and its revelations false. "How then," ask the authors, "are its crude and juvenile hypotheses about *Human Creation* to be viewed?" The English version is especially the object of Mr. Gliddon's contempt. He does not expect to live till a new English version shall be "authorised." Before that shall occur, "the developments of science will have rendered any *new translation* altogether supererogatory among the educated who are creating *new religions* for themselves." He has the reputation of being a kind and obliging man in private life, and we desire not to deny to him those virtues he really possesses. Of his courtesy as a writer little can be said. He seems to hold the clerical profession in sovereign contempt. Such "teologastri" as we are, such "biblical dunces," such "idiotic," "ignorant," "impudent" "simpletons," such "unliteral dogmatists," are not worthy of a respectful notice. *We*, especially, are in "that undeveloped stage of the reasoning faculties, which, in accordance with Comte's positive philosophy, has been already classed as "the *theological*." All that is said in opposition to his *extraordinary* learning, he treats as the "puerilities of the ephemeral tourist, the twaddling inanities of the unlettered missionary, or the Egyptian hallucination of the theological rhapsodist."

We should long since have paid our respects to this volume, which is a repetition only, with enlargement, of what its authors have before said, had we not been hindered by other avocations, and deterred by the accumulated *drift* which this ethnological flood has swept down and left heaped together in wondrous confusion. It equals almost the wonderful deposits of the Mississippi, which, according to Dr. Usher, whose conclusions seem to be adopted by the authors of this work, has been flowing for 150,000 years. In this drift Dr. Usher has found the skeleton of a

man of the *aboriginal American race*, which was buried in the spot in which it was discovered 57,600 years ago! Whether others will be in like manner successful, in finding so early an origin for man, in the accumulated deposits of these authors, remains to be proved. Whether they have established it as a *scientific* fact that the various types of the human race did not and could not, have descended from Adam, others may judge. To us, the book establishes nothing, except the self-complacent skepticism of its authors.

---

2. *Daniel: A Model for Young Men. A Series of Lectures.*  
By the Rev. W. A. SCOTT, D. D., *New Orleans. New York:*  
ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS. pp. 340, 8vo. 1854.

"Those Lectures were prepared from week to week amid the pressure of the duties, cares and anxieties inseparable from a large city congregation. They were listened to by crowded assemblies, and with increasing interest to the close of the series." It was the author's "intention to revise them during the leisure moments of summer." This intention was not fulfilled; the prevalence of the yellow fever in New Orleans, the scene of the author's labours, prevented. "More than ten thousand persons died" in that smitten city from June to September, "and among them," says the author, "many of the precious youth who listened to these lectures have fallen its victims." There are occasional inaccuracies of expression which the pen of the author would have corrected on revision, but these discourses are favourable specimens of the popular lecture; the style is terse, and characterised, in many passages, by great force and beauty. The production as a whole, though not constituting in any sense a commentary on the book of Daniel, nor attempting any elaborate research in its elucidation or defence, is just what it professes to be, an earnest, serious, and effective appeal to young men, holding forth the character of Daniel as a model for them, warning them against the errors and snares which surround them at this day, and bring-



ing forth ever and anon apt illustrations from his various reading, and from that practical knowledge of men and things, which an observant mind has treasured up. The book pretends to no originality of views, yet is creditable alike to the head and heart of one of the most successful of our pastors.

---

3. *Ministering Children: A Tale dedicated to Childhood.* By the Author of "*Sunday Afternoon in the Nursery*," &c., &c. New York: RIKER, THORNE & Co. 1854: pp. 414, 12 mo.

A book whose object is to show children and youth how they may be useful, and in usefulness and beneficence find true happiness. The story is skilfully wrought, and has been read in more than one family, as we have reason to know, with unabated interest, and we would hope, with profit. It would be an appropriate present to those who are in the morning of life, and who need to be shown how they can live to some good end.

---

4. *A Manual of Missions: or Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church: with Maps, showing the stations, and statistics of Protestant Missions among unevangelized nations.* By JOHN C. LOWRIE, one of the Secretaries of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. New York: ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH, 1854: pp. 74.

To one desirous of an acquaintance with the missionary work as it has been conducted by the Presbyterian Church, this book will be a valuable aid. It spreads before him the whole heathen world, and shows him what has been done by one branch of the church for their salvation. In doing this, it gives a rapid view of the missionary labours of other Protestant denominations in this and foreign lands. The whole is presented with much clearness and simplicity by a very competent hand, by one who knows by experience the trials and supports of missionary life. Nowhere

else in the sphere of our acquaintance can be found in so small a compass, so much reliable information respecting the work of missions, especially as conducted by the Presbyterian Church. We commend the book in this light to all our brethren in Christ. It is necessary to know what has been accomplished, that we may know what remains to be accomplished. No Christian man in this age, can withhold his hand from the missionary work.

- 
5. *A Notice of the "Types of Mankind:" with an examination of the charges contained in the Biography of Dr. MORTON, published by NOTT and GLIDDON. By JOHN BACHMAN, D. D. From the Charleston Medical Journal and Review for September. Charleston: JAMES, WILLIAMS & GETSINGER. 1854.*

No one can come into conflict with the zealous advocates of the "Diversity of origin," without suffering; unless, perchance, he belongs to the class of human *pachydermata*. Dr. Bachman, than whom no one was more competent, had entered the lists, with Dr. Morton especially, on the doctrine of the *fertility of hybrids*, hitherto reckoned among the absurdities in natural history; the few cases quoted having been viewed as either abnormal, or not well attested. This doctrine was necessary to the position that men are not all descended from a single pair. While this controversy was pending, Dr. Morton deceased. His friends, and especially the authors of "The Types," pour forth their wrath on Dr. Bachman. He too, is of "the clergy," a friend of Missions, and one who honours the true missionary. He is, therefore, one of the "Biblical dunces," the "snubs of universal humanity." If the Sandwich Islands are becoming depopulated, he does not believe that "they are daily sinking beneath *civilization, missionaries and rum.*" We are glad to see that Dr. Bachman has resumed his pen, and that we shall hear more from him soon. We are persuaded that before this controversy is closed, those who have provoked it will discover that they might have been more usefully and SAFELY employed.

# SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER III.

---

JANUARY, MDCCCLV.

---

## ARTICLE I.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY FROM THE  
UNITY OF GOD, AS TAUGHT IN SCRIPTURE, ANSWERED.

The chief difficulty in the way of a candid examination and acceptance of the doctrine of the Trinity, arises from the prejudices with which the mind comes to the investigation,—its unwillingness to submit itself to the truth of God without being able to comprehend the nature of the truth believed,—and above all the enmity and aversion with which this doctrine is associated, because it is so humbling to the pride and self-righteous vanity of man.

The irrelevancy of the objections made against the doctrine of the Trinity on the ground of its alleged unreasonableness, contradictoriness, incomprehensibility, obscurity, and merely speculative and abstract character, we have, we think, satisfactorily proved to be untenable. The objections which arise from “an evil heart of unbelief” against the doctrine itself, and against the system of grace which it involves,—and which after all is the real hindrance to the more universal reception of this doctrine,—these can be removed only when “the natural heart” is transformed by the renewing and enlightening influences of the Holy Ghost, through whose teaching alone any man can call Jesus Lord, and worship Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as one God, “in spirit and in truth.” Of ALL the objections which can arise against the doctrine of the Trinity, it may be truly said that they are based upon the impious and absurd presumption that the Divine Being is more clearly and ful-

ly known to those who are so wise in their conceit, as to imagine they have "by searching found out the Almighty to perfection," than he is to himself. Such persons therefore, imagine that they are better able to describe what God is, and what God is not, than God has thought fit to make known as the truth on these subjects in the sacred Scriptures, which "are all given by inspiration through Holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

The only rational inquiry on this subject undoubtedly is, who or what God is, as he himself has been pleased to inform us, in his own selected language; and whether this God is only one simple, absolute, personal, uncompounded and solitary being; or whether in the Unity of the Divine Being there is a Trinity, composed of three persons who are spoken of in Scripture as the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST. The former of these opinions we affirm not to be the doctrine of Scripture; such a metaphysical unity can be held only by declaring God to be, what he himself has nowhere affirmed that he is, and by peremptorily denying God to be what he has led us to believe he is, from the whole tenor, and from many express declarations, of the sacred Scriptures. The Scriptures, we affirm, plainly teach that God is one,—that nevertheless, there are three persons bearing distinct names and offices who are called Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,—that to each of these three is attributed everything that is most peculiar and appropriate to the Divine nature without any difference;—that those things, which most clearly distinguish God from every created and derived being, do not distinguish these three persons from one another;—that all that is most distinctive of God is not appropriated to THE FATHER alone, nor to THE SON alone, nor to THE SPIRIT alone, but to each and every one of them;—and, therefore, that the only living and true God is a Tri-unity consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and not any one, or any two of these, alone. The Father alone, therefore, exclusive of the Son, and Holy Ghost, is not the one God, the only God, the one supreme cause of all things, or the sole origin of all being, power, wisdom and authority.

But it will be here vehemently urged that inasmuch

as all believers in the Bible admit the unity of God to be clearly, and frequently, taught in the Holy Scriptures, all other passages which seem to teach an opposite doctrine must be interpreted in accordance with this.

Undoubtedly we admit, as fully as our opponents in this controversy do, that the Scriptures teach, as a fundamental truth, that there is but one living and true God, besides whom there is none else. About this point there is no dispute. But the question is, who is this one God, and what is the Unity of this one God.

It is, as we before remarked, commonly imagined, that the Bible is full of texts in which the absolute and personal unity of the Father, as alone the true God, is taught. The truth, however, is, that such a unity of God is nowhere taught in Scripture,—that there are very few passages either in the Old or the New Testaments, which bear directly and dogmatically upon the unity of God,—and that they are by no means as numerous as those in which the plurality of God, and the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost, are taught. The frequent assertions with regard to this subject are very erroneous,—and are made at hazard, and without diligent and faithful comparison.\* There are, indeed, many passages which speak of God as “the true God,” and as one God in opposition to all other Gods. But the passages which *even seem* to teach that the Godhead is not a trinity but a simple uncompounded unity, are very few.

Let us turn to two of these passages, and these the strongest in the whole Bible; one from the Old, and the other from the New Testament.

In the book of Deuteronomy, Chap. vi: 4 and 5, we read these words, “Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, with all thy soul, with all thy might.”

This sentence was proclaimed as a kind of oracular *afflatum*, a solemn and authoritative principle, to the Israelites. By an express command in the oral law, the Jews believe that they are required twice a day to repeat this verse, which they call *Shemah*. The Talmud

\* See Stuart's Letters to Channing, p. 47.

contains also a great many directions about the manner in which it should be pronounced, and its virtue when uttered in a dying hour. This was also one of the four passages which the Jews wrote upon their phylacteries and upon their door posts. And, as it is one form of what our Saviour calls the first and great commandment, it deserves very careful consideration.

In this passage we have a declaration, and an inference from it. The declaration, as it is in the original, is that "Jehovah, our Elohim, is one Jehovah," and the inference from it is, that we ought to love this "Jehovah our Elohim," with all our heart.

From this passage it is inferred, by modern Jews and Unitarians, that Jehovah, the God of Israel, is numerically and metaphysically one; and that he exists a solitary person, and not a trinity of persons. But the text makes no such affirmation. It does not say that Jehovah is one numerically, one metaphysically, or one in person. Had this been the design of the inspired penman, he would have said "Our Jehovah is only one," or "Jehovah, our Elohim, is one Elohim," and therefore, thou shalt love him with all thy heart," &c.

Had God meant to teach that he was *only* one, and in no sense three in one, he would have used also the term *yahid*, which is now employed by the Jews in stating this doctrine of the divine unity in their creed. This term *yahid*, means *only one*; as when God required Abraham to slay HIS ONLY son Isaac, where the term is *yahid*.—(See also, Gen. xii: 16, Jud. xi: 34.) God might thus have said that he was *Eloah yahid, only one God*. But he does not say this. He does not use *Eloah* in the singular, but *Elohim* in the plural; and he does not use *yahid, only one*, but the very indefinite word *ahad, one*; which concludes nothing as to his trinity of persons in one Godhead, nor as to the numerical or personal unity of God. The language of the text, as God has given it, therefore, affirms merely, "that Jehovah the God of Israel is one." And if the adjunct *one* is made to refer to number, then the passage would teach that the Jehovah of Israel was one Jehovah, but not necessarily that he was the only one. The inference would then be entirely inappropriate, and the duty it enjoins

contrary to what would be the duty of every man if there were other Jehovahs equally divine; unless indeed, we adopt the opinion of some German scholars at the present time, that the God of Israel was only regarded and worshipped by them as a tutelar or national God, and not as the only God.\* Their love would in this case, be required merely on the ground of national obedience, an idea however, totally inconsistent with every portion of the Bible.

But the term *one*, cannot refer to number, so as to mean that God is numerically one; because further, a plural term is added, and interposed between the two Jehovahs, in order to qualify their import. The declaration which God here makes of himself is, that "Jehovah, Elohim, is one Jehovah," that is, in English, "JEHOVAH, OUR GODS, IS ONE JEHOVAH." "OUR GODS," who has been pleased to call himself by the name Jehovah, from the consideration that he is self-existent, he is the only Jehovah, that is, the only God that exists,—the only God who is Jehovah,—the self-existent and ever blessed God. The passage, therefore, plainly does not refer to unity of number, but to unity of essence, or of nature; and teaches, as the Jews in their books of prayers express it, that God is UNUS, ONE, not UNICUS,† ONLY ONE. On this account therefore, because Jehovah Elohim is the only living and true God, he alone, is to be loved with all our heart and soul, and strength, and mind. And hence it is added, in the 14th verse, "ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people, which are round about you."

In like manner, the prophet Zachariah, in speaking of the times of Messiah says: "In that day, there shall be Jehovah one, and his name "one." And that this command was so understood by the Jews in our Saviour's time, is evident; for when he quoted this passage in reply to the inquiry, "which was the first and great commandment," the Scribe answered, "Well master thou hast said the truth, for there is one God, and there is none other but he."—(Mark xii: 28-34.) And thus also, the apostle Paul, the learned converted Jewish Rabbi,

\* De Wette, Bauer, Wegscheider. † See *Allix*. pp. 121 and 268.

says, "There is none other God but one."—(1 Cor. viii: 4.) Such also, is the interpretation given by ancient Jewish writers. This has been proved by many both converted Jews and learned Christians. Thus, in explaining the passage quoted from Zachariah, Rabbi David Kimchi interprets it as teaching that "the heathen will acknowledge that Jehovah is alone, that there is no God besides him, consequently there will be his name alone; as they will not make mention by name of any other God in the world; but will make mention of his name only." Indeed, so great is the sameness of this text, and that in Deut. vi: 4, that Rabbi Solomon has explained the one by the other, and has made the former, instead of a solemn attestation of the numerical unity of God, to be a prediction of the universal worship of Jehovah in the reign of Messiah. "He who is our God now, and not the God of the Gentiles, will hereafter be one common Jehovah." So also, Rabbi Abraham, another eminent Jewish Commentator, interprets Deut. vi: 4. "In other words," says he, "he, our God, is the foundation of our faith; and is likewise doubled, on being called one; meaning by himself, or alone; for that Jehovah is in this sense one, there are proofs without end." To the same effect might be quoted Rabbi Bechai Lipman and Rabbi Isaac Abarbinel.\* It is, therefore, very plain, both from the passage itself, from other similar passages, and from Jewish authorities themselves, that the term *one* in Deut. vi: 4, does not refer to a numerical, or metaphysical unity of person in the Deity, but to a unity of Godhead.

The term Jehovah in Hebrew, like the term God in English, refers to the Divine nature, form, or essence, and is thus equivalent to our word Deity or Godhead, which is undoubtedly and invariably in Scripture, declared to be one. And thus this passage, in a most definite and expressive manner, conveys the idea that notwithstanding the real plurality which is intimated in the term Elohim, Jehovah is still one in his incomprehensible essence. Unity and plurality are, therefore, evidently united in the one God, who is alone Jehovah.

\* See given in the original in Oxlee's "Christian Doctrine of the Trinity maintained on the principles of Judaism."—Lon. 1816, 3 vols., vol. i, p. 334.



The propriety of the emphatic *one* is lost in the Greek (which employs the term *Lord* for *Elohim*,) and in the English also, which renders the passage, "the Lord our God is one Lord." To say that our Lord, or God, is *one*, is an unmeaning tautology in comparison with "our Elohim is one." The plurality of that term shows the necessity of the restriction, and is equivalent to saying, "Jehovah our Elohim, though three persons, is one Jehovah. As there is only one God, there can be only one true God; and therefore, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are the only true God." For why else, we ask, does God in this passage, written "by holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," employ these three terms,—Jehovah, Elohim, Jehovah, in apposition to each other and one of them plural? The term *Elohim*, in Hebrew, has a singular form *Eloah* or *Eloh*, which is found as we have seen, above seventy times in the Old Testament, (as in Deut. xxxii: 15, 17.) Why then, is this word *most frequently* introduced in the plural form, signifying Gods; and that too, when the Deity himself is exclusively the subject, and authoritatively the speaker?\*

To this enquiry the Jews themselves admit the necessity of some reply, since Rabbi Huna remarks that had not God himself used this word, it would have been unlawful for man to do so.† The common people among the Jews, have also been prohibited from reading the history of the creation, lest they should be led into heresy,‡ and the Hebrew doctors have regarded this portion of Scripture as containing some latent mystery,—a mystery not to be revealed till the coming of the Messiah,§ and according to the Cabbala, the term Elohim is composed of the two words *El* and *Him*, that is, *they are God*.|

The only reply attempted to be given to this inquiry is an assumed idiom of the Hebrew language, by which

\* The term Elohim is used by Moses alone, *thirty* times in the history of the creation; and *five hundred* times, in one form or other, in the five Books of the Pentateuch.

† See in Martini Pugeo Fidei, p. 488.

‡ Allix. p. 182.

§ This the Rabbi Ibba expressly affirms.

| Rabbi Bachai in Kidder's Demonstration of the Messiah, pt. 3, p. 81.

it is said to be merely an honorary, or complimentary form of speech. But this is a complete begging of the question. The Hebrew is a sacred language—the language of that people whom God chose out of all others, to be the depository of his truth,—and the language in which for ages, that truth was revealed. It was imparted by God, as many have thought, as the original language, or when he gave the laws at Sinai. At any rate, God had the choosing of the language in which to reveal his truth, and the particular form in which his truth should be revealed. The Hebrew language which God has employed, has singular forms, not only of the name Elohim, but also for the other names by which God is designated. And if God, in his person, had been numerically and only one, he would *always*, as he has *sometimes*, employed the singular title; and thus have avoided a plural form, which, he must have foreknown, would be regarded as an evidence of plurality and not of Unity, in the one Divine nature. Why then, did God, by holy men, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, employ these plural titles of God? Why did this so-called idiom originate with the sacred Scriptures, and with God's revelation of himself in his own word? Either the language of the Scriptures is the language of polytheism and idolatry, as some have blasphemously supposed, or else this appellation of the Deity in the plural number is employed to express a plurality of persons in that Godhead to which it is appropriated.\*

In order to meet this argument, modern Jews and Unitarians have instituted two general modes of interpretation; the first of which is, that this is the regal form of speaking, in which the plural is used for the singular; the other, that it refers to the Deity in conference with his angels in council. The former opinion has been maintained on the ground of a number of Scriptural texts, all which Rabbi Abraham, one of their own doctors, is pleased to call false allegations; and has not only shown their irrelevancy, but demonstrated, that the opinion itself, has no manner of foundation. Indeed, there is not the smallest authority for it in the compositions of

\* See Oxlee, vol. i., pp. 68-94.

the Old Testament; which, being penned with that simplicity peculiar to the early ages of the world, introduce all princely characters expressing themselves invariably in their own proper number, and with the strictest grammatical propriety; nor does it distinguish, in that respect, between the most potent of sovereigns and the very lowest of the human species.\*

And as it regards the second opinion: That angels should act as coadvisers and coadjutors in the administration of the affairs of the world, is not only repugnant to the very meaning of the term angel, itself; which denotes a being deputed on a mission from God; but is wholly unsanctioned by any declaration to that effect, either in Moses or in the Prophets. It is, indeed, difficult to determine, whether the absurdity or the impiety with which the Creator is thus supposed to consult with created beings on such highly important matters, deserves the greater execration, for, says Scripture, "Who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor."

John Xeres, a Jew, converted in England some years ago, published a sensible and affectionate address to his unbelieving brethren, in which he lays before them his reasons for leaving the Jewish religion and embracing the Christian. "The Christians" says he, "confess Jesus to be God; and it is this that makes us look upon the gospels as books that overturn the very principles of religion." Then, he undertakes to prove that the unity of God is not such as he once understood it to be, an unity of persons, but of essence, under which more persons than one are comprehended; and the first proof he offers is that of the name Elohim. "Why else," says he, "is that frequent mention of God by nouns of the plural number? as in Gen. i: 1, where the word Elohim, which is rendered God, is of the plural number, though annexed to a verb of the singular number; which demonstrates as evidently as may be, that there are several persons partaking of the same Divine nature and essence."

To what has been said, we will add the testimony of the

\* See also, the exposure of this objection in Smith's *Messiah*, vol. 1., pp. 486-488.

celebrated Jewish work called Zohar,\* a work esteemed by the orthodox Jews, and by all former Jews, as scarcely second in authority to the Bible, and believed by *them* to have been written before the Talmud, if not before the time of Christ.† The author of this work renders Deut. vi: 4, in this manner: "The Lord, (or Jehovah,) and our God, and the Lord, are one." In his exposition of the passage beginning with *Jehovah*, he says: "He is the beginning of all things, the ancient of ancients, the Garden of Roots, and the perfection of all things." The other, or *our God*, is the depth, and the Fountain of Sciences, which proceed from that Father. The other (or Lord,) is called the measure of the Voice. He is one; so that one concludes with the other, and unites them together. Neither can one be divided from the other. And, therefore, he saith, Hear, O Israel, that is, join these together and make him one substance. For whatsoever is in the one, is in the other. He hath been the whole, he is the whole, and he will be the whole.‡ To the above exposition we would add the following,

\* See quoted in Kidder's Demonstration of the Messiah, pt. iii., p. 88, and Jameson's Reply to Priestly, vol. 1., pp. 75, 76.

† It certainly dates from the first to the eighth Century.

‡ These words are also given by Rabbi Markante, which undoubtedly implies his approbation of them. Such is the remarkable exposition of this passage, as given by Dr. Jameson, in his reply to Dr. Priestly. (1) From other portions of this work these expressions are quoted, (2) *Jehovah*, *Elohenu*, *Jehovah*, (i. e. *Jehovah*, our God, *Jehovah*.) These are the three degrees with respect to this sublime mystery; "in the beginning God (*Elohim*.) created the heavens and the earth," and again, "*Jehovah*, *Elohenu*, *Jehovah*, they are one; the three forms (modes or things) which are one." Elsewhere it is observed, "there are two and one is joined to them, and they are three, and when the three are one, he says to (or of) them these are the two names that Israel heard, *Jehovah*, *Jehovah*, and *Elohenu* (our God) is joined to them; and it is the seal of the ring of truth, and when they are joined, they are one in unity. This is illustrated by the three names the soul of man is called by, the soul, spirit and breath. The great Phillippe de Marnay, (3) among other ancient authors, quotes the exposition of Rabbi Iba of this text, to this purport, that the first *Jehovah*, which is the incommunicable name of God, is the Father; by *Elohim* is meant the Son, who is the fountain of all knowledge; and by the second, *Jehovah*, is meant the Holy Ghost proceeding from them, and he is called *Achad*, one, because God is one. Iba adds, that this mystery was not to be revealed till the coming of the

[1] See vol. i., p. 75, and the references.

[2] See Gill's Comment. in loco, and Univ. Hist. vol. iii., p. 11.

[3] Avertissement aux Juifs, see in Anot. Hist. vol. i., p. 11.

taken from the work itself. "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord: Israel unites the three hypostases, the Lord, our God, one Lord, to make all, to be but one."—(Zohar, vol. ii., fol. 160, col. 2.) The following passage is also found on the same page, viz: "The Lord, our God, Lord: this is the mystery of the unity in three hypostases.

But it is not merely to the use of the plural term as that by which the Old Testament Scriptures usually designate the Deity, that we refer as a proof, that according to God's own revelation of what his nature is, it unites a plurality of persons in a unity of essence. Written at a time when polytheism abounded, and to a people ever prone to fall into idolatry, the use of this term by God in reference to himself, and that even when announcing his Unity, is, indeed, most powerful evidence. This conclusion is, however, confirmed by another remarkable anomaly in the language used by the Old Testament writers when speaking of God, viz: the combination of these plural appellatives with singular verbs, pronouns and adjectives. To this usage only a few exceptions are found in the Hebrew Scriptures, from among hundreds of cases in which the plural appellative is used,—a circumstance which, whilst it shows that this was the regular usage of the sacred writers, at the same time proves that it would have been equally consistent with the idiom of the language, to have followed the ordinary rule of grammar applying to such cases. "For this anomaly, the Trinitarian hypothesis suggests a natural and easy solution. Apart from this hypothesis, however, no explanation of this usage can be furnished; and it must remain as one of the most unaccountable and capricious departures from one of the fundamental laws of human speech, of which we have an instance in the literature of any nation."\*

We are thus brought to the conclusion, that in this

**Messiah.** The author of the Zohar applies the word holy, which is thrice repeated in the vision of Isaiah, (4) to the three persons in the Deity, whom he elsewhere calls three suns, or lights, three sovereigns,—without beginning and without end.

[4] Chapter vi., 3.

\* Smith's Messiah.

first and great commandment, God makes known the unity of his Godhead, and yet, at the same time, the trinity of his persons, and that such was the interpretation given of it by the most ancient, the wisest, and the most authoritative Jewish Rabbis. And it is no small confirmation of this that when the Jews, long before the Christian era,\* ceased to use the word Jehovah which they never utter, they employed instead of it, the word *Adonai*, which is another plural title for the Deity.

When, therefore, in this, and some four or five other passages in the Old Testament, God declares that "he is one God and there is none else,"† the question arises, who is the being who is thus expressly declared to be the only true God? He is called the God of Israel, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. But who, we again ask, is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob? Jacob and the prophet Hosea concur in declaring that he is a certain angel or messenger before whom they walked; who fed Jacob all his life long, who redeemed him from all evil, with whom he had power and prevailed, and who yet is Jehovah the God of hosts.‡ But to be an angel or messenger he must be sent. Who then, is the SENDER of this MESSENGER? This question is resolved by the prophets Zechariah and Malachi. They teach us that the messenger of the covenant, though himself Jehovah and the God of Israel, is nevertheless, SENT, in his quality of a messenger, by Jehovah.§ Here, most unequivocally, we have two distinct persons, a SENDER and a SENT; each of whom is declared to be Jehovah; and the latter of whom, or Jehovah the messenger, is declared by Jacob and Hosea to be the God of Israel. But further, according to Malachi and Haggai, he is a being who is characterized, as the desire of all nations, who is announced as about to come suddenly to his temple; and whose act of coming to his temple is

\* Our evidences are found in the Septuagint.

† Exod. xx: 2, 3, Ia. xlv: 8, and xlvi: 9, and xlv: 21, 22.

‡ These remarks apply to the first and second commandment, in which, the same combination of Jehovah and Elohim takes place, and we are required to have no other Gods but this one, who unites in his one Godhead three persons.

§ Exod. iii: 15, Gen. xlviii: 15, 16, and xxxii: 24, 30, Hos. xii: 2, 15.

§ Zechariah ii: 6, 11, Malachi iii: 1.

chronologically limited to the days of the second temple, which is thence to exceed the first temple in glory, and which was finally destroyed by Titus and the Romans. But to such characteristics Christ alone will be found to answer. Whence, Christians have, in all ages, most logically and Scripturally concluded that Christ, or the second person of the blessed Trinity, or in other words, that God the Son is that messenger Jehovah, who is declared to have been sent by Jehovah, and who is yet Jehovah, and who is also, equally declared to be the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob.

But still further. In many passages of the Old Testament the phrase "The Spirit of God," or "Jehovah," occurs in conjunction with certain attributes, qualities and acts, which lead to the conclusion that by that phrase is designated a Divine person. These would seem to conduct to the inference, that by this "Spirit of Jehovah" was intended as by the phrase already examined, "Angel of Jehovah," a Divine person, in some sense distinct from, and yet in another sense, one with the invisible Jehovah.

In other passages again, these three persons are introduced together. Thus, in Isaiah, lxiii: 9, 10, it is said, "In all their afflictions he was afflicted, but the Angel of his presence saved them; in his love and grace he redeemed them, and bare them, and carried them from the beginning. But they rebelled and grieved his Holy Spirit, so that he was turned to be their enemy, and himself fought against them."

Another passage to the same effect occurs in Isaiah xlvi: 16. "Approach unto me, hear this; from the beginning have I not spoken occultly, from the time when it was I was there, and now THE LORD hath sent ME and his SPIRIT." The speaker here is the same who, in verse 12, calls himself "The First and the Last," and who, in verse 13, claims to himself the work of creation. The speaker therefore, must be regarded as Divine. But in the verse before us, this divine being speaks of HIMSELF as distinct from THE LORD GOD, and as sent by HIM. He describes himself also, as the author of communications to men from the first. Now, such a being can be none other than the second person in the Trinity, the revealer

of God to man, at once the equal and the messenger of the Father; and so the passage has been viewed by the great body of interpreters, ancient and modern.

What then, was the design of God in all these revelations of himself, of which, we have only given an illustration? To use the language of Bishop Hinds, "It surely must have been designed to suggest to the minds of his people, and to habituate their minds to contemplate God as Three. Three different divine Persons appear as the agents and rulers, in a threefold dispensation; so different indeed, that if left to form our conjectures of the divine nature from the facts of this progressive economy, all view of *one* God must have been discarded. The facts of Revelation represent God as a Trinity; and it is only by express and perpetual qualifications of a view so suggested, that we are assured of his Unity.

The doctrine of the Trinity in short, rests primarily on historical facts; the doctrine of the Unity on a series of declarations and other provisions made in reference to those facts. If we suppose the Bible stripped of all those provisions which it contains for qualifying its historical representations of the Divine nature, it would exhibit three Gods; but with those provisions, that representation becomes a Trinity in Unity.\*

Having thus disposed of the fundamental proof-text for the unity of God in contradistinction to all other pretended deities, as found in the Old Testament, let us now take one of the most striking declarations respecting the Unity of God in the New Testament. This is found in John xvii: 1-3. "These words spake Jesus and lifted up his eyes to Heaven and said, Father; the hour is come, glorify the Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

The argument drawn from this passage by Unitarians is, that since THE FATHER is declared to be THE ONLY true

\* See *The Three Temples of the One True God Contrasted*.—Oxf. 1850.



God, our Saviour, and the Holy Ghost are not truly God. But, in this argument, there is a gross fallacy. The very precise, and cautiously chosen, words of Christ are misstated. What Christ does say is, that his Father is the only true God, but he does not say that his Father **ONLY** is the true God. He affirms that his Father, in contrast with all the other so-called Gods, is the only true God, but he does not say that the Father **ONLY**, to the exclusion of the Son and the Holy Ghost, is alone this true God. Between these declarations there is a radical and essential difference. Christ affirms that there is an only true God, and that his Father is this only true God, both of which propositions we believe to be true. But this leaves the question still to be answered, as in the case of the Jehovah of the Old Testament,—who, and what, is this **ONE ONLY TRUE GOD**? According to his own representation of himself, God we have seen, is not an absolute, and uncompounded person, but is a triplicity of persons in one Godhead. God is a necessary, self-existent, spiritual being, in whom Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, do necessarily co-exist, so as to constitute that one being. The Father is the only true God, not excluding the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Son is the only true God, not excluding the Father and the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit is God, the only true, not excluding the Father and the Son. When, therefore, it is said the Father is the only true God, since each of them participates in that one essence or Godhead which is the only true and real God, each and all unite to constitute this one Godhead. And as this Godhead is common to each and all, it may be attributed to each; and each, therefore, may be called the only true God. Such is, as we believe, the teaching of Scripture as to the natural, necessary, and eternal union, in one Godhead, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And against this our Saviour affirms nothing; since he does not say thou Father **ONLY**, art the true God, but that the Father is **THE ONLY** true God, a declaration which is equally true of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

The term Father, when applied to God, does not always in Scripture, refer to the person of the Father, as distinct from the Son, but is employed as a general title

of the divine nature, and thus includes the three persons.\* When the term Father is applied to God personally, and not as to his Godhead or essence, it is either in reference to his paternal relation to his creatures, and especially to believers, or to Christ as his only begotten Son, "whose goings forth," or, as the words mean, "whose generation is from of old, from everlasting."†

Now, what our Saviour says, he says of "MY Father," *i. e.* of God as that eternal Godhead with whom he was "in the beginning as God, the Son." Christ, therefore, says, that God as his Father, that is God in that infinite essence and Godhead in which as he elsewhere declares "he and the Father are one," is the only true God. The very selection, out of all possible titles of God, of the term Father necessarily implies, and has reference to, the Son of whom Scripture is full. We everywhere read also, of the Holy Ghost, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, who is God. Now, the term Father implies that the person so described, in the order of internal relation between the persons of the trinity, is the source or fountain of the trinity and the first in authority and office. Of him, therefore, it may emphatically be said, that he is the true God, since he includes and implies in his own nature, the Son and Holy Ghost.

Besides, whatever of divine honour is here ascribed to the Father is also ascribed to the Son. For, it is not only necessary to eternal life to know the Father to be the only true God, but also, as our Saviour's words certainly imply, to know the Son also, as being also, the only true God as well as the Father. We are to know that and all that of the Son, which we are to know of the Father; that is, that he also, is the true God, and therefore, as elsewhere, God teaches us "we are to honour THE SON, EVEN AS WE honour THE FATHER."

Both the Son and the Father, therefore, and not the Father alone, or the Son alone, are represented as being unitedly and equally the grand objects of spiritual, saving knowledge, a statement which never would have been made without infinite presumption and impiety

\* Deut. xxxii: 6; Is. lxiii: 16, and lxiv: 3; Matt. v: 16, 48, and vi: 4, and 7, 11; John viii: 41.

† Micah vi: 4. See Jonathan Edward's Works, vol 9.

by Christ were he not himself "God, blessed for ever."

The knowledge here made requisite is, it must be remembered, a spiritual and heartfelt reliance on the united object presented to our faith. It includes love to him, adoration of him, and obedience to his commands. And as this knowledge is to be directed to the Son as well as to the Father, in order to obtain eternal life, the Son is to be regarded as the only true God equally with the Father. And this is what we are elsewhere taught, when we are told that "God is IN CHRIST reconciling the world unto himself," Christ being "GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH."

But further, the Father is here said to be the only true God, because he only can give eternal life. But this eternal life is here and elsewhere, more frequently and emphatically, associated absolutely and entirely with the Son, who must, therefore, also be the only true God. And hence Christ is denominated frequently "the life." He is frequently said to give "everlasting life" and "eternal life."\* And the apostle John, as if in allusion to this passage, declares, "and we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is TRUE, and we are IN HIM that is TRUE, even IN HIS SON JESUS CHRIST. THIS IS THE TRUE GOD AND ETERNAL LIFE."

And that the Son is elsewhere called the true God in Scripture, is admitted by Socinus himself, the father of modern Socinians.† "It is very false," says Socinus, "that we should openly declare Jesus Christ is not true God. We profess to say the contrary, and declare that he is true God, in several of our writings, as well in the Latin as in the Polish language." "Jesus Christ," says Smalcinus, another father of the Unitarians, "also may be called with a sovereign right our God, and the true God, and so he really is." Our Saviour therefore, in attributing to HIMSELF as well as to THE FATHER the title "only true God," speaks, as our opponents admit, in conformity with the other portions of Scripture; as when, in the Old Testament, that being, whom we have

\* John vi: 27, and x: 28; Matt. xix: 16, 21.

† See Ad. Wick., p. 49, in Abaddie, p. 275.

identified with Christ, is made to declare "I am Jehovah thy God; thou shalt have no other Gods before me." "Is there a God beside me? Yea, there is no God; I know not any;" and again: "There is no God else besides one, a just God and a Saviour; there is none besides me; for I am God, and there is none else:" and again, "I am God, and there is none else; I am God and there is none like unto me."

The expressions in this text manifestly allude to the multitude of Pagan divinities who falsely bare the name of Gods. The adjective *true* is opposed to false, and the adverb *only* is opposed to many. Christ was, evidently, speaking in opposition to the corrupt theology of the heathen, as if he had said, "The Gentiles perish, because they have no knowledge of any but false Gods; but it is life eternal to know thee, the only true God, in opposition to idols, including his co-equal and co-essential Son, who is Jesus the Christ."

Of exactly similar import is the declaration of the apostle in 1 Cor. viii: 4-6. "As concerning therefore, the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, as there be gods many and lords many; but to us there is but one God,—THE FATHER, of whom are all things, and we in him; AND ONE LORD JESUS CHRIST, by whom are all things, and we by him." Here also God,—that is, the Godhead, or God considered in his essence, and as implying the Father and the Son, is said to be ONE in opposition to idols as in 1 Thess. i: 9. If we compare this with the expression of St. Thomas, "My Lord and my God," we have the following argument: "To us there is but one God the Father—but to us Jesus Christ is also Lord and God. The Gospel has, therefore, either preached two Gods, one distinct from the other, or that the "one God the Father" is here the name of a nature, under which Christ himself, as God, is also comprehended. The same conclusion may be also deduced from several other passages. Thus, in Matt. xxiii: v. 9, it is said, "Call no man your Father upon earth, for ONE IS YOUR FATHER, which is in hea-

ven." But in verse 10, it is said, "Neither be ye called MASTERS, for ONE IS YOUR MASTER, EVEN CHRIST, (vide John iii: 13,) which is in Heaven. Now, if from the words, ONE IS YOUR FATHER, an argument is drawn for the exclusive divinity of the Father, the same argument would prove, *that one person only is our master*, and that this person is Christ, which excludes the persons of the Father and the Spirit from the honour of that title, and therefore, reduces the argument to an absurdity. We are to conclude then, that as the phrase, "one master," cannot be meant to exclude the Father, so neither do other similar expressions applied to the Father, as "one good," or "one is your Father," exclude the person of Christ. The title of Father is, itself, ascribed to the second person of the Trinity; for Christ, the Alpha and the Omega, says of himself, "He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I WILL BE HIS GOD, and he shall be MY SON."\* Isaiah expressly calls him the EVERLASTING FATHER. Again, it is written, "They are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection:" "but," says Christ, "I am the resurrection." Christ therefore, is God, and the believers are his children. The word Father, therefore, cannot always be a name that distinguishes the first person in the Godhead from the other persons of the Godhead, but is often to be understood as a term merely of relation, and as in this sense, applicable to the second person also.†

But Whitby so fairly meets, and so fully confutes the argument which Dr. Carpenter, and Unitarians generally, derive from this passage, that I shall here transcribe his comment. The passage is this: "To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in (or for) him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." Hence, (says Whitby,) the Arians and Socinians argue against the Deity of Christ, as he who saith there is one Emperor, to wit, Cæsar, saith in effect, there is no other Emperor but Cæsar. So he that saith there is one God the Father, saith in effect, there is no other God besides the Father. Again, he who, having separately spoken of one God,

\* Revel. xxi: 7, Isaiah ix: 6, Luke xx: 36, John ii: 45.

† See Jones on Trinity.

proceeds distinctly to speak of one Lord, to wit: Jesus Christ doth, by that distinct title, sufficiently show Christ is not that God. Such is the argument of Unitarians. To this Whitby replies: "To the second argument the reply is obvious, by retorting the argument, as to the ancient Commentators, against this Arian objection, thus: That, as the apostle, by saying there is one Lord Jesus Christ, cannot be reasonably supposed to exclude the Father from being the Lord of Christians, as he is often styled in the New Testament; so neither by saying, there is one God the Father, ought he to be supposed to exclude Jesus Christ from being also, the God of Christians. So argue Origen and Novatian; especially if we consider, first, that he is here styled *that one Lord, by whom are all things, i. e.* "by whom all things are created."—Ephes. iii: 9. "All things which are in heaven or in earth."—Coloss. i: 16. For "he that made all things is God."—Heb. iii: 5. And "by the works of the Creation is the Godhead known."—Rom. iii: 20. And this is elsewhere made the very description of God the Father, that it is he, by whom are all things.—Rom. xi: 35, and Heb. xi: 10. And next, that all things were created not only by this Lord, but (*εις αυτον*) "for him" also.—Col. i: 16. Now, this is the very thing which the apostle here ascribes to God the Father.

"Secondly, to the other argument I answer, that we and all the ancients assert, as truly as our opponents can do, the unity of the Godhead, and that Christ Jesus is not another God, but only another person from the Father; and that the application of the word God here to the Father, doth not necessarily exclude the Son from being God also, but only from being the fountain of the Deity, as the Father is. Thus, when these words, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, (Revel. i: 17; ii: 8, and xxii: 13,) are by St. John, applied to Christ, it cannot be concluded hence, that the Father is not also Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, as he is often called in the Old Testament; and though our Saviour be the proper title of our Lord Jesus, as his very name informs us, yet is the Father in Scripture styled our Saviour, (1 Tim. i: 1, and ii: 3,) and the Saviour of all men, iv: 10. The primitive fathers considering God

the Father as the fountain of the Deity, and Jesus Christ as God of God, frequently assert two things, which may illustrate this passage:

First, That Christians acknowledge one God only, even the Father, and yet that Jesus Christ was truly God, of the substance of the Father.

Secondly, That God the Father was the Creator of all things, and yet that all things were created by the Word."

And here, also, in describing this God, as he exists tri-personally, the Son is associated with the Father by the term Lord, which is equivalent to Jehovah or Supreme Divinity, and by the attribution to him of the same universal, infinite and divine dominion. And so also, in the only other very distinct allusion to the unity of God in the New Testament in 1 Tim. ii: 3, 5. The apostle in verse 3, speaks of God our Saviour, and attributes to our Saviour as God sovereign power and dominion, and then adds: "For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," where with God, who in his essence is called one, Christ is again associated in the statement of the object of Christian worship and adoration. The Apostle, in effect says, pray for all men; because all, without exception, are accountable to one supreme moral authority, and have only one way of hope and salvation. To all men, there is no other than one Saviour, the only Deliverer from the guilt of sin and the wrath to come.

Thus, it appears that even in affirming the unity of God, the New Testament, as well as the Old, never teaches the absolute and personal unity of God, but only the unity of his essence in contrast with all false Gods. So far from doing so, we have seen that even in declaring the unity of God the New Testament holds forth Christ as associated in the one Godhead, as "the true God and eternal life;" and in another passage, as "the blessed and ONLY potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who "ONLY hath immortality." Such is the union between the Father and the Son, that in respect of their essential glories, what is asserted of the one, is to be understood of the other. Jesus, therefore, not only says, "I and the Father are one;" but also affirms

that "he who honours the Son, honours the Father also." And again, he says, "ALL that the Father hath, is mine,—his nature, essence, or Godhead. He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father also."

It will afterwards be shown that Scripture attributes to the Holy Spirit, as well as to the Son, everything which is ascribed to the Father, and that he therefore, is also, "the only true God." But, at present, it is enough to have proved this of the Son, and that too, from the very passages adduced to establish the absolute, personal, and metaphysical unity of God.

We thus perceive that, on the one hand, we are taught in Scripture, that there is one only true God. On the other hand, we are equally taught in Scripture, that the Father and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are alike this one only true God. Hence, devoutly receiving the Bible as the divine word of inspiration, and presuming not to be wise either above what is written, or contrary to what is written, we conclude from these several declarations of Scripture, that there is one only true God, the maker of heaven and earth, but that this one only true God, mysteriously exists in three persons, or hypostases, as he himself terms it, and that the Supreme Being is one, in regard to his substance or his proper divine nature; but that he is three, in regard to his component persons or hypostases.

A Christian is bound therefore, to believe, that there is one only true God, and that the Almighty Father of heaven and earth is that God.

This tenet, at once separates him from those who worship the multifarious rabble of Pagan divinities; for, if he admit as the very foundation of his creed, the existence of one only true God, he must of necessity, reject from his creed a plurality of false gods.

But, as a Christian is bound to believe, that there is one only true God; so is he likewise bound to believe, that the one only true God hath sent Jesus of Nazareth in the character of the promised Messiah; and that as such, HE is God manifest in the flesh, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the mighty God, the everlasting Father and the Prince of Peace,—the co-equal person, with the Father and the Holy Ghost in the ever-blessed



triune Jehovah. This is the God to whom as a Christian, every believer is dedicated, into whose name (or nature and glory,) he is baptized, in whom he is to believe, and whom he is to love, honour, worship and obey with all his heart, and soul, and strength, and mind.

The former article of his belief separates the Christian from polytheistic Gentiles. The latter article of his belief separates him from the Jews; for though they have ever firmly expected the promised Messiah, they have generally, as pertinaciously denied that the Messiah has come in the person of Jesus of Nazareth,—that he is God,—that the Holy Ghost is God,—and that God is a triune Jehovah, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in one essential nature.

We must never forget, however, that mere doctrinal knowledge, however essential, will stand us in little avail, unless it is manifested in our practice. That same Divine person, who declared the knowledge of God the Father and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to be eternal life, declared also, no less unequivocally, “Not every one, that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which in Heaven.\*

Unitarians may say, that to know Jesus Christ, is to know the will of God, as delivered by Jesus Christ. But it is not knowing the will of God, but God himself as a Saviour, that will secure us eternal life. To know Jesus Christ is, therefore, to know him as he is represented in the Gospel, as God and man; and as having become such for our redemption; and to believe in, love, and obey him as such, and thus we perceive the plain, practical, and fundamental character of the doctrine of the trinity.

This does God's book declare in obvious phrase,  
 In most sincere and honest words, by God  
 Himself selected and arranged, so clear,  
 So plain, so perfectly distinct, that none  
 Who read with humble wish to understand,  
 And ask the Spirit given to all who ask,  
 Can miss their meaning, blazed in heavenly light.

\* 1 Peter, i: 5-7, and ix: 11.

The true One God, in Persons Three,  
Great Father of eternity,  
Swift with the sun departs the day,  
Oh, shed on us a heavenly ray.

At morn and even to Thee we raise  
The sigh of prayer, the song of praise,  
Though poor the strain, its aim is high,—  
God over all to glorify!

Father, for ever be adored  
And Thou,—the Son,—our only Lord,  
And Thou, true Consolation Giver,  
Now, henceforth, and for ever!

---

God the Father! with us be,  
Shield us Thou from danger nigh,  
From sin's bondage set us free,  
Help us happily to die!

God the Saviour! with us be,  
Shield us Thou from danger nigh,  
From sin's bondage set us free,  
Help us happily to die!

God the Spirit! with us be,  
Shield us Thou from danger nigh,  
From sin's bondage set us free,  
Help us happily to die!

Keep us in the heavenly faith,  
From Satan us deliver;  
Thine in life and thine in death,  
Thine only and for ever!

God! with thy weapons arm us,  
With all true Christians, shall we,—  
Nor earth, nor hell, to harm us,—  
Hallelujah sing to thee!

*Hymns of Ancient Church.*

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE PSALTER OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

The essential element of the Romish apostasy is *creature-worship*. Popery, like heathenism, has “changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served

the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever."

Perhaps no single work ever written, by Papist or Protestant, exhibits this feature of the great apostasy more strongly than the one, the title of which we have placed at the head of this article. It consists of one hundred and fifty Psalms, in imitation of the inspired Psalms of the Bible, all addressed to the Virgin Mary; several songs of praise in like manner, addressed to her, parodied from different passages of Scripture; a hymn in imitation of the *Te deum laudamus*, and a creed answering to that of St. Athanasius. The whole is arranged as a service, distributed into *hours* for all the days of the week, in imitation of the usual services of the R. C. Church, and designed to be used constantly as a book of devotion.

Though written six hundred years ago, and many times printed, widely circulated, and extensively used as a book of devotion in Roman Catholic countries, it is comparatively little known to Protestants; and we have thought it well worth while to draw the attention of our readers to it, and to present them some extracts from it. We trust it may subserve the cause of truth, by exhibiting one of the gross, yet subtle corruptions of Christianity, and by arousing some lukewarm Protestants to a sense of danger from the insidious advances of Romanism in various parts of our beloved land.

Nearly twelve years ago, when the question of the endowment by the British Government of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, was under discussion, both in and out of Parliament, Protestants in England, were astonished at the announcement, made in a public meeting by a member of Parliament, that such a book existed, and that it was one in constant use at the College, which it was proposed that the nation should endow. Many of our readers, we doubt not, will be equally astonished by the extracts which we present; and we think they will thank us for drawing their attention to so remarkable a development of the corrupt system which, throughout Europe, passed under the name of Christianity, in the age when the "Psalter of the Virgin Mary" was written.

Some doubts have been raised as to the authorship of this work. It is not necessary to discuss them. It is sufficient for our purpose, that its reputed author\* is a Saint of the Roman Calendar; and that the work is, and has been for centuries, in extensive use and high repute, as a devotional book, among the members of that communion. The edition from which our extracts are taken, was printed at Lyons, in 1729, in Latin and French, with the Royal privilege and approbation, and accompanied by a recommendation from a Doctor of the Sorbonne, in which it is styled "a work of great piety." The writer of the preface says:

"The devotees of the Holy Virgin will be charmed, in reciting this Psalter, with the sentiment and affections with which it is filled; for the holy Doctor has here collected all that can be said, both grand and tender, respecting Our Lady. They will see here, with admiration, what a sublime idea of MARY the Holy Spirit gives to the souls which it possesses; and how far the greatest Saints have carried their love, their confidence, and their praises, towards this divine Queen."

"Those who are little touched with the love of the Holy Virgin, and little enlightened in respect to her graces and privileges, will, perhaps, be surprised at the manner in which our Saint expresses himself, in speaking of a mere creature. But let them reflect that it is a Doctor of the church who speaks, a Doctor too, who, by his eminent holiness, earned for himself the title of *The Seraphic Doctor*. He was both too enlightened to err, and too holy to fill an entire work with sentiments not conformed to the Spirit of God. Let them reflect that this mere creature, whom the Saint here addresses, is the

\* St. Bonaventura, born at Bagnorea, in Tuscany, in the year 1221. At the age of twenty-one he became a monk of the order of St. Francis; at thirty-five, General of his order; and the year following, Doctor of the University of Paris. At the time of his death, in 1274, he was a Cardinal and Papal Legate at the Council of Lyons. It is an evidence of the high regard in which he was held that his funeral was attended by the Pope, the Cardinals, two Patriarchs, and five hundred Bishops.

St. B. wrote on the rules of his order and in its defence, on the worship of the Virgin Mary, celibacy, transubstantiation, &c. His *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* is said to have been the work which procured for her the title of "the Seraphic Doctor." He was canonized by Pope Sixtus IV.

Mother of the Creator and Redeemer, spouse of the Holy Spirit, Queen of Heaven and Earth, Sovereign of angels and men, to whom the world owes its deliverance; and who, having been associated with her Son in the work of redemption, is still (associated) in his glory, in his dominion, and in that supreme power which has been given to him in heaven and on earth. Whoever can penetrate, as St. Bonaventura did, all that these titles signify, how easily would he understand the language of this holy Doctor, and how much relish and consolation would he find in it!"

After an argument to prove that this worship of the Virgin is not inconsistent with that which is due to Christ, admitting "that the merits of Jesus are infinite, while those of Mary are finite," he proceeds:

"Still this difference stands not in the way of the fact that it hath pleased that adorable Son to render his holy Mother all powerful with himself; to share with her all his goods, all his honours, all his titles, and to make her the depositary and dispenser of his treasures. This is what the Saints have believed; this is what the universal church gives us to understand, when it calls Mary our Advocate, our Refuge, our Hope, our Life, our Sweetness, our Succour, our Consolation, Mother of Grace, Mother of Mercy, Pole-star, Gate of Heaven, &c. St. Bonaventura has said nothing of the holy Virgin which is not included in these titles. What have we then to fear in using the same language which he used, and in nourishing the devotion of the people toward the Mother of God, with the same affections with which we see that the greatest Saints nourished theirs."

After alluding to the numerous editions of the work which had been already published in various parts of the world, and mentioning some traits of his own, the edition proceeds:

"We believe that in contributing by this means to foster devotion to the holy Virgin, we are rendering a service to the church and to the country; for it is a remark universally true, that wherever this devotion flourishes, there the faith also flourishes; and that on the contrary one of the speediest effects of heresy (!) is, first,

to weaken, and at length to abolish entirely, devotion to the holy Virgin."

In closing his preface, the editor strongly recommends that this work should be put into the hands of youth, "to impress seasonably upon their tender hearts, devotion towards our Lady, and to cause them to taste its sweetness."

But we must hasten to present some extracts from the work itself. They might be taken almost at random, and yet could not fail to exhibit throughout, the same application of idolatrous epithets, the same attributing to Mary of the honors, attributes and powers of her Son. Take the 18th and 19th Psalms (corresponding to Psalms 19th and 20th,) as specimens. We give them entire :

## PSALM 18.

"Cœli enarrant gloriam tuam, Virgo MARIA, et unquentorum tuorum fragrantia in omnibus gentibus est dispersa.

Respirate ad illam, perditii peccatores; et perducet vos ad indulgentiæ portum.

In hymnis et psalmis et canticis, pulsate viscera ejus; et stillabit vobis gratiam dulcedinis suæ.

Glorificate eam, justi ante thronum Dei; quia fructu ventris ejus estis justitiam operati.

Laudate eam, cœli cœlorum; et nomen ejus glorificet omnis terra.

The heavens declare thy glory, O Virgin Mary, and the fragrance of thy ointments is dispersed among all the nations.

Pant after her, ye lost sinners, and she will conduct you to the port of pardon.

Touch her compassion by hymns and psalms, and songs of praise; and she shall shed upon you the grace of her sweetness.

Glorify her, ye just, before the throne of God, for by the fruit of her womb, ye have wrought righteousness.

Praise her, ye heavens of heavens, and let all the earth glorify her name.

## PSALM 19.

Exaudias nos, Domina, in die tribulationis, et precibus nostris converte clementem faciem tuam.

Ne projicias nos in tempore mortis nostræ; sed succurre animæ, dum deseruerit corpus suum.

Mitte angelum bonum in occursum ejus, per quem ab hostibus defendatur.

Hear us, O Lady, in the day of trouble, and attend kindly to our prayers.

Cast us not off in the day of our death; but succour the soul when it leaves the body.

Send a good angel to meet it, by whom it may be defended from its enemies.

<p>Ostende ei serenissimum Judicem saeculorum; qui ob tui gratiam veniam ei largiatur.</p> <p>Sentiat in pœnis refrigerium tuum; et concede ei locum inter electos Dei.</p>	<p>Cause the Judge of all worlds to be most favourable to it, that for thy sake he may grant it pardon.</p> <p>In the pains [of purgatory,] may it feel thy consolation, and grant it a place among the elect of God.</p>
---	---

That the pains, mentioned in the last verse, are those of purgatory, is evident from the French translation, which has *dans les peines du Purgatoire*.

But, it will be unnecessary to do more than give brief extracts. Almost every sentence contains ascriptions to Mary of that which belongs to God alone. Praise, thanksgiving, confession, and the fullest outpouring of trust and confidence are, throughout, offered to one who trusted as truly and as singly to Christ, for the salvation of her own soul, as the lowliest penitent that ever cried, "God be merciful to me a sinner."

The 28th of these remarkable Psalms begins thus :

<p>"Auferte Domine nostræ, filii Dei; auferte Domine nostræ laudem et reverentiam."</p>	<p>"Offer unto our Lady, ye sons of God; offer unto our Lady praise and reverence."</p>
---	---

The 30th thus :

<p>"In te, Domina, speravi; non confundar in æternum; in gratia tua suscipe me."</p>	<p>"In thee, O Lady, have I trusted; let me never be confounded; in thy grace undertake for me."</p>
--	--

The 44th contains the following :

<p>"Per tuam sanctitatem peccata mea purgantur; per tuam integritatem mihi incorruptibilitas condonetur."</p>	<p>"By thy holiness let my sins be purged away; and by thy uprightness let immortality be conferred upon me."</p>
---	---

The 50th commences thus :

<p>"Miserere mei, Domina, quæ Mater misericordiæ nuncuparis."</p>	<p>"Have mercy upon me, O Lady, who art named the Mother of Mercy."</p>
---	---

And ends with these words :

<p>"Fructui ventris tua me reconcilia; et pacifica me ie, qui me creavit."</p>	<p>"Reconcile me with the fruit of thy womb, and make my peace with Him who created me."</p>
--	--

The 90th commences :

<p>"Qui habitat in adjutorio Matris Dei, in protectione ipsius commorabitur."</p>	<p>"He that dwelleth in the help of the Mother of God, shall abide under her protection."</p>
---	---

And the following one thus :

"Bonum est confiteri Virgini Mariæ;  
et psallere illi gloriam prosperitas est  
mentia."

"It is a good thing to give thanks  
to the Virgin Mary; and to sing  
her praise is the prosperity of the  
soul."

The reader will, perhaps, consider these extracts more than enough. One spirit pervades the whole, and that is a spirit of intense devotion to the worship of a creature. The first Psalm in this collection of blasphemous parodies commences, "Blessed is the man who loveth thy name, O Virgin Mary," and the last one ends, "Let every thing that hath breath praise our Lady."

And the prayers and other pieces interspersed between the Psalms are no less intensely idolatrous. An invocation at the beginning has the following expressions: "To thy protection we resort, holy Mother of God; despise not our entreaties in our necessities, but deliver us from all danger, Oh, glorious and blessed ever-Virgin. Oh Lady, open thou my lips, and my mouth shall show forth thy praise," &c.

The *Te Deum laudamus* is parodied, and becomes *Te Matrem Dei laudamus*, and "Holy, holy, holy," becomes "Sancta, sancta, sancta Maria, Dei genitrix." "All the earth doth worship thee, as the spouse of the Eternal Father! All angels and archangels, thrones and principalities, serve thee with fidelity," etc. In a litany at the close, Mary is styled "Mother of Divine Grace," "Mother of the Creator," "Mirror of Justice," "Seat of Wisdom," Cause of our Joy," "Mystical Rose," "Tower of David," "Ivory Tower," "Golden Palace," "Ark of the Covenant," "Gate of Heaven," "Morning Star," "Health of the Weak," "Refuge of Sinners," "Help of Christians," and "Queen of Angels."

It is not strange that a system of worship which appeals so strongly to the imagination, and to human sympathy, should have a powerful hold on its votaries, especially if they have been trained under its influence in early life. On the contrary, the wonder is, that any escape from its toils. Its tendency is to greater and still greater excesses. One of the Prayers appended to this Psalter of St. Bonaventura is addressed "To the sacred *Heart* of the Holy Virgin." It behooves us to remem-



ber, however, that earnestness of devotion to a religious system does not prove it true, any more than firm intellectual persuasion; but that it must inevitably render a false system all the more dangerous.

We dismiss this remarkable production, simply entreating the reader, be he Papist or Protestant, seriously to consider how that whole scheme of creature worship, of which it is a distinguished exponent, must appear in the eyes of Him who has said, "*My glory will I not give to another,*" and "*I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God.*"

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE POWER OF MORAL HABIT, AS IT AFFECTS THE POWER OF FAITH.

The general fact that the feelings of the heart do exercise an important influence over the operations of the intellect, none will deny. This influence is produced even by states of feeling which are transient. Much more does it follow from those which are habitual, and which constitute the permanent features of the moral character. To previous habits of association and sympathy, more than to mere differences of intellectual capacity, we must trace the various and conflicting opinions of men on almost every subject. It is this intimate connection between the dispositions of the heart and the decisions of the intellect, which renders man responsible in the belief or the rejection of truth. The belief of error on many subjects, may be morally indifferent, and involve no degree of guilt, either in its origin or results. But this can never be the case, where the essential truths of religion are concerned. From the very nature of those truths, belief or unbelief must be traced to a corresponding state of the moral nature. The distinction between truth and falsehood here is not merely intellectual, but at the same time, and essentially, moral. This will appear more evident, if we consider the nature

of her faith, and remember what is implied in really believing religious truth.

Faith is an emotional, as well as an intellectual act. "With *the heart* man believeth unto righteousness." It follows necessarily from the nature of the truths and doctrines of religion,—from their direct adaptation to our desires and wants, our hopes and fears,—that whenever they are rightly apprehended, and really believed, the emotions of the heart must consent and coöperate with the conceptions of the mind, in regard to them. There may be degrees of true faith, according to the intensity of conviction in the understanding, and the amount of truth embraced in the belief. But the degree of effect produced on the heart will be in exact conformity to these conditions. The awakened mind of the anxious inquirer may, at first, really apprehend and believe only certain portions of Gospel truth; and the feelings of his heart are affected accordingly. He may believe in the existence of God, the obligations of his law, and in his own guilt and condemnation as a transgressor of that law. But, enveloped in darkness and bewildered by fear, he may not as yet, give heed to that inviting voice of a merciful Saviour which says, "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe in God, believe also in me." Hence, he remains a stranger to that repentance and trust, that hope, joy, and love, which a real apprehension of this transporting truth awakens in the breast of every sincere believer. A real belief of religious truth is, invariably, attended by a class of feelings, which correspond to the amount and character of that truth: and the genuine faith of the sincere Christian, which embraces the whole circle of Gospel truth, implies that radical change of heart, that entire transformation of character, which is termed regeneration. He is a new creature in the practical operations and moral results of that faith, which "works by love and purifies the heart." This is the only kind of belief in Christianity, which is genuine and entire. Any form of faith which falls short of this is either partial or insincere. It is absurd to speak of a belief which is *merely intellectual*; if we mean that such a belief possesses any consistency with itself, or with the truths of religion. It is true, this term is often em-

ployed to denote that vague, careless, and contradictory assent, which a large class of unregenerate men are accustomed to yield to the truth of Christianity, while their hearts and lives remain wholly uninfluenced by its authority, and while they manifest in reference to its teachings, a habit of *practical unbelief*. Perhaps the term may serve as well as any other, to indicate the kinds of belief, which such persons entertain,—a belief which springs from an unquestioning acquiescence of the mind in the impressions of early education, or the influences of public sentiment; while, in some cases, it may be sustained by a general survey of that mass of evidence which supports the Gospel. But does such an assent possess the character, and does it deserve the name of a real and rational belief in the Gospel of Christ?—an assent to Christianity as a general system of truth, which assent is, at the same time, directly contradicted by a positive disbelief of the facts separately and severally, which compose that system,—a belief in general, but unbelief in particulars?

Apply some of the facts and doctrines of Christianity to the experience of such men, and see if they are really believed by them. Take, not only the existence, but the attributes of God, as they are revealed. Those essential features which constitute his character as God. For example, his omnipresence, his omniscience, and the sovereign and universal sway of his providence. Unregenerate men admit the idea of a God; but it is a God divested of those attributes which are essential to his character. Do they realize his constant presence? Do they act under the conviction that his eye surveys all the secrets of their hearts and all the facts of their history? Do they cherish habitually, a sense of their absolute dependence on the protecting care of his over-ruling Providence? Are these the real convictions of their minds, and the genuine sentiments of their hearts? Or rather, is it not true of such, that “God is not in all their thoughts,” and that they live “without God in the world?” Are not such convictions and sentiments at positive variance with their uniform and life-long habits of thought and feeling?

Take again, the doctrine of human depravity,—not

merely as a general fact pertaining to our fallen race,—but as a positive truth, in its personal application to each individual of the race; that the heart of each man, by nature, is corrupt, deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, at enmity with God and opposed to his law; that each man is a sinner, not from the innocent infirmities of his condition, but from the wilful promptings of a wicked heart; and that he stands justly condemned before God, without an excuse to urge in extenuation of his guilt. Now, we ask, is this truth really believed by unregenerate men? Do they honestly entertain such ideas of their own character?

Take again, that truth, so palpable to all experience and observation, as well as so plainly revealed in the Bible, which affirms the vanity of this world as a portion for the soul; and that the great end of the present life is to secure a preparation for a life to come. Do unregenerate men practically believe this? Do they habitually cherish such convictions? Do they honestly act under such impressions? Where are their affections and hopes, their plans and purposes, and to what are the energies of their lives supremely devoted? The world, in its pleasures, and honours, and riches, is held as the chief good, the only substantial reality, while all above and beyond it, is regarded as a dim region of shadows and dreams.

We might enumerate other prominent truths of religion which are practically disowned and rejected by those who yet professedly admit the truth of revelation. Now, the question recurs, do such persons really believe the religion of Christ? We answer, no! Do they then disbelieve, and are they infidels? They would feel themselves aggrieved by the charge; and we shall not insist on it, at present. But, wherein lies the actual difference between such an one and him who is confessedly an infidel? Direct the infidel to that train of evidences which support Christianity as a divine institution, and he replies they are unsatisfactory, he withholds his assent from the conclusion to which they would bring him, pronounces the whole matter a cheat and delusion, and gives himself no further concern about it. Direct the other to the same evidences, and he may follow, step by

step, that mighty argument which places Christianity on a foundation of rock, and he may feel at each step, a growing conviction of its truth, until he arrives at the conclusion, assured beyond a doubt, that this religion is divine in its origin. But he, also, turns away, and gives himself no further concern about it. Direct the infidel to the history of the Gospel. Tell him to mark the traces of its journey along the fields of the past, and he replies, "you are chasing a phantom," and he turns away from the pursuit as profitless and vain. Direct the other to the same point, and he at once exclaims, "Lo, here are the foot-prints of something divine." But, when the living object itself, is overtaken, when Christianity in its real features stands revealed before him, he passes by with an averted look and a careless air, as if it were something wholly unworthy of his notice. Close your Bible, and offer it to an infidel, and he spurns it away from him as a fable and a lie! Present the same Bible closed, to an ordinary man of the world, and he meekly receives it as a revelation from Heaven. But open its sacred leaves, and let the smothered light of truth come in contact with his mind, and he is just as great an infidel! Yet he possesses some kind of a belief in Christianity, though it be a belief which is positively contradicted and nullified in his whole actual experience. Now, why is it that he maintains this inconsistent and contradictory position? When the light is confessedly admitted within the outer chamber of the intellect, why is it arrested and shut out from all access to the heart and conscience? Why, in direct opposition to the truth, as acknowledged by the understanding, does he maintain an attitude of blind indifference and practical unbelief? Is it owing to a want of light,—a defect of evidence,—the absence of sufficient proof? No, he already professes himself perfectly convinced of the general truth of the system. The difficulty would not be removed by multiplying evidence. Indeed, the obstacle in his case cannot be reached by demonstration. It is located, not in the rational, but the moral part of his nature,—not in his intellect, but in his heart. It is formed by the permanent features of his moral character. It springs from the settled habits of the inner man.

The previous views and sentiments, tastes and affections, desires and hopes of such a character,—all those secret streams which combine to form the mighty current of the will,—bear down in direct opposition to the teachings and tendencies of truth. While this moral character is maintained, such practical unbelief will be perpetuated. No human power can give it a more real or consistent shape. No exhibition of evidence, no array of argument, no intervention of miracles, could produce a real and cordial belief, while such a character remained. Even should one arise from the dead, and with the habiliments of the grave around him, should bear his awful testimony to the realities which lie beyond it, those who possessed this character would not be inwardly, effectually persuaded of the truth. That character must be changed before a cordial belief of the truth is possible. Indeed, the very act of true belief implies such a change of character; and by its first living motion within the soul, faith completes the overthrow of all previous habits of thought and feeling, which have opposed its existence.

The causes then, which produce this practical unbelief are, obviously, wholly of a moral character. The light which is admitted by the understanding, is excluded from all access to the inner man, because it meets with positive resistance from the previous elements of the moral nature. The moral habits which are inseparable from an ungodly mind—the views of life, the plans and purposes, the affections and hopes, which are peculiar to a worldly spirit,—are all at positive variance with the dictates of truth. And while such a character is maintained, truth is necessarily rejected from the heart, even after it has gained access to the understanding. And man is willing to submit to the contradiction involved, so long as he may be able to smother and hide the truth under a covering of indifference. Unwelcome guest though it be, he permits it to remain in that outer apartment, provided it will only consent to sleep on there in quietness, and not prove troublesome by untimely intrusions within more private quarters.

Now, the same causes which produce this practical unbelief, even where the truth of Christianity receives

the assent of the understanding, are sufficient in other cases and under different circumstances, to prompt its entire rejection by positive infidelity. The same spirit of hostility which would prompt one man, after admitting a visitor within his house, to treat him with silent indifference and contempt, to take no notice of his person, and give no heed to his remarks, and turning his back upon him to act as if wholly unconscious of his presence, might prompt another man, perhaps with greater consistency, to bar his door against his first approach, and wholly forbid his entrance within his dwelling. When this prevalent form of practical unbelief is so obviously to be traced to moral causes, and when these causes are such as are common, alike to all unregenerate mankind, it is not surprising, that in other cases, men are prompted openly to reject and disown the authority of truth. It is rather, an evidence of the overpowering majesty of truth, that such instances are so rare, and that for the most part, men are led to yield a reluctant assent to its authority, even when their hearts and lives rebel against it. Practical unbelief is native to the unrenewed heart; and the essential features of all kinds of unbelief are the same. Avowed infidelity is only practical unbelief carried to its legitimate results, and rendered consistent with itself. Speculative unbelief is only an effort of the intellect to defend a position previously assumed by the heart—an attempt at self-consistency.

In tracing unbelief of all kinds, to moral causes, it is not necessary therefore, to suppose the infidel to be the chief of sinners, or to conclude that he is actuated by a darker degree of depravity than those who rest contented in the inconsistency of practical unbelief. We need only suppose him to be so constituted as to be dissatisfied and restless in such a condition. He may possess a more inquisitive turn of mind. He may have been trained to think by the teachings of experience. He may have been awakened from the slumber of indifference by the voice of Providence, or the secret whispers of God's spirit. And yet, while thus denied the repose which others have found, the same moral causes which led them to a position of practical unbelief, may have

driven him beyond, into the open field of avowed infidelity. But, while on the one hand, we willingly release him from the supposition of greater depravity and guilt, as the prompting cause of his unbelief, yet, let him not, on the other hand, flatter himself that his peculiar position is owing to loftier powers of intellect, or a more independent exercise of reason. For the same moral features which are common to unredeemed human nature, are possessed by him; and these are responsible for all the forms and degrees of unbelief. If he be no worse, he cannot claim to be better than other men, and the same moral causes, which exclude truth in their case, from the heart, may suffice in his, to drive it from the intellect.

It is no arbitrary decree, by which faith is made the condition of salvation, and unbelief the ground of condemnation. Faith involves and secures the exercise of all devout affections; while unbelief of every form, implies a false and perverted state of the moral nature. The evidences of Christianity are not such as to render belief compulsory. This would be inconsistent with a state of probation, and would destroy the moral character of faith. But they are amply sufficient to satisfy the mind of every candid and earnest inquirer, while they are attended with difficulties which may perplex and bewilder those whose moral tendencies are opposed to the truth. As Pascal says, "There is light enough for those whose sincere desire is to see, and darkness enough to confound those of an opposite disposition." Wilful opposition to light is the great condemnation of the world; and this is chargeable on every form of unbelief. This principle is clearly affirmed in Scripture,—not, it is true, as the only ground of condemnation, (for men have incurred previous guilt, and stand already condemned before they approach the Gospel,) but as the source of aggravated guilt,—as the chief and crowning condemnation of the world. "Light has come into the world, but men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." "If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, whose minds the God of this world hath blinded." "The light of the body is the eye. If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light; but if



thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness." Hence, unbelief is uniformly traced to the state of the heart, and it is emphatically termed "an evil heart of unbelief."

The infidel of course, regards these as hard sayings, and refuses to hear them. And when we accordingly suggest that moral causes operate to produce unbelief—that the habits, tastes, and tendencies of the inner man, create a secret prejudice against the truth, and that the will recoils and rebels against its authority,—he pronounces all this uncharitable denunciation arrogant assumption, and unreasoning bigotry and cant. He affirms that he is sincere in his convictions, that he has honestly followed the dictates of an unbiased reason, and that without prejudice or partiality, he has been, reluctantly, led by the force of evidence, to reject the Gospel. He will, perhaps, express a sentimental regret over the necessity of his position, and be ready to lament the loss of repose in a blind faith, which he has incurred by the fatal possession of a penetrating and powerful intellect! But he is not charged with conscious insincerity or wilful hypocrisy. He may be perfectly sincere *in the present act of unbelief*, and yet he may have been subject to an unconscious moral perversion, in *the previous stages* of that process by which he has been led into infidelity. We cast no censorious imputation on his integrity. We are not arrogating the prerogative to search the heart. We are not presuming to pry into the secret motives of his life, and pass judgment on the measure and proportion of his personal guilt. We leave all this where it exclusively belongs. We only take facts that are potent and palpable on the very surface of his character. We take the features that pertain to him in common with unregenerate mankind. We take those moral habits which he, himself, will admit, do pervade and characterise his daily career, as one living without God and without hope in the world. And *here*, we affirm, are moral causes at work, which, at some point or other in his experience, do create a wilful opposition to the light of truth,—which do prompt him either to smother and hide the truth in secret, or openly to disown and discard it away from his presence.

Whether he may occupy a position of practical unbelief, or of avowed infidelity, does not affect the question. We may even drop the distinction between the different forms of unbelief, as merely nominal. The essential features of all are the same. And as a characteristic common to the whole class, we do affirm, that the moral habits which mark an ungodly and worldly life, are so many potent causes of unbelief,—are so many positive obstructions to the exercise of faith.

We say there is wilful opposition to light, *at some point*, in the experience of every unbeliever. It matters not at what point that may be. It matters not at what period in his history, or in reference to what portion of the system of truth, that resistance may have occurred; it is still sufficient to form an obstacle to the exercise of faith, and a just ground of condemnation for his unbelief. He may not be conscious of *present* resistance to light. He may think himself perfectly unbiased, in considering the evidences of Christianity. That resistance may have taken place *before he came to consider those evidences*. He may have closed his eyes on the light of nature, before he approached the light of revelation. This will be found true in every instance of unbelief. The natural light of observation and experience, of reason and conscience, has been previously disregarded or violated by all who reject the superadded light of the Gospel. If this were not the case,—if man faithfully followed the guidance of previous light as far as it shone on his path,—if, in the moral habits of his life, he uniformly thought and felt, and acted, in accordance with that familiar light, which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world, then he would be prepared, not to believe without evidence, but to discern promptly, to weigh impartially, and to appreciate justly, those abundant evidences which enforce belief. He would discover the destitution and darkness in which the light of nature left him. He would be in a state of eager expectancy and desire,—on the outlook for just such discoveries and remedies, as are brought to light in the Gospel, and thus, at least, would he be waiting and watching for the light of truth until the day dawned and the day-star arose in his heart. With such a preparatory disci-

pline,—with such a previous moral attitude as this, decided and downright unbelief would be an obvious impossibility. Nor would such a character remain long perplexed in a state even of doubt or uncertainty as to the truth of Christianity. He who has honestly followed the guidance of nature's light, and practically heeded the plain familiar lessons imparted by her voice, will not be averse, or even indifferent, to the higher disclosures of the Gospel of Christ. Where Christianity meets with secret aversion, or careless indifference to its disclosures, in any character, there has been previous violence done to the light of nature. His infidelity commenced before he came in contact with Christianity. He has not heeded or laid to heart the primary lessons of the first book of truth. His views of the character of God and the obligations of his law,—his views of his own character and condition,—his motives, affections, plans, and purposes in life, are habitually opposed to the clear disclosures of nature's light. Now, the moral habits of such a character, involving as they do, a previous conflict with truth, must place a positive barrier in the way of true faith. This is not a mere dogmatic assertion. We have ample proof to sustain it. We have abundant evidence to show that, where previous light has been habitually resisted, a cordial belief of Christian truth is thereby rendered morally impossible.

1. *The necessary condition, the natural order of progress in all knowledge, human and divine, is violated in this case.* There are first principles in every science. There are certain primary and introductory lessons in every department of truth, and these must be first studied and applied, before the mind can advance to a comprehensive knowledge of the system with which they are connected. Thus, he who fails to master the alphabet and grammar of a foreign language, will be unable to read or comprehend what may be written in that language. He who neglects the terms and definitions of any branch of natural science, will find that science a complete labyrinth of mystery, as he advances. The simplest problem of geometry must remain a perfect puzzle to him who is ignorant of the primary rules and axioms of mathematics. Religion likewise, has its first

principles, its elementary lessons, which are introductory to its higher truths, and which must be fully known before the mind can advance to a just comprehension of the Christian system. Its various truths are related in mutual connection and dependence. One reflects light from another, and each must be viewed in its order of succession. The light of nature is introductory to the light of revelation. "The law is a school-master to bring us unto Christ." And it is by impressing these elementary lessons, which are written on the heart, and announced by the reason and conscience, that it fulfils its office in the preparatory process of Christian education. We must begin at the beginning. "Then shall we know if we follow on to know the Lord." We must give heed to truth already known. We must be guided by the light as far as it shines on our path, if we wish to attain to ampler discoveries of truth. But if we close our eyes on the light, if we neglect those first lessons which teach us the character and law of God, our duty and guilt as transgressors of that law, the vanity of this world, and the necessity of preparation for the next,—if these solemn realities are neglected or forgotten, there will be darkness and mystery over the whole surrounding field of truth. The mind is made to discern the relative adaptation and harmonious consistency between the different parts of the Christian system.

2. But, not only is the natural order of progressive discovery in truth destroyed, *the subjective power of vision, by which truth is discerned, is impaired by previous resistance to light.* As the uniform result of human depravity, we are told that "the natural man discerneth not the things of the spirit, neither can he know them." This native blindness is increased by continued wilful indulgence. For, not only is the moral sense blunted and the conscience seared, but the moral vision is obscured, by a necessary law of deterioration in sinful habits. Nor is this principle affected by the fact that a divine influence is indispensable, in order to produce true faith. The same law of proportion still applies. Faith, in every case, is the gift of God. The understanding must be enlightened, and the heart must be opened by the agency of the Spirit, before man can cor-

dially believe the truth. But God communicates his grace, and imparts the gift of the Spirit, as a general rule, according to the previous measure of improvement or abuse, which may have attended his benefits. In this sense, "unto him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he seemeth to have." He who has diligently used the grace already received, is encouraged to expect additional supplies hereafter,—not because of the relative proportion of his own merit, but because of the promised order of Divine grace, which pronounces "grace for grace,"—grace superadded to grace, improved. But where grace has been wilfully abused, where light has been previously resisted, the prospect of future supplies is continually diminished, until at length, the man may be wholly forsaken of God, and given over to the delusion and darkness of utter unbelief.

3. Again, where previous light has been disregarded or resisted, the mind is thereby rendered *incapable of appreciating the force of the strongest, and indeed, the only effectual evidences of Christianity*,—the internal and experimental evidences. These are essential to the production of true faith. Without them, unbelief may be silenced, but it is not convinced. The external and historical evidences, when arrayed on the field of controversy, may serve to repel the hostile aggressions of infidelity on the territory of truth, and succeed so far as to capture the intellectual outposts of the enemy; but they do not dislodge it from its strong citadel in the heart. The internal evidences consist first, in the light of disclosure which the Gospel throws over the facts of our character and condition, so as to coincide with our conscious experience; and then, in the perfect adaptation and harmony which arise between the provisions and remedies of the Gospel, and the wants and woes of our nature. But where the mind has wilfully disregarded the plain and primary lessons of truth,—where, during his past experience, the man has maintained a habit of ignorance concerning his relations to God, his character and state as a sinner, the insufficiency and vanity of all earthly things, his constant dependence and exposure in this life, and his total blindness and helplessness in

regard to his future destiny, where these solemn realities are all smothered and hid under the torpor of careless indifference; in his case there can be no perception of either branch of this evidence. He can neither see the truth of the disclosure, nor feel the force of the adaptation. On the contrary, the entire testimony of the Gospel concerning his character and state has been rejected *in advance*, by his previous habits of thought and feeling. Here is the radical point, on which the alternative of belief or unbelief, is suspended; and this is determined by other evidence and older light than that of Christianity. If that light has been already resisted, he can see no truth in the descriptions given of his moral disease, and no adaptation in the divine remedies provided for its care. And when this is the case, of what avail are all other evidences of the truth of Christianity? The Balm of Gilead and the Great Physician are all inevitably rejected. The essential and saving power of the Gospel is practically disowned. "The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." And if a man can succeed so far in deluding himself, as to be wholly ignorant of his malady, and to imagine himself to be sound in health when he is the victim of a deadly disease, the remedies of medicine would be deemed inappropriate and unnecessary, and the skill of the physician would be resolutely refused. Such delusion is impossible in physical disease, for its evidence is direct and sensible, in the pain and suffering, and feebleness, which attend it. But nothing is more possible, nothing alas, more common, than a habit of gross delusion as to moral disease. And where such a habit prevails, the mind cannot intellectually discern the adaptation, nor can the heart experimentally feel the healing power of the Gospel of Christ. The man is necessarily an unbeliever. But the habit of delusion, which forms the necessity, at the same time constitutes his guilt. For, it has been wilfully indulged, in opposition to the clearest light.

But, besides this threefold obstruction to the exercise of faith, which arises from a previous habit of blindness or delusion, in regard to the primary lessons of truth, there are other adverse influences springing from the

same source, which appear with different degrees of prominence in different characters. We shall proceed to point out some of these additional means by which the power of wrong moral habit operates to impair or destroy the power of faith.

1. *Pre-occupancy of mind with opposite interests, forbids due attention to the claims of Christianity.* This disqualification invariably attends a character of worldliness. But this character of worldliness is based on an abuse of light and a perversion of truth. The God of this world first blinds the minds of his worshippers, in order to secure their devotions. They are led, not only to suppress and smother the testimony of visible things to the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the presence of an unseen world of spirits, by which we are encompassed, so that this earth becomes isolated as the only scene of human sympathy and interest; but they disguise the real aspect, they hide the naked features, they ignore the necessary conditions and issues of this world itself, so as to sink into a delusive dream of earthly happiness, and suffer their hearts to become engrossed and their thoughts circumscribed by the scenes of time and sense. It is by such a process of perversion that a character of worldliness is formed. That character is based practically and really on the system of the Sadducees. Whatever opposite theory may be carelessly avowed by the lips, this is the creed embraced in the heart and acted on in the life. The mirror of nature, which reflects the glory of God, is reversed, and with its dark side outward, intervenes as an opaque medium, to conceal what it ought to communicate. The mind converses only with second causes and their sensible effects, and never rises to the Great First Cause, from whom they spring. The gifts of Providence are idolized, and the giver is forgotten, and the circumference of this visible world becomes in effect, the boundary and limit of all reality. When a character of worldliness is thus formed, the mind is pre-occupied with interests which stand in direct opposition to the claims of Christianity. The attention is already engrossed and confined in a contrary direction. Such minds have no interest or inclination which would lead them to consider candidly

and patiently the claims of a subject so foreign to their sphere. In imagination they are already "rich and increased in goods and have need of nothing." They care for none of these things. They have little leisure and less inclination to engage in such remote speculations, and amid the press of more immediate and urgent interests, the claims and credentials of Christianity are carelessly evaded. Nay, so far from allowing either the opportunity or the inclination to give to the Christian religion a calm, candid, and patient investigation, such a character, in the very formation of its habits of worldliness, *has already pre-judged and actually condemned, and that too, without a hearing, all religion of every form.* What hope of justice can Christianity have before such a tribunal?

2. Connected with this same general worldliness of character, another influence arises to obstruct the exercise of faith. This is the effect of familiarity with certain processes and results, with certain trains of thought and associations of ideas, in confirming the credulity of the mind to the same level with the experience of the life. It is, obviously, much easier to believe in a given case, when we have been accustomed to the same or similar things; while on the contrary, it is more difficult to give credit to things of an opposite character. This simple influence, which arises from our limited experience, and the extent of our ignorance, which, while it affects *the credulity of our minds*, does not, in the least, affect *the credibility of things*, in themselves considered, Hume has magnified and mystified into a so-called philosophical argument against the truth of Christianity. A worldly mind, as we have seen, is accustomed, in its habitual views and exercises, to look only to secondary causes and sensible effects. Everything which accords with this confined and narrow experience, wears an aspect of familiarity, and meets with a corresponding readiness of reception to the confidence. But everything above this dead level of materialism,—everything beyond this contracted sphere of visible things,—everything which implies a direct exercise of Almighty power,—everything which involves a connection with spiritual interests,—will, at once, strike such a mind as strange,



unreal, marvellous and incredible. The heart spontaneously prompts the question of Nicodemus—"How can these things be?"

3. Again, the assimilating and degrading power of sinful habit, which reduces the scale of our aspirations and hopes to the same level with our present character, presents another obstacle to the exercise of faith. He who lives alone to this world, and gives himself up wholly to its pursuits, pleasures and interests, will find it in the same proportion difficult to conceive the propriety and reality of those high, immortal hopes, which are brought to light in the Gospel. He, who has no higher aim than to revel in sensual enjoyment,—he, who consents to brutalize his nature, can alone acquiesce in the destiny of a brute. This is no proper feeling of humility, no becoming sense of unworthiness, which merely measures its prospects by its deserts. It is not a disavowal of our merit, but a disparagement of our nature. It is the conscious degradation of a soul debased in sin, which sinks its future destiny to a level with its present attitude. It is the profane act of a prostituted nature, which, having grown self-complacent, and even proud, in its pollution, stupidly despises its immortal birthright, and like Esau, barter it away in exchange for some brief scene of sensual enjoyment. To a nature, whose tastes, sympathies, and aspirations, are thus gradually assimilated to its moral attitude, the high provisions, promises, and hopes of the Gospel, are as pearls cast before swine. What capacity can there be in such a character, to apprehend, appreciate and believe the wonderful disclosures of the Gospel, of God's condescending love and mercy to our world, of the person, offices, and work of Christ in our redemption, and of those scenes of glory, honour and immortality, which await the redeemed in Heaven?

4. But, in conclusion, a more direct and powerful obstruction to the exercise of faith remains to be stated. This is the power of wrong moral habit in producing *aversion and dislike* to the entire system of saving truth,—the spontaneous recoil of a diseased nature from those remedies, devised by Infinite Wisdom, to restore its health. This applies, not only to that class of cha-

acter which we have already described, but to many others, who may seem exempt from the sordid spell of worldliness and the grosser forms of sensuality. Even those who may boast of intellectual, refined and spiritual natures, but whose moral habits are opposed to the dictates of true piety, will display, not merely the absence of any attraction, but the presence of a positive repulsion towards the entire system of Christianity. If any man has lived in habitual forgetfulness of God, regardless of his relations to such a being, without realizing his dependence on Divine protection, or feeling his responsibility to the divine law, he must, of course, therefore, be ignorant of his own character, proud, self-willed, and conscious alike of alienation and guilt. Not liking to retain God in his knowledge, he would recoil from that scheme of reconciliation, which aims to restore him to communion with God. Walking only in the sight of his own eyes, and after the desires of his own heart, he would revolt against the precepts and penalties of the Gospel, which impose restraints on his self-will. Ignorant of his own character, proud, and self-reliant, he would spurn that economy of redemption, which abases man before God and ascribes his salvation to free unmerited grace. Conscious of guilt, and exposed to danger, he would gladly be rid forever of that unwelcome Gospel, which reveals a remedy which he dislikes, and a doom which he dreads. With such moral habits as these existing, it is manifest that, if such a character be led cordially to believe and embrace Christianity, it must be in direct opposition to the tastes, tendencies, and sympathies of his nature. Pride, self-will, and guilty fear pertain to the fallen nature of man, until renewed by the grace of God; and these secret, moral antipathies are so many smothered and subterranean fountains of unbelief in the heart. They may either be drained off as it were, by a blind ditch of practical unbelief, or they may flow forth in an open channel of avowed infidelity.

To sum up then, our conclusions on this whole subject,—we have seen that true faith moves the heart and moulds anew, the moral character,—that where professed belief was not followed by such results, it was be-

cause the light admitted by the understanding was resisted by previous moral habits, and shut out from the heart,—that these moral habits were common to unregenerate mankind, and were sufficient in other cases to prompt the entire rejection of truth by open infidelity,—that these moral habits were founded on a previous resistance to the light of nature,—that where such previous resistance prevailed, there arose a threefold obstruction to the exercise of faith,—that the mind, ignorant of first principles, could not advance to a knowledge of higher truth,—that the power of moral vision was impaired, and the prospect of gracious illumination lessened by previous abuse of light. And that the mind in such a case, was unable to discern and appreciate the strongest evidences of the truth of Christianity, the internal and experimental evidences. Again, supposing a character of worldliness to exist, we have seen, that the mind, pre-occupied with opposite interests, refused to consider the credentials of Christianity. Nay, that, by the very fact of this pre-occupancy, it had already pre-judged and condemned, without investigation, the claims of all religion,—that the mind, familiarized with the uniformity of secondary laws and sensible effects, is startled with surprise, and staggered with incredulity at the testimony of invisible and spiritual realities,—that the mind, assimilated in its tastes, aspirations, and hopes, to the low scene of its sinful habits, refuses to rise to the apprehension and belief of the high disclosures of the Gospel of Christ. And finally, we have seen, that even in characters exempt from the sordid spell of worldliness, there yet existed secret moral antipathies, such as alienation, pride of intellect and of heart, independent self-will, and guilty fear, which served as sufficient sources of unbelief.

The Gospel of Christ makes its appeal before a prejudiced tribunal. It does not find the nature of man in an attitude of preparation to welcome its heavenly light. It does not meet him already advancing on his way in pursuit of truth and holiness. It does not approach him at that point of progress in the right direction, where, after following the light of nature as far as it shone, he stands waiting and watching for the light of

Heaven, which comes in as a mere supplement to the light of nature. No! It pursues and overtakes him afar off, going astray, with his face averted, his eyes closed, and his back turned on the light, not seeking for the truth, not feeling after God, if happily he might find him,—not crying from the heart, “O that I knew where I might find him! Then would I approach even to his seat, and order my cause before him!” But exclaiming “Depart from me, for I desire not the knowledge of thy ways!” The known features of man’s character, the moral habits of his life,—the history of the Christian religion,—the plain and positive declarations of the Bible,—and the very structure of Christianity itself,—all unite and conspire to prove, that the Gospel comes, not to ignorant beings who desire light, but to depraved beings who love darkness. So, that if Christianity had met with a welcome reception in the world, we then would have had reason to doubt its divine origin.

In view of these facts, what is the course of true wisdom,—what are the dictates of right reason? To assume at the outset, that the heart is pure and the mind unbiassed?—deny the influence of taste, prejudice, and passion,—assert the rectitude of the will,—ignore the blinding and perverting power of moral habit,—and set up reason as an infallible Judge, to discern at a glance and pronounce by intuition, on the truth or falsehood of God’s word? No, “If any man seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise.” Let man assume that attitude which belongs to a finite creature, before an infinite Creator and a guilty sinner, before a holy God,—the attitude of a little child, conscious of his ignorance and anxious for instruction. Sincere in his desire for light, and aware of his liability to delusion, let him go back to the first principles of truth, review and examine those plain, familiar lessons, which he has never fully comprehended, nor honestly applied, and aware of the adverse tendencies of an evil heart and an ungodly life, let him, with humble prayer, seek the illuminating spirit of God, and with childlike docility, read and study the word of God. This is not to renounce, but to release and liberate reason. This is not to enslave, but to exalt and enlarge the soul of man.

“If the truth shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.”

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE ROMISH CONTROVERSY, ITS PRESENT ASPECT, AND THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH WITH REFERENCE TO IT.\*

The incidents of sacred story may furnish us instruction, either by the examples which they contain, the principles which they involve, or, as simple illustrations of the truth.

The 12th Chapter of 1st Chronicles, records the number and the strength of the tribes, that came up to David, at Hebron, themselves, or by their representatives, to make him King over all Israel, after the death of Ishbosheth. And with the characteristic terseness of the sacred writers, we have also, in a few words, the qualifications of each tribe, to meet any anticipated emergency that might arise from the opposition of the house of Saul. It is said of some, that they were “mighty men of valor;” of others, that they were “expert in war,” and of others, that they “were not of double heart.” To the men of Issachar belonged the proud distinction, of combining with an equal zeal for the cause, a superior intelligence, and a perfect organization: they “had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do; the heads of them were two hundred, and all their brethren were at their commandment.”

Now, without even approximating the exploded principle, which sought a type, in every notice or allusion of Old Testament history, and allegorized the simplest state-

\* The following article is the substance of a sermon, delivered before the Synod of Virginia, at their late meeting in Alexandria, Va., from 1st Chronicles, 12th chapter, 82d verse: “And of the children of Issachar, which were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do; the heads of them were two hundred, and all their brethren were at their commandment.”

ments, into the most wonderful theological dogmas; we may yet avoid the opposite extreme, which is, to treat a large portion of Scripture as if it were a mere collection of bald and barren annals, standing in no immediate relation to the dispensation of grace in the Gospel. The recorded events, in the establishment and progress of the Hebrew monarchy, have, certainly, something more than a bare historical interest: they stand in a more intimate relation to the kingdom of Messiah, than those which attended the founding of the throne of the Cæsars, the reign of Henry the Fourth, or the downfall of the Stuarts. By the authority of prophets and apostles, the throne of David is the standing type of His dominion, whose righteous kingdom shall extend from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. Admitting then, as we must admit, from the essential difference in nature between an earthly sovereignty and the spiritual dominion of Jesus Christ, that the means of founding the first, have not the force of an authorized example in extending the second, yet it is not too much to say, that the record is of more value than any uninspired narrative, and its incidents are something more than mere historical illustrations. As we think there is here, a designed analogy, by which we may learn, from the method of God's dealings in one case, the designs of his providence in another, and emulating the recorded courage, devotion, and skill of those who, in other days, were the instruments of his power, in fulfilling his purpose, we may more successfully marshal the sacramental host of God's elect, in the contest with opposing errors.

Taken in this light, the pertinence of the context referred to will be easily apparent. Among the errors which oppose the progress and full establishment of the kingdom of grace in all the earth, Romanism is justly regarded as one of the most inveterate and dangerous. There are those, indeed, who do not hesitate to give it the bad preëminence of being the very master-piece of Satanic ingenuity, for withstanding and subverting the truth. But it would require an investigation more difficult than profitable, accurately to estimate the comparative influence for evil, of this, and other forms of error and unbelief. It is enough to know that it is a system

which, from its very nature, is determined in its hostility, and necessarily aggressive in its spirit. It could not be what it is, without being intolerant and relentless, and its very life-blood is, that zeal of propagandism which springs directly from its claim to a universal and exclusive authority. Infidelity is a system of negations, and for the most part, contents itself with a denial of revealed truth. Its utterances are mainly the out-givings of restless minds, vainly striving to search for themselves the repose of a firm conviction, by their own ingenious sophisms, or haply by an increase to the ranks of unbelief. In general, its apostles only claim to be their own apologists, and if it has any missionaries, they are commonly those who affect singularity for the sake of distinction, or in whom the enmity of the carnal heart works itself out, in this, as in other forms of ungodliness. But Romanism, like the house of Saul, claims the kingdom for its own. It is a rival to Christianity. It assumes to be Christianity itself, and the history of fifteen centuries is the record of its struggle for the supremacy. That, with varied fortunes, and often with seemingly fatal reverses, it has been enabled to maintain the contest through all that period, proves that it is no despicable foe; and that, in this nineteenth century, it still exists in the midst of christendom, formidable by the number of its adherents, as unscrupulous as ever in its measures, and increasingly arrogant in its tone, should be reason enough, it would seem, for a frequent review of the controversy, and the aspect of the times, with relation to it, that like the sons of Issachar, we may "know what Israel ought to do."

In considering the present attitude of the controversy, with this gigantic system of error, we shall have more particular reference to its position and progress in our own country. But we should greatly err in forming an estimate of the resources, and the spirit of Romanism, if we take our view of it, only from that modified phase which it has been its policy hitherto to present to us here. For, notwithstanding its boast of being "always and everywhere the same," and in its essential elements, which are also, its worst elements, it is so, yet upon principle, it is a changeling, and has a thousand protean

shapes, to suit the ever-changing exigencies of time and place. To understand the true position of the controversy, at any time, will, therefore, require a previous insight into the nature and genius of this system of manifold error :

I. Let me briefly sketch some of its more prominent characteristics :

1. And first, we shall do well to remember, that it is not the product of a single mind, or the birth of a single age, but the up-growth of centuries. Its vaunted claim of antiquity is, at least, so far just, as that it dates its origin at an early period in the history of the Church, and some of its radical errors reach far down towards apostolic times. These grew by accretion, through the natural affinity of error, and by the equally natural law of development, one departure from the simplicity of the truth, being the prelude to another, just as one crime prepares the way for many and greater. But though the seeds of the deadly Upas were early sown, yet, it did not spring into its full proportions, as by a single bound. It was not till the seventh century that it stood revealed in its distinctive form, and not until towards the eleventh, did its far-spreading branches overshadow the earth, distilling the dews of death upon the nations, nor did it reach its culminating point until the decisions of the Council of Trent gave the shape and symmetry of a system to its daring assumptions.

2. The manner of its growth, by this gradual unfolding, as it has modified its form, so it may also serve to explain the nature of its errors. Unlike most other heresies, they are less the result of bold speculations than the offspring of circumstances, and the adopted expedients wherewith to compass a particular, or an ultimate design. If we examine the peculiar tenets of this system, we shall find them all tending, more or less directly, to a given end, viz: the accumulation of power in the hands of the Priesthood, and its concentration in the hands of a hierarchy, of whom the Pope, according to his talents and temper, is either the executive organ, or the supreme dictator. If we examine these errors yet more closely, we shall also find, that however revolting some of them may be to the human understanding, yet they are remarkably congenial to the prevailing dispositions



of our fallen nature. During the ages of their development, the tendencies of the depraved heart were left to work themselves out, with fewer restraints than are laid upon them now. And on the principle of adapting means to an end, a Church, all whose policy aimed at the supremacy, would find its interest in dogmas, which made the governing, though godless, dispositions of men, tributary to its purpose. Thus, even the primacy of the Bishop of Rome itself, gained its first formal recognition, through the pride and passion of a blood stained Emperor, desirous only of gratifying his malignity and revenge against the Patriarch of Constantinople. But the same "cunning craftiness" which could extort from the wickedness of a tyrant a decree of supremacy, and afterwards, when its power had sufficiently increased, pretended to found this impious claim upon a right divine, is no less strongly marked in those other definitions and "infallible" decisions of doctrine, which grew, at length, into a stupendous system of Priestly domination, before which, Emperors themselves, trembled for their crowns.

3. But, if the forming period of Romanism was one of comparative darkness, let us not imagine that its errors have grown effete, or that its dogmas have no adaptation to an age like our own. The principles of human nature are always the same, and those doctrines which are the up-growth of its desires, or have been framed with a skilful accommodation to its propensities, will be found capable also, of an easy adjustment to the peculiarities of any age or people. "Popery," says Calvin, "stands not but in ignorance." The sentiment is, undoubtedly, just. But we may not infer that the errors of Romanism will disappear before the advance of civilization and the progress of science, literature and the arts. The highest perfection of these is entirely compatible with that ignorance which is the mother of superstition. The light of divine truth alone, can dissipate religious errors. Gross absurdities of doctrine, in a church, with unblushing corruption of morals and ostentatious ceremonial fooleries, may for a time, work out their own destruction, and drive cultivated minds into indifferentism and infidelity, as they did in France. But to be without a re-

ligion, is not the normal condition of man, and unless error is expelled by the truth, the exorcised demon will return, and most probably with "seven other devils worse than the first." We rely upon a false security if we expect that the worldly wisdom of this wonderful nineteenth century, and the general intelligence of these United States, will be an adequate protection against the progress of Romanism here. There may be much general information, with the smallest amount of religious knowledge, and even the great men and counsellors of the earth, do often betray a wonderful ignorance of the very rudiments of the Gospel.

It is to be remembered, moreover, that the reception of religious truth, or the liability to religious error, is more dependent upon the moral and spiritual condition of a man, than upon his intellectual capacity. There is more than always meets the eye in those remarkable words of Christ, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." But precisely in this, is an essential difference between the doctrines taught by Christ and his apostles, and those which Romanism offers to the faith of its followers. The full reception of the former requires a spiritual discernment of them, the enlightenment of the Holy Ghost, which implies also, a radical change in the affections, for it is "with the *heart* that man believeth unto righteousness. But for the embrace of the latter, the heart is already predisposed by the very perverseness of its nature,—and, as has been intimated already, they are congenial with, because the up-growth of, its desires, or carefully conformed to its governing propensities. It was well and wisely said by the great moralist of England, that "to find a substitute for violated morality is the leading feature in all perversions of religion." And we may add, that this substitute is always found, in some external relations, doctrines, or practices, which may co-exist with the governing tendencies of the carnal heart. Man, as a sinner, must have some opiate for a troubled conscience. But Romanism presents a whole pharmacopœia of nostrums, where each may find a prescription to his taste, unless indeed, he comes with a "broken heart," and that soul-sickness of sin, through the power of a convincing Spirit, which only

the Great Physician can heal, by the application of his own blood. The spectacle is sometimes witnessed with wonder, and it is heralded forth as a triumph of worldly wicked men, or men of speculative, sceptical minds, suddenly becoming the abject and bigoted devotees of Romanism. But the metempsychosis is easily explained. A conscience-troubled sinner will fly to any sanctuary that offers a refuge from his fears without requiring a renovation of his heart, and for the sake of its protection he may consent to sacrifice the outward, grosser forms of impiety, or even to wear the habit of virtue. So too, a bold but irregular thinker, whose vigorous, but erratic mind, has circled through the whole round of sceptical negations, seeking rest but finding none, may bring up his career at last, by the embrace of a system which interdicts speculation, and from that very exhaustion of wasted intellect, which covets repose, he may consent to receive the dogmas of a church, and the dictum of a Priest, with a blind unquestioning credulity, need I add that silly women, of both sexes, laden with divers lusts, will seek relief in a crucifix, rather than the cross; in the anointings and absolutions of a Priest, rather than in "the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than that of Abel?" The congeniality of Romanism, with the prevalent tendencies of our fallen nature, will always make it a plausible and a dangerous system.

4. And it is all the more so, from its singular flexibility, at which I have already hinted, and its unlimited capacity of accommodating itself to the exigencies of time and place.

Though in its essential evils always and everywhere the same, yet in its outward manifestations it is endlessly diversified. In constitutional England and free America, it has a very different aspect from that which it wears in stifled Italy, or decaying Spain, and like the government itself, it is everything by turns, in revolutionary France. Essentially tyrannical in its nature, and the sworn ally of despotism, where despotism prevails, it can alternately baptize the barricades of Paris, and sing "te deums" to the usurpation which succeeds them. In our own country its brawling voice is heard at the polls, vociferating for the largest liberty, while through the

pulpit and the press, it gravely propounds the cardinal principles of all intolerance. It has a different bearing towards the poor emigrant; who, from youth, has been trained in its vassalage, from that which it assumes to the recent or half-formed proselyte, yet a novice to its mysteries, and unbroken to the vigor of its iron yoke. It has the stern air of authority, and the terrors of Priestly anathema, with which to dragoon the ignorant who are already in its toils, whilst it has also, the suavity of a courtier, and the liquid accents and honied words of persuasion, with which to captivate the unwary. It has its prepared appeals to the fears of the timid and the weak, to the hopes of the ambitious, to the imaginations of the dreamy, and to the superstitions of all. Where its power is dominant it interdicts all other forms of worship, all freedom of speech, all rights of conscience, even refusing the privilege of a decent burial to the dead. But where it is yet in a minority, and the truth is free, while, with one breath, it impudently defends the principle and the practice of its own outrages upon the rights of man and the feelings of humanity, yet with the next breath, it waxes loud in its complaints at all discussion of its doctrines, or exposure of its corruptions, or resistance of its schemes, as an invasion of its own chartered rights, and seeks to soften the blow of its frequent defeats by enlisting sympathy for itself with the whining cry of "persecution!" "persecution!"

To speak of a free press, in any country, under the dominion of Romanism, would be an obvious solecism in language. But what this system sternly denies at home, and has anathematized in all the world, as "the never sufficiently to be execrated and detested liberty of the press," it can yet freely employ abroad, and if there ever was a Journal, exceeding in the license of personal abuse and bitter denunciations of the prevailing religious opinions of the country, and in the licentiousness of an unblushing mendacity, the acknowledged organ of his Romish Right Reverence of New York, then we will agree that such a journal has attained to a preëminence which should justly entitle it to the sole distinction of "infernal." But, it has also, its seemingly philosophic dissertations for the learned in the more stately numbers

of its Quarterly, and its "Popery Made Easy," in the polite phrase and apologetic tone of its lighter and more attractive publications. In a word, there is not a grade of human intellect, there is not a mental idiosyncrasy, there is not a phase of character, for which Romanism has not an accordant note in the gamut of its endless variations.

5. And yet withal, it is essentially and necessarily, the most intolerant of systems. With a laxity in its moral requirements which leaves ample verge and scope for the workings of an unsanctified heart, it expends all its rigours, against deviations from its doctrinal standards, or denial of its infallible authority. As distinctly as the Bible draws the line of separation between the righteous and the wicked, Romanism divides all the world into two great parties, distinguished by their submission to, or rejection of her, rule, and impiously assigns to each, the awards which the searcher of hearts has reserved to the discriminations of the great day. "Her very creed draws a line, deep, and broad as the impassable gulf between the world within and the world without the pale of her communion," and by that same creed, regarding this outside world as under the dominion of the devil, it is her avowed mission to subdue and exterminate all who belong to it, by argument and artifice when she must, by coercion and constraint when she can, and by fire and sword when she dare. A church which claims infallibility and makes its own dicta the rule of faith, must necessarily be exclusive in its pretensions, and by an equal necessity, intolerant in its spirit. This is the open and repeated avowal of Romanism itself, and by her own authority, we have been taught in what light we ought to read the bloody annals of her history. Her surpassing cruelties were not the excesses of a transient fanaticism, or the offspring of an age of darkness, but the exponents of her infallible principles. It is stereotyped in her formularies that "there is no salvation outside of her pale," and it has been boldly, though prematurely avowed, that she tolerates protestantism in this country now, only because she must, and the times are not ripe for the exercise of her prerogatives.

6. In immediate connection with this fact, it becomes

us to remember also, her peculiarity as a politico-religious despotism. -Other systems of doctrine, which challenge the faith of men, yet leave it to individuals to bear for themselves the responsibility of accepting or rejecting them, and look upon those who dissent, only as misguided men, to be pitied and instructed. This system alone, claims as of right divine, a two-fold universal supremacy; an external and civil, as well as an internal and spiritual dominion over the whole earth; and all who refuse this claim are regarded, not only as heretics to be converted, but as rebellious subjects to be punished. A bold and persevering effort to realize this idea of a universal sovereignty, on the one hand, and a determined purpose to resist it on the other, has been the great conflict of ages. Let us not suppose that the struggle is over, because, for the time, the monstrous claim is held in abeyance. To obtrude it with prominence, in behalf of the imbecile old man, whose tottering throne at Rome, is propped by the bayonets of France, would be too supremely ridiculous, nevertheless, the theory lives, the dogma, though exploded, is not abandoned, but it is the secret spring of a perpetual intermeddling in civil affairs, an occasional collision, as in England, with the laws of Protestant countries, and an ambitious grasping after political importance and power everywhere.

7. Nor should we forget that is a system, which, in its organization, surpasses, in some respects, even the rigor of military discipline. Not a Macedonian phalanx, a Roman cohort, or the legions of Napoleon, were ever trained to a more perfect subordination, than that which pervades the papal hierarchy. From the Parish Priest to the Sovereign Pontiff, there is a gradation of rank and a distribution of power which, whilst it secures a mutual dependence, secures also, a unity of action, and a prompt obedience. Subjection and obedience to ecclesiastical superiors is incorporated in the oath of every Cardinal, Primate and Bishop,—the vows of every Priest, Monk, and Nun, and is the burden of Romish teaching, from its first lessons in the nursery, to its last utterances over the dying and the dead. And this obedience is enforced, not merely by such sanctions as give authority

to civil governments, but by ghostly terrors which, to a superstitious mind, are more formidable than the last extremity of physical pains and penalties. It may seem to invalidate the fact of this jurisdiction, in temporal matters, at least, that the reigning Pontiff actually needs the aid of foreign arms to protect him against his own subjects at Rome. But, it should be remembered, that a nearer view of the mysteries of Papal iniquities, and a more sensible impression of the evils of its misrule, has often served to weaken its hold upon the conscience, and it is probably true, that in the States of the Pope, there is less real devotion to the Church, than among its adherents in any other country. There have also, been a few instances in our own land, where the stretch of prelatical prerogative has been firmly resisted, and it would be strange indeed, if the liberal institutions and democratic tendencies of our people, did not operate as an occasional restraint upon Priestly assumptions. But, notwithstanding these, and such like exceptions, the general fact remains, that no government on earth, has a more complete organization, or exerts a more direct and powerful authority over its subjects, than that ecclesiastico-political organization, through which Romanism acts, and that control which it exercises over all its adherents. Claiming, as of Divine right, a superiority to all civil jurisdiction, it also claims, at its pleasure, to release its members from their allegiance to the State. And though the mandates flowing from this assumption may occasion a conflict between the patriotism and the churchism of some, yet it is easy to see which way the scale will ultimately preponderate, in minds which are thoroughly imbued with the peculiar errors of this system. Rome has absolutely at its command, and organized for its service, all the millions who sincerely receive the doctrine of Church authority and Priestly absolution.

8. But, besides these characteristics of Romanism, in its origin, spirit and organization, it is needful also, to take a rapid glance at those distinguishing doctrines which underlie the whole system, and are the basis of the entire superstructure.

These may all be included under one or other of those three cardinal points, which are the points of divergence

between all religious truth and error; viz: the rule of faith, the ground and method of a sinner's acceptance with God, and the true nature and object of worship. And upon each of these points, we shall find that Romanism has "changed the truth of God into a lie," not by directly denying it, but by adding to it, first, its own inventions, and then by magnifying these until they have entirely overshadowed the truth, and have come at length to be substituted for it. By this process the teachings of men have usurped the authority which belongs only to "the incorruptible word." The doctrine of human merit has come instead of justification by faith. The Priesthood has arrogated to itself the offices of Christ. An elaborate and unmeaning formalism has eaten out the spirituality of worship, and the utmost point of departure from the truth has been reached, in the idolatry of saints and angels.

1. The question is sometimes asked, and it is a pertinent one, if Rome has departed so far from the truth as is alleged, how is it that errors so gross, came to be first introduced, and succeeded in grafting themselves so firmly upon the faith of the Church? But this question involves no such embarrassment as is supposed by those who suggest it occasionally, as a puzzle to Protestants. The answer is historical and it is easy. It is found partly, in the fact already noticed, of the gradual unfolding of doctrines, which, if propounded at once, in their full development, would probably have met with a general rejection. But this is the nature of error, and often the art of the errorist, slowly to unmask dangerous delusions, and by plausible statements, which seem scarcely, if at all, to diverge from the truth, to insinuate the venom, until it has poisoned the springs of thought, and prepared the mind for any conceivable absurdity.

The state of the public mind in the earlier ages of Christianity, was favourable to this gradual diffusion of error. And from the habit of subjection to governmental tyranny, together with the prevailing ignorance of religious truth, it was equally favourable to that assumption of Church authority, which is, after all, the foundation-stone of the whole fabric of Romish superstitions. The dogma, which, in its mildest form of statement,



claims for the Church, as an organized body, a co-ordinate authority with the Scriptures, in matters of faith, always has been, and always will be, found in its legitimate effects, to dethrone the word of God, and make it void through human traditions. It is a doctrine which surrenders the very citadel of truth; overthrows the only unerring standard, and flings wide open the doors of the sanctuary itself, to the free ingress of all manner of false and foolish inventions. Under its operation, the Bible will be made to speak whatever language the exigencies of the times, or the designs of ecclesiastical rulers may seem to require. And when it cannot be made subservient it will be suppressed, that the infallible decrees of Popes and Councils may more effectually bind the consciences of men. Herein we find our further answer to the enquiry, how did the errors of Romanism come to prevail? They were baptized and consecrated as infallible truth by the authority of a dominant Church, which the people were taught to regard as an authorised and unerring guide, in all matters of faith and practice. This dogma of Church authority is radical, and it is germinant, and from it there needs must spring a prolific and monstrous growth of human folly and impiety.

2. Among the most prominent, if not the earliest of this pestiferous growth, would be the perversion of the truth, in regard to man's condition as a sinner, and the method of his recovery. The teachings of the Scriptures, upon this point, are, of all others, most repugnant to the feelings of the carnal heart, and with the fullest and clearest expositions of the truth, it is not easy, so to repress the tendencies of our fallen nature, as not to seek after, or accept, some other ground of reliance than that which God has revealed. But Romanism not only fosters this tendency, she has consecrated it, and so adroitly is her entire system adjusted to its cravings, that she has not only made it her strongest hold upon the conscience, but the chiefest source of revenue to her exchequer. A right understanding of that great central truth of the Gospel, which makes it the "glad tidings of great joy," to the true penitent, viz: the doctrine of justification by faith alone, would sweep away, at a blow, all her impious Priestly pretensions, sacramental ab-

surditities, and purgatorial dreams. Let it but be written upon the heart of the sinner by the Spirit of God, as it is written in his Word, that "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son, cleanseth us from all sin," and he will cease to depend upon the efficacy of ordinances, or value the absolutions of a Priest, or tremble at the rattling of the keys. Let him but understand that there is only "one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus," and he will turn aside from those human and self-constituted mediators, many who claim to stand between him and his God, and by a graduated tariff of prices, take toll for his sins, before they will suffer him to hope in redeeming mercy. Just here, is the most dangerous element of the system. Its strength lies in this, that it seizes upon the conscience, and in the name of Christianity, professing to direct it, reduces it to a slavish subjection, by alternately stimulating its fears and soothing its alarms. The essential nature of justification, that is to say, its judicial nature, as "an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth *all our sins*, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us and received by faith alone," is entirely excluded from its definitions of doctrine, or introduced only to be anathematized as damnable heresy. Rome never allows her votaries to believe that *all* their sins are pardoned, and their transgressions blotted out through atoning blood, for if they should once be enabled to say with Paul, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," it would take them so far out of her hands as to place them beyond the reach of her exactions. Therefore, it is, that whilst retaining the *name*, she yet ignores and repudiates the *fact* of justification, by confounding it with sanctification, and making both dependent upon the sinner's own exertions, whilst she assumes to direct those exertions, and claims to be at the same time, the judge of the nature, extent, and quality of them, and to make them efficacious at last, by her official interposition. If this is not putting a man entirely at the mercy of the rulers of his Church, it is impossible to conceive in what way it could be more effectually done. Hence, we find that upon the broad

basis of this assumption, Rome has erected that stupendous fabric of practical delusions and Priestly prerogatives, whereby she "maketh merchandize of the souls of men." First, she has the mass as a perpetually renewed sacrifice, to supplement the offering of Christ upon the Cross, and an expiation for the sins which the once shedding of his blood had failed to cleanse. Then comes the sacrament of penance, including confession, for that part of sin which neither the blood of the Cross, nor the offering of the mass could take away. But as the prayers and fastings which the Priesthood prescribes, may not always be agreeable or convenient, we have next, the doctrine of *indulgencies*, in which, the Church assumes to herself the power of compounding these penances for money. Thus she conducts the sinner through life, keeping him still in her toils, though terrifying his fears and amusing his hopes, by turns, and that she may not loose her grasp upon him in life, she has also, her extreme unction for his dying bed. Nor is she willing to part with him yet, but tells him before he goes, and his weeping friends when he is gone, that there is an intermediate place of purgation, which is neither heaven nor hell, but exclusively her own territory, over which her power is absolute, and from the sufferings of which, he can only escape through her good offices. Considered thus in itself, we might conclude that such a system of barefaced assumption, and one tending so directly to clerical usurpation and tyranny, could make little or no progress in an enlightened age and country. But we may not forget that the grand effort of our fallen nature is to seek after, or make some sort of self-righteousness upon which it can rely for pardon and acceptance from God. The history of religion in every age and country, proves that this effort will be made, either in the way of an attempted compliance with the laws of morality, or in external religious observances and ceremonies. The latter is so far the prevailing type of all false religions, that ritual observances do almost invariably come to be substituted for moral duties. And whilst human nature remains what it is, a Church, which in the name of Christianity, accommodates its teachings to this tendency, will not be wanting in adherents, however mon-

trous, severe, or humiliating its exactions. Men who cannot escape from their own consciences, will submit to anything that offers a refuge to their fears, sooner than they will submit themselves to "the righteousness of God," and that because this latter implies a moral renovation, and anything else may be endured, or performed without it.

3. If I speak now of the idolatry of Romanism, as immediately connected with its perversion of the truth, in regard to the ground and method of a sinner's acceptance with God, it is with reference to the logical, rather than the historical relation of these errors. Whatever may have been the date or history of their origin, they have both, long been used as parts of the same design, and conspiring to the same end, viz: to intercept the sinner's direct approach to God in Christ, and turn off his trust and service from the Redeemer of men, to the advantage of that Church which claims to be herself a mediator. In this point of view, the invocation of saints and angels, the worship of the host, and the idolatrous reverence paid to images, pictures, and dead men's bones, all follow on, as natural sequents, to the substitution of Church authority for the word of God, and the great central error concerning the nature and grounds of justification.

The same consciousness of guilt which leads a man to seek after a righteousness of his own, will also leave him dissatisfied with it. And the same indolence and self-distrust which make it easy to rely upon the authority of others, in matters of faith, in like manner will prompt to a reliance upon the merits and intercessions of others, in the matter of acceptance with God. Now, to meet this tendency also, the Church of Rome claims to have in her possession a vast fund, or, in her own language, "a sacred treasury of merits," over and above the righteousness of Christ, and of which she is the custodian and dispenser. From this store-house she professes to help out the imperfect righteousness of her saintly followers,—and that she may enhance the value of the commodity, she is wont to exalt and deify those, whose works of supererogation have enriched her treasury. Their deeds are recorded in "lying legends," their names are enrolled in the catalogue of saints, set days are observed

in their honour, their relics encased in gold and jewels, are enshrined within the altar,—vows are offered, and prayers are made to them continually, and all this, while it withdraws the sinner from the sole-efficacy of Christ's mediation, binds him, with ten-fold stronger cords, to the church, which has assumed his office, and affects to be the keeper and dispenser of all merit.—It is, after all, the exaltation of the Church and its prerogatives, which is the effect, if it is not also, the grand design of Romish idolatry, as of all its other errors. The worship of the Virgin Mary, and of all the saints, is inseparably linked with a devotion to the Church, which claims the Virgin for its patroness, and the saints for its property,—and even where Christ is professedly recognised, his name and offices are made subservient to the same end, for, if it is the mystic presence which is worshipped in the adoration of the host, yet it was the Church that changed the wafer into a God.

Such, in its prominent features, is the system with which we are called to contend. A system whose joints and bands have been knit and hardened by the growth of centuries,—a system subtle in its distinctions, artful and unscrupulous in its methods, and thoroughly organised in its activities. A system which seizes upon the great facts in man's moral condition, and admirably harmonizes with the tendencies of his fallen nature, while in the name of Christianity, it professes to rectify and exalt them. And yet a system, the most despotic and intolerant in its spirit, and all comprehending in the grasp of its ambition. Will any man say, that in a country like this, such a system may be safely ignored, and left to its own undisturbed workings; that it can be laughed out of existence, or that it does not demand the continuous, careful and profound study of all who are set for the defence of the truth? Does any one suppose that its adherents are to be conciliated and won by our silence or concessions, or by that easy, good nature, baptised with the engaging names of "liberality" and "charity," which lends itself to its designs by encouraging words, and pecuniary aid to its schemes?

But, it is time that we turn from the essential nature of this system of errors to consider:

II. The present aspect of the controversy with it,—as perhaps, yet more suggestive of “what Israel ought to do.”

1. And our first remark is, that as to the great questions at issue, it is essentially the same controversy which was begun at the Reformation. Rome may have changed her tactics, but she has not departed from any one of her errors. The decisions of the Council of Trent, occasioned by the doctrines of Luther, have given form and perpetuity to her system, which cannot be modified without being wholly abandoned. She may have found it her policy to disguise and conceal some of her most offensive dogmas, and to forego some of her most repulsive practices, and to soften down, or gild over, with plausible statements, her distinguishing doctrines. But, after all, upon the authority of her own creed, she remains in spirit and in fact unchanged. And the controversy now, is just a renewal of the battle upon the same old issues, upon which it was fought and won three hundred years ago. It is not now, nor was it then, simply a contest about indulgences, purgatory, transubstantiation, or any other particular corruption or abuse. These were but the occasions which awakened the struggle, and opened to the minds of the Reformers, an insight into the radical errors from which these evils grow. The putting down of Tetzels and the burning of his parchment pardons, could not change the nature of the Papacy, or hinder an ultimate outbreak of Scripture and reason, against its monstrous assumptions. The conflict with this gigantic system of delusion, was not, nor is it now, whether a stupid friar shall publicly peddle the Pope's license for theft, adultery and murder, at a certain per centage. Upon questions of that sort, Rome may be a thousand times overthrown, and yet survive and flourish. The struggle in which her defeat must be final, is that which has been the conflict of ages, and which, in some one or more, of its aspects, is, and is to be, preëminently the conflict of this age;—a struggle for the supremacy of God's written word, as opposed to all human speculations, or Church authority, for the dominion of “Christ and his crown,” or, to use another pregnant expression, equally consecrated in the struggles of the

past, for the "headship of Christ," as opposed to all civil or prelatical assumptions, for God's method of saving sinners through the righteousness of Christ, as opposed to all the patchwork of human inventions, and for the spirituality of worship, as opposed to a barren formalism, that always terminates in superstition and idolatry.

2. But, though the controversy in its issues is the same, yet in its circumstances and accidents, it is materially different.

In those countries in which the reformation was strangled in its birth, and which remain still under the dominion of Rome, all discussion being interdicted, the contest must await the developements of providence, in the silent working of the leaven which may be infused, or in the result of those political convulsions which may yet enfranchise the people whose energies have been crushed by ages of oppression.

Without subscribing to any theories of prophetic interpretation, we may yet anticipate the coming of events which shall shatter the theories of tyranny, and break the iron sceptre of a Priestly despotism.

But, whilst in her own territories Rome refuses to be questioned, and stifles inquiry by the strong arm of power, she is yet ambitious of conquest, and is not only open, but impudent in asserting her claims, in lands where they may be freely investigated. In such countries, especially if pervaded by a general intelligence, we might expect some measure of reserve, and politic concealment,—that she would put on a decent exterior, and present altogether, a more comely appearance than she did to the Reformers, or does even now, where she has nothing to gain by the masquerade. In our own country, and in England, this has been her policy, until more recently, presuming upon Protestant indifference and apathy, she seems to have been making experiments upon the maxim, that the bolder the assumption and arrogance, the more certain the success.

In diffusing her dogmas, she claims for herself, the benefit, to its utmost extent, of the Protestant doctrine of religious freedom and universal toleration, while at the same time, sundry of her organs are indiscreetly confessing, that liberty of conscience is no part of her

creed, and a persecuting intolerance is the logical and necessary result of her doctrines. With the plea of equal rights she boldly asserts the right to rule, and though in never so pitiful a minority, she demands it, as of justice, that the majority should bow to her dictation, though it be to proscribe the Bible and falsify history, and silence the voice of prayer. She marches boldly to the ballot box, in the solid phalanx of her followers, when she can make her influence to be felt by parties or persons,—and when her political intermeddling has produced its inevitable reaction in her own defeat, she makes the welkin ring again, with the cry of a “violated constitution” and religious bigotry.”

In all this, it is not difficult to detect her design, which seems to be a studied effort to withdraw the controversy, even at the expense of frequent discomfitures, from the great points in dispute, to local and secondary questions of temporal interest and policy. She prefers to skirmish along the outposts, where defeat is not disastrous, and the accidents of war may give an occasional victory,—to a charge upon the centre in which her triumph would be hopeless and her overthrow fatal. Thus, the contest is every day becoming more and more practical. It is no longer the debate of learned scholastics about the meaning of a word, or the disputed testimony of doubtful Fathers. It seizes upon the interests and realities of every-day life, and by appealing to all the passions and prejudices of men, it arrays them in mutual hostility. This might seem, indeed, like a suicidal policy, for a Church, which aims at accessions from Protestant ranks, and whose position one might think, should render her conciliatory, rather than belligerent. But, let us not imagine that she has forgotten, or repudiated the arts of fawning and flattery, in certain quarters, even while fomenting an irreconcilable animosity in others. The audience to this controversy is not now, as of yore, the august presence of assembled councils and crowned heads, whose verdict would be potential upon whole kingdoms and provinces. In this country, at least, the issue is to be tried before the people themselves, and what has never been true before to the same extent, and under similar circumstances, the adherents



of Rome themselves, are a part of the jury. Now, it is not more important to make converts, than it is to prevent defections, and Rome aims at accomplishing both. From the Evangelical Churches of the country, which are the received type of Protestantism here, she can have but slight hope of accessions, and yet it is from the efforts of these, that her own followers are most in danger of being snatched from her grasp. Against these, therefore, it is her policy to awaken in the minds of her own people, all the antipathy which national and religious prejudices can engender, thus rendering them inaccessible to influence or instruction from without. But the vast majority of our population have no special Church relations, and though decidedly Protestant in their feelings and tendencies, yet this is more the result of circumstances, than of intelligent convictions. Moreover, among these, the religious element in its external manifestations, has never attained to that strength and unity of expression which it has reached, for example, in England or Scotland. We have no living traditions and monuments, of past struggles with the Papacy, which have concentrated the national feeling against it. On the contrary, nominal Protestants among us, so far occupy a neutral territory, that they are much in the habit of looking upon all religions as alike. They are greatly inclined to ascribe to sectarian bigotry and prejudice, any exposures of Romish delusions and abuses. Or looking upon the controversy, as only the contest of rival sects, their sympathies naturally tend towards the weaker party.

Now, whilst expending all its native rancor and bitterness against the different Churches, yet Rome knows how to be exceedingly gracious and conciliatory towards those who have no special interest in any. And if, besides a prevailing indifference, the enmity of the carnal heart has been at all stirred up against the truth, she knows how to second its objections, and confirm its opposition, commending herself the while, by an affectation of liberality, and an exemption from everything austere and puritanical, either in doctrine or practice. Recalling, in this connection, what has already been said of the conformity of her tenets, with the tendencies

of our fallen nature, it will be seen, that she has no unpromising field for the exercise of her arts. She enters this field, not with the arguments of ordinary polemic strife, but with those influences and agencies, which are particularly taking, with minds unaccustomed to theological distinctions, and easily affected by external plausibilities. She allows no element of influence or power to be wasted. Employing for her purposes every species of talent, and every shape of enthusiasm, she has also, her agencies, suited to every possible avocation.

In the growing towns and cities of a new country, public buildings are regarded as public benefits, and she has availed herself largely, of the architectural argument, in pretentious, and often really imposing Churches and Cathedrals. In older and larger cities, the emporiums of trade, and the receptacles of congregated misery and vice, where amid the scramble for wealth, the spirit of a heartless selfishness too often reigns, and where the unobtrusive, and often extended labours of private benevolence, are unnoticed and unproclaimed, she is constantly parading the machinery of her ostentatious charities, and challenging for them public applause and support, while multitudes of her own poor, are left to the provisions of city and State institutions. It is proverbial, that the establishment of schools and seminaries of learning, save for the education of her own Priesthood, has occupied but little of her attention, in those lauds where her power is already predominant. But, in a country like this, where the cause of popular education has received an irresistible impulse, it is necessary to her ends, either to embarrass or control it. She is aiming at both, by her ceaseless endeavors, first, to dictate the books and subjects of instruction in the public schools, and then to thrust her hand into the public treasury, and appropriate to her exclusive use a portion of its funds. She has also, her seminaries and high schools for educating the children of Protestant parents, who are willing to pay for having the minds of their sons and daughters poisoned with her errors. In this department, as in others, she avails herself successfully of her female aids. And because there is in one day a particular rage for certain ornamental foreign follies, she comes to the

relief of our semi-barbarian Protestantism, and the once brilliant Madame This, or fascinating Countess That, having been duly transformed into Sister Ursula or Saintess Theresa, shall teach our daughters the latest Parisian accomplishments, and most exquisite Italian music, teaching them at the same time,—all pledges to the contrary notwithstanding,—to take the veil when they are done, or at least, to take a confessor. She has also, her theological champions for the strife of words, and if bold affirmations, artful diversions, and specious, but shallow sophistries, could always conceal obnoxious errors, they would be oftener successful. Let not the Protestant who enters the arena of this debate, expect to encounter a manly and straightforward discussion of cardinal principles. Whatever may be the topic in hands, the old story will return, of Protestant divisions, the different interpretations of the Bible, with all the various readings, and minor errors of transcribers and printers, to the end of the chapter. Servetus will die a thousand deaths, and the New England witches will be burned, and the Quakers will be banished, as many times over, to offset the fires of Smithfield, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the Spanish Inquisition, no matter though Protestantism has, for centuries, deplored and disowned the errors and excesses of those but partially imbued with her spirit, yet they are the stereotyped answer to all the cruelty and blood which has blackened the history of Rome, from its earliest origin, and which are the necessary and conceded results of principles still retained and avowed.

The history of the Romish controversy in this country, would be a curious and instructive chapter. Almost simultaneously with the first settlements on this continent, Rome was engaged in efforts to secure it. She planted her colonies and established her missions. On the rugged soil of the North and the rich Savannahs of the South, her emissaries were found. It is not more than a hundred years ago, since the whole of that vast region west of the Alleghanies was claimed by a Romish Government, and a chain of French settlements and forts, strengthened by Jesuit missions, extended from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf. The lakes, the streams,

the cities, designated by the names of tutelary Saints, from the Falls of Niagara to the delta of the Mississippi, are the memorials of that gigantic scheme of French and Papal dominion, which received its death-blow at the peace of 1763. Since that period, and especially since the organization of our Government, the approaches of Romanism have been more insidious, but not the less determined, and with perhaps, equal confidence of success. There has been a remarkable revival of her energies within the past few years, and though her own boastful statements are always to be received with considerable allowance, yet there is little doubt that her members and her power have been greatly augmented. This increase, it is true, is owing chiefly to immigration. But herein is another fact which gives a peculiar complexion to this controversy,—that the adherents of this usurping Church are mainly foreigners. Principally from those lands where the despotism of Rome has least of all been broken, they come to us, from the densely populated cities and districts of the old world, with all the ignorance, errors and superstitions of ages, and yet often, with the most inflated notions of their own prerogatives and importance when they get here. But slowly amalgamating with our people, they move in masses, and are peculiarly susceptible to the influence of a few governing minds. This renders them a formidable element in political struggles, when there is a nearly equal ballancing of the parties. The result is, that they are, to both sides, the objects of flattery and dread, and frequently become to both, the objects of detestation, in the end. This, so far from destroying, only gives additional power to the influences by which they are governed, and renders them still more inaccessible to instruction.

Such, in its nature and present aspect, is the state of the controversy with this old and formidable foe to the reign of truth and godliness.

We turn, then, to our last enquiry :

III. What is the duty of the Church in the case? "What ought Israel to do?"

It would be presuming too much, if upon this point, I should offer anything beyond a few hints.

1. And of these, the first and most obvious is, that we ought to make ourselves thoroughly acquainted with the system which we are called to combat. This is, especially, incumbent upon those of us, who are "set for the defence of the truth." Wherever the field of our labours may be, however remote from those great centres where the influence of the Papacy is the most marked and formidable, our people, all, need to be instructed in regard to the distinguishing errors and arts of this apostate, yet ambitious Church. It is not to be numbered among the dead heresies of the past, which it would be worse than useless to exhume, for the sake of exhibiting a few fossil remains. These may be left to the cabinets of the curious, and the studies of the learned. But this is a living monster, of which it becomes us to know; not only the habits and the haunts, but also its confirmation and structure, in order that we may know also, its points of vitality. We cannot tell at what moment, or under what circumstances, any of our people may be exposed to its arts, or any of ourselves may be called to encounter its polemics. Let us not hazard too much in relying upon the vague, general impressions of Rome's errors and iniquities which pervade all Protestant countries, but which gradually lose their power as they become indistinct, through their increasing distance in time from the great conflicts which awakened them. Let us not peril the cause of truth by an indolent repose upon our convictions of right, without being able to substantiate those convictions by the demonstrations of facts and arguments. Protestantism suffers when some zealous, but uninformed champion, essays the combat with one of the trained and unscrupulous dialecticians of Rome. If we would successfully defend the truth and withstand the progress of error, we must penetrate beneath the surface, and even go down into the abysmal depths of this "mystery of iniquity." It will be a tedious and gloomy descent, and as the wreck of some bold and vigorous minds has proved, it will be dangerous too, if we go down with only the flaring torch-light of human reason and philosophy for our guide. It is like exploring the deep recesses of a mine, where fire-damps and deadly vapours are generated,—the only safety lamp

is the light of Divine truth, and the only protection the panoply of Divine grace.

2. But the more thoroughly she is instructed, the more fully will the Church be convinced that she gains nothing by attempting to conciliate through her silence, the adherents of this system. The opinion is sometimes expressed that its discussion is harmful, as tending to confirm the antipathies and prejudices of Romanists, and the question is often asked, "how many have ever been converted by such discussions?" But this is taking a most inadequate view of the case. The subject may, indeed, be presented in a spirit and manner, not only repulsive but disgusting, and we have witnessed some exhibitions from a race of beggarly itinerants, certain quondam or quasi Priests and Monks, whose ignorance and effrontery would ruin any cause that might be cursed by their advocacy. And it is possible, that even good and great men, may have occasionally forgotten, that the most successful exposure of error is, that which at the same time persuades and convinces the errorist. But it does not follow from this, that the Church is to forget, or forego the fulfilment of her great mission, as a witness for the truth. And so long as her condition is that of a militant Church, she may not content herself with a bare proclamation of the truth in its native simplicity, but she is bound to maintain it, in all its adaptations to the ever-changing exigencies of the age, and in all its antagonism to the prevailing errors of the world. Let her do this in the utmost spirit of Christian benignity. But then, as she would not be recreant to her high calling, let her do it also, in all fidelity and boldness. I have no patience with that maudlin charity which is too polite to be honest, or with that miserable expediency which claims to be wiser than God. There is less danger that discussion will confirm the prejudices of Romanists, than there is that the doctrines of grace will arouse the enmities of the carnal heart. But shall we, therefore, cease to proclaim the doctrines of grace, and sew pillows to all arm-holes, by degrading the pulpit to the graceful utterance of a few short and easy lessons on morals? Suppress the truth through fear of exciting opposition, and you have not only betrayed the truth to

its foes, but you have also strengthened that opposition for a future and more successful resistance. Wanting the power to compel, Rome can ask for nothing more than the ability to intimidate or flatter us into silence.

3. And this leads to our third remark, namely, that the duties of the Church in this controversy, belong to her in her character and office as a witness for the truth.

The weapons of her warfare are not carnal but spiritual. Her only arms, the power of truth and godliness. Her agencies the legitimate influence of instruction and example. She claims no power of coercion, beyond the urgency of the truth in love. She arrogates no ghostly dominion over the conscience. She imposes no physical restraints upon the conduct. The genius of our religion is benign. And though truth is necessarily intolerant of error, because truth, like the God who is its author, is one and supreme, yet the spirit which it breathes, like the world-embracing benevolence of Jehovah, is universally kind and tolerant towards the victims of error. She comes to them with the word of God in her hand, and with the accents of unaffected kindness upon her lips, declaring at once their danger and their remedy. And all this is perfectly compatible with the freest and fullest exposure of the errors and the arts of a Church, whose character and destiny the pen of inspiration has written, in terms of greater severity than any which we can employ.

It is the more important to observe this distinctive office of the Church, as a witness bearer, from two opposite tendencies, one of which has been referred to already, in the easy and indolent disposition to keep back the truth, and thus sometimes imperil its interests by default,—and the other, to which there is a strong temptation in the aspect of the times, is a tendency to exceed her legitimate functions, and become entangled in the ecclesiastico-political contests of the day. Whatever may be lawful for men as individuals, or needful for the preservation of our civil institutions, yet the Church is out of her sphere, and always will suffer when she permits herself to be involved, even by implication, in the strife of parties. "Let the dead bury their dead." Let native born and foreign citizens, settle their own civil and

political relations. And while every encroachment upon Protestant liberty of speech, and liberty of instruction, is promptly met and manfully repelled, yet, let not the intermeddling of Popish Priests and Prelates, be excused by the example of the Protestant ministry; let no man be allowed to believe that he is politically proscribed and disfranchised because of his religion. Especially let it not be believed that the Church, in the discharge of her functions, as a witness and a teacher of the truth, is a party to such a result.

Moreover, it is important to preserve the distinctive character of the Church as a Witness Bearer, from a disposition to confide this whole controversy, and its connected duties, to the hands of individuals and irresponsible associations. We disparage no labourer in this field, and no combination of efforts to diffuse the truth. But the Church has her own work to do, and she only can do it aright. She owes missionary work to the benighted Romanist, no less than to the benighted Hindoo, and she owes it to herself no less, to select the agents and supervise the execution of that work. Why has she left it so largely and so long in other hands? Why are her efforts so stinted in this direction, compared with the importance of the field? The whole power of the Papacy is mainly expended now, upon Protestant countries, and yet how little of the power of the Church is expended upon the deluded followers of Rome. God has still his "hidden ones" within the pale of that mystic Babylon, but how faint our echo of his voice, saying "Come out of her my people, and be not partakers of her plagues."

---

## ARTICLE V.

### GOD'S REST, OUR REST.\*

Egypt had bound Israel with a thousand chains of violence and craft; but the sword of the Lord had cut sheer through them all, and his people "went out with

\*Suggested by Heb. iii, and iv.



a high hand." Sore and terrible had been their bondage there, so that they "groaned" under it with a hopeless and utterly servile lamentation; but their cry went up unto God. Beyond their thought, and even against their will, he wrought out a mighty salvation for them.

It is a daily mistake among men to imagine that God's plans are direct, simple, quickly reaching their conclusion, in a victory palpable to us in our gross estimation of them. If a purpose of his becomes apparent to us, we look for an immediate conclusion of it; a few days more must unfold the whole of it, and something new begin. So judged the Hebrews, because Jehovah had "brought them forth with a strong hand and an outstretched arm,"—had riven the waters, and congealed the deep flood in the heart of the sea, so that the waves stood up like a wall on the right hand and on the left,—had destroyed the mighty oppressor of their race, even when they felt the hot breath of his chariot-horses on their necks, and had broken the power of that fierce nation for generations to come,—they thought the agony was past. They either hoped that the sands of Arabia would suddenly blossom for them like the rose, and the solitary wastes of Midian sing aloud for joy at their coming; or at least, that fountains would spring up spontaneously along their way; and rich food mysteriously lavish itself upon them in the desert, and the mountain walls of Canaan open wide their rocky gates at their approach, so that "the promised land" should be theirs without an effort. Manifestly they were disappointed when silence, barrenness, and thirst looked grimly out upon them from the hills, and bare rocks and a howling wilderness hemmed them in.

Unlike their father Abraham, who waited with iron constancy and undying hope the fulfilment of a promise that was delayed a quarter of a century,—unlike him, they had no patience with their almighty Deliverer. The pledge that was not fully redeemed to-day, was, in their view, already falsified. The oath of the unchangeable God was as the idle wind to their unbelief, if fulfilment did not tread upon the heels of promise as thunder follows the lightning.

No doubt, the discipline upon which they were put,

was almost intolerably severe; but it was the introduction to glory and privilege unequalled on earth. David confessed it, when he said: "He hath not dealt so with any nation." Their powers were kept at their utmost tension. Day after day they marched through rocky and barren solitudes; mothers with their children, men with their armour and their herds. Fatigue and thirst wore out their energies, foes beset them by pitched battles and sudden ambush; yet they must press on and on—whither? To the graves appointed them! Twelve hundred thousand dead must people the wilderness of Sin, or hew out their tombs in the rocks of Horeb. For they that come from Egypt "could not enter in" to Canaan, "because of unbelief." "God swore in his wrath that they should not enter into his rest." "Hope deferred," though it was righteously deferred, "made their hearts sick;" their faith failed them, and they were cut off from his people.

But on this word—"His rest, "My rest,"—Paul suddenly rises to another thought. *God has a rest.* It is said that, on the seventh day, he "rested." Into that rest, of which, Canaan was but a symbol and a faint foreshadowing, he bade his ancient people enter; and it "remaineth" for them unto this day. He has himself, partaken of it; Christ has entered it; the redeemed shall dwell there.

Let us dwell a little on this thought—*God's rest, our rest.* And first, let us think of it as *God's rest.* "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Such is the sublime and simple record.

The works which God created and made were the six day's wonders of the creation. In his arms he had gathered up the clouds and seas, and formless energies of chaos,—shaped a planet, and poised it in space. Light and life, obedient to his word, descended from Heaven and sphered it in lustre and in hope. A mist went up from the earth and watered it, and God blessed the lands with verdure, and fruit, and shade. The air, the plains,

the sea, teemed with busy happiness. He touched the silent soil, and man sprung up from the dust of the ground,—received into his nostrils the breath of life,—became a living spirit, the earthborn representative of his almighty Father.

The character of “work” was given to this achievement,—not by the fact that God expended greater effort, or put forth unusual exertion then and there, but by the fact that it was a *peculiar* effort, and that attributes which generally (so to speak,) lie back and are kept in abeyance, wrought here, and were manifested before the angels. Instead of leaving the display of power to natural laws and second causes, he now put himself in direct contact with events, and was seen to carry out the mighty plan.

This done, God returned into his rest. The voice august, no longer uttered creating words. The Hand divine withdrew that mysterious energy which moulded living creatures or struck out worlds. The new kingdom was established; and the concenting stars and the joyful sons of God inaugurated it with shouts and heavenly anthems. But clouds and darkness, and silence, enshrined the throne: Omnipotence seemed to have returned into itself. Self-sufficing, impregnable, victorious, its work done, that secure, majestic Might needed no flashes of mere display to make it glorious. Thus God rested.

But as God's “work” was not labor, so his “rest” was not inaction. Forty centuries later, Christ declared “My Father worketh hitherto,” (*v. e.* has been working till now.) For him to cease all action would be, not merely to abdicate his throne, but to change and deny his nature. His heart had not ceased from love, and therefore, his hand must persist in goodness. There were the angels to be sustained and blessed; the countless worlds to be governed; the new subjects to be taught and fed, and watched. He is the keeper of the universal fold—the shepherd of an innumerable people—the king of heavenly armies—the teacher and present friend of his new-made children.

But it was rest in this sense; that this particular enterprise was finished, and,—with the addition of a new

department to His kingdom,—its *routine* proceeded as of old. His attributes returned to their wonted order of display. It is His *nature*, one may say, to be a Governor,—to rule His vast empire by comprehensive and happy laws,—to breathe out and to receive love,—love pure, supreme, immortal,—over that domain He has made populous with loyalty and joy. In this, His right and natural position, the whole universe shows a symmetry, a beauty, and a bliss, in which He finds divinest honor and delight. He reigns, and is obeyed: He loves, and is adored: He shines, and is worshipped. This, I say, is the normal state of things; government by love is to us, God's glory and his life. In this, therefore, his last splendid self-revelation as Creator was merged. In this he "rested."

Yet once more: we must enlarge upon this thought a little, to fill out our idea of God's rest. Advancing from the particular instance, the seventh day, we must learn what that general condition is, of which he can partake with his little children.

It is the having accomplished worthy ends. A holy thing done,—a wise counsel fulfilled, an era is *set* among the ages. There is a fixed point upon which the necessary powers centered, and to which, as to a date and a landmark, events that follow may be referred. That to which previous deeds pointed, and for which they prepared the way, is at last accomplished: the long purpose is lost in the present fact. History now may take breath; suspense is ended; the consummation is come. Thus it was in this case. God's eternal purpose took form at the creation, as the chaos did. The light he spoke into being illumined his counsels for his creatures, and made known his will to them. On the seventh day, intention had become achievement. It was the broad, bright border-line,—that first Sabbath,—between two eras,—that which ended in creation, and that which began in man.

It is serene repose in the consciousness of right deeds and a right heart. The calm that follows action is almost involuntarily a time of *review*. Our deeds array our principles and set them forth to us, as to others. In returning to rest, he who has acted returns into his general

course of feeling, tempered by his last resolves and his last deeds. The ruling thought re-asserts its sway; the great ends of being stand confessed and are sought with the old regard; the heart that was happy regains its joy; the wounded spirit repeats its grief. Thus, we are told of Jehovah, as he completed his wonderful work, in the closing of the 16th day, that he "saw everything he had made, and behold it was very good." It was the first soft twilight hour of God's rest. For, as of old, he looked forth upon his kingdom, the work of his hands,—he took in, with that all-comprehending glance, this new territory in his domain,—and returning thus to the eternal course of his perfect blessedness, he resumed that grand repose,—the consciousness of mighty deeds, and of infinite love.

The second thought we propose to set forth is this—in our faith and love we begin here to partake of God's rest: we also look back upon an effort and an achievement; we also behold with a deep delight its steadily unfolding results; we also come out from our effort into a certain permanence and security of happy feeling: the very thought that spreads out into a waveless happiness in him, shines, a little lakelet of content and rest, in us.

He, says the Apostle,—“he that hath entered into rest *hath ceased from his own works*, as God also from his.” The crisis of our histories arrives and confronts us. We have lived in unbelief and sin, long years; this treacherous world has spread out its charms before us, and received our affection; the heart's early tenderness, that was awed by the simplest infant thought of God,—that wept at the sorrows of the dear Redeemer and longed for his love,—that trembled at the thought of judgment and owned the terror of hell,—that early tenderness is all encrusted with self-deceptions and idolatries, grown callous under the threats of the law and the pathos of the Gospel. But through these strong defences flies the “barbed arrow,—sharp in the heart of the King's enemies.” Conscience awakes; fear shouts to us through his shrill trumpet; God looks down in his holy jealousy, and withers our spirits with dismay and shame; temptations and terrors multiply; resolutions

break like ropes of sand ; all our efforts prove abortive, and ruin stares us in the face.

At last we remember Christ the Lord ; God's holy Spirit brings that precious thought upon us, and invests it with significance and hope. Now, therefore, after so long a time, we come distinctly to understand that there is a way of escape by him : not only that there is no other name given under Heaven, but also that his name is given as the key to our difficulties,—the name whereby we may be saved. We advance a step farther ; we see that he is beautifully good, eminently true and trustworthy,—that he simply demands reliance on him, and obedience as the daughter of reliance. Thus then, in some hour of storm, when the heart's whole frame is shaken by self-accusation, conflict and despair, by a sudden revulsion the scourged and desperate thoughts fly out to Christ Jesus the Lord. Suddenly there is a great calm.

“ At once a calm and heaving sleep  
Fell o'er all the glassy deep.”

The rescued heart looks back and sees the victory achieved—how, it knows not ; it may never know ; but that it is, the healed wounds, the risen hope, the springing health, eloquently witnesseth, there is rest in that still remembrance of escape,—that look back from the protecting shield upon foes discomfited and disarmed !

But, besides all this, there is rest in watching the results of this, first illustrious event, as they unfold in our histories. Many things are born of it ; our lives are populous with deeds and joys that owe their being to this, that we have trusted in Christ. It was not so, perhaps, in our expectation. When we were convinced of sin and looking to religion, as the thing we must achieve, with more of fear than hope, our unwilling hearts parleyed with conscience, and recounted many things we would “ have ” to do, many to forego. For days without number, swelling into a life of years, we should be obliged to pray, and study Scripture, and meditate,—confess sin, keep good resolutions, stir up and maintain certain feelings,—affect Christian society, oppose the sceptical and vicious world ; keep a conscience void of

offence towards God and man. What an overwhelming prospect! Endless efforts to be made, uncounted pleasures to be refused,—gain to be sacrificed,—in short, a life of absolutely unbroken watchfulness, self-denial and toil to be entered on and lived steadfastly out to its end! Who has not entertained this thought, and shrunk from ensuring such a future?

But when, by God's help and blessing, we have heartily accepted all this, and whatever else may be involved in self-consecration to him,—when at last we have entered on the work and are striving in good faith to keep our covenant with the Lord,—behold our wonderful redemption and rest. Much of the future was wrapped up in the past; the resolutions we were so painfully to keep, grow silently into habits; some of the pleasures we were to deny ourselves have lost their charm, while others are withering and growing powerless daily; the enemies we were to fear, and watch, and heroically beat down under our feet, are dead or dying. Just as the balloon's whole ascension is involved in the cutting the cords that bind it down,—just as every foot it rises is so much removed from the earth's attractions and its own downward tendency,—so the Christian's victories all depend on that first stormy, but auspicious hour, and every step of progress sets him free. In this steady unfolding of results, this gradual developement of powers, this slow unclouding of his western sky, is there not rest?

Yet more notably do we enter into God's rest in this—that the feelings we attain are the same in kind as his. Of course we must make allowance here for the fact that we regard him with emotions he can never share; but by a Father's tender sympathy with his children. Our gratitude for redemption, our shame at having so bitterly grieved and injured him, our fear that we shall yet offend and leave him,—these are all our own. But there are others that we lost when we lost God's image, to which he has brought us back in restoring the faint outlines of that image. To these Peter refers, when he calls the children of God “partakers of the Divine nature.”

Faith itself, when we look at it closely, is not without this godlike character: for we can trust that only which

we have come to realize and know, and we can comprehend those feelings only with which we sympathise. "It is the heart alone," a wise philosopher has told us, "that can understand the heart." This is the reason why sin is always unbelieving, and that repentance and faith are inseparable. God looks with complacent confidence upon the angels, because their pure hearts answer to his heart. We rest on him, because there is begun in us a nature like his own. Thus, though in one view,—

"Faith and hope are given  
But as our guides to yonder sky—  
Soon as they reach the verge of Heaven,  
Lost in that blaze of truth they die."

Yet, in another aspect, faith is immortal. Mutual confidence is the life of Heaven; to that our faith aspires. In its humble measure therefore—bringing, as it does, relief to our fears, and putting joy into our hearts,—it makes us partakers of God's rest.

Yet more accurately is this true of love—for God is love. It was to love, as the perennial outflow of goodwill and blessing, that he returned when he "rested." The ineffable communion of the Three in one—their smile upon the angels, which throbbed through Heaven in light,—the long procession of bounties and delights that flowed out like a river from the throne and filled all human hearts with food and gladness,—these were the forms and the fruit of love in Heaven. Whosoever, therefore, is verily born of God, loveth. That most exquisite and tender of all joys is springing up within him: the old conflict of self against self, passion against passion, lust against prudence and pride, and shame, is swept away. A real delight in the beauty of God's holiness, a supreme devotion to his will and honor, a hearty sympathy with his wise and pure desires, is shed abroad within us, and nerves us to self-denial and devoted loyalty. We are brethren, too, to all his children. Love begins, at first feebly, then in a stronger and a warmer stream, to run through all our actions: and love is born of God, and knoweth God. Thus, at our infinite distance, with our torpid and purblind hearts, like Herschel before the sun, we dimly reflect his light, and re-



peat, amid the darkness, his bright benignant glory. The consciousness of this is rest; and it is like God's rest.

In Heaven, God's rest becomes fully and forever ours. The conflict that had only been subsiding in life is now ended—has died in our death, has been sealed up in a perpetual tomb. No hard question, no doubtful venture, no lukewarm zeal, no lame, suspicious half-belief, no remonstrant conscience, no dexterous self-deceiving subtleties, no wasted labors: a land of certainty, and safety, and goodness!

Like God's rest in this—that the work is *fully done*. With him, there was no returning after the Sabbath to complete the plan,—no forgotten purposes to fulfil,—no unsuccessful attempt to be undertaken again,—no chasm in the rounded earth to fill up,—no lacking company in the mighty armies of nature. It was essential to the perfectness of his rest that it should follow a *finished work*. The outstretched, creative faculties gathered themselves up into the cloud of light; for the emergency they had evoked and employed was past. So in Heaven, the whole, long life-battle will have been fought out,—the consummation of our hopes and labors perfectly achieved. In God's strength we undertook to reinstate him in a rebellious heart—to turn out the stubborn idolatries that had taken root and flourished there—to break up the hard and evil will that rejected him and brought forth only sins, and passions, and fears,—and to bring him back into his vineyard, unquestioned Lord there,—the Gatherer of all our little harvest. And behold, it is done! The whole bright spirit is his own.

We sought to make it pure as well as loyal. We were ashamed of the vile thoughts and sordid worldliness that harbored there; and with a resolute and holy jealousy we cast them out. Slowly and painfully we removed each stain, receiving the heavenly help without which, we can do nothing, and into their place brought in hope, and peace, and communion with God. This also, is done; Christ's righteousness and the Holy Spirit have "presented us faultless with exceeding joy," before our Father. We aimed, again, at self-developement and Christian maturity. We felt and lamented the feeble-

ness of all good things in us; we set ourselves to grow stronger,—to attain “the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.” This, too, is accomplished; the time of weakness,—the time of stumbling, the time of childish helplessness, has passed away. We have attained our growth and are armed with angel’s strength.

Like His rest in this—that the thing done is a *creation*. It was no working up of old materials, the making of this noble world: He called it out of nothing by His word. Thus also, the new heart that enters Heaven is no old heart refitted or repaired. Love to God does not ripen out of self-love, or obedience out of wilfulness, or loyalty out of rebellion, or tender affection out of a hard and carnal wickedness. “Behold, I make all things new; old things have passed away” and vanished forever. In their place come trust, peace, joy in the Holy Ghost. So, now the new man is created, and the old nature swept away into oblivion and darkness, we enter into divine, eternal rest.

Likest God’s rest in this—that order and beauty, and glory are the continual outcome of this work,—our immortal inheritance. When Jehovah finished his creating work, all was faultless, happy, glorious. He looked down from his lofty throne and rejoiced in his admirable and perfect deed. Yea, and though sin has marred God’s excellent handiwork, the glory and the bliss enure to him as of old; it is the same revelation, though Satan and rebel man contradict or pervert it. When Christ our Lord returned to Heaven, he beheld the work of mercy finished,—his reign begun, his people assured to him, the heavenly mansions built and ready to receive the ransomed multitudes. His foes were vanquished, his travail ended, his kingdom established. “To him,” therefore, “shall the gentiles seek, and *his* rest shall be glorious.” When we lay down these fleshly bodies in the grave,—when faith has triumphed over both life and death,—when the last temptation has been met and overcome,—when that “last enemy” shall have been “destroyed,”—there shall remain for us an immortal body, an eternal victory, an incorruptible and undefiled inheritance that fadeth not away. Then shall we sing with Paul—“I have fought the good fight, I have

finished my course, I have kept the faith! Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the Righteous Judge shall give me."

Return, then, unto thy rest, O my soul; for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee! Let the sweetness of what surely shall be, quench the bitterness of what is. Look patiently across these lengthening shadows to that momentary night, which alone parts the evening from the "perfect day." Shall thy entering into rest fail "because of unbelief?" Remember, *it will not fail for any other cause.*

Lean heavily upon the Lord's arm! Fear not,—try its strength by the large burden rolled off upon it. He who talked with Adam while the twilight wind blew softly, will talk with thee, if thou walk with Him; and His words shall be of welcome and of rest. Return then, my soul! Hasten out of all these thy wanderings into the King's highway. Shake off these vile companions, sloth, passions, and worldly wisdom. What though, in that pure air, that arduous beginning of bliss, pain and toil beset this gross body? What though the outward man perish? It is enough that thou art renewed in His image day by day; the life also of Jesus shall be manifest in thee!

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### EARLY HISTORY OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

"Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations: ask thy father and he will shew thee; thy elders and they will tell thee. When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. For the Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance. He found him in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness; he led him about, he in-

structed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye." So sang the aged Lawgiver of the Jewish people, in one of those sacred songs, whose strains of sweetness, of holiness and love, were repeated by inspired and bard-like prophets for ten centuries, in which the spirit of prophecy was continued in the ancient church. He had conducted the tribes of Israel through the Red Sea and the waste howling wilderness, and had seen all the men that came out of Egypt, except Caleb and Joshua, die for their sins. To those then on the stage of action, he repeated the law heard by many of them in childhood, at the foot of Sinai, and to all he points out the deliverances of the past, the struggles, the defeats and the victories, as ground of instructive meditation. As long ago as the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, in the dispersion of men at the tower of Babel, when he separated the sons of Adam, he had this chosen race in view, and he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. This central land of Palestine, looking forth upon three quarters of the globe, and upon a sea which was the thoroughfare of ancient civilization, he committed to an energetic but doomed people, to be subdued, cultivated, and filled with cities, for *them* to occupy; that from it, one day, might go forth the law, and the sceptre from Jerusalem. It was through a period of servitude in a foreign clime, that Israel had been trained. When rescued from it, he was found in a desert land and in the waste howling wilderness; but there the Most High was his miraculous protector and guide. He led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye. For the Lord's *portion* is his people; Jacob is the *lot of his inheritance*.

In every age may the true Church of God, or any fragment of it, see, in what happened to the Israelitish people, what has also happened to themselves, for He, our Maker and our Husband, has lifted up this one nation before the world, as an example of what He is, has been, and will be to all those whom he has chosen to be his. In how many instances in the Psalms of David, does the worshipper of God rehearse the history of his own people, and in the special providence which shaped its

fortunes, find themes of praise to the King of Zion, or instruction to his own generation. Beckoned on by such examples, and by that of the dying Stephen in Gospel times, we invite you to turn your eyes back over the way the Lord has led you, and consider the years of many generations.

In the first place, then, let us look at *the gathering of the Church of God*. It is by the effectual calling of the Holy Ghost. But this is accomplished through the preaching of the Word, and the general tender of salvation in Christ. "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Around this central truth do the chosen of God cluster, embracing the salvation offered, and rejoicing in a Saviour found. Hitherto they were hidden, and not distinguishable from the mass of men; but, as the particles of iron in the sand, which no eye can separate from their fellow particles, cluster around the magnet that approaches them, and by it are discovered and lifted forth, so are these by the offer of Christ the Saviour, through the efficient action of the Holy Ghost. They are the true *ecclesia*, called forth thus from the indiscriminate mass of men. They are born of God by a new and heavenly birth. They have the spirit of adoption by which they cry Abba Father! The family tie is felt among them, the bond of fraternal love, and by virtue of their new and heavenly relation, they constitute a new community, in this world as yet, but distinct from the world of the ungodly. To them are also aggregated by motives of self-interest, or through self-deception, some who profess faith in Christ, or believe themselves to have experienced the renewing of the Holy Ghost, but to whom it will be declared by the Master, in the end, "I never knew you."

As this Church came into existence, it received a *form and order under the apostolic hand*. All were not teachers, because some were appointed expressly to teach; all were not rulers, nor was the Church a democratic body, because some were appointed to rule, and the rest are commanded to obey. The Churches were not independent of each other, because it is plain, that in Jerusalem, where they consisted of many thousands, too

many to meet in one congregation, or be instructed by one pastor, they are yet addressed as one Church and appear to have submitted to one and the same control, and because also, the whole Church is spoken of as having a visible unity, which is realized in our own alone, of all *Protestant* forms of ecclesiastical polity. Three orders of officers are found among them, besides the extraordinary office of apostle, which was temporary; the one taught, as his especial function, and in common with others that performed the office of rulers chiefly, participated in the power of government; while a third took from the shoulders of the other two the burden of pecuniary affairs, and the care of the poor, that they might devote themselves to spiritual duties, and more especially to the word of God and prayer. This Presbyterian government pre-supposed, the departures from it, on either hand, are easily explained by the modifications which human wisdom preferred to add, for various reasons, to the apostolic scheme. From time to time by one Church father, or enlightened man, or another, has this been acknowledged as the earlier form, even when corruption had buried from the common view God's pure truth, or pomps, ceremonies, and mitred and stoled dignitaries, drawn the attention away from the simple but significant and efficient order of the house of God.

To us too, it is matter of satisfaction, that when the stream of pure doctrine which had run beneath the ground for so long a time, burst forth at the Reformation, and God's true Church showed itself again, creeping forth from the corruptions by which it was oppressed, it re-organised itself throughout Christendom, with but few exceptions, on that model which we ourselves retain. With the apostolic truth, came also, in Switzerland, in France, in Holland, in Bohemia, in Germany, and in Scotland, the apostolic form of ecclesiastical order; which, though we acknowledge it less important far, than the essential, life-giving truth of the Gospel, has still a venerable and excellent beauty in our eyes.

Of the *Ante-American History of the Presbyterian Church*, before its several branches sought an asylum on these shores, we have time only briefly to speak. They came from their native soil, from whatever quarter gath-

ered, instinct with the love of freedom and hatred of oppression, and disciplined in the school of persecution and suffering. The last victim who publicly sealed with his blood, his testimony in behalf of Scotland's Covenant and the Divine Mediator's sole sovereignty over his Church, against royal and prelatical oppression, Jas. Renwick, was put to death in 1688, which was 18 years after the first settlement of South Carolina. During this fierce persecution, which raged for 28 years, when the bloody Claverhouse sent to the eternal world, in brutal fury, so many spirits of heroic martyrs for the truth of God, during which 18,000 of Scotland's purest sons suffered by death, slavery, imprisonment, or exile, many were banished to the plantations and met that pity here which their own countrymen denied them, or, in voluntary expatriation, found on these wild shores what there they sought, "freedom to worship God." Sayle, the first Governor of Carolina, it is believed, was a Presbyterian, and others of our faith were found among the earliest settlers on these shores. And in 1682, Lord Cardross, many of whose friends had endured imprisonment, or the rack, and death itself, and who had himself been persecuted under Lauderdale, brought over a small colony of Scotsmen, out-casts from their own land, ten families in all, the remnant of a large association, which embraced thirty-six noblemen and gentlemen, and which was formed two years before, with the view of affording a place of refuge to the persecuted Presbyterians. Some of the members of this association became involved meanwhile in political conspiracies; among whom were Russell and Sydney, who suffered on the scaffold. The colony of Lord Cardross, which settled at Port Royal, was attacked by the Spaniards, and some of them returned to Scotland, among whom was Dr. Dunlop, afterwards Principal of the University of Glasgow. Others were left behind, and from this and other sources, a small company of resolute Scotsmen, mingled with other dissenters, kept alive the piety and doctrine of their ancestors.

Among the earliest emigrants to Carolina too, were a colony of Dutch from New York, increased by fresh importations from Holland, who settled Jamestown, on the south-west side of Ashley River. These men belonged

to the Presbyterian division of the Protestant Church, and may have added some little to our strength, though the major part, perhaps, became gradually incorporated with the Lutherans, with whom they were more intimately allied in language than with ourselves. They too, bore in their memories, the sanguinary persecutions they had endured at the hands of the Duke of Alba, the century before, in which so many of their Protestant countrymen met with the confiscation of their property, imprisonment, and cruel death. The German Reformed Church, whose founder was Zuingle, contributed still more largely to the population of Carolina. Indeed, when the Lutheran Synod was formed in 1787, six of the fifteen Churches that entered into the organization were, we believe, of the Calvinistic faith.

Another section of our Presbyterian band was of the persecuted Huguenots of France. They came from scenes of suffering and blood, to find a genial home in these Southern climes. They came bearing with them that simplicity of Christian character, that refinement, that industry, and that noble, manly courage which had distinguished them through a century of terrible persecutions. Some fifty families arrived the year before the settlement of Charleston on its present site, and their numbers were greatly increased in the year 1685, the date of the revocation of the edict of Nantz. Among them were also commingled a small band of Swiss Refugees from the valleys of Piedmont, of those devoted men for whom Milton calls out in pious and poetic strains,

"Avenge O Lord, thy slaughtered Saints, whose bones  
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold:  
Even them who kept thy truth so pure of old."

Another element which entered into the Presbyterianism of South Carolina, was the Irish element, at first not largely, but afterwards constituting the great body of emigrants of our own communion. They were, originally, Scotsmen of the Presbyterian faith, who were settled in the early part of the 17th century in the province of Ulster, to hold that country against the native Irish of the Papal Church, who had striven to shake off the English rule. There they had resided and prospered.



There too, they had witnessed, and in some part suffered from the Irish Rebellion of 1641, in which unexampled cruelties were inflicted by the native Irish upon the English Protestants whom they sought to expel from their Island. And there too, some eight years after the settlement of Charleston, they had themselves endured, at the siege of Derry and Inniskillen, more than tongue can tell, from the Irish Papists, and were rescued by William of Orange, at the battle of the Boyne. Another class, and that perhaps at first, the most numerous of all, was the English Dissenters, born, also, in the school of adversity, the larger share of whom, if we take Hume for authority, were Presbyterians; more than 2000 of whose ministers had but recently been ejected from their parishes, and driven forth upon the earth, or lodged in prisons, because of their inability to conform to the established Church. A portion also, were Independents, some strictly so, and others professing the modified Independency advocated by that most able of England's Divines, whose works on Church Government appeared at this time, the Rev. John Owen. These then, were the immediate founders of the Presbyterian Church, in South Carolina.

Before Francis Makemie gathered the first Presbyterian Churches on the Eastern shore of Maryland, a Church existed in Charleston, which, in the early records of the congregation, is habitually called the Presbyterian Church, but in which Congregational Dissenters and Presbyterians worshipped together, gathered probably as early as 1682, and to which Joseph Blake, Governor, and Landgrave, made a donation of £1,000 in 1695, and which is now perpetuated in the Circular Church, in the City of Charleston. The French Huguenot Church was gathered in Charleston in 1686, and was the first that was purely Presbyterian in South Carolina. Rev. Pierre Robert, the first minister of the French on the Santee, was a Piedmontese of the Waldensian Communion. Its second Pastor was officiating in 1700. A third existed in the Parish of St. Dennis, perhaps nearly as soon, and another in the same Parish which had but one Pastor.

The Dorchester Church, first from Dorchester, Eng-

land, and then from Dorchester, Massachusetts, which migrated to South Carolina, with its Pastor, and settled on the Ashley River in 1796, on the Congregational platform, and subsequently removed to Liberty co., Ga., in 1753, was one of the earliest establishments of the Congregational Church, perhaps the earliest which was strictly such.

The arrival of the Rev. Archibald Stobo, in Carolina, one of the four Ministers which the Kirk of Scotland sent out with the ill-fated colony that nation attempted to settle on the Isthmus of Darien,\* was a fortunate thing for the Presbyterian cause. The colony was unsuccessful. King William opposed it,—it was attacked by the Spaniards, and at length abandoned. One of the vessels which brought away the remnant of the inhabitants was wrecked off Charleston bar in the year 1700, but Mr. Stobo, who had come up in the long boat to the city, was thus providentially, spared.† He became Pastor of the Church in Charleston, for a few years, and was succeeded by Livingston, another Scotch Clergyman, and these men greatly strengthened their Presbyterian brethren. Mr. Stobo's labours were continued through nearly half a century, and he became the founder of several Churches of our faith.‡ A letter from S. Carolina, published in London, bearing date June 1, 1710, mentions that there are eight Ministers of the Church of England; three French Protestant Churches, whereof two of the Ministers had already conformed to the Church; five of British Presbyterians; one of Anabaptists, and a small number of Quakers.¶ The population of the colony at this time, probably amounted to about seven thousand white inhabitants. The first donation of three hundred acres of land for the support of a Presbyterian Minister on Edisto Island, dates A. D. 1717.

Although the little colony maintained at this time some distant garrisons to keep the Indians in check, as among the Congarees, the whole territory occupied, except the

\* See Dalcho, p. 38.

† Another vessel belonging to the Scotch Colony, was disabled, put into Charleston, and was sold and broke up.—Dalcho, p. 38.

‡ Ramsey's History of Circular Church, New Edition, p. 3.

¶ Hodge i, 85.

settlement at Beaufort, seems to have been bounded by the Santee and Edisto Rivers, and to have embraced what is now Charleston District, and a small part of Colleton. The colonists were girded on every side by savage tribes, and went armed to Church, with posted sentries around their houses of worship, a custom which was followed also, during the revolution, and which is enjoined by a still unrepealed law of the State. In the next quarter of the century were founded the Churches of Pon Pon or Walterboro, in 1728, of which Mr. Stobo was the first Pastor, and the first Presbyterian Church in Charleston, in 1731. The Churches on John's and James' Island existed before 1734 or 1735, and indeed, it is quite possible that they were gathered early in the century. We can scarcely make out the five Churches of British Presbyterians in 1710, unless we reckon these, and either that of Edisto, or that of Wiltown, and perhaps both, as among them. The Presbytery of Charlestou, or as it was sometimes called, the Presbytery of the Province, was also, probably in existence early in this century. In 1738 the Church of Wiltown was strong enough to quell an insurrection, when they were assembled on the Sabbath, the men with arms in their hands. The Church of Williamsburg, the mother of at least five other Churches, two of which are in Tennessee, was founded in 1736. The Independent Presbyterian Church of Stony Creek, in 1743. Several Churches which have become extinct in Williamsburg, and some other places in the low country, belong to the same general date, and some much earlier.

About the middle of the 18th century the up-country began to be settled. In 1754 the Rev. Mr. Thain of New Jersey, preached under an oak, to a congregation gathered at the settlement which is now called the Fair Forest Church. They consisted of about six families, the whole population of that part of the country. These were subsequently obliged to flee to the more southern settlements till after the Indian war was over, for self preservation. In the same, or the following year, Hugh McAden, sent out as a Missionary by the Synod of New York, preached on the Tiger River and on the Broad River, at several points, and perhaps visited the Presbyterian settlement on Duncan's Creek. In the same year

was the commencement of the Waxhaw Church in Lancaster District. At this time the population of the up-country was exceeding sparse. In the year 1755 the country from the Waxhaws to Augusta on the Savannah, did not contain twenty-five families, where now are twelve large and populous Districts. In 1764, the Rev. Jean Louis Gibert arrived in South Carolina with two hundred Huguenot members of his Church and congregation, under the auspices of Charles II., and settled the townships of New Bordeaux and New Rochelle in Abbeville District. They were probably descendants of the Albigenses of the South of France, and were disciplined therefore, in the school of affliction. Their French Ministers had no successors, and though they kept up worship in their native tongue till within the memory of some of their descendants in the present generation, they were, at length, prevailed upon to cast in their lot with the neighbouring Churches, and their descendants are now embraced in the Willington and other adjacent congregations.

There are many other congregations of the up-country, to whose history it would be pleasant to allude if time allowed. Nearly all the principal Churches through that and the middle regions of the State, were gathered before the close of the 18th century. The emigration was large from the North of Ireland, from Pennsylvania, and other more Northern States, where the North Irish, and North British people had made their earlier settlements. The petitions for supplies from Presbyterian neighbourhoods, to the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, were now frequent. In 1770, Messrs. Russell and McAlpin were sent to the Synod of Philadelphia and New York, meeting in the latter city, to solicit, on behalf of the inhabitants of Long Cane, ministerial supplies. As the result, Messrs. Lewis, McCreary, Rose, and Close, were dispatched as Evangelists to the Southern settlements, the two latter being expressly directed to labour at Long Cane. Previous to their arrival, a committee of five were appointed,—the names of four are still known, Patrick Calhoun, Andrew Pickens, John Irwin, Wm. McAlpin, to arrange where congregations should be formed. The places selected were those now occupied by Rocky Creek, Upper and Lower Long Cane,

Rocky River and Saluda (now Greenville,) Churches. The faithful Missionaries came, performed their labours well, ordained elders, baptized children, administered the Lord's Supper in every place. The Churches of Salem, B. R., of Indian Town, of Bethel, Cedar Shoals, Fishing Creek, Duncan's Creek, Bersheba, Bullock's Creek, Catholic, Bethesda, Fair Forest, Purity, Little River, Jackson's Creek, Cedar Creek, in Richland District, were gathered before the Revolution, a few during that bloody contest, more afterwards, previous to the present century, whose names time does not permit us to mention. The early settlers, like the early settlers of the low country, suffered much from Indian depredations and cruelty. Some were brutally slain, a few borne off and tortured to death by their savage foe. So, that when it becomes necessary to conquer and expel the barbarians, many in the Church, private members and elders, marched to the conquest of the Indian territory.

The patriotic spirit of the men of our Church made them among the foremost in the war of the Revolution. Their Ministers were hunted like partridges upon the mountains, and it was safer for a Presbyterian man to be with the army in the field, than to occupy his own home and attempt the protection of his wife and children. During this period some of our clergymen were more or less active in promoting what they regarded the true interests of their country. William Tennant of the Circular Church, in Charleston, belonging to the Tenants of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, made the circuit of the middle and up-country with Wm. Henry Drayton, to stimulate the people to resistance. Simpson of Fishing Creek, encouraged his own flock to deeds of heroism or patient endurance, and was himself, at times, found bearing arms, and was in several engagements; and Alexander, a fugitive often from his own home, yet at all times offered his dwelling as a hospital for the sick or disabled soldier. Hayne, the martyr to the cause of liberty, was an elder of the Walterboro' Church, Col. Williams, who fell at King's Mountain, an elder in the Little River Church. All the officers indeed, who commanded in that sanguinary contest, were, I believe, Presbyterians. Gen. Pickens, Col. Hamilton, Maj. James,

and others, held the same office of the eldership. The suffering of that day few can tell, but our ancestors had been accustomed to suffer for conscience sake, had contended for religious freedom, had detested oppression and tyranny, and resisted it for generations.

Persons are yet living who remember that the men of the congregations, old and young, as they went into Church, stacked their loaded arms within the entrance, while faithful men paced to and fro as watchful sentinels while the worship of God proceeded.

The progressive extension of our branch of the Presbyterian Church may be known by a few facts. In 1755, when the Presbytery of Hanover was erected by the Synod of New York, but seven members were constituted that Presbytery, none of whom were in this State, and yet its jurisdiction was to extend over Virginia and all the South. At that time, there could not have been over a dozen Ministers of any shade of Presbyterianism who have become associated with us, in the entire State. In 1770, when the Presbytery of Orange was set off from the Presbytery of Hanover to have jurisdiction over the country south of Virginia, it consisted of but six members in all, two of whom, Griswell and Alexander, were alone settled in South Carolina. And the probability is, that there were not more than six Ministers, in all, of our own faith, in the middle and upper Districts of this State, during the period of the Revolution.

At the close of the century the entire Ministry in this State, in connection with the General Assembly, or separate from it in the low country, was about twenty-five in all, with three or four licentiates, and about sixty-four Churches.

The Ministers at the time of the foundation of the Theological Seminary were about forty-five in number, in the whole State. The entire number now, is about ninety Ministers, one hundred and fifteen Churches, and about twelve thousand Church members. There has been a re-duplication of our Ministers, and very nearly of our membership, within the last twenty-four years, although the population of the State has increased in this time only about one fifth.

In 1813, when the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia was formed, its jurisdiction extended to the Missis-

issippi River, and yet it consisted of but thirty-two Ministers in all. In the same bounds, there now are three hundred and twenty-eight Presbyterian Ministers, five hundred and nine Churches, thirty thousand two hundred and forty Church members. Many of these were emigrants from this State. For, it is probable, that there are at least two-thirds as many Carolinians, and two-thirds as many Presbyterians from the bounds of this Synod out of the State as there are in it. Our Church in general, in these one hundred and fifty years, since the Presbytery of Philadelphia was formed with seven members, embraces in the Old School portion of it, twenty-eight Synods, one hundred and forty-six Presbyteries, two thousand two hundred and three Ministers, two thousand nine hundred and seventy-six Churches, two hundred and twenty-five thousand four hundred and four members. Its organization touches the Pacific on the one side, while on the other it has reached over into Northern India its Missionary hand, and has planted its Presbyteries and Churches there. Our separated brethren of the New School, have not increased in the same proportion, yet their numerical strength added to ours, shows a Ministry of three thousand seven hundred and seventy-three, and a membership of three hundred and sixty-five thousand eight hundred and eighty-six,\* without including other branches of the Presbyterian family, whose statistics we are not able now to give.

The Presbyterian Ministry in the State, have always been the friends of Education. The school has always been planted hard by their Churches. Mount Zion College at Winnsboro', and the College at Old Cambridge, were early efforts of theirs to promote education, and their efforts have never to this day, ceased. The private institutions of Dr. Joseph Alexander, of Bulloch's Creek, who is spoken of by his pupils as a man of accomplished scholarship, and of Dr. Waddell, at Willington, did much towards training the men of the generation now passing away. Some of our eminent Jurists and Governors of the State, have not been ashamed to confess that they owed their education wholly to the labours of these men. In the earlier days too, the evangelistic la-

\* Numbers of the New School taken from Report of 1853.

hours of our Ministry in tours of Missionary effort to found new, or keep alive feeble Churches, were more abundant than now. Many of the infant Churches before the Revolution and after, were saved from extinction for years, by these means; and not a few have since been left to expire, or to lapse to other organizations, for the want of the regular ministry of the word of life.

Seasons of revival too, have been not unfrequently enjoyed; under Whitfield, in the low country, in 1733; and onward, who being deposed by Commissary Garden, of Charleston, from the Episcopal Ministry, was received by the other congregations with open arms, and was the instrument of the conversion of many souls. In 1800 and onward also, when meetings of great power were held in many important Churches in the upper country, and where there were those singular nervous exercises of the physical man, connected with the mental excitement, which existed in many who were soundly converted, and many who were not; in 1825, and the years immediately following, in many Churches; again, twenty-one years since, and now, also, under the labours of one who then, and now, has been signally blessed as a Minister of Christ.\*

We would have flourished more as a Church, if our people could have released their Ministers more entirely from the school and the farm, by providing for them a more ample support, and could have allowed them to devote themselves wholly to the work of the ministry, to storing their minds with profounder studies of God's truth, and preparing themselves with greater ardour for its impressive utterance. We would have flourished more if Ministers and people had possessed at all times, a more aggressive zeal, with more in fine of the true Missionary spirit. We would have been more united if no man of a mind strong, but not well-poised, had never arisen with novel speculations, to lead others astray. Above all, we would have flourished more if we had lived more constantly at a throne of Grace; if, with John, we had leaned more in rapt admiration on the bosom of our Master; if, with Paul, we had been more assiduous, bold, earnest, and free to reason with the high

\* Rev. Daniel Baker, D. D.



and the law on the doctrines and duties of the Gospel of Christ, or with Peter, we had kept in view the coming of the Lord, and been looking for and hasting unto that day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements melt with fervent heat, and waiting for it in all holy conversation and godliness.

To us, the earthen vessels, belongs all the shame and sin of our derelictions, and of the unsteady hand with which we have carried on the work of God, to him the praise of the excellency and power which have attended even this unworthy promulgation of his truth. How gratefully should our hearts laud and magnify his name that he has not wholly cursed our labours and rejected the comparatively barren and impotent service we have rendered him! "When we remember these days of old, and consider the years of many generations," we can indeed, say, "The Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance. He found him in a desert land and in a waste howling wilderness; he led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye."

In view of all the facts which have been spread out before us, too tediously minute, perhaps, to have been profitable, we should honour, next to God, those human instruments he has used in advancing the interests of his Church. Our fathers in the ministry who have gone before and entered into rest, had around them, in this country, new as it was, and disturbed by border conflicts, and desolated by civil war, (leaving behind all these demoralizing influences which war ever brings in its train,) difficulties to contend with which never has fallen to our lot. That in the process of years, they have accomplished so much, while it is cause for thanksgiving to the Giver of all good, is honourable also to them. Of some there is evidence yet existing, of their fervent piety and self-consuming zeal. Of others, evidence of self-reliance, and firmness and boldness of character. Others had made respectable attainments in learning, others were gifted with rare powers of popular address, and impressed their hearers with a deep sense of the truths they uttered; most appear, whatever advantages or disadvantages they may have enjoyed, to have been true and devoted Ministers of Christ.

And as to ourselves, if they were not apostles unto others, yet doubtless, they were to us, for the seal of their apostleship are we in the Lord.

2. We should address ourselves with earnestness and diligence to the work which yet lies before us. If the next twenty-four years is to see a doubling again of our ministry and membership, we have ourselves a work to accomplish which we should hasten to perform. In respect to the outward temporal means, we have advantages our fathers never enjoyed. The wealth of the State has greatly increased. At no former period could these lines of communication between its different parts which now exist, and are deemed indispensable, have been constructed; which are at once the fruit of increasing enterprise and wealth, and the necessary means of a more rapid increase for the future. At no period were there such facilities of a thorough education, both for our sons and daughters, and at none such ample means for training an educated ministry. At none were there such facilities for furnishing our people with a religious literature, and at no period were they so thoroughly furnished as now. At no period did the virtue of sobriety, especially in the use of intoxicating drinks, so extensively prevail, for there is evidence enough that there was a thoughtless freedom in the use of these, which often went on to an excessive indulgence in those who bore the Christian name.

If, with an equal zeal, and fervour, there shall not be a higher scale of Christian beneficence, and a more extensive scheme of benevolent effort than existed with them, we shall be recreant to our sacred trust. We can give thousands where they could give but hundreds, or but tens, to the cause of Christ. We can in a few hours travel distances in our evangelistic labours which it would have required days for them to accomplish. As there is an economising of time from earthly drudgery, there should be a greater profusion of effort in things religious and spiritual. As we stand upon the institutions they have founded, as upon a higher vantage ground, there should be with us a wider scope of effort, and a more continuous and uninterrupted diligence in spreading the Gospel. We should carry forth, in every community, a religious influence over those neighbourhoods

and persons who have hitherto seemed beyond its reach. And the ever increasing numbers of our servile population, few comparatively in the days of our fathers, must be indoctrinated in the truths of the Gospel, with which, in this Christian country, they should be brought into contact that they may be saved.

We have sometimes feared that the spirit of Evangelism prevails amongst us less than among our fathers. Both as to Domestic Missions and Foreign, it is possible that for years past, there has been no increase of zeal and effort. When we find in 1793, Robert Wilson of Long Cane, passing through the length of the State, as far as Wiltown, near the sea, on a missionary tour, and read his account of his reception in various places, when we find Hall from the Synod of the Carolinas performing missionary work in Georgia, till the grateful inhabitants gave his name to one of their counties in testimony of their regard; when we find Sloss, Hurlburd, and Stuart, sent to found churches in Alabama, and from 1800 to 1803 Bowman and Montgomery, and Dr. Hall, sent forth as missionaries to the Natchez, who were followed by Daniel Brown and James Smiley; when we find in 1811, the Presbytery of Harmony sending Drs. Fisk and Storrs, then young and untitled ministers, through Middle and Lower Georgia, to preach the Gospel; and when we see the Missionary Society of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, founded in 1819, under Dr. Barr as its President, sending out two of its members, one of whom is amongst us this day,\* first to the Creeks, and when rejected there, onward to the Chickasaws in Mississippi, to make arrangements for a Missionary station, and then planting there Stuart, Hugh Wilson and Blair, with two families of Lay brethren, and continuing the mission till they resigned it to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in 1827, and at the same time sending Domestic Missionaries through this State and Georgia; and when in 1837 we had five brethren, natives of this State, preaching the Gospel in Foreign lands, and have now but one, and he of those who then went forth, it may well be questioned whether with our increase in Missionary contributions we have really increased in Missionary zeal.

\* Rev. D. Humphrey.

And when we view our common country, as yet not rent asunder as Israel at length was, into two rival kingdoms; when we consider the goodly heritage God has given us, our extended territory, with its virgin soil, its lakes and majestic rivers, its subterranean stores, and all its boundless sources of prosperity; when we behold it looking forth upon two oceans, touching the wealth of Europe with its right hand and of Asia with its left, covering every sea with its commerce, and destined in its midway station to be the thoroughfare of nations; when we consider that as the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he committed to the barbarous tribes who preceded us, this vast domain, to keep till we should inherit it, and that the Church here planted, occupies a vantage ground for the world's salvation, are we not called upon to redouble our zeal in external efforts, and to render more efficient our home organization that we may do our full share in advancing Christ's Kingdom. It behooves us, indeed, to wake to more assiduous labours, more self-denying charity and larger enterprises.

3. Yet, while as a body, we should possess the *aggressive* missionary spirit, we still have work to do, earnest work, each in his own local sphere in which God has placed him. Some of us might well be, for the Church's good, followers of Paul in the missionary work, our souls filled to their utmost capacity, with a desire not to build on another man's foundation, but to preach the Gospel in the regions beyond, "running," as one of the Fathers describes the course of Paul, "from ocean to ocean like the sun in the heavens." But, without ever changing our location, there is enough to do around us, enough to do in the profound study of God's truth, enough to do in petition and intercession at the throne of grace, enough to do in affectionate meditation on the Redeemer's inestimable worth, enough in bending all our reading and intercourse with men, to an effective service in our utterances of the Gospel of Christ, that our ministry be not despised, that our discourses be rich in doctrine, warm with love, and pointed with the sharp arrows of truth. Is this laborious? We are born to labour. Our rest is not here, but yonder in the skies! Does it require increasing ardour of soul, and strong, overpower-

ing motive? And can we not find it in a Saviour's love! "I want more tongues, more bodies, more souls for the Lord Jesus," says Whitfield, "Had I ten thousand, he should have them all."

And the time is short. This disastrous year and its frequent deaths admonish us. The heads of some of us are hoary, and our steps totter to the grave; and we have lately seen how the young, the gentle, the affectionate, the promising soldier, whom we had just welcomed to our ranks, can be cut off. We may say to you, in the language of another, "Go on" increasing in your ministerial work, but "an inch of time remains, and then eternal ages roll on forever."

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1854.

The annual meetings of our General Assembly, aside from the interest which pertains to them as current events of the day, have a far wider interest, considered as an index of the existing spirit and tendencies of the great body of Christian people therein represented, now the largest Presbyterian body in the world.

The late General Assembly, whose session opened at Buffalo on the 18th and closed on the 31st May last, is entitled to consideration in this regard, perhaps, in as high degree, as any other Assembly for years past. The unprecedented fulness of the representation, especially of the Eldership, the ability, age, and experience of many of the members, the harmony and kindness, and at the same time the manliness and boldness of the discussions, together with the intrinsic and permanent importance of many of the acts passed, all concur to invest the proceedings of the body with unusual interest.

We recur, at this late period, and after they have lost all their freshness and novelty, to these proceedings, with a view chiefly to discuss the true interpretation of the more significant of them. Some of them are of importance, because of their direct and palpable bearing upon

great and vital interests of religion. Others, because they involve principles, far reaching in their consequences, and widely extending in their application to the great measures of the Church. Others, because of their significance, as indicating a movement of the mind of the Church, more clearly and strongly in a right direction as we think, than perhaps any other since 1837 and 1838.

And that they have been generally so regarded, is apparent from the strong tendency manifested among the more earnest supporters of certain measures,—mistaking and misinterpreting many acts of the last Assembly, by reason of their strong partiality for favorite schemes,—to claim for them an endorsement which they did not receive; to fancy issues made before the Assembly which were not made, and adjudications of questions which were not mooted,—the final closing of controversies which were not opened, and battles won which were not fought.

Following the order of the Minutes, and aiming to select for remark, chiefly such topics as relate to questions of general and permanent importance, we notice first:

*The Organization of the New Synods of Baltimore and Alleghany.*

The erection of these two Synods, thereby reducing materially two of the largest Synods of the Church, is an event whose importance is by no means to be estimated by the local conveniences and advantage thereby secured to the parties immediately concerned, great as these manifestly are. That the formation of the Synod of Baltimore, involved other results, viz: a removal of one of the Boards from Philadelphia, was predicted on the floor of the house, and the anticipation of such a result may have been at the bottom of the otherwise unaccountable zeal of the opposition to the measure. And though any such purpose was earnestly disavowed by the immediate representatives of the new movement, as among the reasons which induced them to desire the new Synod, still the tendency of public opinion in the Church is manifestly toward such a change of the location of the Boards, and the measure in question may in some respects facilitate the project.

However this may be, these two acts of the Assembly, in the way of equalizing the Synodical arrangements of the Church, have an important bearing on another question. We mean as a preparatory step toward the solution of the difficulties now beginning to be felt from the inconvenient bulk of the General Assembly as at present constituted, and the consequent impossibilities of any adequate attention to the constantly increasing business, which the rapid growth of the Church is throwing upon that body. This fact, which formed the staple of the argument for judicial commissions in the discussion which arose near the close of the Sessions, suggested the proposition moved by Dr. Breckenridge, but for want of time not acted on,—and by the operation of a rule singularly unfortunate in some instances, (since it is often as important to know what did *not*, as what *did* pass,) excluded from the Minutes,—to send down to the Presbyteries an overture proposing a change from Presbyterial to Synodical representation in the General Assembly, with provision for a re-apportionment of representation every five or ten years. Some such change must inevitably soon take place; and it is well to have attention directed to the subject in time, before it shall, in connection with some exciting controversy, be forced upon the Church, under circumstances unfavourable to a calm and well matured decision.

The proposition for a Synodical representation in the Assembly is by no means a novel one. As early as 1820 the scheme was suggested by a Synod in the west, and urged on the ground of the difficulty of reaching from the far west, the General Assembly, whose meetings at that period, were fixed at Philadelphia. These reasons have now lost their force, but other more important and permanent reasons have arisen, calling for a change. In addition to the reasons already suggested from the present unwieldy bulk of the Assembly, and the consequent delay in the transaction of business, and from the same cause this difficulty made more incapable of remedy by prolonging the time of the Sessions; the question of expense to the Church is not unworthy of consideration, especially at a time when great interests of the Church are hindered for want of funds. At an average expense

for travel, &c., of fifty to sixty dollars, not a large estimate, all things considered, the Assembly as now constituted, with some three hundred and twenty members, if full, costs the Church, (or some one else,) annually, from fifteen to twenty thousand dollars. Now, when it is considered that half the number could transact the business in less time and far better, and probably represent the Church just as well, and that therefore one half of this sum is expended for that which is a hindrance to the work which the Assembly has to do, it may well be doubted whether the ends to be gained by a large representation from the Presbyteries, are worth the outlay.

Independent of these considerations, is the additional fact, that the present scheme of representation is in its results very unequal and unjust. The Synod of Nashville, for instance, for 35 Ministers has 5 Ministers, and for 3100 Communicants, has 5 elders on the floor of the Assembly,—one Minister for a constituency of 7 Ministers, one Elder for a constituency of 600 Communicants. The Synod of S. Carolina, to represent 113 Ministers has 6 Ministers, and to represent 11,300 Communicants has 6 Ruling Elders on the floor of the Assembly,—one Minister to a constituency of some 20, and one Elder to a constituency of some 2000. Thus, one Minister of the Synod of Nashville, has the ecclesiastical power of three Ministers of the Synod of South Carolina, and a Church member in the Synod of Nashville the power of three in the Synod of S. Carolina. But, if this inequality existed only in exceptional cases, the injustice of it might be extenuated, on the score of the necessity of exceptions in the working out of all general rules. In reference to this subject, however, the inequality referred to, extends far beyond individual instances. An examination of the tabular views in the Minutes will show, that arranging the 30 Synods into three classes according to their representation, as equal to, above or below, the average representation of the whole Church in the General Assembly, (which is about one Minister to every 14 Ministers, and one Ruling Elder to every 1400 Communicants,) we shall have an equal number of Synods in each class, and a comparison of the average representation of the classes, will result in a like inequality. Thus,



(throwing out in the reckoning, the Foreign Mission Synod of N. India and the Foreign Missionary Presbyteries from the Synod of New York, as not coming under ordinary rule,) the ten Synods of Albany, New York, New Jersey, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Virginia, Pittsburg, Alleghany, Wheeling, and S. Carolina, (all above the average,) containing together 1,115 Ministers, and 181,821 members,) over half the Ministers, and not far from two-thirds of the members of the whole Church,) are entitled to 64 Ministers and 64 Elders, representatives on the floor of the Assembly; that is an average of one representative for every 18 to 19 Ministers, and one Ruling Elder for about every 2000 Communicants. Passing by now, the nine Synods of the second class, whose representation is about the average of the whole Church, as above stated,—then the ten Synods of the third class,—namely, Buffalo, Iowa, Northern Indiana, Wisconsin, Nashville, Texas, California, Mississippi, Arkansas and Georgia, containing 408 Ministers and 28,000 Communicants, (little more than one sixth of her Ministers and one ninth of the members of the whole Church,) are entitled to 43 Ministers and 43 Ruling Elders, as representatives on the floor of the Assembly; that is, one Minister for a constituency of 9, and one Ruling Elder to a constituency of 700 members. Thus taking ten Synods as a class, in each case, the vote of one Minister in the third is equal to the vote of two Ministers in the first, and the vote of one Church member in the third, equal to that of three in the first. It is obvious, that on the occurrence of any great question which might divide the vote of the Assembly, according to this classification, the decision of the Assembly might not be the true expression of the voice of the Church.

We regard every such change as tends to reduce the larger Synods to the average size, as an important preparatory step toward a Synodical representation and a consequent reduction of the number of the General Assembly, and an equalization of the representation therein. Such an arrangement in the first place, better adapts the Synod to perform the important functions which it was designed to perform in our system; thereby increasing its influence and importance as a representation of the

Churches of a large district; and in the second place, will render it less difficult for the Synod to choose such a delegation, fewer in number, as may truly represent the Ministers and Churches of the larger district in the General Assembly. With the whole Church arranged into 30 Synods of from 75 to 100 Ministers, with a proportionate number of Churches,—a General Assembly composed of 2 or 3 Ministers, and as many Ruling Elders from each Synod,—and numbering therefore, from 120 to 150 members, would more truly represent the whole Church, than the Assembly as at present constituted, and far more wisely and efficiently direct our ecclesiastical affairs. The provision for a re-apportionment of representation every ten years, would be a sufficient remedy for any inequality that might gradually again grow up, and at the same time, adapt the construction of the body, to the expansion of the Church in this new country.

*Correspondence with the General Synod of the German Reformed Church.*

A resolution referred to the Committee on Correspondence with Foreign Bodies, and reported back to the Assembly by that Committee, proposed, that “in view of the peculiar position of the General Synod of the German Reformed Church toward the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, whose Professors, we are pained to witness, have so notoriously become antagonistic to Protestantism, and lest a continuance of our correspondence may be understood as countenancing the fundamental errors which they are labouring to disseminate; and lest we be regarded as disapproving the course of those in that communion who have so nobly contended against them,—a respectable number of whom, we learn, have wholly withdrawn from her General Synod, on account of the alarming prevalence of those errors in that body; therefore, this General Assembly will suspend its correspondence with the General Synod of the German Reformed Church, and decline sending a delegate to that body.”

This resolution the Assembly declined acting upon, but at the same time declined appointing a delegate to

the General Synod. Under all the circumstances, this was, doubtless, the most wise and prudent course. In the first place, because so formal a renunciation of correspondence with a sister Church ought not to be passed, under any circumstances, without careful and mature consideration. In the second place, because, just at this present time, our peculiar relation to other bodies than the German Reformed Synod, are becoming such, as to demand a careful review and reconsideration of this whole matter of correspondence with Foreign Bodies. The discussions and the action of several of the New England Associations since the meeting of the General Assembly, all indicate plainly that the time has come for a distinct and clear understanding of what is involved in such a correspondence by delegates or otherwise, between ourselves and other ecclesiastical bodies. Thus, for instance, in the General Association of Massachusetts, (we select this by way of specimen, because the report of its meeting is before us,) we are informed, "that every report, both from the District Associations and from other States, (*excepting of course, the Old School General Assembly,*) reported a deep feeling excited in the public mind by the Nebraska Bill, and a settled determination to resist all further encroachments of the slave power."—(See Puritan Recorder, July 6th, 1854.) We are informed farther, that "Mr. Eldridge reported his visit to the Old School General Assembly. Mr. Marvin inquired if he presented the subject of slavery to that body *according to the requirement* of the rule of this body." So also, "Mr. Hinsdale reported his visit to the New School Assembly. Mr. Storrs inquired if he presented the subject of slavery to that body." Again, "Mr. Marvin offered a resolution: The Committee of arrangements approved of the introduction of Mr. Marvin's Resolution, which was against the appointment of delegates to the Old School General Assembly. Mr. Warren moved the appointment of a Committee to report on this subject, which motion carried." This Committee subsequently "reported resolutions to the effect, that it is the desire and expectation of this body, that its views on the subject of slavery should be thoroughly represented by our delegates to the Assembly; and that,

if this be not allowed, the delegates be instructed to withdraw." We quote briefly, from the reports of debate on this resolution, by way of illustrating the views of members of this Association.

"Mr. Warren, the Chairman, replied, that the Committee had especially in view, the resolution of the Assembly passed years ago, in which they had declared, that our presenting this result was offensive to them, and that if we did not abstain, it would lead to a rupture of the correspondence."

Dr. Clark. "This resolution makes no advance on what we said last year, except what we ought not to advance, that is the idea of withdrawing. We said last year, that you must let us deal with you thoroughly on the subject. And now we say the same; and add, if you don't, we will withdraw."

Dr. Davis said, the proposal of the resolution was, if your children were invited out to tea by a neighbor who was a little hard, with regard to some things; and their father should tell the children, "give my respects to this neighbour and remind him of his hard dealings; and if he won't sit and hear your lecture, don't stay to tea."

"Mr. Wheeler said, the case was *rather of children on an errand, and told, if the neighbour would not hear the errand, to come civilly home.*"

Dr. Edward Beecher's speech, (the main speech on the subject,) assumed that the correspondence involved such endorsement of the Assembly's views of slavery, as rendered the Association partaker in the sin, &c.

Some members wishing that the delegate from the Old School should be called upon to state his views, the Moderator called upon him accordingly. After stating that his views of his relation to this body would have prevented him from becoming a party to such a discussion, yet the body itself, having assumed the responsibility of calling upon him, he would say, first, as to the form which, as amended, the resolution now assumed, substituting "all Foreign Bodies in place of Old School Assembly," he would prefer, and no doubt his Church would prefer, that they should say, not circuitously, but directly, "Old School Assembly." Our cause of complaint against some of you in the controversies of past

times, has been the suspicion, that in expressing their form of faith, they say one thing and mean another. Speak out just what you mean. If you mean "Old School," don't say "Foreign Bodies." This is a question involving the very nature and purpose of such a correspondence between Churches. If your views are those that have been expressed on this floor—if your delegates are sent to us on this special "*errand*," to deal with us, in regard to our sin of slavery, let us know it, and we will tell you, you had better not send. Or, if again, in your opinion, this sending delegates involves, as Dr. Beecher says, "*a virtual endorsement*" of our views, on any subject, then say so, and we will be in haste to give it up. For, if so, of course, we are understood to endorse you. And if we supposed, by sending delegates to this body, we thereby endorse in any way your views, either of theology or government, we should terminate the connection very hastily. This correspondence is simply a form, but a form of marked significancy,—it is one of these great things which are words,—a word proclaiming that we hold in common the great truths of salvation."

"Mr. Richards said, we come together as Christian Ministers, not as anti-slavery men. And if we were to send an errand to the Assembly, we should find a difference among ourselves, and a difficulty in making out the errand. It puts a delegate into a mean position to send him under such orders; and us into an undesirable position to send whomsoever may be sent, and give him such powers, that if he is put down for his impudence or whatever else, he is to turn his back upon them, by our authority, and come home."

"The resolution came to the vote—that part requiring the delegate to withdraw was stricken out, and the rest was carried, and that was in substance a repetition of what passed last year."

We have aimed to present in the briefest possible space, the principal points made in this discussion, as a fair illustration of the views of this correspondence held by bodies holding this relation. This scene in the Massachusetts General Association is but a representative of what, in one form or other, occurred in most of the other New England Associations this year. It is manifest,

that very vague and indefinite views of the nature of such correspondence prevail in these bodies, and perhaps also, in our own. Prudence would seem to dictate, that before some case shall arise, involving important consequences, and embarrassing the main question with incidental issues, our Assembly should review the whole question of correspondence with Foreign bodies, and adopt some general Minute, declaring distinctly what is understood to be implied in it. It would seem, that from its very origin, this practice of interchanging delegates, has obtained among us, without any very definite idea of the meaning and significancy of it. As early as the third meeting of the General Assembly in 1791, we find this practice spoken of as thus originating.

“Whereas, there existed before the late Revolution, an Annual Convention of the Clergy of the Congregational Churches of New England, and of Ministers of the Synods of New York and Philadelphia, which was interrupted by the disorders occasioned by the war; this Assembly being particularly desirous to renew and strengthen every bond of union between *brethren so nearly agreed in doctrine and forms of worship, &c.*

“The Assembly did, for this purpose, appoint Rev. Dr. Rogers of New York, and Rev. Dr. McWhorter of Newark, New Jersey, a Committee to take such measures for the obtaining of the proposed object,” &c.—Minutes of Assembly, p. 29.

At the recommendation of this Committee, delegates were subsequently appointed (page 33,) to go to New England, and propose to the Association, and consult on “such plan of correspondence and intercourse as shall seem eligible.” At the succeeding meeting of the Assembly, (p. 52,) a plan was reported as having been agreed upon by the delegates, embracing, beside a provision for the admission of Ministers of one of the bodies to Ministerial privileges and standing in the other respectively, also, a provision for “sending delegates to sit and consult with the Association,” and the General Assembly, respectively. Accordingly Dr. Jonathan Edwards and Mr. Burnet, appeared and took their seats in the General Assembly of 1793, as delegates from the General Association of Connecticut.

It is thus manifest, that the existing arrangement for an interchange of Delegates, had its foundation originally in the assumed agreement "in doctrines and forms of worship" between Presbyterians and Congregationalists. That such agreement did at the time substantially exist, we have no doubt. That the tendencies of New England Congregationalism have, of late years, been to widen the difference, by a constantly growing departure from her platform of faith, and by substituting for the practically Presbyterian government of the early Congregationalism, an irresponsible Independency, we have no less doubt. The facts in connection with the increasing disposition of the New England bodies to avail themselves of every opportunity to intermeddle with the internal affairs of our Church, as shown by the discussions and acts of these bodies during the past year, conspire to render it a matter of grave consideration to the General Assembly, whether the time has not come, if not for terminating an arrangement, the original reasons for which no longer exist, at least for coming to a very distinct understanding as to the grounds on which, and the conditions under which, it shall be continued. We regard the resolution proposing to suspend correspondence with the German Reformed Synod, as very opportunely calling the attention of the Church to the general subject; and we regard the action of the Assembly upon that resolution, as eminently wise, considering it as simply the expression of the sentiment, that the question is one demanding farther and more mature deliberation.

#### *The Theological Seminaries.*

The results of the action of the last Assembly, in filling the several vacant Professorships in Seminaries under care of the Assembly, has no doubt been hailed with heartfelt satisfaction by the Church generally. The final establishment of a third Seminary at Danville, and under prospects so flattering, we regard as an important event in our ecclesiastical history. Not only important, as evincing the remarkable zeal and liberality of the Presbyteries of Kentucky, and as the opening of another nursery for the training of the rising ministry—but still

more important as expressing, in connection with the founding of Alleghany Seminary, the settled purpose of the Church, to depend for the education of the ministry, not upon one great central Seminary, but upon sectional schools. We need not now enlarge upon the immense importance of such a policy,—the dangers that must inevitably attend upon the centralization of power in any one school—no matter how perfect and pure the men who are selected to wield it—the vast extent of territory and the varied population to which the ministers of our Church must adapt itself—and the large increase of the ministry, which the wants of our home and foreign field so loudly call for—all go to confirm the wisdom of providing numerous sectional schools of theology.

The amendment to the Report of the Committee—declaring “that nothing in the action of the Assembly in relation to the Danville Seminary is intended in any way to interfere with the Theological Seminary at New Albany; or with any of the Synods which shall continue to be united in the support and control of that institution;”—(Min. p. 23,) when taken in connection with the proceedings of the previous Assembly and all the documents relating to the “establishment of one great Seminary for the west,” and in view, moreover, of the documents, purporting to be official, published by the Trustees and Directors of the New Albany Seminary, subsequent to the Assembly of 1853,—to say nothing of the extraordinary tone and spirit of the speech of the immediate representative of New Albany on the floor of the Assembly, in support of the amendment,—is a somewhat curious illustration of the inconsistency of ecclesiastical proceedings. If the utterance of this declaration by the Assembly mean nothing, as an approval and endorsement of the scheme of carrying on a Theological School in the vicinity of the Assembly’s new Seminary—then it was useless—and not only useless, but offering a strong temptation to the friends of the scheme, to misinterpret it, and practically use it as has since been done, as an endorsement and approval. If, on the other hand, it is intended to approve and endorse that movement, then it is virtually an indirect recall of the pledge of the previous Assembly “to establish one great Seminary for



the west," on faith in which pledge the Presbyteries of Kentucky gave their money to the new Seminary. Nor is it any apology for their action, that the immediate representatives of the Danville Seminary and the Synod of Kentucky expressed indifference as to the Albany Seminary's continuance. That proud self-reliance on the merits of the Kentucky school against any opposition, by its friends, is certainly far from either absolving the Assembly from the pledge to the people in Kentucky who raised the money—or from justifying the Assembly in any approval, either direct or indirect, of any scheme for setting up or carrying on a school, in rivalry to that of the Assembly's own choice. It is manifest that, the Assembly of 1853 either did intend that her Danville Seminary should be exclusive, for the time being, of any other in the same region, or did not so intend. If such was not the intention, then there was no call for this expression in 1854, for nothing was done in 1854, even seemingly, contrary to the spirit of the action of 1853. If, on the other hand, the Assembly of 1853 did intend to encourage the idea of one Seminary exclusively, according to the plan and pledge of the west in convention, then the declaration of 1854 is in the face of the act of the previous Assembly, and in violation of the pledges given in that action to the friends of Danville: certainly in either case, as much as could be claimed of the Assembly, would have been to say nothing at all. And we doubt not, that but for the irregular way in which, as a personal courtesy to the very amiable and eloquent member from Indianapolis, the matter was allowed to come before the house, and then after a hearing of one side, all debate was precluded by the previous question, such a resolution would never have passed the Assembly.

*Action on the Report of the Board of Education.*

There was nothing, in itself considered, in the action of the Assembly on this subject, of marked importance—the resolutions of the Assembly being very general, and the discussion on them being rather a dispute as to what ground the Education Board intended to occupy, rather

than the merits of the measures or doctrines of the Board. The discussions which have been had on the whole matter, have obviously arisen from the unusually general and indefinite terms, in which the propounders of the new doctrines and measures on the education question have chosen to express themselves. We have no desire to enter into the discussion of the question here, but confine ourselves simply to the point,—in how far the resolutions of the last Assembly justify the opinion of the Repertory, (Bib. Rep., July, p. 554,) that “all these resolutions sustain and endorse the course of the Board of Education.” In order to a correct judgment on this point, it will be proper to review, in few words, the history of this controversy, and set forth clearly, exactly what has been the course of the Board in relation to the mooted question of secular education. This question, so far as concerns the Board, had its origin in the legislation of some New England States, and especially of New York in 1842 and 1843 and subsequently, excluding all religious teaching from the public schools. Owing to the general defection from the faith and the wide-spread latitudinarianism in New England, and the skilful use of his position to control the political demagogues by Bishop Hughes in New York—the cry of sectarianism was raised, and a system of legislation adopted on the subject of education, which, once their purpose to exclude the Bible from the schools was accomplished, the Romanists themselves were the first to pronounce “Atheistical and Godless.”

One of two courses was now left to the real friends of popular education. Either to arouse the people to resist these outrageous proceedings and restore the Bible, or to renounce the public schools altogether, leaving them to the infidels,—and establish schools under some other than State patronage for the children of those who held to religious culture as an essential part of education. Very unwisely, as we think, the latter course was resolved upon by those whose position, intellectual superiority and high claims on public confidence, would have provided a leadership for popular opinion, worthy the great occasion; and without doubt, as recent events clearly show, they would, with a little courageous resistance

have utterly overthrown the infidel host. For, in the first place, the legislation referred to it is so clearly a tyrannical interference of the State with the prerogatives of parents, that aside from any question of religion, the people could not fail to resist such an encroachment upon the liberties even of a minority, once pointed out to them. In the second place, the political power in those States was clearly in the hands of those who held to the Bible as a means of education, if only they had been made to understand the real question involved, and to understand one another. In the third place, after all the noise, neither New York, nor two or three of the New England States with New York, constituted the whole Union; nor did it follow that the victory of Infidelity, Romanism and Indiferentism in New York, did by any means, render it useless for the friends of education to strive for their principles in other States.

Acting however, on this view of the case, the proposition immediately began to be agitated in our church, to employ the church as foster-mother to the common schools, in place of the State. In 1844, a committee was raised which reported finally, through Dr. James W. Alexander, to the Assembly of 1846. In this report the question of the prerogatives since claimed for the church, as a party to education, are no where set forth. But an eloquent and able plea is made simply in behalf of the thing to be gained, religious education. The Report throughout, with extreme modesty and diffidence, makes suggestions as to the duties of Presbyterian people in the case, and closes with the declaration, "It is too much to exact that such a revolution should be attempted at once, still less to expect that it should be made part of a uniform church scheme."

Had the new educational movement confined itself in the spirit of this report, to efforts for counteracting the growing tendencies of infidel and Popish legislation to destroy the public schools,—or even to making such provision as the emergency called for, to supply the lack of such schools as were no longer safe, or to call into action more fully the old spirit of Presbyterianism,—from the first and long before the modern theories of the prerogatives of the church as a party, or the party to education,

famous as the practical educator of the people; there had never been two parties in the Presbyterian Church on this subject. In an address before the Assembly of 1847, which seems to have furnished the groundwork of the subsequent course of the Board of Education, Dr. Hodge, after explicitly declaring that the exclusion of religion from the public schools "is an unauthorised encroachment on the religious rights of the people," instead of proposing a bold and manly resistance to the tyrannical legislation which is thus encroaching on the people's rights, in the very direct manner which the people have of reaching such tyrants,—at the polls,—he proposed on the contrary to renounce in effect, the public schools, so far as concerns the Presbyterian Church, and take the education of the people out of the hands of the State. The positions taken are: 1. That there "may be great doubt whether God ever intended to devolve upon the State the religious education of the young." 2. That this duty rests upon the church—the school is her peculiar and appropriate province." 3. "By a strange perversion, after long enlisting *the State as her agent*, she has come to think education the work of the State," &c. 4. "It is a reproach to Protestants, that Romanists have been the first to discern this necessity," *i. e.* "of declaring off from the control of the State, and of asserting the right of the children to be taught religion."— 5. "This we must do, let the State take what course it may. We should carry out the good old Presbyterian plan of having one or more schools in every Parish, a classical academy in every Presbytery, and a college in every Synod, all under the control of the church." "The teacher to be appointed, and the instruction directed, by the Session; and the Pastor having it as a part of his stated weekly duty to visit and examine the scholars, and to participate in their instruction." Here is, in brief, the foreshadowing of the course of the Board of Education. It involves, as will be seen, the practical withdrawal of Presbyterians from the public schools, the placing of schools, academies and colleges, universally under direct control of the church courts. And this change, on the ground that it is the special duty and prerogative of the church, to manage the education of

children,—and a usurpation on the part of the State,—save as the *agent* of the church, so to do.

Now, the resolutions of the last General Assembly do not fully endorse this course of the Board of Education,—for the plain reason that the Assembly endorses the Christian training, especially by parents at home, teachers in institutions of learning, &c., in other words, the ancient views of the duty of the church, before the new theories of the Board had come into fashion,—and these resolutions express also, “*entire friendliness* to all other educational efforts, not positively injurious,”—and still farther, the resolutions declare that “the Assembly has never denied the importance of State coöperation, but, on the contrary, rejoices in the general enlightenment of the masses under the public school system, and hopes that all Presbyterians will continue as heretofore, to be known as true friends of general education,” &c. Any one who has kept pace with the discussion and reports of the Board, since 1847, will see, that so far from “sustaining and endorsing” the foregoing declarations, the resolutions are directly in the face of many of the schemes of the Board hitherto, and in fact, of nearly every *distinctive* feature of the Board’s policy. The only portion of the Assembly’s action which really sustain and endorse “the Board, is the very remarkable parenthesis in Resolution No. 7,—That the General Assembly (*by affirming the church to be one of the parties in education, and by acting on that principle in accordance with the practice of all the Reformed Churches,*) has never denied the importance of State coöperation,” &c.

Touching this remarkable parenthesis, we have to say:

1. It is peculiarly significant in its form, as a true representative of the course of the Board which it endorses, in too many of the cases in which the Board has presented their peculiar views for the Assembly’s judgment. This is the standing complaint of those who differ from the Board, that these new doctrines of church prerogative are never brought fairly and squarely to the test of a vote on their own intrinsic merits, but evermore *hid thus away in a parenthesis*: The deceitful dose covered up in the coating of sweet syrup, with whose taste we have long been familiar. These very resolutions,

Nos. 5, 6 and 7, are a fair sample of the method of the Board before the Assembly, three lines or less of the new doctrine in a parenthesis, preceded and followed by twenty-five lines of what, if it were consistent with the dignity of the occasion, and might not offend our Irish friends, we could find a term to characterize, but what we are content to denominate *compliment*, to all sorts of popular opinions and favorite educational measures.

2. The terms of the parenthesis itself, are sufficiently vague and indefinite, and may obviously be expanded or contracted in their meaning to sustain and endorse almost any variety and degree of church educational measures. Nor is it now, for the first time, a subject of complaint, that the discussion of these questions of church education in any, or in all our courts alike, has been chiefly, not so much the question, "is the Board of Education right?" as "what does the Board of Education mean?" It is manifestly from serious defect in some quarter, that after seven years of discussion on so practical a subject, the debate should still be on propositions so very vague as "the church is a party to education," "the church has a right to educate?" We are constrained, in spite of our reverence for the real dignity and high worth of the excellent advocates of these views, and our warm and heartfelt regard to them personally, to express the distaste we have felt toward their favorite modes of expressing their theories, in vague and, to us, unmeaning and almost "cant" phraseology? The real question, as presented in these measures, is simply "ought the Presbyterian people of this country to withdraw their aid and influence from the public schools, and is the church bound in her *organized capacity* to provide a system of secular education for her people? Is it the prerogative of a church session, and their duty, to be *ex officio* common school trustees? No one can deny that here is presented the real issue. That it is the duty of Presbyterian Ministers and Ruling Elders, as educated and patriotic Christian men, to use all their influence for the promotion of religious education in the schools, and of Presbyterian people to see that as far as lies in their power, their children are provided with such schools, was an obligation felt and acted upon long anterior to

1847, and felt and acted upon since 1847, fully as much by those who have opposed, as those who have favoured, the distinctive plan and doctrines of the Board of Education. In giving utterance to these propositions, the Assembly no more endorses the Board of Education than when approving of honesty, integrity, sincerity, and zeal in God's service, the Assembly sustains and endorses the Board of Education. But when it comes to these vague generalities, "the church is a party to education," "the church has a right to educate," the church has, as her divine commission to teach," &c.,—propositions that not only any man of any party, may with equal propriety affirm, nay, which the same man may with perfect consistency, both *affirm* and *deny* at the same time,—we must demur to the plea, "the church is a party to education." So the church is a party to all financial and business contracts as between Christian men; for integrity violated by any of her members, she must enforce discipline. If it is a logical sequence from the first proposition that the church sessions are, therefore, bound as such, to establish separate schools and superintend them, it is equally a logical sequence from the second, that the church sessions shall constitute a tribunal for deciding on cases of contract and questions of business between man and man. Precisely as the church has, as one great end to promote honesty and integrity among men, and has a right to apply the rule of discipline to her members who violate, in this regard, the law of Christ's house, so in like manner it is one end of the church to promote knowledge and intelligence generally, and religious knowledge and intelligence particularly; and it is her right to apply discipline in case of parents who neglect their duty to their children in this regard, and violate the solemn vows imposed upon them at the baptism of their children. The church is a party to education just in so far as the declared creed and constitution of the church makes her a party, and just in so far as the means for executing her work are pointed out in the book, and no farther. Here, as in so many other questions of late agitated in the church, the question is easily and best settled by going directly to the book. There the church is made a party *indirectly*, to the edu-

cation of children, in the Ordinance of Baptism, requiring of parents then and there to teach their children. But let it be observed, the Book at the same time recognize the parents as the party, and the only party directly, to education of their children. The error as we conceive of the politicians, who claim for the State the control of what children shall be taught as against the parents, and the error of those, who claim for the church a direct right to educate children irrespective of parents, are analogous, in both alike ignoring the complete and entire right of parents. God has given to the parents the direct control, and imposed on them the corresponding duty—the parent is the party to educate, and, in any real and literal sense, the only party. The State, for reasons of expediency, ought to provide means to enable the parent to discharge his duty to his children, not assume for the parent his duties, and say what the child shall or shall not learn. The church has no right, direct, over the children at all, but through the vow of the parents to educate them properly; and the only duty of the church is, in case the parent is unable to provide means, to administer to the parents' necessities in this regard, just as in any other particular, and on the same principle, as inability to provide for the temporal wants of the children. But as to the proposition, the church is a party, in the sense of affirming a corresponding duty of the church in *her organized capacity*, and of direct right to provide common school education, under direct control of the officers of the church, we contend the Assembly has never endorsed, nor will be likely to endorse any such proposition nakedly made. We go farther, and maintain the Assembly has no right to endorse any such dogma. It is going beyond the book. Not only is no such prerogative claimed, and no corresponding obligation recognized in our standard, but the silence of the standards is of that sort in which "silence is greater than speech." The various officers of the church are fully provided for, ministers, elders, and deacons, but no such officer as the church school-master. The duties of the elders are clearly laid down, but among them, nothing of their office as school-masters. The minister, among his various duties, as ruler, teacher, minister,



ambassador, is no where declared to be ex-officio a pedagogue. The deacons, whose functions also have been so utterly forgotten, are not trustees of a school corporation. The church sessions have no such duties imposed as regulating the school, appointing the teachers, &c. Nor among the duties of Presbytery, Synod, or General Assembly, are specified any duties of the sort, which of late have given rise, in so many meetings of our church courts, to angry debates and waste of time about College trustees, to the exclusion of the peculiar business of a court of Jesus Christ.

And this again suggests the thought, that great evil practically results to the church from the assuming this new prerogative, and imposing on the church officers corresponding duties. The tendency of the church is ever to formalism—and it is obvious that under this new view of official duties, the practical effect will soon be, that the people will select elders with a view to the character and representation of the school, rather than the purity and piety of the church. Those will be looked for—not best qualified as prayerful and Godly men to rule and minister in the church—but those rather, who will be best qualified as school trustees. The professional man—lawyer or physician, often not being the most devout, but the best educated and therefore best qualified to discharge his duty of trustee in school, will be chosen to the eldership. The allusion in this remarkable parenthesis to the practice of the Reformed Churches as a precedent, is particularly unfortunate. Dr. Hodge in his Address in 1847, and many of the Essays on the subject from the Board, have shown *how* the Reformed Churches were connected with the public education of the country, through their connection with the State. But it is the peculiar glory of the Presbyterian Church in this land, to bear her testimony against any such connection between the church and the State, as in its very nature dangerous to the interests of religion. For this reason, precedents from the Reformed Churches of Europe, in any case relating to measures of church policy, are rather evidence against, than in favor of, any cause which they may be cited to support in the American church. It is obvious that from our peculiar circumstan-

ces, exposed at all times, through the influx both of ministers and people who have been educated under the church and State system, to the infusion of the heresies that inhere in that system, we should be ever on the watch against, rather than in search after, their systems of action. One great cause of the confusion that ever prevails in our midst, and the too prevalent want of clear apprehension of the true working out of our system, we are disposed to attribute to the constant influx of prejudices and errors from New England Congregationalism, on the one hand, and the prejudices of church and stateism from across the water, on the other. It is on this very account that we press the importance of careful study of the principles of our constitution, rather than of precedents and usages, and the theory of "strict construction of our constitution, not only in reference to this question of the right of the church to educate, but of all measures proposed for the church's action. Here is the ground of our complaint against the "course of the Board of Education,"—that in a matter so important, in the claim to prerogatives so lofty, and duties so wide extending, the claim is urged in terms so vague and uncertain, and defended by arguments so indefinite in their point and application. Take the proposition in parenthesis. The General Assembly (by affirming that the church is a party to education," &c.) What are we to understand by "*the church?*" If we look to the reasonings of the Board, we find that the church in this connection represents two very distinct ideas, according as the exigencies of the argument require—sometimes in the sense of the individual Christian people, who looking to their duties as parents, endow and patronize schools in which religion forms one of the subjects studied,—in other cases in a vague sense, the church, as denoting the same people, represented in some formal capacity, by a Presbytery or a Synod, acting for the time being, as an educational convention, passing resolutions for manufacturing a public opinion in favor of some educational enterprise to which the body has no direct official relation whatever. In either of these cases, of course, no one disputes the general proposition, which is in effect the simple truism—that Christian people ought to patronize Chris-

tion schools. But, in the distinctive proposition and measures of the Board, "the church" is always taken for the body of Christian people, as represented in the courts of the church, in their capacity as such. This is altogether a different affair. The same is true of the other term—"a party,"—which determines nothing, as we have shewn already; if "a party" in the sense of, one who incidentally has an interest in, no one disputes; but if a party in the sense of having a controlling power and corresponding responsibility for children, then we utterly deny. The parent, in the strict and proper sense, is the only party to education. The State and the church alike, are parties only incidentally; and any claim of either, except under and through the parent, and for incidental ends, is absolute tyranny, as much in one case as in the other.

So also of the third term "education"—a term notoriously vague and indefinite. In so far as education relates to the preparation for intelligent citizenship, the State has an interest incidental as a party,—in so far as education concerns holiness of heart and life, the church has incidentally an interest as a party in education. But to say that education as training in religion is an affair of State, or education as training to good citizenship is an affair of the church, is equally in the face of the rights of the parent, as against either church or State.

Nor is this objectionable vagueness confined to the use of terms in expressing the proposition. The arguments advanced in behalf of the new doctrine, are to us exceedingly unsatisfactory as specimens of logic, though always excellent in their spirit. Keeping in mind that the main point to be established, is simply whether the church, as such, and in her organized capacity, should set up a scheme of secular education, with sessions, ex-officio, for school trustees; and Presbyteries, curators of the corresponding High schools; and Synods regents of the Colleges: look for instance at any of the formal papers on this subject, as specimens of argument on this proposition. We may select, as a fair sample, the Report of 1852, which discusses "who are the parties in education—the rights and responsibilities of each." The

proposition, "the church is a party in education," is sustained by the following arguments :

1. The church is a party "because the true objects and nature of education necessarily include religion."

2. "Because teaching is one of the functions of the church;" and here it is expressly said, "the question is how far the teaching of *other things* besides pure religion is embraced *within the scope of ecclesiastical authorities.*"

3. Because her children are members of the church.

4. Because the ordinance of Baptism justifies the church in acting as a party in education and in establishing for her children religious institutions."

5. Because the church *has a great interest in the work.*

6. Because she is able *effectually to superintend and promote the work.*

7. The history of the church proves it to be a lawful party in the training of the rising generation.

8. The revelation of the eternal world will disclose that the church was a party to education.

Now, we submit, with all respect to the source from which the argument comes, whether this is the sort of reasoning whereon one of the most remarkable claims of prerogative,—one of the most immense responsibilities, and one of the most solemn obligations of duty with every officer and private member of the church,—should be allowed to rest? This sort of discourse, however appropriate to the platform in Exeter Hall, or in the Tabernacle, is not the sort of reasoning surely for a great church paper, to control and direct the responsible action of a high court of Jesus Christ. If any body of men in the world, from the high official responsibilities under which, and the important ends towards which, and the definite and restricted powers by which, they act, should have propositions clearly made and logically argued, it should be our General Assembly.

Nothing has impressed us more strongly, in reviewing the papers connected with this whole subject, than the evidence everywhere exhibited in the papers, that their authors, evidently men of great piety, learning, zeal and earnestness, had been driven by some excitement from

without, into the positions which they take first, and then set about to find reasons to justify the positions. To this cause we are disposed to attribute many of the incidental views expressed in the papers—as “that the *parent is an agent for the church,—the State an agent for the church in education,*”—though freely admitting elsewhere that the parent is chiefly the party responsible. So, too, with the analogy from the duty of the church to provide for her poor, though the State also makes provision, and individuals, as men and Christians, are bound to provide for the poor,—all in apparently utter forgetfulness of the fact, that in the very organization of the church, her ordinances and officers support the poor of the church. It is expressly provided. Has not the church deacons, for this very end? Yes; but has the church schoolmasters? If the advocates of this new view will show that the book provides for the office of schoolmaster, as it does for that of Deacon, the analogy would be of force. So also, the argument derived from the exigencies of Missionaries among the heathen, which obviously, however it bear any resemblance to the case in question, has no relevancy, since it is arguing from an admitted case of exception to the general circumstances of the church. In this connection we might refer also, to some very extraordinary views of the right of the State as a party, in an article in the Reports for July, 1854. Lest we be thought to misrepresent, we quote the case in question :

“All the arguments which go to prove the right of the State to provide for the education of the people, go to establish her right and duty of making that education religious. If the design of the State is the promotion of the public good,—if religious education is necessary for the attainment of that object,” &c.

“It may be objected to this argument, that *since the preaching of the Gospel is essential to the public good, the State is under obligation to secure the preaching of the Gospel to the people.* So it would, were there not other agencies,” &c. The point to which we refer here, more particularly, is the rights and responsibilities of the State in regard to religion, as measured simply by the expediency of interfering with it. The confusion of

ideas here is so remarkably analagous to the indefiniteness of views in reference to the prerogatives of the church, of which we have complained above, that we think the two cases remarkably illustrate one another, and both alike, go to establish the very important consequences of confounding the limits and obscuring the marks that God has made clear, between the three Divine institutions, the church, the family, and the State. If the above argument be correct, then the only reason why Congress, or one of the States, shall not provide and send forth preachers to the wastes of our land, is because the thing can be better done by *other agencies*. But, in large portions of our country, it is *not* done by other agencies. What then? Either it is better not done at all, than that the State shall do it; if so, the argument falls to the ground, or, if the argument is good, the State of Pennsylvania, or Virginia, should be called upon at once, to make the provision of the means of grace for their destitute fields. We think we can here discover traces of the influence of the study of precedents of the Reformed churches, in giving to an American Presbyterian mind this strong bias toward large powers over the question of religion. The argument above quoted, is precisely the argument of European advocates of Church and State, wanting only one simple link, to wit: as it is the State's duty to provide a religion, so it is a plain duty to provide the *best* religion, and of course, to exclude from the State all religions that interfere with the chosen one. Add this clause, the logic of which, is indisputable after the former argument, and we have precisely the reasoning of Vattel's famous chapter on religion.

We are not sure that we are ready to accept, in all its extent, the proposition of the New Englander, which the Repertory characterizes as a "miserable and shallow sophism,"—namely, that "the State, the civil power, in whatever form in this country, is no more Protestant and Christian than it is Jewish or Mohammedan." It is of no religion whatever. It is simply political, interposing or having the right to interpose in matters of religion, only by protecting its citizens in the free exercise of their religion, whatever it may be." We are free to

confess that we prefer to err with the New Englander, rather than with the Repertory, which adds, "we, on the contrary, maintain that the State in this country, is Christian and Protestant, and bound to see that the schools which it establishes are conducted on Christian and Protestant principles." The inference of the New Englander, that because the State or civil power, is not Christian, as such, therefore any one has a right to object to the teaching of religion in the State schools, is altogether a *non sequitur*. Since, as we contend, the parent is the party to decide what the child shall be taught,—the State has the right only incidentally, to assist the parent in his work. The nation being a Christian and Protestant nation, that is, the people being such, the schools will, necessarily, be Christian and Protestant schools in the main; unless the State violate the freedom and rights of parents. In the sense of Mr. Webster and Judge Story, this is a Christian and Protestant nation,—the people are such, and Christianity is, in an important sense, the law of the land. But, that the Government, the State, the civil power, as such, is Christian and Protestant, is altogether another proposition. The State, in this sense, is of no religion. Religion is not one of its functions. As incidental to its own ends and purposes, and on grounds of expediency merely, the State recognizes the religious convictions of the people. It therefore, has a Sabbath as a civil regulation, not because the State has the right to decide the Sabbath to be holy and kept holy, but because the temporal expediency requires that those who think it holy shall be protected in its observance. The State may, therefore, forbid labour on the Sabbath, but cannot require men to keep *holy* the Sabbath. On precisely the same principle, the State is bound to protect parents in educating their children in religion, who regard religion a proper part of education. The allowing religion to be taught in the schools, decides nothing as to the religious character of the State, since the ground of the State's allowing religion in the schools is not the State's official belief in the Divine authority of the religion taught, but simply the will of the people who send their children. The New England and New York legislation, banishing the Bible from the

schools, was simply an act of tyranny and usurpation, which it was the duty of all Christian people to resist to the last extremity,—not tamely submit to, and give up the funds of the State to the hands of the infidels.

We have already far transcended the limits which we set for ourselves when we commenced our remarks on this subject. The truth is, the more closely we have looked into this subject, the more has its importance grown upon us. On a review of the argument, we are specially struck with the difference of manner and logic of the two sides of the question. We have dwelt at length upon the papers of the one side. We can only refer our readers to the other. The speech of Dr. Breckenridge before the Bible Society, in 1839, stands unequalled, in our opinion, as a model of logic and eloquence combined. So the article of the same gentlemen also, in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*. The letter of Dr. Thornwell to the Gov'r. of So. Carolina, discusses the relation of the State to religious education with most masterly power. The essays in the *Presbyterian* during last winter, supposed to have been from one of the Professors in the College, at Princeton, are a clear, practical, pointed discussion of the branch of the subject relating to College supervision by Synods. The pamphlet of Mr. Vaughan, of Lynchburg, recently issued,—and we are sorry to learn, intended for only a very limited circulation, as a review of the whole question of church prerogative in education,—is, in our judgment, bating a little diffuseness of style, one of the most clear-headed and masterly pieces of philosophical argumentation we have seen. In that argument alone, we would not fear to rest the question of the prerogatives and rights of the church, as a party in education, before the Assembly of 1854, without fear of a refusal to question and endorse it in all its chief points.

*Report and Resolutions on Systematic Benevolence.*

This action of the Assembly, we would cite as one of the instances, in which the act of Assembly is an indication of a movement of the mind of the church in a right direction. As yet, this Report of the Committee,—and



especially the first and second Resolutions,—seems not to have excited the attention which either the subject intrinsically demands, or the bold statement of the truth, with its obvious consequences, would have led us to anticipate. A very remarkable paper, founded on this action of the Assembly, in form of an address to the churches under their care, from the Presbytery of Baltimore,—which, we learn, is to be distributed widely, through the benevolence of some gentlemen in that city,—gives evidence of an appreciation of the importance of this subject in that part of the church, and we hope will be the means of arousing attention to the views of the Assembly's Report. The distinctive peculiarity of these Resolutions, consists in their recalling the minds of Christian people to the fact, of late apparently forgotten, that our book makes all needful provision for the raising and disbursing funds for objects of beneficence, as a regular and ordinary duty of God's people. That it is not a measure, but a doctrine,—not simply resting upon the obligation to obey the exhortation of the General Assembly or the Board, but on the obligations to obey Christ's ordinance. Not one of the things which the Assembly recommends merely by resolution, but one of the matters of faith and practice over which the courts of the church have power in the administration of authority, and the right to call delinquents to account.

The Resolutions of the Assembly go to the bottom of the subject. And the principles of the Resolutions, fully carried out, will, necessarily, bring about an entire change in the whole manner and spirit of the church operations. If the contributions to pious uses is one of the stated ordinances of worship, and to be attended to whenever the people assemble for the regular service, as much as the prayer, praise, and reading the Scripture and preaching,—(as is declared in the Directory for Worship,)—chap. 4th, sec. 5th,—then plainly it is competent for the Presbytery to inquire into the faithfulness of the congregation in this, as in the observance of any other of the appointed ordinances of worship. And it is equally competent for the Synod and the Assembly, to call Presbyteries to account, and in short, to treat the neglect of this ordinance as a practical heresy. If the Presby-

tery see fit to receive the annual or monthly contribution, instead of the weekly contribution, that may all be well enough, (though of that there may be grave doubt,) still the power of the Presbytery over the subject is unimpaired.

It is obvious therefore, that the necessity for extra machinery, agencies for the collection of funds, &c., in our church, has all grown out of a neglect of the first principles of our book; and that a return to the methods and plans of the book will do away with all such machinery. The funds will be provided, by the ordinary attendance upon the services of the house of God,—the Deacons, restored fully in the church, will be the Board of each congregation,—the stated returns to the Presbytery, will bring the funds into a common treasury, and through the Presbytery, pass into the central treasury for the support of the general operations of the church. Thus the sentiment of Dr. Rice, “The church is a missionary society,” will be fully realized as a great practical fact, not as heretofore, as a mere rhetorical figure. We think the times very propitious for the movement indicated in these Resolutions. Perhaps at no period since the division in 1837, could such a going back to the simple scheme of our book, have been successfully attempted. The leaven of voluntaryism, through the long connection of our church with that system,—a system made necessary only by the glaring deficiencies of independency, especially in the matter of any unity of action between their churches,—had worked too widely amongst us to allow the church to see clearly the old land-marks; and therefore, whilst adopting the scheme of church control in form, yet that was in connection with many of the practical heresies of voluntaryism. These errors have at length so effectually worked themselves out, that the most earnest advocates of the measures in which they were implied are ready to give them up. The agency system, so necessary a part of the machinery of the voluntary societies, has developed its results so fully, that for some time past the wisest and most thoughtful of those who manage the affairs of the church, have given it up, whilst those who continue the system, are obliged to use means for raising money which excite the fears

and disgust of many among the most liberal of God's people. The expanded operations of the church require a more certain support, than that arising from the constant operation of extra appliances; and the habit of dissociating the contribution from the worship of the Sabbath, while at first, producing larger immediate results, yet has left the piety of the church so untrained in this regard, that the difficulty of raising funds in the large amounts by subscription, is constantly increasing, while no corresponding enlargement of the field for contributions is taking place. After fifteen years of working under the present arrangements, one half of the churches are reported as doing absolutely nothing. We hail with pleasure this first movement, toward the recognition of these great works, as having a sure foundation in the piety of the church developing itself through the regularly appointed ordinances of the house of God. Having no space here, for the illustration of the Assembly's Resolutions, we refer our readers to the pamphlet of the Baltimore Presbytery above referred to. We look upon it as one of the auspicious signs of the times, that among our Pastors, full of the cares and duties of active Pastoral labour, there are those who can think so profoundly and discuss so clearly, the great principles that underlie the active life of the church.

#### *Church Erection.*

It seems to have been on this question, and indirectly, that some discussion of the policy of the Boards of the Church took place in the Assembly. Of that part of the subject we shall have occasion to speak hereafter, and therefore, in this connection, confine our remarks to the question of church erection alone. We have seldom had occasion to notice so remarkable an instance of the suffering of a cause at the hands of its special and immediate friends, as in this case. The object itself, is plainly one vital to the interests of the church, in such a country as ours,—so plainly such, that it would seem hardly possible that it should not take strong hold of the sympathies of the church. From the peculiar nature of this cause,—fundamentally an appeal to the richer in behalf

of the poorer classes, and at the same time an appeal which has nothing in the way of bodily suffering to press it upon the church, it is manifest that a first consideration with those who represent it, ought to be to keep it clear of all side issues, and all grounds of general controversy. A second consideration, obviously, should be to keep it in as close connection as possible, with some other interest appealing still more strongly and immediately to the church at large. Unfortunately for this cause, its immediate friends and representatives in the last Assembly, and both before and since, seemed inclined to the reverse of both these considerations. Though urged by well-wishers to the cause on the floor of the Assembly, to confine themselves simply to the demand on the church for aid in the work, and avoid any responsibility for the manner in which the aid should be rendered, they thought proper to allow their measure to become entangled with the question of a new Board, or what some looked upon as a preparation for a new Board, and even to throw themselves, as partizans, into the arms of one side of this question. What if the Assembly constitute a new Board, and that too, in opposition alike to the principles of those who are in doubt as to the expediency of the system, and to the opinion of those who consider simply the present number of calls as many as the church will bear, and to the economical views of such as think the present machinery very expensive,—what then? The creation of a new Board does not, any more than the creation of a Committee, create the money,—the chief thing our practical church extensionists want! But it may create, nay, is very certain to create, many a bolt and bar, to exclude the agent of such a Board from many, if not most of the churches. The result of the action of the Assembly, as was foreseen, has been only to entangle and to embarrass with new difficulties the cause of the Board of Missions. Nothing has yet been done by the Board, nor is likely to be, beyond some earnest talk, and perhaps, exciting discussions. The Convention of the North-west, have recently proposed a solution by the Cæsarean method. Seeing that the move in their behalf in the Assembly was a total failure—as ought to have been foreseen by their re-

representatives—they now propose outright, a new *Board* for this special purpose. The new Board may be obtained, but their great practical end will still be as far from its accomplishment as ever. Nothing can be plainer, than that the policy of the peculiar friends of church extension, is not to separate their cause from the Board of Missions, but on the contrary, to connect it more completely and indissolubly with the Board of Missions, as part and parcel of the one great Missionary operation. The place of worship, so far as it is essential to the Missionary labour,—and that is as far as the purpose of these gentlemen goes,—is as legitimately and properly a charge upon the Missionary fund, as the Missionaries' travelling expenses. And money spent upon Missionary fields year after year, with no provision for a house of worship, is not commonly well spent. Far more wisely would it be applied to giving efficiency to a Minister's labours in some other field, wherein a small appropriation for a house of worship would be the decision perhaps, of the question, whether a church shall there be permanently planted, and the result of previous years of labour be turned to account of the cause. That the funds for Missions would be allowed to fall short, if thus the claims of the two were inseparably blended, no one can believe who knows the feeling of our people in regard to this work.

#### *Boards of the Church.*

In connection with the matter of church extension, an incidental discussion arose, which, though in itself unimportant, and neither getting at the real merits of the question, nor leading to any practical results, has, since the Assembly, been made to occupy a conspicuous place in the proceedings. This instance, perhaps, as strongly as any other, is in illustration of the tendency already referred to, "to fancy issues made which were not, and battles won which were not fought." The paragraph in reference to this discussion, in the annual article on the General Assembly, in the *Repertory* for July '54, pp. 560 and 561, is so remarkable in itself, has been so widely copied in the journals of the church, and brings into

view so completely the topics, of which we desire very briefly to speak,—that in order to more brevity, we take the liberty of using that paragraph as the foundation of what remains to be said, touching the Boards of the church,—our only remaining topic. Summing up the result of the discussion, the Repertory says, “The sense of the house was so strongly evinced in *favour of the Boards, and in opposition to merely speculative objections to their existence, that we presume the controversy will not be renewed.*” Now, there was no such “controversy” opened in the first instance, and no “objections to their existence,” either speculative or practical. It so happens that in this case, we have not to rely for proof of this fact, upon the mere *absence* of any such opinions in the reported debates,—but the two gentlemen who are named as the parties in opposition to the Board, have furnished positive proof in their own utter denials. Mr. Armstrong has since felt called upon to deny formally, in the Presbyterian, that he ever was opposed to the existence of the Boards. Mr. Robinson, at the close of this very discussion, complaining that he had been precluded by the previous question from repelling as misrepresentation, the charge that he was an enemy of the Boards,—asked leave to offer Resolutions, not for action, but record,—(and singularly enough the request failed, from the objection of the Secretary of the Board of Missions, whose misapprehensions they corrected.)—Resolutions which he had previously read, but not offered, and which he declared, set forth fully all his “heresies” on this subject. These Resolutions, so far from expressing opposition to the existence of the Boards, purport to aim at “the diversity of views touching the efficiency of the Boards as now *organized and located,*” “which diversity of views tends to impair and embarrass the action of the Boards,”—and suggest an inquiry as to three points: 1. Simplifying the *form* of the Boards to correspond with the fact, that they are Committees of the Assembly. 2. Requiring the Boards to act simply as organs and agents of the Presbyteries, not having to do with the concerns of individual Missionaries. 3. The expediency of locating the Board at different centres. So far as the two gentlemen named are concerned, therefore, they

were parties to no such controversy. The Reports of debates, clearly show that neither Dr. Breckenridge nor Dr. Adger, were parties to such a controversy, at this or any other stage of the proceedings. On the contrary, the Boards found in the former a true helper and friend, as they had before found him. But, whether such a controversy was had in the Assembly or not, if the paragraph of the Repertory be the true exponent of the views of those who claim to be the special friends of the Boards, we venture to predict that events will show that never was there a presumption more unfounded, than "that the controversy will not be renewed." It is singular to observe how, in this language of the Repertory, is brought out again the idea which ever seems prominent in the minds of many of the leaders in these measures of the church,—that of all other evils to the Boards and the church, discussion, controversy, is to be feared, and quiet acquiescence to be of all blessings desired. The speakers on this subject in the Assembly, held the same tone, and for that chiefly, are lauded in the Repertory. "Dr. Musgrove," we are told, "closed the debate, by one of the most effective speeches delivered on the floor of the Assembly for a long time." Then the Reporters have manifestly done the speaker not less injustice than his friends did at its close, in forcing the previous question by pre-concert, in face of the worthy Chairman of the Committee, (Dr. Adger,) and his parliamentary rights in the discussion of his own Report. The speech, as reported, contains but three points relating to the general subject,—one the implied logic of the question, "Why do they not say what is wrong,—and not bring vague charges?" To which question, a most satisfactory answer is found in the incident just alluded to,—the fact, that the "previous question," was the peroration of this discourse. The other points made, was a singularly unfortunate analogy between objections founded on the admitted failure of the Board system, thoroughly to arouse the church,—and objections against Christianity itself, on the ground of its failure to conquer the world; which of course, has no force, except on the assumption that the hearts of God's people are, naturally, as averse to the work of Missions, as the hearts of natural men are

averse to the spiritual truths of the Gospel. The third point, was an analogy still more unfortunate, on more accounts than its want of parallelism, between the case of the Board and the speaker's twenty years Pastorate in Baltimore; in which, to grant the parallelism in the two cases, would by no means strengthen the argument on the Board's side of the question, as results prove. The chief purpose, however, of these illustrations, is to present prominently, the single point, of the seeming aversion of the more prominent advocates of the present measures of the Boards, to all such discussion,—this being the marked characteristic of the tone, both of the speakers referred to, and of the Repertory. In connection with this indisposition to discussion, it may not be amiss to point out, in this paragraph, the same vagueness of terms, in regard to the question of the Boards, that has already been referred to, as marking the discussions in education. Thus, on the one hand, it is asserted, "It seems, indeed, unworthy of debate, whether the body, &c., be called a Committee, and be appointed by the Assembly, or whether it be called a Board. In the one case, it would be a small body in the large." This we take to mean, that the Board, as now organized, is simply a large Committee of the Assembly, nothing else, and it is "unworthy of debate," whether a Committee be large or small. But have the advocates of simple Committees never made any other demand than simply, a smaller Board? The Repertory need not be reminded that a Committee, constituted of Presidents and Vice-Presidents,—under charter of incorporation,—a Committee in which membership may be bought for thirty dollars, and "directorship," (a singular function in a Committee man,) for fifty dollars, is something out of the usual order of a Committee of a church court. After thus stating the case, as simply between a Committee, large or small, the Repertory itself, proceeds to argue the advantage of a Board over a "simple Committee,"—as protecting the church against the effects of throwing a responsibility and power on the Executive Committee which they ought not to be entrusted with;" as "serving the purpose of break-waters," &c.,—and finally, that the objection to the Boards that they are not church



courts, is the "*jus divinum* theory in its dotage." Now, it is plain, that after thus comparing the several descriptions here given of Boards, the first and most difficult question to decide,—is the Board a *Committee* or not? Nor is this an unimportant question, since in this is involved the question, is "the church a Missionary Society?"—competent in her organized capacity, and provided in *her Constitution*, with all the agencies for carrying on her work. Or, is the Presbyterian Church, in this respect, no better off than the Independency, out of the defects of which grow up voluntary societies. This is the true issue involved in the old controversy between voluntary societies and Ecclesiastical Boards. The question of reporting or not reporting annually, to the General Assembly, of Directors appointed by the Assembly, or a close corporation,—is a minor question compared with the other. Strangely enough the Repertory makes the admission, that "the accountability of an Executive Committee," (and, by parity of reasoning, of a Board,) to a body like the General Assembly,—a body, from its nature, incapable of effective inspection, would be *merely nominal*." And again, "so long as everything goes on well, the responsibility of the Executive Committee is *merely nominal*." This admission gives up, practically, the whole ground once held as against voluntaryism,—and at the same time admits that the Boards are not Committees of the Assembly, but "a body intermediate between the Committees and the Assembly." If so, then, the Boards are something extra to the system of our church, and but a white-washed,—or rather, faintly *blue-washed* variety of the voluntary society; and then the whole question involved in the controversy of 1835 to 1838, would "seem to be, indeed, unworthy of debate." Let the true issues on this subject be clearly and distinctly brought out before the church—Are our Boards simply Committees of the Assembly, representing the church in her organized capacity, working through her constitutional agencies? If so, then let us not speak "half the speech of Ashdod, and according to the language of each people." Our objection to the paragraph of the Repertory, is precisely that of the Ancient Re-

former, in Israel, to the mongrel tongue,—and for precisely the same reasons.

As to the challenge given in the Assembly, to point out the objections to the present working of the Boards, it was not accepted, for the very sufficient reason above given,—no opportunity was afforded. The gentlemen challenged, moreover, shewed then and before, that they were too earnest in their desires to see the work of the church done, even if not in a manner exactly to their mind, to engage with any pleasure in the work of criticism and fault-finding. The gentlemen who gave the challenge may rest assured, however, that it is no difficult task to accomplish, once a man has a heart for it. We set down here, for their mature consideration, in brief outline, what are some of the difficulties in regard to the Boards, *as now operating*, in the minds of a larger number by far, than care to incur the odium of a fault-finding spirit, and to be pointed to as dangerous, unsafe, and troublesome men.

In the first place, there are many, and some of them among the most wise and experienced labourers in the work of the Boards, who cannot see the wisdom of the present structure of the Boards, with all the paraphernalia of Life Members, Life Directors, &c. 1. Because the *mongrelism* of the thing is, they think in the way of making the people understand the obligations of this work upon them, as the regular, ordinary, and special work of the church, as such. 2. Because nothing is gained in the way of efficient superintendence, by Boards of 100 men, who are scattered over a continent, and a majority of whom, probably, never has assembled in any one meeting,—thus giving the power practically, to a few, while the corresponding responsibility is destroyed by being divided among so many. 3. Because the tendency is thus to make the responsibility of the church's agents to the Assembly practically *nominal*.

Again, others object,—that the results of the system after 16 years of trial,—in the way of bringing up the church to her duty, have not been such as to authorize us to feel satisfied with the efficiency of the measures employed,—one half the church as yet, doing nothing,—

and a large portion of the active part working irregularly, and apparently not realizing the obligation to contribute funds to the Lord's treasury, as an act of worship, spontaneously, but requiring to be incited thereto by appliances and means not in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel. Whilst even the Presbyteries, the constituted overseers of the work, in large part, are slow in assuming their proper responsibilities, and disposed to throw them upon the Boards,—who should be simply a bond of union, to the Presbyteries,—not substitutes for them. There are those also, who look with concern at the vast irresponsible power, now placed in the hands of the Secretaries, especially the Secretary of the Board of Domestic Missions, whose influence over the 4 or 500 men, whose support, practically and really, depends upon him, and who are as labourers in the field, responsible to him, may well excite alarm. The objections formerly urged against the power of the head of the Home Missionary Society, lie in nearly all their practical, though not their theoretical force, against the arrangement of our Domestic Mission system. The responsibility to the General Assembly, admitted to be nominal,—the responsibility to the Board, beyond a few members of it being not even nominal,—at least, in all ordinary circumstances,—the Secretary of the Board has, on the other hand, a power of patronage sufficient at all times, to hold the balance of power in the Assembly, and the church has no guarantee, beyond the high personal character of the man, against the use of this power, so long as he is discreet enough to exercise it through the hundred channels, through which it may be exercised, without rendering himself liable to any charge of gross dereliction of duty, which can be proven. And yet, while Professors in Theological Seminaries must be called to their office by the voice of the whole church through the Assembly, these officers, to whom so much power is entrusted, are appointed frequently by the voice of a handful of men in one city. Probably no Secretary of any of our Boards has been elected for years past, by a vote of one-third even of the members of the Board whom he serves. The present Secretary of the Board of Publication, holds his office by vote of

a majority of a larger meeting of his Board, than has occurred for years past, and yet that meeting consisted of less than one-third of the whole body. One of his predecessors in office was elected at a smaller meeting, and then by a majority of *one* vote, which *one* vote was subsequently discovered to have been given in mistake by a gentleman who did not know even that he was *not* a member of the Board. We wish not to be understood as selecting this Board for illustration, because of anything peculiar in its history. This is contrary to the facts. The last election of a Secretary by the Board of Missions, was by a still smaller fraction of the Board, and that too, in the face of a protest spread upon the Minutes by some of the most influential members among even that small number. These facts are cited to show how little responsibility attaches to most important offices of the church under this system,—and that if, in view of such facts, there be those in the church who occasionally express doubts of the absolute perfection of our present methods, they should not be regarded in the light of enemies of the Boards, or of the men who control them.

There are again, economists in the church, who gravely consider the relative expense of the Boards,—while such an argument might have had no force so long as the effect to arouse the church was in its incipient stages, yet it is an argument of great force now, that full time has elapsed to show the result of the outlay. The argument of Dr. Plumer's Report in 1848, that the expenses of our system would be no greater, if involving twice the amount of disbursement, it must be remembered, ought to be constantly losing its force of application,—since one of the reasons which made the church content to bear the great expense at the beginning, was the expectation of increase of funds to be disbursed in future, at relatively less expense. If, therefore, that expectation has not been met, the reason for the large expenditure falls. In the light of this principle, many are disposed to doubt of the perfection of our system,—in view of scores of such facts as these: that the aggregate expenditure for management of funds in the Philadelphia offices is \$25,000 per annum; that for fifteen years

past, the income of the Board of Education has been stationary at about \$33,000, of which sum \$25,000 are disbursed to candidates for the ministry, and \$8,000 for the whole cost of management; that the Publication House,—doing a business of \$80,000, (excluding colporteurs' salaries and expense, which is altogether a distinct matter, and paid out of a distinct fund,) is managed at an expense of \$10,000 annually, for salaries alone. It is needless to multiply citations,—the purpose is not, then, that the labourers there are too well paid,—such is not the case,—but that the system under which we are operating is a costly one, while it is not promising such expansion of the work as will diminish the relative cost.

The desire of others again, that the Boards should be located at several centres in the church, and thus avoid the manifest evils, both to the work of the church at large, and to the Pastoral work in Philadelphia, from crowding thus, so much of the work, and the official influence of the Boards, into a single city,—has already been referred to, and needs not to be enlarged upon. Such are a few of the things which the gentlemen who were challenged “to point out what was wrong,” would probably, have cited as cases in point, if they had deemed the occasion proper. As wise men, they cared not, perhaps, to point out evils, so long as they saw no disposition to look at them and reform them, among those whose position and relations to these matters best qualified them to reform them, with least injury to the church, and to the Boards themselves. Let it not be supposed, however, that those who see these evils, see nothing but evil in the present state of things. On the contrary, they see many a cheering and encouraging indication of progress in the right direction. The renunciation of the agency system is a great step. The resolutions on systematic benevolence, if once their force and meaning be apprehended by the church, are a still more important movement. But we must forbear.

Among all the grounds of discontent which have been enumerated, nothing has been said of the complaint of many, whose chief objection to the Boards, arises out of this constantly manifested hostility to free, bold, manly discussion of the principles involved in their action,—

and their taste for mere measurism,—and demand of acquiescence in mere measurism on the part of others. This is clearly not the wise ground, for the representatives of interests so immense. The plea of unsettling the minds of the people, among such a people as ours, is utterly preposterous. The much-talked-of “confidence in the Boards,” if it can be impaired by manly, open inquiry, is a poor, piping, emasculated, unintelligent backing, which can do the Boards no good. It is manifest, that so far from being at the end, we are but at the beginning of the agitation, discussion and settlement of great principles, in the adaptation of our Presbyterianism to the glorious field which God has here given it to cultivate. It is too narrow and unworthy a view of our work, surely, to begin to talk of things ten years old, as finished and settled precedents. It must be remembered that many a measure, which the necessities of feebleness rendered expedient as temporary measures, may become subversive of the faith and order of the church, if recognised as permanent law. The plan of union of 1803, was not perceived to be hurtful in the days of the pioneers, but once the church grew up to power, its evils became so manifest as to require its utter abolition. Nor, as we have no precedents as yet, in our own church, for want of age, neither can we receive the acts of the Church of Scotland, or the Church of the Continent of Europe, with uninquiring acquiescence. A church united with the State, can have little in her acts of policy to furnish precedents to a church free from the State. It is closing our eyes on the light of the sun, and our ears to the calls of Providence, to permit ourselves, in our novel and amazing circumstances, to attempt to fetter the church with empty forms of mere authority. But it is equally blind, to turn aside to human inventions and expediences, wherewith to do this great work for Christ, if Christ himself hath left to his church, a government and a form of working in the field. The conservatism we need, is simply the conservatism that seeks to abide by *principles*, not by *measures*. If there is danger of excess here, and of seeking to fetter the church, “with the split hairs of metaphysics,” that error is not so bad by half, in its results, as the error of fettering the church with

the drowsy cobwebs of a dull dogmatism. There are changes needed now,—there will be more changes needed. No sane man can hope, that the adaptation of our church to her new condition can be accomplished, without many mistakes first made, and continual reforms. One thing alone is sure and stable, the truth and order of Christ's house. We want no new machinery, no new measures, but simply clearer developements of the Divinely appointed machinery and measures, in their adaptation to the new and ever varying phases of the work to be done. We are free to confess no sympathy with the spirit, which for years past has marked the movements, or rather want of movement, at our ecclesiastical centre. Great issues are at stake, and constant changes needful. And changes must come—the more for the peace of the church, if they come through the natural channels,—but come they must, either peaceably or forcibly, through the Boards or over the Boards. It matters little whether at first, great truths have few or many advocates, if they be truths.

“They wake—  
To perish, never.”

The result of a calm and close investigation into the various causes of the agitations of the church, will be the discovery that with great unity in doctrine, there are radical differences amongst us, as to the polity and measures of the church, in fact, two distinct Presbyterianisms, becoming more and more clearly marked, and promising at some future day, to present themselves for choice to every officer in the church. It is a difference analagous in some respects, to that which divides the two political parties of the country,—the theory of “strict construction,” as it is called, against the theory of large powers to the General Government. As regards the church, one of these theories finds, in the written Constitution of the church, all the agencies and means necessary to carry out the purposes of the church, and inquires concerning all measures proposed, Do they comport with the Constitution? The other theory, “rejecting the split-hairs of metaphysics,” argues the propriety of its measures from their expediency chiefly. The ten-

dency of the one is ever therefore, to stick closely to the book, and guard jealously the purity of the church. The tendency of the other, to overlook the book and ever devise measures and expedients. The late Assembly leaned to the former of these theories.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* By Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE and J. S. HOWSON. SCRIBNER. *New York.* 2 vol., 8 vo.

This is a very elaborate and learned treatise. The two large octavo volumes contain about 1,000 pages. In the theological circles of England, the work has excited great interest. The purpose of the authors is declared by them to have been, to give a living picture of St. Paul himself, and of the circumstances by which he was surrounded. It is easy to conceive the variety and extent of collateral information requisite to fill up and carry out so comprehensive a plan, involving as it does, an exposition of the public polity, domestic economy, social and industrial life of the Jews under the Roman dominion; nor these alone, but also the influences, whether emanating from early education, or from later contact with Grecian philosophy and Oriental superstition, which more or less pervaded the popular thought, and how far they operated to oppose or to promote the reception of the heaven-born truth, which it was St. Paul's mission and design to propagate. Nevertheless, even this vast undertaking appears to have been adequately executed; and thus a work of high value as a professional treatise, by reason of its stores of various and discursive knowledge, is made a repository of information of which students will be likely to avail themselves.

The author first named on the title page, is known as a regular contributor to the *Quarterly Review*, and enjoys a well-earned reputation among the literary men of great Britain.



Without adulation or flattery, we take the liberty of saying we regard the work, upon the whole, as one of extraordinary merit, and a valuable contribution to Biblical literature. Ripe scholarship is felicitously combined with rich and varied illustrations, drawn from every source which could be presumed to throw light upon the Scripture narrative. All the circumstances that could affect the character of the apostle are elaborately explained; such as the position of a Jewish family in Tarsus; the usual routine of instruction for expounding the law; the condition of the Roman empire at the time, especially in its provincial relations; the influences of the Greek literature and language on the Hebrew mind; the prevalent Rabinnical theology; the mixed elements of Jews, proselytes and heathen, entering into the material from which the early churches were formed; their strifes and dissensions,—together with the needful information as to the places and scenes visited by the apostle. Besides numerous engravings of natural objects and architectural remains copiously gathered from the most reliable researches, there is a new translation of the writings of the great apostle, freer than that in the adopted version, designed to elucidate what seems now obscure, and to give the style a modern aspect.

Although not prepared to endorse all the speculations and opinions of the authors, yet we are fully convinced that their work, if diligently studied, will contribute to the formation of large and more correct views of the character and services of the apostle, of the structure and spirit of the early churches, and of the Christian religion itself.

This book should be in the library of every minister, theological student and intelligent layman. \*

---

2. *A South Side View of Slavery: or Three Months at the South, in 1854.* By NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D. Boston: T. R. MARVIN, and B. B. MUSSEY & Co. pp. 214, 16 mo.

It is so rare that the South and its institutions are spoken of by a Northern pen, in the language of candor, that we confess

ourselves taken with an agreeable surprise, as we peruse these pages. Here at last, is one writer, who can speak of our people in something else than the language of abuse, and has been led to see the institution of domestic slavery not wholly an unmitigated abomination. The book is a faithful record of the impressions made on a mind of singular candor and due penetration, which, by education and every other antecedent, was opposed to the institution of slavery, when, mingling with our people, and servants, it saw Southern life, both as respects master and slave, under the several phases which it really presents. Dr. Adams was one of the signers of the Anti-Nebraska petition, had sympathised deeply in the representations in "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and had grown up with all those prejudices against slavery which exist in Northern society. It is interesting to see the process by which his doubts were solved, one after another, merely by what he saw in our every day life, and by which he was led to do justice to Southern character, and to admit that all is not as bad, either as to master or servant, as has been represented. The book is well suited to enlighten the mind of the North, if our brethren there are not wholly resolved to shut their eyes to the truth, and to produce a kindlier feeling between the South and the North, in proportion as it shall be read. It is of various contents, showing, in its style, the man of genius and refinement, and if occasionally open to correction here and there, as to its deductions, yet just in its general conclusions, and pervaded by a cheerful philanthropic spirit. It will be read with great satisfaction by all candid men. The author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" will be little pleased with his estimate of the tendencies of that *romance*, and of the false impressions it makes respecting master and slave. "All this time," says he, "that this book is making these impressions with regard to the slaves, those slaves, notwithstanding the inherent evils and liabilities of their state, surpass any three millions of labouring people, in any foreign land, in comforts, in freedom from care, in provision for the future, in religious privileges and enjoyment, and probably send tenfold more from their number to be in Heaven Kings and Priests unto God."

3. *Synonymes of the New Testament: being the substance of a course of Lectures addressed to the Theological Students, King's College, London.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH. Redfield: New York: 1854: pp. 243, 12 mo.

The writings of Chenevix Trench are becoming classics in those departments of Theology to which he has given his attention. The soundness of his views, the suggestive graces of his style, and the learning he displays, alike commend them to our favourable regard. This little treatise on the *words* of the New Testament, though less elaborate, has the same general merits with his former publications. Most heartily do we sympathise in his desires for the improvement of the exegetical department of Christian Theology. "I have never doubted," says he, that setting aside those higher and more solemn lessons, which in a great measure, are out of our reach to impart, being to be taught rather by God than man, there are few things which we should have more at heart, than to awaken in our scholars an enthusiasm for the grammar and the lexicon." "The words of the New Testament are eminently the *στοιχεια* of Christian Theology, and he who will not begin with a patient study of these, shall never make any considerable, least of all any secure, advances in this: for here, as everywhere else, disappointment awaits him who thinks to possess the whole without first possessing the parts of which the whole is composed."

- 
4. *The Faithful Mother's Reward: A Narrative of the Conversion and Happy Death of J. P. B., who died in the tenth year of his age: with an Introduction.* By Rev. CHAS. HODGE, D. D. Philad: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 369, 12 mo.
5. *The Youth's Visitor: or, Selections in Prose and Verse from the Presbyterian Sabbath-School Visitor: with illustrations* Philad: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 240 12 mo.

6. *Primary English Grammar, introductory to the Manual of the English Language.* By RUFUS W. BAILEY, A. M., author of "The Manual." Philadelphia: CLARK & HESSER. 1854: pp. 144, 12 mo.

This little volume is designed as an introduction to the Grammar which has received a favourable notice in our pages heretofore. It seems well adapted to its purpose, and is enlivened by sundry familiar colloquies, at least, at the beginning and close, between the father and his children, on the subject of Grammar.

- 
7. *Letters of the Madiai, and Visits to their Prisons.* By the Misses SENHOUSE. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 166, 12 mo.
8. *The Captives of Abb's Valley: A Legend of Frontier Life.* By a son of MARY MOORE. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 169.
9. *The Justified Believer: his Security, Conflicts, and Triumph.* By W. B. MACKENZIE, M. A., Incumbent of St. James', Holloway. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 150, 12 mo.
10. *Memoir of the Rev. Joseph W. Barr.* By the Rev. E. P. SWIFT, D. D. A new Edition. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: 1854: pp. 132, 12 mo.
11. *The History of Peter Thomson: The Premium, The Dying Sheep, and The Bible the Best Book.* Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 107, 12 mo.
12. *The Baby: Good and Bad Luck, The Golden Image, and the Star.* By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 108, 12 mo.
13. *Anne Bell: The Hated Task, The Red Berries, &c.* By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 108, 12 mo.
14. *The Pictorial Second Book: or Pleasant Reading for the Young.* By COUSIN MARY. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 107, 12 mo.

15. *Scripture Natural History: Illustrated by numerous engravings.* Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

A useful compend, including much valuable information drawn from larger and expensive volumes, and brought together in a convenient form. Our Sabbath Schools and Bible Classes are highly favoured in the numerous volumes furnished to them by our Board of Publication, and from other sources, at trifling cost, illustrative of the Holy Scriptures. Knowledge is not now locked up for any great length of time, in learned tomes. It is soon popularised and placed as it should be, in the hands of the people.

- 
16. *Witnesses for Christ: or, The Poet, The Hero, The Statesman, and The Philosopher.* Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 72, 12 mo.
17. *Why will ye Die? An Expostulation with Self-Destroyers.* By the Rev. WILLIAM J. McCORD. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 83, 12 mo.
18. *The Story of Nineveh, its Greatness and Ruins.* Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 54, 12 mo.
19. *J. H. and his Nurse and The Child's Prayer.* Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp: 36, 12 mo.
20. *Devotional Poetry, or Hymns for the Closet and the Social Meeting. Selected from the Psalms and Hymns approved by the General Assembly.* Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 32, 12 mo.
21. *Thoughts on the Resurrection of the Body.* By a LAYMAN. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 29, 12 mo.

22. *The Waldenses: Sketches of the Evangelical Christians of the Valleys of Piedmont: with illustrations on wood, drawn by DOEPLER, and engraved by LYONS, LOUDERBACK, ORR, and ROBERTS.* Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 392, 8 vo.

A beautiful volume, and finely illustrated, on a people whose sufferings for the truth have made their name precious to the Protestant Church. Those who would know the tender mercies of Rome, and the faith and patience of the Saints, can learn them effectually here.

- 
23. *Defence of Denominational Education.* By R. C. SMITH, of Oglethorpe University, Ga. Milledgeville, Ga: 1854.
24. *A Review of the Doctrines of the Board of Education, of the Presbyterian Church, upon the Relations of the Church to the General Interests of Education.* By C. R. VAUGHAN, Pastor First Pres. Church, Lynchburg, Va. Lynchburg, Va: 1854.
- Able arguments on opposite sides of one of the great questions now agitating the Presbyterian Church.

- 
25. *The Influence of Missions on People and Nations: A Discourse preached by the appointment of the Synod of Nashville, at their meeting in the City of Nashville, October 4th, 1854.* By Rev. WILLIAM H. MITCHELL. Published by Request of Synod. Nashville: 1854.
26. *Study, the only Sure Means of Ultimate Success: An Address delivered before the Thalian and Phi Delta Societies of Oglethorpe University, Georgia, at the Annual Commencement, July 19th, 1854.* By Hon. WILLIAM H. STILES, of Savannah. Milledgeville: 1854.

---

~~As~~ Other publications have been received which our space does not permit us to notice.

# SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER IV.

---

APRIL, MDCCCLV.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

Among all the absurdities that prevail among those who receive the Scriptures as a Divine revelation, none perhaps, is more astonishing than that which disrobes our Saviour of his Divinity. Christ is not the Supreme God, but a creature only, is the opinion of an Arius, a Socinus, a Priestly, and a Belsham, and their numerous disciples, in direct opposition to what we deem the explicit teachings of both the Testaments, which they professedly believe and revere. It is really strange, in our judgment, that candid and intelligent men, after even a cursory examination of the Scriptures, should ever arrive at such a conclusion. There is no better evidence of the extraordinary subtlety of Satan, in his work of deception and ruin, than the effort he makes, and the success with which that effort is attended, to divert serious minds from the obvious import of Divine revelation, and occupy them with a creed that has its origin in a grievous perversion of truths of infinite moment. If he cannot utterly destroy the word of God, nor arrest its circulation, he will destroy its influence, by adulterating, or else by torturing it. This remark is made with all due respect toward those whose views we are about to combat. We should all be humble enough to acknowledge that we are possibly holding with tenacity, errors which are to be attributed to Satan's power over us.

There are two facts with which our minds should be deeply impressed. The wonderful constitution of our Saviour's person, which, as we believe, combines the Divine and

human nature, would of course, lead the sacred writers to use expressions, when speaking of him, that might appear at variance to those who do not continually contemplate him as God-man. Even to one who looks upon him constantly in this light, his mysterious person must present difficulties. There will, of necessity, be much that is marvellous to us in the things of God. The doctrine of the Trinity, with which the question of Christ's Divinity is so intimately connected, we should not expect to comprehend. That was a wise remark of Daniel Webster, when asked, Do you believe, Mr. Webster, that three can be one and one can be three, he replied, "I believe, sir, that you and I do not understand the arithmetic of Heaven." This is said to have staggered the querist, and well it might, for its force could not be evaded.

It should also be remembered, that God, when addressing us in the Scriptures, would not employ abstruse phrases, or philosophical technicalities, which are calculated to mislead the humble reader, when the subject did not demand it. Our Bible is the poor man's book, and is adapted to very humble capacities, so far as its exalted themes will admit; its precious instructions are to be taken in their plain and obvious import. We must not charge the Author of this blessed volume with prevarication and double-dealing. When Christ is spoken of as God, without any qualification whatever, we are to understand that he is God, and that we are so to love and worship him. The book speaks as to unsophisticated men, who are perishing in their sins, and directs their attention to subjects of vital and eternal moment. The aim is not to afford amusement to the fantastic quibbler. To say so, would be unmitigated blasphemy.

On the subject before us, we are not flattered with the prospect of advancing ideas that are bold and novel. There is a taste at present, in the literary world, to which eminent writers are sinfully condescending, and young aspirants vainly endeavoring to gratify. Our aim is to keep the truth before the minds of men. And we trust it is not our ambition to torture an argument out of its best position for novelty's sake.



*Our Saviour is Divine.*

I. The names of God he bears. "Who is over all, God blessed forever."—Rom. ix: 15.—Paul said that he had great heaviness and continual sorrow in his heart because of his kinsmen, the Jews, to whom pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises, and whose were the fathers, and then adds: "and of whom, as concerning the flesh, (implying that he had another nature beside the human,) Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen." The evidence afforded by this passage, we regard as absolutely conclusive. "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God."—John i: 1. This apostle appears almost to have anticipated the opposition which this doctrine would encounter, and intended that it should be put to rest at once, if his testimony would do it, for not only is his language pointed, but this was the first subject on which he commenced to write when he had taken his seat. "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."—1 Timothy iii: 16. Here, Christ is said to be "God manifest in the flesh;" in other words, in his mysterious person there are two natures combined, the Divine and human. Thomas exclaimed, "My Lord and my God!"—John xx: 28. Did Christ rebuke his idolatry? Did he correct his error? No, but replied: "Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." "Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom."—Heb. i: 8. Paul is showing the superiority of Christ over angels, and among his proofs he declares that the Father addresses the Son as God, but never addresses the angels in this manner. And surely the Father would never say to the Son, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever," if he were not really God, for he has said, "I am Jehovah, that is my name, and my glory I will not give to another." In

Matthew i: 23, 24, the language of Isaiah is applied to Christ, "And they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." Here, again, he is represented as God in human nature. "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."—Isaiah ix: 6. Here a child is born among men, and that child is called the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father. Who can this be but Christ, the God-man? "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, (or Jehovah,) make straight in the desert a highway for our God."—Isaiah xl: 3. This is applied to John the Baptist, the harbinger of Christ, by Matthew, and by John the Baptist himself.—Matt. iii: 3; John i: 23. "This is the true God, and eternal life."—1 John v: 20. "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ."—Titus ii: 13. He is also, called the Lord of hosts, and the God of Israel, as may be seen in several passages in the Old Testament, which the New Testament writers quote and apply to Christ. What now shall we infer from all this? Jesus Christ is called God, God manifest in the flesh, God over all, My God, the God whose throne is established forever, God with us, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, Jehovah, the True God, the Great God, the Lord of hosts, and the God of Israel. Are these phrases, as applied to Christ, to be taken in some inferior sense? Then for the authority. Why are we not so informed, distinctly, when it must be known to the Infinite Mind that such language will lead to idolatry? Our Saviour is really the Supreme God, if we may repose any confidence in the "rule of our faith," and in the inevitable conclusions of impartial and correct reasoning.

II. The attributes of God he possesses. He is omnipotent. "I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the ending, who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty."—Rev. i: 8. He is "able to subdue all things to himself;" he "made all things;" and he doeth "whatsoever things the Father doeth."—Phil. iii: 21;

John i: 3; v: 19. He is omniscient. "Thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee."—John xxi: 17. "And all the churches shall know that I am he that searcheth the hearts and the reins."—Rev. ii: 23. "And Jesus knew their thoughts."—Matt. xii: 25. He is omnipresent. "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."—Matt. xxviii: 20. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."—Matt. xviii: 20. Although on earth, Christ declared that he was in Heaven, as we learn from John iii: 13: "No man hath ascended up to Heaven but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of man which is in Heaven." Eternity is ascribed to him. He has said himself, "Before Abraham was I am."—John viii: 58. Here, by the use of the present tense, *I am*, it is intimated that with him a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years. "These things saith the First and the Last, who was dead and is alive."—Rev. ii: 8. Here we are taught that he is the First and the Last; that he existed from all eternity past, and will continue to exist to all eternity to come; no being has lived before him, and none will live after him. "And thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting."—Micah. v: 2. He is also, immutable. In Hebrews i: 12, the following language, from the 102d Psalm, is applied to Christ: "But thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever."—Heb. xiii: 8. Now, what a heaping together of evidence have we here! Not only the peculiar names, but also the incommunicable perfections of Deity, are repeatedly ascribed to our blessed Redeemer. According to the Scriptures, he is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, eternal, and immutable. Can all this, we solemnly ask, be predicated of a mere creature? If he is not really God, who possesses the distinctive attributes of God, in what does true Divinity consist?

III. The worship of God he receives. The *Saints* are described as those *who call upon the name of Christ.*

“Unto the church which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be Saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.”—1 Cor. i: 2. “And let all the angels of God worship him,”—taken from the 97th Ps., and applied to Christ in Heb. i: 16. Here, he is presented as an object of worship even to the angels. “And I beheld and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders, and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing; and every creature which is in Heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.”—Rev. v: 11, 12, 13. In the apostolic benediction the grace of Christ is invoked upon men. “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.”—2 Cor. xiii: 14. In the administration of baptism Christ is worshipped. “Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”—Matt. xxviii: 19. Stephen, a man full of faith and the Holy Ghost, prayed directly to Christ in the hour of his martyrdom. He saw Heaven opened, and beheld the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God; and to the keeping of his Redeemer, whom he loved, he entrusted his immortal spirit, and prayed that he would not lay the sin of his enemies to their charge. “And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge; and having said this, he fell asleep.”—Acts vii: 59, 60. Paul prayed to Christ, “Now God, even our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you.”—1 Thess. iii: 11. He commences his epistles, and concludes them with what we call the apostolic benediction, in which, as already mentioned, the grace of Christ is invoked. Abraham and

Lot worshipped him.—Gen. 18th and 19th chapters. If, then, it be proper that Christ should receive the worship due only to the Supreme God, we infer that he must be God, really, and in no subordinate sense, for we are not at liberty to render such homage to a creature. The triune Jehovah proclaims, “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” This heads the holy decalogue.

IV. The offices of God he performs. “By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him.”—Col. i: 16. “By him all things were made, and without him was not even one thing made which hath been made.”—John i: 3. He is the Upholder, as well as Creator, of all things. “And upholding all things by the word of his power.”—Heb. i: 3. He is also, the Governor. He is “over all, God blessed forever.”—Rom. ix: 5. “This person is Lord of all things.”—Acts x: 36. He also administers quickening and sanctifying grace. “That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing.”—Eph. v: 26, 27. He also bestows forgiveness on transgressors. “Even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye.”—Col. iii: 13. He also bestows eternal life. “I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish.”—John x: 28. He will raise the dead on the day of the resurrection. We are so taught in many places,—for example, John vi: 56, “Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.” He will also occupy the Throne of Judgment, and pronounce sentence upon every man according to his deeds.—2 Tim. iv: 1. If, then, Christ is the Creator, Upholder, and Governor of all things; if he dispenses sanctifying grace, pardons sin, and bestows eternal life; if he will raise the dead, and will be the Judge at the last day, we may surely pronounce him the Supreme God, and revere and trust him as such. Better evidence of his Divinity reason will never demand.

V. Christ has declared that he is God. We shall present some of his language, and then endeavor to arrive

at his meaning. He often called himself "the Son of God." He often spake of God as his "Father." He said to the Jews, (John v: 23,) "All men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father." Again, he said, (John x: 30,) "I and my Father are one." Again, (John x: 17, 18,) "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it up again; no one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again."

And now, that Christ taught that he was really God, and that he should be honored as such, is evident from the testimony of John, Paul, the Jews, and Christ himself. "Therefore, the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God."—John v: 18. Here, the apostle declares that Christ made himself equal with God, and why? because he had said that God was his Father. Paul says, (Phil. ii: 5, 6, 7,) "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." And the Jews thought our Saviour "made himself equal with God." They thought so when he said, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work," because they went about to kill him, thinking he had blasphemed. And when he stood before the Sanhedrim, Caiaphas put the question to him directly, "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God?" He meekly replied that he was, and the high priest rent his clothes, and said, "He hath spoken blasphemy," and they all pronounced him worthy of death. What now was it they thought blasphemy, and wished to punish with death? Evidently, that Christ made himself equal with God, by calling himself the Son of God. And we insist that Christ also, virtually gave his testimony in favor of this construction of his language, because, if the people around him were in error here, he would surely have corrected their minds. He had no end to accomplish in keeping them deceived. Indeed,

to say that he is not truly God, is to charge him, it appears to us, with having acted, if not uttered, a falsehood in presence of the Jews. According to the principles of moral philosophy, it is a lie to produce an erroneous impression on the minds of men, and knowingly suffer it to remain, intending that they should be deceived. Paley says, (and he has said some things well,) "It is the wilful deceit that makes the lie." Again, he observes, "A man may act a lie; as by pointing his finger in a wrong direction, when a traveller inquires of him his road; or when a tradesman shuts up his windows, to induce his creditors to believe that he is abroad; for, to all moral purposes, and therefore, as to veracity, speech and action are the same, speech being only a mode of action." Again, he says, "There may be lies of omission; a writer of English history, who, in his account of the reign of Charles the First, should wilfully suppress any evidence of that Prince's despotic measures and designs, might be said to lie; for, by entitling his book a History of England, he engages to relate the whole truth of the history, or, at least, all that he knows of it."\* If we apply these principles to the conduct of Christ, (and with all reverence be it done,) does it not appear that he was guilty of a most unaccountable falsehood, when he suffered the Jews to believe that he made himself God, when he was not, and even encouraged them in that belief, to the peril of his peace and life? When they inquired of him so often, and so particularly, concerning this matter, charging him with blasphemy, and going about to kill him on account of it, was it not strange duplicity in him to vex them as he did? Why did he not tell them plainly, that he was not God, or that he was God in some very inferior sense? Why did he not qualify his language, and show them its true meaning, when he saw how greatly he was misunderstood; how unnecessarily he tormented the Jews, spoiled his own peace, and was about to perpetuate serious blunders among his devoted followers? This much integrity might be expected of ordinary men; and of course, we are at liberty to look for it from the truthful,

\* Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy, Book iii., part 1, chap. 15.

benevolent, and amiable Jesus,—the most correct and lovely character the world has ever seen, as all parties unanimously admit.

VI. The denial of Christ's Divinity involves the Bible in a multitude of inconsistencies, and degrades the whole Christian scheme infinitely.

1. Then angels and good men stand accused of gross idolatry. Stephen, Paul, Abraham, Lot, and other apostles, patriarchs, and devout men, have prayed to Christ, as to the Supreme God,—have invoked his grace, presence, and providential support, and committed their spirits to his hands. The angels of light bow before him in the kingdom of glory, and ascribe to him "power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." What shall we call this, if it be not genuine worship? If, then, we conform to the conduct of the angels,—if we be followers of the apostles and patriarchs, and humbly imitate their parental example, we shall run into grievous idolatry, and give that glory to another which is due only to God. There must be sin in Heaven, strange as it may seem. And Paul was, evidently, inconsistent, when he said, "Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry," after having introduced the very same epistle thus: "Grace be unto you and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ."

2. It also appears that Christ, and the apostles, and the prophets, and the great Father, have taught us idolatry. Christ, we have seen, produced the impression on the minds of the Jews, and of his own disciples, that he "made himself equal with God," and this impression he, in many ways, knowingly cultivated. The prophets and apostles called him the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the True God, the Great God, and God over all, ascribing to him the works of the Supreme God, and exhorting men and angels to worship him. Even God the Father has said, "And let all the angels of God worship him." If we act in consistency with such instructions, and they proceed from a high source, we shall violate the first commandment, if Christ be a mere creature. How then, shall we understand God? Will he inculcate in one place what he has positively forbidden



in another? Where is our standard of duty? These are questions of grave importance, involving the dignity of the Scriptures as a rule of life.

3. In what light shall we regard the Jews? If Christ be not God, he did indeed, appear to blaspheme, and, according to the Mosaic law, it was right that he should be put to death. The Jews declared they did not stone him for a good work, but, because he, being man, made himself equal with God. He was thus charged with blasphemy to the face. Had he thought it improper to take this honor to himself, he would, in some way, have removed this impression. And being, therefore, as the Jews supposed, a blasphemer, they felt bound, according to their law,—a law which God had given,—to put him to death. If he were not really God, it would be difficult to show that the Jews acted as wickedly as we are accustomed to represent; and it would be hard to account for those Divine judgments which have rested upon them ever since, and which have pursued them into every corner of the earth. But the truth is, Christ was God; he so taught, and he made it appear by the precise fulfilment of prophecy, and by stupendous miracles. But the pride and unbelief of the Jews made them reject the claims of so humble a Messiah, steel themselves against all conviction, and put him to an ignominious death, regardless of the magnificent credentials he presented in attestation of his divinity. Here lies their guilt. His advent was really too heavenly and divine, and too little adapted to their vain expectations, to make him an acceptable visitor. This will show why the judgments of Heaven have scattered the Jews over the earth, and made them a by-word and reproach, despised and persecuted among the nations. This will vindicate an inspired apostle: “Him ye have taken, and with *wicked* hands have crucified and slain.”—Acts ii: 23.

4. How shall we understand the teachings of the Scriptures concerning original sin? There are analogies instituted in the Scriptures between Christ and Adam. “As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.”—Rom.

v: 18. "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."—Rom. v: 19. Whatever, therefore, affects the imputation of Christ's righteousness to us, must affect the imputation of Adam's disobedience to us. If we are not made righteous by Christ as a covenant-head, we are not made sinners by Adam as a covenant-head; if we do not derive righteousness from the one by imputation, we do not derive guilt from the other by imputation; because, according to the apostle, as by Adam's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of Christ shall many be made righteous. If Christ be not a Divine Saviour, it appears necessary to clothe the man with more power; he must not come into the world under the curse, and with a nature radically depraved; he must not be born "a child of wrath," "dead in sin," and dependent upon God. He must appear at first, on the stage of life, free from sin, and able to conform to the Divine law, and recommend himself to the Divine friendship. These are the consequences to which Unitarian sentiments must lead. And hence, we find men of this persuasion exceedingly unsound in their views of original sin. They torture the teachings of the Scriptures on this subject out of their proper posture, to make them correspond with their position in relation to the divinity of Christ. This system of religious faith, we do humbly believe, has done immense mischief in this very way. We are much mistaken if the division of the General Assembly into the Old and New School bodies, may not be traced to an influence akin to this system. The errors that gave rise to this division were engendered by the same spirit of speculation which brought Unitarianism into existence, and were soon found so extensively prevalent throughout the Presbyterian ranks, that it was thought best to submit to a separation of elements that were so uncongenial. When we consider the *character* of these errors,\* (the very errors which Unitarianism is so well adapted to produce,) and the *spots* from which they were caught up, (the very

\* See Dr. Wood's *Old and New Theology*; especially the *Preface* to the first edition in 1838.

spots where Unitarianism reigned,) we are no longer perplexed to discover the common parentage of both.

5. The doctrine of the atonement is in a manner annihilated. There is nothing more distinctly taught in the Scriptures than that Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for us; that he was made sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. And yet those who deny Christ's divinity, to be consistent, also deny that he made an atonement for sin, as the ground of our acceptance with God. And those who are not bold enough to venture so far, hold to absurdities that are truly ridiculous, and flatly at war with the Scriptures. If Christ be a mere creature, he was unable to render an atonement for the sins of men. Every act of obedience he could perform, he owed to God himself, and he could not, therefore, be our righteousness before God. All he could possibly do, the Creator had a right to require of him, as an individual subject of his moral government. It is not strange that those who deny the divinity of Christ, also deny that he made an atonement for the sins of men; for, such an atonement he could not have rendered, unless, as God-man, his obedience possessed infinite merit. How cold and comfortless the religious system that ignores the atonement! When do the people of God feel the happiest? May we not answer, when in imagination they see the Lamb of God bleeding for them on the tree; when they behold that same red blood streaming from his body which washes away their sins, and presents them without spot to God. Oh, how sweet to their taste are passages like these: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son, cleanseth us from all sin."—1 John i: 7. "God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him."—1 Thess. v: 9, 10. "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ."—1 Peter i: 18, 19. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."—Isa. liii: 5. O believer, can you love

a system of religion, although it should claim the Scriptures as its charter, which robs you of the consolation arising from the atonement of Jesus Christ? Does it not grieve you to see Christianity thus mutilated; to see the brightest star plucked from its crown, or rather, the whole crown trampled in the dust?

6. How must we regard the doctrine of regeneration by the Holy Spirit? It is urged that regeneration is effected by man's own efforts, and by the influence of virtuous companions. This is another of the numerous progeny of that parent error against which we are now arrayed. Indeed, the divinity of the Holy Spirit is denied; his claims are as little regarded as those of Christ. We are left to accomplish our own regeneration, and to win the Divine friendship by our own exertions. Do the Scriptures so teach? "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."—John iii: 5. "According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost."—Titus iii: 5. Here we are taught that we must be born again, or renewed, and that by the agency of the Divine Spirit, before we can enter the kingdom of God.

7. The doctrine of justification by faith, as we hold it, is also gone. Man is accepted on account of his own repentance and obedience, and not on account of Christ's righteousness imputed to him. Where the term faith is used, it means a mere intellectual assent to truth, or what we call historical or doctrinal faith. Now, how does the word of God instruct us on this subject? "If righteousness came by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."—Gal. ii: 21. "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them."—Gal. iii: 10. "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified."—Rom. iii: 20. "By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God."—Rom. ii: 8. If man is not justified by faith in the blood of Christ, and only thus, we are utterly perplexed to understand the Scriptures. This was Paul's great doctrine; he brought all his eloquence and power of argument into service to set forth its claims. He has written upon it beautifully, richly, and at length; and we doubt not, it would have been a treat to have

heard his living voice illustrating and urging this glorious doctrine before the listening multitude. O Paul, we, too, live in an obstinate generation,—ours too, is a rebellious day! With all thy written eloquence before our eyes, and in defiance of thy masterly logic, we still withhold from our Divine Redeemer the glory of our salvation! And what did Paul's mighty pupil, the Monk of Erfurt, find in the Scriptures? What did he believe, and what did he teach, after his eager eyes had passed over the sacred page? This same doctrine of justification by faith in the blood of Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God. This was his battle-cry, his war-signal, as he walked forth from his cloister, in all the majesty of heaven-inspired resolution, to rescue mankind from a cold-hearted, ceremonial despotism. With this blessed doctrine glittering upon his banner in characters of light, he marched on, conquering and to conquer, and the prince of darkness trembled for his kingdom. And now, let this great doctrine, which Paul and Luther so earnestly proclaimed, never be driven from the sacred desk. Ever let this be the joyous theme of those who are commissioned to announce the tidings of the Cross to a perishing world.

8. The denial of Christ's Divinity encourages immorality and infidelity. If it be false that God has assumed man's nature, to effect his redemption from the curse of the law; if it be false that a most costly and wonderful atonement has been made for our sins; if the doctrine of original sin, as we hold it, be a mere human fabrication; if we are able of ourselves to win the Divine favour; then sin will not appear so hideous, nor so offensive to God, and we shall have more encouragement to lead immoral lives. The most powerful motives to holiness, and the most powerful dissuasives from criminal conduct, will then lose much of their influence over us. Accordingly, we find that those who deny the Deity of Christ, are not very remarkable for practical piety. This statement is made on the authority of some of their own distinguished leaders. With them, religion is more an affair of the brain than of the heart; more a visionary philosophy than a rule of life. And it is also a notorious fact, that many of them run into infidelity. After

changing their religious creed, and their ecclesiastical connection, a few times, and exhibiting a very unsettled state of mind, they not unfrequently take the scorner's chair, and speak reproachfully of the whole system of Christianity. If we would put down infidelity, immorality, and crime, and promote virtue and piety among men, it will not be wise to encourage any religious system in which our Saviour's Deity is not recognized.

9. The missionary enterprise will never be rapidly forwarded by those who do not believe in a Divine Redeemer. What stimulates the heroic missionary to brave every danger, and persevere amidst the most disheartening difficulties, to make known Christ to dying men? We answer, the bleeding compassion of God's eternal Son; the wondrous love of a Divine Saviour. He knows that "in this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." He knows that "although the Son of God was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich." This fills him with wonder, gratitude, and love. The fact that the Mighty God, the Creator of heaven and earth, thus loved us, delights his heart beyond expression, and he flies with the good news to benighted parts, that he may gladden the souls of others. He also knows that the curse of the law is resting upon men,—that they are perishing in their sins,—that they cannot win salvation by their own obedience,—that Christ crucified is their only hope. He is anxious, therefore, that they should hear of the cross. This is the very life of missions,—a transporting view of the Divine Redeemer's bleeding love, and a compassionate sense of the perishing condition of mankind. The divinity of our Saviour also gives solemnity and dignity to the Gospel message in the eyes of those whom the missionary addresses. He has news to proclaim that may well engage the attention of men, and make them listen with astonishment and delight. But let Christ be stripped of Deity, and let the doctrines of original sin, the atonement, regeneration, and justification by faith, as held by us, be set aside, and what will become of the missionary cause? When will the pagan world come to the knowledge of

the truth? When shall the nations sitting in the region and shadow of death, rejoice in the light of the sun of righteousness arising upon them "with healing in his wings?" Those who do not believe in a Divine Saviour have never yet contributed much, either in the way of money or labourers, to support and advance the missionary enterprise. And where men and money are withheld, prayers are neither very abundant, nor very fervent. If we would have the Saviour's command obeyed, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature;" if we would have the banners of Christianity planted on every shore, and its blessed hopes irradiating every heart, this grand truth should have full play, and exert all its influence upon men: Christ, "God manifest in the flesh," hath loved us, and hath given himself for us.

Having advanced a few arguments in proof of Christ's Divinity, we shall proceed to consider briefly some of the positions occupied by those who deny that the Scriptures contain this doctrine.

I. They argue that Christ and his apostles repeatedly asserted his inferiority to the supreme God. Let us consider a few of the passages to which they refer. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."—Mark xiii: 32. Here, it is said, we are informed there were facts of which Christ was ignorant, and that he was not the Father's equal in the knowledge of future events. We know, however, that he predicted many events fully as difficult for a finite mind to ascertain as the destruction of Jerusalem, or the day of judgment. How, then, shall we construe his language? The truth is, as God, he well knew when the city of Jerusalem would be destroyed, and when the general judgment would arrive, (for his language may refer to either,) but, as a prophet, he had no commission to reveal this. He would remain silent on these points, because to disclose them was no part of his business; it did not fall within the scope of his prophetic commission. The term *know*, in this passage, is used somewhat in the same sense in which Paul used it, "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and

him crucified.”—1 Cor. ii: 2. Scott remarks, “The precise season, either of the day of judgment, or of the destruction of Jerusalem, was no part of the revelation which the incarnate Son of God had received to communicate to the church.” And Porteus observes, “He was not commissioned to reveal this.” It should also, be remembered, that Christ sometimes referred to himself as man, and not always as God, for he had a twofold nature. The question of his Divinity should not be tried by every observation he made concerning himself. Knowing that he was regarded by many around him, who did not understand his wondrous nature and mission, as man only, he had to adapt his instruction in some measure, to their limited views: He may possibly have spoken of himself in this passage, as man, and still not have disowned a Divine nature.

Our attention is also directed to Matt. xix: 17, “Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God.” Here Christ evidently adapted his instruction to the narrow comprehension of the young ruler. This individual was ignorant of the exalted character of Christ, and also, of the true condition of justification; and hence he addressed him as they did the Jewish rabbies, calling him Good Master, and expressed a desire to know *what good thing he must do* to inherit eternal life. Our Saviour, in his reply, taught, more or less distinctly, three things, first, that we cannot win salvation by doing good things, or by our own righteousness; secondly, that the rabbies should not receive the idolatrous adulation bestowed upon them; and thirdly, that he deserved the title, Good Master, in a higher sense than the young ruler had ever imagined. He was, as God, infinitely good, but considered in the light in which this individual viewed him, he would not claim the honor.

We are also reminded of John xiv: 28, “My Father is greater than I.” Here he refers to himself as a mediatorial ambassador, acting under a commission from the Father. He had just been speaking of his ascension to the Father, which would take place as soon as his earthly mission was fulfilled, or as soon as he should finish the work which the Father had given him to do. And it was in view of the fact that he had been sent by



the Father, and was engaged in his service, that he said, "My Father is greater than I." He was greater officially, and by mutual arrangement, but not in nature and perfections. That he is to be understood thus, seems clear, because an apostle has declared that, "being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God." If we keep in view the fact, that the Father represents the Godhead, and that the Son came to satisfy his justice, and to magnify his law, (a voluntary humiliation,) and to get up a reconciliation between him and rebel man, we shall readily understand other passages which have been cited, and be able to reconcile them with the Saviour's Deity. "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him."—1 Cor. xiii: 6. Here, the Father represents the Godhead, and Christ is the Divine Mediator. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."—John xvii: 3. By what mode of interpretation, other than the one proposed, can we reconcile this passage with the following: "And we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. *This is the true God*, and eternal life."—1 John v: 20. "The Son can do nothing of himself."—John v: 19. In other words, he must do the very things which the Father had laid upon him, having engaged to do his will. Of the same character is the following passage: "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."—John vi: 38. The Saviour said that when he was lifted upon the Cross, men would know that he did nothing of himself, but only as he had been taught by the Father; in other words, they would then have astonishing evidence that he came from Heaven, and was engaged in his Father's service.—John viii: 28. And accordingly, we find that a heathen exclaimed, amid the appalling events that attended his crucifixion, "Truly this was the Son of God,"—truly what he said of his Divine mission was correct.

We are also directed to 1 Cor. xv: 28, "Then shall the Son also, himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." This may refer to the act of subjection performed by Christ,

when he shall deliver up his Mediatorial Kingdom to the Father, as the representative of the Godhead, of which the apostle had been speaking. And it must be remembered that Christ's human nature will, of course, be eternally subject to the Divine sceptre.

It is also objected, that Christ prayed to the Father: but, as man, this he was bound to do. He had the duties of other men to perform. And, as Mediator, it was a part of his business to intercede for the perishing. Having taken upon him the form of a servant, he discharged the obligations of a servant. His prayers did not prove that he was naturally or essentially inferior to the Father.

II. But, it is also argued, that this doctrine makes more than one God, and is, therefore, unscriptural and absurd. This, however, is an unfair statement. We believe there is but one God, but we believe that the Scriptures teach that there are three persons in the Godhead,—that there is a trinity of persons in a unity of essence. But it is said, if the Father be God, if the Son be God, and if the Holy Spirit be God, there must consequently be three Gods. This, however, correct as it may appear, is not according to the Scriptures, and is a conclusion by no means absolutely inevitable. But we do confess there is mystery here unfathomably deep to our narrow comprehension. The Scriptures do positively teach that God is three in one sense, and one in another, and how it is, we confess we are not able to perceive. We read, "There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one."—1 John v: 7. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—Matt. xxviii: 19. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all."—2 Cor. xiii: 14. "And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness."—Gen. i: 26. "The Lord our God is one Lord."—Mark xii: 29. "For there is one God."—1 Tim. ii: 5. If we understand this language, there is only one God, and yet that God embraces three persons, distinguished by the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And strange

as this may appear, we must humbly believe it, remembering that it is not our privilege to comprehend everything. We cannot understand that union of soul and body which constitutes the living, thinking, moving man. We cannot understand the constitution and growth of a single blade of grass around our feet. And of course, we should expect that the constitution and character of the Supreme God will present incomprehensible mysteries to the human mind. If we are taught truths in the Scriptures which we cannot reconcile with our own conceptions, we should not deny that those truths are taught, but in all humility, receive what has been revealed, remembering that there are fields of vision to which our feeble minds have not attained, and which are surveyed only by the all-absorbing eye of the Omniscient.

The term *person*, when we say there are three *persons* in the Godhead, may contribute much to the perplexity in which the human mind is involved in the investigation of this subject. We are accustomed to apply it to men totally distinct and disconnected in their individual being. And yet this word is, perhaps, the best that we can select; and the use of it is justified by the application in the Scriptures to the Father, Son, and Spirit, of the personal pronouns *I*, *thou*, and *he*. Our language is probably, even more inadequate than our minds to the task of explaining the doctrine of a *trine* God.

The objection that, since we thus make three Gods, we confound the government of the universe, has evidently, no weight. If we even made three infinite and disconnected beings, (which is not true,) they would have the same perfections, all be omnipotent, omniscient, and infinitely benevolent, just, and holy, and would therefore, fix upon the same wise and good measures for the government of the universe. If all three were absolutely perfect, there could be no discrepancy between them; their purposes and acts would always be the same. But, although we believe, according to the Scriptures, that there are three persons in the Godhead, called Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that each of these possess all the attributes of God, we still believe, according to the Scriptures, that there is but one God,—but one Divine essence or being. Mysterious

as it may appear, we are so taught by the Infinite Mind, and we must believe it. There is no danger of our doctrine involving us in the same difficulties with the ancient Greeks and Romans. They had such a multitude of deities, that they knew not which to propitiate by oblations and penances, when calamities befell them, nor which to adore and bless, when signal favours were bestowed upon them. They were compelled to divide the work of the gods; making Mars the god of war, Neptune the god of the seas, Diana the goddess of the chase, and so on, that they might understand the relations they sustained to the respective deities that presided over them. And after all this division of office, they were often painfully bewildered, and could not understand which of their divinities was angry, and required propitiation, and which crowned their lives with prosperity. Our doctrine does not place men in any such absurd position. We have but one God, the triune or three-in-one Jehovah; and when afflictions are sent upon us, to Him we bow in penitency and prayer; and when we enjoy peace, plenty, and happiness, to Him as a common centre, we lift our hearts and voices in joyous adoration and praise. And when, as reasonable men, we are asked to explain, we promptly advance to where the voice of revelation has ceased to instruct, and there we pause in reverential awe, and, with our fingers upon our lips, we solemnly beckon the inquirer to be silent, and respect that limit which the Infinite One hath set to the investigation of his nature and being. Should he still mutter in discontent, we give *him* the catechumen's chair, and we put a few questions concerning his own nature, which of course, he should understand better than we can understand the nature of God. We ask him to make us comprehend how his soul and body are coupled together; how this union gives life and activity to the body; how his arm moves at the bidding of his mind; what his soul is composed of, and where it came from; how his food becomes incorporated with his body, to sustain and strengthen it; and how disease may at length, effect a dissolution of his material and spiritual parts. If he cannot give us perfect satisfaction on all these points, and make it all clear as day, he cannot

reasonably require of us a complete elucidation of all the mysteries appertaining to the Supreme Existence, who hath forewarned us that "clouds and darkness are round about him." Mystery here is not contrary to reason, because right reason will teach us to expect it.

III. But, another argument to which we would briefly reply, may be stated thus: the name God, all must acknowledge, is applied in several places in the Scriptures, to created beings, and yet this does not make them really divine. The Lord, we know, did say to Moses, "See, I have made thee a god unto Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother, shall be thy prophet."—Exodus, vii: 1. And in Psalm, lxxxii: 1, we read, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, he judgeth among the gods." And in the 6th verse, "I have said, ye are gods; and all of you are children of the Most High." But, evidently, in such passages the word is used figuratively, and is intended to teach that, *in some particular*, the individual to whom it is applied appears to *resemble* God; and the connection will readily indicate what this particular is. But where is this name given to a mere creature *in the absolute*, without any qualification, expressed or implied? Where is any man, or even an angel, said to be "over all, God blessed forever?" When it can be shown that a mere creature has been called God in the absolute; that the attributes of God, omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, immutability, and eternity, have been ascribed to him; that the works of God, such as creating the world, governing the affairs of men, changing the human heart, raising the dead, and judging mankind at the last day, are said to be performed by him; and that men and angels are positively commanded to worship him, and have actually worshipped him with Divine approbation: when all this can be shown from the Scriptures, we shall then acknowledge that this argument is worthy of the most solemn attention. But as it is, we do not deem it sufficiently important to detain us long.

Our attention will now be directed to a few interesting thoughts arising from the Divinity of Jesus Christ, our Saviour and King, and from that controversy in which learned men have been engaged respecting it:

This doctrine is full of encouragement to believers. A Divine Saviour is one in whom we may repose unbounded confidence. He has rendered complete satisfaction to eternal justice, because his Divinity would give infinite merit to his mediation. There was an awful depth of meaning in the words of John the Baptist, when he pointed to Jesus, as he passed by, and said, "Behold the Lamb of God,"—there goes the Anointed One, the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person,—there goes, in humble garb, the august antitype of Jewish figures, God manifest in the flesh, who hath appeared at last to make himself an offering for sin. Surely, there can be no deficiency in an atonement rendered by such a Lamb.

Our Saviour is also able to defend us from all our enemies. "Fear not, I am thy shield." He turneth the hearts of men whithersoever he will,—he holds the winds in his hand,—the billows of the sea obey his voice,—the dark cloud marches at his bidding,—hills tremble at his presence,—the earthquake and volcano, in the height of their fury, cannot transcend the boundaries which he has fixed,—the black-winged pestilence veers around at the word, "Hitherto, but no farther." He will fortify us against Satan's assaults, whether secret or open, direct or indirect. He will preserve us amidst the temptations of the world, which we encounter at every step. He will prevent us from being ensnared by the treachery of our own hearts. We may, therefore, say in holy triumph, "The Lord is my helper,"—"he is my light and my salvation, of whom shall I be afraid,"—I will not be dismayed although thousands should encamp against me."

Our Divine Redeemer will also supply all our wants. He will not be inattentive even to the necessities of our physical nature. He will see that we are fed and clothed. He will direct us to the chrystal stream, as the exiled Hagar was directed of old, that we may drink and be refreshed. He will provide a place for our slumbers, if it should be in the leafy woods under the soft moonlight. He who could not find in our inhospitable world a place to lay his head, will give his beloved sleep, and holy angels shall watch around us. When we need

spiritual strength, he is prepared to impart it. When we feel desolate and gloomy, he is ready to administer comfort. When we cannot enjoy Divine worship, nor appreciate our religious privileges, he will open our eyes, roll the burden from our souls, and "make us joyful in the house of prayer." His eyes are ever over us, and his ears open to our prayers. Christ is also able to carry on the work of sanctification which he has commenced in the believer's soul. He cannot be arrested nor defeated. He will yet make him more holy in his motives, more heavenly in his aspirations, and more humble, affectionate, and God-fearing in his daily walk. He will be with him in a dying hour, to remind him that he trod the valley of death before him, that glorious scenes await him, and that soon his afflictions will all be over forever. Oh, to have the company of our Divine Redeemer in that solemn hour,—how sweet it is! And when the soul escapes from its fleshly prison, he will receive him into everlasting mansions, "that he may behold his glory."

He will also, be able to raise the nations of the dead, and administer to them upright judgment. The grave will not always hide us. He who raised Lazarus, and whom death could not retain under its dominion longer than he was pleased to remain its captive, will remember us at the appointed time, and will bring us forth in beauteous forms, in all the bloom of immortality, from our cold, clay beds, where the sobs of weeping friendship, and the sighs of orphaned love, have long failed to reach our ears. Oh, no, we shall not always sleep in the earth's cold bosom, nor shall dear Christian friends we have buried always sleep there, because our Redeemer is God, and, when ready for the judgment, will bring us forth. And he will be our judge! Surely, we shall wish for swift pinions to bear us to his feet, that we may behold him as he is, and receive some new token of his love. And upon us, the dear objects of his eternal care, he will smile with ineffable sweetness, saying, in accents sweeter far than the notes of an angel's lyre: "Come, come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." When you lie down to die, believer, remember that Christ will

bring you forth from the grave in due time, and you shall then see his face in peace, and under the broad banner of his love, enter into rest.

It is also, a most animating thought, that the church, having a Divine Head, will surely triumph over all her enemies, and grow up and flourish, until she becomes the glory and praise of the whole earth. Dark days have passed over the Christian church. Our hearts beat faster, the blood bounds more quickly along the veins, and an air of deep solemnity settles upon the countenance as mention is made of a Nero, a Bloody Mary, a Claverhouse, the Duke of Savoy, and others, who persecuted the Saints of the Most High with revolting barbarity. The smoking blood of thousands of Christ's slaughtered people has cried to Heaven against the cruel hell-bounds of the Prince of darkness. The martyr's stake has consecrated many a plain. The sun in mid-heaven has looked down upon many a scene of lamb-like suffering for Jesus' sake. But, although such has been the church's experience, and although many a storm of persecution may yet beat upon her, we should have no fears for her safety, because the Almighty is her King and Head, and he will maintain her cause. He has been pleased, in the plenitude of his wisdom, to permit his people to be persecuted, and trained for Heaven in the furnace of affliction; but be assured, he never has yet, and never will while his throne endures, forsake the church he has ransomed with his blood. His own *body*, he will, of course, nourish and defend. No weapon formed against her shall prosper, and every tongue that shall rise against her in judgment shall be condemned. Her waste and desolate places, and the land of her destruction, shall be too narrow by reason of the inhabitants, and they that swallowed her up shall be far away. The mountains may depart, and the hills be removed, but the Lord's kindness shall not depart from her, neither shall the covenant of his peace be removed. He will lay her stones with fair colours, and lay her foundations with sapphires, making her windows of agate, her gates of carbuncles, and all her borders of pleasant stones. He will contend with those that contend with her; he will feed them that oppress her with their own flesh, they shall be drunken



with their own blood, as with sweet wine, and all flesh shall know that he, the Lord, is her Saviour and her Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob. He will cause the glorious Gospel to be proclaimed to the ends of the earth, and clothe it with Divine efficiency, that all nations may be won to his standard. He will make his enemies his footstool, triumphing over whatever may exalt itself against him, until his kingdom shall entirely occupy the world. Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O Most Mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty. And in thy majesty ride prosperously because of truth, and meekness, and righteousness; and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the King's enemies, whereby the people fall under thee. Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Sing, O heavens, and be joyful, O earth, and break forth into singing, O mountains, for the Lord will comfort his people, and will, in majesty and might, claim the nations for his own.

Our Divine Redeemer has exhibited a most astonishing love. The God of Heaven, who made us, assumed our nature, and placed himself under the law, that he might obey, suffer, and die in our room, to deliver us from the curse, and secure to us unspeakable honors and privileges. Truly, this is "love all love excelling." The sacred writers bear ample testimony to the mysterious character of this love. They call the Gospel, on this account, "the mystery of the faith," "the mystery of godliness," and "the mystery of Christ." There is no better evidence of the cold ingratitude of the followers of Christ, than their backwardness to spread abroad over the earth a knowledge of this transcendent love. We are all guilty here; not a single man is doing his whole duty. We should all be at the work with our whole hearts, either sending or bearing the news of the cross to all men,

"Till nation after nation taught the strain,  
Earth rolls the rapturous hosanna round."

Remember also, it is no light thing to reject a Divine Saviour, and treat with contempt the overtures of his love. Why will not the impenitent multitude think

of this fact? The richest blood that ever fell to the earth has been shed for them, and yet they evince little more concern than when the blood of an ox is spilt. And this same despised Redeemer, will meet them on the judgment day! Who can picture their anguish and dismay, when, as they assemble before the bar, they shall espy upon the throne this same Jesus, whose offers of pardon they had disdained, and from whom they are compelled to receive the irrevocable sentence. They cannot escape—hills and rocks will refuse to cover them from his sight—they must behold his dread countenance, “with clouds of glory circled round,” and openly encounter the fierceness of his wrath. Would we could speak to all stout-hearted unbelievers with an angel’s voice, and solemnly warn them that they are not done with Jesus,—that they must meet him soon in all his Divine majesty, when he shall come upon his great white throne, and with his hosts of living chariots, to the judgment of the great day.

And finally, we have an important suggestion to make, arising from that controversy in which learned men have been engaged concerning the divinity of Christ. Never should the fact that minds of no mean repute are enlisted against us, shake any man’s faith. This is easily understood. Men often decide what is reasonable and what is absurd, what is true and what is false, before they consult the sacred volume, and then they must torture whatever they meet with there into conformity to their views. We must exercise reason in relation to the teachings of the Scriptures, but due allowance must be made for the fact, that human reason is limited, blinded, and perverted. Our attention was once arrested by the following passage from the pen of a popular divine: “We have sat down in pensive grief, when we heard from the lips of tyros in divinity, solemn and unmeasured denunciations of *reason* in matters of religion.”\* This remark may be just, for so far as we exercise reason correctly, upon the Word of God, it can only throw a halo of glory around it. But, there is, evidently, too much unsound philosophizing over the Scriptures.

\* Barnes in his *Introductory Essay to Butler’s Analogy*.

There is too much importance attached to the decisions of a narrow and perverted reason. We are not at liberty to force the Scriptures into a complete parallel with any system of human philosophy we may be pleased to adopt. Man should turn to God with the utmost docility, and, as it were, receive the truth from his lips. We should love the testimonies of the Lord like David. "Thy testimonies are righteous and very faithful. Thy word is very pure, therefore thy servant loveth it. I do not forget thy precepts."—See Psalm 119th.

In conclusion, dear reader, we commend to you the song of celestial worshippers, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and blessing." "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." May we be permitted to sing this song together in that temple where sits the Lamb "in the midst of the throne." Amen.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### INTERNATIONAL COPY-RIGHT LAW.

The subject indicated, has already excited an interest in the Republic of Letters, and elicited animated discussions in a few of our well-conducted and able periodicals. As the principles involved are intimately and essentially connected with the righteousness that exalts a nation, and also, with the temporal security and happiness of literary and scientific writers, it is hoped that a brief investigation, however humble and desultory, of the objections proposed and the advantages accruing from the establishment of such a law, will not prove entirely uninteresting or unprofitable.

That we may possess a clear and definite knowledge of the signification of the terms employed, we merely remark, by the international copy-right alluded to, we understand a law to be so ordained by the American

and English Governments as to secure to English authors the exclusive privilege of printing, re-printing and selling their original works within the United States and her territories, and also, to permit the same privilege to be enjoyed, on the other hand, by all American authors within the limits of Great Britain and her dominions. It must also, be mutually understood, that all English authors, while in the United States, shall enjoy all the privileges, rights and protection to which her own citizens are entitled in reference to works first published by them, and that the same privileges, rights and protection should be extended to all American authors while in Great Britain. Although we believe this to be a full and correct explanation of the phraseology, yet, so far as we have collected information, it appears that the design of such a law would be, not so much to secure to authors the exclusive privilege of republishing and selling their works abroad, as to prohibit other men from re-printing and selling them without their permission. This construction provides that no citizen of the United States shall re-publish the works of a British writer, nor any citizen of England the works of an American, except he shall first have obtained license by the purchase of the copy-right. According to this aspect of the case, the cardinal principles of equity, and the admirable direction of the golden rule, are prominently exhibited and vitally concerned; and, for our own part, we are convinced that an international law, with this special object in view, and to this effect, would not only be just, but would raise the standard of literary excellence, and greatly meliorate the condition of the wisest and most useful class of citizens.

When, by means of cultivating the soil, mercantile pursuits, or other honourable avocations, a person has succeeded in acquiring an estate, it is his own property. The laws of the land consider it such. He has a right to dispose of it as he pleases, either at home or abroad, and any attempt to deprive him of it, or to change his chosen method of its disposal, is regarded as an encroachment and an invasion. Every wise and good government will protect the merchant, planter and tradesman, in the enjoyment of their possessions, and in their pre-

ferred disposition of the proceeds of their labour. What shall we say, then, with regard to the productions of an author? If, by the exertion of his intellectual powers in persevering and indefatigable study, he produces an original work, has he not a right equally inalienable and valid as that of the merchant or farmer, to prefer a claim to it as so much property, honestly acquired? The only conceivable difference is, that in the one instance, the acquisition is effected by physical, in the other by mental discipline and labour; and this difference completely turns the scale in favour of authors, since all men acquiesce in the belief, that if an individual can prefer a better right to one part of his property than another, it is *that* in the acquirement of which, external means have been most wanting. In the production and manufacture of almost all objects of value, the essential materials are supplied from without, and man only coöperates with nature and extraneous instruments in furnishing the articles. But the composition of a history, or treatise of any description, is the offspring of the unassisted toil of mind. External means are entirely wanting. It is supplied from abroad only with the paper and ink used for recording the work and affording the evidences of its accomplishment. But, we need not consume more time in substantiating this proposition, as it has long since been confirmed by the soundest and ablest moralists, that an author possesses a right as absolute and unquestionable as can well be imagined, to the proceeds of mental effort and toil, and that too, independently of any special enactment. Now, it necessarily follows, that the author has the prerogative to dispose of his book as he pleases, and that it would be nothing more than just for him to demand and receive the profits arising from its sale. But it were impossible to obtain a portion, much less the entire amount of such profits, unless he possess or lawfully acquire the exclusive right of re-publication. At present, publishers are not so scrupulously considerate and covetous as to request the consent of authors, or to remunerate them for their claims in the books which they desire to present to the public. This method of procedure is, in our humble opinion, unjust to the author, and would be at once condemned by pub-

lishers themselves, were they to witness its continual practice in other departments of business. The enlightened reason and intuitive moral faculty of man will concur in our estimation of the validity of the author's title to the rewards of his labour, and the justness of his receiving adequate and righteous compensation. The best and only mode of effecting this, is to establish an international copy-right law, with a view to secure to the author what is really and justly his own. At this point we meet with a few objections. Publishers will readily admit that an English author ought to possess and hold the exclusive right of re-publication of his works in Great Britain, but not in the United States. We ask, why not? They answer, we purchase a foreign book, and it is ours. We are prepared for the purpose of publishing books, and we re-publish a number of copies of this book, and thus diffuse its advantages. We act on the same principle as the trading planter who purchases a thousand bushels of foreign wheat previously unknown. He sows it on an improved farm. It yields a luxuriant harvest, and he sells it out to his neighbours and friends, that they also, may partake of its advantages. The cases, say they, are analogous and parallel. They are both praiseworthy acts, beneficial to mankind, right and proper in themselves, and injurious to none. But, an essential part of true logic is overlooked. The author who sells one copy of his works to an individual, does not thereby, authorise him to re-publish and sell as many copies of the same as he may choose. By no means. True, the purchaser may call the paper, typography and binding his own; but these minor items no more constitute a part of the exclusive property which the *author* has in the works, than a deed conveying an estate is a part of the thing conveyed. The author still holds the right of re-publication, and ought to be amply remunerated for it by the publisher.

But, it is objected, that if such a law were enacted, publishers would be compelled to set a higher price on their books, and will, consequently, sell fewer copies, so that they will suffer on account of the smaller profits, and the public will not be so extensively benefitted because of not receiving as much instruction as the other

method would afford. To this we might reply in the well-known language of Hale, "*justitia fiat et cælum ruat.*" But, it would be difficult to imagine that a publisher would give a larger amount for the copy-right of a book than he could afford, and still succeed and prosper in his business. There is a great deal of human nature in Adam's family. Men possess and cultivate a higher regard for their personal interest than to act against the dictates of common reason and prudence. This is the true posture of the negotiation. Should the publisher be requested to pay for the copy-right of a foreign work, the consequence would be, that he would endeavor to ascertain its general success and popularity, and should he discover that its circulation would be limited, he will only give such an amount as when assessed upon the copies to be issued, will not materially enhance their price. Thus, the publisher could afford to abate and reduce all additional expenses, to so low a rate as not to be a burden, when he considers the security against all interference. But, on the other hand, if the work should be exceedingly popular, he would be entirely safe in stereotyping it, and from this source would emanate a greater multiplication of copies, and in proportion as the number of copies re-printed and sold is greater, the price paid by the people will be less. Hence, we perceive that an international copy-right, instead of being a hindrance and barrier to the publisher, presents itself as the most effectual means of advancing his prosperity and wealth. It is argued, however, that this would be true, if authors were not exorbitant in their demands. We answer, why should they be? Tyrants and despots will exert their power, and it is natural to conclude that every other class of men having power, will use it for their own ends and purposes. But, to what extent can the author use his, if he possess any at all? He may demand as much as he may think proper, for his copy-right. He may raise the price to three or five times its value, but is the publisher compelled to give whatever the author may require? Must he accede to any proposition that may be made, whether it be promotive or prejudicial to his interest? Manifestly, there is no compulsion in the case. Authors, like other men,

are solicitous, and possess the right to dispose of their literary estate to the greatest advantage. But should they be extravagant in their requisitions, or demand more for copy-rights than they are really worth, they must be content with charges instead of compensation. This would be a lamentable condition for an indigent writer, and such, indeed, has been the condition of a majority of the best authors. This dear-bought experience would deeply impress the truth of the maxim, "large sales and small profits are the secret of successful business;" and thus, in the end, the matter adjusting itself as it does in similar instances, such a price would be mutually established by the parties as American publishers would be able to give, and foreign authors be willing to receive. But, even admitting that authors should not receive a compensation for the privilege of re-printing and selling their works, (which we by no means admit,) we contend that a sufficient cause for establishing an international law on the subject, is found in the fact that, under the present system of literary piracy, they are deprived, not only of their money, but their fame also. A member of British Parliament having once given as his opinion, that an author ought to be allowed a livelihood out of his earnings; and that he need not be, as Botta and others, under the necessity of starving, while his works were making the fortunes of a legalized banditti, Lord Camden replied, "Glory is the reward of science, and those who deserve it scorn all meaner praise." The noble peer did not perceive that the scheme which he advocated robbed the writer of all security for his glory as well as his purse. Though we would not recommend the pursuit of fame as the only governing aim of life, we maintain that if any honour result from a history or other literary performance, it is certainly due the author. But without an international copy-right law he is, to a great extent, deprived of this also. This is done in two ways: first, publishers often take the liberty of mutilating, expunging, or omitting as much of the work as they suppose, will promote their private interests. The original author is thus held responsible for all errors arising from such omission. These errors will consist in a want of connexion, or both. To



understand this part of the subject more clearly, let it be remembered that our best writers are extremely careful to express their thoughts in as few words as possible. It is then, redned to fact, that to mutilate a work, or to strike out any portion of it, in the re-print, is to remove that which is absolutely essential to a distinct and full comprehension of the author's sentiments. Not only so, but in proportion as the quantity of matter omitted is less or greater, the whole treatise will be less or more involved in obscurity, and be changed into a mass of unintelligible ideas, instead of a source from which information could be derived. For this the reputation of the author must suffer. He alone is censured by the reader and reviewers, when indeed, it is the fault of the publisher. A state of law which permits authors to be thus placed in a false position, and their reputation to suffer, and will not take cognizance of the aggressors, is morally wrong; and we affirm that nothing can be *politically* right which is wrong morally, and that no necessity, however imperious, can justify a law that is contrary to the immutable and eternal principles of equity.

But if there be no sympathy for foreign authors, in this particular, we should at least, have some respect for our own. This unhallowed game is played by both English and American publishers. "*Hanc veniam petimisque damusque.*" We defraud each other equally, on both sides of the water. The celebrated Sparks, having employed himself more than ten years in laborious study and collection of proper materials, produced the "Life and Writings of Washington." As the work was large, it was one of considerable cost, and this circumstance limited its circulation. He supposed it would yield him a handsome return from sales in England, and accordingly, advertised it in the popular journals. But almost simultaneously, was offered by a London bookseller, a mutilated and spurious copy, under the title of "Personal Reminiscences and Diaries of George Washington," by Jared Sparks, in two volumes. Now, these two volumes contained nothing more than a few selections from the original work, with additional notes appended by the Editor. The imposture was soon detected. But

when the publisher, Mr. Colburn, was called to account for the phenomenon, he replied in vindication of his conduct, that he was only acting in accordance with the code of honour established and followed by American booksellers, who re-published all his books the moment they crossed the Atlantic. Although this plea suited the publisher for an excuse, it was small consolation to Dr. Sparks, who, as he was deprived of the substantial property, would have preferred to have been left alone with the glory to which the facetious Camden, acknowledged that authors had a right. We might adduce similar instances of mutilation, perversion and suppression, but we merely add, that if such a state of law long continue, the day will speedily come when different books, under the same name, will be in the hands of American and British scholars, when references will cease to be guides in reading, and when the identity of the great monuments of genius and study will be confounded and lost. Eventually, such publications must prove deleterious to literature, as well as destructive to accurate and reliable information. Much better would it be were the integrity of a work protected from such unwarrantable perversion by an international law.

The second method by which authors are robbed of the honour due them for their labor, is the re-publication of their works without their consent.

If our neighbour confer a favor upon us, we should feel it a duty to return it at the proper season; and if he labor for us, and expect or require no wages, we ought at least, to call him a good and clever man. But for the author, who has toiled for years in our service, for our instruction or amusement, and has filled our libraries with the choicest of all earthly treasures, there is nothing! Neither recompense nor honor! All is gone. Our sympathy and gratitude are no more. Is not this a conclusive evidence in favor of an international law for mutual protection of British and American writers?

But, there is another view of the subject that addresses itself to those who are friendly to an elevated and honourable policy. No literature is so well adapted to national prosperity as the congenial growth of the native soil. This is the very basis on which previous Re-

publics were founded, and is the only one on which ours can be expected to prosper. If we would have a literature suited to the wants of the community, and which will increase the political strength and security of the nation, we must look for it in works of domestic origin. They must be manufactured in America. They can be produced no where else. But before this can be secured, provision must be made by the Governments to afford encouragement to indigenous authorship. We cannot reasonably expect a multitude of works of a high character amongst ourselves, as long as American writers are met with the excuse, "It is not worth our while to pay you for your copy-right since your publishers can re-print the best English books for nothing."

Authors must enjoy some security for receiving the value of their labors, as well as other men. The only provision that is necessary is a law that will not permit the gratuitous re-publication of foreign works in the same language. As soon as such a law is established, American authors will be sufficiently protected and amply remunerated, and the same privileges will be extended to British authors, whether living or dead. No longer excluded from fair competition, American writers would produce books in greater abundance, and in a short time the advantages resulting from a purely national literature would be fully realized. Literary labor being more largely remunerated, will attract to itself greater numbers, and encourage to higher degrees of mental culture and effort. The nation will be more thoroughly instructed. Refusing to depend on foreign aid and learning, and thus to condemn its citizens to intellectual impotence and dwarfishness, it will at length, place itself in a favourable position for winning all those trophies of science which are the brightest ornaments of States.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE EARLY CONVERSION OF CHILDREN.

In the life of Dr. A. Alexander, is recorded this remark, "I have a favorite notion that this is a rich

uncultivated missionary field. There should be a class of preachers for children alone. If I were a young man, I would, God willing, choose that field." And again, "Sermons suited to children can be preached. I have tried it over and over, and I never had an audience more attentive, or who better understood my meaning."\*

This is, undoubtedly, the voice of wisdom; the suggestion is worthy of our most profound consideration. The rising generation of children and youth are the great hope of the world. And how long will the Church and Christian parents sleep over their most solemn responsibility in this matter? How few, even of those who have carried their children to the altar and dedicated them to the Saviour, fulfil their solemn pledges, to take those same little ones and train them for God.

It may not be expedient, at present, to act upon the suggestion of Dr. Alexander, and provide a set of preachers specially for children; but Christian parents can be awakened to duty; to preach, both by precept and example in their own families, to labour for the salvation of those standing in so new and interesting a relation to them.

And to a reflecting mind, and especially to a parent, what more interesting object than a new-born child? Weak, both in body and in mind, it has just started in a race towards a goal it will never reach; it has begun an existence that will never end, but run parallel with that of its Creator. Its future history all a blank—unwritten—unknown—save to the mind of Omniscience.

Whether the heir of joy or sorrow, of prosperity, or of diversity, no one in this world can tell.

What an object of tender love, and of anxious solicitude to the immediate cause of its being; and if a first born, how strong, and yet how strange that new affection, that, from the planting of our Creator, springs up in the parental bosom, simultaneous with the new relation and new responsibility. Angels we suppose, were created all at once; all by the same word of power, and in the possession of mature faculties, they started together the race of immortality. There is no such thing among them as successive generations. But a power almost

\* Pages 588, 584, quoted in *S. P. Review*, Oct. 1854, p. 201.

creative is conferred on creatures of a mortal race, to be the means of bringing into being others like themselves; to give being without the power of taking it away; to call up out of non-existence, a self-moving, conscious creature, and confer upon it, in einbryo, unmeasured expansion of spiritual life. It is more than probable that a power like this is given to creatures in no other world.

And can any who stand in so solemn a position in this world, giving birth to young immortals, *under a curse*, be unconcerned about the greatest of all concerns to those children so dependent on them? Whether they should be or not, under God, rested with them; and now, whether they shall be forever children of wrath, and heirs of eternal misery, or hold serapha' harps in the realms of glory, almost or quite as much depends on them.

By parental neglect, they may be led to say with the patient patriarch, "Let the day perish wherein I was born, and the night in which it was said, 'there is a man child conceived.' Let that day be darkness; let not God regard it from above, neither let the light shine upon it."\*

They may, in the end, wish they had never been born, rather than to have filled up life with sin and misery; than to have met a shameful end, and a disgraceful death: instead of doing what they might have done, in filling up life with usefulness and honour, and dying only to live again where life shall never end, instead of shining like the stars, forever and ever. They may curse forever the worse than neglect, the cruel hatred, as they then view it, of those who gave them being, but who, while attending, perhaps faithfully, to their physical wants, forgot that they had souls, and neglected to provide for their imperishable part.

Let us imagine the thoughts that at this moment fill the minds of lost souls in the world of woe, who might, and would have been saved, if at the proper time, and by proper attention, their parents had instructed them, restrained them, prayed for them, and laboured for their salvation, who were the children of the covenant, and to

\* Job iii: 3, &c.

whom the promises belonged. If they had sowed the good seed of the Word in the infant mind, and watered it with tears, and waited for the Divine blessing promised from on high. For God has established a sure connection between means and ends here, as well as in natural sowing and reaping.

But, by parental neglect of a plain duty, they lost their souls, their crown of life, their birthright of bliss.

And what will be their bitter reflections? They will think within themselves, God did not make us, as he did the angels, in the full exercise and maturity of our intellectual and moral powers, to govern and control ourselves from the first, but made us dependent on others who had them, to be exercised for our benefit. If that maturity of mind, and capacity of knowledge, that was in the angels at their creation, had been given to us at our birth, we would have done differently; our course of life, and our whole destiny, as rational beings and free agents, would have been more in our own hands, and at our own responsibility.

Or, if our parents, that by the law of nature, could not stand in such a relation till they had attained a good degree of knowledge and judgment, both for themselves and for their children, had exercised them in our behalf as God intended, we might have been drinking draughts ever fresh from the fountain of life, instead of draining dry the cup of the Almighty's wrath for our wayward courses.

These reflections are natural, and who will say that they are too strongly expressed? Who will say they are not in part true? For men do not lose their rationality when they lose their souls. Indeed, this internal action of the mind tearing and rending itself to pieces; this power of reflection, this exercise of reason and conscience, while the thoughts are accusing or excusing one another, and memory is adding fuel to the flame, is their torment.

And whatever efforts they may make to throw the responsibility of their destruction upon others, and whatever blame may attach to others in it, they cannot rid themselves notwithstanding, of the thought, that "they knew their duty, but did it not." Every one shall bear

his own burden. He cannot justify himself by the failure of others, but every effort to do so will be made.

Nor let it be supposed, that the reflections we have imagined to rise in the minds of the lost, are peculiar to those who have gone down to perdition from the families of Ministers of the Gospel, of elders, or even of private Christians. Or, that the duties to which we have alluded, are confined to professors of religion. All parents are under the same obligation to do all that one can do, to secure the welfare of those they have brought into being for eternity. These obligations are independent of the fact, whether they themselves, are Christians or not. They owe them to their children, when not within the pale of the Church, just as much as if they were. Neglect of duty to themselves, a failure to work out their own salvation, does not excuse their neglect of duty, both natural and revealed, to those who, but for them, would not have lived at all; and so, but for them, would not have run the fearful hazard of eternal loss. All ought to be children of God, that the promises may belong to *them*, and to their children. And he who entrusts so precious a treasure to their hands, as an immortal soul, the workmanship of Divine skill and power, will, undoubtedly, hold them responsible for its safe keeping, and safe return to him, to be laid up among his jewels; washed in his blood, sanctified and adorned by the graces of the Holy Spirit. We believe that the time must soon come when very different views will be entertained, at least by Christians, from what now obtain, in relation to the early conversion of children to God. We hope and believe, that the time is not far distant when the Christian world will look with astonishment at the apathy that has so long prevailed on the subject.

When, instead of regarding it as almost a miracle, a real prodigy, that a child from two or three, to ten years of age should be converted, and made to bear the fruit, and give evidence of solid, consistent, piety, efforts will generally, be made to secure such a result, and it will more generally be looked for as a matter of course, in Christian families at least, if no where else. And infant voices more frequently than now, will be heard

praising the Saviour who said,\* "suffer little children to come unto me," and who, out of the mouths of babes and sucklings has perfected praise. And what is needful for a consummation so devoutly to be wished?

1. That the church, by the constant presentation of truth and duty on this subject, be made to feel their responsibility in the matter. That parents and guardians be made to feel that they stand as the *trustees* of covenant blessings in behalf of the rising generation, more valuable than all the gold of California, and, as related to an endless life, more important to their welfare than all possible temporal provision can be. And that to secure these blessings, to those who are not so much separate beings, at least for a time, as shoots growing out of the parent stem; continuations of themselves, and having the same organic life, is the most solemn duty that can be thought of next after making their own calling and election sure. That they feel, that to make a great figure in this world, acquire an education, great wealth, and an establishment in life, to become famous in the eyes and in the history of the world, is nothing and less than nothing to their children, in comparison with gaining the true riches,—a crown of unfading glory, and being known of God above the stars.

And that whether or not, their children should be found there, and rise up and call them blessed in the heavenly mansions, depends on them, almost as much as their features, their bodily health and strength, their gait in walking, their tastes and dispositions. That it may almost be said the power of life and death, the keys of Paradise or of perdition, are in the hands of parents. That though they must be converted, and need the communication of Divine grace, in order to see the kingdom of God, yet that the conduct of the parents may secure, or prevent this heavenly gift. For it does not flow in natural channels as does the old corruption of the first Adam. The connection between the faith of the parent

\* Matt. xix: 13, 14; *παιδία*. So, in Mark x: 13, 14—a little child: in Luke xviii: 15, *βρέφη*, infant, babe. Comp. Matt. xxi: 16, *παισίν*, infants.



and that of the child, if it exist, is not by a natural, but by a supernatural link. Organic life communicates sin, not grace, for "eternal life is the gift of God."

2. That attention to this great object begin early, while sin is in embryo, as well as everything else pertaining to the new being. It should be a matter of plan, purpose, and distinct calculation at the earliest possible moment. Let it no sooner be announced "unto us a child is born, a son is given," than it is also resolved, that this child shall be given back to God, and made an heir of his. Do not men make arrangements in other respects, for the reception of the expected stranger before his arrival?—As if a messenger from Heaven,—a gem, a flower bud,—a cherub from the sky dropped into their bosoms? And why not, even before it opens its sparkling eyes for the first time on this beautiful world, begin to make preparation for polishing and refining that living gem, that whether it spend many or few days on the earth, it may be fitted for a place in the Saviour's crown of glory? Who can tell what impressions for good or for evil, can be made upon the mind and heart of the infant, long before he can articulate the first word? and before the developement of reason? There is a stamp of the character of the parent on the child, almost like the stamping of coin in the die.

"Many persons seem never to have brought their minds down close enough to an infant child to understand that anything of consequence is going on with it till after it has come to language, and become a subject thus of instruction. As if a child were to learn a language before it is capable of learning anything! Whereas, there is a whole era, so to speak, before language, which may be called the era of *impressions*, and these impressions are the seminal principles in some sense, of the activity that runs to language, and also of the whole future character. I strongly suspect that more is done in the age previous to language, to affect the character of children, whether by parents, or when they are waiting in indolent security, by nurses and attendants, than in all the instruction and discipline of their minority afterwards, for, in this first age, the age of impressions,

there goes out in the whole manner of the parent, the look, the voice, the handling,—an expression of feeling, and that feeling expressed, streams directly into the soul, and reproduces itself there, as by a law of contagion.

What man of adult age, who is at all observant of himself, has failed to notice the power that lies in a simple *presence*, even to him? To this power the infant is passive as the wax to the seal. When therefore, we consider how small a speck, falling into the nucleus of a crystal, may disturb its form, or how the smallest mote of foreign matter present in the quickening egg, will suffice to produce a deformity; considering also, on the other hand, what nice conditions of repose, in one case, and what accurately modulated supplies of heat in the other, are necessary to a perfect product, then only do we begin to imagine what work is going on in the soul of a child during the age of impressions. Suppose now, that all preachers of Christ could have their hearers for whole months, in their own will, after the same manner, so as to move them by a look, or motion, a smile, a frown, and act their own sentiments over in them, and then for whole years, had them in authority, to command, direct, tell them whither to go, what to learn, what to do, regulate their hours, their books, their pleasures, and their company, and call them to prayer over their knees every night and morning,—who that can rightly conceive such an organic acting of one being in many, will deem it extravagant, or think it a dishonour to the grace of God, to say that a power like this, may well be expected to fashion all who come under it to newness of life? “And what I here endeavor to do is, to awaken in our churches a sense of this power, and of the momentous responsibilities that accrue under it. I wish to produce an impression that God has not held us responsible for the effect only of what we do or teach, or for acts of control and government, but quite as much for the effect of our being what we are, that there is a plastic age in the house, receiving its type, not from our words, but from our spirit,—one whose character is sleeping in the moulds of our own.”\*

\* Bushnell's *Christian Nurture*, Princeton Review, Oct. 1847.

3. That Christian parents have impressed upon them the solemn obligations acknowledged in the ordinance of baptism. They have offered their children to God in the most solemn manner; they have vowed unto him and cannot go back. It is as if Christ received "the little children," at their hands, and then gave them back in trust, to be trained up in the way they should walk, just as the mother of Moses was employed to educate him for Pharaoh's daughter. It is true, the ordinance of baptism does not *create* the obligations of parents, but it tends to impress them, and to increase the fidelity of parents, by "*requiring* that they teach the child to read the word of God; that they instruct it in the principles of our holy religion, as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; \* \* \* that they *pray* and *wrestle* for it; that they set an example of piety and godliness before it, and endeavor by all the *means* of God's appointment, to bring up their child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."\* If parents fulfil their vows, they will, undoubtedly, be rewarded according to their faithfulness. The Saviour will give them for their hire, the souls of their beloved ones.

The conversion of any souls, is in answer to the prayer of faith; on the part of those who have an interest at a throne of grace, and what prayer will the Saviour answer sooner than that of a believing parent in behalf of the child that has been given to him in the arms of faith? Especially, when he says he is *more ready* to give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him, than earthly parents are to give good gifts to their children? Every new generation of believers is born again by the Spirit, through the faith of preceding believers, who are their spiritual progenitors. When, then, natural, parental affection is combined with Christian parental love, with importunity "offering up its desires to God for things agreeable to his holy will," and it is known that he has said, "*suffer* little children to come unto me," will he not regard such prayer? Will he not hear the father's and mother's prayers in behalf of their children?

\* Presbyterian Confession of Faith.

And if their ardent wishes ascend in their behalf, even before they see the light, while receiving a sinful nature in Adam, their being born under that head, may be only a prelude to their transfer, by a simultaneous second birth, through the same parentage, instrumentally considered, to a new head in Christ. While parents are giving birth to one nature, they may at the same time, be travailing in birth with a second nature, "the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness." And the transition may be immediate, from a state of death and condemnation, to a state of life and justification. The parents may sustain that relation in a double sense, at the same time: the outer man bearing their image, but the inner man the image of Christ.

And if the same heavenly agent must do the work at last, why wait till sin grows rampant?—till depravity has grown with the growth, and strengthened with the strength of the child?—till Satan has set up his strong holds in the heart? You can break down the little shoot just springing out of the acorn, but let it stand till it becomes the majestic oak, throwing its arms wide, and pushing up its top towards the sky, and the strength of a Samson will not suffice to break or uproot it. And though it may be said, that it is all the same to the power of Divine grace that works, when, where, and to what degree He pleases, yet we know as a matter of fact, that very few old and hardened transgressors are converted, and that the longer men pursue the path of sin, the less probability there is that they will find the path of life.

4. That advantage be taken of that confidence that naturally exists in children towards their parents.

It is through confidence in the teacher that religious truth finds its way to the heart of the pupil. And what a strong link is here! Children early learn to quote the words of their parents for authority. Let them then employ this influence to impress the truth, and lead to its belief. It is natural for children to adopt the opinion and sentiments of their parents on *other subjects*, and why not on this, the most important of all? "The influence or power which the judicious parent acquires

over the child is great, and in such hands, naturally tends to beneficial purposes."\*

5. And let it be remembered, that the outline of Gospel truth, sufficient to be the means of conversion, lies in a small compass, and may be easily understood. Those things that are hid from the worldly-wise and self-sufficient, are revealed unto babes. To know that there is a God who deserves to be loved, and that they are sinful for not loving him, can be understood very early. Very young children can feel compunctions of conscience for doing wrong. They can pray; they can repent; they can love the Saviour, and be made sensible of his goodness in dying for them. They can feel their need of his cleansing blood.

That very truth that is most needful to be known as a means of conversion, its Author has made plain and easy to those who seek after wisdom. Children may learn the fear of the Lord: they that seek him early shall find him.

6. They can show evidence of their conversion by their works. Perhaps not altogether in the same way as older persons, and more mature minds. Their experience will be that of children, but there may be more of the simplicity of Christ, more tenderness of conscience, more yielding to the authority of the Divine word, so far as known, than in older persons. They will be more lovely and sweet in their tempers and dispositions; they will love their parents, brothers and sisters more, and seek the salvation of their unconverted friends.

Nor are we left without examples of persons made heirs of God in childhood. Many such are recorded in the Bible. Samuel, the prophet, was sanctified in infancy; Jeremiah was sanctified before birth, and ordained a prophet unto the nations.† The same is true of John the Baptist.‡ And though we cannot tell at what time of life Timothy was converted, yet we know that he had a pious mother and grandmother, whose "unfeigned faith" he had followed, and that from a child he had known the Holy Scriptures.§

\* See the "Moral Power of the Domestic Constitution," in Anderson's Family Book.

† Jeremiah i: 5. ‡ Luke i: 15. § 2 Tim. i: 8; iii: 15.

Nor is the work of that Spirit, whose operations, as Christ has taught us, in his discourse with Nicodemus, are so mysterious, in the conversion of infants, and very young children, confined to the age of miracles, or of inspiration. Modern times have furnished many proofs of this. The history of the church records the experiences of many of the lambs of Christ's flock that he has gathered in his arms.

President Edwards, in giving an account of the great work of grace in New-England, about the middle of the last century, remarks, "*The souls of very many little children have been remarkably enlightened, and their hearts wonderfully affected and enlarged, and their mouths opened, expressing themselves in a manner far beyond their years, and to the just astonishment of those that heard them; and some of them from time to time, for many months, greatly and delightfully affected with the glory of divine things, and the excellency and love of the Redeemer, with their hearts greatly filled with love to, and joy in him, and have continued to be serious, and pious, in their behaviour.*"\* And again, "God in this work has shown a remarkable regard to little children; *never was there such a glorious work amongst persons in their childhood, as has been of late in New-England. He has been pleased in a wonderful manner, to perfect praise out of the mouths of babes and sucklings.*"

Cotton Mather says of John Clap, who died at the age of thirteen, "from his infancy he discovered a singular delight in the Holy Scriptures, whereby he was made wise unto salvation, and he also made himself yet further amiable by his obedience to his parents, and his courtesy to all his neighbours." "Anne Greenough left the world when she was but about five years old, and yet gave astonishing discoveries of a regard unto God and Christ, and her own soul, before she went away." These, and several other such cases, the author "preserved and published for the encouragement of piety in other children."†

Others have recorded similar examples of those who

\* Old Edition, Part i., page 59, and Part iii., page 186.

† Mather's *Magnolia* Ed., 1853, vol. 2, pp. 480, 485.

were young in years, but old in grace. David Brown, who died at the age of four and a half years, loved the Saviour, prayed, sung, and recited hymns. He feared not death. Louisa Mortlock gave evidence of having a new heart after four years of age, and died at about ten. She read the Bible at five. She felt deeply, the evil of sin, and trusted in the merits of Christ for pardon. She manifested a deep interest in the spiritual welfare of her friends, remarking to her sister, "the hope of glory through the blood of Christ makes me happy."—See Prov. xx: 11.

But time would fail us to speak of Jas. Jones, Mooney Mead, Mary Lathrop, Phebe Bartlett, Margaret Walton, and others, whose names are in the Book of Life, and who, in the morning of their days, were gathered into the fold of the Good Shepherd.

We cannot forbear to quote however, the following most touching incident: "A little girl, in a family of my acquaintance, a lovely and precious child, lost her mother at an age too early to fix the loved features in her remembrance. She was beautiful; and as the bud of her heart unfolded, it seemed as if won by that mother's prayers to turn instinctively heavenward. The sweet, conscientious, and prayer-loving child, was the idol of the bereaved family. But she faded away early. She would lie upon the lap of the friend who took a mother's kind care of her, and, winding one wasted arm about her neck, would say, "Now tell me about my mamma!"

And when the oft told tale had been repeated, she would ask softly, "Take me into the parlor; I want to see my mamma!" The request was never refused; and the affectionate sick child would lie for hours, gazing on her mother's portrait. But

Pale and wan she grew, and weakly,—  
Bearing all her pains so meekly,  
That to them she still grew dearer,  
As the trial hour grew nearer.

That hour came at last, and the weeping neighbours assembled to see the little child die. The dew of death was already on the flower, as its life-sun was going down.

“Do you know me, darling?” sobbed close in her ear, the voice that was dearest, but it awoke no answer. All at once a brightness, as if from the upper world, burst over the child’s colourless countenance. The eye lids flashed open, and the lips parted; the wan, curdling hands flew up, in the little one’s last impulsive effort, as she looked piercingly into the far above. “Mother!” she cried, with surprise and transport in her tone, and passed with that breath to her mother’s bosom.”\*

It is the general belief that infants, dying in infancy, “coming forth like a flower and cut down,” are the purchase of Christ’s death, and among those whom it was his purpose to save; that those, whom God in his holy providence, has determined to remove from the chilly blasts of this sinful world, and to transplant to a more congenial clime to bloom beneath the rays of the Sun of Righteousness, will be purified by the blood, and sanctified by the Spirit of our Lord, and trained under his immediate inspection, by angels, for his more complete service.

We believe that none can bring a clean thing out of an unclean, and that the human race are altogetherborn in sins; that were an infant from the best of families, so far as he derives anything from Adam, taken at birth, and carried to the purest place in any other planet, where it would be exposed to no corrupt communications, or evil examples from others, he would still need justification and regeneration in order to be happy; and that, though incapable of exercising any conscious experience of faith and repentance, yet as he has without any agency of his own, come into union with Adam, and hence come under condemnation in him, so as the counterpart of that, and without any personal agency of his own, and before capable of accountability, he may be found in Christ, and made a partaker of the redemption purchased by him. No sooner is the poison of sin infused into the souls of such, than the remedy meets, counteracts and subdues it, and grace reigns forever; so that there is never in them the conscious working of sin and Satan. In this way, according to the purpose of

\* Harbaugh’s *Celestial Recognition*, Ed. 1852, pp. 209, 210.



him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, Heaven is filled with an innumerable company. For a very large proportion of the human race die in infancy. "Elect infants dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where, and how he pleaseth."\* And we have the authority of Christ himself for saying, that "of such is the kingdom of God," (Luke xviii: 16,) and of Paul that, at least externally, they are holy.—(1 Cor. vii: 4.

"Let it be recollected that not far from *one-half* of the children which are born die in infancy, or early childhood, and there is reason to believe are happy in a future world, their faculties being expanded at death, so as to prepare them for the full enjoyment of Heaven."† This is the argument of Dr. Gregory, in opposition to the objection of infidels that God "makes the *greater portion* of his intelligent creatures forever unhappy."

Admit his statement, and how many millions have been translated to Heaven from this sin-stricken world, with scarcely a taste of sin or death! We look upon those thus snatched away, just as they were when removed from our sight, as is the case with those from whom we have been separated on earth; we think of them as we last saw them. But, as the latter are growing in stature, and developing in intellect, during the separation, and at length we behold with surprise, the great change, so, with our prattling babes, the delight of our eyes, how great will be our surprise to recognise them grown up under the tutorship of angels, and their minds expanded with fuller measures of knowledge than ours, who have lived on earth so much longer!

In the time when infanticide prevailed at the Sandwich Islands, a mother sent away an infant daughter to share the common fate of such, but the bearer, without her knowledge, saved the life of the child, and took it to another island and reared it; at length after the introduction of Christianity, and the infant had grown to

\* *Prea. Conf. Faith*, ch. x: sec. 8. Do. in *Cumb. Conf.* x: 8. Do. in *Conf. adopted by Synod of N. E. at Boston, 1680*; *Mather's Mag.* vol. 2, page 190, ed. 1853. Do. *Synod of Dort*.

† *Gregory's Evidences*, page 448.

woman's estate, she was restored to the arms of the astonished and delighted mother. And what a meeting was that, after such a separation! It was truly as life from the dead!

So, when the mother meets on high,  
The babe she lost in infancy,  
Hath she not then, for pains and fears,—  
The day of woe, the watchful night,—  
For all her sorrow, all her tears,—  
An *over-payment* of delight?

The following beautiful Hymn is from the pen of a great man, who, when President of the United States, repeated the prayers his mother taught him:

That inextinguishable beam,  
With dust united at our birth,  
Sheds a more dim, discoloured gleam,  
The more it lingers upon earth.

But when the Lord of mortal breath  
Decrees his bounty to resume,  
And points the silent shaft of death  
Which speeds an infant to the tomb;

No passion fierce, no low desire,  
Has quenched the radiance of the flame;  
Back to its God the living fire  
Reverts unclouded as it came.

Then at the Heavenly Father's hand,  
Nearest the throne of living light,  
Behold the infant seraphs stand  
And dazzling shine where all are bright.

If then, it be the will of our Heavenly Father, that those whom he has decreed to remove before the period of personal accountability, should enjoy the efficacious influences of the Spirit, why not much more those whom he has decreed to remain here, to grow up in time, and under parental instruction? Why not expect regenerating influence, almost as a matter of course, in the latter case, as well as in the former? It is the same power that does the work in both cases, and if the children of Christians are not sanctified in infancy, let them remember, that sanctifying grace is abundant, and ready in the hands of Christ, who has received gifts for men, and moreover, if they have true faith, that is the channel

ready provided for that grace to flow through, and they must beware lest it be said in the end, "Ye *had* not because ye asked not," when they see their children on the left hand of the Judge.

God does regard his holy covenant; he cannot deny himself. The Church is an organized body, perpetuating itself. It is true, that in its progress, it incorporates some foreign elements; it draws in many from the world that lieth in wickedness, and makes them fellow-citizens with the saints; but the main body, from generation to generation, is from within itself. As the gulf stream along our coast, passes through the waters of the ocean, commingling in some small degree, though for the most part, preserving its own, so is the course of the church in the midst of an adulterous and sinful generation.

If statistics could be collected from most of our churches, we should, in all probability, be astonished at the result.

It was found that, in a congregation in one of the Northern States, where two-thirds of the attendants were not professors of religion, there were added to the church, in a course of years, five hundred members, and out of these, *four hundred and eighty* were the children of the church, and of the covenant.

It is a great blessing to be connected with the household of faith, even externally. "It is a fact, that a comparatively large proportion of the descendants of the pious themselves, for many generations, become true Christians." "Some of the most devotedly pious people of this land, are the descendants of the Hugonots, who were expelled from France. A very large proportion of the piety in this country has been derived from the "Pilgrims," who landed on the rock of Plymouth, and God has blessed their descendants in New England and elsewhere, with numerous revivals of religion. We are acquainted with the descendants of John Rogers, the first martyr in Queen Mary's reign, of the tenth and eleventh generations. With a single exception, the oldest son in the family has been a clergyman,—some of them eminently distinguished for learning and piety, and there are few families in this land, a greater proportion of whom are more pious than that family.

The Secretary of the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society, in 1838, made a limited investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the facts about the religious character of the families of Ministers and Deacons, with reference to the charge so often urged, that the "sons and daughters of Ministers and Deacons were worse than common children." In 268 families he found 1290 children over fifteen years of age. Of these, 884, almost three-fourths, were hopefully pious; 794 had united with the churches; 61 entered the ministry; only 17 are dissipated, and about half only of these became so while with their parents. In eleven of these families, there are 123 children, and all but seven pious. In fifty-six families, there are 249 children over fifteen, and all hopefully pious.\*

There are many advantages in early conversion. We can but just indicate a few of them:

1. It is, humanly speaking, easier, and the longer a person lives at enmity with God, the less hope of his conversion.

2. True piety makes children more lovely and obedient, and causes more satisfaction to parents. An ungodly child is a fountain of misery to both father and mother.

3. If they live they will be saved from many sins of youth. And how many suffer deep remorse all the latter part of life for these. So prays the Psalmist, "Remember not against me the sins of my youth."†

4. They will be better qualified to serve God as they grow up. Their piety will increase in power, and become the habit of the soul. It will prevent the formation of sinful habits to be broken up and corrected afterward.

5. If they die early, their great work will be done; and if they live, they will have so much longer time to lay up treasure in Heaven.

1. This subject has an important bearing on the conversion of the world, and the introduction of the millennium. Piety must flourish in the family, then its diffu-

\* Rev. A. Barnes' Com. Isa. ch. lix: 21.

† Ps. xxv: 1. See also, Job xiii: 26, xx: 11; 2 Tim. ii: 22.

sive influence spread through the church, and then, like leaven, it will spread over the world. The love of the Christian heart will first embrace friend, parent, brother, his country next, and then the human race. The moral power of progress in the church is *home piety*. This is the nursery where souls are born into the kingdom and trained up for glory. Here are the centres of that influence that is felt, and will be to the uttermost parts of the earth, and to the remotest ages of time. This is the real missionary spirit, that carries the sons and daughters of the church to the arid wastes of Africa, the burning clime of India, or to the snows and ice of Greenland, to seek the welfare of their race.

2. It is both impossible and absurd, that the minds of children shall be left free from all bias till they come to maturity, and exercise their own choice as to the opinions they shall adopt, as is often claimed by infidels. The seeds of sin and error are already planted; unless checked and restrained by pious culture, they will grow and bear fruit unto death. Instead of being left free and untrammelled, to make choice, the die is cast, the soul is committed; and to leave the matter there is to give great vantage ground to the enemy. Train up a child in the way he *should go*, or he *will go* in the wrong way.

3. There is great value in church relations and privileges, if rightly improved. It is a great blessing to be a member of a Christian family, and hence "*holy*," in the sense of the apostle. God remembers mercy to a thousand generations of them that love him and keep his commandments. The estimate that should be put upon such a connection with the church, as follows the line of Christian parentage, may be seen by comparing the influence brought to bear upon the mind and heart in a well ordered household, where God, and his law, and his ordinances are honoured, with those that tend to prove the character in the families of the irreligious, the worldly, the profane. By comparing the condition of those placed by Providence under the discipline and instruction of persons of consistent piety, with the families of the heathen, who call not upon the name of God, but whose tender mercies are cruelty, we may see what

they lost, when broken off from their own olive tree, to whom once belonged "the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God and the promises."

They rejected the Messiah and he rejected them, and the unbelief and guilt of the fathers are perpetuated in their children to the latest generations, while we, Gentiles, succeed to the inheritance, and stand, while we do stand, *by faith*.

And it is a thought that should weigh heavily on the minds of ungodly heads of families, that they are sinning, not only against their own souls, but depriving their children of a great blessing. It is often remarked of those who have been connected with the church, and have taken offence at the truth, and turned persecutors of godly Ministers, that their families become irreligious, dissipated, and go to ruin. "Yea," says a quaint old divine, "you may sometimes mark it in our churches; a church has long enjoyed an excellent Minister, but they grow at length full of unaccountable prejudices against him: the Son of God seeing this, their folly, sends for that Minister away to Heaven presently, and lets them supply themselves with such another when they can find him."

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### BLEDSON'S THEODICY.

*A Theodicy; or vindication of the Divine glory, as manifested in the Constitution and government of the moral world. By ALBERT TAYLOR BLEDSON, Professor of Mathematics in the University of Mississippi. 1854.*

We feel rather surprised that this book says nothing about poor, dear, Michael Servetus. It omits also, the nasal psalms of the ancient covenanters;—says nothing about the burning of witches in New England;—nothing

about the grief of St. Augustine at parting with his concubine. But, to judge from what does appear, and from the spirit of the book, those things will come yet, in some future edition, when the author's heart shall be set up in types, in complete form. Though the book is one of higher pretensions, and in some respects, of decidedly superior merits, to the common anti-Calvinistic tracts, in which our Methodist brethren take delight; yet the same hot and half-phrenzied antipathy to the theology of the apostle Paul, appears in it, whenever, in an unguarded page, the passions of the soul break through the incrustations of calm philosophic dignity in which it is intended to be written.

During the summer of 1854, Professor Bledsoe was elected by the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia, to be Professor of Mathematics in that institution, and was accordingly, transferred from the University of Mississippi, in which he had held the similar chair, to the University of Virginia. Simultaneously with the appearance of the new, learned, and distinguished Professor in Virginia, was the appearance of this new work of his; not on subjects usually held to lie within the peculiar province of a Professor of Mathematics, but upon some of the deepest questions of moral and theological speculations of all time. The simultaneous appearance of the author and his book among us, was well adapted to give an acceptance to the book which it might not otherwise have attained. Then, although the book is on a subject on which no man has any business to inquire at all, as no man possesses either the means or the capacity to inquire; and if any man does inquire at all, it ought to be long after his undergraduate age, in his sober and mature years,—yet it has evident adaptation to captivate wayward, passionate, aspiring, young minds; is artfully addressed to those “*who may possess both the desire and the capacity to think for themselves,*” and can be held guiltless, we think, by no reader of its pages, of a wish and an attempt, to create fierce and passionate prejudices, by its constant raillery, and its frequently genuine wit, against a large class of the Christian community. In all this, we do not intend to utter one syllable of complaint. We shall admit the largest freedom

on such matters to be the best policy. We shall even admit a change of the good old Latin maxim: *Cuique in sua arte credendum*. So it used to read. But if the Professor of Mathematics wished to teach theology, or theodicy, so be it. We shall enter no protest, though the maxim be henceforth held, in the Virginia University, to read: *Cuique in altera arte credendum*;—and the other wise old saw be also newly set to read: *Omnes possumus omnia*. We say we shall make no complaint of those things, and enter no protest, but simply indicate, before hand, our reasons for treating this book, as we may be able, and as will appear further on in this article.

The great question of the Theodicy, is the great question on which men who love to speculate upon the unrevealed secrets of God, and think themselves capable of doing so, have been prone to try their flights in all ages: **HOW CAME SIN INTO THE WORLD?** To this question the following solution is given; page 197:

“The question why God permitted sin seems to be an unmeaning question. It is unmeaning because it seeks to ascertain the reason why God has permitted a thing which in reality, he has not permitted at all. Having created a world of moral agents; that is, a world endowed with the power to sin, it was impossible for him to prevent sin, so long as they continued to exist as moral agents. A universe of such agents given, its liability to sin is not a matter for the will of God to permit; this is a necessary consequence from the nature of moral agents. He could no more deny peccability to such creatures than he could deny the properties of the circle to a circle; and if he could not prevent such a thing, it is surely very absurd to ask why he permitted it. On the supposition of such a world, God did not permit sin at all. It could not have been prevented.”

This is sufficiently intelligible. It is the fundamental proposition of the book. It is not new. But so bold an espousal of it has rarely occurred. It has sometimes ✓ been brought out as a mere hypothetical mode of escape from the atheistic question, why God did not prevent sin, if he was omnipotent, and hated sin. But our author adopts it, not as a hypothesis, but as a fact;—not



because he *needs* it, but because he *likes* it;—not merely against the atheist, nor principally against the atheist, but also and principally, against the Calvinist. And he seems heartily to adopt that peculiar mode of mental philosophy, as to the nature of moral agents, which removes the human soul from under Divine influence, which necessarily goes along with his theory; we quote from page 194:

“If infinite wisdom, and goodness, and power, should muster all the means and appliances in the universe, and cause them to bear with united energy on a single mind, the effect produced, however grand and beautiful, would not be the virtue of the agent in whom it is produced. Nothing can be his virtue which is produced by an extraneous agency. This is a dictate of the universal reason and consciousness of mankind.”

Many other declarations to this effect might be produced, but this is sufficient, and will hardly be denied by any one, to be a fair statement of the doctrine of the book in relation to the influence of motives on the human mind, or as they are called, “extraneous agencies.” The Book is equally explicit in denying the efficiency of the other mode of influence over the human soul, usually ascribed to God, that is, the influence of the Divine Spirit within the heart; page 353:

“All divines admit, says Bayle, that God can infallibly produce a good act of the will in a human soul, without depriving it of the use of liberty.” “This is no longer admitted,” says Professor Bledsoe. “We call it in question. We deny that such an act can be produced, either with, or without depriving the soul of liberty. We deny that it can be produced at all; for whatever God may produce in the human soul, this is not, this cannot be, the moral goodness or virtue of the soul in which it is produced. In other words, it is not, and cannot be, an object of praise or of moral approbation in him whom it is thus caused to exist.”

The reader will see from these passages, the fairness of which we do not fear that any reader of the book will question, to what an immense, and cold, and comfortless, distance from God, this book removes the soul of man. He will also, begin to see *what that thing is*, which Pro-

fessor Bledsoe calls the liberty, or freedom, of the human will. He will begin to perceive that by freedom of the will, he means its exemption, not only from subjection to God, but exemption also from the influence of truth, reason, wisdom, prudence, and every other motive of past, present, or future; heaven, earth or hell. The only exception to this remark, now remembered, is found in a glaring contradiction to the main philosophy of the book, into which the exigencies of his position drive him in the later chapters, of which we shall speak in its place. But here we shall let the author speak further, and explicitly for himself; page 133:

"It is universally agreed, that every state of the intelligence and of the sensibility is necessarily determined by the evidence and the object in view of the mind. It is not, then, either in the intelligence, or in the sensibility, that we are to look for liberty." And again, on page 135:

"The mind is passive in judging and feeling, and hence these phenomena *necessarily demand* the operation of causes to account for them; but the mind is active in its volitions, and this *necessarily excludes* the idea of causes to produce them." A more glaring exhibition of a *felo-de-se* of its own principles, in its very obvious drift, than this last sentence furnishes, as indicated by our own italics, we have rarely met with. That, however, simply by the way. The reader will be good enough to notice that it is one of the peculiar crotchets of Professor Bledsoe's psychology, that mental activity cannot have a cause; that because volitions are *active*, they cannot have been produced by a cause. This is one of the most obvious fallacies of the book. No proof is presented, that we remember. We are very sure that no adequate proof can be presented. And we do not believe that any intelligent reader needs anything more, to induce him to reject it, than the positive denial which is all we have time now to give it, and with which we appeal to ten thousand experiences of every thinking man, every week in the year.

But to permit the book further to describe itself; p. 60:

"We deny that volitions and their antecedents are necessarily connected."

And again, on page 153:

“ We lay it down then, as an established and fundamental position, that the mind acts, or puts forth its volitions, without being efficiently caused to do so,—without being impelled by its own prior action, or by the prior action of anything else. The conditions or occasions of volition being supplied, the mind itself acts in view thereof, without being subject to the power or action of any cause whatever. All rational beings must, as we have seen, either admit this exemption of the mind in willing, from the power and action of any cause, or else lose themselves in the labyrinth of an infinite series of causes. It is this exemption which constitutes the freedom of the human will.”

Why one cannot acknowledge the BLESSED SPIRIT OF God, as one single cause of the action of the human will, without being driven between the horns of the dilemma of no cause, or an infinite series of causes, we never expect to be able to see. But so reasons the Professor of Mathematics of the University of Virginia! And such are the theology, and the mental philosophy, of this book, stated in the most definite utterances we have been able to select from its pages.

He maintains that God could not have prevented sin from entering the world without destroying the freedom of the mind of man;—that holiness produced by the power of God, or as it is called necessary holiness, (that is, holiness having a cause,) is a contradiction in terms, and never is seen in fact;—that the Holy Spirit of God could not overcome the opposition of the will of all sinners; and consequently, that there are a part of mankind whose salvation is impossible even with God. It is said on page 302: “ *We believe that salvation is impossible to some*, because a necessary holiness is impossible, and they do not choose to work out for themselves what cannot be worked out for them, even by omnipotence. It was the bright and cheering light which this truth seemed to cast upon the dark places of the universe, that first inspired us with the thought and determination to produce a theodicy.”

If the fundamental principle of the philosophy of this book was true, that impression produced on the under-

standings and sensibilities of men, their prejudices and their passions, have no necessary connection with the determination of their wills, then we should at once admit that it was time thrown away to notice the book at all; for, out of its own mouth, it would follow, that the determination of the wills of the readers of the book, to turn away from what we think the basis of all comforting religion, would not be "subject to the power or action of any cause whatever," brought to bear upon them on the pages of the book itself. But, as we are sure that all the wit and logic of the Theodicy to the contrary notwithstanding, the wills of men will continue to be under the influence of judgments, of prejudices, and of motives, and that it is now, as it was in the garden of Eden of old, that when the worst is made to appear the better cause, the will follows the impressions on the judgment, we admit that we think the book a dangerous one. It is the more dangerous, the more false it is, by self-demonstration.

The Theodicy derives its name from a work by the great Leibnitz, of a very different stripe however, on the same general subject. In point of style, it is among the most readable and transparent of all books of its kind. The wit with which, when he cannot refute them, he whistles down the wind, such old fogies as Augustine, Calvin, and Edwards, is often genuine and pleasing. There is another extremely dangerous attraction about this book. With a good deal of shallow gladiation, in which the author jumps to a conclusion against one of the old giants without having seen more than the surface of that giant's thought, and shouts victory, after a fencing match with the giant's shadow, yet there is a deification of human reason, manifested throughout the work, a daring hopefulness of being able to grapple with the grandest of the state secrets of the court of Heaven, and a contemptuous sneer, everywhere more or less visible, at the expense of those prudent ones who warn us off from such inquiries, as if the prudent had no other reason than a fear that the brave thinkers would discover the shallow tricks of all prudence and caution; which are very dangerous to a certain class of bold and wrestless minds. He who accepts the *limitations* of his

religious inquiries from the Bible, as well as the solutions of them, and is content to speculate concerning the counsels of Heaven no farther than Heaven has seen fit to reveal those counsels, will pretty certainly escape the fascinations of this book; but then he will about as certainly be a Calvinist. And when, under the pretext of refuting the atheist and the Calvinist, the spirit of intellectual pride and self-confidence is as boldly invoked as it is in this book, it requires very little observation of the ordinary history of such mental epidemics as Coleridgeism, Emersonism, Taylorism, and Optimism, to see that many more of miserable and dream-haunted skeptics are made, than there are of atheists or Calvinists reclaimed. By a deep and fearful nemesis of God, men who thus spend their time in trying to give another account of the Fall than the simple one which God has given, often *re-enact the fall*;—Lucifer, son of the morning, sinks down to a loss of all his glory, for presuming to be equal with God; man is driven from the bowers of bliss forever, for eating the forbidden fruit of the knowledge of good and evil. Neither Lucifer, nor Adam, nor the man who awakes in youthful bosoms, the spirit of restless speculation beyond the confines of Divine Revelation, has the privilege of falling alone. They all pull down many hapless spirits with them. ✓

The easy and merry facility with which this author frequently deems himself to have refuted President Edwards, the actual contempt with which that great man is treated, the different appearance of Edwards on the pages of the Theodicy, from that which he makes on his own pages, as well as the dignity and importance of the matter itself, all require us to look closely at the reasonings of the Theodicy concerning the will, and the influence of motives over it. The giant error of the book lies there. We hope we may be fortunate enough to give the reader such an insight into it, though so sadly cooped up by the limits of a single article, that he may afterwards deliberately and thoroughly unravel it for himself. In order to do so, we must attend closely to the author's various expressions of his own idea, as it occurs on different pages of the book, to see whether he does not himself do exactly that with which he has the hardi-

hood to charge Jonathan Edwards: "establish his proposition in one sense and build on it in another." We have seen, on a former page, that Professor Bledsoe denies that volitions and their antecedents are necessarily connected; denies that convictions of the judgment, or impressions on the sensibilities, control the will at all; denies indeed, that volitions have any efficient cause or antecedent of any kind. Here is another of the utterances of the book on the subject. It is found on PAGE 155: "But in truth, the freedom of the mind does not consist in its possessing a power over the determinations of its own will, for the true notion of freedom is a negative idea, and consists in the absence of every power over the determination of the will. The mind is free because it possesses a power of acting, over which there is no controlling power, either within or without itself." And here also, is another,—one of the most deliberate and measured declarations of the whole book—the enunciation of one of his prodigious victories over the shadows of some of the giants, which shadows he has conjured up for his own especial conquest. It is found on page 152: "Hence we conclude that an act of the mind, or a volition, is not produced by the action of either mind or motive, but takes its rise in the world without any such efficient cause of its existence." This is the proposition on which he builds. We shall expect to see presently, that this is not the proposition which he establishes, if there be one at all, of which that honour may be predicated. But a word concerning this the main position of the book. There are no words of more frequent occurrence on the pages of the Theodicy, than an appeal to the "universal voice and reason of man,"—"the universal voice and consciousness of man,"—"the universal intelligence of man,"—"the unbiassed reason of man." To that court of appeals then, we will go with him. We affirm that the free moral agency above described, is the moral agency of a *mad-house*, and of no other place, or world, that we know anything of, that ever did, or can exist; and for the truth of the remark we will go to individual consciousness, to our own observations upon other people, ten thousand times every year of our own lives, as the creatures of motives and

of impulses; to the implications contained in all human words and forms of expression on the subject; to all we learn from the pages of history, about the arts by which statesmen have wielded the governments of nations of men; and lastly to the views which all writers have given of human nature who have been famous for fidelity in delineations of that description. No dramatist ever did, or ever will, indite either tragedy or comedy, to give correct views of human nature, out of a Lunatic Asylum, on the principles of moral agency on which the Theodicy is built. No statesman ever dreamed of adopting any such principles for the government of rational beings capable of law. And all forms of expression in human language—even the very name of the thing under discussion itself: *moral agent*,—imply the influence of motives over volitions. The independence of the choices of the mind of man upon the character of the mind itself, and upon motives in the external world around, may be an admirable theory with which to attack Calvinism. It may be capable of beautiful and plausible arrangement in a Theodicy. It may even commend itself, as a speculation, to the adoption of many of those peculiar persons who are fond of frost-work speculations. But the mischief of the matter is, that *nature* will not adopt the theory. You may make it as a basis on which to build a great amount of inference, and inference which may deeply gratify your prejudices. But then, the theory is not TRUE. It melts the moment the sunshine of fact strikes it. Neither statesmen, nor lawyers, nor professors, nor preachers, ever lay plans on the theory of the Theodicy. The book itself could never have seen the light on its own theory. We have seen, on a former page, by its own confession, that a certain consideration, in regard to the brightness of his system, has the credit of having “*first inspired us*, (the Professor,) with the thought and *determination* to produce a Theodicy.” In this confession, from the book itself, that it owes its existence to the *determination* of its author’s will by motive, we find a refutation of the whole theory of the book, and a magnificent tribute to the unextinguishable “voice and reason of man.” Although men may speculatively believe in the system of the Theodicy, yet, until

✓ they shall have been driven, by sad calamity, to the lunatic condition of a will unhinged from the desires of the heart, and the convictions of the judgment, they cannot either speak, or act, or compose theodicies, or any other books, on the system of this theodicy. Whether you expel nature with a pitch-fork, or a theory, she will still incessantly return upon you. She brings down all castles of speculation erected against her authority, as the sun brings down the bright but chilly bowers of February frost. And while you stand sighing over the fallen and crushed mass of the icy sheen, the sunshine will soon persuade you that truth and nature are better than shining theory.

✓ The theory of Prof. Bledsoe's Theodicy is no more the theory of the Bible than it is the theory of the thought, and speech, and action, of practical life. Can any reader explain how it is, that good and wise men should feel called upon to write books to explain how sin entered into this world, without paying the slightest attention, or without any more than the slightest attention, to the account given of that great fact, in a book which they admit to be the inspired word of God? The simple account there given, of the entrance of sin into the world, is that a motive for disobedience was presented to the mind of Eve, which, owing to her state of mind, and to the false impressions produced on her judgment, by the arguments of the Tempter, seemed stronger to her than the motive to obedience. But there is not in the book of Genesis, or in any other place in the Bible, anything which looks, in the least degree, like an intention on the part of the Holy Spirit, to make the impression that God could not have prevented the fall of Eve without destroying the free agency of Eve. ✓ And if this theory of the Theodicy can be fairly engrafted upon the religious systems of the country, in the silence of the word of God on the subject, then so also can the Roman Catholic doctrines of purgatory, and of the invocation of Saints, and of prayers for the dead, be fairly engrafted upon the religious systems of the country, and with not one iota less of authority. The account given in the Scriptures of the successful resistance of the Tempter by the Saviour, is not, that when the Tempter plied him



with misapplied quotations from the sacred oracles, he resisted them by means of the freedom of his mind from the influence of motives,—not that his will acted “in the absence of every power of determination,”—not that his “volitions took their rise in the world “without any efficient cause of their existence.” The account is, that the proper motives clearly and fairly appeared to his divine understanding, and determined him to perfect obedience. And the statement made in the Scriptures of the grounds on which the salvation of men depends is, that the tremendous motives of God’s word are made efficient by the operation of the Divine Spirit. But, we must not yet bring our author further before a tribunal to which he so rarely appeals, as he does to the Scriptures, in this part of his work. We shall go with him to the “universal voice and reason of man,” while he wishes to go thither. We shall go with him to the Scriptures when he shall choose to go thither, which we shall see anon.

We are now fully ready to affirm, and appeal to the reader, and to the “universal reason and voice of man,” for the truth of the remark, that on the principles of this book, neither sin, holiness, nor moral agency, could ever have entered into this world at all. We mean to say that this book is justly and fairly chargeable with those very principles, destructive of all responsible and accountable agency, which, by means of false metaphysics, it endeavours to fix upon Calvinism. If “the mind is free because it possesses a power of acting, over which there is no controlling power either within or without itself,”—if its volitions “take their rise in the world without any such efficient cause of their existence” as motives, then man is not a creature to be governed by laws and motives, by rewards and punishments. Eve was only acting in accordance with the laws of her nature, in eating the forbidden fruit. In giving her a command not to eat, and threatening her with death if she should eat, God did not employ means which had a controlling power over her. The volition to eat “took its rise in the world without any controlling power within or without.” According to Professor Bledsoe, the “rise in the world” of that volition was an entirely legitimate

and natural phenomenon. It was in perfect accordance with the laws of Eve's created nature, and was, of course, perfectly innocent! According to this theory, there seems to be no such thing as moral agency connected with volition; for volitions take their "rise in the world," independently of considerations of right and wrong. They are, indeed, but the productions of blind, unthinking, undetermining chance! Threats of death and promises of life can have no controlling power over them! Mount Sinai and Mount Calvary are both swept off from the face of the earth, and nothing is left but volitions "taking their rise in the world without any controlling power either within or without." What progress has this writer made in escaping from atheism?

✓ We have seen in what sense he builds on the proposition that motives do not control the will. Let us now see whether he proves that proposition in argument, in the same sense in which he builds on it in theory. When the author's theory concerning the will comes to be used as a single stone in the erection of his whole theory of the government of God, then his theory concerning the will is, that its volitions take their rise in the world without any controlling cause, and are independent of motives. This we have already seen abundantly. Under the evil influence of this theory, the author falls into one of the most glaring mistakes which we ever remember to have met with, in a book on any exact science whatever. That is, he supposes that, when a very powerful motive infallibly leads the will against a small motive, the will cannot be free! The good man's will is not free, if it be granted that the attractions of righteousness are as *twelve* in weight to his mind, while the attractions of vice are but as *eight*! The wills of the angels in Heaven are not free, because the visible glories of God overwhelmingly win their hearts, and control their wills! Jesus Christ was not free of will, in the desert of temptation, because the correct view of providence, and of human glory, and of the proper object of worship, was to the false view which Satan presented, as a *million* to *nought*! God himself is not endowed with free will in his holy and eternal and unchangeable love of truth, because falsehood and truth

influence him as *infinity to nothing*, so that it is impossible for God to lie! "*It is true,*" says Prof. Bledsoe, on page 157 of the Theodicy, "*that if we suppose, according to the doctrine of Sir William Hamilton and Dr. Reid, that two counter-influences act upon the will, the one being as twelve and the other as eight, then the first must necessarily prevail. But, if this supposition be correct, we are not only unable to conceive the fact of liberty, we are also able to conceive that it cannot be a fact at all. There is a great difference, we have been accustomed to believe, between being able to conceive how a thing is, and being able to conceive that it cannot be any how at all: the first would leave it a mere mystery, the last would show it to be an absurdity.*"

And the writer goes on to declare the doctrine of Sir William Hamilton and Dr. Reid an absurdity! And to propose a view of "the phenomena of mind, as they exist in consciousness, and not through the medium of *material analogies!*" This may be the philosophy of Prof. Bledsoe's consciousness. But, we calmly submit to the reader, that it is *not* the philosophy of human life, in which it is one of the most common and indisputable facts, that motives, persuasives, inducements, reasons, considerations, *do make* communities, armies, senates, councils, *willing* to adopt certain courses. The world would not else be a rational world. We calmly submit the question to every intelligent and candid Christian, whether he is an Arminian or a Calvinist, an Episcopalian or a Presbyterian, *is this the philosophy of the Bible?* Shall we ignore God's influence over the mind of man, to all practical intents and purposes altogether? Was it concerning the blessed administration of our Divine Saviour, or was it not, that the principle was adopted: *thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power?*

But when Professor Bledsoe comes to refute this view of liberty entertained by Hamilton, Reid, Edwards, and others, he most generally speaks of it as if it was a *physical compulsion* of the will. In speaking of their views, on page 157, he represents them as holding that the will of God is "*impelled* by a power back of his own," if God is necessarily holy. On page 158, he speaks of God, as a being who, on his theory, "can act without being ne-

cessitated to act like the inanimate portions of creation," implying that the theory he is opposing represents God as necessitated like inanimate things. Again, on the same page, he speaks of his own notions as giving the "idea of an omnipotent power, moving in and of itself, *in obedience to the dictates of infinite wisdom and goodness*; and speaks of those opposed to him as maintaining "the dark scheme of an implexed series and concatenation of causes, binding all things fast, God himself not excepted, in the iron bonds of fate." Where now is his former theory of the independence of the will on motives? He here attributes *physical compulsion* to the Calvinists, which he has fully admitted they do not hold. He, himself, places God's will in "OBEDIENCE" to wisdom and goodness! Saul is among the prophets! Professor Bledsoe among the necessitarians!

The truth is, that Prof. Bledsoe uses his own strange theory of the will, while he is building his system. But, in conducting the argument, on whatever high place he builds his seven altars, he is still compelled, like the prophet of Moab, to prophecy as the Balak of his theory does *not* require. He only does what all sound philosophy, and all human literature, and all human history, and the word of God had done before. He establishes the Calvinistic scheme of the necessary influence of character, principles, and motives. Perhaps it is not a matter upon which we ought to venture to indulge the hope of convincing the learned writer himself. We own however, that that hope has sometimes crossed our vision. We hope to be pardoned if it be presumptuous. But it is human to err. It is something higher and nobler, of which we have no right to suppose this writer incapable, to forsake error. There is one place where the usually intricate sophistry, of using against the Calvinists, what is good only against the advocates of physical compulsion, becomes *so plain, so transparent*, that we almost dare to hope that when it is pointed out to him, the author will not be the last, candidly, to see it. It is found on the 148th page of the Theodicy. It is in the argument against Edwards, in which the facility of his supposed victory over that grand old intellectual Paladin, ought itself to have led Professor Bledsoe to suspect

some fallacy in his own reasonings: "*There could be,*" says he, "*no act of the mind unless there were a mind to act, and unless there were a motive in view of which, it acts.*" This, the Professor states as his own ground. And now, he proceeds to state what he apprehends to be Edwards' ground against which he is battling: "*but it does not follow that the mind is compelled to act by the motive.*" This is one of the grand sophisms of the whole affair. Here, it is perfectly transparent. No one ever did hold, we presume, that motives *compel the will*. The author must pardon us for saying that he has permitted himself to be blinded by "*material analogies.*" Motives control men, not wills only. In one sense they *create* wills. They make men willing.

But we have a word or two to say on behalf of President Edwards. We really begin to think that the remark of an intelligent friend, when he first heard of the professed achievement of the Theodicy, was true: "No man would ever undertake to refute Edwards if he understood him." If the reader wishes a perfect contrast, let him make it by putting the bright sparkling pages of the Theodicy down before him, through which you never get a single glimpse of practical religion, of human nature, or of objective truth, but live ever in a world of theory; and then put down by the side of them; the plain, affectionate, simple, homely, unpretending pages of Edwards, through which, nevertheless, at every turn, you obtain clear views of practical religion, of human nature, and of objective truth. It is not the first time by many, and it will not probably be the last by many, when men shout victory over the dead lion. But, for our parts, we have ceased to be greatly moved by these shouts of victory. Just call me back from theory to fact, and the victory evaporates. We should just as much expect to see a victory in athletics won over a ponderous Roman legionary, from the field of Lama, or of Munda, or of Pharsalia, by one of the well-dressed gentlemen clerks of Broadway, whose forms furnish those lithographed moulds of fashion which are nailed up over the tailors' boards.

But we mean to be satisfied with nothing short of a complete vindication of Edwards from the charge of

holding that the will is compelled by motives—or compelled in any otherwise. We think that this will be perfectly attained by a simple quotation of Edward's own language;—part of it written in capitals by the author himself, as a definition of which, he claimed the benefit, in his ensuing treatise. It is from the Inquiry on the Freedom of the Will, Part I., Section 8.

“It appears from what has been said, that these terms *necessary, impossible, &c.*, are often used by philosophers and metaphysicians in a sense quite diverse from their common and original signification; for they apply them to many cases in which no opposition is supposable. Thus they use them with respect to God's existence, before the creation of the world, when there was no other being; with regard to many of the dispositions and acts of the Divine Being, such as his loving himself, his loving righteousness, hating sin, &c. So, they apply them to many cases of the inclinations and actions of created beings *wherein all opposition of the will is excluded* in the nature of the case.” These last are our italics. They are intended to call the attention of the reader to the fact, that the *necessity* which Edwards maintains, is expressly declared by himself to be one in which *all opposition of the will*, and of course all compulsion of the will, are excluded in the nature of the case. But let us hear him further:

“*Metaphysical or philosophical necessity* (his own italics,) is nothing different from their certainty.” When these explanations are over, then he gives his definition, as follows, italics and capitals all his:

“*Philosophical Necessity* is really nothing else than the FULL AND FIXED CONNEXION BETWEEN THE *things signified by the subject and* PREDICATE OF A PROPOSITION which affirms something to be true. When there is such a connexion, then the thing affirmed in the proposition is necessary, in a philosophical sense, whether any opposition or contrary effect be supposed, or no.”

We think the reader is now pretty well able to judge for himself whether the boasted conclusion, that *motives do not compell the will*, is a conclusion against God's own Jonathan Edwards, who lived a century ago, and wrote a book on the will; or whether it is a conclusion

against that very different person, the Edwards of the fourth chapter of the first part of the Theodicy. Will the candid reader sit down and look over Edwards on the Will, and tell us: how *did* the impression arise, that the author of that book held the *compulsion of the will by motives*? We can account for that impression in no other way than that it took its "rise in the world" "without any efficient cause of its existence," and free from "any controlling power within or without itself;" as all the volitions in which the author of the Theodicy believes, "take their rise in the world."

There is no case on record, with which we have met, of a handsomer refutation of one's own principles by himself, than is to be found in the logic of the second part of the Theodicy, considered as directed against the first part. Let the reader who would satisfy himself on this point, sit patiently down and compare the reasonings of the two fourth chapters; that in the first part, with which we have been principally engaged, with that in the second part, in which the author tilts with that other grand Paladin of the past, John Foster. In the first part, as we have seen, every such a thing as necessary sin, and necessary holiness, is scornfully repudiated. But, in the second part, the very awful fact of eternal punishment is justified, not simply on the ground of clear declarations of God's word, which we think all the justification required on that subject,—but on the ground that "*the habit of sinning may be so completely wrought into the soul, and so firmly fixed there, that nothing can check it in its career of guilt.*" That is, here is a necessary sinfulness confessed, and exactly in the sense in which Calvinists hold necessary sin and necessary holiness; save that they do not hold such things to be beyond the omnipotence of the Spirit of God, or affirm at all on the latter point. And the writer, who had, in the first part, denied to motives any controlling power over rational minds, in the second part, vindicates eternal punishment, and we believe with truth and propriety, as far as we can see into the subject, as a gigantic motive, needed by "the exigences of the case;" and from the very tremendousness of the motive, probably better for the universe on the whole, than if

the punishment of sin were limited. We humbly think, that this is a giving up of the case concerning the influence of motives, as well as a giving up of the point concerning necessary sinfulness.

It was a style of argument which we do not greatly admire, entirely to suppress and ignore Edwards' definition of necessity, and then march out against him with drum and trumpet, as if he were standing there, just where he says positively that he is not standing, and shout out victory over the shadows with which we may choose to people an empty encampment. But there is another specimen of the spirit of the book, still less in accordance, we humbly opine, with a lofty and philosophic candour than that. It is this. The first section of the chapter on "God's Eternal Decree," in the Westminster Confession of Faith, is *entirely suppressed* in the Theodicy. The author endeavours, through a large part of his book, to blacken Calvinism for *making God the author of sin*;—for offering *violence to the will of the creatures*;—and for taking away *the liberty and contingency of second causes*. These are some of his gravest charges against it. They are some of the very spots on the disc of the divine glory, which the Theodicy came to sweep away. And Professor Bledsoe very carefully quotes the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh sections of that chapter, in full, word for word. How is this? We will show how it is. Here is the *first* section of that chapter in the Confession; that wicked first section, which is not so much as noticed, in all the thunders of the Theodicy against Calvinism for making God the author of sin, for enslaving the human will, and for binding all things in the iron links of fate. "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; YET SO AS THEREBY NEITHER IS GOD THE AUTHOR OF SIN; NOR IS VIOLENCE OFFERED TO THE WILL OF THE CREATURES, NOR IS THE LIBERTY OR CONTINGENCY OF SECOND CAUSES TAKEN AWAY, BUT RATHER ESTABLISHED."

That is, the Confession distinctly disavows, in the threshold, the very charges brought against it! And the readers of the Theodicy are never informed that it is so! We suppose that this mode of dealing must be ta-



ken as another specimen of the new species of volitions, which the consciousness of the author tells him, are to be found in his own mind;—volitions not caused by the prior action of the mind, nor of anything else;—volitions which take their rise in the world without an efficient cause; and acknowledge no controlling power, from within or from without. If so, we have only to say that we admire the practical operation of such volitions, no better than we do the philosophy in which they appear.

The subject of the imputation of Adam's sin to infants is entirely misapprehended in the Theodicy. We do not say that the author does not understand it. For to the author, aside from this book, we owe nothing but respect and kindness. We do say that there is no sign in the book that he understood it. And we say very plainly, moreover, that he ought at least to have understood it, before railing at it as is done. He seems to regard the Calvinistic doctrine of imputation, simply as a mode of accounting for the sufferings of infants by their descent from Adam. Not a glance seems to have been thrown towards the fourth and fifth chapters of the epistle to the Romans, where the doctrine of imputation is stated and enforced. But little, if any attention could have been paid by the writer, to the language of the Westminster Confession, whose doctrines he was in the act of reviling. The Confession says: "*They—the first man and woman—being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation.*" And the spirit of God most distinctly declares that: *by one man's disobedience many were made sinners. Romans fifth chapter, nineteenth verse.* The doctrine of imputation is simply a mode of explaining the tendency to sin, with which children are born. A writer might say that our invariably sinning, as soon as we grow up, is no proof of native depravity, or of a tendency to sin in our nature. But we should not hold such a writer bound by the laws of reason. Whoever will admit that invariably acting in one way, is a proof of a native tendency in that direction, admits the fact of which we speak, the "death in sin and corrupted nature" of which the Bible

and the Confession speak. The question is, how are we to account for the birth of children with this corrupted nature? The Scriptures tell us that it is to be accounted for by the connection of the children of men with the "*transgression of Adam*,"—that it was "*by one that sinned*;"—"*by one man's offence*;"—"*by one man's disobedience*." The Calvinistic doctrine introduces no new fact—either gloomy or otherwise, into the matter. It simply explains a fact which all men who need to be reasoned with, must admit, that children are born with a tendency to sin. It explains that fact, as the Bible does, by saying that the children of serpents are serpents, the children of doves are doves, and the children of men are men. But, what will the reader think of a book written by a Professor of Mathematics, a book earnestly inviting men to come out of the Calvinistic system, that they may obtain clear views of truth, which treats this whole subject of imputation, as if it were merely a mode of explaining the *sufferings* of infants;—a book which proposes too, to account for those sufferings of infants, as *disciplinary sufferings*!—and not sufferings which are owing to their being born of a race of sinners! Really, it would seem that one might be completely outside of Calvinism, and completely on the inside of the metaphysics, and the theology of this book, without a great superfluity, either of clear views, or correct apprehensions.

There is one precious topic more in the Theodicy, which we cannot fail to notice. It is a topic on which, at length, the writer condescends to exhibit some little dependence upon the declarations of the Scriptures. It is a topic on which he comes down from the lofty heights of philosophy, to deal in questions of interpretation. It is the doctrine of ELECTION. We welcome, with warm congratulations, the descent of the aeronaut, and shall seek to meet him upon the firm ground.

We quote from Theodicy, page 330:

"We cannot suppose that God elected any one because he foresaw his good works, so as to make election to depend upon them, instead of making them to depend upon election. This does not prevent an individual, however, from having been elected because God fore-

saw from all eternity, that the influences attending upon his election would, by his own voluntary coöperation therewith, be rendered effectual to his salvation. This is the ground on which we believe the election of individuals to eternal life to proceed. Accordingly, we suppose that God never selected, or determined to save any one who he foresaw would not yield to the influences of his grace, provided they should be given. And we also suppose, that such is the overflowing goodness of God, that all were elected by him, and had their names written in the book of life, who, he foresaw, would yield to the influences of his grace, and, by their coöperation therewith, "make their calling and election sure."

Such is the Professor's scheme of election. Though here softly stated, throughout, as what he *supposes*, yet he seems to hold it very tenaciously; and in fact, it is the natural consequence of the peculiar philosophy of this book. No account is here taken of the enmity of the carnal mind to God, in consequence of which the coöperation of such a mind with God, is absurd. In accordance with the author's wild Pelagian philosophy, all power is denied to the grace of God to make an unwilling mind willing;—to make a hostile mind friendly;—to make an opposing mind yielding. Without the exercise of this power by the Holy Spirit, to remove the resisting, opposing, unfriendly principle from the heart of the sinner, we submit it to the experience of our readers, if all religion is not an impossibility. Such we verily believe to be the case. Let any thoughtful mind look closely, and see whether this theory of conversion, is not the very main-spring of Unitarianism, with its substitution of moral culture for spiritual religion. ✓

But, how are we to understand the remark with which the author introduces this topic? "We agree," says he, "with both Calvinistic and Armenian writers, in the position, that no man is elected to eternal life on account of his merits. Indeed, the idea that a human being can merit anything, much less eternal life, of God, is preposterous in the extreme. All his gifts are of pure grace." How is this? Is there then no merit in that "voluntary coöperation" with the divine influences? Is there no merit in "yielding to the influences of his grace?" Use

words as the author may, it is clear, in his scheme, that eternal life depends on this "yielding" and coöperation." If he does not choose to give it the name of merit, he makes it the price the sinner pays to God for salvation. He assigns to it the *power* of merit, we care not for the name. This is not all. The philosophy of this book denies to God the control of the will. It most distinctly denies that motives control the will. It distinctly denies that the will is controlled by any power, within or without, as we have abundantly seen. Now, election is made to depend on the *voluntary* coöperation of man. On what then, is the eternal life of the soul of man made to depend, in this book? on a wild, lawless, uncontrolled volition, of which no account can be given or taken;—that is, on blind CHANCE;—on the most horrible of all fatalisms, the fatalism of accident. All this is done from a sheer disregard of numerous declarations of Scripture, definitely declaring that "*it is God which worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure.*"

But, why is this attempt, at page 330, to show that the election treated of in the Scriptures, is a conditional election of persons to eternal life, the condition being, their coöperation with the grace of God? It had been laboriously shown, at page 318, that the election treated of in the Romans was *national* election. Is it then, nations who are to be saved on condition of their coöperating with the grace of God? Will not the device of national election quiet the author's conscience for twelve pages! Has the ghost of Banquo come back so soon upon the author's vision? Does he find two separate and distinct elections, taught in the Scriptures, one national, as in the ninth chapter of the Romans, and the other personal, but conditional, as we have seen above? If so, it ought to have been distinctly so stated, in a work exhibiting such clear light, that men are importuned to come into it to obtain that privilege. As it appears in this book, it seems as if the national election was the device to escape the clear point of Scripture, in one chapter where all conditions were out of the question; and the conditional election, a similar device in another chapter, where nations are out of the question. Which parts of Scripture are to be referred to the na-

tional device, and which to the conditional, ought to have been clearly stated. There would have been this great advantage in it, that we could, a little more easily, make the author answer himself. Where it is claimed to be national, we could bring his admission that it is unconditional. And where he thinks it conditional, we could quote his admission that it is personal. Then, we could bring that most decisive and irrefragable proof, which must present itself readily to the mind of the intelligent reader, that the lofty theme of the apostle in both places, is the same in principle, in all places, and chapters.

But, let us fairly and patiently hear our author, page 318:

“The precise passage on which the greatest stress is laid seems to be the following: The children not yet being born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. Now, the question is, does this refer to the election of Jacob to eternal life, and the eternal reprobation of Esau; or does it refer to the selection of the descendants of the former to constitute the visible people of God on earth? This is the question; and it is one which, we think, is by no means difficult of solution.”

The device of conditional election, on a foresight of “coöperation,” would not answer in this place. The tone of the apostle is too decided. The national device must be tried here. And the writer subsequently informs us that there is not the least shadow of such a thing as election to eternal life in the whole record. This is the disposal made of the cases of Esau and Jacob, the first of the apostle’s illustrations of his doctrine, in the ninth chapter of Romans. He makes it the election of the descendants of Jacob to constitute the visible church;—and the rejection of the descendants of Esau from that privilege; without a shadow of eternal life in the whole affair. Pharoah, King of Egypt, is the apostle’s second illustration: “*For the Scripture saith unto Pharoah.*” But what the author of the Theodicy does

with this case, it has not entered into the heart of man to conceive. The national crotchet clearly will not bear to be introduced here; for Pharoah was not a descendant of Abraham, as Esau and Jacob were. And it would be rather too absurd to talk of rejecting Pharoah from the visible church. Nor will the conditional crotchet serve the purpose here, for the language of the apostle is too stern and definite: *for this same purpose have I raised thee up*. For aught that we can see, a *third* species of election will have to be discovered, in some future edition of the Theodicy; a separate category for Pharoah, King of Egypt, by himself.

But, how are we to understand national election? Was there no eternal life enjoyed among the visible people of God, which was not enjoyed by other nations? Was eternal life not one of the privileges of the Old Testament Church? Will this author deliberately say that no eternal life fell upon the hearts of those who came believingly under the Jewish types and shadows? Did the promise made to Abraham include only temporal blessings? If we are Christ's then, are we, or are we not, Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise? When the Jews were constituted a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, were the privileges of eternal life equal among the Babylonians, the Arabs and the Egyptians? In short, was our Saviour himself mistaken, when he told the woman of Samaria: *Salvation is of the Jews?* National election then, was personal election to eternal life by the wholesale. Nothing else can be made of it, except by affirming that the Old Testament Church had nothing to do with eternal life. The votaries of the Church of Rome, and some Protestants of strong papistical leanings, hold that salvation is confined to the visible church. We have not yet met with those who hold, save as the expedient of escape from the point of some clear Scripture, that salvation is not now, or that there ever was a time when it was *not specifically connected* with the visible church. That is, indeed, Theodicy, with a witness!

But, let us hear our author again, page 321:

"We shall not dwell upon other portions of the chapter in question: for if the foregoing remarks be just, it

will be easy to dispose of every text which may, at first view, appear to support the Calvinistic doctrine of election."

We do not think the author's difficulties are quite so nearly at an end, as he has flattered himself to believe. For, in that very same chapter, there is still another election spoken of, an election *from among* Israel itself. "A remnant shall be saved." "The Lord of Sabaoth hath left us a seed." "The election hath obtained it and the rest were blinded." To a Calvinist, these various historic cases adduced by the inspired apostles, are but different illustrations of the grand principle of the Divine sovereignty. But they have this wonderful peculiarity, that hardly any two of them can be reduced to the same sophistical crotchet by which the doctrine of election is usually explained away. The cases of Esau and Pharoah cannot be reduced to the conditional crotchet. The cases of Pharoah and the Israelitish remnant in the days of Isaiah, cannot be reduced to the national crotchet. We cannot see but that there must be yet another, a *fourth* device still, for the election *from among* the Jews.

But we must again hear the Theodicy: "We shall dismiss the consideration of the ninth chapter of Romans," says Professor Bledsoe, "with an extract from Dr. Macknight, who, although a firm believer in the Calvinistic view of election and reprobation, does not find any support for his doctrine in this portion of Scripture. "Although some passages in this chapter, (says he,) which pious and learned men have understood of the election and reprobation of individuals, are in the foregoing illustration, interpreted of the election of nations to be the people of God, and to enjoy the advantage of an external revelation, and of their losing these honourable distinctions, the reader must not, on that account, suppose the author rejects the doctrines of the decree and foreknowledge of God. These doctrines are taught in other passages of Scripture.—See Rom. viii: 20." "Thus," says Professor Bledsoe again, "this enlightened critic candidly abandons the ninth chapter of Romans, and seeks support for his Calvinistic view of the divine decrees elsewhere."—Page 321.

Now, herein is a wonderful thing; and one of those wonderful things which will give the reader of this article, who has not read the Theodicy, some idea of the spirit of that book. The passage selected by the author for his refutation of the Calvinists, as "the *precise passage on which greatest stress is laid*," is a passage concerning which the author had, doubtless, lying before him at the moment, the concession of a candid and enlightened Calvinistic critic, that no stress was by him laid on that passage at all!

We shall give our author further room to speak for himself, page 132; he says:

"Let us, then, proceed to examine the eighth chapter of Romans, on which he (Dr. Macknight,) relies. The words are as follows: 'For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son, that he might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called, and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified them he also glorified.'" We need have no dispute with the Calvinists respecting the interpretation of these words. If we mistake not, we may adopt their own construction of them, and yet clearly show that they lend not the least support to their views of election and reprobation."

After some explanations of the manner in which he understands, and agrees with Professor Hodge, in his annotations on these words, the author of the Theodicy proceeds:

"The bare fact of the election is all that is here disclosed. The reason, or the ground, or the principle, of that election, is not even alluded to; and we are left to gather it from other portions of Scripture, or from the eternal dictates of love and mercy. Hence, as this passage makes no allusion to the ground or reason of the divine election, it does not begin to touch the controversy we have with the theologians of the Calvinistic school. Every link in the chain here presented is perfect, except that which connects its first link, the election to eternal life, with the unconditional decree of God; and that link, the only one in controversy, is absolutely wanting. We have no occasion to break the



chain, for it is only to the imagination that it seems to be unconditionally bound to the throne of the Omnipotent."

The crotchet of conditional election is here yielded, not expressly, but as implied in the adoption of yet another device of interpretation. National election will not answer in this place, for obvious reasons. The Pharaonic category admits no other case but the individual one for which it was manufactured. Something else still was now to be done. The links of this chain were too strong. The order in which they come was too definitely stated; foreknowledge, predestination, calling, justification, and final glory. The link which binds this chain "unconditionally to the throne of the Omnipotent" is not expressly stated, we admit, in the passage itself. It is a link, however, which is found in the English Grammar. It is, indeed, one of the first principles of grammar, that a verb must have a nominative case; and that the person who is the nominative to the verb, does those things which the verb affirms to be done. There is the wanting link. We challenge mortal man to break it. Inspiration itself wraps it "around the throne of the Omnipotent!" God foreknew. God predestinated. God called. God justified. God glorified. Let the reader remember that this chain, *in its order*, is conceded, in the passage above quoted from the Theodicy. An election based on a foresight of the sinner's coöperation with the divine influences, is but expressing, in other words, a predestination based on justification. But justification is admitted to flow from predestination, according to the plain order, and the obvious sense of the passage of Scripture in question. And this is all we can make of the interpretation, that predestination is based upon justification, and justification is based upon predestination! It does not seem to be a better device of escape from distasteful Scripture truth than the others.

Why is this author so reluctant that the chain of the government of this world should be "unconditionally bound to the throne of the Omnipotent?" We beg to know around what other throne he would wish to have it bound? Does it give him more pleasure to contem-

plate human destinies, as bound around the throne of those peculiar volitions of his philosophy, which, being too strong for law, for motive, or for God, "take their rise in the world without any efficient cause of their existence," and without being subject to the control of "any power within or without?" The Christian knows of no such thing as fate, chance, or accident. He beholds an all-wise, all-powerful, and spotlessly holy God upon the throne. What are not revealed of the reasons of that God for what he does, are known, in the confidence of faith, to be holy, and just, and good. And there is comfort, deep and strong, in this vision of a universe with a righteous God on the throne. But, we believe that the strongest teachings of the stoic Chrysippus himself, concerning the "adamantine links of Fate," will be found, on practical experiment, as pleasant to the Christian heart, as that apotheosis of a lawless human will, which constitutes the main staple of this whole book.

There are many and overwhelming testimonies in the Scriptures, against the philosophy of this book, and against its view of what it calls the "great *theandric* fact of regeneration," which would have greatly cheered and warmed our discussion, if our space had permitted their introduction: such as the calm assumption, everywhere visible in the Bible, that God has efficient power over the human will without destroying its freedom;—that his counsel shall stand and he will do all his pleasure;—that he can turn the hearts of all men whithersoever he will, when reasons dictate, which must be forever unknown to us, save that they are holy, just, and good; that his designs find as infallible fulfilment through the free agency of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, Caiaphas and Herod, Pilate and Judas, as through Elijah, Isaiah and Paul; that he risks his veracity, and places the pledge on record, for the infallible certainty of the largest, and longest, and deepest, and highest concert and harmony, and chorus of events, on the widest stream of prophecy, just as if he were the real and efficient Lord of all. We may add, that he directs repeatedly, constantly, distinctly, that we PRAY to him, not as the God of this Theodicy, who cannot turn the human

will, but as able, when the time shall come, to turn the hearts of all, to bow all stubborn knees, and to make all human souls willing to the reign of him whose right it is to rule.

There was once a man among us, one of the humble and childlike great men of other days; the Washington of the theological chair; a man of giant intellect, but one who found theodicy enough for him, in the written word of God; a man in whose decease there passed away from the earth, intellect enough to have made very many ambitious Theodices, but who has left upon paper, almost nothing to show his mighty powers; from whose lips it was once our labour of love to catch falling pearls of deep and genuine, but temperate and modest wisdom, and commit them to paper, for others sake and not for his. Here is one such pearl, with which we conclude this article:

“I have never read a treatise on the subject of the power of motive over the will, which did not seem to lean too far one way or the other. If the power of motive is made to deprive the mind of all causal power, it takes away guilt. If it gives it too much self-determining power, it removes the sovereignty of God, and contradicts the Scriptures. How a free being is controlled by the sovereign God, is, perhaps, a secret to the highest angel in Heaven. Most treatises on the subject are attempts to find out this deep secret. It is better to let the metaphysics of this point entirely alone.”

---

#### ARTICLE V.

#### ON ELOHIM AS A TITLE OF GOD, AND AS IMPLYING A PLURALITY IN THE GODHEAD.\*

The names of the Deity in general and constant use in the Hebrew language are more numerous than in either of the beautiful languages of classical antiquity,

\* Intended to illustrate and confirm the argument from this name in the article on the objection to the Trinity, founded on the unity of God, in the January No. of this Review.

er in the most cultivated tongues of modern Europe. There was no shadow of necessity, difficulty, or even inducement, for the adoption of a phraseology which, *on Unitarian principles*, every candid mind must confess, can with difficulty, if at all, be defended from the charge of pernicious example and very dangerous tendency.

Among these names, are the term ELOAH, a singular form of a word signifying the object of fear, reverence, or the principal and mighty, or the swearer, or one who enters into covenant by oath,—and ELOHM, which is a regularly formed plural of the singular word, and having the same meaning, if regarded as derived from it. The etymology of this word, however, says Dr. Pye Smith, has been much contested; some making it a compound of *El*, and *Jah*, so as to signify “the Mighty *Jah*”; others deriving it from *Ala*, “to enter into an engagement by oath,” and thus signifying “the Being of sworn veracity and faithfulness.” The most reasonable and probable derivation, so far as I can judge, is that of Schultens, Reineccius, and a host of the most eminent orientalist, who make its primitive, *Ala*, which, though not occurring in the existing remains of the Hebrew, is preserved in the Arabic “*Alaha*,” and denotes “to adore.” Hence, the noun will signify “the object of adoration,” or, as the illustrious Schultens well expresses it, “*Numen Tremendum*.”\*

Much however, may be said, and we think, with great force, and no little Scriptural support, in favour of the first derivation. The word Eloah signifies a denouncing of a curse, a curse denounced either upon oneself or others, or both, and therefore, an oath taken or given, for what is an oath but a conditional curse or execration? It was so used by the ancients; and, to this manner of swearing our blessed Lord himself submitted.—(See Matt. xxvi: 63, 64.) Hence, the word Elohim, which is a regularly formed masculine plural of Eloah, would naturally signify the denouncers of a conditional curse. So, we find Jehovah swearing to Adoni, (Psalm cx.,) on oath, certainly prior to the creation.—See Prov. viii: 23, and seq., comp., John xvii: 5, 24. According-

\* Smith's Messiah, vol. i., p. 465.

ly, Jehovah is at the beginning of the creation called Elohim, which implies that the divine persons had sworn when they created. It was from this oath that the ever blessed Three were pleased to take that glorious and fearful name, (Deut. xxviii: 58,) Jehovah Elohim; glorious, in as much as the transaction, to which it refers, displays in the most glorious manner, the attributes of God to men and angels; and fearful, in as much as, by one part of the oath, eternal and infinite power, Jehovah himself, is engaged to make the enemies of Christ his foot-stool.—Psalm cx.

Let those who have any doubt whether Elohim, when meaning the true God, Jehovah, is plural or not, consult the following passages, where they will find it joined with adjectives, pronouns, and verbs plural, Gen. i: 26, iii: 22, xi: 7, xx: 13, xxxi: 53, xxxv: 7; Deut. iv: 7, v: 23, or 26; Josh. xxiv: 19; 1 Sam. iv: 8; 2 Sam. vii: 23; Ps. lviii: 12; Is. vi: 8; Jer. x: 10; xxiii: 36. So, chald. Elohim, Dan. iv: 5, 6, 15, or 8, 9, 18. See also Prov. ix: 10, xxx: 3; Psal. cxlix: 2; Eccles. v: 7, xii: 1; Job v: 8; Is. vi: 3, liv: 5; Hos. xi: 12, or xii: 1; Mal. i: 6; Dan. vii: 18, 22, 25. It is also to be observed, that the Greeks had, from this name Elohim, by a perverted tradition, their Ζεὺς ὀπίσιος Jupiter, who presided over oaths. Hence, also, the corrupt tradition of Jupiter's oath which overruled even Fate itself, that is, the fated and necessary motions of the elements of this world.\*

The derivation here adduced, is very ably supported by Geddulph, in his *Theology of the Early Patriarchs*, vol. ii., pp. 1-27; and favourably regarded by Horsely in his *Biblical Criticism*.

This view was ably defended by Hutchinson, Calcott, Bates, Ahoab, and others in their dissertations on this word.—See also, Calasio's *Concordance*, London Edition.

But, passing from the derivation of this word, we remark that this term Elohim, is the most usual appellation of the Deity in the Old Testament, which is constantly translated God. The singular form Eloah occurs chiefly in the poetical books;—twice in the Hymn of

\* See Parkhurst's *Heb. Lex.*, sub. nom. *elohim*.

Moses, (Deut. xxxii: 7,) several times in the Prophets, forty times in the book of Job, and in the other books sixteen times; but the plural Elohim, occurs about two thousand five hundred times. This plural appellative is generally put in agreement with singular verbs, pronouns, and adjectives, as in the first sentence of the Pentateuch, "Elohim created;—creavit Dii;—les Dieux créa." This is the ordinary construction through the whole Hebrew Bible. But sometimes the apposition is made with verbs, pronouns, and adjectives in the "plural" number likewise; and sometimes singulars and plurals are put together in the same agreement.

For example, Gen. xx: 18. "*Elohim hithoo outhi,*" the Gods have caused me to wander."

Gen. xxxv: 7, "*Sham nighlo elau haelohim,*" "there were revealed to him the Gods."

Josh. xxiv: 19, "*Laavod eth Jehovah chi lo him kido-shim hoh,*" "to serve Jehovah, for he are holy Gods."

Is. liv: 5, "*Chi boalaich oosaich,*" "for thy husbands are thy makers."\* Nor is Elohim the only divine title used in the plural form. Drusius, Buxtorf, Heeser, Eichhorn, Gesenius, and other distinguished scholars, have maintained that "Adonai and Shaddai," are plurals of an obsolete form; and this very plural title is the word which the Jews of a very early age, certainly hundreds of years before Christ,† substituted for the use of the title Jehovah, which they never pronounce, and for which singular title of God they have always employed, and now always employ, the plural title "Adonai, my Lords."

This Ewald controverts, but he assigns no satisfactory reason, as apparent to me, in either case; and Gesenius remains unconvinced; whose opinion in a case of philology, especially, if at all favourable to a doctrine of revelation is really equal to an argument.

It is further to be observed, that the first person plural, is used in reference to the Divine Being.—Gen. i: 26. "And Elohim said, let us make man in our image,

\* See also, Deut. v: 23; (Engl. v: 26;) 1 Sam. xvii: 26; 2 Sam. vii: 23; Psal. lviii: 12, cxlix: 2; Prov. ix: 10; Jere. x: 10; Dan. vii: 18, 22, 25, 27; Ho. xii: 1; (Engl. v, xi: 11.)

† Since it is so used in the Septuagint.

according to our likeness," chap. iii: 22. "And Jehovah Elohim said, behold the man is become as one of us," chap. xi: 7. "Come, we will go down, and there we will confound their language," Is. vi: 8. "And I heard the voice of the Lord (Adonai,) saying, whom shall I send, and who shall go for us?"

Such are the facts in regard to the employment of a plural title in connection with plural forms of speech, to designate the Deity. This use must be in accordance with a divine intention and direction, and not from any necessity in the case. It is evidently, the result of choice and design. In what then did this peculiarity of idiom originate?

The question is, why is the plural pronoun used, when the singular was required by the subject, and would have been, not only equally dramatic, but indeed, more terse, and vigorous, and striking? The question is not about the analogous, unfrequent, and secondary application of the title to express Gods who were false, or God's agent as Moses. "It is, says Dr. Smith, about the proper, primary, and direct signification of the word." That Elohim is ever so applied to any other being than God, has been denied. But, granting that it is so, this will not prove that in its proper and primary meaning it is applied to God, and that too, with unquestionable design. For the same is true of all the titles of God, not even excepting Jehovah which, as Oxlee remarks, "Though generally regarded by the Jews as a noun appropriated to the individual subsistency of the Godhead, is also common to many persons, for being found in construction, and accompanied with adjuncts restraining its signification, it necessarily ceases to be proper. Thus, we read: "The Jehovah of hosts." And R. Abraham ben Ezra, confesses, that when thus placed in regimen with the term hosts, it partakes of the nature of a common appellation." But, besides being found in construction, and having other marks of a noun common, it is absolutely equivocal; angels being called by this name, as well as the Deity. Nor is this any modern opinion of the Jews, on the contrary, it was the generally received notion of the ancient Jewish Fathers, as appears from what is recorded of R. Simeon ben Lakis, who was wont

to maintain it on Scriptural authority. Finally, not only the angels, but even the Messiah, the Saints, and the city of Jerusalem, are called by this title of Jehovah. The fact is thus attested by R. Moses Alsheah: "Behold our Rabbis of blessed memory, on the authority of R. Samuel Nachmanides, assert, that there are three things which are called by the name of Jehovah, the Saints, the Messiah, and the city of Jerusalem."\*

Thus, adds Oxlee, the most sacred appellations of the divinity being proved to be common and equivocal, furnish an argument which tends strongly to establish the leading position, in that it makes for the pluri-personality of the Godhead, according to the Trinitarian hypothesis.

The question, therefore, we again say, is not about such secondary, derivative, analogous and metaphorical applications of this title of God, but about the proper, primary, and direct signification of the word *elohim*.

The fact which principally requires our attention, is the constant use of *Elohim* to designate the one and only God, and this in the language of the patriarchs and prophets, who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." Is it not, we may well say, a little remarkable that, in the sacred books of Israel, books whose very words, in many cases at least, were selected and dictated by the inspiration of Jehovah, the ordinary name and style of the Only Living and True God, should be in a plural form? Did some strange and insuperable necessity lie in the way? Was the language so poor that it could furnish no other term? or, if so, could not the wisdom of inspiration have suggested a new appellative, and have forever abolished the hazardous word? None of these reasons existed. The language was rich and copious. The names of the Deity in general and constant use were, as we have already remarked, more numerous than in either of the beautiful languages of classical antiquity, or in the most cultivated tongues of modern Europe.

The ancient Israelites always affirmed that a plurality

\* See in Oxlee, vol. i., pp. 74, 75-78, where quotations from Jewish authorities are given at length.



is indubitably understood in the Deity. This plainly appears from what Philo says on the terms "τοῦ ποιησωμεν," (*πλῆθος ἀμφοινοντος*)—and "το ὡς ἐς ἡμῶν," (*οὐκ ἑνός, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πλειόνων, τίδεσαι.*) The expression, "Let us make," manifests a plurality;—the expression, "As one of us," is put to signify, not one, but many.—Phiol. ed., Mangey, tom. i, pp. 430, 431. This and the like affirmations of truth, seem to have very greatly perplexed the Jews of the middle ages who were very hostile to Christianity and Christian doctrine. Their perplexities appear by their having been so hard pushed as to invent many a childish story. We will only quote one. "Rabbi Samuel bar Nachman said that Moses, when in writing the Law he was come to the place where he was by divine dictation to write, "Let us make man," paused, and replied to God, "Lord of the world, why dost thou afford an occasion for error, with respect to thy most simple unity?" But that the Lord answered, "Moses, write thou so; and he that desires to err, let him err."—Bereshith Rabba, ap. M. ben Israelis Concil., in Gen. qu. vi." That the Jews of the middle ages, do not stand alone in error on this most important point, appears very evident from the many theories invented, in order to explain this use of plural titles for the Deity. Some have gone so far as to say that the term was originally employed by polytheists and literally expressed a plurality of divine beings. But this is historically false, and it is also un-supposable that when the Israelites came to abominate Idolatry, and to treat it as high treason, they would employ as a frequent name of God, one which was polytheistic and pagan.

This notion was advanced by R. Judah Levita, and others spoken of by Abarbinel, who holds this notion as perfectly inadmissible; for, says he, it would follow of necessity, that the language of the Scriptures is the language of Idolatry, and that the worship of images was the primeval religion. His concluding remark upon this subject is worthy of attention. "This account of the Rabbi, says Abarbinel, is, in fact, more inexplicable and unintelligible, than that of any other writer, who has handled the subject, besides himself."

The Rabbins, generally, explain this as an honorary

and complimentary form of speech,—a plural of majesty. But this is a mere subterfuge. “For,” says Ewald, “It is a great error to suppose that the Hebrew language, as we find it, has any feeling for a so-called ‘pluralis majestaticus.’” “The instances” says Pye Smith, from which this opinion is inferred, are extremely few, and they all refer to such kinds of ownership as are a burlesque on all ideas of dignity and majesty.” Every candid mind examining the paucity and dubious character of the examples by which it is conceived to be sustained, and their feeble claim to the notion of “dominion or dignity;” the non occurring of the same, in names and titles of honour which occur in the language, such as those which denote kings, princes, nobles, generals, priests and prophets, will certainly find not one instance of this pretended notation of dignity, since it can never be imagined that such an indication of majesty, exalted dignity, and most excellent honour, should be conferred upon the owner of an ass, and denied to the sovereign of a kingdom. The question, therefore, we again say, is why this form of speech in any case, and especially in the frequent title of God, should first originate with the ancient Hebrews? No reader, says Oxlee, who is tolerably conversant in the Hebrew Scriptures, will be so bold as to assert that this is an idiom of the inspired penmen. It is, indeed, a most unsatisfactory way of accounting for the plurals in question. So it did appear even to R. Abraham who, being hard pushed, was glad to subjoin another reason. His reason, however, was most ably confuted by Abarbinel, whose words are as follows: “But truly R. Abraham’s statement respecting the term Elohim; that it is used in the plural form by way of honour, is, in my opinion, without the least colour of truth or probability; as we find it in the plural number predicated of things, which God expressly forbids to be honoured. Much less is it true, with regard to any language, in which it is customary to address a superior in the plural by way of reverence; as is the case in languages of Europe. For it happens only when they speak to a superior in the second person, that they apply to him the plural form, as though he were equal to many single ones in his

stead. But, in subjects of the third person, should they chance to mention a superior, they do not speak of him in the plural number. Besides; if plurality of number in a name of the Deity were to add honour to that name, why do not we find it in some other of his names, as well as in Elohim? Moreover, with respect to the position, that God is called Elohim, in the plural, on account of his work having been performed by the instrumentality of angels, that likewise is destitute of all probabilities. For, from this it would follow of necessity, that the Elohim, which is used in the first verse of the book of Genesis, is meant of the angels, which would be in the highest degree erroneous, as the primary creation originated solely from the first cause, without any instrumentality, and not from the angels, who were themselves, but a part of the general creation."

We may also add, that it is very absurd to think that God should borrow his way of speaking from a king, before a man was created upon the earth! And even granting this to be possible, yet the cases will not agree. For though a King or Governor may say *us* and *we*, there is certainly no figure of speech that will allow any single person to say *one of us*, when he speaks of *himself*. It is a phrase that can have no meaning, unless there be more persons than one to speak out of.

Such an opinion is also expressly contradicted by Scripture, since it is written, "who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor?"—Rom. xi: 34; Is. xl: 13.

Many feeling the force of the prophet's declaration, were forced to invent other notions; for instance, R. Solomon, boldly affirms that the plural noun, by being associated with verbs and adjuncts in the singular number, is divested of its plural import. But such fallacy can be entitled to no regard. For, in Greek, a noun of the neuter plural is usually associated with a verb singular, and yet, no scholar would contend, that because the verb is of the singular number, the noun does not actually express a plurality of subsistencies. And, it is by no means the fact, that the plural term, Elohim, when used for the true God, is accompanied with verbs and other adjuncts always, in the singular number. The ac-

count which the patriarch gives of his being induced to leave home, the solemn attestation of Joshua in his address to the Israelites, the exclamation of the Philistines on beholding the ark of Jehovah, the solicitation of the children of Israel to supply the vacancy of Moses by the symbol of a calf, together with their subsequent declaration respecting its divinity, not to mention many other instances, do certify the contrary.

Again, R. M. Gerundensis, would have the term Elohim, deduced from *El*, God, and *hem*, they; supposing it to comprehend in its signification all spiritual powers and virtues, whatever, originating from the Deity, and has defined it, as if it were written,—*MeEl hem*,—they exist from God. Abarbinel's objection to this is so clear and strong, that I will quote it verbatim: "R. M. G. assigns no reason for the omission of the *Mem*, in the beginning, so necessary to the sense which is here affixed to it; nor why the *God*, contrary to all propriety, should be inserted in the middle, and still less reason, why in every case of affixation it should be treated as a plural." "This notion, moreover, is repugnant to the authority of the Masorites, who, by placing the *Holem* point to direct the pronunciation, clearly manifest the opinion of antiquity, that Elohim was written defectively for Eloaha, the plural form of Eloaha, the Deity.

Abarbinel also, to avoid if possible, the belief of a plurality in the Deity, tries to say that the term Elohim, is a compound of *El* and *Jah*, signifying the God Jah; and so urges by way of recommending the hypothesis, that nothing will be found to have been created without the express mention and agency of this Jah. He instances Ephraim, Metsraim, Chilaim, and Chushim, as proofs, that the termination, *im*, does not, necessarily, signify many, and regards the *Mem* as added, in the present case, to distinguish the absolute from the construct form. But, this is, indeed, a specimen of reasoning quite unworthy of the great Abarbinel. There is, in the first place, a strange and unprecedented transposition of the two letters, *He* and *Jod*; in order to form from *El*, *Jah*, the term Elohi; as the author proposes. Besides, the instances here adduced, are, by no means, in point; being all of them proper names, and never

used either with an affix or an emphasis, like the noun Elohim. Neither has he assigned any reason, why this alone, of all the names of the Supreme Being, should be accompanied sometimes with verbs and adjectives in the plural number. The most evident cause of complaint, however, is, that, contrary to the established usage of the language, he derives, by the addition of a *Mem*, a singular absolute from a singular construct form.

Indeed, the author himself appears to be dissatisfied with his own opinion; and, as though he foresaw that it would not carry conviction to the mind of the reader, has endeavoured to account for this plurality in another way, by comparing the Deity with the soul of man, in respect of the number and variety of its operations. But here the wonted perspicacity of the author has again deserted him. For though it be very true, that we observe resulting from the self same mind of man a variety of actions and operations, without ever calling in question the singularity of its number; yet does that add nothing to the support of his argument, because in no language with which we are acquainted, is the human mind ever expressed in the plural number on that account, and, therefore, affords no reason why the noun Elohim, should be so used, on account of the multiplicity and variety of its operations.

It remains, then, that we contemplate this appellation of the Deity as being actually in the plural number, agreeably to both grammar and analogy; and as expressing a number of persons in that Godhead, to which it is rightly and for the most part appropriated.

This opinion was unquestioned in the Christian Church until the time of Calvin, when it was only partially, and for a short time, interrupted by the opposition of himself, Mercer, Pareus, Drusius, Bellarmine, &c. &c.

It is further observable that the Rabbinical writers, even while supporting their alleged rule, recognize a designed plurality in the name Elohim, and say that it is expressive of the manifold faculties or operations of the Deity. "*Elohim*: its explanation is *Possessor of all powers*: and for this reason he, (Moses,) does not say *El*, nor *Eloha*, but *Elohim*, in the plural number. So also, *He is the Holy God*, (*Elohim Kedoshism*,) because

he perfectly comprises all holinesses." This is the opinion also, of the ancient Jewish author of the book *Coeri*, quoted by Hengstenberg, vol. i., pp. 216, 217. The opposition, however, both of Calvin and others, to this view of the word, was made to the idea that the word Elohim, in and of itself, expressed the idea of the Trinity. But even these writers admit that it is itself plural, and that it indicates the plurality of the Divine Nature, and is absolutely inconsistent with the Unitarian and modern Jewish theory of God, being personally, metaphysically, and only one.

Thus to quote only the most learned Buxtorf who, though in his disquisition on this subject, takes great pains to support the negative opinion with Calvin and others, yet, at the close, he acknowledges nearly, if not altogether, the opinion here supported. His words are as follows; "Not that I think that this argument should be altogether rejected among Christians, for, upon the same principle on which not a few of the Jews, as we have seen, refer this emphatical application of the plural number to a plurality of powers, or of influences, or of operations, that is, *ad extra*; why may not we refer it *ad intra*, to a plurality of persons, and to personal works? Yea, who certainly knows *what* that was which the ancient Jews understood by this plurality of powers and faculties?"—Buxtorf, fil. Dissert. Philolog. Theolog. Diss. v., pp. 244. Philo has, also, expressed himself in full accordance with this view of the case. See Philo, ed., Mangey, tom. i., pp. 430, 431.

This word, says Ewald, "appears to have remained always in the plural even in prose, not so much on account of its resemblance to the idea of *Lord*, as because they conceived the Deity in ancient times as infinitely numerous, and yet as conjoined. "Ewald's Heb. Gram. by Nicholson, pp. 231. Neither is this inconsistent with the theory supported with so much learning by Hengstenberg and Havernick, that Elohim is used only to distinguish God in his fulness of power, without reference to his personality or moral qualities, to any special relation in which he stands to men, either as to the benefits he bestows, or to the requirements he makes, and that Jehovah is employed to denote God as person-

ally revealed, manifested, and in covenant with man. For Hengstenberg admits that "the one God comprehends multiplicity in himself. Thus he can oppose to the "*we will build,*" "*we will make,*" of *men* who trust in their numbers and combination, *his own* "*we will go down.*" "*We will confound.*" The ancient Jews approached to a correct explanation of the plural? This view is very strongly supported by Theodoret, who advocates the allusion to the Trinity.

Even Hengstenberg, in reference to the views taken by Calvin, &c., on this subject, says, "It is not to be denied that this erroneous view involves a portion of truth. The plural form, as it indicates the infinite riches, the inexhaustible fulness of the Godhead, serves to combat the most dangerous enemy of the doctrine of the Trinity, that abstract monotheism of which Schelling, (*uber die Gottheiten von Samothrace*, pp. 87,) admirably says, "Mohammedanism may indeed be called monotheism, which only allows one personality or one simple power to the name of God. That this is not in the style of the New Testament, requires no proof; that this is not agreeable to the old Testament, see Weltalter, Th. i., "Since Elohim is opposed to this view, which, in many respects, stands below polytheism, it contains certainly the germ of the doctrine of the Trinity."—Hengstenberg, vol. i., pp. 268, 269, note.

It is, indeed, affirmed as by Mr. Belsham, that "in all languages it is a common anomaly for words of a plural form to have a singular signification." But he has not produced any instance, and I apprehend that it would not be easy to find one that would prove unexceptionable. Mr. Belsham further says, that "the word Elohim is almost used uniformly in apposition with singular verbs." This is a part of the very case to be accounted for. "It is not so," says Dr. Smith, with the "words of a plural form," in other languages, which the author says "have a singular signification;" they are always put in apposition with plural attributives. But, if we content ourselves with regarding the apposition of *Elohim* with singular verbs, adjectives, and pronouns, as a Hebrew idiom of which no other account can be given than that so we find it, what can we say upon the other

part of the case, the construction with *plural* attributives? It is *this* which forms the great peculiarity of our question, it is *this*, upon which the chief stress of the argument is laid for an allusion or implication in favour of the doctrine of a Divine plurality, but upon *this* the writer was silent!"

Mr. Belsham further says, that "Elohim is not limited, like Jehovah, to express the Supreme Being alone." "For that very reason, then, it became the more necessary to guard against possible and probable abuse. As the word was in ordinary use to designate the numerous false deities of the nations, it was the *more* likely, and even unavoidable, that the Hebrews would understand its perpetual occurrence in the plural form, as the designation of their own God, to be an express intimation that *plurality* in some sense belonged to *Him*; while, from other infallible testimonies, they were absolutely certain of his essential unity."

Once more, Mr. Belsham affirms that, "though Elohim is in a plural form, it commonly expresses one object only."

But, after carefully examining the examples brought by Mr. B. to support his assertion, we will only say with Dr. Pye Smith, that they are all irrelevant.

To bring this review to an end, we remark, in the words of Dr. Pye Smith, "We have thus endeavoured to present a faithful view of the whole evidence on both sides of this celebrated question. After the closest attention that I can give to all the parts of the case, the impression on my mind is favourable to the opinion that this peculiarity of idiom *originated* in a design to *intimate* a plurality in the nature of the one God; and that thus, in connexion with other circumstances calculated to suggest the same conception, it was intended to excite and prepare the minds of men for the more full declaration of this unsearchable mystery, which should in proper time be granted. This supposition implies, of course, a divine direction in the origin, or in the application of the term, and the intention which we suppose was merely to *intimate*, not to give an absolute declaration. Now, we know that the earlier dispensations of revealed knowledge were constructed upon the



plan of a course of *intimations*, (as it were involucra,) with regard to a variety of truths, the clear manifestation of which was reserved for the brightness of the Gospel day. Under such a system, it would be a necessary consequence that the design would be perceived, and the interior meaning apprehended, in various degrees, according to the piety, intelligence, and attention of different persons; and, in all probability, the careless majority would pay no attention at all to such subjects."

To this, we will only add the testimony of Gussenius, in his *Commentarii Linguae Ebraicae*. "From these considerations it follows, that the plural form of speech concerning God, is to be taken strictly and in its full force, if we would comply with the idiom of the Hebrew tongue; and that therefore, it ought to be acknowledged, that by this phraseology, plurality in Deity is most distinctly and strongly affirmed." In the same connexion, he also expresses himself in the following remarkable words: "But you will say, this plurality is inconsistent with the nature of God; I ask, in return, how do you know that? The declaration of God, *who knows*, is of more weight than your reasoning, *who do not know*. There are other causes, you retort, of a plural form of speech. I answer, its proper and natural cause is plurality in the things signified. It is from *this* that the plural form of a noun usually arises; nor could it have been indicated in a manner more effectual than by this description of phrase, at once elegant and consistent with use. Let every humble learner, therefore, of the word of God, settle in his mind, to receive, in sincerity and truth, whatever he (God) may dictate."

See a long note on the subject, in Wardlaw's *Socinian Controversy*, pp. 488, and note D, Gale's *Court of the Gentiles*, vol. 4, ch. 3, p. 237. Also, Amyraldus *Probatio Trinitatis ex V. T.* in Wagenselii *Telae Ignæ Satanæ*, pp. 141, 165.

## ARTICLE VI.

## THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF THE PAGAN DOCTRINE OF TRIADS, OR A TRINITY.

The fact of the existence of a doctrine of a trinity of Supreme Gods, with more or less distinctness, in all the earlier forms of religious belief, is now universally admitted.

The degree in which any resemblance is found to the Christian doctrine varies with the proximity and clearness of the traditions of a primitive theology.

It will be interesting to present an outline of these Triads from the sources within our reach and chiefly from an elaborate analysis included in a more general review some years since.

The Hindu Triad bears but little resemblance to the Scriptural doctrine of the Trinity, although it has been made use of by sceptical writers for the purpose of attempting to cast discredit on Christianity. Still, it may seem strange that such a doctrine as that of the Triad should have been conceived by man; especially when to it is added the doctrine of Avatars, or Incarnations, which are part of the functions peculiar to Vishnu, the preserver, the second deity of the Hindu Triad.

And though the resemblance, in its mythological form, is greatly warped and marred, yet it cannot but strike any inquiring mind as very remarkable, that opinions so much above the conceptions of mere reason, and bearing apparently so much more resemblance to the doctrines of Christianity than did the revelation given to the Jews, should have been held time immemorial by the Hindus. The surprise of the inquirer will certainly not be diminished, if he be led to ascertain that a similar doctrine prevailed in the earliest ages of every people in the world, whose national existence extends to a sufficiently remote antiquity, and whose ancient records have been at all preserved. A full elucidation of this ancient doctrine is not within either our power or our limits to give; but regarding it as the only key by which the secrets of ancient mythology can be unlocked,—re-

garding it as the lever by which all their delusions may be subverted and overthrown, we request the attention of our readers to so much of a disquisition concerning the recondite mythology of the ancient heathens, as may be requisite for enabling them to apprehend the bearing and force of our argument.

In the Hindu system of mythology the main elements are not properly and strictly a Trinity in Unity, but a Monad producing a Triad, and then retiring farther from action,—even from consciousness,—the Triads thenceforward remaining the deities and rulers of the universe. They must also, have perceived that this Triad was essentially of the character of materialism, and conveyed a mythic personification of the producing, preserving, and destroying powers of nature. Whether this mode of attempting to explain the mystery of the universe was within the reach of the unaided powers of human reason, we shall not at present inquire; but, let us, at least, show that it was not peculiar to the Hindus.

Partly from fragments of ancient records, and partly from recent hieroglyphic discoveries, we are enabled distinctly to perceive, that the Egyptians held the same doctrine of a Triad, and that, too, in such a degree of conformity with the Hindu system, as to show that they are essentially the same. The Egyptian Monad, or fountain of deity, is named Amon-Ra, or Eicton,—physically, Chaos,—and is identical with the Hindu Brahm. Phtha is the *creating* power,—Kneph, the *preserving* power,—and Khem, the *destroying* or reproducing power.

It is worthy of observation, however, that the Egyptians arranged their Triad somewhat differently from the Hindus, though the official attributes were the same, placing them thus,—Kneph, Phtha and Khem, in conformity with their strictly physical attributes, ether, light and heat. It must also, be added, that the names of Egyptian gods, better known to classic scholars, occupy the same positions, and claims the same characters, as those above mentioned;—as Chronus, Osiris, Herus and Typhon, the first being the Monad, the three latter the Triad. Indeed, there may be distinctly traced among the Egyptian gods three such Triads, as they

may be termed, and regarded respectively as celestial, terrestrial and infernal deities.

The Phœnician mythology bears a very close resemblance to that of the Egyptians, although in a modified form, indicating a later period of formation or reception, when certain metaphysical theories had begun to refine the simplicity of the ancient, physical, or material creed. In this the Monad is Chaos; from the Chaos proceeds a dark windy Air, or Ether; from the embrace of these springs Pothos, or Love; and from these Metis, or Mût, Intellect or Counsel.

With this the Hermetic and Orphic systems are closely connected, and deserve attention as the intermediate link between the Egyptian, and the later or classic Greek. The Monad is here again Chaos, co-existent with which is Ether, sometimes termed Phanes. Thence spring Ericapæus, Pothos, and Metis; or, as other Orphic fragments arrange and name them, Ericapæus, Phanes or Apollo-Pythius, and Metis. The classic Greek, it is well known, implies also, a Monad, producing a triad,—the monad being Chronos or Saturn, the triad, Zeus, Poseidon, or Neptune, and Pluto, manifestly a mythic mode of representing the three imaginary elemental principles of air, water, and darkness, or the unknown regions of nature.

The Syrian, Sidonian, and Tyrian, are nearly the same. In them the monad is Baalshilishi or Baal, and the triad are Ether Ulomus and Chosrus or Chronus, Pothos and Omichles, or water, Ilus and Heracles, or Chromes.

The Chaldæan has not reached us in its primitive form, except as may be gathered from what are termed the Chaldæan Oracles of Zoroaster. The fundamental tenet of these oracles is, that a Triad shines through the whole world, over which a Monad rules. This triad is termed Father, Power, Intellect; and one passage implies that it had been in the most ancient times Air, Fire, and the Sun.

The Persian is, evidently, a refined, or perhaps we might say, a partially reformed modification of the ancient Chaldæan. According to it, the monad is Zeronane, or Time unbounded; the triad consists of Ormuzd,

Mithras, and Ahriman, exactly corresponding to the character and the arrangement of the Hindu triad,—the creating, preserving, and destroying powers, or the Good principle, the Mediator, and the Evil principle.

According to the Chinese, from Zao, the incorporeal reason, sprung a *duad*, from which proceeded a *triad*, by whom all things were created.

The simplest form of the Scandinavian mythology is, that which names the monad Bor, and the triad Odiu, Hæmur, and Lodur; the powers respectively of Ether, Light, and Fire, or, as applied to man, life, reason, and blood.

The Druids specified no monad, and their's was entirely of a metaphysical character,—Life, Knowledge, Power; from which it may be inferred, that the Druid system is not nearly so ancient as those already mentioned, and cannot belong to a more remote antiquity than one subsequent to the metaphysical refinement of the Pythagorean period.

It deserves to be mentioned, also, that among the Peruvians the same system of a monad producing a triad, formed the ancient creed.

The monad they called Viracocha, or Pachacamac, (soul of the world;) this primary being they regarded as symbolized in some measure by the Sun, who was, of course, the chief object of their worship; the triad they designated, Father-Sun; Son-Sun; and Brother-Sun.

From this necessarily very brief and imperfect outline of the most ancient systems of heathen mythology, we are irresistibly led to the conclusion, that all the nations of primitive antiquity worshipped a Triad of divine persons,—which Triad they believed to have been in some manner inherent in, or to have proceeded from, or to have been produced by, a Monad, who was recognised as the supreme source of deity.

The most ancient aspect of this system, which is also, the simplest, is purely of a material character, and is found in the Hindu and Egyptian mythologies. In them the correspondence is very close,—

Hindu,	<i>Monad,</i>	Brahm;	<i>Triad,</i>	Vishnu,	Brahma,	Shiva,
Egyptian,	<i>Monad,</i>	Amon-Ra;	<i>Triad,</i>	Kneph,	Phthah,	Khem,
Physical				Ether,		Fire,
nature,		Chaos;		Spirit,	Light,	or
				or Air,		Ocean.

The attributes respectively are:	Preserving power,	Creating power.	Destroying power.
The colors sacred to these deities corresponding to their physical nature, are	Blue,	White,	Red.
The Chaldean ancient Triad is also,	Ether,	Light,	Fire.

These are, beyond all question the most ancient mythological tenets of the most ancient of heathen nations; and, therefore, they present to us the nearest approach to the primitive opinions of the post-diluvian patriarchs, or rather, let us say, the first corruption of patriarchal religion.

Having thus begun to worship the elemental powers of nature, the next corruption was easy, and indeed, inevitable, namely, the worship of the heavenly bodies, and especially of the sun, sometimes as the monad, sometimes as the first person of the triad, the moon, and the earth, or the moon, and the ocean. The worship of the moon, of the ocean, and of the earth, as also, of the infernal or subterrene regions, were later additions to the worship of the sun, as that luminary was held to possess all the powers of the triad, creative, preserving, and destructive, and reproductive. He is the Baal or sun-god, of the second corrupt system of heathen worship, which prevailed very extensively among the nations of central and western Asia; and, when combined with, and modified by the Hermetic and Orphic systems, (themselves partly derived from the Egyptian,) formed the intermediate and connecting links between the ancient system and the classic mythology of Greece and Rome.

Let it, however, be carefully noted, that there were two other systems of mythology prevalent among the ancients, both intimately connected with the system we have been considering,—one as a farther corruption, the other, as an attempt at reformation, or at least, a sort of explanatory refinement. The most ancient of these was the worship of deified human beings, leading directly to idolatry. The first and greatest of these hero-gods occupies the position of the monads of the earlier system. He is the sole king of the world. He is threatened with some fearful calamity, from which he escapes by taking refuge in a boat, a cavern, a coffer, or ark, the moon, or

the hollow of a lotus leaf. He finally surmounts the danger, re-organizes the frame of nature, or becoming the parent of three sons, re-peoples the world. In this system the worship of the moon, the earth, the sea, the serpent, rainbow, and the dove, may be found under various symbols, more or less obscure, and more or less successfully combined with the more ancient (as we think,) and simpler system of the monad and triad,—the chaos and the elemental powers and attributes of nature. It is impossible not to recognise in this a confused mythological representation of the events of the deluge, and the history of Noah and his three sons,—together with a still more confused reference to the history of the fall, and of Adam and his three sons. This, which we may term for the present, the *patriarcho-idolatrous* system, appears to have sprung up, as we shall have occasion to show, shortly after that of the physical monad and triad theory, which we may term the *patriarcho-pantheistic* system. It may be possible to show, that these two systems were opposed to each other, their respective adherents contending with the most deadly animosity, in the remotest antiquity,—even in patriarchal times; while it must be evident to all, that their partial combination contributed to the formation of those transition stages ending, as already stated, in classic mythology.

What we have designated as an attempted reformation, or sort of explanatory refinement of these ancient systems, had its origin in a much later period, and was of a metaphysical character. In it the monad is, the soul of the world. The triad is: Spirit, or Love, or Power, or Intellect, Truth, Justice. From this the Druid system, Life, Knowledge, Power, is evidently derived, from which some approximation to the period of its origin may be obtained,—as also, to the region whence it sprung.

The Persian system, as given in the Zendavesta, bears a close resemblance to this metaphysical system, with one peculiar characteristic of its own, highly deserving of attention. In it the monad is Time-unbounded, or eternity; the triad,—

Ormuzd,	Mithras,	Ahriman,
or The	or The	or The
Good principle,	Mediator,	Evil principle.

In this system, it will be observed that there appears, if not for the first time, at least more distinctly than in any of the more ancient, the idea of the two opposing principles of Good and Evil; and from this peculiarity men of less judgment than learning have attempted to account for the introduction of the Hebrew Scriptures of the same idea, in consequence of the intercourse of the Jews with the Persians, during the period of the captivity. We trust soon to prove, that the very opposite was the truth,—and that the Persians actually received it from the Jews.

Let us, briefly, recapitulate, for the purpose of presenting in the most succinct and intelligible form, the conclusions to which we have arrived. The most ancient system of heathen mythology is, that which regards as the chief object of worship one supreme source of all being, the universal self-existing monad, of which chaos is the material symbol, or which is itself, chaos; and a triad proceeding from, or produced by, the monad, of which air or ether, light, and fire, or sometimes the ocean, are the material symbols. This speedily degenerated into the worship of the heavenly bodies themselves, and became a kind of pantheistic materialism. Almost, if not entirely, contemporaneous with this, arose an opposing system, assuming as the chief objects of worship, not the symbolized powers of elemental nature, but the historic events and persons connected with the creation and deluge; thus endeavouring to avoid pantheism, but sinking into idolatry and hero worship. To trace the subsequent contentions, and blendings, and modifications of these systems, as the nations where they chiefly prevailed, held hostile or friendly intercourse with each other, would be to give a complete history of heathen mythology,—and, with the key thus furnished, would be a task more of time than of difficulty. The next great modification of these original mythic systems was the metaphysical, which attempted to explain them in conformity with certain mental and moral abstractions, or



rather ideas, derived partly from the contemplation of the nature of the human mind itself,—thus endeavouring to make the microcosm, or little world of man, the known element by which, reasoning analogically, they might explain the system of the universe.

We need not waste space in showing that the metaphysical system led inevitably to pantheism, if not to atheism,—extremes meeting in this as in all other cases, and every false system tending ultimately to destroy itself; and we merely suggest the idea, in passing, as we may have occasion to revert to it hereafter. But, having now arrived by an analytic process at the very essence of all heathen mythology, we must next attempt to point out its origin and progress, so far as our limits will permit, and to the extent required for the object we have in view.

We need not hesitate to say that the Bible must be our chief guide in the investigation which we are now commencing; but, at the same time, we shall produce such a mass of corroborating facts, dates, and arguments, as shall, we trust, convince every impartial inquirer, that it is not a mere hypothesis he is tracing, but the actual vestiges of long-unnoticed truth. Every person will admit that Noah and his sons were in possession of the whole amount of religious truths which had, at that time, been communicated to man. The history of the creation and the fall, would, necessarily form the basis of all true knowledge, both respecting the character and the works of God, and respecting the relation subsisting between God and man, together with those laws given to man for the regulation of his belief and his conduct. An outline of these truths, sacred and historical, is given in the first five chapters of the book of Genesis. The fundamental truths there stated, are, first, those which regard God; and then those which describe the creation. The sublime idea of one God, the creator of the heaven and the earth, is there revealed in the clear simplicity of its own unapproachable greatness; yet even in that, the farther idea of a plurality of powers in the Godhead, is suggested by the use of the plural noun Elohim. The next idea, is that of the elements of nature, created at first in a chaotic state, while

the vivifying Spirit of God brooded upon the liquid and formless mass. It must be evident to every thinking person, that in the perversion of these two distinct doctrines, and their combination, originated the heathen tenet of Brahm, Amun-Ra, the Chaos, and the Chaos, embracing the Ether, which appears as the monad of the respective systems of the most ancient nations; the sublime Scriptural doctrine of the ETERNAL UNITY OF BEING IN PLURALITY OF PERSON, possessed of every possible attribute in infinite perfection, being lost in the dim notion of a chaotic monad, devoid of all attributes, mental and moral, and existing only as a crude mass whence the universe might be constructed.

The three next creative stages, in which the creation of light, the firmament of the heavens, and the separation of sea and land, and consequent production of vegetation, are related, seem also, to have given rise to the primitive triad, the elemental powers of nature, Light,—the Heavens or the Air,—and Fire or Ocean. In this, it may be observed, the Hindu system follows exactly the course of the days of creation, Brahma being the elemental light, Vishnu, the heavens, and Shiva, fire or ocean, the life-producer, destroyer, and re-producer; while the Egyptian transposes the two former of these powers, arranging them thus, Kneph, the heavens, Phthah, light, and Khem, fire or ocean. From this it ought to be inferred, that the Hindu system was somewhat more ancient than that of Egypt.

The three next stages of creation, together with the first great event in the history of man, appear to have been also seized upon by the mythologists of ancient times for the purpose of constructing a second system of a monad presiding over, or appearing in, a triad. In the Bible these three stages are, the creation of the sun and the moon, to be the measures of time, “for signs and for seasons,” as well as lights in the firmament,—animal life,—and man; to which may be added the first great event in the history of man, the temptation by the serpent and the Fall. Upon this basis the mythologists have erected the system of a second monad, Chronus, or Sev, with the attribute Time, and the material symbol, the Sun; and a second triad, Osiris, Horns, and Ty-

phon, among the Egyptians, with the attributes Life, the Good-principle, and the Evil-principle. With this the Persian, as reformed by Zoroaster at a much later period, almost exactly corresponds; as the monad Zeronane, or Time-unbounded, symbolized by the sun, and sometimes called also, Mithras, and the triad Ormuzd, or Oromasdes, the good-principle, Mithras, the mediator or preserver, and Ahriman, or Arimanius, the evil principle. How much information was communicated to Adam and to Noah respecting the future Deliverer, the promised seed of the woman and the enemy of the serpent, we cannot know; but that they were acquainted with the doctrine of His divine nature and incarnation, we do not doubt; whence arose the Indian doctrine of Avatars, or Incarnation of Vishnu, the second person of their triad; and also, the doctrine of the good and evil principles of the Persian system.

Thus it appears, that the most ancient systems of heathen mythology arose from either the voluntary perversion, or ignorant misunderstanding and misapplication of the true history of the creation, as known traditionally to the patriarchs, and subsequently again revealed in its original purity to Moses. The opposite great corruption of patriarchal religion, as has been already stated, consisted in the worship of the first patriarchal family, which also, being composed of a father and his three sons, retained the idea, to a certain extent, of a monad producing a triad, and tended to confirm and perpetuate that primitive mythic system, even while introducing absolute idolatry. But, here let us remark, that although we are persuaded the above is the true origin of the heathen triad, as it appears in the most ancient mythological systems, we are far from holding that the true idea of a Trinity in Unity was unknown to the patriarchs. On the contrary, we fully believe that it was; and that a vain attempt to explain it, by the use of material symbols, in such a manner as to render it intelligible to the human mind, was the great cause of its corruption and abuse. And this is in exact conformity with all that experience, philosophy, and revelation teach us respecting the characteristic tendencies of man.

Experience tells us, that men are almost irreclaimably prone to materialism,—few, very few, ever being able or willing to rise above the regions of the senses, and of mere physical existences. Philosophy tells us, that this is inevitable, in consequence of the continual and urgent demands made by our sensuous frames under the pressure of physical necessities, rendering the culture of our mental faculties not only more difficult than that of our physical, but even of comparatively inferior moment. And revelation informs us why these things are so,—whence the difficulty arose, and in what it chiefly consists. It tells us of the fall of man, and the consequent loss of that spiritual faculty by which alone spiritual things can be adequately discovered. Hence it was, that the spiritual truths which Noah had to communicate to his descendants, were not, and could not be, by them spiritually received, except where any of them were favoured by express spiritual enlightenment; and, therefore, inevitably sunk during transmission into these forms of materialism which constitute the very essence of ancient heathen mythology. It thus appears, that the origin of all false systems of religion consists in the materializing perversion of the great doctrine of the unity of God. All mythology, therefore, and in particular, Hinduism, its most fully elaborated system, ought to be regarded as a complete demonstration, that as man cannot “by searching find out God,” neither can he, when God has revealed himself, retain the knowledge of him, without the constant indwelling aid of the Holy Spirit. Nor is this demonstration of less than the utmost importance even to Christians. Even with the Bible in our hands, we are perpetually liable to entertain such notions of the infinite Jehovah as tend to represent him as “altogether such an one as ourselves.” And this arises from the very same cause. Spiritual truths cannot enter into the depths of the mind and heart, however they may seem to be speculatively believed or admitted, except a man be spiritually taught; nor be retained, except by the constant internal operation of the same divine agent. Fallen man is the slave of his senses,—strives to reduce all infinite truths to finite forms,—in

the sign petrifies and kills the thing signified,—and perverts the patriarchal into the heathen, the Christian into the Popish, and both into infidelity.

Lest, however, our readers should consider this view as of a nature too hypothetical to command implicit assent, we shall trace it historically, by means of some very ancient fragments that have been transmitted to us from different sources, and through the lapse of many ages; and which have been put into a form accessible to all by the laborious researches of Mr. Cory, in his invaluable work, 'Ancient Fragments,' to which, and to his more recent 'Mythological inquiry into the Recondite Theology of the Heathen,' we take this opportunity of acknowledging ourselves greatly indebted.

There are two great events mentioned in the Bible,—the dividing of the earth among the descendants of Noah,—and the dispersion of the builders of Babel,—the dates of which, if they could be exactly ascertained, would serve to fix the chronology of all ancient history. Not wishing to frame any hypothesis of our own, where that can be avoided, we may assume the date of Peleg's birth as that of the earth's divisions which is commonly stated as the year 2247 B. C. The close approximation to this date which is obtained from the most authentic annals of the chief nations of antiquity is very remarkable. Our space will not permit us to cite the authorities on which the following dates are given, but our readers may rely upon the utmost care having been taken in their compilation. The different eras of the origin of nations are those of the Chaldæan, 2233; the Chinese, 2207; the Indian, 2204; the Egyptian, 2188; and the Assyrian, 2185, B. C. Of these, the Chaldæan is the most ancient, and the best authenticated, as was to have been expected from the fact that Babylon was the seat of the first monarchy. The approximation is, at any rate, close enough to show the general truth of the whole, and the agreement between the Bible and the most ancient historic records.

From the account given in the Bible of the building of Babel, and the dispersion of those who were engaged in it, we may infer that Nimrod was the leader of a large

body of men who had rebelled against the authority of the great patriarch Noah, and, in all probability, at the same time had introduced a corruption of the patriarchal religion.

Now, it is very remarkable, that in some ancient fragments preserved by Epiphanius, Cedrenus, and in the Paschal Chronicle, it is stated that the first form of religion was called Barbarism, which is said to have prevailed from Adam to Noah,—and which, therefore, must be the patriarchal form. The second is termed "Scuthism, which prevailed from the days of Noah, and thence downwards to the building of the tower of Babylon." This we believe to have been the gradual materializing process through which the patriarchal tenets passed, till by Nimrod, or perhaps his father, Cush, they were formed into the earliest monad and triad system already explained. The third is called Hellenism, or Ionism, which "originated in the days of Serug, with the introduction of idolatry. The Egyptians, and Babylonians, and Phrygians, and Phœnicians, were the first propagators of this superstition of making images, and of the mysteries." This second corruption is manifestly that which has been already described, as the worship of the Noachian family, which we have pointed out as the origin of absolute idolatry, and yet retaining somewhat of the original monad and triad system. But, it is remarkable that this Ionism, the second corruption of patriarchal religion is said to have been begun by Serug;—we are also told in the Bible that Nahor and Terah, the immediate ancestors of Abraham, were worshippers of idols;—and ancient history informs us that the Dove (Ionah,) was the standard of the Assyrians. From all these we think the conclusion is inevitable, that Scuthism, and the mythic system of the elemental monad and triad, were identical, and that this was the first corruption of the patriarchal religion, and prevailed chiefly in the Hametic and Japhetic races of mankind: and also, that Ionism, or Hellenism, (the worship of the Dove, and of the Arkite or Noachim family, combined with the worship of fire, Elain, whence the term Hellenism,) was the second corruption, and was almost

peculiar to the Shemitic race, of which the Assyrian was the chief nation, as the Egyptian and the Hindu were of the Hametic and the Japhetic races.

Even the dates of these corruptions may be very nearly ascertained. The foundation of the Babylonian monarchy by Nimrod, 2233 B. C., may be assumed as the origin of Scythism, at least in its completed form. The æras of China, 2207, and of India, 2204, would seem to indicate that these nations had followed the direction of Noah, and gone to their respective territories without delay, and before any further corruption of religion had taken place. In them accordingly, we find the system of Scythism in its greatest simplicity. The birth of Serug, and the æra of the Assyrian monarchy are almost exactly synchronous, and both are connected with the second corruption, Ionism, the date of which, therefore, we may assume to be 2185 B. C., or 48 years subsequent to the Scythic heresy. It can scarcely be doubted that wars would very speedily ensue between the adherents of these hostile creeds, if, indeed, the very building of Babel itself was not the first act of hostility directed by the Scythic leader, Nimrod, against the Patriarchs; and in this we might find the true history of what is known in classic mythology as "the war of the Titans," waged against Chronus, or Noah, and his sons. The exact date of this event cannot, however, be fixed, except that it probably occurred between the periods of the building of Babel and the foundation of the Assyrian empire, within a range of 48 years.

The first Chaldæan, or rather Babylonian dynasty, founded by Nimrod, is stated by Syncellus to have lasted 225 years, and to have been succeeded by an Arabian dynasty. The designation, Arabian, is manifestly erroneous, as there could have been no such nation at that time in existence. The overthrowers of the Nimrodean dynasty were more probably Assyrians, and to this war the classic fable of "the war of the giants" may most likely refer. Abydenus places Ninus, the founder of the Assyrian empire, sixth in descent from Belus, its nominal founder, and within eight years of the assumed Arabian dynasty of Babylon. This seems to confirm the conjecture that the new dynasty was, indeed, Assy-

rian in its origin, though Babylon may have been governed by satraps, while Nineveh remained the seat of empire. But what is most deserving of notice is, that this change of dynasty in Babylon, by the overthrow of Nimrod's successors, occurred in the year 2008 B. C.; and that the invasion of Egypt by the Hyksos occurred in 2002, as has been ascertained from the monuments.

The Egyptian records respecting the Hyksos are sufficiently confused, still we may learn from them that the invaders assailed them from the eastern shores of the Red Sea,—that they were hostile to image worship, and were in truth, worshippers of the sun, or of fire. In these respects they completely harmonize with the characteristics of the expelled followers of Nimrod, whose Scuthism had by this time, declined into Zabaism, or the worship of the heavenly bodies, and especially the sun, and his symbol, fire.

The period of six years from their expulsion out of Babylon till their arrival in Egypt, is not too much for them to have expended in travelling through Arabia, or rather round it, following the course of the sea-coast till they turned the point of the Red Sea, and seized upon the fertile regions of the Delta.

It may be added, that this expulsion of the first Babylonian dynasty synchronizes very nearly also, with the Hindu æra of the first Buddha, who introduced a more refined materialism into India, hostile to their original system, and leading to infidelity. This also agrees with the Egyptian accusation against the Hyksos, that they were "contemners of the gods."

We have thus obtained somewhat of a historical account of the rise and progress of the different perversions and corruptions of the patriarchal religion, with a series of dates which are at least, a close approximation to the truth; by the use of which we are persuaded that it is perfectly possible to lay hold on any system of heathen mythology, and trace it to its origin in the corruption and misconception of some still more ancient and divinely revealed truth; by seizing upon which, and reversing the process, correcting the mythic legend at every step, the whole may be exploded, and the true system of divinely revealed religion established upon its



ruins. The pure, patriarchal religion, as held by Noah, was corrupted into Scythism, or the mythic theory of a monad producing a triad, themselves merely the elemental powers of the material universe, by Cush, or Nimrod, about 2233 B. C. This system was embraced chiefly by the Hametic and Japhetic races; the Hametic however, sinking towards a grosser materialism, and to idolatry, while the Japhetic pursued a more intellectual process, hovering between pantheism, or infidelity, and the worship of the sun, or of fire. The Semitic race adopted a different perversion of patriarchal religion, termed Ionism, the characteristic tendency of which was hero worship, (at first that of the Noachian family,) and idolatry; the date of which cannot be later than 2185 B. C. The expulsion of the first Babylonian dynasty by the Assyrians caused an infusion of the purest Scythism into Egypt with the Hyksos, and into India, where it was known as the earliest appearance of Buddhism. All the corruptions of the patriarchal, the true revealed religion, were thus thrown into such juxtaposition with each other, as to produce a universal idolatry, of which the forms were considerably different, but the leading tenets the same, and all having for their basis a confused notion of a monad producing a triad.

We have shown abundant proof of the universal belief in the doctrine of a Trinity, or at least of a Triad, with some obscure notions of an Avatar or Incarnation, among the Gentile nations, from the earliest times, long previous to the æra of the Mosaic dispensation, and therefore not derived from that source; this can be accounted for only by the supposition, that this doctrine, together with that of the Incarnation, formed the chief tenets of the ancient patriarchal religion, held and taught while mankind constituted but one family, or one community, and carried with the various branches as they separated from the parent stem. But we have traced, also, the very early corruptions of patriarchal religion, till it became wholly obscured by mythic fables, or perverted into gross idolatry. Let it be noted, that as successive migrations took place, and tribes wandered to a distance from the chief seat of the nation, they necessarily sunk into greater degrees of barbarism, and their

religion became more and more corrupt. The simplest and purest forms, therefore, are to be found in the central seats of each main branch of the human family in Persia, India, and Egypt. When these simplest forms are found in remote countries, the inference is, either that a considerable settlement must have taken place from the central seat, the latter opinion being rendered absolutely certain when the simpler tenets of antiquity are found to be superinduced upon a more degenerate system.

By attending to this view, much light would be thrown both upon the religious history of man, and upon the migrations of various races. Let it also be marked, that when the patriarchal religion had been thus corrupted, and the allwise God was pleased to communicate a new revelation to man, while the first chapters of the book of Genesis contained a re-statement of the history of the creation, as it had been known to the patriarchs, the law did not expressly contain a re-statement of the doctrine of the Trinity. This essential doctrine was, indeed, contained in the Mosaic dispensation, and the successive revelations which God made to his chosen people; but it was so concealed under types, and symbols, and in predictions, that the spiritually enlightened alone discerned it, and thus it was effectually preserved from being again corrupted by the materializing process natural to the darkened mind of fallen man. The sublime doctrine of the Unity of the only living and true God was thus maintained, the Jews kept from lapsing into idolatry, and the false worship of heathen nations kept in check, while reforming influences were from time to time infused into the heart and mind of the world, preparatory for the full and clear manifestation of Divine truth in the pure system of Christianity, so far as to the weak and finite mind of man the infinitely mysterious, yet infinitely true doctrine of TRINITY IN UNITY AND UNITY IN TRINITY, can be manifested.

The names under which the Hycksos or Shepherd-King Dynasty in Egypt, says Mr. Poole, (*Horæ Aegyptiacæ*, pp. 204 and 206,) “as found on the monuments of Egypt, worshipped the sun, are ‘Aten-ra,’ or the solar disk, that is, the visible sun; ‘Muce-ra,’ the bright-

ness, or rays, of the sun; and 'Ra,' the power supposed to reside in the sun. We find the names of their God enclosed in two royal rings, shewing that they ascribed to him a regal character. The names thus enclosed read 'Ra' of the two solar abodes, who rejoices in the solar abode in his name Muce-ra, who is in Aten-ra."

Zoroaster and his followers (I do not mean those holding the opinions of the Zend-Avesta,) generally speak of but one deity, though it is evident that they worshipped a triad or triads, just as the sculptures of the sun-worshippers in Egypt uniformly represented but one object of adoration, although that people, also, evidently worshipped a kind of triad. It appears to me from the different names given to the god of the sun-worshippers that they adored one god whom they supposed to be resident in the sun, and operating through its rays, and yet that they worshipped this god through the medium of the sun and its rays. These evidently correspond to the fire, the sun, or light, and the Ether of the Zoroastrian triad originating from a monad. The only one of these correspondences that appears at first sight strained, is that of Ether in the Zoroastrian triad, with the god supposed to reside in the sun by the sun-worshippers in Egypt; but the objection is removed when we remember that the Ether of Zoroaster corresponds to the soul or spirit of the universe of some of the ancient theologians and some of the philosophers. How interesting is it to see in the earliest monuments of Asiatic nations of which the date is proved, the first records of that religion, which so widely prevailed in Asia, for so many ages, and which is not yet extinct.\*

"Nothing, perhaps," says Mr. Cory, in his very learned work, (*Ancient Fragments*, page 354,) "is more uniformly insisted on among the heathens, than that their Trinity was a Triad Subordinate to a Monad; which Monad was clearly one of those two independent principles, which were conceived to have existed before the formation of the world, and was the Etherial Intellectual principle of the Universe, which was in a manner superse-

\* See Voltaire's *Analysis of the Platonic Trinity* in Hey's *Lectures on Divinity*, vol. i, pp. 488, 2 vol., ed. W.

ded by the Triad. The Triad is likewise maintained to be Phanes or Eros, the Sun, the Soul and Ruler of the World.

To ascertain the person of this triad, then, I shall merely place the most ancient speculations upon the subject under one another; but at the same time I would observe, that it is one of those questions, which, for want of sufficient evidence, is incapable of being brought to the test of absolute demonstration.

From the different Orphic fragments we find that the Orphic Trinity consisted of

Metis,	Phanes, or Eros,	Ericapœua.
Which are interpreted,		
Will or Counsel,	Light or Love,	Life or Life giver.
From Acusilaus,		
Metis,	Eros,	Ether.
From Hesiod according to Damascius,		
Earth,	Eros,	Tartarus.
From Pherecydes Syrius,		
Fire,	Water,	Spirit or Air.
From the Sidonians,		
Cronus,	Love,	Cloudy Darkness.
From the Phœnicians,		
Ulomus,	Chusorus,	The Egg.
From the Chaldæan and Persian Oracles of Zoroaster,		
Fire,	Sun,	Ether.
Fire,	Light,	Ether.
From the later Platonists,		
Power,	Intellect,	Father.
Power,	Intellect,	Soul or Spirit.
By the ancient Theologists, according to Macrobius,		
the Sun was invoked in the Mysteries as		
Power of the world,	Light of the world,	Spirit of the world.
To which may, perhaps, be added from Sanchoniatho		
the three sons of Genus,		
Fire,	Light,	Flame.

By omitting the earth, water, and other materials, which in the formation of the world, are elsewhere disposed of, and passing over the refinements of the Pythagoreans, who sometimes even deviated so far as to place the (*αἰγασον*) first cause, as the Monad, and the three co-causes as the Triad, I think we may find in the above enumeration sufficient ground for maintaining the opinion that the persons of the Trinity of the Gentiles, viewed under a physical aspect, were regarded as the Fire, the Light, and the Spirit or Air, of the Etherial fluid substance of the heavens, which in a Metaphysical aspect were held to be no other than the Power or Will, the Intellect or Reason, and the Spirit or Affections of the Soul of the World; accordingly, as the prior Monad was contemplated in its Etherial or Intellectual substance. \* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \* The numerous passages in the Scriptures in which the Persons of the Christian Trinity are shadowed forth by the same natural and mental powers which I suppose to constitute the original triad of the Gentiles, are too numerous to require to be specifically referred to. The Father is continually typified as a Fire accepting the sacrifices, consuming and punishing the guilty, as the Lord of all power and might, to whom all prayers are commonly addressed;—the Son, as Light, as a Mediator, and a Teacher, enlightening the understanding, addressing himself more particularly to the Intellect, pointing out the distinctions between good and evil;—the Spirit, as Spirit or Air, a mighty rushing wind, opening upon the Affections, Feelings, or Emotions. We are commanded by the Christian faith to look to the Son for knowledge, to obey his instructions, and to accept the conditions of salvation he has offered,—to the Spirit, for grace to influence us in all our feelings, wishes and intentions;—and to the Father, our prayers are to be directed for the power to act.

## ARTICLE VII.

## AMBITION REBUKED,

*Or Self-abasement and Self-denial the necessary conditions of Greatness in Christ's Kingdom.\**

This was the third time, within the space of a few months, that the Saviour found it necessary to reprove the ambition of his disciples. Journeying in Galilee, "they had by the way disputed among themselves, who should be the greatest." As they were sitting in the house, after they had reached Capernaum, the Master asked them "what was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way?" and when ashamed to tell, "they held their peace;" he endeavoured to eradicate the evil feeling which had prompted their discussion, by showing them the nature of preëminence in his kingdom,— "if any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all and servant of all." This was not the preëminence that could excite or gratify the feeling of ambition. Then, to illustrate the spirit which they ought to cultivate, "he called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of Heaven."

Some months after this occurrence, as they were on their way to Jerusalem, when the two sons of Zebedee had, through their mother, asked for the chief places in his kingdom, and the rest had been moved to indignation at this attempt to gain what they conceived to be an advantage over them, Jesus called them unto him and said, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles ex-

\* A Sermon, preached at the opening of the General Assembly in Buffalo, May 18th, 1854, from Luke xxii: 26: "But ye shall not be so; but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth rule." Written out from short notes, for the Review, by request. Various accidental causes have combined to delay its transmission hitherto.—[Eps. S. P. R.]

exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them; but it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister, and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be the servant of all." On this occasion he taught them still more clearly and fully, that preëminence in his kingdom could be won only by foregoing all the advantages which rank and power are supposed to confer on their possessors in the kingdoms of this world,—and that the greatest in that kingdom was to be he of whom was to be required the most absolute and unqualified resignation of all that made distinction and authority the objects of men's desires. This view of their duty, and of the principle on which it rested, he enforced and illustrated by an appeal to his own example,—“for even the Son of man came not to be ministered to, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.”

And now, even on the very night before his crucifixion, we find this same spirit of ambition again kindling a flame in the hearts of his disciples, and our Saviour again directing his efforts to extinguish it. As they sat down to the last meal which they were to take with him on earth, something seems to have occurred which gave rise to the question of superiority. The order in which they attempted to take their places may have occasioned, at that particular time, this unbecoming strife for rank and precedency. After the various admonitions previously administered to them in consequence of their discussion of this subject,—one of them, too, so recently,—it seems scarcely credible that their jealousy and rivalry could have broken forth in words upon this solemn occasion, and it seems most probable that they had only indulged in *feelings* which they had not dared to utter. Be this as it may—whether this spirit was unuttered or expressed, the Saviour had marked its re-appearance; and earnestly desiring to repress it, as one destructive alike to the personal happiness of his followers and to the interests of his kingdom, he repeated his former instructions with some variety of form, and then proceeded to enforce them, not merely as before, by an appeal to his general course of life as furnishing a model

for their conduct, but by performing before their eyes a most striking and significant act of humble and self-denying service to each one of them, and proposing this act as an example for their imitation. By reference to the Gospel of John, we learn that he "rose from the supper, and laid aside his garments, and took a towel and girded himself. After that, he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded." "After he had washed their feet and taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."\*

The evils engendered by this spirit are such as to make its extirpation from the hearts of his followers an object that was well worthy of these varied instructions, admonitions, and warnings of the Divine Redeemer. Called by different names, according to the diversity of aspects which it presents,—ambition, love of power, anxiety for distinction, desire for supremacy,—it has ever been found exerting its baleful influence in the church from the days of Diotrophes down to the present hour, originating or nurturing all the strifes that have discredited, the schisms that have rent, and the heresies that have corrupted her. And do we need proof, brethren and fathers, that this unhallowed desire for preëminence, this contentious spirit of rivalry, has naturally, a deep lodgment in all our hearts, and demands our strenuous efforts for its expulsion? Look at these disciples of Jesus! For three years, they had daily witnessed the meek and lowly conduct of their Divine Master,—they had attended constantly on those discourses, full of grace and truth,

\* Compare Matt. xx: 25-28, and xviii: 1-9; Mark ix: 33, and x: 42-45. Luke ix: 46-48; John xiii: 17.



which had shown them the nature of true greatness and true glory, and had disclosed to their view high and holy, and eternal objects suited to draw their affections from the low and sordid aims of earthly ambition,—they had listened again and again to his direct and earnest admonitions, to his affectionate and repeated warnings against the indulgence of this evil disposition. Yet, all these opportunities and advantages had not availed to extirpate this evil feeling from their hearts. Even the genuine love and deep respect felt by them for their Master, the awe inspired by his presence, the solemnity of the scene, the dim apprehensions and undefined forebodings of some strange and trying events that were about to occur,—all these failed *even to repress* this feeling. *There, at the last supper*, it swelled in their bosoms,—and among the last instructions imparted by the Saviour were those that were designed to aid them in their future struggles against this unhappy passion. If it so tenaciously retained its seat in the hearts of these beloved and favoured disciples, how much reason have we to fear lest it may, even though unrecognized by our consciousness, exercise its evil influence over us! To minds of a certain description, and especially when they belong to a class of men circumstanced as we are, this is a more dangerous sin than any of the more violent and outbreking fleshly lusts,—it is a hidden and often unnoticed fire within us, secretly and unremittingly consuming our spirituality, while they are the tornadoes that sweeping only occasionally and openly over the soul, alarm us by their visible ravages, and make us aware of our peril. It is a subtle sin, usually disguising itself under the semblance of a virtuous desire for the means of extended usefulness. It is not one of those low, degrading, mean, and despicable vices, that destroy the respect of our fellow-men and then give us warning of our danger of perdition. It never consigns its subjects to contempt and scorn, but even by those who condemn it, it is often palliated and excused as “the last infirmity of noble minds,”—while by many, it is honoured and commanded as “the spur to noble deeds.”

Usually, the most effectual mode of resisting evil is to flee from temptation. But we cannot thus escape

danger here,—for we cannot strip ourselves of power, nor even forbear to use and increase it. Our very position as office-bearers in Christ's kingdom implies the possession of some degree of authority and distinction. The office of an elder or bishop, from its very nature, confers power on the holder of it; and the faithful discharge of its duties increases this power, yet, "he that desireth the office of a bishop desireth a good work." Standing then, in our places, and with temptations continually increasing upon us, we must struggle with this evil propensity of our nature, using those means with which God has furnished us for overcoming it, relying on his promised strength for our success. Prominent among these means stands this injunction of our Divine Master, delivered to his disciples in such varied forms, under such peculiar circumstances, and with such striking illustrations. Its habitual and prayerful contemplation could not fail to exert a happy influence over every mind that has been, to any extent, renewed in the image of God. To a single, but important view of the nature of this injunction, we desire at present, to direct your attention.

Every precept may be regarded as the embodiment of a principle—and, as in every system are found two sets of principles, the one essential and the other incidental, so there are found corresponding precepts. The absolute indispensableness and obligation of a precept can then be ascertained only by examining the principle which it exhibits. Now, it will be found, on examination, that the principle embodied in this injunction of our Lord, is not one of those isolated and independent principles which might be changed without effecting any radical change in the nature of our blessed and holy religion, but is derivative and dependent, naturally originating from other ulterior and broader principles which lie at the very foundation of this religion,—that it *is not the result of any mere positive appointment, or special and separate act of legislation on the part of our Divine Redeemer, but is the necessary consequence of certain great elementary principles, or fundamental laws, which constitute the very basis of this kingdom, and impart to it its peculiar character as a spiritual kingdom.* If it

can be seen to be true, that the principle of this injunction is the necessary outgrowth of other principles, which we all recognize as the vital elements of the religion of Jesus,—that it is the bud and the flower naturally produced by these principles, we shall see more clearly and feel more deeply the necessity of conforming our hearts and lives to such an injunction.

The injunction is, "*He that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger, and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.*" The principle is, that *exaltation in Christ's kingdom is incompatible with the spirit of ambition, or (to present the idea in another form,) that self-abasement and self-denial are the necessary conditions of greatness in Christ's kingdom.*

I. The first great principle or law of the Redeemer's kingdom, of which the principle of this injunction is a necessary result is, that *the very object of this kingdom makes it impossible that greatness can be achieved in it, save by the possession of those qualities which, as far as they are possessed, render a man incapable of ambition.* Greatness is not absolute but relative—and what makes any person great in one sphere may disqualify him for greatness in another. Those very qualities which placed Achilles and Ajax foremost among the warriors who battled around the walls of Troy, would have effectually hindered them from rising to eminence, had they been placed among the sages who taught wisdom and self-control in the groves of the Athenian Academy. Greatness in the kingdom of our Redeemer is the result of that combination of faculties and dispositions, which best fit their possessor for promoting the object for which this kingdom was established, viz: "destroying the works of the devil." Any one can become great here, then; only in proportion to his qualifications as an instrument in the hands of God, to win souls to Christ, and thus "destroying the works of the devil," inducing them to abandon their sins and labor to remove the evil effects which flow from them. From the spiritual nature of the work it is manifest that no amount of mere intellectual powers would qualify any man for its successful prosecution. It would be as unnecessary as it would be tedious, to enumerate all even of the moral qualities that are needed

for eminent success in this work. It is sufficient for our present purpose to point out a few which are *indispensable*, and which are utterly inconsistent with the spirit of ambition, the Diotrephian love of preëminence.

1. As first among these qualities we may mention *thorough devotedness to the cause of Christ*—that principle which enabled Paul to utter the sublime declaration, “for me to live is Christ,”—that principle, the absence of which from the hearts of many of his associates the Apostle so deeply deplored, and the presence of which in his beloved son Timothy, induced him to send *him* to the Phillippians with the assurance that his mission would prove a blessing to them. “For I have no man like-minded, who will naturally care for your state. For all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ’s.” It needs no argument to prove that this quality is essential to any high degree of success in fulfilling the object of our Saviour in the establishment of his kingdom, or that it is utterly at variance with that spirit which seeketh great things for itself.

2. Another quality essential to all successful efforts for destroying the works of the devil is, a *deep sense of our unworthiness of the honour to which God has called us*,—that habitual feeling which found utterance in the striking contrast drawn by the apostle between his own desert and the glory of the work which God had assigned to him, when he exclaimed, “unto me who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ,”—that feeling which again broke forth in his humble confession that he was “the chief of sinners.” This feeling is the genuine result of habitual and correct views of the holy character of God and our own sinfulness,—of the obligations which his kindness has laid upon us, and our inexcusable and shameful violation of these obligations,—of his wondrous mercy and our utter want of all claim to that mercy. This feeling of unworthiness and these views from which it springs are indispensable qualifications for the work to which God has appointed his servants,—and they are utterly destructive of all those feelings which would lead us to self-aggrandizement and self exaltation.

3. Another quality, without which, we must fail in the work of combatting against the principalities and powers of darkness is, *a thorough conviction of our dependence on God for success*,—that conviction which was expressed by the apostles of the Gentiles, when he disclaimed for himself and his fellow-labourers, all the glory awarded to them by the Corinthian disciples. “I have planted and Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So, then, neither is he planted anything, neither he that watered, but God that giveth the increase.” Need I produce elaborate proofs that such a feeling of dependence on God is necessary to success, when we hear the Saviour saying to his disciples, “without me ye can do nothing,”—when we hear the great apostle telling his experience, “when I am weak then am I strong,”—when we hear the Most High declaring that he will not “give his glory to another,” and that he will blow upon all schemes conceived and executed in reliance upon human power. And how is such a feeling compatible with the spirit of ambition? Seeking to magnify ourselves by performances which owe their whole success to God’s power working through us as mere instruments, appears as incongruous as it would be for the “axe to boast itself against him that heweth therewith, or the saw to magnify itself against him that shaketh it, or the rod to shake itself against him that lifteth it up, or the staff to lift up itself as if it were not wood.” The full and distinct recognition of this dependence on God for all that we achieve by our spiritual labours, as effectually prevents a man from undertaking such labours with a view to his own exaltation, as it inevitably leads him, after they have been crowned with a blessing, to exclaim from the depths of a grateful heart, “Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy great name be all the glory.”

4. The last quality to which I shall allude as requisite for attaining greatness in God’s kingdom is *benevolence*,—that feeling which makes the good of others, not our own gain or glory, the object of our aims and efforts,—that feeling which embodied itself in language, when the apostle, oppressed with a sense of the interminable and intolerable woes that his brethren were bringing on

themselves by their unbelief, exclaimed, "I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart, for I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." The victories of a spiritual kingdom are achieved not by force, but by persuasion, for its dominion is to be extended, not over the bodies, but the hearts of men. This kingdom originated in that "love of Christ which passeth all understanding,"—it was established by the display of that love before the eyes of men,—and it increases in extent just as rapidly and as far as sinners can be led to comprehend and believe in that love. And how can one who does not strongly sympathize with the pervading spirit and spiritual principle of this kingdom, labour successfully in its extension? He who would win souls to Christ must be one who willingly spends and is spent in their service,—for thus alone can he gain a salutary influence over them, thus alone can he present before them a living image of the blessed Jesus, and thus alone can he lead them to form some conception of that perfect love of Christ, which constrains men to yield their hearts to his gracious sway. And can there be aught more incompatible with the spirit of self-seeking ambition than this "love which seeketh not its own?"

Were additional evidence needed to show that qualities utterly inconsistent with an ambitious spirit are indispensable to the attainment of eminence in the Redeemer's kingdom, this evidence might be drawn from the fact that those who have ever been recognized as greatest in that kingdom have all possessed such qualities in an eminent degree. We might direct your attention, also, to the fact, that so universal is the recognition of the necessity of these qualities, as to force those who, while conscious of their lack of them, still aim at greatness in this kingdom, to assume the appearance of them and pretend to their possession. It is only when the kingdom of the Redeemer has become, in a measure, converted into a kingdom of this world,—when, by the establishment in it of a hierarchy, and by welding it with the civil power, its nature has been changed, and it has been made to resemble the incongruous image of gold and brass, and iron, and clay, it is then only that men

aim at greatness in this kingdom, without at least, affecting or pretending to humility, dependence, devotedness to God and love to man. The indispensableness of these qualities might be further proved, conclusively, from the fact that their possession is made a condition of the enjoyment of the kingdom of Heaven. If the Saviour has promised the blessings of his kingdom specially to the meek, the mourners, the poor in spirit, the merciful, the peace-makers, and those who are persecuted for righteousness, the conclusion is irresistible that *exaltation* in that kingdom will be *proportioned to the degree* in which these qualities are possessed.

A last and most convincing proof of the need of these qualities to the attainment of greatness in the Redeemer's kingdom is furnished by the fact, that through their possession the glorious Head of this kingdom obtained his own mediatorial exaltation.

II. Another great principle or law of the Redeemer's kingdom, of which the principle of this injunction is a necessary result, is, that *those prerogatives which worldly greatness is supposed to confer on its possessors, and which render such greatness an object of desire, can never, from the very nature of their work, be enjoyed by those who are great in this spiritual kingdom.*

Let us consider, for a moment, what constitutes the fascinations of power, the charms of rank and elevation,—what are the objects which ambition aims at securing, the prizes which draw men into the struggle for eminence and authority.

1. *Exemption from control* is one of the objects longed for, when men desire power or high position. We naturally chafe under a sense of responsibility. It is vexatious and humiliating to feel that we are compelled to render an account of our actions to others, and to recognise that they may punish us unless those actions accord with their pleasure. These shackles upon their freedom to follow their own impulses and inclinations, men feel galled in wearing, and they long for a condition in which they may throw them off. Command, authority, or elevation above others, places them, as they imagine, in such a situation, and hence it becomes an object of eager desire.

2. *There is a pleasure in the very exercise of power, and even in its conscious possession,* which leads men to seek it. Whence this feeling springs we need not enquire. All are aware of the fact, that there is a satisfaction in the conscious control that we exert even over the elements of nature around us, over inanimate matter when we mould and fashion it at our pleasure,—and much stronger is this satisfaction when we are conscious of controlling the acts and feelings of our fellow-men. So strong is this feeling in the minds of some that there have lived not a few who have been so satisfied with its enjoyment as to have been willing to forego for it all the other advantages of power. Provided they were permitted to bend the wills of others to their own, to shape their acts, and influence their destinies, they were willing to relinquish to others all the external honours and emoluments derived from place and reputation. They have been contented to labour unseen and unnoticed, and unhonoured, letting others have the *credit* of their labours, provided they could enjoy the *consciousness of control*, and silently witness the effects which they were producing.

III. *Power is desirable because it enables us to use others as the instruments for securing the satisfaction of our varied wants, and for enlarging indefinitely, the sphere of our gratifications.* From the earliest dawn of reflection we are conscious of our need of the instrumentality of others, in satisfying our craving desires and furnishing us with the means of a pleasurable existence. The control of others thus becomes an object of paramount desire, as including in it an indefinite amount of resources for the most varied enjoyments. In proportion to the number of those whom a man can command, and the extent to which he can make them minister to him, he feels that he can indulge his appetites, gratify his tastes, and give free scope to his passions. These are the objects which greatness is supposed to secure, and which men covet when they seek it. But, *in the Saviour's kingdom, the greater any one becomes, the less of these objects he can expect to secure.* This arises from the very nature of his work.

1. *It is a work, in undertaking which, a man re-*



nounces self-control, and assumes fearful responsibility; for he is "a steward of God," and "in stewards it is required that a man be found faithful." His position is one in which we are told he must "labour to be accepted of God,"—one in which "he must watch for souls as one who must give an account." None perhaps, has stood higher in the church of God than the great apostle of the gentiles, and no man ever felt more deeply a sense of control and responsibility. Every one who is spiritually enlightened sees that an enlargement of his powers and an elevation of his position, increases the amount of his responsibility to God, and his need of direction and support from him, and in the sincerity of his soul, looking at the account he has to render, he exclaims "who is sufficient for these things?" When that eminent servant of God, John Knox, was called by the united voices of his brethren in the castle of St. Andrews, to assume the office of a preacher of the gospel, he shrank from the work overwhelmed by a sense of its fearful responsibility. He whose dauntless spirit never quailed in view of the perils which ever beset the path of his eventful life,—he, over whose grave was pronounced by the Regent of Scotland, the memorable eulogy, "There lies one who never feared the face of man,"—he, this lion-hearted man, burst into tears and fled from the assembly which wished him to undertake this high and holy vocation.

2. It is a work which necessitates the subordination of his own will to the will of others. So far from enjoying the pleasurable consciousness of power, he who is chief in Christ's kingdom, feels more deeply than any other, the consciousness of absolute dependance on God, and so far from feeling that his will is the law which controls others, he feels that he is a soldier under the orders of a commander, a servant subject to the authority of a master, an apostle that must obey the directions of Him that sent him. And while he is employed to rule others, it is on the condition that he is to "become all things to all men,"—that he is "not to please himself," but "to bear the infirmities of the weak."

3. It is a work which *consists in performing labours, enduring hardships, and making sacrifices for others.*

When the apostle is vindicating his title to eminence and authority in the kingdom of Christ, he does it by presenting a picture of self-denials and sufferings in the service of his fellow-men, the sight of which is sufficient to chill the fever of worldly ambition.—2 Cor. xi: 23-29. The apostle asserted his claim to power, by showing, not the extent to which he made others minister to his gratifications, but the extent to which *he* ministered to *them*.

If any other proof were needed than that which is furnished by the nature of the service, that greatness in Christ's kingdom is only attainable by the renunciation of all those objects which lead the minds of men ordinarily to covet power and distinction, it would be found in the example of Him who is greatest in that kingdom, its Divine Founder. His whole life was a continuous renunciation of all those objects. He sought no exemption from control and responsibility,—“I have a work to do, and how greatly am I straitened till it be accomplished,—“He came not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him.” He sought not the enjoyment of power, but denied himself its exercise even for delivering himself from agony. When he could have put away the cup of wrath, he declined to do it, exclaiming, “Father, not my will, but thine be done.” With twelve legions of angels ready to do his bidding, he suffered himself to be seized by an insignificant band of servants and soldiers who came against him, as if a thief or a robber, with swords and staves. He suffered the menials of the High Priest to smite him with the palms of their hands, to spit upon him, and to jeer him, when he could by a word, have shut forever the blaspheming mouths that taunted him, and paralysed the impious hands that struck him. He sought not to make others minister to his gratifications, but he ministered to all who would receive his services, even to the giving of his life a ransom for them.

Some important deductions may be drawn from the view which has been presented of the grounds of our Saviour's injunction.

1. We may deduce from it a *striking and independent proof of the truth of our holy religion*,—for it exhibits this religion as containing in its essential princi-

ples an *unlooked* for, yet *effective* provision for relieving us from many of the evils of life. We are formed with such a constitution and placed in such circumstances, as to be all mutually dependent on each other for the larger amount of happiness or misery, of which each of us is partaker. How wonderfully adapted then, to the nature of man, as a scheme for remedying the evils of his lot, and conveying to him blessings, is a kingdom organized on such principles as to give the highest honours and greatest rewards to *him who excels in doing good*,—thus substituting in the heart of man for the selfish principle of ambition, which crushes the happiness of millions in its remorseless struggles after place and power, that self-denying benevolence which consecrates its energies to the mitigation of human woe and the increase of human enjoyment? What a change in the condition of man would be wrought by the universal diffusion of these principles? If the princes of the earth, who now “exercise dominion” over their subjects, and the great ones who now “exercise authority upon them,” were brought to feel the power of these principles and act upon them, how rapidly would disappear those political and social evils under which the nations have groaned for centuries,—against which they have partially and vainly struggled, and from which they can be delivered only by the power of Him who can change the hearts of men, and who, at the cry of his saints, “How long, O Lord, how long,” has promised to come out of his place and shake the earth. Nor would rulers be less of gainers than their subjects, by seeking greatness according to the principles of the gospel. A deceived heart turns them aside from the only true path that leads to glory and happiness. The objects for which they struggle elude their grasp, and as the fruit of their toils and cares in the pursuit of eminence and power, they reap only vexation, disappointment, and the empty appearance of good.

What infinite heart-ease must kings neglect  
That private men enjoy! And what have kings  
That privates have not too, save ceremony!—  
Save genial ceremony!

2. From this view we may deduce *one of the strong-*

*est motives that can urge us to subdue our natural love of preëminence.* If it is true, that this spirit is incompatible with the existence of at least, a portion of those qualities which are needed to make a man truly and spiritually great,—if it is true, that to be faithful and successful in the service of Christ requires the renunciation of all that men desire when they labor for preëminence, then its indulgence is as worldly an indulgence and as subversive of all the principles of godliness, as indulgence in sensuality, and we should pray and strive against the one as earnestly and watchfully as we do against the other. Napoleon was not a sensualist. Julian the apostate, was not a sensualist. It was the desire of authority and distinction that ruined their souls, and made their influence productive of evils to mankind, greater than those inflicted by the most degraded voluptuaries that ever filled the throne of the Cæsars. How despicable is the man who enters the ministry of reconciliation to obtain a piece of bread, or who discharges the duties of his sacred office to secure or enlarge his income. But, is he less guilty in the sight of God, who seeks to acquire *distinction* and *power* by his labours in this holy calling? Will he, in that day when the secrets of all hearts are revealed, and the issues of all actions are exhibited, be less deeply scarred by the thunderbolts of Jehovah's wrath? His aim is more specious and elevated, indeed, but not less pernicious, or less subversive of the principles on which the kingdom for which he professedly labours is established.

3. From this view, *we may deduce some valuable instruction as to the mode of subduing this strong tendency of our nature.* The Saviour here shows us the nature of that greatness which he bids us seek, and how it is to be attained. He proposes to us higher ends than the desire of distinction and power among men, and points us to his own example. Let us look at the model of greatness embodied in the life of our glorious Master, who was great in his benevolence, great in his meekness, great in his patience, great in his condescension, great in his labors, great in his self-denial, great in his sacrifices, great in his sympathy, great in his compassion,—let us look till we admire, adore, love and imitate

him. Look at the glorious end that he proposed, "For the joy that was set before him," (the joy of redeeming sinners and crowning them with life,) "he endured the cross, despising the shame." For this object "he who thought it not robbery to be equal with God, took upon him the form of a servant, and being found in fashion as a man, humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God, also, hath highly exalted him, and hath given him a name which is above every name." The end which the Saviour sought we are to aim at, and the exaltation which the Saviour attained, we, according to our preparation, shall receive. We are not forbidden to seek greatness like his, and its rewards are offered to us. To those who were to be chief in his kingdom, he promised that they should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel,—a promise which, however interpreted, foreshadows the highest glory and honour. To us, too, if we cultivate his spirit and imitate his greatness, is promised the honour that cometh from God, high employment in his everlasting kingdom, and nearness to his ever-blessed throne. These are the rewards that will be bestowed on those who are truly great in his kingdom below. And how infinitely are these preferable to all distinction, in the eyes of our fellow-men, and to all the fruits of power to be enjoyed here on earth? And even while we tabernacle here below, how far do the joys of true greatness surpass those of selfish ambition? Possessed of his spirit, the servant of Jesus may be baffled, disappointed, defeated in his attempts to extend the dominion of his blessed Master, but he is not cast down. Paul and Silas, though dragged before an unrighteous tribunal, beaten, imprisoned, with their feet made fast in the stocks, could still express their joyous and triumphant feelings in hymns of praise. Our labours may be cut short, our honours may be trampled in the dust, our names may perish, but the cause which is dear to us shall not perish,—Jesus lives and his kingdom shall be established "from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." Yes, and we, too, shall live and reign with him forever, enjoying the companionship of the hosts of Heaven, sharing their employ-

ments and honors, and admitted to the presence chamber of the King of Kings. Can it be that such glory awaits any of *us*? Is it not *presumption* in us, to expect more than *admission* into Heaven,—to be permitted to occupy the lowest seat in that holy and happy place? Sometimes we fear to raise our hopes so high. When we look at what we have done for the Saviour,—when we look at what we are, we feel that “God be merciful to me a sinner,” is a more suitable prayer for us, than to ask for a *throne in Heaven*. Alas! alas! how much of corruption remains in us! How far are we from that glowing zeal, that burning love, that deep humility, that entire dependence on God, which would fit us to be great in the glorious kingdom on high! Can beings so weak, so wayward, so ungrateful, so prone to pitiful self-seeking, so forgetful of the blessed Jesus,—can *such* ever sit with him upon the throne? How often do our hearts overflow with thankfulness, and our eyes with tears, as we sing,—

“Lord, when I read the traitor’s doom,  
To his own place consigned,  
What holy fear and trembling hope  
Alternate fill my mind.

Traitor to thee, I too have seen,  
But saved by matchless grace,  
Or else the lowest, hottest hell  
Had surely been my place.

Hither I was by law adjudged,  
And thitherward rushed on,  
And then in my eternal doom,  
Thy justice might have shone.

But lo! what wondrous matchless love!  
I call a place my own,  
On earth, within the gospel sound,  
And at thy gracious throne.

A place is mine among thy saints,  
A place at Jesus’ feet,  
And I expect in Heaven a place  
Where saints and angels meet.

Who of us, as he has thus sung, but has often felt ready to exclaim, “Lord, ’tis enough, Lord, ’tis enough, stay thy hand, thy mercy overwhelms us.” Our aspi-

rations after higher glory pass away, as we realize our weakness, our vileness, and the glorious riches of God's goodness towards us,—from the depths of humbled and thankful hearts we can cry only, "Jesus, Master! help thy feeble servants, lift us up that we may follow thee, draw us near to thyself, that we may feel and live like thee!"

Brethren and fathers, we have met in council to advance the interests of the glorious kingdom of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of sinners. Woe unto us, if we seek our own glory instead of the glory of our Master. We are beset with peculiar dangers in such an Assembly, "temptations without and corruption within." Unused as we are to debate, the conflict of opinions, and the excitement of collision endanger our equanimity, our courtesy, our brotherly kindness, and stir up the spirit of strife and ambition. These evils we may abate by remembering the conduct and principles of our Divine Master. Let us give diligent heed to the admonitions, "Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than himself." "If an evil thought be in thy heart put thy hand on thy mouth." In all our discussions let us strive to exhibit proof that we are disciples of him who directed the "greatest to be the least, and the chief of all to be the servant of all." But grace, special grace, alone can preserve us from this deep-rooted and sinful principle of our depraved nature. Let us daily and hourly ask that grace, assured that we shall obtain it through the intercession of him who hath promised to be our advocate with the Father.

To our Master alone each of us is responsible. He alone can judge the heart. Our actions may seem fair to men, yet God may abhor them,—they may be condemned of men, yet God may approve them. Let us each judge himself, and let us ask God to "try us, and show us if there is any wicked way in us, and lead us in the way everlasting." We shall soon cease to sit in these assemblies. We are sitting in the seats of the fathers who have fallen asleep—others will soon occupy our seats, and our names will be forgotten. But what matters it? Our influence passes away and our names

perish from the earth, but Jesus lives, and remains forever with his church. We feel that the cause which we love is safe in his hands. Meanwhile, we, if we prove faithful, go up to "shine as stars forever and ever." And may God, of his infinite mercy, grant, that to none of us who stand in these high places of God's heritage on earth, shall be reserved the blackness of darkness forever.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *True Practice of Religion*: from the Dutch "Shorter Doctrine of Practice," of the Rev. EWALDUS KIST, D. D. pp. 448: Published by JOHN BALL. New Orleans.

This work is a translation, by a gentleman, a merchant of New Orleans, during his moments of leisure, of the Practical treatises of Dr. Kist, who has been well styled the Baxter of the Church of Holland. Of the merits of the translation we cannot of course, speak, having never seen the original. The style is very simple and didactic, possessing little of that fervor which marks the practical writings of the great English Dissenter, with whom the author is compared. Yet there is no lack of the calm earnestness which is often found to pervade purely didactic treatises, when the writer is sincerely persuaded of the truths he inculcates, and addresses himself with lucid statements and dispassionate reasoning to obviate the difficulties which obstruct the practice of religion. From the nature of the work, the author is not so much engaged in the full, objective statement of the doctrines of grace, as with the analysis of the subjective exercises of believers themselves. The objection therefore, lies against this as against all treatises of this kind, of regarding the work of sanctification too exclusively on its negative side. The difficulty is, indeed, inherent, and not simply accidental. Books of this sort have a value,



in leading Christians to a more complete and systematic analysis of their own feelings; but have, in our judgment, sometimes an injurious influence, when regarded as exhausting the entire subject of Christian Holiness. From the fact that they present chiefly the negative side of sanctification in the expurgation of sin, they are inadequate; and treatises are needed which direct the believer to the contemplation of Christ and to the offices of the Holy Spirit. These two classes of experimental writings are the complements of each other; by which the Christian is instructed, not only to "cleanse himself from the filthiness of the flesh and the spirit," but also to "perfect holiness in the fear of God." The treatise of Dr. Kist is most excellent of its class—discussing all the difficulties, trials and temptations of the believer, and exposing all the spiritual maladies which the Gospel proposes to heal. It is consistently evangelical in its tone, and marked by transparency of style and acuteness of discrimination, rendering it intelligible to the most simple understanding, and easy of personal application.

---

2. *Bronchitis and Kindred Diseases.* By W. W. HALL. New York: REDFIELD: 1854. Eighth Edition, pp. 382, 12 mo.

This treatise has been long before the public, and has now reached the eighth edition. Its frequent re-publication attests the extent to which diseases of the organs of respiration prevail in our country, and to which we fear they are increasing. Dr. Hall has some reputation as a successful practitioner in these cases, and his book is a plain and popular exposition of the nature and symptoms of these diseases. In one opinion of his we cannot express our concurrence, the inutility of resort to a milder climate. This measure is not adopted in a majority of cases till the last stages of disease, when it is worse than useless. We can testify to the recuperative influence of our own climate, of the summer heats and the genial mildness of winter, upon a system which was a prey to these diseases. The positive influence of the summer heats upon a constitution yet sufficiently vigorous, is far more beneficial than the negative effect of the winter.

3. *The Characteristics and Laws of Figurative Language.* By DAVID W. LORD. Designed for use in Bible Classes, Schools, and Colleges. New York: FRANKLIN KNIGHT. 1854: pp. 306, 12 mo.

The above is the title of a book, in many respects valuable, of an able and earnest writer. It gives a minute analysis of the several figures of rhetorical style, the principles on which they are employed, and the rules by which their meaning is to be determined. As a rhetorical treatise, it is entitled to the consideration of scholars. But its object is to bear on the interpretation of the Scriptures, and the volume is offered to the instructors of Bible Classes, Schools, and Colleges. It is believed and hoped that with these views of figurative language a different understanding will prevail of the prophetic writings. We fear we shall hardly be forgiven, if we, in any measure, withhold our assent, even for a moment, from the principles of interpretation peculiar to the author. The idea that the ancient theocracy, its history and institutions, furnish the *costume* of prophetic descriptions, when the kingdom of Messiah is the subject of prophecy, and that therefore, these descriptions are not to be interpreted according to the *letter*, is even violently denounced. "It is a most unscholarly and clumsy contrivance, without a solitary reason to justify it, to set aside the plain and indubitable teachings of the Word of God, for the purpose of substituting in their place the lawless fancies and absurd dreams of presumptuous men." But, who are these "presumptuous men," and absurd dreamers. Not Prof. Stuart only, but Alexander, Hengstenberg, and indeed, the majority of Protestant Divines, men altogether as sincere, and as learned as the author, and altogether as desirous of holding forth the pure truth. Yet of them, he again says: "For this extraordinary construction not the slightest reason can be given, except a wish to get rid of teachings which, though specific and indubitable if construed by the established laws of language, are at variance with certain favorite theories respecting God's purposes, or the measures it becomes him to pursue in the government of the world." Such language strikes us as little fraternal and otherwise in bad taste, as

pecially on the subject of prophecy, which is confessedly obscure, and from whose interpretation all dogmatism should be excluded.

---

4. *The World in the Middle Ages: An Historical Geography, with accounts of the origin and development, the institutions and literature, the manners and customs of the nations in Europe, Western Asia, and Northern Africa, from the close of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifteenth Century.* By ADOLPHUS LOUIS KOEPPEN, Prof. of Hist. and Germ. Lit. in Franklin and Marshall College, Penn. Accompanied by complete historical and geographical indexes, and six colored maps from the Historical Atlas of CHARLES SPRUNER, L. L. D., Captain of Engineers in the kingdom of Bavaria. New York: D. APPLETON & Co. London: 1854: fol: pp. 232. The same, 2 vols., 12 mo.

The above truly acceptable work meets the many *desiderata* of a student of the Middle Ages. This period of human development is, perhaps, less understood than either the more ancient times of classical literature, or the more modern period since the Reformation. And yet its great importance must be manifest, since then were laid the foundations of nearly all the governments of Modern Europe. Prof. Koeppe, is admirably qualified to superintend the compilation of such a book. His materials were ample, being chiefly collected during a long residence in Italy and Greece, and during his travels in the East; and his European education, for he is a native of Denmark, has put sources of information within his reach, which it would have cost far more labour for an American scholar to obtain. The student, both of church and of secular history, will find the study of the letter press contained in these pages a source of great satisfaction to him as explaining the political geography of the Mediæval period, while the accompanying maps from Spruner, are of great value, exhibiting the position of the Roman Empire and the Northern Barbarians in the 4th Century, Europe at the beginning of the 6th Century,—in the times of Charlemagne,—in the time of the Cru-

sades,—in the second half of the 10th Century, and at the end of the 14th Century. Had we now a similar work for Ecclesiastical Geography, with Maps, after the plan of Bingham in his *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, it would be an additional and very valuable help. The author promises an *Historical Geography for the Modern world since Century the 14th*, if the reception of this work in the republic of letters shall give sufficient encouragement to further undertakings.

---

5. *An Historical Text Book and Atlas of Biblical Geography.*  
By LYMAN COLEMAN. Philadelphia: LIPPINCOTT, GRAMBO & Co. 1854: pp. 319, Royal octavo.

A compend in some respects similar to the former, passing over the several epochs of Biblical History, with accompanying Geographical descriptions and illustrations. The Maps, eight in number, mostly founded on the basis of Kiepert's Bible Atlas, but modified by reference to other, and those the most reliable, sources, are valuable aids to the student of the Bible. Without being profound and elaborate, the book is, evidently, the fruit of diligent study, and is a suitable guide to those seeking an acquaintance with the history and geography of the lands of the Bible.

---

6. *Manual of Sacred History: A Guide to the understanding of the Divine Plan of Salvation according to Historical Development.* By JOHN HENRY KURTZ, D. D., Prof. of Church History in the University of Dorpat, etc. Translated from the Sixth German Edition. By CHARLES F. SCHAEFFER, D. D. Philadelphia: LINDSAY & BLACKISTON. 1855: pp. 436, 12 mo.

The author of this Manual has obtained a high reputation as a Professor of Church History in the University of Dorpat in Livonia, and is acknowledged for his learning and talent throughout

Germany, which is emphatically the land of scholars. The work before us professes to be a guide to the reader through the domain of Sacred History, a guide whose profusion of words and illustration shall not overwhelm, and whose brevity and boldness of outline shall not disappoint us, as it attempts to spread out the Divine Plan of Salvation as it is developed in the Sacred Scriptures. A book of this kind has been greatly needed as an outline of church history during the Biblical period. It is eminently suggestive, and on the whole, while open to exceptions in a number of particulars affecting doctrine, is evangelical in tone and spirit. It is all the better, in several respects, that it is the work of a German scholar, as it presents history from points of view different from those in which it is commonly regarded by English and American Divines, and thus presents trains of thought wide from the hackneyed and stereotyped opinions generally received, and sets the mind forward in new lines of research. It has reached the sixth edition in Germany in a period of ten years, and is adopted as a text-book and foundation of lectures in many of the higher institutions of that country. The translation is well executed by a very competent scholar. It shows the rising interest taken in historic studies in our land, that the three works whose titles are given above, have been issued from the American press within the last few months. In Theological Literature this is becoming one of the most favourite departments, and is bearing rich fruit under the culture which some of our best minds are bestowing upon it.

---

7. *History of French Literature in the Eighteenth Century.* By ALEXANDER VINET, Professor of Theology at Lausanne. Translated from the French, by the Rev. JAMES BRYCE. Edinburgh: T. & T. CLARKE. 1854: pp. 482, 8 vo.

The substance of a course of Lectures prepared for delivery during the summer of 1846, and which was interrupted by the illness of the lamented author. He was arrested by mortal disease when he was in the midst of his Lectures on the character and

writings of J. J. ROUSSEAU, and died after a few months illness. The value set upon the labours of Vinet, is strikingly exhibited in the care with which every thing he uttered is gathered up and published to the world. His Lectures were nearly extemporaneous in their delivery. He spoke from imperfect notes, suggesting the progress of thought, happy expressions, and passages for quotation, in a manner extremely felicitous and impressive. From these notes, and the note-books of four of his pupils, are these Lectures collected, preserving in a wonderful degree the piquant style, originality of thought, and Christian spirit of a man, one of the chief ornaments of the Protestant Church of France.

- 
8. *First lines of Christian Theology*: In the form of a syllabus, prepared for the use of the students in the Old College, Homerton: with subsequent additions and elucidations: By JOHN PYE SMITH, D. D., L. L. D., F. R. S., F. G. S., Late Divinity Tutor in that Institution. Edited from the author's manuscripts, with additional notes and references, and copious Indexes. By WILLIAM FARRER, L. L. B. Secretary and Librarian of New College, London. London: JACKSON & WALFORD. 1854: pp. 741, 8 vo.

To a learner in any department of knowledge, and more especially to one who is himself a teacher, it is interesting to see the method pursued by others in their investigations and instructions in the same field of research. The above is the title of the notes of Lectures of Dr. J. P. Smith, in constant use by him as a Theological Instructor for a period of four and forty years. They appear to have been founded on the syllabus of Dr. Edward Williams, one of the most able defenders of Modern Calvinism, who was the instructor of Dr. Smith. The latter seems to have commenced filling up this outline as early as 1798 as a College exercise, and to have enlarged, modified, and corrected it during a protracted life spent in the constant duties of a teacher of Theology. It is dedicated to the Ministers of Jesus Christ in Great Bri-

tain and elsewhere, educated under the superintendence of Dr. Pye Smith, and is designed chiefly for students of Theology of Junior standing. No one need expect to find in it complete Lectures, after the manner of Dick, or a complete treatise like that of Turretine. It is rather a syllabus, (on some heads full and extended, on others meagre,) like that of Doddridge, with references to the standard authors who have discussed the several points. In its thoroughness and completeness we have been somewhat disappointed, though it suggests much that is valuable.

- 
9. *Leila Ada, The Jewish Convert.* An Authentic Memoir. By OSBORN W. TRENNERY HEIGHWAY. Revised by the Editor. Philadelphia: BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 230, 12 mo.

A deeply interesting account of the conversion, persecution, and triumphant death of a young Jewess of rare endowments and virtue. Seldom have we read a story which has interested us more in the character which it portrays, or in the peculiar trials of those who renounce the Synagogue and its worship, and forsake father and mother to become the disciples of Christ.

- 
10. *What is Calvinism? Or, the Confession of Faith in harmony with the Bible and Common Sense.* In a Series of Dialogues between a Presbyterian Minister and a young convert. By the Rev. WILLIAM D. SMITH, D. D. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 260, 18 mo.

The Rev. Dr. Smith was a Professor in "Anderson's Collegiate Institute," at New Albany, Indiana, at the time of his death. This little volume appears as a posthumous publication, called into existence by those studious perversions of Presbyterian Doctrine and Discipline heard so often from the lips of opposing sects. To the natural heart these doctrines are ungrateful, because humbling to human pride. So has God's truth ever been in this re-

volted world. To another class of men, those who have been renewed by Divine grace, and who practically act upon those truths in the interior services of their religion, they are made to wear an unlovely aspect by the caricatures drawn of them, or the misapprehensions which exist in honest minds, which have never seen them set forth in their true proportions. The form of dialogue adopted in this volume has some special advantages, in the presentation and removing of difficulties. The book is plain and conclusive in argument, and will be welcome to many doubting and perplexed minds.

- 
11. *South Side View of Slavery: or Three Months at the South in 1854.* By NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D. Second Edition. Boston: T. R. MARVIN: pp. 222, 12 mo.

We are glad to see that this little volume has reached a second edition though but a few months old. We need not repeat the favourable notice we gave of it in our last issue. The position of the author has been mistaken, both in the North and the South. He does not come forth as an advocate of Slavery. He states only those palliations of it, which a Northern mind, reared in hatred of it, could see when it came to behold it as it is. He does justice merely, and as far as what he actually saw compelled him, to master and servant, to southern institutions and character. In this view we have hailed the effort of the respected author with delight. One independent, *true* man, has at last had the manliness to express convictions favourable to us, and for it has been obliged to stem the torrents of misrepresentation and abuse which have been pouring around him. Evidence this, palpable enough, that, as the author says, "the indwelling sin of self-righteousness at the North, the belief that our conscience is more correct than that of Southern Christians, is the root of evil which we, [the people of the North,] chiefly need to have removed." We of the South have manifest proof that this is, indeed, "a *root of bitterness*, which springing up has troubled us; the vine has been of the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah.



12. *English, Past and Present.* By CHENEVIX TRENCH, B. D., Author of "The Study of Words," "The Lessons on Proverbs," &c. &c. REDFIELD. New York: 1855: pp. 207, 12 mo.

Further chapters "On the Study of Words," by a writer who never fails to delight and instruct. Lect. 1. The English a Composite Language. Lect. 2. Gains of the English Language. Lect. 3. The Diminutions of the English Language. Lect. 4. On changes in the meaning of English words. Lect. 5. On the changed spelling of English words.

- 
13. *The Remains of the Rev. Richard Cecil:* to which is prefixed a view of his character by JOSIAH PRATT, B. D. F. A. S. pp. 353, 16 mo. Philadelphia: PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

We have no need at this day to describe the merits of a book, which has long since been received as a religious classic. It is, of course, fragmentary in its character: but every particle of gold, even its dust, is precious, and the occasional thoughts of this Godly man have warmed the heart of many Christians. It is well worthy of adoption by our Publication Board, and of being thus brought to many hearth-stones throughout the land.

- 
14. *The Faithful Mother's Reward:* A Narrative of the Conversion and happy death of J. B., in the tenth year of his age; with an introduction by the Rev. CHARLES HODGE, D. D.

The endorsement of Dr. Hodge's name upon this little book may be taken as a guarantee of its value. The practical effect of the narrative itself is to remove the scepticism which so extensively prevails that young children may not be the subjects of the

Spirit's saving influences; and to show the connexion of them with Parental fidelity in the early spiritual training of the young.

---

15. *Moral and Religious Anecdotes.* By JOHN WHITECROSS.  
PRES. BOARD OF PUBLICATION: 2 vols. 12 mo., pp. 163, 175.
16. *Devotional Poetry, or Hymns for the Closet and the Social Meeting:* Selected from the Psalms and Hymns approved by the General Assembly. 12 mo., pp. 32. PRES. BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

These books are sufficiently described by their titles. From the first may be gleaned many striking illustrations of Divine truth—and the book will, doubtless, be welcome to those who are fond of storing their memories with illustrative anecdotes.

The brief collection of Hymns is very excellent, embracing those which are always in the hearts, and often upon the lips of the pious. In glancing over them, we cannot but give expression to our long cherished conviction that the Psalmody of the Church is much too extensive, and embraces much that no person will ever use as the vehicle of praise. We would, on our part, freely consent to have it reduced one half.

---

17. *Sabbath-day Readings: or Children's own Sabbath Book.*
18. *The Youth's Visitor: or Selections from the Pres. S. S. Visitor.*
19. *The Blind Man and the Pedlar: or the Scoffer Convicted.*
20. *White Lies, and Little Oaths. Minna and her Lamb and Doves.*
21. *The Rose-bud and other Stories. Dorcas, a model Female Portrait.*

All these are contributions to the Juvenile department of the Books of the Board of Publication; which is doing its utmost to

provide a literature for this class, suitable for Sabbath Schools and Juvenile libraries at Home.

- 
22. *The Words of Jesus.* By the author of "THE MORNING AND NIGHT WATCHES," &c. New York: CARTERS. 1854: pp. 131, 16 mo.

Brief and appropriate meditations upon the most consolatory words of him who spake unto us that his joy might remain in us, and that our joy might be full.

- 
23. *Presbyterian Tracts.* Vol. 8, 12 mo. PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

This forms the eighth volume of a series of Tracts on the Doctrines, order and Polity of the Presbyterian Church. The subjects treated of are all important and interesting.

---

Pamphlets received, of which, for the most part, the titles alone can be given:

24. *Paul's Argument for Home Missions.* By GARDINER SPRING, D. D., L. L. D.

One of Dr. Spring's most effective and appropriate sermons.

25. *The Rights of the Pulpit, and Perils of Freedom: Two Discourses* preached in Lowell, Sunday, June 25th, 1854. By EDEN B. FOSTER, Pastor of the John Street Congregational Church. Lowell: 1854.

The spirit of these sermons may be known from the following sentence: "The Nebraska bill is passed, and already the Southern fetter is on our limbs, the clanking of our galling chains is in our ears." Sad to say, these sermons were preached on a Sun-

day: and still more sad, from these texts, "It is time for the Lord to work; for they have made void thy law." "The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled, because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant." Was ever Scripture so perverted? Did even the Great Teacher, Paul, or any apostle preach such a discourse? We are sorry for our brother so hard bestead, especially as he intimates he must soon be an exile from his native shores. "If," says he, "neither of these three things can happen—if neither public opinion, nor a united Northern ballot, nor a peaceful Northern secession can check the aggressions of Slavery, and restore the loss which this Nebraska robbery has wrenched from the hands of Freedom, then I shall despair of my beloved country; and, taking my children by the hand, Providence permitting, I will migrate to the country whence the fathers came out; turning, if possible, the pilgrim tide backwards, to the land whence the Puritans were driven by persecution, but now a land more free than ours."

26. *A Letter of Inquiry to Ministers of the Gospel of all Denominations, on Slavery.* By Rev. NATHAN LORD, D. D., President of Dartmouth College. Boston: 1854.

The independence, vigorous thought, and determination to do right, and maintain truth and justice in the midst of fierce and cruel opposition, which this "Letter of Inquiry" exhibits, so different from the spirit of the preceding pamphlet, entitle the venerable author to the respect of all good men. Published anonymously at first, President Lord now fearlessly avows the authorship, and defends the impregnable positions he had assumed. That they may prove a breakwater to the flood of misrepresentation and fanaticism sweeping over the Eastern States of this Union, is our earnest prayer to Him who "stillemeth the noise of the seas, and the tumult of the people."

27. *God's Way in the Deep:* A Discourse on the occasion of the Wreck of the Arctic. Delivered in the Presbyterian Church, Burlington, N. J., October 15, 1854. By CORTLANDT VAN RENSSELAER, D. D., Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Education. Published by Request. Philadelphia: 1854.

28. *A Sermon delivered before the Brainard Evangelical Society of Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania, on Sabbath Evening, July 23, 1854.* By the Rev. MATTHEW ALLISON, of Mifflintown, Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: 1854.
29. *A Discourse: Delivered in the Leacock Presbyterian Church, Lancaster County, Pa., on Thanksgiving Day, November, 23, 1854, in which is Sketched a History of that Church and Congregation from 1741 to the present time.* By the Rev. P. J. TIMLOW, Pastor. Philadelphia: 1855.
30. *The Attainments of Men in Secular and Religious Knowledge, Contrasted: A Sermon, preached in the Church of Rev. H. A. BOARDMAN, D. D., on Sunday, October 8, 1854.* By the Rev. JOSEPH H. JONES, Pastor of the Sixth Presbyterian Church. Philadelphia: 1854.
31. *Fifty Years a Pastor: A Semi-Centenary Discourse, delivered in the Spring Garden Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, December 31, 1854.* By the Rev. JOHN McDOWELL, D. D., Pastor. Philadelphia: 1855.

The four preceding Discourses are from the publishing house of JOSEPH M. WILSON, of Philadelphia, and as specimens of Typography, especially the two last Discourses, are creditable to the taste and correctness of the publisher. The sermon of Mr. Timlow belongs to that class of Historical Discourses so valuable and interesting to their appropriate localities. That of Dr. Jones is on an attractive subject, which it handles with ability and wisdom. Dr. McDowell's sermon is a review of his own ministerial life protracted through the unusual period of half a century of active labour.

32. *Proceedings of the Union Missionary Convention, held in New York, May 4th and 5th, 1854, together with the Address of the Rev. Dr. DUFF, at the Public Meeting in the Broadway Tabernacle.* Published by order of the Committee. Fourth Thousand. New York: 1854.

An interesting memorial of the visit of Dr. Duff to the Churches of America.

33. *Continuation of the Review of "NOTT & GLIDDON'S Types of Mankind."* By J. BACHMAN, D.D., No. 2. Charleston: 1855.

34. *Patience Essential to Success*: A Commencement Discourse preached in the College Chapel of the Forsyth Female Collegiate Institute, July 9th, 1854. By S. K. TALMADGE, D. D., President of Oglethorpe University. Macon, Ga. 1854.
35. *The Shadows and Sorrow of Savannah*: A Sermon preached in the Presbyterian Church at Waynesville, Ga., October 8th, 1854. Savannah: 1854.
36. *The Inauguration of the Rev. JOHN MCLEAN, D. D., Tenth President of the College of New Jersey, Wednesday, June 28, 1854.* Princeton, N. J.: 1854.
37. *Our Slaves should have the Bible*: An Address delivered before the Abbeville Bible Society, at its Anniversary, July, 1854. By ROBERT A. FAIR, Esq., Abbeville, S. C. Due West, S. C. 1854.
38. *Report of Hon. JAMES MEACHAM, of the Special Committee of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, on the Distribution of the Income of the Smithsonian Fund, &c. Washington*: 1854.
39. *Civil and Religious Toleration*: Speech of Hon. WILLIAM S. BARRY, of Mississippi, delivered in the House of Representatives, December 18, 1854.
40. *The Temporal Power of the Pope Dangerous to the Religious and Civil Liberties of the American Republic*: A Review of the Speech of the Hon. JOSEPH R. CHANDLER, delivered in the House of Representatives of the United States, January 10th, 1855. Delivered in the Presbyterian Church, Maysville, Ky., on Sunday Evening, February 11, 1855, by the Pastor, Rev. ROBERT C. GRUNDY, D. D. Maysville, Ky.: 1855.
41. *Address to the Ministers, Elders and People Connected with the Presbytery of Baltimore upon the subject of Systematic Benevolence.* Baltimore: 1854.
42. *Semi-Centennial Celebration of the South Carolina College*: Consisting of the Baccalaureate Address, by the President of the College, the Semi-Centennial Oration, by the Hon. JAS. L. PETIGRU, and Answers to Letters of Invitation. Published by order of the Board of Trustees. Charleston: 1855.

*H. C. Bronson*

THE  
SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

An Association of Ministers,

IN

COLUMBIA, S. CAROLINA.

—  
Vol. 8--No. 3.

=====  
JANUARY, MDCCCLV.  
=====

COLUMBIA, S. C.  
TYPOGRAPHY BY I. C. MORGAN.  
1855.

## THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

Is published Quarterly, in July, October, January and April, at Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance.

It is devoted mainly to the exposition and defence of the Doctrines and Polity of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Still, as it is designed to be thoroughly Evangelical and Protestant, its Editors hope to give it attractions for all who love the truth as it is in Jesus.

☞ All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C. No subscriptions are taken for less than a year, and subscribers should remember that a subscription cannot be discontinued legally until all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the July number, and not at the beginning of the year.

☞ A few copies of the back volumes can be had at reduced prices.

### TO OUR PATRONS.

The patronage which the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW has enjoyed during the past seven years, would have put it beyond all reach of failure, if it had been constant and uniform. But like all periodicals of the kind, it has experienced considerable flux of patronage; though, for the most part, names of those who have withdrawn their support have been supplied by others. We have regarded this as natural during the infancy of a new journal, which, putting itself in competition with others of older date, must quietly and patiently work up to its own niche in public estimation. We are cheered every day by an increase of contributors, who enliven our pages by the products of their industry and genius,—and we invite all, who desire to see sanctified science and literature prevalent through the land, to aid us in sustaining, at the South, a journal entirely devoted to this object.

It would be indecent in us to say a word designed to solicit patronage. The 4800 pages of diversified matter, already laid before the world, are our proper credentials: the verdict which they extort from a candid and intelligent public, we should be content to abide.

### AGENTS.

Rev. C. Johnston, Charlotte, N. C.	Mr. J. Whiting, Montgomery, Ala.
" S. A. Stanfield, Harmony, N. C.	Rev. R. S. Gladney, Aberdeen, Miss.
" A. A. Morse, Abbeville C. H., South Carolina.	Nash & Woodhouse, Richmond, Va.
Mr. J. Rösser, Camden, S. C.	Prof. D. H. Hill, Lexington, Va.
" John Russell, Charleston, S. C.	Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., N. Orleans.
" Wm. E. Mills, Mt. Clio, Sumter, South Carolina.	Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, 323 Chesnut- street, Philadelphia.
" John R. Dow, Augusta, Ga.	Mr. Jas. Armour, Memphis, Tenn.
" W. G. Foote, Savannah, Ga.	Rev. J. M. Becton, Larissa, Chero- kee Co., Texas.
Rev. J. P. McMullen, Havanna, Ala.	W. N. White & Brother, Athens, Georgia.
Rev. Wm Flinn, Demopolis, Ala.	



*H C Bronson*

THE  
SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

An Association of Ministers,

IN

COLUMBIA, S. CAROLINA.

Vol. 8--No. 4.

APRIL, MDCCCLV.

COLUMBIA, S. C.  
TYPOGRAPHY BY I. C. MORGAN.  
1855.

## THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

Is published Quarterly, in July, October, January and April, at Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance.

It is devoted mainly to the exposition and defence of the Doctrines and Polity of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Still, as it is designed to be thoroughly Evangelical and Protestant, its Editors hope to give it attractions for all who love the truth as it is in Jesus.

✉ All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C. No subscriptions are taken for less than a year, and subscribers should remember that a subscription cannot be discontinued legally until all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the July number, and not at the beginning of the year.

✉ A few copies of the back volumes can be had at reduced prices.

### TO OUR PATRONS.

The patronage which the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW has enjoyed during the past seven years, would have put it beyond all reach of failure, if it had been constant and uniform. But like all periodicals of the kind, it has experienced considerable flux of patronage; though, for the most part, names of those who have withdrawn their support have been supplied by others. We have regarded this as natural during the infancy of a new journal, which, putting itself in competition with others of older date, must quietly and patiently work up to its own niche in public estimation. We are cheered every day by an increase of contributors, who enliven our pages by the products of their industry and genius,—and we invite all, who desire to see sanctified science and literature prevalent through the land, to aid us in sustaining, at the South, a journal entirely devoted to this object.

It would be indecent in us to say a word designed to solicit patronage. The 4800 pages of diversified matter, already laid before the world, are our proper credentials: the verdict which they extort from a candid and intelligent public, we should be content to abide.

### AGENTS.

Rev. S. C. Pharr, D. D., Charlotte, N. C.	Mr. J. Whiting, Montgomery, Ala.
" S. A. Stanfield, Harmony, N. C.	Rev. R. S. Gladney, Aberdeen, Miss.
" A. A. Morse, Abbeville C. H., South Carolina.	Nash & Woodhouse, Richmond, Va.
Mr. J. Rosser, Camden, S. C.	Prof. D. H. Hill, Davidson Col. N. C.
" John Russell, Charleston, S. C.	Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., St. Francis Co. Ga.
" Wm. E. Mills, Mt. Clio, Sumter, South Carolina.	Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, 228 Chesnut- street, Philadelphia.
" John R. Dow, Augusta, Ga.	Mr. Jas. Armour, Memphis, Tenn.
" W. G. Foote, Savannah, Ga.	Rev. J. M. Beeton, Larissa, Chero- kee Co., Texas.
Rev. J. P. McMullen, Havana, Ala.	W. N. White & Brother, Athens, Ga.
Rev. Wm. Flinn, Milledgeville, Ga.	