

THE
SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOLUME IX.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
PRINTED BY I. C. MORGAN.
1855-1856

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

NUMBER I.

Article.	Page.
I. Presumptive Arguments for the Doctrine of the Trinity,.....	1
II. A Plea for the Study of Hebrew Literature,.....	32
III. The Throne of God,.....	55
IV. Success in the Ministry,.....	72
V. Bible Principles on the Subject of Temperance,.....	85
VI. Moral Philosophy,.....	113
VII. Romanism at Home,.....	128
VIII. Introduction to Paul's Epistles,.....	134
IX. Correspondence,.....	151
X. Critical Notices,.....	154
<p>1. College Discipline.</p> <p>2. The Monumental History of Egypt, as recorded on the ruins of her Temples, Palaces and Tombs.</p> <p>3. Uhlemann's Syriac Grammar.</p> <p>4. The Miscellaneous Works of the Rev. Matthew Henry, V. D. M.</p> <p>4. Books issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication : 1. Minutes of the General Assembly from 1821 to 1835. 2. Memoirs of Rev. Walter M. Lowrie, Missionary to China. 3. Monitory Letters to Church Members. 4. Sketches of the Presbyterian Church. 5. The Book of Popery. 6. The Bohemian Martyrs. 7. The Perseverance of the Saints. 8. The Youth's Casket of Gems and Pearls. 9. Lily among Thorns and Old Gabriel. 10. The Boat and the Drowned Officer. 11. Fear not, and Rest in Christ. 12. Adam and Christ. 13. Mary Searching for Jesus. 14. A Warning Cry from Niagara. 15. Child's Catechism of Scripture History.</p>	

NUMBER II.

Article.	Page.
I. The Influence of Presbyterianism on the Culture of the Human Intellect and the Progress of Piety,	161
II. Philosophy of Utility	188
III. The Positive Philosophy of August Comte,	202
IV. On Organs,	224
V. The Doctrine of the Trinity either the Offspring of Reason or of Primitive Revelation,	246
VI. Types of Mankind,	250
VII. Critical Notices,	300
1. Ridgley's Body of Divinity.	
2. Which: The Right or the Left?	
3. Christian Theism: by R. A. Thompson.	
4. Theism: by J. Tulloch, D. D.	
5. Alleghan: a Poem.	
6. Select Works of Thomas Boston.	
7. Foxe's Acts and Monuments of the Church.	
8. Russia, as it is.	
9. The Southern Cross and Southern Crown.	
10. Sermons and Essays by the Tennents and their Contemporaries.	
11. Church Music.	
12. Memoirs: including letters and select remains of John Urquhart.	
13. The Footsteps of St. Paul.	
14. A Memorial of the Christian Life and Character of Francis S. Sampson, D. D.	
15. Learning to Converse.	
16. The Christ of History.	
17. Of Temptation: by John Owen, D. D.	
18. La Borde's Physiology.	
19. The Acts of the Apostles: by Baumgarten.	
20. Stier's Words of the Lord Jesus.	
21. Ullmann's Reformers before the Reformation.	
22. Fairbairn's Ezekiel, and the Book of his Prophecy.	

NUMBER III.

Article.	Page.
I. Testimony of the Early Fathers to the Doctrine of the Trinity,	313
II. Slavery,.....	345
III. Various Readings of John, 10: 28, 29,.....	364
IV. Life out of Death,.....	379
V. The Book of Job,.....	390
VI. Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton,.....	402
VII. Thoughts on Original Sin,.....	425
VIII. Critical Notices,.....	462
1. A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church, from its origin in America to the present time.	
2. The Skeptical Era in Modern History.	
3. Modern Pilgrims.	
4. Suggestions on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes in the Southern States.	
5. The Priest, the Puritan, and the Preacher.	
6. Union Bible Dictionary, for the use of Schools, Bible Classes, and Families.	
7. Old and New Theology: or the Doctrinal Differences which have agitated and divided the Presbyterian Church.	
8. India, Ancient and Modern—Geographical, Historical, Political, Social and Religious.	
9. Documentary History of the American Revolution.	
10. Glances over the Field of Faith and Reason.	
11. The Presbyterian Family Almanac for 1856.	
12. Slaveholding not Sinful.	
13. An Historical Address, delivered at the Centennial Celebration of Thyatira Church, N. C.	
14. A Dedication Sermon, preached at the opening of the new Presbyterian Church, Chesterfield, S. C.	
15. Our Obligations to God: A Sermon.	
16. The Glory of Woman is the Fear of the Lord.	
17. The Exigencies of the Church.	
18. Campbellism: Its Rise, Progress, Character, and Influence.	

NUMBER IV.

Article.	Page.
I. Testimony of the Reformers to the Doctrine of the Trinity,.....	473
II. Modern Theology—Taylor and Bledsoe,.....	492
III. The Prophets of the Restoration,.....	513
IV. Michael Servetus,.....	520
V. Revelation and Inspiration,.....	555
VI. Import of Hebrew History,.....	582

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER I.

JULY, MDCCCLV.

ARTICLE I.

FURTHER OBJECTIONS TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY
ANSWERED.

A consideration of the Heathen Doctrine of the Trinity, the opinions of the ancient Jews, and the almost universal testimony of the Christian world, both ancient and modern.

We have now endeavoured to meet fairly, fully and candidly, the objections offered as presumptive arguments against the doctrine of the Trinity.

There is, however, one other objection that occurs to our minds, and which may deserve a passing notice. It has been said that if this doctrine of the Trinity is so essential, and so practically important as we allege, it would have been revealed as clearly in the Old Testament as in the New. To this objection we would reply, *first*, that the objection admits that the doctrine of the Trinity is taught clearly in the New Testament. But, if the doctrine of the Trinity is clearly revealed, as true, in the New Testament, then to all who receive it as containing the doctrine taught by Christ and his apostles, it becomes fundamental, and vitally essential, whatever may have been the degree in which it was revealed to believers under the Old Testament. But, in the *second* place, we reply, that the doctrines of a future life, of the resurrection of the dead, of the nature of everlasting life, of the mercy of God, the way of acceptance with him, and the principle of obedience, not to mention others, are, on all hands, admitted to be of fundamental and

practical importance, and among "the first principles of the oracles of God," and yet these are far more clearly and fully revealed in the New than in the Old Testament. And it is therefore only in accordance with the progressive character of God's revelation that the doctrine of the Trinity should be more distinctly revealed in the New, than in the Old Testament. But, *thirdly*, we affirm that there is more in the Old Testament to lead to the belief of a plurality in the Divine Godhead, than there is to regard that Godhead as a simple and absolute personal unity; and as this plurality is limited to the mention of the invisible Jehovah,—the visible, Jehovah, the God of Israel—and the Holy Spirit, we have in the Old Testament a *sufficient* revelation of the doctrine of the Trinity.

We now proceed however, to remark, that in coming to the investigation of Scripture as to the doctrine of the Trinity, we are not only relieved from all presumptive objections against it, but are assisted by a presumptive argument in its favour, which, to our minds, has no small importance in rendering it probable that the Trinity is a doctrine of divine revelation.

It is admitted by both parties in this controversy, that the doctrine of the Trinity of the Godhead is infinitely above, and beyond, the *comprehension*, or the *discovery*, of reason. The very fact, therefore, that a doctrine so remote from the ordinary conceptions of reason should exist, and should have existed always in some form, is a presumption that the human mind was, originally, led to such a conception by a direct revelation from Heaven.

The **UNIVERSALITY** with which this belief, in some form has been held, is a powerful confirmation of the opinion that the origin of this doctrine must be referred to a primitive and common revelation, since, as is admitted, and even urgently advanced by our opponents, it is not a doctrine which could naturally suggest itself to the human mind. It would require a volume to contain the evidence of the actual existence of the doctrine of a Trinity, in some form or other, among almost every nation of the earth. Volumes *have* been written upon this subject containing proof of the belief in a Trinity—a triad of supreme and co-equal deities—in Hindostan—in

Chaldea—in Persia—in Scythia, comprehending Thibet, Tartary, and Siberia,—in China—in Egypt—among the Greeks—among the Greek philosophers who had visited Chaldea, Persia, India, and Egypt, and who taught the doctrine of the Trinity after their return to Greece—among the Romans—among the Germans—and among the ancient Americans.

The truth of this fact it might be necessary to establish by full and explicit evidence, were it not fully admitted by Unitarian writers who base upon it, an argument for the heathen origin of the doctrine. A considerable portion, for instance, of Dr. Beard's recent work entitled *Historical Illustrations of the Trinity** is occupied with the presentation of evidence that "a divine triplicity was common in the heathen world prior to the Gospel of Christ." He gives proof of its existence among the Babylonians, the Phœnicians, the Persians, and in India. Zoroaster, he quotes as declaring in so many words, that "the paternal monad (or the Diety) generates too, and in the whole world shines the triad over which the monad rules." In the most ancient of all mythologies, that of Egypt, "as described by authors who lived before the Christian era, and as set forth on the walls of the temples in which its ritual of worship was performed, it was taught to the initiated, and concealed from the vulgar, that God created all things at the first, by the primary emanation from himself, his first-born, who was the author and giver of all wisdom, and of all knowledge, in heaven and in earth, being at the same time the wisdom and the word of God. The birth of this great and all-powerful being, his manifestation as an infant, his nature and education through the succeeding periods of childhood and of boyhood, constituted the grand mystery of the entire system." The idea of a divine trinity, then, more or less distinctly outlined in other Eastern systems of religion, appears in that of Egypt fully and definitely formed, and may in consequence, says Dr. Beard, be legitimately considered as the immediate parent of the modern doctrine.†

* *Hist. and Artistic Ill. of the Trinity* from Lond. 1846. The works of this writer are in great repute among American Unitarians.

† Dr. Beard, pp. 19, 20, 21.

Dr. Beard quotes as an ancient proverb the declaration "every THREE is perfect." Servius, in his Commentary on Virgil's 8th Eclogue says, "they assign the perfect number three to the highest God, from whom is the beginning, middle, and end." Triplicity was, therefore, found in those things which were held to be mirrors of the Divine essence. And Plutarch (de Iside 56,) expressly says, the better and diviner nature consists of the three."

Servius remarks that "the distinctive attributes of nearly all the gods are represented by the number three. The thunderbolt of Jupiter is cleft in three; the trident of Neptune is three-forked; Pluto's dog is three-headed; so are the Furies. The Muses also, are three times three." Aurelius, according to Proclus, (in Tim. ii. 93,) says, "the Demiurge or *Creator* is triple, and the three intellects are the three kings,—he who exists, he who possesses, he who beholds. And these are different.*

And we learn further, that there existed and was familiar to the heathen mind the idea of a Θεανδρωτος, *Theanthropos*, or GOD-MAN.†

It follows from what is thus admitted by this learned Unitarian, *first*, that the absolute, metaphysical, or personal unity of God for which Unitarians contend, never was the doctrine of human reason, or of human religion; and *secondly*, that in ALL ancient religions we find the evidence of an original doctrine of a Trinity.

As to the Romans, "the joint worship of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva,—the Triad of the Roman Capitol,—is, (says Bishop Horsley,) traced to that of the THREE MIGHTY ONES in Samothrace; which was established in that island, at what precise time it is impossible to determine, but earlier, if Eusebius may be credited, than the days of Abraham."‡ The notion, therefore, of a Trinity, more or less removed from the purity of the Christian faith, is found to have been a leading principle in all the ancient schools of philosophy, and in the religions of almost all nations; and traces of an early popular belief of it, appear even in the abominable rites

* Dr. Beard, p. 4. † Dr. Beard, p. 27. ‡ Horsley's Tracts, p. 49.

of idolatrous worship. In regard to Plato, it is well known that he largely discoursed of a divine Trinity; the three component members of which are, (says Bishop Horsley,*) "more strictly speaking, one, than anything in nature, of which unity may be predicated. No one of them can be supposed without the other two. The second and third being, the first is necessarily supposed; and the first αγαθον, (*agathon*) being, the second and third, νους, (*nous*) and ψυχη, (*psyche*) must come forth. Concerning their equality, I will not say that the Platonists have spoken with the same accuracy which the Christian Fathers use; but they include the three principles in the Divine nature, in the το Θειον, (*to theion*) and this notion implies the same equality which we maintain." "In the opinions of the Pagan Platonists, and other wise men," adds Bishop Horsley,† "we have in some degree an experimental proof, that this abstruse doctrine cannot be the absurdity, which it seems to those who misunderstand it. Would Plato, would Porphyry, would even Plotinus, have believed the miracles of Mahomet, or the doctrine of transubstantiation? But they all believed a doctrine which so far at least, resembles the Nicene, as to be loaded with the same, or greater objections."

"God is but One; who holds a Trinity,
Believes in that which is not, cannot be,
For Three in One's impossibility."
Thus speaks the "Christian" of Socinus' brood.
What said the very heathen! "There are Three
Who are One God," quoth Plato, "th' only Good,
The Word, the Spirit." Nay, the Pagan rude
In Scythian wilds, less stormy than his mind,
Who hoped from foemen's skulls to quaff Heaven's mead,
Believed one God, from whom all things proceed,
And yet declared Three Gods had made mankind,
Each giving his own blessing. Shame, oh Shame!
That men should ape the Christian's heavenly name,
And yet be darker than the heathen blind!

Such then, are THE FACTS in this case. What inference, then, are we to make from these admitted facts, proving, as they do, the universal belief of the doctrine of a Trinity. "If reason," says Bishop Horsley,‡ "was

* Tracts, p. 247. † Horsley's Tracts, p. 77. ‡ Ib., p. 49.

insufficient for this great discovery, what could be the means of information, but what the Platonists themselves assign." "A theology delivered from the gods," *i. e.* a revelation. This is the account which Platonists, who were no Christians, have given of the origin of their master's doctrine. But, from what revelation could *they* derive their information, who lived before the Christian, and had no light from the Mosaic Scriptures? Their information could be only drawn from traditions founded upon earlier revelations; from scattered fragments of the ancient patriarchal creed; that creed which was universal before the defection of the first idolaters, which the corruptions of Idolatry, gross and enormous as they were, could never totally obliterate. Thus the doctrine of the Trinity is rather confirmed than discredited by the suffrage of the heathen sages; since the resemblance of the Christian faith and the Pagan philosophy in this article, when fairly interpreted, appears to be nothing less than the consent of the latest and the earliest revelations."*

That this universal belief in A Trinity is to be traced to an original revelation is, however, proved not only by the incapacity of reason to discover such a doctrine, and its reluctance to receive it when discovered, and by the equally universal reference of it to an original divine revelation, but also by the fact that it is only in the very earliest and purest traditions and theologies that this doctrine exists in any degree of clearness. As human reason was developed the doctrine became obscured, and was either hidden from public knowledge, or transformed into a mere intellectual refinement. Dr. Minchola in his Treatise on Vaticination § 4, speaking of the experiences of all nations as a proof of the rationality of even supra-rational doctrines says: "Here we meet, in the first place, the mysterious number "three," in all the religious systems of antiquity, and even where such systems are not, and were not, existing, the number of the highest gods have so frequently been found to coincide with "the number three," *e. g.* the Laplanders, the Finns, the Germans, the South Sea Islanders, the an-

* Tracts, p. 50.

cient Mexicans, and others, that this phenomenon cannot be considered as an accidental one. The ancient philosophical systems were likewise based upon this mysterious number; *e. g.* those of Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, the very ancient Chinese philosopher, Laodhoë, in later times, that of Aurelius, (*Suidas sub voce*), of the Jew Philo, of the modern Platonists and the Cabbalists, so that we can only say that the mystery of the Divine Trinity has found its wonderful mystic harmony, from the beginning of the world, among all zones and nations. However, the fountain from which this mystery has flowed, can have been no other but "the Lord," *i. e.* the first revelations of God to man."

To use the language of a recent poet who has ably written on this subject:*

Gross as was the darkness on man's mind,
 And wild as were his hopeless wanderings,
 Tradition, if 'tis fairly followed out
 In every quarter of the world, will show
 That man's progenitors in early times
 Worshipp'd and own'd a triune Deity.
 Chaldea, China, Egypt, India,
 Greece, Persia, Seythia, Scandinavia, Rome,
 Britain, and all those late discover'd realms,
 Named from Americus, with one accord
 [To all who trace their superstitions up
 Unto the Fountain-head] proclaim aloud
 That, through the darkness of the human mind,
 Their polytheism was derived thence;
 And every system of Idolatry
 First rose from worship of the Living God,
 When man, to fancy giving up the reins,
 Began to substitute philosophy
 For the plain lessons which his Maker gave;
 And shew that all their best and wisest men
 Beheld the great First-Cause as *three in one*.
 When, at th' Eternal's high command, the floods
 Subsided, and the earth, long drench'd in tears
 Of penitence for sin, brighten'd once more
 Her wave-wash'd features to a joyous smile,
 The patriarch Noah unto all his race,
 Whilst he abode a pilgrim on the earth,
 Made known the nature of a Deity.
 To China, Ham the knowledge carried forth,
 [Himself the founder of that ancient state,]
 Where, till the days of the Confucius,
 They, as a triune spirit worshipp'd God;

Ragg's Poem on the Deity, pp. 125-127.

And in their sanctuaries hymn'd His praise,
 Without an image or a symbol there.
 Chaldea's region, chief abiding place
 Of Shem, of all the post-diluvian world,
 Was probably the earliest peopled land,
 Whence the surrounding nations all derived
 Their knowledge of the arts and sciences;
 And her great Zoroaster, first of those
 Who, from the hillock of philosophy,
 Dar'd lift their eyes to the Eternal One,
 To his disciples in plain terms declar'd
 That "The Paternal Monad amplifies
 Itself, and generates a Duality,
 Which by the Monad sits, and shining forth
 With intellectual beams, o'er all things rules,
 For Deity in Triad shines throughout
 The world, of which a Monad is the head;"
 Which Triad, Virtue, Wisdom, Truth, he styled.
 Losing its clearness still, on either hand
 Thence roll'd the stream of sacred doctrine forth
 To Indostan and Persia; varying oft
 In breath and depth, but ever bearing signs
 Of that all-glorious Fountain whence it flow'd;
 And Brahma, Vianu, and Siva here,
 There Oromasdes, Mithra, Ahriman,
 Shew forth corruptions of th' Eternal Three.
 Through middle Asia, more or less corrupt,
 With Shem's and Ham's remaining progeny
 The doctrine spread; and unto Egypt borne
 By Taut, Phœnicia's early emigrant,
 Upon the fertile banks of Nile, we view
 The same great Triad in another form,
 (Not deeply darken'd yet, though not so clear
 As in His primal loveliness reveal'd
 In persons of Osiris, Cneph, and Phtha."*

* For the testimonies of the heathen to the doctrines of a Trinity, see Professor Kidd's Essay on the Trinity: Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. iv., ch. 2, 3 and 4: Dr. Hales on the Trinity, vol. ii., p. 266-285: Simpson's Plea for the Divinity of Jesus, p. 432-456: Kidder's Demonstration of the Messiah: Cudworth's Intellectual System: Pritchard's Egypt, p. 295: Faber's History of Idolatry, vol. iii., pp. 111, &c., 611, 616, 617: Work on Egypt, by London Tract Society, p. 136, &c. Newman's History of Arianism in the 4th Century, p. 100: Poole's *Horæ Egyptiacæ*, p. 204-206: Gale's Court of the Gentiles, vol. iv., p. 306, and vol. i., ch. 2, p. 68: Smith's Testimony to the Messiah, vol. iii., p. 420: Morris's Prose Essay on the Hindua, pp. 165, 365, and notes, p. 391: Spencer de Leg. Hebraeæ, Lib. iii., Diss. 5., ch. 3: Hutchinson's Trinity of the Gentiles and Moses, Linc. Hcy's Lectures on Div., B. iv., Art. 1, § 1., vol. i., p. 486, 2 vol. ad. See however, particularly, Ancient Fragments, with an Introduct. Dissert., and an Inq. into the Trinity of the Ancients, by Isaac Preston Cory, 2d Ed., Lond., Pickering, 1832, which contains all the evidence from which to form our opinion.

This argument is also pursued at length, by Chevalier Ramsay, in his *Princ. of Nat. and Rev. Rel.*, ed. Glasgow, 1748, vol. i., p. 97, and

Before leaving this presumptive argument, we will offer three remarks in confirmation of it:

In the *first* place, we would wish it to be distinctly understood that we do not by any means, concur with Dr. Beard and other Unitarian and infidel writers, in thinking that the heathen triads are *similar* to the Christian Trinity, or could by any force of imagination have been transmuted into it. Many learned and able writers, who have perceived in the heathen triads the corruption of a primitive revelation of the Trinity, have nevertheless pointed out their manifest and essential dissimilarity to it.*

On this subject there is, therefore, a safe and middle way to be pursued. We are not, with Bishop Horsley, to attempt to construct out of the heathen triads a clear threefold personal distinction co-existing in one essential Godhead or nature, nor are we, on the other hand, to reject the manifest and indisputable *analogy* which they present to the doctrine of the Trinity. This analogy is as great in regard to this doctrine as it is to that of sacrifice and other firmly revealed and divinely authorised truths, and so great as to be altogether inexplicable, except upon the supposition, that like them, it is the corruption of a primitive revealed truth.†

vol. ii. See also, Vossines, Huet, Kurher, Thomassin, Stanley and Purchas. Ramsay regards all the Pagan triads as variations of one common original faith, and the Chinese and Egyptian triads as going beyond and being independent of the Mosaic records.

See also, note A, being an Analysis and Historical account of the Pagan Triads, p. 560, vol. viii, of So. Pres. Review.

* See Gale, vol. iv., p. 388: Cudworth, B. i., c. 4, § 84 and 85, and particularly Faber, as above, and in the pages following.

† "Much, (says Mr. Cory,) in his very learned work, (*Anet. Fragments of the Phœnician, Chaldean, and other writers, with Dissert. and Inq. into the Trinity of the Ancients*, Lond. 1832, Pickering,) as has been said upon the Platonic trinity, I must confess that I can find fewer traces of that doctrine in the writings of Plato, than of his less refined predecessors, the Mythologists. I have given such extracts as appear to me to relate to the subject, together with a fragment of Amelius, which expressly mentions the three kings of Plato as identical with the Orphic Trinity. Dr. Morgan, in his Essay upon the subject, satisfactorily refutes the notion, that Plato regarded the Logos as the second person of the Trinity; and upon this refutation he denies that Plato held the doctrine at all, more particularly, as from the time of Plato to that of Ammonius Saccas, in the third century, no disciple of his school seems to have been aware that such a doctrine was contained in his writings. Perhaps, however, we may trace some obscure allusions to it in the beginning of the second

Our object in the presentation of this presumptive argument in favour of the Trinity has, therefore, been two fold. First, to repel the *a priori* objection to this doctrine founded upon its alleged unreasonableness and contrariety to the general conceptions of mankind, and secondly, to prove that as the doctrine is one evidently above, and beyond, and contrary to, the natural conceptions of uninstructed reason, it must be traced to the source to which the Fathers and ancient philosophers themselves traced it, that is, to an originally divine revelation. "We may reasonably conclude," says Cudworth, "that which Proclus assented to of this Trinity, as it was contained in the Chaldaic Oracles to be true, that it was at first a Theology of divine tradition or revelation, or a divine Cabbala, viz: amongst the Hebrews first, and from them afterwards communicated to the Egyptians and other nations."*

The understanding of man can never be more grossly insulted than when Infidelity labours to persuade us, that a truth so awfully sublime as that at present under consideration, could ever be the offspring of human invention: nor can history be more violated than when it traces the origin of this doctrine to the schools of Greece. Equally above the boldest flight of human genius to invent, as beyond the most extended limit of human intellect fully to comprehend, is the profound mystery of the ever blessed Trinity.†

We remark then, in the *second* place, that the very earliest manifestations of the Deity to unfallen, and to fallen man, give proof that God was then known, not as

hypothesis of the Parmenides, and in the passages which I have given, (though in the latter the doctrines appear rather to refer to the Monad and Duad, than to the genuine Trinity of the ancients.) So far from any such doctrine being maintained by the Pythagoreans, or in the Academy, we find only such vague allusions as might be expected among philosophers who revered an ancient tradition, and were willing after they had lost the substance, to find something to which they might attach the shadow. "The Christian Trinity is not a Trinity of principles, like that of the Persian philosophers; it does not consist of mere logical notions, and inadequate conceptions of Deity, like that of Plato; but it is a Trinity of subsistences, or persons, joined by an indissoluble union."

* B. i., c. 1, § 85, quoted by Gale in Court of Gentiles, vol. iii., p. 286, and see also, vol. i., p. 8, ch. 2.

† Maurice Ind. Antiq., vol. iv., pp. 39, 40.

a personal unity but as a Trinity. God, we are everywhere taught in the Scriptures, is absolutely invisible to mortal eyes, and as a fact, never has been visible, "no man having seen," or being able to see "God at any time."* The Jehovah therefore, who is everywhere visible to men,—who appears to them and converses with them, cannot be Jehovah the Father, but must be Jehovah the son.

We find however, in addition to this primitive revelation of a visible Jehovah,—and of a plural deity who is also called Jehovah,—distinct mention made of "THE SPIRIT OF GOD moving on the face of the waters," which SPIRIT we are told, would "not always strive with the children of men."† And thus we are led to the belief that a knowledge of a trinity of persons in the divine unity was the primitive revelation made of himself by God to man, and "that the universal traditionary beliefs in this doctrine are the fossil remains of that primitive revelation."

The *third* remark, on which we wish to dwell at some length before leaving this point is, that even should it be denied that this universal belief in the doctrine of a Trinity is the traditionary form of a primitive revelation, it does not follow that the Christian doctrine originated as Dr. Beard and Unitarians generally,—following Voltaire, Volney, Gibbon, and other infidels,*—affirm, in Pagan and idolatrous superstition. For, as we *have* already seen in part, and *will* further hereafter shew, there are sufficient grounds to believe that this doctrine of the Trinity is the doctrine of the Old as well as of the New Testament, and of the ancient Jews as well as of the primitive Christians, and thus we are again brought to the conclusion that the doctrine of a Trinity is found to exist among all nations, must have been derived from the Hebrew Scriptures and people, or from a primitive and common revelation, and not from Pagan philosophy. And to suppose that mankind so universally, and in many cases so clearly, arrived at the separate and inde-

* See numerous passages to this effect.

† See numerous similar passages.

‡ See Voltaire's Works, vol. 24, 26, 27, and Gibbon Hist. of Decl. and Fall, vol. ii., 4 to p. 227.

pendent belief of some kind of Trinity in unity, is at once to abandon the whole foundation on which opposition to this doctrine rests, and to admit that instead of being irrational, contradictory, absurd, and incredible, the doctrine of the Trinity, and not the doctrine of a personal unity of the Godhead, is the result to which human reason has been universally brought by its own convictions. And if this is so, then that revelation should teach clearly, authoritatively and universally, what reason only taught obscurely, unauthoritatively and to the initiated and philosophic few, in perfect accordance with the teachings of revelation, on the subjects of future life, immortality, and many other doctrines, such as the existence of angels.*

The historical fact that the doctrine of a Trinity is found embodied in all the most ancient forms of religion the world over, must be explained in some way. The hypotheses by which this fact can possibly be explained, are, however, very few.

By collecting all the evidence that can be had, and examining separately, and excluding successively every hypothesis which shall be found inconsistent with the admitted and undeniable facts, we may contract the circle of conjecture till but one hypothesis is left; which one must be the truth, and is thus negatively rendered matter of demonstration.

Now, Mr. Faber, in his admirable work on the Pagan Idolatry, has collected and separately examined all the different systems of the Heathen Mythology; and has shown that there is such a singular, minute and regular accordance among them, not only in what is *obvious* and *natural*, but also in what is *arbitrary* and *circumstantial*, both in *fanciful speculations* and in *artificial observances*, so as to render untenable every other hypothesis than this,—that they must all have arisen from some common source.

Having thus shewn their common origin, he enumerates three hypotheses, as the only three on which, he conceives, the common origination of the various systems of Paganism can be accounted for:

* See Horaley's Tracts, p. 45-50, and also Tholuck, *see* Note B.

I. Either all nations agreed to borrow from one, subsequent to their several settlements :

II. Or all nations, subsequent to their several settlements, were compelled by arms to adopt the superstition of one :

III. Or, all nations were once assembled together in a single place and in a single community, where they adopted a corrupt form of religion, which they afterwards respectively carried with them into the lands that they colonized.

After examining, and shewing the utter impossibility of maintaining either the first or the second of these hypotheses, he concludes that the third only can be the truth.

May we not, therefore, as Dr. Cudworth remarks, adore the wonderful providence of God, who so ordered that this doctrine of a Trinity should have been generally retained in the heathen world, and received by their wisest philosophers. "Whereas," says the learned writer, bold and conceited wits, precipitantly condemning the doctrine of the Trinity for nonsense, absolute repugnancy to human faculties, and impossibility, have thereupon, some of them, quite shaken off Christianity, and all revealed religion professing only Theism, others have frustrated the design thereof by paganizing it into creature worship or Idolatry; this ignorant and conceited confidence of both may be retunded and confuted from hence, because the most ingenions and acute of all the Pagan philosophers, the Platonists and Pythagoreans, who had no bias at all upon them, nor any Scripture, (which might seem to impose upon their faculties,) but followed the free sentiments and dictates of their own minds, did, notwithstanding, not only entertain this Trinity of divine hypostases eternal and uncreated, but were also fond of the hypothesis, and made it a main fundamental of their theology.* The latter Platonists and unbelieving Jews were, therefore, led, as this author points out, to adulterate the Cabbala and the genuine doctrine of Plato, in order to weaken their evidence in favour of the reasonableness of the doctrine of the Trinity.

* See also remarks to the same effect in Stillingfleet on the Trinity, pp. 216, 217. See also Note A.

This conclusion however, that the Pagan doctrine of triads originated in a primitive revelation, though to our minds irresistably strong, is very far from being admitted by our opponents. There was a time when the policy pursued was to deny the existence of any other than an imaginary resemblance between the Pagan and Christian triads. "Thus have I given," says Dr. Priestly, "the best view that I have been able to collect of every thing that can be supposed to constitute the Trinity of Plato, from his own writings: without finding in them any resemblance to the Christian Trinity, or indeed to any proper personification of the Divine Logos; which has been made the second person in it."

The discovery however, has now been made, that the Christian doctrine of the Trinity was first introduced into the Christian system by certain of the early fathers, who, by their too great fondness for the philosophical learning of Gentilism, corrupted Christianity, in respect to the tenets of Christ's godhead and the Trinity, Justin Martyr being commonly set down as the ringleader of the innovators. The other Fathers chiefly implicated in this serious charge, are Ireneus, Athenagoras, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria. The opportunity being thus afforded for imputing to the doctrine of the Trinity a Pagan origin and character, the heathen triads were henceforward acknowledged to be, not only essentially analogous to, but the very sources and origin of the Christian doctrine.

Such is the hypothesis. Is there then, we would ask, any foundation for this assertion in the writings of these Fathers? If indebted for such important truth to the Gentile philosophers, to whose works they had been devotedly attached, we may expect to hear them speak of them with gratitude and praise. If, however, on the contrary, we find them in the face of all the shame, reproach and persecution to which their belief of this doctrine subjected them; if we find them treating these

* Hist. of Early Opin. Book i, ch. 6: Works vol. 6, p. 164. "A similar statement occurs also, in Dr. Priestley's Letters to Bishop Horsley. As to the Trinity of Plato, (says he,) it was certainly a thing very unlike your Athanasian doctrine. For, it was never imagined that the three component members of that Trinity were, either equal to each other, or (strictly speaking) one."

philosophers with contempt, and tracing up their views to the Hebrew Scriptures, as the only pure foundations of primitive revelation, then we may feel assured that this hypothesis is gratuitous; unwarranted by the facts, and framed only as a subterfuge from the overwhelming power of the universal belief of this doctrine by the Fathers, as a proof of the primitive revelation of the doctrine of the Trinity.

Let us, then, hear what Justin Martyr says, "You will adduce," says he to the Greeks, "the wise men and the philosophers: for to these, as to a strong hold, you are wont to make your escape, whenever concerning the Gods, any twits you with the opinion of the poets. Wherefore, since it is fitting to begin with the first and the most ancient, commencing with them I will shew: that the speculation of each philosopher is still more ridiculous than even the theology of the poets.* He then proceeds in regular succession, through the several opinions of Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Heraclitus, Anaxagorus, Archelaus, Pythagorus, Epicurus, Empedocles, *Plato* and Aristotle, for the purpose of convicting them all of manifest and indisputable folly. With respect to Plato in particular, nothing can be more contemptuous than Justin's sneer at him. "Plato forsooth, is as sure that the Supreme Deity exists in a fiery substance, as if he had come down from above, and had accurately learned and seen all the things that are in Heaven."†

"Since," continues he to the Greeks, "it is impossible to learn from your teachers anything true respecting piety towards God, inasmuch as their very difference of opinion is a plain proof of their ignorance; I deem it an obvious consequence, that we should return to our own forefathers, who are of much higher antiquity than any of your teachers, who have taught us nothing from their own mere phantasy; who among themselves have no discrepancies, and who attempt not mutually to overturn the opinion of each other, but who, without wrangling and disputation, communicate to us that knowledge which they have received from God. For, neither by nature,

* Justin ad Græc. Cohort. Oper. p. 8. † Ibid. p. 4.

nor by human intellect, is it possible for men to attain the knowledge of such great and divine matters, but only by the gift which descends from above, upon holy men who needed not the arts of eloquence, or the faculty of subtle disputation, but who judged it solely necessary to preserve themselves pure by the efficacious energy of the Divine Spirit.”*

Equally vituperative is the language of Tertullian. “For the authors of our Theology,” says he, “we have the apostles of the Lord; who, not even themselves, arbitrarily chose what they would introduce, but who faithfully delivered to the nations that discipline which they received from Christ. Finally, heresies themselves, are suborned from philosophy. Thence spring those fables and endless genealogies, and unfruitful questions and discourses, creeping like gangrene, from which the Apostle would rein us back by charging us, even in so many words, to beware of philosophy. What then is there in common between Athens and Jerusalem, between the Academy and the Church, between Heretics and Christians? Our institution is from the porch of Solomon, who, himself, has admonished us to seek the Lord in simplicity of heart. Let those persons see to it, who have brought forward a stoical, or a Platonic, or a dialectic Christianity.”† “From the Prophets and from Christ, we are instructed in regard to God; not from the Philosophers nor Epicurus. God hath chosen the foolish things of the world, that he might confound the wise. Through this simplicity of the truth, directly contrary to subtilequence and philosophy, we can savour nothing perverse.”‡

* Justin Cohort, Oper. p. 87.

† Tertull. Adv. Marcion, Lib. ii., § 13, Oper. p. 181.

‡ Tertull. Adv. Marcion, Lib. v., § 40, Oper. p. 328. Stillingfleet, in his work on the Trinity, replies to this objection as follows: (p. 213-215.)

“But our Unitarians have an answer ready for these men, viz., that they came out of Plato’s school with the tincture of his three principles; and they sadly complain, that Platonism had very early corrupted the Christian faith as to these matters. In answer to which exception, I have only one postulatum to make, which is, that these were honest men, and knew their own minds best, and I shall make it appear, that none can more positively declare, than they do, that they did not take up these notions from Plato, but from the Holy Scriptures; Justin Martyr saith he took the foundation of his faith from thence, and that he could find no certain-

It is thus apparent that the very witnesses produced by the Unitarians to prove the Pagan origin of the doctrine of the Trinity, reject such imputation with scorn for its foolishness, and actually give their testimony in favour of its origin in a primitive Divine revelation. But this is not all. These witnesses go further and charge home upon those who had endeavoured to suborn and pervert their testimony, the introduction of their errors from that very Pagan philosophy to which they would daringly and blasphemously ascribe the origin of the Christian Trinity.

To this purpose speaks the venerable Irenæus, who yet, by Dr. Priestly, has been accused in conjunction with Justin and sundry others, his contemporaries, of introducing the doctrine of the Logos from the schools of the philosophers into the system of Christianity. "Heretics (says Irenæus,) are not only convicted of steal-

ty as to God and religion anywhere else; that he thinks Plato took his three principles from Moses; and in his dialogue with Trypho, he at large, proves the eternity of the Son of God from the Scriptures, and said he would use no other arguments, for he pretended to no skill but in the Scriptures, which God had enabled him to understand.

Athenagoras declares that where the philosophers agreed with them, their faith did not depend on them, but on the testimony of the Prophets, who were inspired by the Holy Ghost. To the same purpose speaks Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, who asserts the co-eternity of the Son with the Father, from the beginning of St. John's Gospel, and saith their faith is built on the Scriptures.

Clement, of Alexandria, owns, not only the essential attributes of God to belong to the Son, but that there is one Father of all, and one Word over all, and one Holy Ghost, who is everywhere, and he thinks Plato borrowed his three principles from Moses; that his second was the Son, and his third the Holy Spirit. Even Origen himself, highly commends Moses above Plato, in his most undoubted writings, and saith, that Numenius went beyond Plato, and that he borrowed out of the Scriptures; and so he saith, Plato did in other places; but he adds, that doctrines were better delivered in Scripture, than in his artificial dialogues. Can any one that hath the least reverence for writers of such authority and zeal for the Christian doctrine, imagine that they wilfully corrupted it in one of the chief articles of it, and brought in new speculations against the sense of those books, which at the same time, they professed to be the only rule of their faith? Even where they speak most favourably of the Platonic trinity, they suppose it to be borrowed from Moses. And therefore Numenius said, that Moses and Plato did not differ about the first principles; and Theodoret mentions Numenius as one of those who said, Plato understood the Hebrew doctrine in Egypt; and during his thirteen years stay there, it is hardly possible to suppose, he should be ignorant of the Hebrew doctrine, about the first principles, which he was so inquisitive after, especially among nations who pretended to antiquity."

ing from the comic writers, but they likewise collect together the sayings of all those who are ignorant of God, and who are called philosophers. Out of these numerous, vile, borrowed rags, they industriously patch up a sort of cento; and thus through the introduction of a new doctrine, they prepare themselves with subtle eloquence, a system superficially plausible.”*

Exactly similar also, are the repeated declarations of Tertullian. “Turning from the Christians to the philosophers, from the Church to the Academy and the Portico, Hermogenes has thence borrowed from the Stoics the phantasy of conjoining matter with the Deity. For, matter, he contends, always existed; being neither born, nor made, nor having either beginning or end: and out of this God afterwards created all things.”†

“In good truth, (adds Tertullian,) I grieve to say that Plato has become the universal seasoner of heretics. Since then, those matters, which heretics borrow, are insinuated by Plato, I shall sufficiently confute heretics, if I demolish the argument of Plato.‡ Philosophers are the patriarchs of heretics.”§ “Finally, (adds he,) heresies themselves are suborned from philosophy.”§

Cyril of Alexandria, makes similar remarks. “Porphyry, expounding the sentiment of Plato, sayeth, that the essence of God proceeds even to three hypostases, but that the Supreme God is “the Supreme Good,” and that after him, the second is, the prime Opificer or Creator; moreover, that the third is, the mundane soul, (or universal spirit.) For, the Divinity extended itself to the soul of the universe. This Platonic trinity Cyril refutes, as that which is the spawn and seed to Arianism.”

Athanasius also charged upon the Arians two things as Gnostic and Valentinian, which undoubtedly, are so: ** one was their bringing in, will, (1) between the Father and his *word*; another was their *creature* Creator. (2) Philastrius (3) farther charges them with having borrowed another principle from the infamous Apelles, (of the

* Iren. Adv. Hær. Lib. ii, c. 19, sec. 2, p. 117.

† Tertull. Adv. Hermog. sec. 1, Oper. p. 335.

‡ Oper. p. 659. | Ibid. p. 339. § Tertull. Adv. Hær. sec. 2, Oper. p. 97.

** See Dr. Waterland's Second Defence, vol. iii., p. 289. (1) Athan, p. 608. (2) Athan Orat. ii., p. 439. (3) Philastrius Hæres, cap. 47.

Marcionite tribe,) which was the making a *second* God, a *creature* and a *subject* of the *first*, not to mention that Bishop Bull had run up your doctrines to the old Gnostics, (4) long ago; and was never yet confuted, nor ever will be."

That Arianism originated in Pagan philosophy, was the opinion of Melancthon, who, says "Paulus Samosatenus—who adopted the blasphemy of Ebion and Cerinthus—was led to his errors in the following way: Plotinus the philosopher, who was a scholar to Ammonius, reading in the school of Alexandria, had mingled with his philosophy allegories touching the eternal Word, and in as much as there were many debates about these things from the writings of the ancients, Paulus Samosatenus drew thence his impostures, and maintained that Jesus Christ was only man; and that by *λογος*, *logos*, the word; (John i., 1,) we are not to understand any person subsistent, but the declaration and word of promise. These reveries were received with much praise by curious spirits, and particularly by Zenobia, Queen of Arabia and dame of Antioch, by whose means P. Samosatenus was defended for ten years. This heresy of Samosatenus, in denying the divinity of Christ, was received by Arius, and that from the very same foundation of Platonic philosophy, yea, in the very same school of Alexandria."

The same fact is stated by Aquinas.* "We find, (says he,) in the books of the Platonist, that in the beginning the Word was, by which Word, they understood not a person in the Trinity, but an Ideal Reason, by which God made all things—whence sprang the error of Origen and Arius, who followed the Platonists herein. So again, in what follows. Q. 34, A. 1. Aquinas assures us that Origen laid the foundation of Arianism, by affirming that the word in Divine matters, was to be interpreted only metaphysically, not properly. That Arius also, derived his opinion from the Platonists through this school of Alexandria, is evident, since Arius was a Presbyter in this Church, and student in this school, where the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy was at

(4) Bull, D. F., Sect. iii., Cap. 1.
* Sum. Part. i., Q. 32, A. 1.

this time wholly in request, Aristotle not having come into play till afterward."

Similar is the opinion of that great French reformer, M^orelus.* "It has been the custom (says he,) to use disputes in many places, whence many inconveniences may follow: for such disputes tend only to awaken and discover the spirit, whence follows much presumption and ostentation, and the starting of high and curious questions, which may afterwards trouble the church." The Arian heresy had its rise from the particular conferences of learned men in the city of Alexandria. Indeed, Constantine sharply reprehended these curious disputes, &c. The same may be applied to the Photinian heresy, which was the same with the Arian and Samosatenean.

Origen, therefore, introduced the Aristotelian philosophy in order to counteract the paganizing effects of the Platonic, and for the same purpose endeavoured to harmonize the Platonic and Christian Trinities, and thus paved the way for greater errors.†

We have thus, I think, demonstrated that so far from being true that the doctrine of the Trinity was derived

* *Discipl. Liv. ii., chap. 4, pp. 87, 88.*

† The error of identifying the Platonic and Christian trinities, says Mr. Cory, (1) took its rise with a few of the writers in the second century. "They were led into the mistake by the word *Logos*, used by Plato and St. John, and made the Platonic Trinity to consist of God, the *Logos* and the Soul of the world, and this in spite of all the professed followers of Plato, who, however they might vary among themselves, uniformly insisted upon placing the *Monad* and *Duad*, or at least, a *Monad* above their *Triad*.

In the first century of the Christian era, Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, had attempted to expound the Scriptures on Platonic principles; and after the promulgation of the Gospel, many of the fathers warmly adopted the same mode of exposition. The different sects of the Gnostics went far beyond the Grecian sage, and sought in the East the doctrines, to which they looked upon the writings of Plato merely as essays, introductory to the sublimer flights of the Oriental mysticism, and they treated his followers with that contempt, against which the vanity of a philosopher is seldom proof; and as long as these schools existed, a bitter enmity prevailed between them. The Gnostics gave at once a real existence to the *Ideal* world, and continuing the chain of being from the Supreme through numerous orders of *Eons*, personified abstract ideas, of which the second and third persons of the Trinity were the first and second *Eons*, and from thence to the lowest material species, founded that daring

(1) *Ancient Fragments*, p. 7, *Introd.*

by some of the early Fathers from the Pagan doctrine of Plato and other philosophers; these Fathers brand, repudiate and deny the charge, condemn those doctrines as erroneous and foolish, and attribute to them the heresies which are now advocated by Unitarians. But these Fathers go still further than this. These very Fathers attribute whatever is true or good, in these ancient philosophers, not to human reason, not to their genius, or original invention, but to the revelation of God. "Your philosophers," says Justin Martyr to the Greeks, "through the agency of the Divine Providence, have unwillingly been even themselves, compelled to speak on our side of the question: and now, especially those who sojourned in Egypt, and who are benefitted by the theosophy of Moses and his ancestors. For those of you, who are acquainted with the history of Diodorus, and with the productions of other similar writers, can scarcely, I think, be ignorant; that Orpheus and Homer, and Solon, and Pythagoras, and Plato, and several others, having sojourned in Egypt, and having been benefitted

heresy which so long disturbed the tranquillity of Christendom, and with this spurious Platonism of the fathers of the Arian heresy, is likewise intimately connected.

But the internal heresies of the Church were not the only ill effects of which the misguided zeal of the fathers, in forcing upon Plato the doctrine of the Trinity, brought about. Though it is possible, that by pointing out some crude similarity of doctrine, they might have obtained some converts by rendering Christianity less unpalatable to the philosophical world of that day, yet the weapon was skillfully turned against them, and with unerring effect, when the Pagans took upon them to assert that nothing new had been revealed in Christianity; since, by the confessions of its very advocates, the system was previously contained in the writings of Plato.

In the third century, Ammonius Saccas, universally acknowledged to have been a man of consummate ability, taught that every sect, Christian or Heretic, or Pagan, had received the truth, and retained it in their varied legends. He undertook therefore, to unfold it from them all, and to reconcile every creed. And from his exertions sprung the celebrated Eclectic School of the later Platonists, Plotinus, Amelius, Olympius, Porphyrius, Jamblicus, Syrianus and Proclus, were among the celebrated Professors who succeeded Ammonius in the Platonic Chairs, and revived and kept alive the spirit of Paganism, with a bitter enmity to the Gospel, for near three hundred years. The Platonic Schools were at length closed by the edict of Justinian; and seven wise men, the last lights of Platonism, Diogenes, Hermias, Eulalius, Priscianus, Damascius, Isidorus and Simplicius, retired indignantly from the persecutions of Justinian, to realize the shadowy dreams of the Republic of Plato, under the Persian despotism of Chorocea.

by the history of Moses, afterward set forth matters directly contrary to their former indecorous speculations concerning the gods. Thus, for instance, Orpheus, though the first teacher of Polytheism among you, declared to his son, Museus, and to other sincere hearers, the unity of the Godhead. We find him also adjuring **THE VOICE OF THE FATHER**: by which expression, he means **THE WORD OF GOD**, through whom were produced the heavens and the earth, and the whole creation, as the divine prophecies of holy men teach us. For, becoming partially acquainted with those prophecies in Egypt, he thence learned that the whole creation was produced by the word of God. Pythagoras, likewise, who, through symbols, mystically declared the dogmata of his philosophy, learned just sentiments, concerning the unity of God, during his abode in Egypt. After a similar manner, Plato, as it seems, learned in Egypt the doctrine of Moses and the prophets respecting one only God. For, wishing to interpret to the ignorant what was mystically said concerning the eternity of God, he wrote as follows: "God, as the ancient discourse sets forth, has the beginning, and the end, and the middle of all things." Here, under the name of the ancient discourse, Plato clearly and openly alludes to the law of Moses: though through fear of Aconite he did not venture to mention the precise name of the Hebrew Legislator.*

Hear also, to the same effect, Clement of Alexandria. "Plato," says he, "remarks, God, as also the ancient discourse teaches, comprehends the beginning and the end, and the middle of all things. Whence, O Plato, did you thus darkly set forth the truth? The nations of the barbarians, says he, are wiser than those. Truly I well know your teachers, though you may wish to conceal them. From the Hebrews you have borrowed both all your good laws, and your opinions respecting the Deity."† "Pythagoras transferred largely from our Scriptures into his own system of dogmatic philosophy. For, Numenius, the Pythagorean philosopher, undisguisedly writes: what is Plato save Moses atticising?‡ Again,

* Justin Cohort, ad Græc. Oper. pp. 11, 12, 14, 18.

† Clem. Alex. Admon. ad Gent. Oper. pp. 43, 46.

‡ Clem. Alex. Strom. Lib. 1, Oper. p. 342.

he says, "The philosophies of the Greeks without acknowledging their obligations, borrowed the best of their dogmata from Moses and the prophets."*

According to Justin Martyr, the three principles of the Greek philosopher were God, and Matter, and Form: to which he sometimes added a fourth, under the title of the soul of the universe.†

But, Porphyry exhibits Plato's second and third principles, as being active instead of passive: whence he sums up the entire three as the Highest Good, God, the Second Creative God, and the Soul of the World. And this last statement of the speculation seems to be favoured by the language of Plato himself: for, mentioning them altogether in his second epistle to Dionysius, he denominates his three divine principles, Essential Goodness, and Creative Intellect, and The Universal Mundane Soul. "Now, in the Triad of Plato, (says Faber,) some of the early Fathers wished to discover a real, though corrupted declaration of the three persons of the Trinity: and the theory upon which they proceeded was avowedly the following: The doctrine of the Trinity, they maintained, so far from being an invention of Plato, was, in truth, a *primitive patriarchal revelation* of the divine nature. This primitive revelation was, with a more ample developement, confirmed under the Gospel. Plato, meanwhile, had corruptly borrowed its outline from the writings of Moses and the Prophets. Consequently, men need not wonder to have found a prominent dogma, both of the ancient and Hebrew Church, and of its successor the Christian Church, in the works of a speculative Greek, who had been largely conversant with the Orientals.‡

Thus, it is made apparent that the Fathers, instead of lending any countenance to the Unitarian hypothesis; that they derived the doctrine of the Trinity from Plato and other Pagan philosophers, condemned their doctrine of triads as a corrupt perversion of the teaching of the

* Justin Cohort, ad. Græc. Oper. p. 5.

† Justin Cohort, ad. Græc. Oper. p. 6.

‡ Justin Apol. 1, Oper. pp. 72, 73. See Faber's Apost. of Trinitarianism, vol. ii., B. 2, ch. 3, from which we have taken our authorities and the argument. See also, do. ch. 4, p. 145-150. Gale's Court of Gentiles, vol. iv., p. 386.

Hebrew Scriptures, and of an original primitive revelation, from which they borrowed their ideas.

But, passing from the ancient world to the various portions of the Christian Church, the fact that this doctrine of the Trinity has been the almost universal belief of that church in every country, and in every age,—the fact that the denial or modification of it led to the formation of the earliest creeds and the controversies of Christians with those calling themselves Fellow-Christians,—the fact that, with the exception of one period, when for reasons which can be stated, a modification of this doctrine called Trinitarianism prevailed,* all who denied it were excommunicated as heretics, as abandoning the essential doctrine of the Gospel,—the fact that during that age referred to, Christian men contended earnestly for this doctrine as “the faith once delivered to the saints,” “even unto blood,”†—the fact that from that time this doctrine has been received as a fundamental doctrine by the Western, Greek, Oriental, Syrian and Waldensian Churches;—the fact that at the reformation this doctrine was adopted by every church, and introduced into every confession of faith, without exception,‡—the fact that all denial and discussion of the doctrine has only convinced the almost unanimous mind of Christendom that this is the doctrine of the Bible, and that it is vital and fundamental;—these facts surely carry with them a very powerful presumption in favor of our opinion that this doctrine is clearly taught in the word of God.§

But the *character* of these witnesses is as striking as their number. In the *first place*, we have the testimony of the ancient Jews. This is fully established by the writings of Philo, who was contemporary with the Apostles, and by the Dialogue of Justin Martyr with the Jew Trypho, in the middle of the second century, as well as by the Jerusalem Targum, or Paraphrase, written about the fourth century, by the Targum or Paraphrase of the Pentateuch, as ascribed to Jonathan ben Uzziel, written

* See Newman's History of Arianism in the 4th Century.

† See Note C., for the testimony of the early Fathers.

‡ See Note D., for the testimony of the Reformers.

§ Note on the views of the Fathers.

in the sixth or seventh century, and also by other Jewish works of acknowledged antiquity. That the ancient Jews were led to the belief of a plurality—a trinity—in the divine nature, has been further illustrated from the Books in the Apocrypha, as well as from the works above mentioned. “To the man who is really conversant in the writings of the Targumists, Cabbalists and Daraschists, remarks Mr. Oxlee, who is himself to be guided by their direction and authority, the doctrine of the Trinity can offer no scruples. The Targumist certainly distinguishes between Jehovah—the word of Jehovah—and the Habitation of Jehovah, by ascribing to each of them personal actions and properties, whilst he makes them all equally God, by assigning to them those effects of wisdom and power which are peculiar to the first cause; and yet he is not accused of having established three Gods, nor of having denied the unity. The Cabbalist distinguishes between the higher Numerations, Supreme Crown, Wisdom and Understanding; which he asserts to be no properties, as the name might import, but eternal subsistence of the Godhead; and yet he is not charged with having violated the unity of Jehovah, nor with having induced three Gods. Finally, the Daraschit vindicates the eternity and divinity of the Law and of the Throne of Grace, by demonstrating that they actually existed with Jehovah prior to the creation, and that on the authority of the inspired penman, they all denote one and the same thing; that is, one and the same God; and yet he is not condemned for having dissolved the unity by the number of his pre-existences. How then can the Professors of Judaism with any colour of propriety object to that tenet, which agrees in every essential point with the principles of their own church.*

* On this point, the reader can examine the judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church against the Unitarians, by Alex. Simpson, *Plea*, pp. 407-431. Haleson on the Trinity. Maurice *Jud. Antiq.* vol. 4, ch. 11, pp. 113. Jamieson's Reply to Priestly, vol. i., pp. 48-117. Randolph's View of our Saviour's Ministry, vol. ii., pp. 343-354. Gill's Commentary on all the Passages. Lightfoot. Whitaker's Origin of Arianism. Kidder's Demonstration of the Messiah, Part iii., ch. 4, 5. Horsley's Tracts, pp. 242-244. McCann's Old Paths. Stillingfleet on the Trinity, pp. 208-206. For a full account of the Targum, see Prideaux *Connect. of Old and New Test.* Part ii, B. 8.

We do not allude to these writings of the Jews because we think they have any claim of authority over our judgment, or that they are entitled to any high regard for the soundness of their understanding, or the correctness of their principles of interpretation: but their testimony is valuable, as historical documents giving us relics of the better knowledge and the purer faith of their ancestors. Neither do we undertake to affirm that these ancient writings of the Jews as clearly teach the triune personal distinction in the Godhead as so many and so learned men have been led to believe they do. Their opinion is our own. But still, we do not offer the testimony of these writings as *in itself*, a *positive* proof of the divine authority and truth of the doctrine of the Trinity, but as a *presumptive* proof that it is so, because the ancestors of those who now oppose the doctrine so interpreted Scripture, and so contemplated the Divine Being as to conceive of a plurality in the one Eternal Godhead. Against the Jews, who regard these writings as authoritative, their testimony must undoubtedly be conclusive, and against all presumptive arguments of Unitarians, they are equally conclusive, since they prove that the doctrine of an absolute personal unity in the divine nature is a defection from the ancient faith of the Jews as well as of Christians, and was never held either by believers in revelation, or by Gentiles without revelation.*

It must be remembered also, that a great number of the early converts to Christianity and to the belief of the Trinity were, like Paul and the other apostles, Jews, and some of them, like him, trained up in their schools and familiar with all their learning. And as a contradiction between the Old and New Testaments would be destructive to the inspired and authoritative claims of both, the adoption of Christianity *with the doctrine of the Trinity as a vital principle*, by them, is an irrefragable proof to their belief in its perfect consistency with what they regarded as the teaching of God's word.†

* Note D., Testimony of Jews.

† The alleged Unitarianism of the early Hebrew Christians has been triumphantly overthrown by Bishop Horsley, in his Tracts against Priestley, and in Jamieson's Vindication in reply to the same writer in Whitaker's Origin of Arianism, and other works.

A multitude of the early Christians were, on the other hand, Greeks, or at least familiar with the Greek language, and with that dialect spoken in Palestine, and in which the Books of the New Testament were written. Many of them also, like Paul, had been learned in all the wisdom of the ancient philosophers, and some of them had been teachers of their systems, and enthusiastic admirers of their genius and eloquence.

But further, all the primitive and early disciples of Christianity, had either been brought up Jews or Pagans. They were imbued therefore, with all the prejudices and bigotry of these nations, and their enmity even unto blood against Christianity. To the unbelieving, who constituted the great majority of the Jewish nation, the doctrine of the deity of Christ and of the Trinity, was an opprobrious scandal, nay a God defying blasphemy, for the open avowal of which they condemned Jesus Christ to what, by their law, they considered a merited crucifixion. To the Greeks and Romans this doctrine was the uttermost folly, contradiction and absurdity. It was made the ground-work of opprobrious ridicule, as may be seen in the oath put by Lucian into the mouth of a Christian, and by the charge contained in the letter of Pliny to Trajan.* By the philosophic few these doctrines were regarded as pure polytheism and the idolatrous worship of a mere man, while they rejected all faith in the Gods. To the multitude among them, on the contrary, they appeared as the impious substitution of a new system of polytheism for one already established, as the faith of their fathers.

That the early Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, should have adopted Christianity, and with it as a prime verity, this doctrine of the Trinity, is, therefore, overwhelming presumptive evidence, both that the doctrine is Scriptural, and that it is Divine.

It is a further evidence for this conclusion, and a new line of presumptive and corroborative proof, that some even of the ancient heretics, who separated themselves from the body of the church and were cut off by it, as fully retained the doctrine of a consubstantial trinity as

* See given in Note C., as one line of proof. See also, Lardner's Works.

the orthodox. This was the case with the Manichees* and the Montanists, Tertullian having written *some* of his strongest works in favour of the Trinity after joining this sect.

Such then, are the many various and antagonistic witnesses, who unite their testimony in favour of the doctrine of a trinity, as having been the doctrine originally, of a primitive divine revelation, and as being the undoubted doctrine taught in the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. The heathen world, the Christian world, the various and conflicting denominations of Christians, the ancient Jews, all converted Jews, Romanists and Greek, and all other oriental Christians, the Syrian Church buried for ages on the coasts of Malabar, and the Waldenses equally concealed from the earliest times amid their inaccessible mountains, all unite in testifying to this glorious and divine truth.

Now, be it remembered, that fact thus testified to, is not the *truth* of this doctrine, but the simple, palpable, and easily understood *fact*, of this doctrine having been handed down more or less, and purely from primitive and patriarchal revelation; and of its being at this moment, and ever since they were written, embodied and taught in the sacred Scriptures.

It must also be remembered, that the Greek and Roman Churches were early separated, and have ever since remained rival and antagonistic churches. The firm tenure of this doctrine therefore, by both churches, their mutual and earnest contending for it as the faith once delivered to the saints, and their undeviating preservation of it amid all their other changes and corruptions, gives undoubted strength to the force of their independent and yet concurrent testimony.

The undoubted fact of the early and established belief in the doctrine of the Trinity is, itself, a powerful presumption in favour of its apostolic origin. For, as it is itself, altogether remote from the conceptions of the human mind, had the primitive Jews and Jewish converts, and Christian converts, been Unitarian, it is impossible to conceive how, or in what manner the doctrine

* See Lardner, vol. iii., pp. 361, 380, 387.

could have been so firmly and finally established as the doctrine, both of the Old and New Testaments, and as fundamentally important.

To these considerations must be added, not only the almost universal testimony of Christendom, in the present and all modern times, to the doctrine of the Trinity,—but the amazing learning with which every point bearing upon this question has been discussed;—the erudition and research employed in the study and analysis of the Greek and Hebrew languages; and the definitive character now given to the proper and only legitimate interpretation of the sacred Scriptures.

The passages from which these various and independent witnesses deduced the propositions which constitute the elements of the doctrine of the Trinity, are all those which teach that God, while in his Godhead or nature, he is absolutely one, is, in some sense plural, and not absolutely or personally one, that this plurality is limited to the persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that each of these are God. Now, these passages of Scripture are not few. They are exceedingly numerous and enter into the whole structure and phraseology of the Bible. And as it regards their qualities of clearness, plainness, and determinate signification, we appeal from the prejudiced dogmatism of an adversary to the judgment of the truly calm and sincere inquirer, and from the comparatively few who have attempted to sustain the Unitarian hypotheses, upon purely Scriptural testimony,—to the innumerable witnesses we have produced, who, against all the prejudices which stood in their way, have been constrained to receive the doctrine of the Trinity as the doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.

There is still another remark, which will strengthen this presumptive argument for the Scriptural authority of the doctrine of the Trinity, and that is, that were it not plainly and indubitably taught by God himself, no sincere believer could ever have dared to promulgate it. For, if there is one point on which the Scriptures are more full, express and positive than any other, it is in their denunciations against all idolatry and false Gods.

Of Christ, it is almost essential characteristic in the prophetic writings, that he should "utterly abolish idolatry."—(Isa. ii., 18.) If therefore, the doctrine of the Trinity be not true, then believers in any age, have been almost universally idolaters. And hence, from anti-trinitarian principles, the blasphemous consequence follows,—that God himself has led his creatures into temptation,—temptation to that very sin, which, above all others, he hates and abhors,—temptation to idolatry! The Deity declares that he is a "jealous God;" that his glory he will not give to another, nor his praise "to graven images." He most pathetically expostulates upon this subject, (Jer. xliv., 3.) "Oh, do not this abominable thing that I hate." With what scrupulous care does the Supreme Being guard against all temptations to idolatry? Lest the Israelites should worship the relics of Moses, the Deity himself privately interred him, and no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." The brazen serpent also, was destroyed, lest it should lead the Israelites into idolatry. But, if the Deity used such precaution to prevent men from worshipping the body of Moses and the brazen serpent, how can we believe that he would use no precaution where the temptation was infinitely greater. How can we imagine that he would use no precaution to prevent men from worshipping his Son and the Holy Ghost, if only creatures? Is not such a supposition in the highest degree, absurd and unreasonable, and impious? We find that, not only is there no precaution employed in the Scriptures to prevent men from such idolatry, but that everywhere and in every way the Scriptures teach and require men to worship, both the Redeemer and the Holy Spirit. The most glorious perfections of Deity are ascribed to them; the most glorious works of Deity are performed by them,—those very works by which the being and attributes of God are proved,—by which his eternal power and Godhead are manifested,—and by which he is distinguished from all false gods. They are, also, everywhere represented as the object of the prayers of men, and of the united praises and adorations of all intelligent beings. What temptations to idolatry if these persons are only crea-

tures or attributes. All the temptations that ever existed compared with these, were nothing, and less than nothing."*

Finally, if, as it is said by Unitarians, we cannot and ought not to believe the doctrine of the Trinity, even though the Scriptures when interpreted, as all other books are, clearly teaches it,—then, since God has given us no other laws of interpretation by which to understand their meaning, it would follow that the Scriptures cannot be received as an authoritative and inspired standard of faith and practice, and we are thrown upon the wide sea of scepticism and human conjecture as to what is truth. By the great majority of those who have candidly studied the Bible, it has been regarded as teaching the doctrine of the TRINITY of persons in the ONE Godhead, and therefore, it follows that the great majority of those who believe the Bible to be the inspired word of God, must, also, believe the doctrine of the Trinity. They have no alternative between infidelity and Trinitarianism, and since they cannot adopt the latter they must adhere to the former.

From these consequences, therefore, which follow from the rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity, and from all the reasons which constitute our presumptive argument in its favour, we are brought to the conclusion that it is very probably true, that it will be found clearly taught in the Scriptures, and that its opponents therefore, are bound to prove that Christianity distinctly and equivocally condemns and rejects this doctrine before they can offer any valid argument against it on the ground of antecedent impossibility, or in any degree tamper with the plain meaning of the words of Scripture. In coming therefore to Scripture to ascertain what God has revealed on the subject of his own nature, we are not only freed from any prejudices against the probability of finding there the doctrine of the Trinity, but are presumptively led confidently to expect that it will be clearly and distinctly taught in those Scriptures which "were

* On the alleged idolatry of the doctrine of the Trinity, and the consequences it involves, and its futility, see Wynpersee on the Godhead of Christ, sec.*17, pp. 187-162.

given by inspiration of God and are profitable for doctrine,"—"the law and testimony,"—the rule and standard of all revealed truth.*

* We would earnestly ask our readers to distinguish carefully between the doctrines proposed in Scripture to our belief, and the things themselves that are the matter and subject of them. The former may be known, and ground sufficient seen for receiving them; where our reason, at least in this its weak and impaired state, can't reach the full clear, and adequate understanding of the latter.

"Would not advantage be given to Deists and Anti-Scripturists, not to say Atheists, to scoff at the Bible, if after pretences of its truth and authority, and that its great end is to call off the world from idolatry and polytheism to the knowledge, worship and service of the one only true God, and of its plainness to such purposes, being for the use of all; yet even as to this main point, the setting forth of this one true God, distinguishing him from all other beings, it is allowed to be done in such a manner, that not only one, or a few, through carelessness or prejudices, or judicial blindness might mistake; but that the generality of Christians, in all ages, have mistaken, under as good capacity to understand it, as good means and helps thereto, as much concern and diligence, impartiality and faithfulness in the study of it, as sincere and earnest prayer to God for his guidance, and as good ground to hope for it from him as any can pretend to! What use, may they say, can such a book be of, or what likelihood that it is from God? Could he not speak plainly of himself, where 'tis pretended he designed to do so? Is all there so delivered, that the world might, and almost all actually have erred, as to the very object of their faith, worship and obedience, and in whom their felicity is placed? Would not that book, instead of leading to life and salvation, be the most insidious and dangerous one that can be? Of what tendency must those notions be from which any such consequences would justly follow?"

ARTICLE II.

A PLEA FOR THE STUDY OF HEBREW LITERATURE.

While the names of Heathen, as well as Christian sages, are scarcely ever mentioned without calling up feelings of affection and regard towards the nations that gave them birth; the names of the sages of the Hebrew nation, who were once justly styled, by common consent, Sapientissimi, are passed over in silence; they are never thought of; very few think it worth their while to explore their invaluable writings; having imbibed the idea that all Jewish productions, without exception,

are full of absurdities,—productions of a most ignorant and superstitious people, whose intellect has become barbarised through the study of Rabbinism.

Such must be reminded of the fact that the reckless grasp of superstition has chained unnumbered myriads of minds,—minds the most exalted, as well as minds the most degraded,—the mind of the philosopher, no less than of the serf. National religious superstition is, therefore, no criterion of a nation's inferiority of intellect.

Genius and learning are by no means the property of any sect or nation.

Thus, it is generally considered that we are chiefly indebted to Greece and Rome for arts and science, although their religions were inexpressibly superstitious. Socrates, by universal consent, wears the crown of reputation for wisdom, more than any other ancient philosopher; yet his degraded state of mind, as far as religion was concerned, as proved by his sacrificing a cock to *Æsculapius*, at the last hour of his life, is not taken into consideration to counterbalance his subtle disputations, profound inquiries, acute reasonings, and admirable discoveries.

Were but the literature of the Hebrews studied as that of Greece and Rome, its students would indeed, find that it is not at all inferior to theirs. Had Hebrew literature been introduced into the University course, Hebrew philosophers, mathematicians, astronomers, historians, grammarians, poets, critics, metaphysicians, orators, theologians and commentators, would not only convince the student of the fact, that Hebrew literature is as elevated, as beautiful, and as elegant as that of Greece and Rome, but also in a special manner, excite in his mind the warmest affections for sacred literature in the sacred tongue.

They would emphatically, re-echo the sentiments of the celebrated Bishop Lowth, whose language is as follows: "It would not be easy, indeed, to assign a reason why the writings of Homer, of Pindar, and of Horace, should engross our attention and monopolize our praise, while those of Moses, of David, and of Isaiah, pass totally unregarded." They would remind the world of the fact that, when Europe was veiled in superstition and

ignorance, when it could boast of no other literature than Monkish Legends that were unknown beyond the cloisters where they were penned, and when the genius of knowledge seemed almost to have fled from the earth, a lively cultivation of mind flourished among the Israelites to such a degree as to honour the Jewish Rabbins with the occupation of the highest chairs of philosophy and mathematics, in the renowned Moorish schools of Cordova and Toledo; and, that even in England, the first school where experimental philosophy, geometry, algebra and logic, were taught, was that of the Hebrews at Oxford, where the record of its ancient teachers is still kept in the names of the celebrated Moses' Hall and Jacob's Hall.

Had Greece and Rome produced, not only their own statesmen, orators, philosophers and poets, but those of all other nations put together, what had even such a concentration of genius and learning been when compared with the productions of the Hebrews? They were fathers in literature before any of the present nations, especially those of Europe, had their existence. To estimate their value, in this respect, we must travel back, by an astounding climax, through the Gemara and Mishna, the Hellenic writings of Josephus, Philo, the New Testament, the Septuagint, and the Maccabees; through the minor Prophets to Nehemiah, who wrote 140 years before Xenophon; to Isaiah, 700 years before Virgil; the Proverbs and Psalms, 1040 years before Horace; to Ruth, 1030 years previous to Theocritus; and to Moses, above 1000 years the predecessor of Herodotus.

It was from such a literature, that, centuries before the birth of the Baconian aphorism, "knowledge is power," the Hebrews had learned that "a wise man is strong," and had proved its veracity in the fullest sense of the term. Hence the non-existence of an enervating tendency in their books; and the order of learned men which the Hebrews had possessed for uncounted past ages, with a literature only exceeded in bulk by that of the associated countries of Christendom regarded as one body.

A large proportion of their literature consists, as it may be expected, of comments on Scripture, elucidation

tions of the Talmud, and legal decisions; but this is not all: they were, and are still, distinguished for their attention to grammatical improvements of languages; none have ever surpassed the Spanish Israelites in the refinement of their grammars, the accuracy of their lexicons, or the perfection manifest in their standard editions of esteemed books, both scientific and natural.

An innate sense of the elevation which literature bestows on a people, caused the Hebrews to multiply their writings, as fast as the flames of ecclesiastical edicts had consumed the books of their predecessors; all the while aiming at supporting the reputation of their ancestors. Thus, in the composition of poetry, they not only excelled in the rhythmical verse, but have also superadded the use of metrical feet in their poetry, and we may conclude favourably for their endeavours, from the facts, first, that their poets were numerous, and held in high consideration; secondly, that they were stimulated by the vicinity of the Arabs, with whom they kept up a very successful competition.

The following verses which, form the introduction to an epic poem, in 18 Cantos, entitled *Sheri Tefhereth*, by Rabbi N. H. Weizel, or Wessely, will, we hope, fully convince the reader of the purity of the poetic mind of the Hebrews:

Glorious in might, thy dwelling high and grand,
 O God, all spring from thy creative hand.
 Ethereal spirits, from all substance free,
 Arose at thy command,—derived their life from thee.
 Things high and low thou holdest in thy span:
 O, fearful God, then what to thee is man,
 That thou should'st search his heart, explore his views,
 And, gracious, midst his race an habitation choose?
 In Eden's garden, planted by thy care,
 Thou bad'st him, placed there, to share
 Eternal life and bliss, with sense to know
 The Joys which e'er from boundless wisdom flow.
 Had he obey'd, these had he now possess'd:
 He sinn'd; yet, driven from his place of rest,
 Thou neither him nor his didst quite reject:
 Thy glorious name thou gav'st the righteous to protect,
 But when the earth itself corrupted grew
 By man's foul deeds, thou, righteous to pursue,
 Didst cut him off: thy cup of wrath was still
 With mercy sweeten'd, whilst, released from ill,
 The righteous thou didst set apart, to save

From the wild rush of the destructive wave:
 Blessed by thee, protected from the flood,
 Both Noah and his sons unhurt before thee stood.
 Evil increas'd again with men's increase;
 Their erring passions robb'd their hearts of peace.
 All moral rules they broke with scornful pride,
 Until, confused their speech, each turn'd aside
 And track'd the earth; which dark as night had grown,
 Had not the glorious light of Abraham shone,
 Taught men the folly of their idol-creeds,
 And, wond'ring, to behold their mighty Maker's deeds.
 The heav'nly firmament, the starry maze,
 Proclaim aloud thy never-ending praise;
 So did this pious sage aloud thy grace declare,
 Teach men to raise to thee the supplicating prayer;
 To know that here, created not in vain,
 By practis'd virtues, it is theirs to gain
 A state of endless life, a good degree,
 From earthly cares and griefs, from earthly pleasures, free.
 For after-years to him thou wast reveal'd,
 With him alone the covenant was seal'd,
 Thou chos'dst him with thy benignant grace,
 From all his father's house: And, childless yet, his race
 Mad'st holy to thyself: Their future weal and woe,
 Their joys and griefs, permittedst him to know;
 And in a vision, clear of view, to see
 The wondrous things to come, the deep futurity.
 In his old age thy wonders still appear:
 Isaac born to him in his hundredth year,
 When Sarah ninety transient years had seen!
 He, as a sacrifice, had nearly been
 Consum'd upon thy altar; had not thy
 Angel of mercy, with arresting cry,
 Call'd to his father, "This has only been
 Thy piety to prove, which now is clearly seen."
 The perfect saint, protected by thy love,
 Endow'd by thee with worth and force above
 The strength of angels, whom, unknowing, he
 Compell'd to own his might, was Isaac's progeny.
 To him thou cam'st at Bethel, when he paid
 The vows which, in affliction's time he made;
 And blessing him with happiness and fame,
 From Jacob unto Israel thou didst change his name.
 Thy chosen people whom thou e'er didst tend,
 The tribes of God, those men of fame, descend
 From righteous Israel, the lasting vine
 Round which the healthy tendrils clinging twine.
 Joseph, the branch most fruitful of them all,
 When envious blasts and hatred caus'd his fall,
 Thou didst to Egypt send, rais'd from the pit,
 O'er nation's fates to rule, on kingly thrones to sit.
 Then o'er their hearts were bonds fraternal spread,
 By thee united: no more did the dread
 Of famine, or of want, disturb the mind

Of Joseph's brethren; for they found him kind,
 And of their deeds forgetful. Jacob went
 With all his house to Egypt; and, content,
 There found his son, bless'd by the power divine.
 Whose promises, O God, so lasting are as thine?
 When Israel's sons reach'd the Egyptian States,
 To them each city gladly ope'd its gates,
 Gave them the fruitful lands and fields to share:
 Where, bless'd with ease and riches, void of care,
 In numbers and in strength they daily grew.
 Then rose a mighty nation from the few
 Who, for their wants once seeking to provide,
 Now safe amidst the sheltring tents of Ham reside.
 Sudden the gloom of night o'erspread their day:
 Lost was their power, their minds to grief a prey:
 The flock thou guardest found their lot was chang'd;
 And Ham's wild sons, by hate and wrath estrang'd,
 Their former friends to harm and injure sought.
 Foul arts they tried, and rack'd each evil thought,
 Plotting such measures as they might employ,
 With savage cruelty and rage, thy people to destroy.
 The seed which in the earth despis'd lies low,
 At length springs forth; and then its blossoms blow,
 Producing fruit. So was it with thy vine,
 Thy beauteous plant; at times laid low, supine,
 Like to the thorn; at times when faded, dried
 Away in strength, to thee thy people cried,
 Imploring aid, and, looking on their grief,
 Thou didst from heaven, in mercy, grant desir'd relief.
 Thence on thy servant were thy glories shed;
 With majesty thou crownest Moses' head;
 Through him the oppressor, who, in savage pride,
 Destroy'd thy vineyard, durst thyself deride,
 Was judg'd and punish'd; taught to know the might
 Of God Supreme, who, from the loftiest height
 Of realms celestial, with an outstretched arm,
 Preserv'd his chosen race from all impending harm.

Having given the above lines from the introduction, we will now give some lines from the 13th Canto, being founded on Exod. xiv: 1-3, in blank verse:

The dread behest of the Most High, made known
 By Israel's faithful chief unto the assembled host,
 They cheerfully obey, retrace their steps,
 But not with fainting hearts. Firm was their trust
 In God; steadfast, whate'er was his command,
 Their confidence and hope. Mizraim's swarthy sons,
 Who dwelt in Etham's plains, beheld surpris'd
 Israel's returning tribes: Far as these spread,
 The question still arose, "whence come they here?
 Why do they tarry? Why not onward move?"
 The hurried messengers, with speed dispatch'd,

Relate unto the king, that, "Israel's sons,
 As Etham they approach'd, had, terror-struck,
 Refused to enter on the desert vast;
 Confus'd their camp, they move they know not where;
 God hath not led them forth; base runaways,
 They fly, by fear perplex'd." With greedy ear
 The monarch listens to the welcome tale.
 Glad, as the captive, who, in fetters bound,
 In dungeon dark immur'd, hails the light,
 And triumphs in the glorious sound, "Thou'rt free:"
 So, glad, triumphant, did the tyrant hail
 The tidings that, within his reach once more,
 The hateful race of Jacob still might feel
 His fell revenge, of his keen sword the edge.
 Nor he alone; his courtiers, servile crew,
 The chiefs who at his council-board find room,
 Partake his joy. Clos'd are the gates of grief
 Within their hearts; wide open those of pride;
 Of arrogance the inward founts o'erflow;
 Full scope unto their evil thoughts they give:
 Against the universal Lord they speak; they rail
 Against the man who unto them had been
 The minister of fate; 'gainst Moses loud they rail.
 Their hatred rank, their silly pride forgets
 That erst, amidst the terrors of the night,
 When Mizraim's pride was blighted, they implored,
 With accents meek and said, "Pray tarry not;
 Be free, depart, and leave our land at once."
 Whilst now, with words of scorn and foul reproach,
 The proffer'd boon recall'd, they wish them still their slaves:
 For Pharaoh's mind is changed; again he strives
 To lord it over those whom late he pray'd, "Be free."
 His haughty soul repines; his servants fan the flame
 Of anger which within him burns: They say,
 "What have we done? How could we e'er consent
 That Israel from our bondage be releas'd?
 Are we the men who, fearless, firm, have braved
 The many perils that assail'd our land,
 Yet, overcome at last by nameless fear,
 Did yield to pestilence, which shunn'd the day?
 Each man, abash'd, scarce dared to meet the glance
 Of his associates: Silent all, their looks
 Downcast, averted, stung with shame and wrath,
 Wav'ring they stand, and know not what to do.
 To give revenge its scope, with blood-stain'd sword,
 Force Israel back again beneath the yoke,
 They durst not do. Ruthless as were their hearts,
 'Gainst pity steel'd, harden'd in guilt and crime,
 They trembled still, as memory's faithful voice
 Rung in their ears the horrid shrieks, the groans
 Of agony, which from the dying burst
 On that most fatal night: How, mute with awe!
 They then had stood aghast, and quiv'ring heard
 The piteous accents that despair sent forth,

Revealing sights that mortal man may not
Behold and live. As when the mighty wind
Binds up the waters of a flowing brook;
So were the floods of wrath, of arrogance,
Of cruelty, within their breasts, spell-bound
By with'ring fear, which cow'd their inmost heart.

Empassant, we will only mention a few of the Hebrew poetical works which may be read with great interest. The Royal Crown, a poetical résumé of the Aristotelian cosmology, by Rabbi S. B. Gabirol, of Malaga. This fertile muse sang the wonders of nature and the movements of the heavenly spheres, but excelled chiefly in the ode. He was murdered about 1075, at the age of 30; it is supposed his assassin was driven to this execrable deed by jealousy of his victim's superior talents.

The book of the Chain, and Tarshish, by Rabbi M. A. Ezra, of Granada. He was famous for his extraordinary knowledge of the Holy Scripture, and Greek Literature. His writings are on eloquence, poetry, and philosophy.

The son of Proverbs, by Rabbi S. Nagid, of Cordova. He was an excellent Arabic scholar, and skilled in every science.

The Battles between Wisdom and Riches, by Rabbi J. Hallevi. He has been styled "the prince of poets." One of his panegyrists poetically exclaimed, "He alone penetrated into the sanctuary of poesy. The gates of Heaven had been locked by the guardian of the empyrean, but the genius of Judah boldly shattered their bars.

A Rhythmical Poem on Chess, by the celebrated Rabbi A. A. Ezra. In it the game is carried on in rhymes, and it concludes with Mat (check mate.) His works are voluminous and various; embracing history, philosophy, medicine, grammar, theology, and poetry.

Wisdom, by Rabbi J. Ben Rabbi S. Alcophrie. It consists of didactic, satirical, and facetious pieces. Every competent judge pronounces this poem to be of superlative beauty.

An Investigation into the Moral World, by Rabbi J. Hapenini. It is a perfect specimen of didactic Hebrew poetry. In it man and his constitution, the world and its moral government, are deeply investigated, and met-

aphysically considered; but the language in which it is dressed is most admirable, and powerfully expressive, and shines with brilliant eloquence. Buxtorf, speaking of the above, says, "Liber insignis, tam quod res, tam quod verba. Agit de vanitate mundi contemnenda, et quærendo regno dei. Id verbis tam eloquenter, polite, et docte effert, ut eloquentissimus habeatur, quisquis stylum ejus imitatur." He was also called "the Jewish Cicero."

The Strong Tower, by Rabbi M. Ch. Luzatz. In masterly genius, refined taste, and pure and elegant style, he rivals all his predecessors, not only Hebrew, but Gentile poets. He was principal of a College in Amsterdam, where he promoted learning very much, as he had an extensive knowledge in almost all the branches of the arts and science. The manuscript of the above work, was only discovered some years ago, and published at Leipsic, 1837, with notes, by S. D. Luzatz and M. Letteris; Latin prolegomena are also prefixed to it, treating of the beauty of Hebrew poetry, where we find the following remarks: "This dramatic composition will be in every language a classical work in the strongest signification of the term, it comprises all the charms and rhythmical euphony of the aspiring genius of Dante, and Tasso's immortal and elevated imagery."

Any one who has at all paid attention to the history of the Hebrews, must acknowledge that they have conferred great benefits on Europe by their studies. There was a period, when the Greek language and its whole literature lay buried to the Western nations. There is a remarkable incident mentioned by Conrad, of Heresbach, of the 16th century, as a fact, that a Monk observed to his companion, "they (*i. e.* the Reformers,) have invented a new language, which they call Greek; you must be carefully on your guard against it; it is the matter of all heresy." The Hebrews, however, were reading in their own language several works of Aristotle, Plato, Ptolemy, Apolonius, Hippocrates, Galen and Euclid; and employed much of their time in writing upon them and others, dissertations and controversial arguments. They were the means of the old classics being actively disseminated amongst the

Western colleges of Christendom. In reference to this fact, a very respectable English historian says, "Moreover, the Hebrew early and afterwards diversified cultivation of literature and science, raised them to a positive standing in the intelligence of Europe so high, that it has been said, we have never yet repaid our debt of grateful acknowledgment to the illustrious Hebrew schools of Cordova, Seville, and Granada."

Of Mathematics, the Hebrews held the principal chairs in Mohammedan Colleges. They also came in contact with many Christians, and spread themselves into various countries; they taught the geometry, algebra, logic, and chemistry of Spain in the Universities of Oxford and Paris, while Christian students from all parts of Europe, (among whom were Abelard, David Morly, and the famous Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II,) repaired to Andalusia for such instruction. Many treatises on mathematics might be mentioned, but as their authors had also written on astronomy, we shall have the pleasure of noting them in their proper place.

In Astronomy, they were teachers of the Moors. Accustomed from the earliest times, in the clear unclouded oriental sky, to watch and observe the courses of the planetary system, their attention was incessantly directed to all the secret mysteries of nature; and they may be classed amongst the earliest astronomers. When the Gaonim left the Euphrates for the Guadalquiver or M. bar Maimon removed thence to Cairo, each of these had as bright a firmament to survey, as had their prophet Daniel in Babylon, where he was master of Chaldean astrologers and astronomers. That in such climates, where the planets, brimful of brilliance, seem running over with excess, the Hebrews could neglect their contemplation, is an incredible supposition and false in fact: God said, "let them be for signs and for seasons,"—this is found in the first pages of the Hebrew Scripture; and we are assured by themselves that at no time have they neglected the admonition. Hereditary astronomers, they pretended to hold traditional secrets brought by Abraham from the land of Hharran, and they appealed to the Hebrew names of the constellations in the book of Job and Amos for the antiquity of their observations.

Such an original impulse seems to have been so deeply fixed, as never to have deserted the Hebrews, even under the severest privations. Accordingly, when Alonso X., had spent nearly 400,000 ducats for the completion of his celebrated tables containing the sidereal observations, we read that they were completed and drawn up by Rabbi Moses of Kiriath-jearim; and by means of Hebrews exclusively, he published the book of Circles, which is still preserved with care at Alcala.

To Rabbi A. B. Ezra, the world is indebted for the equator to the celestial globe. Rabbi Ezra was a profound philosopher, astronomer, physician, grammarian, arithmetician, poet, and Cabbalist. His writings on the arts and sciences are very much esteemed by his brethren.

Rabbi J. B. J. Alcalia, through his profound and accurate knowledge of languages, and great proficiency in mathematics, Abdallah, king of Granada, commonly styled the mathematician, was induced to make his teacher and major-domo.

Rabbi J. ben R. M. Cohen, translated by order of King Alonso, the astronomical works of Avicenna from the Arabic into Castilian, and wrote two books on the fixed stars, which he divided into forty-eight constellations.

Rabbi J. Israeli, was considered the most able mathematician and astronomer of his age; his astronomical works and tables are very highly esteemed. He also wrote on the planetary system, according to Ptolemy's *Almagest*; and a perpetual Almanack.

Rabbi J. B. Israel wrote on the foundations of Embolismic Reckoning, and highly esteemed Astronomical Tables.

Rabbi D. Abudrahan wrote the order of Intercalation in the Calendar, Astronomical Tables, and on the Solstices and Equinoxes.

Paul of Buyos, a Jewish Convert, and Bishop of Carthage, was much esteemed for his proficiency in Astronomy, &c. &c. A contemporary poet says, "that he possessed all human learning, all the secrets of high philosophy; he was a masterly logician, a sweet orator, an admirable historian, a subtle poet, a clear and veracious

narrator, an excellent minister, and one of whom every body spoke well." He continues,

'Twas my delight to sit with him
Beneath the solemn ivy tree,
To hide me from the sunny beam
Beneath the laurel's shade, and see
The little silver streamlet flowing;
While from his lips a richer stream
Fell with the light of wisdom glowing:
How sweet to slake my thirst with him!"

Rabbi M. B. Maimon, besides all other attainments, was a profound logician, philosopher, mathematician, and astronomer. His numerous writings and profound learning, induced the Rev. Dr. Clavering, Bishop of Peterborough, to say "the memory of Maimonides has flourished, and will forever flourish."

A list of more bright names of Hebrew astronomers may be very easily added, but want of space prevents us from so doing. It is enough to say that when the star of Arabian civilization became eclipsed in the capital of the western caliphs, the learning of the descendants of Judah seemed to shine with more and more brilliancy in the first metropolis of Christian Spain, and thence in various parts of the globe.

In medicine, they excelled so much that kings, princes, popes, and nobles, have employed none but Hebrews for their chosen physicians. Their writings on medicine are both very numerous and highly esteemed.

In metaphysics and philosophy, the Hebrews will stand comparison even with the best of modern writers. The following from Rabbi J. Albo's *Sepher Eckarim*, is a specimen of Hebrew metaphysics, of as early as the 14th Century, which, when compared with the writings of others of the same period, will, we are sure, convince the reader that the opinion of the Jesuit Huarte, (in reference to the Hebrew mind,) in his "Examination of Genius," is, by no means exaggerated.

DIVISION I.—CHAPTER V.

"All animate beings on earth may, according to their instincts and manner of living, be divided into three

great classes. One class cannot live and subsist, in a *social state*; as, for instance, beasts of prey: To these, the collecting together and associating in great numbers would be injurious; for, were a vast concourse of them collected on one spot, hunger and their ferocious instincts would soon lead them to destroy each other. A second class cannot live and subsist but in a social state; as, for instance, man; to whom the collecting together and associating in numbers is absolutely necessary for his preservation. His susceptible conformation subjects him to the influence of cold and heat, and of their alternations; he therefore needs raiment to protect him against their influence. His powers of digestion are not great; his food must therefore, be prepared in order to aid them. But neither food nor raiment could be possibly obtain in sufficient abundance, except in a state of society where many join for reciprocal aid and assistance: one weaves while another makes the needle with which the third sews, and it is thus in every occupation that his wants render necessary. The third class of animate beings form the medium between the two extremes; a state of society being to them neither *injurious*, as to beasts and birds of prey, nor of *absolute necessity*, as to man, but their instinct sometimes prompts them to associate and collect in numbers for their welfare; as many beasts and birds, which at certain seasons congregate and flock together for safety and protection, and afterwards separate again. With man, however, a state of society, when once formed, cannot be dispensed with, which induced our Rabbies to say that man, by nature, was a social animal.

“As a state of society is thus natural, and therefore absolutely necessary for the preservation of man, the maintaining of that society in every land or clime on the globe, requires certain regulations to determine and protect the right, and to point out and punish the wrong, so as to prevent the baneful effects which the collision of passions and interests might produce. In these regulations are comprised commands which tend to promote the social welfare, as the prohibition of murder, thefts, violence, and the like. These regulations our Rabbies called “the natural laws of society,” as being absolutely

and indispensably necessary to the existence of society ; and they are generally imparted to mankind by a sage, a prophet, or a hero. The uniformity and perfection of this legal system of society, (as, for instance, the Roman laws,) is called "civilization," which, however, cannot be upheld, unless some head be empowered to watch over and preserve its integrity, either as ruler, judge, or king of the society. And as man, by nature, is a social animal, and is the more happy the more perfect the state of society is in which he lives, it thence results that government is to him a natural institution, as the power of ruler, judge, or king is indispensable to maintain the institutions of society, and with them the well-being and happiness of the individuals of which it is composed.

"If we carefully examine the animal conformation and the perfection of its various members, we shall find that the Creator exerted his bountiful providence to furnish all his creatures with every requisite for their well-being, not only that which is indispensable for the preservation of the species, or the individual, but likewise with whatever might be conducive to their happiness, so as to render them perfect according to their degree in the scale of creation. And when we find the careful dispensation of this bounty towards creatures of an inferior degree, we may reasonably infer its exercise likewise towards those of a superior degree, in order that they too, may be furnished with whatever may tend to make them perfect. Whosoever maturely reflects on this subject, will find that it is the Divine influence alone, by means of which, whatever relates to the perfection of man can be effected ; and that this Divine influence is far more requisite to the well-being of man, who is gifted with reason, than anything with which the Creator has gifted all other animals is to theirs, they being restrained by instinct.

"This Divine influence, although directly communicated to one man only, will, nevertheless, in its operation cause and lead to the perfection of all mankind. For, although the different species of animals, some of which are more perfect than others, do not communicate their perfection to other races ; (as each species forms a whole, and has its peculiar and distinct purpose in the creation ;) nevertheless, in the human species, comprising as

it does, different degrees of mental powers, some superior to others, all these powers combine but for one object,—the perfection of the whole race, which, likewise, has its peculiar and distinct purpose in the creation. If we were to assume that the great men of the earth, from their superior means of acquiring knowledge, are more perfect than their labourers, that the sage again is more perfect than the great, that one or more of each class are more perfect than his or their fellows; yet, the perfection of any one, or of all these individuals alone, would not, in itself, constitute the aim or purpose for which his species was created, but would only be instrumental to the perfecting of the whole species of which he or they, however distinguished, form but a part; as in the body there are different members, each required for the preservation of the whole;—and though some of these members are more important, and, therefore, superior to others, yet they are not so for their own sakes only, but as forming a part of, and essentially contributing to preserve, the entirety and perfection of the whole. And as in the body the heart is the vital part of the animal, the instrument for circulating life throughout the frame, and particularly the brain, by means of which sensation and motion are gradually conveyed to all the different members; so likewise, in the human species, the mass receive the impulse towards its perfection from principal members, not as being distinct from them, but because together, they form but one whole.

“The rank of principal members of the human species appertains to those few selected by the Deity for the purpose of conveying through them, to the rest of the species, the Divine influence and the means of acquiring perfection. And it ought not to be less evident to us, that the bounty of Providence, intent on employing the means most conducive to promote the perfection of mankind, did grant the Divine influence, without which there can be no perfection, to the few as integral parts of the whole human race; than it is, that the same Providence did grant to all other animals, not only what is requisite for their preservation, but likewise what is conducive to their perfection, according to their respective degrees in the scale of creation.

“Directions given by the individuals thus selected by Providence to promote the perfection of mankind, by means of the Divine influence, are called “divine laws.” Their relative degree of importance to the natural laws of society is as that of the regulating principle in a piece of mechanism to its accessories.

“The foregoing sections have demonstrated the existence of two distinct systems of law: 1st, the natural laws of society, which, in their perfection, become civilization; and secondly, the Divine laws. The natural laws concern man as a member of society, independently of time and place. Civilization depends on time and place. The Divine laws are dictated by the Divine influence, through the medium of a prophet or messenger sent by the Deity, (as were Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses,) and are binding on all to whom they are imparted. We have called one of these systems *principal*, and the other *accessary*, because the natural laws direct how to avoid wrong and pursue right: Civilization teaches to avoid impropriety, and to pursue propriety, according to a received standard. But the Divine laws are intended to prepare man for the knowledge that his soul is immortal, and therefore capable of true felicity, and points out to him the means of attaining it. They teach him what is truly wrong, which he is to avoid; what is truly right, which he is to pursue; and how to renounce all transitory good, so as to be indifferent about being deprived of it. In addition to this, they dictate the most perfect rules of equity, with respect to society, in order that the uncertainty which pervades the natural laws may not interfere with that felicity which it is the special province of the Divine laws to afford.

“The inferiority of natural to Divine laws has been happily expressed by the inspired poet, in Psalm xix: 7-10; where he enumerates six important points, in each of which the superiority of the Divine laws is clearly manifest. They are as follows:

1. The natural laws are insufficient to render the knowledge of man perfect, or to affect his immortality, so as to qualify his soul to return to the land of life whence it came to him; as they do not extend their influence beyond doing right and acting with propriety:

whereas, the Divine laws not only inculcate right and propriety, but likewise distinguish between truth and error in the mind. This meaning David conveys in the words, "The law of the Lord is perfect, restoring the soul."

2. Even the knowledge of what is right or wrong, proper or improper, which is all that the natural laws are capable of embracing, cannot by them alone be firmly and immutably settled; because it is very possible that a something may by us be considered as proper or improper, which in itself, is not so. For, impossible as it is, that any one should intuitively be provided with the ability needful to carry on any art or trade to perfection, it is equally impossible that any Legislator, composing his laws according to the dictates of *human* wisdom only, should be free from error, so as immutably to decide what is proper or improper; and therefore his decision on any subject whatsoever, cannot be a certain rule of conduct for others to adopt. In proof of this we find that even Plato might, and actually did, fall into great error; for he says, "It is *proper* that the women belonging to any one class of society should be common to all the members of that class, such as the great, the traders, the labourers and so forth, respectively." This Platonic rule of propriety the Divine laws most strongly condemn; as we find in Gen. xxiii, where Abimelech, King of Gerar, having taken Sarah from her husband, is told, "Behold, thou must die for the woman thou hast taken: She is a man's wife." And he justifies himself by the assertion that he was ignorant of that fact. Aristotle likewise reprobates this rule of Plato; and their difference of opinion on this subject is a proof that no human reason is, of itself, sufficient to pronounce a decision on what is proper or what is improper, in a manner that will receive the unqualified sanction of all men, at all times, and in all places; much less can we rely on it to settle matters of superior knowledge, such as the question, whether the universe is created or increate, or the like. The Divine laws alone are able to set such questions at rest; and, accordingly, David says: "The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple."

3. "The natural laws cannot bestow inward joy on their observers. Their promises have no tendency to afford satisfaction to the mind; and, even if they had, there is no certainty or guarantee for their performance. Moreover, their observer cannot promise himself any merit from their observance: indeed, their vagueness leaves him in doubt whether his observance be meritorious at all. But obedience to the Divine laws will confer that inward joy, and will afford satisfaction to the mind, because their observer is certain that the righteousness they command is the true righteousness, and that their observance is really meritorious: as the Psalmist says, "The statutes of God are righteous, and rejoice the heart."

4. "Natural laws cannot prescribe the conduct to be observed on particular occasions, or extend their dictates to any special case that may occur. All that they can do is, to lay down general rules, the special application of which they leave to the judgement of the individual. Thus Aristotle, in his book on Ethics, repeatedly uses the expression, "that, in a moral respect, it is proper always to act in a manner most becoming the time and place." But he does not specify what is becoming at particular times and places, or what times or places are becoming for particular actions; he leaves this to be decided by the common sense of every man. Again, in the same work, (*Ethica Magna*,) he tells us, that "particular cases must be weighed according to the circumstances under which they occur," but he leaves us no rule by which to adjust the balance, except *propriety*. Had it been possible for erring humanity to lay down uniform rules applicable to all cases, Aristotle would have done it; his mind being as expansive, and his reasoning faculties as great and powerful, as those of any man who lived either before, or after him. But he *did not do it*, because he *could not*. The Divine laws alone supply this deficiency. Thus, while in the Ethics of Aristotle we find, "he is pious who wisely observes a middle course between the extreme enjoyments of voluptuousness, as of eating and drinking, and total abstinence;" he only adds, "teachers of morality recommend that man should act in a manner becoming the time and place, and becoming his particular constitution and the

society he frequents." But not one of these moral teachers instructs us when, where, and how it becomes us to act. The Divine laws, on the contrary, explicitly direct us in every one of these cases. They tell us with whom, when, where, and with what motive, we are permitted to satisfy our sensual cravings; what kind of food is permitted, and from what we are to abstain; and while they allow the enjoyment of wine, forbid all excess, by commanding that no person in a state of intoxication be permitted to perform the rites of divine worship, or to pray. Thus likewise, we find that moralists recommend valour as a virtue; but, at the same time they maintain, that it is improper for any man to expose himself to death, except in case it be more desirable to him to die than to live. But they cannot, and therefore do not, decide the particular case to which they allude. The Divine laws, however, explicitly declare that case to be *whenever it tends to glorify the name of God*, and that then only, (as in the case of Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah,) or in combatting the enemies of God and their evil deeds, (as in the case of Samson,) death is more desirable than life. Thus, whilst on all momentous subjects natural laws are insufficient, and the casuist who is guided by them, gropes about in the dark like the blind, "the commandment of God is pure, enlightening the eyes."

5. "The laws of nature, being of human origin, and, consequently, imbued with all the imperfections of humanity, cannot decide what is proper or improper, at all times. For, whatever is at one time considered as proper and becoming, may at another, be held as quite the reverse; as, for instance, marriage with a sister, which in former days was considered as becoming, but which is at present justly held to be improper. They are, therefore, subject to continual alteration or improvement, as the progress of human reason may dictate. The Divine laws, on the contrary, originating from the perfect wisdom of the Deity, lay down their rules once and forever. They can never become subject to any alteration, as they are free from all error; and their purity insures their duration. David, therefore, with great justice, says, "The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever."

6. Natural laws cannot decide to a nicety on the just

and proper measure of punishment that is due to the violator of their enactments; nor have they any inward control, or the means of punishing concealed guilt, which altogether escapes their jurisdiction; whereas, Divine justice reaches where all human research would be vain; and its laws, weighing the motives as well as the deed, apportion precisely the just quantum of punishment. And although it may appear as if, in this world, the the righteous man sometimes perisheth in his right, whilst the transgressor thrives in his guilt, the Divine laws give us the assurance that our existence does not terminate with this life; and that, though on earth we may not always perceive the perfect justice of events, it is because that perfect justice is reserved to a future state; or, as the Poet-King says, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

Want of space prevents me from giving a larger extract from the celebrated writings of Albo; as also, a list of Hebrew metaphysical writers. The following paragraphs of Hebrew philosophy, taken from A. L. Davids, will, I am sure, of themselves speak the Hebrew mind.

"From the sublime description of the works of creation, contained in the first chapter of Genesis, it appears that there was a time when the earth, the heavens, and the planetary systems had not been called into existence by the Omnipotent. In the first period of the exercise of creative influence, the whole was one chaotic, terraqueous mass, unformed and shapeless, in which, as in the present formation of our globe, the aqueous parts were predominant; and even this, in the absence of the yet uncreated light, its negative quality, darkness bore unrivalled sway. On the first day of creation, the primary impulse of motion appears to have been given to the earth by the brooding of the Divine Spirit, and I think I shall be able to prove, that by this impulse the diurnal motion of the earth was effected. "Let there be light," said the Deity, and light existed; and God saw that it was fit to perform the office of its creation; and he divided between the light and between the darkness; and God called the light "day," and the darkness he called "night;" and the evening and the morning was one day.

“ We will now pause awhile to examine this most important passage. We here discover the existence of light, and of night and day, before the creation of the *sun*; and we are naturally anxious to learn how this was performed. To a *superficial* observer, something like a doubt suggests itself; but, to an attentive inquirer, nothing but true philosophy appears. He discovers the creation of primitive light pre-existent to its present source of *emanation*, but *not* of existence,—the *sun*; into which, on the fourth day, this primitive light was collected: he discovers the existence of day and night previous to the creation of the *sun* as a luminary; and, in answer to the inquiry of how this was effected, he discovers that it could have been accomplished in no other way than by the revolution of the earth caused by the first impulse of motion given to it by the Divine Spirit: and he will thus discover that the revolution of the *earth*, and *not* that of the *sun*, was considered by the ancient Jews, as by the Newtonian philosophers, to be the cause of day and night; and which opinion I hope to be able further to support in the course of my lecture. * * * *

“ We will now proceed to investigate another most important point of this period of Jewish philosophy; one which, through the inattention of translators and commentators, has bid fair to eclipse its whole system, and to throw all the science of the ancient Hebrews into the shade; it is no less than the *sun*, according to the English and other versions, standing still at the command of Joshua. I shall proceed to show that the text of this important passage *says no such thing*; and that the error has crept in through the unphilosophical conceptions which its translators have formed of their *original*.

“ Now, it is essential to our rightly understanding of this passage, to examine both the Hebrew and the English word for *sun*. The Hebrew language, in accordance with strict philosophical principles, has *three* names for *sun*. The English has also three, but they are compound terms, thus,—solar orb, solar flame, solar light; yet we unphilosophically use the word *sun* in all these senses: we say the sun is round, the sun is powerful, the sun is obscured, though we *mean* the solar orb is round, the

solar *flame* is powerful, the solar *light* is obscured. This philosophical accuracy exists, however, primarily in Hebrew. The solar *orb* is expressed by no compound term: the word *Etheres*, expresses this signification; so *Hamma*, the solar *flame* or fire; so likewise *Shemesh*, the word used by Joshua, the solar *light*. This is also extended, as far as philosophical propriety demands, to the *moon*. We find in Hebrew two names applied to this planet, *Lebana*, the *disc* or *orb*, and *Yareah*, the light reflected from it; heat not being one of its qualities, we find no word expressive of the *lunar flame* or *fire*. That the sense of *Shemesh* and *Yareah* is solar and lunar *light*, is not only evident from a multitude of places in Scripture where these words occur, but also from the passage of Joshua itself; for, if we translate *Shemesh*, solar *orb*, solar *flame* or *sun*; or *Yareah*, lunar *orb*, or *moon*, the one must have rested upon Gibeon, the other in the valley of Ajalon. This indeed, would be an extraordinary system of philosophy,—the *sun* resting upon a mountain, and the *moon* in a valley. All this, however, is fully explained by following the philosophical idea of the original, in which the solar and lunar *light* is stayed from advancing and receding upon the opposite hemispheres of the globe, not by the agency of the *sun*, but by that of the *earth* itself.

“The texts to which we allude are these; (Ps. xix: 5,) “In them (the heavens;) hath he placed a tent or receptacle for the *Shemesh*, (sun,) which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber.” *Shemesh* here, cannot mean the *sun*, surely; there is no receptacle for that, without we conceive it fixed in a socket; nor does it *come out* of its chamber; but translate *Shemesh*, “solar light,” and we will make sense of the passage: “In the heavens hath he placed a receptacle for the *solar rays*, namely, the *Etheres* or *orb* of the *sun*, (Exod. xvi: 21,) “and the *Shemesh* became hot.” I cannot imagine how the *orb* of the *sun* grew hot, (Jonah iv: 8;) “and the *Shemesh* beat upon the head of Jonah.” But the most conclusive is that of Psalm cxxi: 6, “and the *Shemesh* shall not smite thee by day, nor the *Yareah* by night.” Was this intended, that the orb of the *sun* and the orb of, the *moon* should not descend from heaven to smite? or was

it that their rays and beams should not affect those spoken of in the text? We need not trouble any with more examples on this subject, though we could produce at least ten times as many proofs. But we think it unnecessary to produce any further evidence than the passage of Joshua itself; for the *sun* can only be said to rest on a mountain by its rays, the moon in a valley by its beams. If it were the *sun*, the *orb*, or body of the *sun*, here spoken of, and not its *light*, we prove this, that the *sun* had a motion given to it which it never had before, co-instantaneous with a cessation of that motion; or, in other words, that it moved, and was in a state of rest, at one and the same time, which reduces this argument *ad absurdum*.

"The passage quoted from the book of Jasher, throws considerable light on this subject, for it explains the relative position of the *sun*: It says, "The *Shemesh* stood still in the *horizon*." Thus, it appears that the *sun* was sinking in the west, casting its last rays on Gibeon, when Joshua, perceiving the near termination of the day, requested its prolongation, &c. The Chinese have preserved a confused account, in their annals, of the '*sun* not going down during the space of ten days.' This happened in the time of Yan, (their seventh monarch from Fohi,) who was contemporary with Joshua. Herodotus says, (Lib. ii: cap. 142,) *Ἐν τοίνυν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ τετρακίς ἐλθόντες ἔξ ἠέσων τον ἡλιον ἀναστῆλαι ἐνθα τε νυν καταδύσται, ἐνδευτεν δὲς ἐπανστῆλαι καὶ ἐνθεν νυν ἀνστῆλαι, ἐνθαυτα δὲς καταβῆναι.* He was told by the Egyptian priests, that from the reign of their first king to that of Sethon, the sun had risen four times in an unusual manner; that he had twice risen where he now sets; and had twice set where he now rises.

"This, though corrupted by its passage through the hands of the Egyptian priests and the wonder-telling Herodotus, may still be traced to a traditionary relation of the miracle of Joshua."

En passant, we will only notice the names of a few able commentators, respecting whose writings, Gesenius thus speaks, "The judicious commentator will know how to use *much* in them that is indisputably true and good; and a facility in understanding these sources is

indispensably necessary to every respectable interpreter."

Rabbi S. Gaon, principal of the College at Sara. He wrote many able Commentaries, but especially distinguished himself by his Commentary on Daniel, and an Arabic paraphrase on the book of Job.

Rabbi S. Jarchi, wrote a Commentary on the whole Bible, which, though full of Talmudism, manifests diligence, acuteness, a thorough acquaintance with the language of Scripture, and a desire to rise above the Talmudic interpretation.

Rabbi A. Aben Ezra, wrote a Commentary on the entire Bible, and far surpassed Jarchi in power and freedom of judgement. He threw a great deal of light on the book of Job, by his knowledge of Arabic.

Rabbi D. Kimchi, wrote Commentaries on most of the books of Scriptures, which are most valuable. He is styled the prince of grammarians, "for his Grammar and Lexicon, (says Dr. McCaul,) have, until very lately, contributed the main portion of all similar productions."

Rabbi L. ben Gershom, wrote a Commentary on the Old Testament, which is, deservedly, highly esteemed. He also wrote on astronomy, logic, and physic.

Rabbi J. Abarbanel, wrote an excellent Commentary on the Bible. It is remarkably pure and easy in style, and may be considered one of the best Rabbinical Commentaries as far as criticism goes. His history (tracing his pedigree to king David,) is very interesting; a short sketch of it is to be found in Wolfius.

Time and space would fail us were we to attempt to enumerate all the praiseworthy Hebrew writings. We would have given extracts from the few works we have just mentioned to illustrate their real value, but this article would have extended to an inconvenient length. We hope, therefore, the student, who has really a thirst for information, will begin to cultivate an acquaintance with Hebrew writings, in order that he may be able to judge for himself, whether our statements are correct or not, and whether we have been biassed by national feelings. The student who admires learning wherever he finds it, would then re-echo the poet's beautiful lines:

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene,
The dark unfathom'd caves of ocean bear."

ARTICLE III.

THE THRONE OF GOD.

"A throne was set in Heaven, and one sat on the throne."—Rev. iv: 2.

Hiero, the tyrant of Sicily, once propounded to Simonides, the poet, this question: "What is God?" The poet, sensible of his unpreparedness to return a satisfactory answer, desired a day to deliberate on the subject. At the expiration of this period, he solicited a space of two days. These having elapsed, he requested a term of four days. Hiero, wondering at this unexpected conduct, desired an explanation. The Cean poet responded in substance, to this effect, "The longer I deliberate on the subject the problem appears the more difficult of solution."

Nor is there anything marvellous in all this. Simonides perceived—as well he might—that the solution of the question was involved in inextricable difficulties. And the more so, inasmuch as this response emanated from a mind swayed merely by the crepuscular lights of nature, wholly devoid of the illuminating influence of a Divine revelation. It is highly problematical—to say the least—whether any poet,—nay, whether the profoundest philosopher, either of ancient or modern times,—unassisted by the teachings of this heavenly record, would have returned a more judicious answer.

Man, in his lapsed condition, irrespective of superhuman aid, has no just apprehensions of the "Throne of God," or of the essential character of Him who sits thereon. This allegation is corroborated by a consideration of those manifold absurdities, and grotesque inventions, which misguided men have so ungraciously palmed upon the world. But what profound cause of felicitation and gratitude have we of the nineteenth century, that we are not doomed with the benighted inhabitants of paganism, to derive all our conceptions of the Deity from the crepuscular glimmerings of a sin-impaired reason? That "we have a more sure word of prophecy," whose prerogative it is to dispel from the hu-

man mind, those clouds of ignorance and superstition in which it is enveloped by nature, and shed light upon all subjects appertaining to the character and attributes of the living God. With this heavenly lamp in our hand, we can push our thoughts beyond the confines of this "visible, diurnal, sphere;" rise in lofty abstraction above it, and hold converse, as it were, with celestial beings. To this source are we exclusively indebted, for all that we know of the subject placed at the head of this article,—*"The Throne of God."* Would we, therefore, aspire to even some faint glimpses of the characteristic lineaments of this throne and the resplendent glory of Him who is seated upon it, to the teachings of the volume of Inspiration must we constantly appeal. Guided then, by the teachings of this ethereal lamp, would we with much diffidence, essay to give utterance to a few desultory thoughts, touching a theme so sublime. Without aspiring "to be wise above what is written," but, in meekness and humility, bowing in all due deference to the legitimate disclosures of this infallible guide we may, peradventure, attain some feeble conceptions of a subject, which, to a mind unenlightened by revelation, must, necessarily, be enveloped in so much obscurity.

What then, are some of the characteristic attributes of the throne of God, as reflected from the pages of the sacred volume? To this inquiry we now address ourselves.

The penman of the Apocalypse—for no other reason than exercising the function of a messenger of the Cross—had incurred the malignant displeasure of Domitian, the Roman Emperor, that paragon of flagitious cruelty. The latter, in order to gratify his fiendish malevolence, denounced against this faithful servant of God, a decree of banishment. The scene of his exile was the sea-girt Isle of Patmos—the modern Patmosa. But even here, amid the abodes of solitude, instead of being doomed to experience the anguish of Divine desertion, he was favoured with cheering manifestations of Heaven's approbation. He enjoyed the signal privilege of being able to lift the veil which conceals from mortal ken, the events of futurity, and obtain some insight into "things which should be hereafter." Under the operation of some divine afflatus, supernatural vision, or rapturous ecstasy,

there was unveiled to his intellectual sight, an emblematical representation of a magnificent, glorious Throne, and One sitting upon it.

The idea that the great and incomprehensible Jehovah, is circumscribed to any particular locality in the material universe, is altogether inadmissible. Such a conclusion would conflict with his acknowledged attribute of omnipresence; the existence of which attribute is unequivocally taught by the inspired Psalmist: "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into Heaven, thou art there. If I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me."*

But, while it is readily conceded that ubiquity is one of Jehovah's attributes, yet the supposition is not preposterous, that there is some place within the confines of creation, where the omniscient One more visibly displays his glorious presence. This conclusion seems to receive countenance from the teaching of the inspired Oracles. Thus, says the Saviour, on one occasion: "In† my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." Corroborative of the sentiment here expressed, is the fact, that Christ's human body after his resurrection, ascended to Heaven. The same may be predicated of those of Enoch and Elijah. Moreover, if the place called Heaven, has no particular locality, where, it may be asked, are those bodies? And where will we assign a residence to the bodies of the saints after the resurrection? Being material bodies they must necessarily have a local habitation, somewhere in the immensity of space. From these considerations, it seems reasonable to infer, that there is, somewhere in the boundless infinitude of space, some local situation, where the eternal Jehovah is wont to make a more effulgent display of his ineffable glory than he does elsewhere.

*Psalm 139. †John xiv: 2, 3.

With these preliminaries, we proceed to contemplate some of the attributes of God, as reflected from the lively Oracles.

The apostle having concluded the epistolary part of his revelation relative to the seven churches of Asia, he now proceeds to unfold the prophetic scene. As he introduced the former with a vision of Christ, so he introduces this with his vision of God, the Creator, seated on his glorious high throne, surrounded with the countless myriads of the heavenly hosts, chanting their loud hosannas to him who liveth forever and ever. This supernatural vision of the apostle, doubtless bears a striking similarity to that exhibited to the minds of the prophets, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel; in which they saw the symbolical representation of a majestic throne, "high and lifted up, and the train of Him who sat upon it, filled the temple."* "Then I looked, and behold, in the firmament that was above the head of the cherubim, there appeared over them as it were, a sapphire stone, as the appearance of the likeness of a throne."† "I beheld till the thrones were cast down and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire."‡

Although no man hath seen, or can see God, at any time, with his natural organs of vision, yet, in this prophetic vision, there was distinctly exhibited to the sight of the Exile of Patmos, a majestic, awful, and glorious throne, established and exalted in Heaven; and the emblem of the Creator and Governor of the world, as seated with august grandeur, not however, in human form, but in an illustrious symbolical appearance, upon His imperial throne, "whose kingdom ruleth over all."

The first idea, here prominently brought to view, is the emblematical likeness of Him who sat upon the Throne. While it is obvious to remark, that no portraiture, or device, or image, invented by man, can convey to the mind, any adequate conception of the appearance of Him who "is a Spirit," yet the context would seem to warrant the conclusion, that a mystical, or emble-

* Isaiah vi: 1. † Ezek. xi: 1. ‡ Dan. vii: 9.

matical appearance of Him was here presented to the enraptured vision of the apostle. While thus emblematically seen by the apostle as sitting upon his empyrean throne, he shone forth with a visible, radiant lustre, bearing some resemblance to that of sparkling precious stones, such as the most brilliant of those which occupied a place in the High Priest's breast-plate.* They are, moreover, represented as placed in the foundation of the New Jerusalem.†

Of the precious stones here specified, the first is that of the jasper. To this his appearance in the vision of the apostle was assimilated. This mineral is said to exhibit the various colours of white, red, brown, blueish, and green. These multifarious hues may symbolize the manifold, and well-connected excellencies of Him who sat upon the throne. Their perpetual brilliancy may be typical of the exquisite complacency there is in beholding Him thus enthroned in matchless glory. His transcendently glorious appearance, being analagous to the splendid transparent colour of the jasper, which was a glittering white, with an intermixture of beautiful tints, may symbolize God's immaculate purity and excellency, associated with various other vouchsafements to his chosen ones. Such a conclusion seems to be warranted from the consideration, that moral purity must, necessarily, be connatural to the essential character of the judge of all the earth. He is immeasurably removed from every thing that makes the least approximation to moral defilement. He cannot even connive at anything which possesses the least tincture of moral pollution. This principle of his nature is strikingly illustrated by the well-known declaration of the man of Uz: †"His angels he charged with folly." Again: "The stars are not pure in his sight." Analogous to the above is the language of the prophet Habakuk: "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity."‡ Thus we see, that so essentially repugnant is the moral character of God, to sin in every form, that he is represented by the sacred penmen, by *turning away* from it; or, as utterly averse even to *looking* upon it.

* Exod. xviii: 17-20. † Rev. xxi: 19, 20.
‡ Job iv: 18: Job xxv: 5. § Hab. i: 12.

Further: in this visionary representation, be that set on the Throne exhibited to the entranced view of the apostle the similitude of a sardine stone, which displays a sanguineous, or reddish hue. May not this complexion be emblematical? May it not symbolize *Jehovah's peerless majesty, unappeasable indignation, and unmitigated vengeance against all his corrigible enemies? Or, may it not shadow forth his inflexible justice,—an essential attribute of his moral character? An attribute which must forever remain unobliterated, notwithstanding the cavils of heretical teachers. To deny his possession of this attribute would be to derogate from his inherent honor and tarnish his moral character. All such efforts, however, must emanate from misapprehensions of the true character of God, and must fall still-born, when fairly tested by the touch-stone of the infallible record.

No jarring attributes characterize the moral character of the eternal Jehovah. They all combine to constitute one indissoluble, harmonious assemblage. Annihilate his justice, and you at once mar the beauty and symmetry of the whole. This attribute must then, forever stand unimpeached and unimpeachable, co-extensive with the existence of God himself. All efforts, therefore, to exalt one of his attributes to the disparagement of another, are destined, *Sisyphus-like*, to rebound upon the heads of their misguided authors.

While it is hereby admitted, that mercy is an essential attribute of God, yet the exalting of it, at the expense of justice, is a mode of reasoning wholly inadmissible. We cannot, for a moment, entertain an idea so derogatory to the Divine character. Instead, therefore, of arranging them in antithetical contrast, we delight rather to contemplate them as existing in harmonious juxtaposition, and constituting essential ingredients in the Divine essence. Thus, says the Holy Spirit, by the mouth of his prophet: "Mercy and truth are

* As this, as well as all the prophetic writings, may be susceptible of different interpretations, we do not set up any claims to infallibility, in the views here expressed. Should, therefore, other expositors of the sacred text, conclude that they have hit upon a more legitimate interpretation, we cheerfully stand to them the right to enter their dissent.

met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other.”—Psalm lxxxv: 10. While mercy is an acknowledged attribute of the Deity, we should scrupulously guard against the impiety of attempting to divest him of that of justice.

“A God all mercy is a God unjust.”

Still further; we have a pregnant illustration of the principle in question, in the story of redemption. Here is a case in which, if justice could, in any event, have been dispensed with, there is reason to believe it would have been done in this. But no. So tenacious was the Divine Law-giver of the honor of his government, that the majesty of the law must be maintained, although his own Son should be the victim by whom the penalty was endured. An infraction of the divine law had been incurred. This could not be tolerated with impunity. The law must be honored. Reparation must be made. The penalty must be sustained, either by the offender himself, or,—in unison with a principle recognized by laws, both divine and human,—in the person of a substitute. This was an undertaking to which fallen man was inadequate. Having raised the puny arm of rebellion against the ruler of the universe—

“Die he, or justice must, unless for him,
Some other able, and as willing, pay
The rigid satisfaction, death for death.”

But where could a substitute, adequate to such an undertaking, be found? This was an inquiry of momentous import;—one, to the solution of which, finite intelligences were utterly inadequate. “Which things the angels desire to look into.”* “And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor; therefore his arm brought salvation unto him.”† But this state of deep suspense was at length relieved.

God the Father, moved by a love, “All height above; all depth below,” gave utterance to the thrilling announcement: “Deliver him from going down to the

* 1 Pet. i: 12. † Isa. lix: 16.

pit; I have found a ransom.”* And mutually responsive is the language of the Son: “I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him; rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth; and my delights were with the sons of men.”† Here we have an unequivocal intimation of the Mediator’s voluntary susception of man’s guilt; of his spontaneous acquiescence in the Divine economy, which devolved on him the stupendous undertaking of offering himself as a vicarious sacrifice for the sins of a ruined world.

Here then, was a conjunction the most favourable imaginable, for suspending the exercise of justice,—for sheathing the flaming sword, when Jehovah’s own co-equal, co-eternal Son was the victim of its vengeance. But no, having been once unsheathed, it must be satisfied, though it be with the blood of his own well-beloved Son. Then was issued from the Throne of the Eternal the sovereign behest: “Awake, sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts:”‡

“Thou, rather than thy *justice* should be stain’d,
Didst stain the *Cross*; and, work of wonders far
The greatest, that thy dearest far might bleed.”

What an incontrovertible proof have we, in this transaction, that justice is an essential attribute in that resplendent assemblage which centers in the Divine Being! [If it should be thought that we have dwelt too long on this item, it will find an explanation in the fact, that this attribute,—his justice,—is frequently impugned, or at least, disparaged.”]

From thus reflecting on the sterner attribute of justice—if we may be allowed the expression—may we not turn to the contemplation of a milder aspect of Jehovah’s Throne? While the sardine stone—typical of God’s inflexible justice, and fiery indignation against all his incorrigible enemies,—was visibly exhibited to the view of the entranced apostle, yet, at the same time, there was prominently presented to his view another impor-

* Job. xxxiii: 24. † Prov. viii: 23, 30, 31. ‡ Zech. xiii: 7.

tant appendant. One indicative that God the Father, was reconciled towards his rebellious subjects. That he no longer darts from Sinai's smouldering peak, the scathing thunders of the broken law. But now, through the merits of Him, in whom he "is well pleased," he speaks in the softer accents of reconciliation. Such a dispensation would seem to be typically represented by the "rainbow round about the throne." This beautiful phenomenon, like a glorious arch over the throne, enlivened with the most delightful green, like that of the emerald, is a token of God's unchangeable faithfulness. This celestial phenomenon was to Noah a token, that he would no more drown the world with a deluge of waters. But, may it not have an ulterior scope? May it not be a symbol of God's covenant of grace and peace, which had an existence before the world began? Such a conclusion is, to say the least, supported by strong probability.

While then, the demands of justice remain unimpaired, it is not necessary to dethrone Mercy. Their co-existence cannot be denied. Pursuant to the stipulations of the covenant of Grace, entered into, between the Father and the Son, far back in the counsels of Eternity, plenary satisfaction to the violated law has been rendered by the latter. Through the efficacy of his atoning sacrifice, the goings forth of mercy, free, unmerited, sovereign, rich, immense, can now, in perfect consistency with justice, be extended to rebel man. In this transaction, the prediction of the prophet finds a realization: "The counsel of peace shall be between them both."*

Further; we shall, in the next place, take a cursory glance at some of the accompaniments of this imperial throne, as delineated in the context. Supplemental to this throne of superlative grandeur, there were exhibited to the vision of the Exile of Patmos, four and twenty seats, or subordinate thrones, of inferior magnificence. On these were seated four and twenty Elders, the representatives of the whole church of the Old and New Testament. Of the appearance of these elders, we have a succinct description. They were decorated with habiliments of unsullied purity, emblematical, not only of

* Zech. vi: 13.

the immaculate righteousness of justification, but also that of sanctification. The attire of their heads was in exact correspondence with the wonted character of saints. "They had on their heads crowns of gold." How aptly significant this, of the honor which will be conferred on God's redeemed! They are, by some of the inspired writers, designated *kings* and *priests*. In what perfect congruity then, are these ornaments with which their heads are so illustriously embellished!

The apostle was not, however, allowed the high privilege of gazing unremittingly on the picturesque spectacle just described. His attention was arrested by one of a far different character. The throne was not without its terrors. There were seen, in alternate succession, coruscations of the forked lightning's vivid flash, in the manifestations of its resistless power. Of this irresistible energy, we have, in our own times, unmistakable indications. These are, not unfrequently, witnessed in the terrific effects displayed in the spectacle of the thunder-riven arms of the ancient oak of the forest,—a standing monument of the omnipotent power of that Being who is wont to dart down with such terrific effect, the winged lightning from the ærial cloud.

Consequent upon, and as a counterpart to, the fearful lightning's vivid glare, was the awful thunder's percussive roar. "The God of glory thundereth. The voice of the Lord is powerful; the voice of the Lord is full of majesty."* These majestic displays of elemental nature, analogous to what were exhibited at the time of the promulgation of the law at Mount Sinai, in token of the presiding presence of the Lord, on that momentous occasion, may be symbolical of Jehovah's irreconcilable indignation against the transgressors of his holy law.

We have a further display of the perfections of Him who sat on the Throne, in the exhibition of seven burning lamps, designated "The Seven Spirits of God." These are not without their appropriate significancy. They are typical of the variety and perfections of the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, which he communicates for

* Psalm xxix: 3, 4.

enlivening, purifying, and warming the souls of his ministers and churches. There was, moreover, unfolded to the view of the apostle, another concomitant of the Throne, namely, that of "a sea of glass," corresponding to the laver, or great vessel of brass in the tabernacle or temple, which, in consideration of its capaciousness, was denominated the "*Molten Sea*." In this laver were the priests wont to purify themselves from the blemish of ceremonial defilement—a preparative requisite to their entering the house of the Lord. Pure, spotless, and transparent as crystal was this "sea of glass,"—emblematical of the purifying and efficacious blood of the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;" which cleanses us from all sin, and with which all true believers must be washed from the stain of moral pollution before they can be admitted to the climes of never-ending felicity.

We contemplate still another appendage of this imperial Throne. We have reference to the "four beasts," or living creatures, as the original term imports. By these we understand a hieroglyphical representation of the ministry of reconciliation. Their characteristics are corroborative of this view. For who have more need of wisdom, prudence, vigilance and circumspection, than the ministers of Jesus Christ? They are enjoined by more than human authority, to "be wise as serpents." It is highly incumbent on them to "be watchful unto prayer."—To "walk circumspectly," not as fools, but as wise."—To look up to God for constant communications of his grace, that they may be enabled to impart to others salutary lessons of heavenly wisdom and "sound doctrine," that cannot be controverted. "That they may be able by *sound doctrine*, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers,"*

The first living creature bore the resemblance of a lion,—symbolizing the boldness and dauntless intrepidity so necessary sometimes, in a messenger of the Cross. This similitude is very apposite when it is considered that our Lord, on one occasion, designated two of his disciples by the epithet "*Boanerges*,—Sons of Thun-

* Tit. i: 9.

der," an account of their unblenching resolution in proclaiming the Gospel. Instead of cowering beneath the menaces of the enemies of the Cross, or betraying a recreant spirit, they evinced a disposition that showed them to be strangers to "the fear of man, that bringeth a snare."

The second living creature, exhibited the likeness of a calf, or ox,—denoting his indefatigable labour;—his unyielding diligence and assiduity in the arduous work of his Master,

The third stood erect, exhibiting the lineaments of the "human face divine,"—designative of that prudence, discretion, compassion, and benevolence, so essentially requisite to a herald of the Cross of Christ.

The fourth was characterized by the similitude of an eagle;—denoting the quick penetration into the sublime mysteries of the everlasting Gospel. As the eagle has a piercing eye and stays aloft, so he who "looks not at the things which are seen," is wont to rise in lofty abstraction, above the lowly, ephemeral things of this sublunary scene. In the exercise of sublime sentiments, and elevated devotions, he soars above the littleness and emptiness of this puny ball, and converses as it were, with celestial beings:

"His hand the good man fastens on the skies,
And bids earth roll, nor feels her idle whirl."

The apparatus of the living creatures claims a passing notice. They had each six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within, similar to the Seraphim, in Isaiah's vision. With two they covered their face, expressive of the profoundest humility, and sacred awe and reverence; and with two they covered their feet,—indicative of great humility, or promptitude, and assiduous diligence in executing their high commissions; and with two they did fly,—significant of their alacrity and expedition in the faithful discharge of their high behests. Moreover, they were full of eyes *within*,—intimating the necessity of looking to the actings of their own hearts; scrutinizing their ruling motives; scanning the origin, progress, and consummation of their every thought and purpose.

They have eyes before them signifying their readiness to look up to God for divine direction ; and also behind them, expressive of their cheerful alacrity, to “ feed the church of God, which he had purchased with his own blood.”*

They bore a further resemblance to the seraphim which appeared to Isaiah, in that they were continually employed in holy ministrations and solemn adorations to Him who sat on the Throne, saying with the profoundest reverence and sacred wonder, in a three-fold acclamation and ascription of glory to the Father, Son, and Spirit,—three persons, but one God,—“ Holy, holy, holy ; holy Father, holy Son, and holy Spirit,”—“ unspotted, infinitely, essentially and communicatively holy, is the Lord Jehovah, the Almighty God, who, from everlasting to everlasting always was, is, and will be unchangeably the same ; and who is the Creator, Preserver, Governor, and Disposer of all things ; their first great cause, and ultimate end ; they all being of him, through him, and to him, to whom be glory forever, Amen.”

Thus then, are the living creatures the representatives of Christ’s ministering servants, incessantly employed in ascribing all divine honours, and the most thankful acknowledgments to the incomprehensibly glorious One, who, as personated by the Father, appeared in emblems of awful and illustrious majesty, as seated on the Throne.

In harmonious concert with these living creatures the four and twenty elders, the representatives of the church, joining in unison with their ministers, who conducted the sublime anthems, bowed down, in low prostration and humble adoration before the august Throne. Impressed with the profoundest sense of his ineffable perfections and transcendent excellencies, they accord to him, who alone is possessed of immortality, the most solemn homage and devout adoration ; while, with the most reverential obeisance, they cast their glittering crowns at the feet of Him who is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end.

In bringing these remarks, (perhaps already too pro-

* Acts xx : 28.

lix,) to a close, it may not be inappropriate to bestow a cursory glance on some of the attributes of the Throne under review. Having already noticed, with some particularity, its *justice*, its re-introduction in this connexion is, perhaps, uncalled-for.

It is a Throne established in *righteousness*. "The judge of all the earth will do right." Any other course of procedure would be diametrically opposed to his essential nature. His inherent rectitude must forever remain utterly ineffaceable. In sustentation of this position, we will here introduce the declaration of the wise man: "His throne shall be established in righteousness."* Of similar import is the language of Job: "I will ascribe righteousness to my Maker."†

The *Majesty* of the throne is a prominent attribute. It is one to which the inspired writers have frequent reference. Thus says the man of Uz: "With God is terrible majesty."‡ In correspondence with the above is the language of the royal Psalmist. Under the influence of an overwhelming sense of Jehovah's superlative grandeur, he breaks forth in the following ascription of homage to the Almighty: "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the *majesty*."§

Again, its *glory*. This has no parallel in heaven or earth. By this we identify the resplendent shining forth of his matchless excellencies. Displays of these are visible everywhere, above us and around us. Animate and inanimate creation, alike conspire, to demonstrate this truth. "The heavens declare the glory of God," says the devout Psalmist.

We next contemplate the *universality* of God's Throne. While we have seen that it is not merely chimerical to suppose that there is, somewhere in the universe, a locality where Jehovah makes a fuller display of his glory, yet we would not be understood as circumscribing his governmental authority to any particular place. The dominions of the greatest earthly potentates, who subdued powerful States, and made nations quail, fell im-

* Proverbs xxv : 5. † Job xxxvi : 3.

‡ Job xxxvii : 22. § 1 Chron. xxix : 11.

measurably short of universality. The utmost that could be claimed for them was the major portion of the inhabitants of this sublunary world. But, were we "to take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;" or soar to the outskirts of creation, there would his omnipresence invest us on every side:—there would we owe absolute fealty to the high sanctions of this imperial Throne. Thus says the pious Psalmist: "All that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all."* Again, says the same inspired writer: "His kingdom ruleth over all."†

Its *stability* may be placed in prominent contrast with the ephemeral existence of terrestrial thrones. The most powerful dynasties of antiquity have been obliterated from the list of nations. Those which now sway the sceptre of dominion will, ere long, be crumbled by the corroding hand of all-consuming time, and will be as though they had not been. But, not so with the Throne of the Eternal. It is impregnable fixed on an immovable basis,—unimpaired by the vicissitudes of time, or the machinations of the combined hosts of its most formidable enemies. "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever."

Nearly allied to the preceding is its *immutability*. Immutable as his own essential essence it must necessarily continue to exist unchanged, and unchangeable, through every succeeding period of time, and be co-extensive with Eternity itself.

The *Eternity* of the Throne of Omnipotence is well fitted to fill the mind with emotions of sacred wonder and reverential awe. The line of human intellect is infinitely too short, to run the parallel, or even to make an approximation to it. Finite cannot grasp that which is infinite. Commensurate with the existence of God himself, is the duration of his Throne. The subject is overwhelming. The mind sinks exhausted, in attempting to grasp it. And while the cycles of eternity shall sweep endlessly along, Jehovah's Throne will still be invested with immarcessible vigor, unimpaired, and un-

* 1 Chron. xxix: 11. † Ps. 103: 19. ‡ Ps. xlv: 6.

impairable. "The Lord shall reign forever and ever."*

Pretermittin other attributes which might be noticed, let us take a desultory glance at some of the attending retinue of this magnificent Throne. This constitutes no inconsiderable feature of its resplendent grandeur. We are warranted by the inspired Oracles, in the conclusion that it is perpetually encompassed with countless myriads of seraphic throngs: "Thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him."† The cherubim and the seraphim are there. There too, is the Shechinah attended with angelic hosts. The arch-angel Gabriel, is seen peering in towering supremacy. Amid this multitudinous host, are seen too, the diversified orders of celestial hierarchies. The serried ranks of spotless intelligencies constitute a portion of this ineffably splendid retinue. These all, in the exercise of the most obsequious fealty, and humble and adoring prostration, unite in harmonious concert, in the loftiest ascriptions of hosannas and hallelujahs to Him who sits upon the imperial throne.

Of the resplendent majesty and glory of Him who sits upon the Throne, we have a graphic description in the following lines of the English bard:

"Now had the Almighty Father from above,
From the pure empyrean where he sits
High thron'd above all height, bent down his eye,
His own works and their works at once to view:
About him all the sanctities of Heaven
Stood thick as stars, and from his sight received
Beatitude past utterance;"

How solemn the reflection, that Adam's universal progeny must, one day, be summoned to appear before Him who sits upon this peerless Throne!

How awfully grand the conception of beholding the multitudinous tribes of the human race, congregated in one immense assembly, at the bar of this dread tribunal! When there shall be a full disclosure of the secrets of all hearts, and the judge "shall reward every man according to his works."

* Ex. xv: 18. † Dan. vii: 10.

ARTICLE IV.

SUCCESS IN THE MINISTRY.

The first call to the Gospel Ministry exhibits, in a striking manner, the true spirit of this work, especially with reference to the important element of success. It was given to Simon Peter, at the shore of Galilee. The Saviour had, just before, directed him to "launch out into the deep and let down the nets for a draught." In doing this he was not unaware of the fruitless toil of the night previous, but he designed to try the spirit of his new disciple. "And Simon answering, said unto him, Master, we have toiled all the night and have taken nothing; *nevertheless*, at thy word, I will let down the net." This reply evinced strong confidence in Christ and a spirit of obedience to his will. The result not only justified, but also increased his confidence in the Master's omniscience and power, and deeply impressed him with a sense of his own unworthiness. It was just as he had been brought to this point, that our Saviour gave him the promise of employing him in the Gospel Ministry,— "henceforth thou shalt catch men." We are forced to believe that he had this *ministerial call* in view from the first of this transaction—and that he regarded the spirit of Peter's answer as the true spirit of the ministry. He saw that the man who, after a night of fruitless, though skilful and earnest toil, was yet ready to renew that toil, simply *at his word*, was the man who would, in the labours of the Ministry, be ever ready to repeat exertions for *his* cause, even after protracted and discouraging labour,—provided only, he had the word of his Master for so doing. This incident, as we conceive, exhibits the true relation between our responsibility and our success.

It is a painful, but undoubted truth, that we are not warranted in expecting universal, even apparent success, in the employment of the means of grace. It is true God has said, that "*his word shall not return unto him void,—that it shall accomplish that which he pleases, and shall prosper in the thing whereunto he sends it.*"

No one can doubt that God *succeeds* perfectly and invariably in all that he really attempts. What we say is, that while the means of grace are adapted to save the souls of men, and are employed by the faithful servants of God to that end, yet neither the Bible nor experience warrants us in expecting that all, or even a large proportion, of those on whom they are brought to bear, will be saved; even when the efforts used are most Scriptural in form and most Christian and faithful in Spirit. "Many are called, but few are chosen."

However desirable it be to labour in confidence of success, and however discouraging this truth may be, to which we refer, it has, nevertheless, been realized by God's servants in all ages of the world. "Who hath believed our report, and to whom is the aim of the Lord revealed?" was the complaining and desponding inquiry of the prophet Isaiah. A similar experience was realized by many other, if not all of the prophets of the old dispensation, who seemed to "stretch out their hands all day long to a disobedient and gainsaying people." But the most remarkable fact illustrative of this truth was the want of apparent success in the ministry of our Lord. It was in anticipation of this, the prophet represents him as saying, "I have laboured in vain; I have spent my strength for nought and in vain." Though "he spake as never man spake," yet how few regarded "the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth!" Though he performed so many and such wonderful miracles, yet how few were convinced of his claims. At the close of his ministry, so abundant in labours, so instructive and solemn, and faithful, so glorious and impressive in the exhibitions of Divine power; and withal so tender and persuasive in its spirit,—at the close of that ministry he was called to weep over infatuated Jerusalem, which refused, with only slight exceptions, to be gathered under his wings. And how many of God's ministers have found sad occasion to recall, for their own comfort, this remarkable example. The disproportion between the efforts employed and the results achieved has, in almost every age of the world, constituted a painful illustration of the fact of which we speak. Nearly every youthful preacher is doomed to have the buoyant

anticipations of his early ministry disappointed, as were those of the gifted and enthusiastic Melancthon. Many a Godly minister has been compelled to labour through long years of anxiety and desire, without being permitted to see the work of the Lord prosper in his hands, in the known conversion of a single-soul. The distinguished Samuel Rutherford, one of the holiest and most faithful ministers of the 17th century, writes to a friend, "I see exceeding small fruit of my ministry, and would be glad to *know of one soul* to be my crown and rejoicing in the day of Christ." And even at the present day when the accessions to the church are greater than at any previous time, since the apostolic age, there are doubtless, many similar instances. Indeed, to a greater or less extent, at one period or another, every minister of Christ, and every labourer in his vineyard is called to encounter this discouraging experience,—to behold month after month, and some, year after year, of earnest and prayerful labour pass away, unrelieved by any marked indications of success in the conversion of souls. And no doubt even the most successful are ready to join in this lamentation, when they contrast the *few* who are gathered in with the multitudes who remain in the way of death.

We propose to consider this general fact as a *source of temptation to all who are enlisted in the cause of Christ*. Not only is it adapted to *test* the reality and strength of our zeal,—it is also a source of serious *danger*, leading, in some instances to injurious and in some, to disastrous results.

The *first class* of these dangers, to which we advert, arises *from improper views of the causes of this want of success*. It is not our purpose to discuss the question,—what are these causes? We take it for granted that our readers recognize the distinction between those which are *secondary* and that which is the grand, *ultimate* cause. With us there is no doubt that all the varied results of Gospel preaching and Christian effort, whether successful or unsuccessful, are to be referred to the sovereign determination of Him "who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will,"—and "who will have mercy on whom He will have mercy." There being in

the hearts of men, no natural nor self-originated disposition to yield to the calls of the Gospel; and neither the word, nor sacraments nor ministers of Christ, having any independent power to produce such disposition, the work of conversion must be, in the most literal sense, the work of God,—and as such, must be wrought *where* and *when*, on the persons, and to the extent which God chooses.—“So then, neither is he that planteth anything, neither is he that watereth: but God that giveth the increase.” Our Saviour referred to this very discrimination in God’s dealing with “the wise and prudent,” on the one hand, and with “babes” on the other, when he uttered the words—“Even so Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight.” Here, then, we are, unquestionably, to look for the ultimate cause of both failure and success. In the one case, depraved man is left in his sins,—in the other, man, equally depraved, is made willing in the day of God’s power. We are never to forget, or undervalue this fundamental truth. It lies at the very basis of our Christianity. It is the most precious source of consolation and encouragement to the ministry and the church, and it should have a conspicuous place and a controuling influence in all our motives, efforts and anticipations.

Assuming then, that we all, habitually, ascribe our want, both of real and apparent success, to the sovereignty of God, we remark that one danger arising from this want of success, is *that of falling into a spirit of indifference*. It is one mark of that selfishness which cleaves even to the renewed mind, that our interest in any result is generally in proportion to our personal connexion with that result, either as sharing in its benefits, or as having an agency in its production. It is true the Spirit of God fires the souls of true Christians with a zeal that is both disinterested and humble—a zeal which is willing to toil for others, and especially for Christ, and to be used as the obscure and dependant instrument in the hands of the Almighty. Still, it is difficult for even the truest, humblest servant of Christ, to tell how much the fervour of his zeal, in the cause of religion, is fed by the conscious efficiency of his own exertions, and the visible success with which those exertions are crowned. Not

that we would brand all such zeal as spurious and wrong. We know not to what extent God himself may be employing this very influence, in stimulating the interest and the activity of his servants. But it is quite apparent how the withholding of success endangers the very existence of that interest, and how surely it will daupen a zeal which is not pure and strong. It is also apparent what relation there is between this influence and our views of the sovereignty of God. While our labours are successful, and souls are being converted by our instrumentality, it were easy to keep our interest alive and our zeal fervent, even while we renounce all self-reliance, and ascribe our success to the sovereign goodness and power of Jehovah. But when we seem to labour in vain and spend our strength for naught,—when no Divine influence descends upon our work,—when the ungodly remain obdurate and impenitent, and few or none are plucked as brands from the burning;—and when we realize, then, there is, after all, no power in our arm,—no intrinsic efficacy in our efforts,—that not even a zealous Paul, nor an eloquent Apollos, can of himself secure the increase, and that God is the ultimate and sovereign source of all results,—then it is that the reality and strength of our zeal are brought to the test,—then it is seen whether that zeal be truly and supremely for God, or whether it depends upon our beholding the triumphs of our own exertions,—and then it is, that, if our zeal be spurious or feeble, or if it be based on wrong convictions, it will die away into a cold indifference. A false zeal cannot endure the combined influence arising from seeing the failure of our efforts to save souls, and from ascribing that failure to the sovereign will of Jehovah. It can live and labour only while flushed with at least seeming success. But a true zeal, which burns with pious love to Christ, and with compassionate love for souls, can labour for the Master, not only amidst animating triumphs, but also amidst discouraging failures,—and that, too, even while it realizes that the sovereign will of the Master himself, withholds success. Though it has toiled through a long and dark night of discouraging exertion, it is ready for new efforts, and for harder labours, just so far, and just in such circumstances, as

the Divine *word* of that Master requires. It shall not demand even the *certainty* of future success, to enliven its fervour, or to prepare it for its toils.

The true servant of Christ has a higher end, and a more animating motive than even the prospect of success, *i. e.* to do the will—to secure the approbation of the Master. And just so long as he sees the standard of that Master advancing before him, and leading the way, he is ready to follow. He is just as willing to labour for Christ without apparent fruit as with it. He is as prompt to follow the pillar of fire by night, as the pillar of cloud by day. Such, we say, are the attributes of a pure and perfect zeal. If ours be such, then we are above the danger of which we speak. But if ours be either a weaker, or a more selfish zeal, then is it endangered by all our failures to do good; and if God sees fit to withhold success from our plans and exertions in his cause, we are exposed to the danger of becoming indifferent to the result, and to the form and fidelity of our labours, and of fortifying that indifference by taking wrong views of the sovereign agency of God. In some instances, this indifference has led to the neglect of even external labour,—taking away all stimulus to action, and inducing a state of criminal sloth. In others, it has led to what we fear is not very much better,—a careless, heartless, and merely professional discharge of external duty,—a continued use of means, without much thought as to the end,—a regular employment of appointed instrumentalities, without any hope of success; between which, and an utter unbelief of God's promises, it is hard to discriminate. Against these evils, it is of the utmost importance to guard and strive, since they are at once sinful, and fatal to all future success. Just so far as God sees fit to try us by this want of success, let us recur to the grand motives for fidelity in the work of God,—our obligations, as the purchase of the blood of his Son, as his adopted children,—as his consecrated servants,—as those who have, by our own solemn and voluntary engagements dedicated our strength and time to Him.

But this suggests another form of danger arising from this same source,—that of confining our view to the ultimate cause of our want of success, and *not duly regard-*

ing those secondary causes which pertain to ourselves. God's sovereign determination seems indeed, adequate to account for all the failures of our efforts; and as a source of consolation and an argument for submission, it is ample. Yet, as we continually teach, *we* are none the less responsible for all this. We are not indeed, responsible for the actual conversion of one soul, yet we are responsible for acquiring all the mental and spiritual fitness possible, and for putting forth all the ability we have, in order to secure the salvation of men. While therefore, we turn to God's sovereignty for consolation, in view of our want of success, let us not forget that just so far as our failure is connected with our lack of industry, fidelity, and prayerfulness, to the same extent shall we be held accountable for all the ruinous consequences which ensue. Though God's Spirit alone can make our best warnings and exertions effectual, yet, failing to warn and labour as faithfully as we ought, God will require *at our hands*, the blood of neglected souls. It is the spirit and teaching of our system of truth to labour just as earnestly and to care just as anxiously for the salvation of perishing souls, as if their salvation depended exclusively upon us,—while, at the same time, we look to God for success just as dependantly and just as trustfully as if he dispensed with our instrumentality. It is this view which combines labour with faith,—a sense of personal responsibility with dependance on God,—and anxiety for success with submission to the Divine will,—the only view and the only spirit which can enable any to toil and struggle on with a loving heart, a lively zeal and an obedient mind, through all the discouragements and trials of unsuccessful, or apparently unsuccessful, labour.

But there is another extensive class of dangers arising from want of success, of a very different character, which we would describe generally, as consisting in *a departure from the word of Christ in the means and the mode of seeking after success.* The class of which we have been speaking, consists in a failure of *all earnest effort*; this is a *departure* from *those* efforts which the Master had enjoined. The cold-hearted, indifferent servant, may be willing to continue in mere outward but careless

labours of the *prescribed form*, and often justifies his course on the ground that it is *regular* and Scriptural in its method and means. The dangers of which we now speak, are no less formidable, and the evils to which they tend no less to be deprecated. The warm-hearted Minister of Christ, who loves the church and loves the souls of men, is prone to feel that visible success is the essential seal of his ministry. This conviction and this anxiety often becomes the sources of serious error, in regard both to his plans of effort and the nature of his exertions. They often beget a species of zeal which the best forms of success do not gratify, and which, in consequence, continually undervalues such forms of success, and fails to seek after them, while it pursues results which are less real, less valuable, and to some extent, hinders those which are more to be desired. We refer to that species of zeal which is *confined exclusively to the conversion of souls*. Far be it from us to utter one syllable in disparagement of an end so glorious and so holy,—an end, worthy not only of man's, not only of a seraph's zeal, but even of God's eternal purpose of redeeming love. Rather would we magnify and exalt an instrumentality having so blessed a design;—since “he that converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save his soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins,”—and “they that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever and ever.” All we wish to say is, that a zeal which is confined to this one part of the work of God is a defective zeal,—that it does not, while thus partial, lead to the best results, and that by failing to have other elements, of vast importance, it often leads to serious error and to injurious results. It is, therefore, a pertinent inquiry—what is the success after which we should aspire,—to which as the ministers, officers and members of the church, we should direct our exertions?

There are results which belong peculiarly to God, which in this, as in all things, we are to seek primarily. He has instituted the church for the display of his own glory and the vindication of his own character in an apostate world. To declare and defend His truth is the first great object to be sought, and nothing which would

either thwart or hinder that, no matter how much it would seem to benefit men, is at all consistent with the grand mission and the first duty of the church. But happily, God has chosen to effect this, and in a way which, at the same time, and in the process itself, secures the highest welfare of his creatures. The first step in this great work is the conversion of souls. This lays the foundation, and is, indeed, essential to all the other parts. To aim at this as extensively as possible is indispensable to a true zeal for the cause of God,—and hence for this we should cherish an intense anxiety and desire,—for this we should pray with agonizing earnestness,—for this we should toil with unwearied exertion. We cannot, indeed, exceed the required measure of zeal for an end so benevolent and holy. Yet, by confining our zeal to this one design, we shall be led to a course of effort involving the neglect, if not the injury, of other parts of the great work. Men are not only to be converted and brought into the church,—it is the design and command of Christ that they be *edified* and built up on their most holy faith,—that they be enlightened and trained,—and that they be carried forward in a career of continual spiritual progress,—that they become more holy and more like Christ,—that they receive not only the grace of pardon, but also the grace of assurance and comfort, and joy in God, and that they be made to abound more and more in every good work. And it is by these achievements, no less than by their conversion, that God is glorified and the Saviour honoured. Herein indeed, are attained the higher ends of the church, beyond which it were impossible to seek for holier or more glorious results. It were a blessed work to toil exclusively for those who are perishing in sin,—but it were no less blessed and no less important and acceptable to God to toil for the sanctification and comfort of the ransomed of the Lord. God indeed, loves sinners. But the strongest expressions of his love refer to sinners as already redeemed, pardoned and saved,—the church which he has bought with the blood of his own son. God loves “the gates of Zion” with a special and distinguishing affection. The church is his peculiar treasure, on which he lavishes his choicest gifts,—on which he

bestows his most extended labours. What end, then, can be more important, and what species of success more to be coveted by the true servants of God, than the spiritual advancement,—the purity,—the consolation and highest usefulness of those who are already the children of Jehovah,—secure though they already be against eternal destruction?

And how important that the church, which is God's kingdom and representative on earth, be pure in her membership,—uncorrupted by false and deluded Professors! Is it not, then, a weighty concern of the labourers in Zion to press upon the church, as a body, such instructions, tests and appliances, as will develop the true character of all. There never was a time when it was more important that the church of God stood forth in her true character,—in the maturity of Christian knowledge,—in the strength of solid and consistent piety,—clothed in the whole armour of God, and prepared to wield with wise efficiency the weapons of a spiritual warfare. And yet there has never been a time since the reformation, when so little attention has been bestowed upon the great work of training the membership. Hence, we urge that it is a defective zeal which leaves unaccomplished, and unsought, and comparatively uncared for; this grand purpose and requirement of the Almighty. And we add, for the encouragement of those whose zeal and anxiety embrace such labours as these, that if they be successfully engaged in building up the Church of Jesus Christ in spiritual knowledge, in holiness, in the practice of family religion, in godly living, in prayerfulness, and in active usefulness,—they are doing a noble, a truly glorious work, both for God and their race, even though they are not permitted to see many converts from the world. It is not the *number* of professions, but their *consistency* which advances the Divine glory. And in view of the number of spurious conversions, there is no field of effort for the conversion of souls more important, than that which is embraced in the walls of Zion,—the conversion of self-deceived church members. And in view of the low state of piety among professed Christians generally,—the covetousness, the indolence, the prayerfulness, the spi-

ritual ignorance, the inconsistencies, the evil influence and the bad examples which abound,—we are bold to say that there is no species, no measure of success more excellent and more to be sought after than that which shall remove or diminish, perceptibly, these sore and wide-spread evils.

But what has all this to do with the danger which we ascribe to a want of success in the conversion of souls? It has at least this to do with it,—that these important and neglected departments of the great work involve more labour and anxiety, and real difficulty, than even the ingathering of converts; while at the same time, even their successful cultivation fails to afford that exciting gratification, and to produce that glow of triumphant feeling which are experienced when our labours result in the conversion of sinners. The latter form, also, counts more largely and more rapidly, and is attended with more *eclat*, both in the church and the world,—while, on the contrary, efforts to train,—to instruct, purify, elevate and edify the church by searching, preaching, and by faithful discipline, is not only a difficult, but also a slow and unpopular work, hence less inviting and less stimulating. Now, if a want of success in the conversion of sinners were to result in more diligent and faithful effort in this neglected part of the work, it would be a happy result of our failure, since it would not only lead to the noble ends of which we have spoken, but also by securing them, would lay the foundation for more extended and glorious successes in the conversion of men, than have been witnessed since the primitive days; inasmuch as it would secure, and set in motion that instrumentality, which, at the present day, is more needed than any other,—that of a holy, praying, active church, coöperating with the ministry in the salvation of a ruined world.

But, such want of success does not always result in this,—and here we come to the most serious danger of all from this source. Anxious for this species of success, and failing to secure it by such means, and in such ways as the Master prescribes, many are led to resort to other means and other modes of effort, unlawful in their origin and injurious in their results. For example, find-

ing that the Scriptural doctrines which they have been preaching are slow in their operation, and scanty in their apparent results, many have been tempted to modify their teachings, with a view to wider influence and more rapid success,—a course into which every one unblest with success, is in danger of falling. Again, finding that converts are few, when judged by the stern tests of the Bible, many are tempted to adopt a lower and a looser judgment, by which multitudes may be admitted to the church. Finding other denominations so ready and urgent to secure for themselves all reputed converts, or who are willing to profess religion, some are led,—*forced* as they feel it,—to admit to the privileges of the church persons who are untried, and thus, in many cases, by a premature profession, made a cause of scandal, and in this way, at least, recklessly expose the church to the danger of impurity. And still further, inasmuch as the use of the appointed means of grace,—preaching the word, prayer, pastoral visitation, personal exhortation and direct instruction to persons inquiring what they must do to be saved,—inasmuch as the use of these means seems slow in producing an effect, many are tempted to try other and more exciting measures,—measures which will be more rapid and extensive in their results, without regard to the character or permanency of those results,—measures which have been found to promote spurious conversions, and to be in many ways, injurious to all the best interests of religion. And in these departures, the ministry are often urged on by the membership of the church, who are apt to partake of the same impatience as to the result.

All these things, however plausible in appearance and indicative of zeal, form parts of a superficial system,—a system destitute of solid and lasting results,—a system which necessarily includes long seasons of coldness and deadness in the church; an irregular, evanescent form of piety, and the multiplication of apostates,—a system which never acts, except with the violence of spasmodic action; and which as surely tends to decay and death. These dangers are all enhanced by the numbers, zeal, and apparently superior success of rival churches, which are striving to proclaim the largest ac-

cessions and the most rapid progress. Our system is not framed for such rivalry. It professes to be governed, not by expediency or human policy, but solely by the word of Christ. It professes to adopt that extended view of the great work, which we have attempted to describe. It aims at the greatest possible *purity* of the church, rather than the greatest magnitude. It aims to glorify God, and not to be popular with men. It aims at solid, not showy results. It aims to build, not with "wood and hay, and stubble," which may be gathered in any field, and by any species of labourers; but with "gold and silver, and precious stones,"—secured with toil and care, but when secured, forming a building of strength and glory, in which God shall delight to dwell. We surely, as a denomination, *could* attain such results as are attained by others,—having, as we conceive, no superior in any of the elements of success,—provided we adopt the same system of effort. But do we desire this? Do we envy the position; the character, the influence or the success of any other church in Christendom? Why then should we ever modify our system in order to emulate their triumphs? We are fully persuaded that just so far as we have copied the measures of others, as distinguished from our scriptural means, we have contributed to impair the permanency and value of our success, and have really lost ground. It is like sewing a piece of new cloth to an old garment, and like putting new wine into old bottles. Scriptural means are best adapted to plant and extend a scriptural theology and a scriptural organization. It is not enough that many have been truly converted by unscriptural means, and by designedly periodical and exciting efforts. By a more faithful adherence to the purity of our system, the regular ministrations of the word would have been more successful, the results achieved would have been more valuable, and we should, this day, have been a stronger, purer, and more useful church than we are. Who are they whose present condition illustrates our want of success in the conversion of men? In many of our communities, they are, for the most part, those who have been already operated on by the very system to which we refer,—and on whom it has spent its power only to

harden and to ruin, and to make them occasions of scandal. And many who have never professed religion, have yet, by their having been subjected to a strained system of effort, become insensible, not only to all less exciting influences, but even to the most moving appeals. Let us therefore heed the lessons of experience. Above all, let us be careful to adhere, in all our labours, to the word of our Master. "Let us not be weary in *well doing*, for in *due season* we shall reap, if we faint not. The husbandman *waiteth* for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath *long patience* for it." Doing this, we shall at least serve Christ. Doing otherwise, we have no assurance of any real success.

ARTICLE V.

BIBLE PRINCIPLES ON THE SUBJECT OF TEMPERANCE.

We wish to ascertain, by a candid investigation of the Scriptures, what are the true rules by which men are to be guided, in relation to the great subject of Temperance, both in regard to the use and traffic of intoxicating liquors. The world has been tremendously agitated on this subject for the last twenty years. The awful ravages of intemperance on private and public interests have excited, and continue to excite the intense investigations of moralists, and more latterly of politicians, as to the causes, operation and consequences of this vice, and the principles of policy by which it is to be checked. The most prodigious efforts have been made: the pulpit and the public forum, the press and the arm of the law have all been put into requisition. Associations of various forms, and of the most extensive ramifications, have been formed; large amounts of capital have been invested in the agencies and conduct of the reform, and high qualities of intellect and private virtue have been enlisted in its advocacy. A degree of interest so intense, producing efforts so vast and complicated, has necessarily accomplished a great deal of good, and like all other en-

terprises in the hands of fallible beings, and in a world like ours, although substantially good in themselves, it has also done a great deal of incidental evil. The doctrines by which the great effort to extinguish the vice and the consequences of drunkenness has been animated, have been placed on the most extreme ground. The use of every fluid possessing an intoxicating property, has been proscribed. *The use of such fluids* has been denounced, as well as *the abuse* of them, and sometimes as being the worst of the two. The occasional use has been confounded with *the constant*; the *temperate* with the *intemperate*; the *conditional* with the *unconditional* use. The principles which the Bible lay down on the subject, have by some, been openly denounced, and by others either so strained or overslaughed in their attempt to explain them, that they have practically ceased to control public sentiment on this branch of morals. The public expositors of the new doctrines, whenever they are compelled to allude to the miracle of Cana, invariably endeavor to explain it away, and when they discuss the doctrines of expediency, as laid down by Paul, they always push them far beyond the limitation which the apostle sets for their employment, and endeavor not only to make a principle temporary and limited, universal and permanent, but also to canonize the *weakness*, as the apostle terms it, in deference to which this principle is enunciated, as the only sound and permanent sentiment which an enlightened conscience should ever admit. Indeed, so far has this thing proceeded, that it is at the peril of a man's reputation for integrity as a Christian, and as an advocate for public morality, that he undertakes to stand on the example of Christ, and maintain the teachings of the word of God on this subject. Unless he goes the full length to which the boasted enlightenment of modern morality may please to lead him, he is looked at with the oblique suspicion that there is something wrong about him, or he is at once denounced as the enemy of temperance and the opposer of public and private virtue. To oppose the extravagant lengths to which the advocates of temperance go, is to oppose temperance itself. To oppose an advocacy of morality which is ashamed of the example of Christ, and is perplexed to dispose of the

various precepts of the Scriptures, is to oppose morality itself. To discriminate between abstinence and temperance—between the occasional and the constant, or the temperate and intemperate use of intoxicating liquors,—between such a traffic in it as can be guarded from direct tendencies to foster vice, and such a traffic as feeds the vices and swells the miseries of the poor, by the pint and the gill, is to forfeit all right to denounce drunkenness, or any of the collateral or direct causes of it. To all this we have only to say, that if we are to encounter it for returning without equivocation, to the teachings of the Bible, we shall do so with perfect content. We shall not attempt to base our advocacy of the virtue of temperance upon any maxims of expediency drawn from our own minds. Human reason is too much dis-tempered by the passions of the heart, and in too confined a position to behold all the relations involved in the settlement of an issue like this. God has been pleased to give us a revelation, setting forth the true principles by which our moral conduct is to be guided, and pointing out to us unmistakably what is the true nature of his will in the case. Nor can we conceive any course better calculated either to set aside the Bible as useless, or to discredit it, as a book of inspiration, as either to pass by its teachings altogether, in the settlement of these questions, or to be ashamed and afraid of its determinations of the issue. We wish it to be understood then, that we go to the Bible for the truth on this subject; that we go to it, not to interpret it by pre-conceived opinions upon our own part, but to learn simply what it teaches; and that we shall not flinch from any consequence which flows unequivocally from the principles enunciated in the Scriptures.

There are two modes by which the word of God teaches on questions of morality: by example, or by incidental, or direct assertion. Whatever is done by Christ is by that very fact stamped with the divine approval, and to say that anything done by the Son of God is censurable for anything—for intrinsic evil, or for mere inexpediency, is to assume ground directly infidel and deistic. In investigating the question, whether wine, as a beverage, is properly to be used or not, we are at once arrested

by the miracle at Cana. It cannot fail to have struck every observer of the current course of instruction given by the modern advocates of temperance, that whenever occasion has called upon them to explain this miracle, that they have been greatly embarrassed by it, and that they have been compelled to adopt some theory of explanation, which indicated a *consciousness* of embarrassment. The whole tone of allusion is the tone of apology. Now, we must say plainly, we have no apologies to make for it. We shall not attempt to explain it away. We shall not put on an air of embarrassment, as if the Saviour had set a very equivocal example here—an example, if not wicked *per se*, at least very *inexpedient*, to use the phrase with which these moralists dodge the charge of implicating the character of Christ. We say that the example was neither wicked nor inexpedient. We say it was an example fit to be made and fit to be followed. We say moreover, that whoever goes *beyond* this example, or its logical limitations, are as foolish as they are wicked, when they attempt to justify their excess by an appeal to this example. We say that whoever thinks this example a warrant for drunkenness, and those who maintain the propriety of it, are the advocates of the vice and are to be denounced themselves as the enemies of the Gospel. No man can, consistently, be a believer in the divine original of the Christian religion, and yet entertain in secret, or openly avow sentiments which arraign the purity of his acts and character. If this example is made the occasion and excuse of excess in wine, it is because the example is perverted from its true implications, and that for all such perversions the individual perverting it is himself responsible, and alone responsible for it. The example warranting a *right use*, must be perverted when used to justify a *wrong use* of a thing; and those individuals assume a fearful responsibility who either pervert the example of Christ, or who use it as an occasion of evil. Nor do those assume a responsibility one whit the less solemn who endeavour to evade or explain away the real nature of this example, from a guilty and weak apprehension that they will do mischief if they do not apologize for it. It is that spirit of apology for the example and teachings of the Bible which is

doing so much to extend the spirit of infidelity. The morality of slavery and the right and conditional use of wine has been denounced on such principles that no man could, consistently, hold those views, and yet allow the Bible to be a revelation from God. A distinguished infidel, quoted in a late work by a Minister of the Virginia Conference, declares that when he wished to disseminate infidel views, he did not attack Christianity as such; he only inculcated such principles on the subject of temperance, slavery, and other popular topics, as would necessarily undermine all confidence in the Bible, as an inspired revelation of truth. We are sick of this perpetual complaint of the morality of the tenth commandment, and of the morality of Christ. Any argument from the tenth commandment which would prove the lawfulness of a man having a wife, or owning an ox or an ass, would equally prove the lawfulness of owning a man-servant, or a maid-servant. Any argument from the example of Christ in attending and countenancing a wedding, which prove the lawfulness of marriage, would equally prove from his supplying the guests with wine, the lawfulness of using it. He was denounced, in his own day, as a wine-bibber, and the friend of sinners, and we suppose that the cry is to be repeated until the advancing power of his kingdom on the earth shall dispose men to submit to his authority and receive his teachings without limitation or reserve, as the truth of God.

It is argued in explanation of our Saviour's conduct by some, that to suppose him to have created wine, when the company *were well drunk*, is to make him "the minister of excess." This explanation which we have heard attempted, is the most absurd of all ever given of it. It proceeds on an assumption utterly false, and falls short in its conclusion of everything but an attack on the character of Christ. We would inquire if this position means to deny that wine was made at all at the wedding of Cana: for to avoid the charge upon Christ as a minister of excess, it is either necessary to deny that he made wine at all, or that he made it when "they were well drunken," both of which assertions are positively contradicted by the record. If this inference is correct,

that to suppose Christ to have made wine under such circumstances, is to make him the minister of excess, then *he is the minister of excess*: for it is unquestionable that he did create wine under these circumstances. But the argument proceeds on a supposition utterly unfounded: the phrase when *they were well drunken*, does not mean *when they had drunk enough, or that they were all intoxicated*. It simply means when *they were nearly done drinking, when the entertainment was well nigh over*. It was in these circumstances, the entertainment *nearly*, but not *completely* over, that the supply of wine failed, and Christ displayed his power to make up the deficiency. That this is the interpretation of the circumstances is clear, not only from the words themselves, but from the remark of the guests to the master of the feast, that he kept the best wine to the latter part of the entertainment, contrary to the custom, which set the best wine forward at first. This exposition of the passage completely answers the fling of those who wish to cover all defenders of the Saviour's conduct with shame, as representing him as supplying a parcel of drunken rioters with the means of dissipation. Those who find it necessary to pervert the statements of the Scriptures in this way, in order to sustain their views and bring reproach upon those who are presumptuous enough to defend the word of God, exhibit a consciousness that a candid statement of the facts would not be favorable to their opinions. Christ did not act tapster for a parcel of drunken rowdies: he supplied a festive company with wine for their enjoyment when the supply fell short; and the man who represents the one as being identical with the other, or who declares both acts to be the same in point of propriety, must answer at the judgment for a libel on his God.

Another sapient explanation of this act of Christ is, that he did not design to furnish wine, but simply to display his power and show forth his glory,—that he did not mean to sanction the use of wine as a beverage, but merely to prove his divinity. This is as true and as sensible as to say that a wagoner in building a wagon, did not mean to build a vehicle, but only to make money for his support; or a lawyer in making a speech,

did not design to make a speech, but only a fee. The absurdity of this is obvious: it confounds the *ultimate* with the *immediate* end, and overlooks an issue about the propriety of a *means*, by tacitly affirming the impropriety of the *means* and aiming to apologize for it by the excellence of the *end* to be attained. This is a question as to the propriety of *means* not of *ends*: it is not whether it was right for Christ to display his power and prove his divinity; but whether it was right for him to do *in this way*, by making wine for the enjoyment of a wedding party. The *end* does not justify the *means*. This doctrine Paul pronounces to be damnable. Can Christ be supposed to act on it? It is certain that he did design both to make wine and to display his power: he designed to do one in order to do the other: the one was his ultimate and the other his immediate purpose; and his act is not only a perfect guarantee of the propriety of the end, but it is equally a guarantee of the propriety of the *means* he used in order to effect it. We are as much at liberty to condemn him for the one as to condemn him for the other.

Another plea equally unsound: it is that Christ did not provide wine on this occasion, *as a beverage*. We are at a loss to imagine then, for what he did supply it. It is obvious that he supplied the deficiency of wine for the same purpose for which the original supply was provided. He came in to meet a loss in the provision for a certain end: what that end was in the original supply of wine by the master of the feast no one in his senses can doubt. The end was the same in both cases: the master of the feast provided a part of the means to it, Christ provided another. Such canvassing of the facts is puerile in the extreme. All of these pleas, it will be seen, proceed on the assumption that it would have been wrong in Christ to have acted contrary to what they endeavor to prove he did do. But this is to beg the question—assume the very point in dispute. The question to be decided is, whether it is wrong to use wine as a beverage; and they first assume this as admitted to be true, and then endeavor to explain away the conduct of Christ to an accordance with their views. We appeal boldly to the example of Christ, as proving it to be *right*

to use wine as a beverage. Even admitting that the miracle of Cana could be explained away, this is not the only passage of Scripture which clearly sanctions the use of wine as a beverage. The Psalmist declares of God, *he causeth the grass to grow for the cattle and herb for the service of man; that he may bring forth food out of the earth: and wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make his face shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart.* If this passage authorizes the use of *bread*, or *oil*, it also, and to the same extent, authorizes the use of *wine*. The law of Moses distinctly warrants the use of it in many places. The whole Bible is full of implied and direct assertions on the point. The blessings of redeeming mercy are repeatedly compared to wine; they are called the *feast of wine on the lees well refined*. Could this have been the case if it had been esteemed the odious and destructive thing it is now supposed to be!—the juice of hell—the water of damnation? What is the testimony of Jehu about John the Baptist and himself? He says to the Pharisees and lawyers, *John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine: and ye say he hath a devil. The son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children.* This passage just as clearly shows that wine was used as an ordinary comfort of the table, as it proves that bread was used. It is also shown that Jesus himself was a user of wine, as well as the creator of it: and it proves beyond a doubt, that whether a man under peculiar circumstances, and for religious reasons, abstains from bread, or wine, as did John, or whether he employs his liberty in using both as did Jesus, he is in both cases justified of wisdom. *If he eateth he eateth unto the Lord: if he eateth not, unto the Lord he eateth not.* To condemn the man who, for good reasons, declined to use his liberty, is just as improper as to condemn him who chooses to use his.

It is argued lastly, and with far more dignity of argument, though with no improvement in the soundness of the plea, that the wine created by the Saviour, *did not possess any intoxicating property*,—that it was the sim-

ple juice of the grape, prior to fermentation, and unpolluted by the presence of alcohol. This is an assumption which is not borne out by facts: it is not true, as alleged, that the wines of Canaan did not intoxicate. Noah got drunk on it: Nabal did the same: Eli evidently knew that the wines of his day were intoxicating, when he told Hannah, when he thought she was praying drunk in the temple, to put away her wine. Isaiah knew that the wine of his day was intoxicating, when he denounces woe on the drunkards of Ephraim as overcome by wine, when he inveigles against them that have erred through wine, and when he exclaims concerning the inhabitants of Ariel, *they are drunken, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink.* Solomon marks the signs of intoxication, and ascribes it to wine: *who hath we, who hath sorrow, who hath contentions, who hath babbling, who hath wounds without cause, who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine.* The New Testament writers are equally decisive in their testimony to the intoxicating property of the wine of their day. *Be not drunk, says Paul, with wine, wherein is excess.* Peter declares, *the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in licentiousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries.* These testimonies are overwhelming against the supposition that the wine made by Christ did not possess an intoxicating property. There can be no demand for such a supposition, except by begging the question in dispute. To say, as has been said,* that Christ could not have created a wine containing an intoxicating property, because it would have been morally wrong, is to assume for granted the very thing in dispute, and to contradict the whole testimony of other parts of Scripture. The general fact that the wines of that day would intoxicate if improperly used, is unquestionable. To say that in the case of this miracle a particular exception is made, is to assert what cannot be proved, and throws the burden of proof upon him who asserts it,—an assertion which has a presumption against it absolutely

* Ed. G., Delaware quoted in Repertory, April, 1841, p. 271.

overwhelming,—a presumption not only created by the general character of the wines in use, but by the other parts of Scripture, which clearly commend their use, on account of this very power in the fluid to produce exhilaration. It by no means follows, as these reasoners suppose, that because a man may use a fluid with an intoxicating property, he may therefore get intoxicated upon it, any more than because a man may use an article which has a poisonous quality in it, that he may therefore poison himself. There is a deadly poison in tobacco; yet it does not give a man *a right* to use it to such excess as to kill, or even to injure himself. Nor does it prohibit the limited and temperate use of the weed. The simple truth is, that although there is an intoxicating property in wine, yet *excess in the use of it is a condition* to this property coming into play, and to use wine within the conditions which are appended to the use of it, is really to use a fluid which cannot intoxicate. Though this quality exists in it, it exists in a state unsusceptible of doing harm, and only susceptible of doing good.—The conditions which are prescribed for its use, provide against the power for harm, and secure only its power for good. Whoever, therefore, violates this condition, by using wine in excess, does it at his peril: he makes a property useful when properly used,—an instrument of evil when improperly used; and for this, he alone is responsible. It is impossible to make God responsible for the abuses of his mercies. All his gifts are conditional, and the grand condition of all is to *use without abusing*. To take the ground that wine cannot be used without abusing it, is to charge God with authorizing in its use all the consequences of its abuse,—a course in which it is hard to tell which is the most conspicuous quality, the blasphemy or the folly. The simple truth is, God gives wine for one end: men use it for another. He gives it on one set of conditions; they use without any limitation, but their own gratification and will. He gives it as a beverage: they use it as an agency of intoxication. He gives it as a gratification: they use it, when they abuse it, because it gives in excess a stimulus which is not the gratification God had in view, and which, in itself, is utterly polluting and destructive.

He has given it on the same general grounds on which he has given coffee,—to be used as a beverage: men, instead of using it as an occasional and temperate gratification, pervert it by constant or excessive use into an habitual source of criminal excitement. Suppose a man uses coffee as a constant drink, and in excess,—not merely at table, or as an occasional beverage between meals,—but as an incessant and excessive potation,—would any man say that he was innocent? Still less would any man say that, because this mode of using coffee was wrong, that all use of it is censurable? Coffee possesses an injurious property,—nay, the vital air we breathe, contains a gas which, in an uncombined condition, is deadly to all living things; but shall we, therefore, declare it to be sinful to use them. Would not the plainest understanding in the world be able to see that, while we may use coffee under certain limitations, within which it is not only harmless, but profitable, we are not thereby authorized to use it in such excess as to bring its injurious qualities into play? It is so with the use of wine and intoxicating drinks. The excess in the use of them, as a general rule, is the indispensable condition to the active movement of its intoxicating influence, and the prevention of that excess is one of the conditions which God has appended to the use of them.

What, then, are these conditions, which God has appended to the use of wine? They are in the most general terms of expression, that we may use so as not to do harm to ourselves and harm to others. It is evident that the first of these conditions—indeed both of them are of variable operation upon different persons, and upon the same person at different times. The zealot of modern reform will probably say that these conditions prohibit the use altogether, because a man cannot use wine under any circumstances without exposing himself to risk or others to contamination by his example. But it is evident to any man that such logic is a contradiction: it is to grant a right to use, and then follow it by a condition which nullifies the grant, and prohibits the use of it altogether. The allegation is properly met by a full contradiction: we deny that it is impossible to use wine without harm to ourselves or others: we affirm

that such is possible. But these conditions prescribe a different course of conduct to different persons under different circumstances, or to the same person under different circumstances, simply because one man may do, without harm to himself, what another cannot do: a man may do at one time, say under a certain state of health, what he could not do with impunity at another; and all men may do at some times, without harm to their neighbours, what they could not do at others. A man, too, may not so traffic in intoxicating drinks as to minister directly to the vices of his fellows. A man has no right to sell wine, or intoxicating liquors, to all persons indiscriminately. If he knows a person to be a drunkard, and will abuse the fluid, he has no more right to sell it to him than an apothecary has to sell laudanum to a man when he knows he means to use it as a poison, and take his own life with it, although he may sell it when he knows that it will be used for proper purposes, or at least has no right to suppose the contrary. This is a part of the responsibility of one trading in liquors; and while it is absurd to announce that a merchant may sell no article until he has first received a certificate from the purchaser that he will do no harm with it, the maxim is of sufficiently easy practical application, if not of a complete and definite logical statement. A merchant has no right to sell powder or arms, if he has reason to believe the purchaser will use them on his own, or the life of his neighbour. This is the consideration which makes the indiscriminate retail traffic in the articles of intoxicating drinks so excessively improper,—a traffic which, in nine hundred cases out of a thousand, ought to be prohibited by law. No man can sell in this way without doing harm. He cannot sell in this way to those who will use, without also selling to those *who abuse it*; and it is at the peril and responsibility of the seller that he does it. If he is at a loss how to discriminate in the case, the only safe chance is to alter his trade. A merchant may lawfully sell wines to customers from whom he can derive a reasonable assurance from their character and habits, that they will not abuse it. No man has a right to sell it so indiscriminately that he cannot tell what is the effect of his trade. The responsibility is his, and he

must determine on that responsibility what is that effect. He has no more right to sell to an indiscriminate mass of people, some of whom he knows must be abusing it, than an apothecary has to sell laudanum to an indiscriminate mass, some of whom he has strong reason to believe, even though he may not be able to tell who they are exactly, mean to use it as a poison on their own persons, or on the persons of others. These are the general principles which regulate the use and traffic in wines and other intoxicating drinks,—principles which afford a wide field for the exercise of a wise and discriminating judgment in the application. The word of God allows the *conditional* use of wine—*temperate*, as distinguished from *excessive*,—*occasional*, as distinguished from *constant*. The *intemperate* use of it, all will condemn. The *habitual* use of it, even when *temperate*, is, in the general, dangerous and improper. It is the *constant* use of wine *temperately*, which lays the foundation for the habit of intemperance, and it is against *this* the cry is so properly raised against *temperate drinking*, as it is called. The damage is, however, not in the *temperate* nature of the use, but in its *constancy*. An *occasional* temperate use of wine, as at a wedding, or as a refreshment in weariness, or as an occasional gratification, is *right*, in itself, and tends to no evil consequences whatever. Evil can only possibly result when the *occasional* is altered into the *constant*, and the temperate expands into the *intemperate*. Who will dare to say that when God authorizes the one, he either authorizes the other, or improperly exposes men to it in his permission to do the first?

The last limitation upon the use and traffic of wines which we shall notice, is the limitation expounded by Paul, founded upon the *weakness* of conscience in a sincere, but erring brother. This principle we shall enunciate briefly with the causes upon which it proceeds, and the limitation upon its action. It is contained in these passages. *Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another who is weak eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth: for*

*God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth; yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand. Let us not, therefore, judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block, or an occasion to fall in his brother's way. It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.**

We shall extend the discussion of this principle, and urge, without reserve, both the positive and negative side of it. The sum of it, that it is good neither to eat meat nor drink wine, or anything by which our brother is offended. We shall discuss the nature of this offence hereafter. But where it exists, we are *imperatively required* by this principle of duty, to suspend our use of a right which is offensive or injurious to the conscience or conduct of our brother. It applies as much to the use of meat, as it does of wine. *But it does not require us to endorse and approve the weakness to which we yield.* We must still call it a *weakness*, and we are bound to *resist*,—not only not to endorse and endeavour to enforce it as a universal rule of faith and practice,—but to *resist* it. Paul tells us, if our brother is offended at our use of wine, we must cease to use it; but he calls the state of feeling that would call for such a suspension of our liberty in the case, a *weakness*; and sure any conscience must be admitted to be *weak*, and somewhat crazy to boot, which offends at the example of our Divine Lord himself. We will, to avoid offence, yield to the weakness of our brother; but we will both call it a *weakness*, and endeavour to instruct his conscience into a more complete accordance with the morality of the Bible. But, we must not be misunderstood: we do not mean that a man cannot relinquish the use of wine at all, except by displaying weakness. Far from it. There is a mode in which a man can suspend the use of wine, which is not weak, but honorable and proper, in the highest degree. If, with a clear conviction that he has perfect liberty to do otherwise, he admits his right, yet declines, on any

* See the whole of 14th chapter of Romans.

grounds satisfactory to himself, to use it, he is worthy of all honour. If, for the honour of religion, a man, with a rational and complete perception of his entire liberty to use meat, should relinquish the use of it, we should honour him highly. But, if he declines from superstitious ideas of the merit or efficacy of it, and denounces every body who will not do likewise, we can neither respect nor tolerate him. It is so with the use of wine. The use of wine is as clearly warranted in the Scriptures as the use of meat. If a man declines to use meat under the above views, he is worthy of high respect; but the man who does not choose to follow his example, is just as worthy of it as himself. It is only when individuals, or societies, get off from this high, clear scriptural ground, that they cease to deserve the unqualified respect of all who honor the Bible. But when they come urging that the use of wine is wrong under all conditions,—contending that the dislike to its use is essential to Christian character,—and total abstinence should be made a term of communion,—and denouncing every body who stands in good faith on Bible grounds, we shall not hesitate to arraign them as inconsistent with truth, and insubordinate to the word of God.

We have said the right to use or traffic in it is conditioned upon the obligation *to do no harm with it to ourselves or others*. This, of course, prohibits all excess in wine, of every degree. We have no right to use wine, or so to traffic in it, as to bring reproach upon our good name, or on the church of God,—to injure our health, or to debauch our morals. It is manifest that this condition applied, a certain state of public sentiment would require a temporary and circumstantial abandonment of both the use and the traffic. Public opinion may be in such a condition,—an exaggerated and wrong condition it may be,—a condition not only unreasonableness, but unscriptural, so that a man may even, by a use or traffic of the article, right in itself, expose himself or the church to obloquy. It would then be required, by a due regard to his own reputation, and the honour of the church, to abandon them. But it would not be required of him to approve the state of opinion to which he yields. On the contrary, it would be his duty, so far as in him lay, to

defend the truth of the Bible, and *endeavour, in all prudent ways, to bring back public sentiment to an accordance with the will and truth of God.* If, for this, he brings his good name into peril, he must bear it, and leave consequences to God. It is one thing for a man to imperil his own and the honor of the church by an imprudent pressure of a liberty of his own in the face of a strong, though perverted public feeling. It is altogether another, for him to peril his reputation in defence of the truth of the Bible, and the honour of his Lord and Saviour. In one word, as a matter of course, this obligation to use without doing harm is of a variable application, and consequently requires a prudent judgment to decide when it becomes obligatory, and when it does not. It is variable in its application, simply because, what can be done without harm in one case, cannot in another. A man may take a glass of wine in his own house, for example, when it would be unbecoming in him to go to the bar of a tavern and call for it. We would not, as a minister, take wine at a social party, not because we should think it wrong to do so, but because, as a matter of prudence, in the present state of public opinion, it would be best not to do it. But the state of public opinion would be *the chief, if not the only* ground of our declining to do it; and if public opinion is suffered to become much more exaggerated on this subject, it will become absolutely necessary for all who mean to stand by Christ and his truth, to resist by their example as well as their arguments, all insinuations that the miracle at Cana was a breach of morality. To a certain condition of public sentiment, we should deem it our duty to yield. To another state of it, we should feel it to be treason against the Master to yield the division of an inch, and we would resist it sternly, both by argument and by example, and to strengthen the logic, as a jury packed by the devil to bring in a libel upon the Bible, and to pronounce his example a breach of morality.

It will be said that the use of wine, under any conditions, will do harm, because it would set a dangerous example. To assert this broadly, as an universal proposition, subject to no limitation, is to condemn Christ at Cana, without a doubt. It is to pronounce all those

Scriptures which warrant the right use of wine as a license to sin. God has given a right to use; but this notion, that no man can take advantage of that right without setting an evil and dangerous example, is to say, in other words, that God has given a right to set such an example,—that he has given a license to sin. The simple truth is, that this assertion is an assumption of the very point in dispute: the question to be decided is, whether this is a *bad* example. What do you mean by a bad or improper example? Do you mean an example intrinsically wrong? Then it is always wrong; and Christ is a sinner. Do you mean an example which is susceptible of perversion, or of being made the excuse and plea of evil? Then, all example whatever, good or bad, is wrong; and Christ is again convicted of sin; for it is certain that his example has been perverted, and many a sinner has gone raving into a drunkard's hell, pleading the example of Christ as his justification. It is clear that whoever goes *beyond* the example of Christ, or of any one else, by the very terms of the proposition, does not follow it. The whole system of morals is a system of limitations upon action, going to a certain extent as right, and there limiting itself, and becoming wrong beyond. Will it be called a proper following of an example, to walk with it up to the limit where it stops, to go beyond, and then appeal to the example for justification?

There is another consideration in relation to this matter of example. An example, right in itself, may become objectionable when attended by some circumstantial and temporary relation to other things. Paul orders that no man put a stumbling block; or an occasion to fall, in a brother's way, and declares that if our brother is grieved with our meat, or is led by it into an improper use of it, we do not walk charitably. One branch of the Corinthian Church could participate in the feasts of the heathen festivals merely as festivals, and without any sentiment of religious worship being mingled with it. But others were unable to do this; they could not participate in them as festivals, without participating in them as worship: and they were emboldened to engage in these splendid celebrations by the example of their stronger

brethren. On this ground, then, Paul prohibited all classes of Christians from engaging in them, because the act of the strong, though in itself right, or at least indifferent, was made an occasion of stumbling to the weaker and less clear-minded brethren. Here, an example, proper, in itself considered, from its relation to the mere circumstantial and temporary state of incomplete emancipation from superstitious notions existing in the minds of the weaker portion of the church, was pronounced to be improper, and inhibited by the apostle. Of course, the force of the obligation in this case to refrain from doing what was proper in itself, resting altogether on the circumstantial and temporary condition of feeling in the weaker brethren, was merely circumstantial and temporary in its existence. This is the grand peculiarity of these rules and maxims of Christian ethics: what belongs to the essence of an act, always belongs to it, and if wrong, it is always wrong. But a thing, right in itself, can only become wrong by some mere circumstantial and temporary relation attached to it by circumstances. The very highest forms of intrinsic good or evil are subject to this partial and limited transformation. Of this sort is the use of wine as warranted by Scripture. In itself, and under the general conditions annexed to its use, it is right, and no intelligent and unperverted moral sense can condemn it. Under peculiar circumstances, ascertainable under the general descriptions and maxims of the Scriptures, even this right, limited and conditional use is entirely suspended. But this suspension is merely circumstantial in its reasons, and temporary in its duration; and to endeavour to establish it as a permanent and universal law, governing through all time, and throughout all possible contingencies, is to change the whole form of the obligation. It is to make grounds nominally circumstantial, really essential, and, of course, an obligation properly temporary, absolutely eternal.—To take ground which makes the absolute exclusion of wine, through all time, and under all circumstances, the law of all enlightened Christian conduct, is to take ground which, however it may be qualified and softened by deprecatory phrases, is essentially deistic. It makes the imitation of Christ at Cana, an impossibility, because

a wrong under all conditions of things and to the end of time. If the imitation is made so absolutely improper, the original example itself, was improper. To say this, is to take the crown from the head and the honor from the character of Christ; and if this is not deistic in nature and effects, whatever it may be in design, we protest we are not able to understand in what deism consists. But, let it be remembered, that the obligation, circumstantial in its grounds, and temporary in its duration though it is, is still of imperative force, as far as it goes, and will be neglected at the peril of him who neglects it.

The obligation to yield to the requirements of a weak brother's conscience is of the same general character with this general law of not doing harm in the use of our liberty. This offence consists in one part in offending his sense of right, and partly in inducing him to do wrong, by doing a thing in itself right, while his own conscience is not satisfied of the right of it. We are not unnecessarily, to offend the honest prejudices of our brethren, even though they may be weak and unscriptural. We may, and must endeavor to correct them, and under the pressure of circumstances, in order to defend the truth, we may and must entirely overlook them. But we may not do this *unnecessarily*: we are required by the broad and vigorous spirit of charity required in the Bible, to yield the use of a mere liberty temporarily, to the honest prejudices of our brother, while we endeavor kindly and firmly to remove them. We are ordered not to despise him that cannot conscientiously eat meat, who, because of his weakness, eateth herbs. It may be that his views are mistaken; but his conscience is honest. To the Lord he eateth not, and therefore his principle, or motive power, is commendable, though his judgment may be mistaken as to what it requires him to do. We are then, not to offend by an unnecessary, or wanton use of our liberty, the honest prejudices of such a mind: we must then, in deference to his views, yield temporarily our right to act, while we are also bound to endeavor to instruct him. If he becomes clearly factious in opposition to the truth, we are no longer bound to yield to his prejudices. But if he is humble, willing to submit to the truth yet unable at

once to perceive it, our obligation to honor his views continues to exist. At the same time this rule works both ways. It seems to be generally considered in the discussion, that it is only necessary to consider these rules in their application to the strong brother and the limitations upon his liberty. But there is also, an application of them to the weaker brother. Why, says the apostle, *is my liberty judged of another man's conscience? Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?* What right have you to come forward and insist upon your mistaken convictions becoming the rule of my conduct? In other words, there is a solemn duty binding on the weak brother, to look into the real nature of his convictions, to bring them honestly to the test of Scripture, and not to assume the responsibility of rashly, or unwisely limiting the rights given to his brother by God himself. Paul, while he insists on the strong brother yielding to the honest, though mistaken prejudice of his brother, insists with equal force on the weak brother's promptly setting about examining the foundation of that prejudice. The strong is bound to instruct the weaker to seek instruction, and when both unite in the humble, earnest, affectionate spirit of real brethren, animated by a simple desire to know the will of God in the case, it cannot be long before the prejudice of the one will be removed, and the other be enabled to resume the exercise of his rights and liberties given by God, without any offence to a brother's mistaken sense of duty.

The apostle guards with the same mutual fidelity against the other sense of offending our brother, which is to induce him to do as we do in a thing which, though right or indifferent in itself, is wrong to him on account of his mistaken convictions in regard to it. The thing is right in itself, and therefore we may do it, who are clear in conscience as to its propriety. But to our brother in his weakness it seems wrong: therefore he cannot innocently do it, on the principle laid down by the apostle, *to him who thinketh it to be sin, to him it is sin.* A person in this condition of mind may be led by the example of another to do it *before his conscience is clear as to its propriety.* He therefore sins, in doing what is

in itself right, because he violates his conscience. To guard against such violations of propriety, the apostle lays down two rules. He first directs the strong brother that whenever he has reason to believe that his example in doing a thing right in itself, will be the occasion of stumbling to a weak brother, that is, of leading him to do the same before his conscience is clear as to its lawfulness, he must not use his liberty in such a case without strong and sufficient reasons. He directs secondly, that one universal rule shall be observed by the weak brother, and that is, never to act in imitation of any one, until his own conscience is clear on the point. The example may be right in itself, but it is wrong to him because his conscience is not clear about it. *Let every man be persuaded in his own mind. All things indeed, are pure: but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth.* Not that every man is permitted to think just as he pleases,—not that any and every kind of notion is to be allowed in every mind; but that every man is solemnly bound to examine his convictions, to bring them honestly to the test of Scripture, to resist all unscriptural and unfounded convictions. But, that while this gradual process of rectifying his views is going on, and before his conscience has become clear, he dare not do what he is certain is right. *He that doubteth is damned if he eat; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.* It is obvious, that the grounds on which these obligations are binding, both on the strong and the weak brother, are variable, or moveable in their nature, creating an obligation of the same variable temporary nature. It will be then seen at a glance, how mistaken is the ethics which lays down one rigid and universal rule, permanent and universal in its application, requiring at all times and under all circumstances, of all classes of men, as equally obligatory on all, and requiring the same conduct in all. The maxim of total abstinence, as an universal and permanent rule of moral conduct, finds no foundation whatever in the Scriptures. The great duty of man is obedience to conscience: the necessary correlative of that is to educate conscience entirely by the word of God, simply seeking to know its teachings, and al-

ways seeking for the Holy Spirit to guide us into the truth. Else it may often happen that a man will be placed in the unhappy dilemma of conscience ordering one thing and God ordering another, in which he can neither do right without guilt, nor refrain from doing wrong without a similar responsibility.

The obligation of total abstinence is not the same in its application to all—not the same in force, in duration, or in the grounds upon which it reats. Upon the man who has once been the victim of intemperance, it is an absolute and unalterable obligation. He can never touch liquor again, except under the most stringent and unavoidable necessity of health, without guilt, because a melancholy experience has shown that no reformed inebriate can ever touch it again without imminent risk, nay, almost the inevitable certainty of reviving the sleeping devil of his ancient vice. It is the duty of all men to be temperate: it is the duty of some men to be uniformly abstinent, because it is only by being entirely abstinent they can be temperate. It is the liberty of some to use with a limited and conditional use, which limited and conditional right is susceptible of being entirely suspended on circumstantial and temporary grounds. The circumstances of individual men may impose upon them a specific and confined and temporary obligation to total abstinence which they would be guilty to neglect. But this obligation cannot be expanded into one rigid and universal rule, simply because it exists only on the circumstances of the individual and expires with them. In all these cases, the individual must determine his own duty, by a consideration of his own circumstances; but he is as unwise as he is uncharitable, when he infers that what may be obligatory on him is obligatory on his neighbour, and fiercely denounces all who do not follow his example.

This brings us to the last point which we wish to consider, which is, the right of man to suspend his liberty in the use of wine, the true grounds on which Temperance Societies may be erected, and the relations of these Societies to the church of God, and the duty of church members in relation to them.

We have already indicated the principle which lies at

the foundation of this subject. If a man chooses to relinquish the *liberty* which God has given him, he may do it, only, provided he does so on no ground which conveys the remotest shadow of a hint that the *liberty itself* was improper. If he does it on any such grounds he is to be resisted. The relinquishment of his liberty will be controlled as to its moral character, entirely by the reasons upon which it proceeds. If a man chooses to relinquish it with a clear perception of the true nature of his liberty, that feeling that he is at perfect liberty to do otherwise, on grounds purely circumstantial, and with an entire relinquishment of all right to dictate the line of duty to others, and for the purpose of doing good to man, arresting the progress of a vice and staying its consequences, he is worthy of the highest respect. Others, acting on the same views, may unite with him and form a Society, and the Society so formed, and so remaining, is worthy of the high regard of all good men. But if a man relinquishes his liberty on grounds that proclaim *no liberty*, or a liberty to sin, on grounds essential and permanent, and with a disposition to suspect the integrity and denounce as suspicious, all who will not join him in his views and unite in an association with him, then he is to be resisted, and any Society formed on these grounds and maintaining them, is to be resisted. If, as we have already said, in different connection, a man chooses to relinquish the use of meat, with a clear and scriptural sense of his right to use it, it is well; he is worthy of all honor. But if he requires that every one else shall follow his example on penalty of denunciation, he is not to be respected. If he does it on superstitious or extravagant grounds, believing either in the efficacy or merit of not using meat, neither his understanding nor conscience is to be respected, except when these notions co-exist with great weakness of mind and evident and high honesty of conscience. It is so with wine; for the use of both of them, or the relinquishment of both of them, are placed on the same footing by the apostle. If a man chooses, with a clear conscience of his right, to use the limited and conditional privilege given in the Scriptures, to relinquish it in order to avoid offence, or to get a vantage ground to do good, on

grounds circumstantial in their nature, and which convey no reproach on the liberty he relinquishes, relinquishing all right to force others to do the same, then his action is worthy of all honor. Any Society taking such grounds is worthy all honor, the respect and countenance of all good men. But when a man relinquishes his liberty, with a feeling that it is a *liberty* to sin, or because his use of his liberty as conditioned in the Bible, would set an example permanently censurable,—when he forgets the nature of his relinquishment as a relinquishment of liberty, or as a compliance with an individual obligation, and consequently, does not see that he has no right to require others to relinquish theirs,—when any individual or Society takes this ground, no matter what may be the *design* in the matter, *the principles* on which they act are opposed to the word of God, undermine all confidence in it as an inspired revelation of truth, censure the example of Christ as an example which had far better never been set; and thus becomes essentially deistic. The proscriptive spirit and the unscriptural theories which have too often disfigured the Temperance Associations of the world, are separable adjuncts of the Associations themselves, and therefore opposition to them, or to the particular Societies which hold them, is not opposition to Temperance Societies as such, much less to the general cause they are seeking to promote. Temperance Societies based on the grounds already indicated, are valuable institutions of society, just as Societies for the suppression of gambling, for taking care of the poor, for the support of orphans; and when properly managed are sources of great good. But, to say that because they are such, therefore every individual, and particularly every member of the church, is absolutely bound to join them, is absurd. As a general rule, there is no obligation at all to join them; it is a mere matter of liberty. Particular circumstances might make it the duty of an individual to join an association of this sort, just as they might make it the duty of a man to join a Masonic Order, or an Orphan Assylum Association; but will any one say that such an obligation is universal and unlimited, requiring every member of the church to become *de facto* a member of these various

orders and associations, though good in themselves? The argument that every good man is bound to aid in every good thing, and must therefore, join a Temperance Society, is absurd as an unlimited proposition. The Missionary operations of the Baptist Church are very good things; so of the Methodist; so of the Episcopal Church. Is it, therefore, the duty of a Presbyterian to join all these churches at once? A Masonic Order is a good thing. Is it, therefore, the duty of all members of the church to join it? Is it the duty of all members of the church to join an anti-gambling association? Any member may: it may be the duty of some, and the ascertainment of their obligation is wholly a personal matter. The simple fact is, it is impossible for a man to aid in every good thing; for there are so many enterprises for good, that there must be a division of labour. Any Christian is at liberty to join such a Society if he pleases, having of course, a wise reference to his other obligations and to the doctrines and policy to which he will become committed by so doing. It may be the duty of *individual Christians* to join a Temperance Society; but the ascertainment of that duty is their own individual concern: the obligation itself, is individual in its extent, and circumstantial in its grounds, and it is folly to expand into a general obligation coincident with the extent of the church, and requiring a church member *de facto* to become a member of a Temperance Society. In simple truth, as a general rule, it is purely a matter of *liberty*, and if an individual does not choose to relinquish his liberty, no one has any right to complain of it. If it had not been right to give this liberty, God would not have done it: to require it to be given up, as a permanent thing, is to impeach both the grant and the grantor of the privilege. The member of the church of God is a member of a great and divinely organized society for the suppression, not merely of one vice, but of all vices. To say he is bound to join another is, in effect, to say his obligations cannot be fully met in the other. No member of the Sons of Temperance would admit there was any *imperative general* obligation resting upon him to join an old Washingtonian Society—created alongside of his order: he would feel at liberty to do it if he pleased;

but he would at once see that an obligation of a general form to do it would be not binding, because it would be superfluous and unnecessary. These are the general maxims of Christian duty on this great subject. The *ends* which these societies have principally in view, are the same, so far as they go, with those of the church of God. They differ *in the means* of attaining them: the societies lay down the rigid maxim of total abstinence: the church lays down the general principles of the Scriptures. 'To say that the other is the best mode of reaching the evils of intemperance, is to beg an important question. We say that the advantages of this principle, in resisting the tide of intemperance, are absolutely dependant upon its being kept in the position in which it is placed by the Scriptures,—the position of a temporary, circumstantial and local, or individual principle. The very moment it is elevated into a permanent and universal principle, it is shorn of its power: the history of the Temperance reform proves it. Although it may sound strangely in the ears of the modern reformers, it is nevertheless *true*, that the doctrine of total abstinence, as an universal law, is not the most effective principle on which to resist the evils of intemperance. It is best for certain cases, nay, indispensable to them, and it is the Bible principle for meeting them: it is indispensable to the reform of the drunkard, and to the maintenance of the reformed inebriate in the ways of sobriety, but not to the virtue of all others without exception. But God's wisdom is superior to man's, and he has promulged no truth which is not better suited to its ends than any fancied improvements which man may endeavor to make upon it; and we hold that the free and unequivocal teaching of the general principles which the Bible enunciates on the duties of temperance, is far better calculated to arrest the terrible vice of drunkenness, than the advocacy of the one rigid and universal maxim of total abstinence. The history of the Temperance movement, in our judgment, proves the truth of this inference. No one feature in this great movement has been more strikingly developed than the singular want of stability which has marked its progress. The celebrated and eloquent champion of the reform, John B. Gough, is said to have stated re-

cently, in a speech in England, that of five hundred thousand persons who had taken the pledge in the last fifteen years, four hundred and fifty thousand had broken it! The various modes of action in carrying forward the scheme have shifted with remarkable rapidity. The original pledge of partial abstinence gave way to the pledge of total abstinence; the old society yielded to the Washingtonian; the Washingtonian to the order of Sons, and the existence of the order in a given locality, is, of all things, the most precarious! What is the reason of this: a question often earnestly canvassed by the noble-hearted advocates of the enterprise? The reason is this, among others, without a doubt: their doctrines have been strung up too high; they have gone on extravagant grounds; they have assumed extreme positions, and the re-action of the sober second thought of the people has carried away the misplaced foundations of their creed and policy. The sober judgment of man will not suffer him to condemn the limited and conditional right to use wine granted in the Scriptures. That sober, second thought, will infallibly settle down as its final results on the conclusions of the word of God. *Every plant which our Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up.* If it is not in the place in which he planted it, he will transfer it. Human reason, in its calmest and deepest judgment, will invariably return, like the needle to the pole, and rest on the teachings of God in his word. The sooner we learn this, as a practical rule of universal conduct, accepting at first, the lessons of revelation, the sooner we shall find our action guided by the broadest of all intellects, the most perfect of all reasons. Let the principle of total abstinence be put into its true Scriptural position, and it becomes instinct with power over the judgments and consciences of men, and is endowed with immortality. Remove it from this position, it excites suspicion of its soundness; it loses power over the intellect and conscience; it becomes a minister of evil as well as of good, and is doomed to expire in the wreck of its influence. *The weakness of God is stronger than men, and the foolishness of God is mightier by far than the wisdom of man.* It is indispensably necessary in the great agitations and conflicts

of men, that there should be a constant recurrence to original principles. If no allowance is thus practically made for the weakness and infirmities of human nature, qualities which insensibly and inevitably will urge him into some false position, particularly on a point of controversy, and in the heat of debate,—if no recurrence is made to original principles it will be impossible to ascertain the existence or degree of the deflection from the line of truth. In the vehemence of their conflict with the evils of intemperance, when their hearts are full of a realizing sense of the wretchedness it entails on the life of man, there is a powerful tendency operating on the minds of the advocates of total abstinence as an universal law, to take extreme ground, and to forget the moderation of truth and the principles of the word of God. It is so much easier to advocate the application of a single maxim which seems to reach the whole case, than to draw the distinctions and define the *principles* which are set forth in the Scriptures, there is a powerful temptation to choose the first of these as the policy to be pursued. This is greatly aided by the fear that the people cannot be made to comprehend these principles and distinctions, that the single maxim will be more effective, and that it will soonest accomplish the end. But these views are too partial: we are still satisfied that the word of God has enunciated the grounds which are best and safest in the end. It may take more labour to expound them; they may be more susceptible of perversion; but they are the only principles upon which the sober and deliberate judgment of men will ultimately rest. What the maxim of total and universal abstinence gains by cutting off the necessity for the discrimination of principles, and in its immediate effect, it loses by not meeting the real demands of the reason of man, and of the revelation of God. In the long run, at the close of the immense experiments which are now going on, it will be seen clearly on this as well as on other great topics of social welfare, that the lessons of the Bible, taken in the simplest and most direct teachings of that wonderful book, are the lessons of the deepest philosophy, the purest wisdom, the most extensive benevolence, and the most permanent application.

We would say in conclusion, we do hope that none will pervert the teachings of this review. If they do, they will do it at their peril; for they are the teachings of the word of God. If any harm comes from them, it can only be because they are perverted from their true implications, and for this, he who perverts them is alone responsible. Indeed, so great is the fear of many persons of wisdom and excellence, that such perversions would be made, that they cannot agree to the propriety of a perfectly direct and unequivocal statement of the real teachings of the Bible on this subject. But, this only reminds us that human wisdom and virtue are not infallible. The conditions under which the voice of God is not to be heard on questions like this, are excessively rare in occurrence, and of very brief duration when they occur. We have no apology to make for an unequivocal and complete statement of what He has been pleased to state on this issue. He has made it the duty of his ministers to declare his counsel fearlessly, and we dare not suppress it. We had infinitely rather encounter the responsibility of being an *occasion* of evil by reason of the infirmity or wickedness of man in perverting the truth, than the responsibility of violating the first duty of the ministerial office, and either silencing, or incompletely re-echoing the voice of God on the issues on which he has chosen to speak in his word. If he has seen fit to enunciate these principles, we can see no reason why we should impeach the propriety of his doctrine,—why we should be either ashamed to receive, or afraid to avow them.

ARTICLE VI.

MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

Discourses on Truth, by Dr. Thornwell, President of the South Carolina College.

These discourses, seven in number, form a neat little volume of 328 pages. They were "preached in the or-
VOL. IX.—No. 1. 8

dinary routine of the author's ministrations, as Chaplain of the South Carolina College." "The structure of the sermons may be explained by the circumstance, that the author sustains the double office in the College, of a preacher of the gospel, and a teacher of moral philosophy." This work is a clear and lucid exposition of some of the fundamental principles of moral philosophy. They are, evidently, the result of that profound and original thought, by which alone a subject can be properly mastered. Few subjects require more deep and varied thought than that of moral philosophy. From the time of Aristotle to the present, philosophers, both ancient and modern, have found here an ample field of effort for all their logical powers. And from the time of the Stoics and Epicureans, different schools have attempted to maintain their respective theories. It is not our object, however, to notice these; but to call attention to the work before us as connected with the education of youth. The question, what should education embrace, has been nowhere more fully discussed than in this country. From time to time, laboured articles have appeared in our Reviews, discussing the subject of education, and presenting the merits of various systems, both in this country and Europe. So far as science is concerned, we shall at present, say nothing, but content ourselves with a presentation of some general principles, having an intimate bearing upon the general character of education. Great efforts have been made, not only to exclude the Bible from public schools, but to exclude its revealed truths from a connection with the subject of moral philosophy. And writers have attempted to establish systems of philosophy, independent of the Bible. We do not mean to say that this cannot be done. We do not mean to undervalue the light of nature. A man may find his way by star-light, but certainly much better by sun-light. Infidelity prefers darkness rather than light. But, there is no greater disgrace to Christians, having the same Bible and a common Christianity, than to permit themselves, through sectarian jealousy, to be made the tools of infidelity in excluding the influences of religion from the education of youth. Man, as a being to be educated, may be considered—

1. *As an Intellectual,*
2. *A Moral,*
3. *A Religious being.*

He has intellectual, moral and religious faculties. A true education is the *harmonious development* of these. This social position, the well-being of society, to say nothing of his own happiness, both in time and eternity, require such an education. It seems to be generally supposed, that education should be confined to the cultivation of the intellectual faculties. This is most pernicious heresy: It is sufficiently refuted by the whole tenor of Dr. Thornwell's book. To this point, however, we would devote a few considerations.

The fact, that man is constituted with the above named faculties, ought of itself, to be a sufficient indication of the manner in which he should be educated. This fact, however, may be called in question by superficial thinkers. It may be denied that he is a moral and religious being by nature. If it be asked, what is the proof, we reply the fact that, and equally as conclusive as that which proves him to be an intellectual being. If we are asked for a proof of the latter, we refer to his works of art and science, to all his displays of intellect. If asked for the proof that there is a moral being, we refer to the various systems and codes of moral philosophy, to all his exhibitions, ~~whether~~ in language or action; of moral qualities. If asked for a proof, that he is naturally a religious being, we refer to the temples and altars he has reared, to the sacrifices offered, to the Gods worshipped, to the systems of religion, and the religious feelings displayed in every age and country. For the question is not, whether these religious and moral faculties have been properly directed, but whether they exist. If this proof be denied, then we deny the proof offered to establish his intellectual character. And then, education becomes an absurdity. Admit the proof, and then it follows, that to educate and develop the intellectual faculties, and at the same time, to neglect to educate and develop the moral and religious faculties, is absurd. Such a system of education is not in accordance with the constitution of man,—is at war with the glory of God and the best interests of society.

For what purpose are youth educated? What interest has the State in education? Evidently to make men more useful and better citizens. But the vices, the crimes and follies that afflict society, are not so much the offspring of ignorance as they are of immorality and irreligion. It is true, that statistics show a diminution of crime, as connected with education. But this is owing to the fact in part, that moral and religious influence has never been entirely separated from intellectual training; and partly to the fact that the more intelligent men become, they avoid more carefully the crimes that would conduct them to the jail or penitentiary. The leaders of the French Revolution were not deficient in intellectual education. They were the philosophers and statesmen of the time. Intellectually, they were great, but utterly destitute of either morality or religion. They were monsters of vice and cruelty.

One set of faculties may be cultivated to the neglect of others, and the result is a defective character. Thus, the religious faculties may be exercised till nothing satisfies the individual but religious excitement, and for the want of intellectual and moral training the individual may pay little regard to moral duties, and withal, be extremely superstitious and bigoted. The extraordinary religious excitements, that occurred in the early part of the present century, the extravagance and folly that attended them, gave ample proof of the existence and power of the religious faculties, and of the necessity of being guided by the intellectual faculties.

The objection usually urged against religious instruction in our academies and colleges, is, that it leads to sectarianism; that it is establishing religion; that it is unconstitutional, &c. It seems almost like a waste of time to reply to such miserable cant. As to sectarianism, it is the best means to prevent it. If we exclude all religion, we establish infidelity and atheism, the very worst of all sects. If we teach the evidences of Christianity, its precepts and its great and leading doctrines received, acknowledged and taught by all true Christians, excluding the peculiarities of sects, we are making liberal and enlightened Christians; we are dissipating ignorance, expelling sectarian bigotry and promoting

love and charity. And surely, the grand and sublime doctrines of the gospel common to all Christians, and its pure and holy precepts, are sufficient to furnish an ample field for the instruction of youth, without interfering with the peculiarities of sects. Expel religion from public institutions and you expel the students. Sectarian institutions will grow up from necessity, and education become emphatically sectarian. Institutions will be multiplied at a great cost to the community, while the standard of education will be lowered.

As before observed, man is a religious being. To exercise his religious faculties is as necessary to him as to exercise his intellectual. If there be any who boast of having no religious feelings, they are exceptions to the general rule, just as idiots are in the intellectual world. If there be some who, disgusted with the abuse of the religious faculties, discard religion, so there are others, who, disgusted with the results of a defective education, discard it as an evil. The one reasons no better than the other. We regard it, therefore, as of the greatest importance, that moral and religious training should, in every institution, be put on the same footing with intellectual training. To the neglect of this in the family, in the primary schools, and in our colleges, is to be attributed chiefly, if not entirely, that irregularity of life, that corruption of morals and dissipation, so often destructive of youth, the source of sorrow to parents, and disappointment to friends. If we have properly described the constitution of man, what else could be expected from such gross violations of it, as the neglect of his moral and religious faculties? Intellectual development, without moral and religious restraint, may make a devil, but can never make an angel. And what, after all, is the chief end of man? It is to glorify God and enjoy him forever. And this is the end for which he is endowed with all his faculties. Of his religious faculties, God is the proper object; of his moral faculties, the creatures of God, of his intellectual faculties, everything that is subservient to the proper direction of his religious and moral faculties. These latter are of themselves blind, instinctive, propelling powers, implanted in his constitution for the highest and noblest of all purposes.

Without these, he would be destitute of moral or religious responsibility. And yet, without the intellectual powers to guide them, they could not answer their purpose. It is the combination of these that makes man what he is. By the exercise of the intellectual powers, he arrives at a knowledge of God, reads his character in his word and works, becomes acquainted with his own nature and condition, his relation to God, to the external world, and to his fellow-man. By these, he is enabled to understand his duties to God and man, while his religious and moral faculties serve to lead him in the path which his intellect prescribes, or scourge him for his rebellion.

This leads us to offer some remarks upon a subject which, more than any other, seems to have perplexed theologians, metaphysicians, and moral philosophers. We allude to the subject of *conscience*. Paley denied the existence of such a faculty. Nor is it strange that he fell into such a blunder, having included in his definition of it, functions that belong to the intellectual faculties. Chalmers, Whewell, McCosh, Harris, and other able writers, have undertaken to explain its office, and have made many valuable remarks upon its nature and its office. Still, all is not clear. The prevalent error seems to result from confounding the intellectual and moral faculties, or rather their functions. To speak of conscience as perceiving the distinction of right and wrong, is to attribute to it that which belongs to the intellect. Dr. Thornwell has very properly said, "There can, consequently, be no progress in virtue beyond the merest elements, or primary dicta of our moral constitution without progress in knowledge. Knowledge is as essential to responsibility as conscience." But we are not so certain that he is correct when he speaks of "the decisions of conscience," (p. 68.) The "decisions" belong to the intellectual faculties, the *feeling* of right and wrong to the moral. If the intellectual mislead, conscience will not correct the error. When Saul of Tarsus was a persecutor, he acted in ignorance, and conscience approved. Allied to conscience is that sensitive emotion that causes the young lady to blush. It is not necessary that she should violate the rules of propriety to

induce the emotion. It is sufficient that her intellect creates the suspicion of such a violation. Conscience is the *feeling* of the moral faculties, acting in concert with the intellectual perceptions of right and wrong; the latter being the occasions of its action. In like manner, the religious faculties do not determine what is true or false in religion. This, in religion, as well as in morals, is the province of the intellect. Hence, to enlighten, is the first operation of the Holy Spirit, and to *teach* is the first duty of the evangelist. This is a truth sadly overlooked. Preaching is too often regarded as something distinct from teaching. To excite the religious feelings, and not to enlighten, is too often the aim of the preacher. Many do not seem to know that the religious feelings may be excited to the utmost without any perception of converting and sanctifying truth. The most remarkable cases of religious phrenzy are known to exist among the heathen. And among Christians, the most extraordinary excitements are not attended with the most happy results. The mere excitement of the religious faculties is no evidence of the Holy Spirit's influence. The Holy Spirit operates through truth. We are saved by faith,—through a belief of the truth. A full exposition of this subject would be of great service to the cause of religion.

We cannot, in justice, leave this subject, without making some remarks upon the term *faculties*. What are we to understand by this term? Says Dr. Thornwell, p. 67, "Our faculties, which are only convenient names for the various operations of a simple and indivisible substance, derive their appellation, not from the specific differences of the objects about which they are employed, but from their general nature." We admit that the mind is "a simple and individual substance." But beyond this there lies an abstruse question. Are these "various operations" performed through one and the same instrumentality, or different instrumentalities? If through the latter, is the term *faculties* to be applied to these operations, or to the instrumentalities through which they are carried on? What may be the nature of mind in itself, and what the inherent difference in different minds, apart from the organization with which they

are at present clothed, and which serves as the medium of their connection with the external world, and of their present manifestation, we know not. Of this much, however, we feel confident, that mind is distinct from matter, and that its powers of manifestation are dependent upon, and measured by, the organization which serves as the medium and instrumentality of its manifestation. Let this organization be defective,—let the eyes be sealed, or the ears stopped, and the power of mental manifestation is proportionally limited. Every part of the body is made an instrument of the mind.—Every limb and nerve and muscle, is subservient to its purposes. Through this organization, it both acts and is acted upon. “So intimate is the union between the mind and the body, that a slight derangement of the latter will often impede the exercise of the former, or fill it with groundless apprehensions: while grief, expectation, or profound attention, will render the body insensible to its ordinary wants. According to Liebig, every conception, every mental affection is followed by changes in the chemical nature of the secreted fluids. Form and features often impart a character to the mind, and a bias to the life; on the other hand, the mental and moral character often impress themselves on some part of the outward form. Aristotle treated at some length on the shades of the hair, the form of the features, the complexion, and of the different parts of the body, as indicative of particular temperaments and mental characteristics. Indeed, it is on the assumption of the conformity between the soul and the body, that cheiromancy, physiognomy, and phrenology, have, at different times, essayed to take the rank of sciences. And, so intimate is the moral nature of man with the other parts of his constitution, that conscience has been represented at different times as a modification of nearly every one of these parts; duty has been based on considerations derived from each; and virtue and utility, though essentially distinct, regarded as ultimately one. “The coincidence of morality with individual interest, is an important truth in ethics.” Now, these are only some of the more obvious relations existing between the continuous parts of his nature, yet no mind, except that of the

Infinite, can comprehend the number which they potentially comprise. But each of these again, is associated with all the rest, by relations more subtle and complicated still, so that no part can be touched, but the whole being vibrates in sympathy." See *Man Primeval*, by Harris, chap. vii., pp. 213, 214, Am. ed. To what conclusion do all these considerations lead? Evidently to this, that such is the intimate union of the mind and body, that the developement and manifestation of the one, is connected with that of the other; and the organization of the body is a wonderful display of wisdom, in adapting so great a variety of instruments to the various purposes of the mind in this world. Thus, the five senses are so many different adaptations of organs to the external world. And in the human system, so "fearfully and wonderfully formed," each varied function of the mind appears to have its own appropriate instrument. And what are moral and religious *feelings*, but so many *internal senses*, just as hearing, seeing, etc., may be denominated *external senses*? And why should they not have their own appropriate organs as well as the external senses? Why not one general plan pervade the whole? Why the incongruity, involved in the supposition that internal operations of the mind have no appropriate organs and instruments, while each operation of the mind, through the external senses, has its own appropriate organ? What has the unity, immateriality or immortality of the mind, to do with the one theory more than the other? And may not an inference from analogy, that it is so, have given rise to the use of the term *faculties*? And would it not be more correct to apply the term *faculties* to the organs or instruments, than to their operations? It is thus we speak of the external senses. This view of the subject adds greatly to the evidence of religion. For if the moral and religious senses have their appropriate organs, there is the same evidence that man is formed to be moral and religious, as there is that he is formed to see, hear, feel, smell and taste. And as these senses all have their appropriate objects, so must the moral and religious faculties have theirs. If the God of the Bible be not the appropriate object of the religious faculties, we may fairly challenge the infidel to

tell us what is. To boast of having no religious sense or feeling, is as great a folly, as to boast of being deaf, blind, or idiotic. It is the folly of the fool glorying in his shame. This subject opens a wide field for discussion, but one, which, however interesting, we must dismiss for the present.

Although in some minor points, we may differ from the author, we hail with the highest degree of satisfaction a work which inculcates upon the young men of the College so high and holy a standard of morals, exposing so clearly the fallacies and dangers of false systems, and establishing so logically and forcibly the great fundamental principles of sound Christian morals. It is impossible for the young men who have been favoured with such instruction, not to be both wiser and better. The influence of such lessons will descend to future generations. Delivered in the chief seat of learning, they will impress their influence upon the character of the State. Happy would it be for this great congregation of nations, if such an influence pervaded every seat of learning. It would give us high-minded, honest and honourable statesmen, a high-minded and honourable people, capable of exercising and maintaining their liberties, of enlarging and perpetuating the blessings of free government. To be deprived of such instructions in the College, we would regard as the greatest calamity that could befall the State.

These Lectures are a model of the moral and religious instruction which we insist upon as a necessary part of education. Free from sectarianism, they exhibit clearly and forcibly the great and fundamental doctrines of Christianity: They inculcate the pure and sublime morality of the Bible, and avail themselves of its high and holy sanctions. All other systems of morality are weak and worthless; weak, because they want authority, and worthless, because they are without adequate sanctions.

One other point we must not pass by. It is the importance of such religious and moral instruction to the good government and discipline of our Colleges. And from no one does it come so appropriately as from him who is at the head of the institution. It clothes him with a moral influence which is felt in every act of discipline. His pre-

sence confounds the guilty, and his example inspires those around him with the highest and noblest aspirations.

Here we had intended to close this hasty and imperfect notice of Dr. Thornwell's book. For, as before said, we did not set out to write a review of it, nor to write an essay on Moral Philosophy; but simply to call attention to it in connection with the subject of education.— But since writing the above, the Letters of Professor Barnard, (then of Tuscaloosa, now of Mississippi College,) on the subject of "*College Government*," have fallen into our hands. And since we have mentioned the importance of religious and moral instruction to the good government and discipline of our Colleges, the reader will pardon us for making a few additional remarks on the subject of College government.

For many years the government and management of youth of both sexes, have occupied the greater portion of our time, and employed a large share of our thoughts. And if success should inspire confidence in the correctness of our views, we need not fear to avow them.— Principles founded in philosophy, and confirmed by experiment, may be deemed correct.

That there are defects in our system of College government, is generally admitted, and must be so long as there are out-breaks and rebellions. With Dr. Wayland and Professor Barnard, we agree that the system is defective; but as to the remedy, we disagree. Professor Barnard correctly observes, "Our collegiate system is an attempted imitation of that which was instituted at Oxford and Cambridge, by the monkish lecturers of the middle ages, founded mainly upon the principle of the monastery; but the imitation is unfortunately complete only in the least desirable of its features, while it is deficient in most of the safe-guards originally designed to secure it against abuses. In those venerable universities of Great Britain just mentioned, every college is a quadrangle, securely walled in, with a janitor always at the door, and with a definite hour for shutting in the entire community by bar and bolt. Within the same architectural pile reside not only the governed, but all the members of the governing body, from the President (master) down to the numerous 'fellows,' one of whose duties it

is to aid the authorities in the preservation of order.—The whole college body, moreover, not only reside under one roof, but dine together at one table; so that, in all save the religious aspect, the distinguishing features of the monastic family are kept conspicuously prominent to this day.”—Letter III. To complete the picture, it ought to be stated that “our collegiate system” was instituted under despotic governments, maintained, not by walls and bars and bolts only, but by soldiers armed with bristling bayonets. Kings and Barons dwelt in palaces secured by walls, bars and bolts, guarded by an armed soldiery. And to this day, the American traveller in Europe is disgusted at the military evidences of despotic government. Is it strange that a system of College government, borrowed from despotic governments, should work badly in the midst, and under the influence of our republican principles? And what is the remedy proposed by Dr. Wayland and Professor Barnard? They both agree that the steward’s hall or commons should be abolished. That, as far as it goes, may all be well; and yet it may not be necessary. Professor Barnard proposes to abolish the dormitory system, and to locate all our colleges in the heart of our large cities. To this there are some strong objections.

1. The great expense of private boarding and living in our large cities, the many temptations to extravagance in dress, to the waste of time in idle amusements, shows, theatres, etc., are serious objections. Such would be the expense, that large numbers would be excluded from the benefits of education. The policy in this country has always been, to secure the best possible education at the least possible expense, securing its advantages to the greatest possible number.

2. It has been taken for granted, that the evils of the present system have their origin in the dormitory system. But, how far is this true? Professor Barnard says, “The college is a sanctuary which the civil power may not invade. It is an *imperium in imperio*, within whose confines no municipal functionary may venture to set his foot. It is a community shut out with more than Japanese seclusion from the surrounding social world; and subject, in its members, to none of those restraining

influences, by which public opinion bears upon the conduct of the individuals who make up the society to which man is born, and to which the student himself must at length return.”—Letter III. And yet the Professor says, in his second Letter, “It is my candid opinion that our colleges have themselves chiefly to thank, for the extent to which their powers of government are paralyzed by the influence of surrounding public opinion.” Upon whom does this “surrounding public opinion” act, to paralyze the government of the college, if it be not upon the students? And why is not this “surrounding public opinion” as powerful to render effectual as to paralyze the college government?

The truth is, neither Dr. Wayland, nor the Professor, has sufficiently analyzed this matter of college government. Some evils there doubtless are, connected with the dormitory system, but the removal of this is neither a necessary nor an adequate remedy. And the proposed remedy of removing our colleges to the heart of large cities, is not only a very costly, but a very doubtful experiment. The present practice of locating colleges did not originate in a mere poetical imagination, and has not been kept up by mere precedent. Solid and substantial reasons have operated upon the minds of men in this, as well as in other matters. But what, you may ask, is the remedy? This we propose to answer in general terms. Every government must, to succeed, be adapted to the governed. In despotic governments, college government may, perhaps ought, to be despotic; the legislative, the judicial, and the executive power being in the same hands.

In republican or domestic governments, college government should be democratic to whatever extent the students are capable of exercising self-government.—Does any object that the young men of our colleges are utterly incapable of self-government? I answer, fearlessly, that *they are* capable of it. Are we to be told that the best educated part of society are not as capable of self-government as the great mass of society, with its great amount of ignorance and corruption? And what higher and nobler specimen of self-government can the world present, than may be established among our

educated young men, aided and guided by all the ability and experience of a competent College Faculty? And what could furnish a better field for their moral training? Here, indeed, would be an "*imperium in imperio*," in which there would be a public opinion of its own, well nigh omnipotent, every one, a party, conscious of his responsibility, not only to the mighty public opinion within, but to the "surrounding public opinion" without. In such an "*imperium in imperio*," there is no escape for the guilty; and treason is eternal disgrace. Under such a system factions and rebellions would never occur. We know what we assert. We make these assertions after full, fair and repeated trials with young men and boys of all ages and sizes. That the numbers were not as great as they are in our colleges, is true. But the principles and mode will apply as well to one thousand as to twenty, thirty, forty, fifty or any other number. We hold the matter to be demonstrated by experiment. We admit that the experiment of self-government among young men, might be made and fail through the incompetency of the undertaker; that some are born to govern while others never could succeed. But it cannot be maintained that the young men of our colleges are not sufficiently enlightened for self-government. If it be urged that their passions and feelings makes them too impulsive, we reply that they have feelings and impulses equally as powerful for the preservation as for the destruction of self-government; that self-confidence has its antagonism in diffidence and so on throughout the elements of humanity.

Let now a proper cultivation of the moral and religious feelings be brought to bear upon the responsibility of self-government, aided and guided by the wisdom and experience of a competent faculty, and we venture that this college "*imperium in imperio*," may be made to present one of the most perfect models of self-government in the world, and one of the most complete schools for moral training that can be devised; and, at the same time, one in most perfect accordance with our republican institutions. We care nothing about the dormitory system. We should not ask the faculty to play the part of both professors and police officers. We would re-

quire no "*exculpation law*." There would never be an array of the faculty on one side and the students on the other. The culprit would stand alone, arraigned and condemned by both; a position which none could bear but the most abandoned.

The history of all out-breaks, in both academies and colleges, proves, that, in all cases, they result from combinations formed against the governing power, which could never happen, if the students themselves formed part and parcel of the government. We well remember the scenes which occurred in the campus; (So. Ca. College,) when in the beautiful moonlight nights of spring or autumn, the idle and thoughtless, eager for sport, came mounted on their chargers, fantastically disguised, with tin trumpets gleaming in the moonlight, like the warrior's burnished steel, while the sound of the trumpets rang like that of the rams horns before the walls of Jerico. The first object to be accomplished was to draw out the Faculty. Without this, it was all a one-sided business. No enemy, no battle, no feats of chivalry, no daring deeds to recount. The Faculty became part and parcel of the sport, and yet strange, they never seemed to discover how essentially necessary their part of the game was to the sport of the boys. And what did all their efforts thus to suppress it accomplish? When religion lost its influence within the college walls, what could be expected under such a system of government? And although the same system of government essentially exists, how great has been the difference under the present able and efficient administration; showing how vastly important sound morals, and liberal and enlightened views of true religion are to the good government of colleges, as well as of all other societies. We regret that Dr. Thornwell has resigned his position in the college. The fewest number of men combine so eminently, the various qualifications necessary to fill his station. To be gifted with those talents which fascinate youth, that capacity for instructing that never fails to enlighten and allure; that high-minded and enlightened piety which inspires confidence and respect, that wisdom and prudence which is equal to every emergency, that "*fortiter in re*" which maintains authority, that "*suaviter in*

modo" which never fails to conciliate, those high attainments which enlarge the thoughts of youth, and that zeal and energy that inspire the young with a similar spirit in the pursuit of knowledge and virtue, falls to the lot of few. And unfortunately for the world, Boards of Trustees, who, more or less, are compelled to rely upon recommendations, which have become, in our day, props for the lame, plasters to conceal sores, or certificates to palm off humbugs, are too often deceived. Not the most competent, but the most eager for place, are likely to be appointed.

ARTICLE VII.

ROMANISM AT HOME.

"Devocionario Sagrado de los privilegios, gracias, y glorias Del Padre Putativo de Jesus y Esposo de Maria El Santisimo.: Patriarca Senor S. José Compatrono de Cadiz. Dispuesto por el Dr. D. Fr. Romero Presbytero de Cadiz. Paris Libreria De Rosa Mexico— Libreria De Galvan, 1840."

We found a book with the above title in a book-store in Monterey, Mexico, in the year 1846, and were devoutly recommended to read its holy pages.

We propose to give a few extracts from it, and to make such comments as these extracts may suggest, so that our readers may see what Romanism is at home, in its own country.

The book, it will be seen, is a re-print in the city of Mexico, of the Paris edition, and is from the pen of Dr. Romero, a well-known authority in the Catholic church. The little volume contains 157 pages, and is known in Mexico as a *Septenario*; *i. e.* each principal division is subdivided into seven sections. The author gives us this most satisfactory reason for such an arrangement. "The number seven is a very *plausible* number in grace, in nature, and in art; in Heaven, and

on earth; among angels and among men; even with God himself. This number is peculiar to Saint Joseph, because in it, are comprehended his principal mysteries, seven of Grief, and seven of Delight."

This lucid explanation must convince the most fault-finding reader, of the practical good sense, manifested by Dr. Romero in the plausible plan of his Septenary. In the execution of his pleasing idea, the astute Doctor devotes the first chapter to the seven Grievances and seven Delights of Saint Joseph, and closes with an offering (o frecimiento) and a Letter of Slavery (Carta De Esclavitud) to Señor Saint Joseph.

But the learned author was not willing to confine the carrying out of his charming conceit to a single chapter. He gives us also, seven prayers for the 19th of March, the birth-day of the Saint; seven prayers for the patronage day (dia del patrocinio) of the Saint; seven prayers to commemorate the espousals of Joseph and Mary, &c.

Some specimens, selected almost at random, from the book, as it now lies before us, will give a pretty correct idea of Catholic worship in a Catholic country.

We begin with the fifth Grief and Delight of Saint Joseph.

QUINTO.

José amadisimo, yo pobre pecador te acompaño en el Dolor, que padeciste al ordenarte el Angel salir para Egypto huyendo de Herodes, cruel Tirano, por las incomodidades que habia de padecer, tu Divina Esposa en el camino, y las inclemencias del tiempo, que habian de afligir á Jesus, por ser tan Niño; pero me gozo con el consuelo, que tuviste de ver caer en tierra los Idolos al entrar en Egypto, nuestro salvador.

Haz, Padre mio, que tenga á mis superiores rendida obediencia, y que con exactitud guarde la Ley Divina. Amen. Pater Nost. y Ave Maria.

VOL. IX.—No. 1.

FIFTE.

Most loved Joseph, I a poor sinner sympathize with thee in the Grief which thou sufferedst when the Angel ordered thee to set out for Egypt, to fly from the cruel tyrant Herod, on account of the inconveniences which your Divine Spouse must needs suffer on the way, and on account of the inclemency of the weather, which must needs afflict Jesus, being such a mere child. But I rejoice at the consolation which you felt, at seeing the Idols fall to the ground on the entrance of our Saviour into Egypt.

Grant, my Father, that I may render due obedience to my su-

periors, and that I may guard with exactitude the Divine Law. Amen. Our Father. Hail Mary.

Voz. Gloria à la Trinidad del Cielo.

Voice. Glory to the Trinity of Heaven.

Responsa. Honra à la Trinidad de la Tierra.

Response. Honor to the Trinity of Earth.

The Evangelist Matthew says nothing of the tumbling down of the Egyptian Idols, at the entrance of our Saviour into the land of Isis and Osiris. We are much indebted to Dr. Romero for supplying the omission. The Scriptures are equally silent about a Trinity of Earth. But we presume that Rome, and not the excellent Señor Romero, is to be thanked for this dogma. For, in the many cathedrals and churches that we visited, and in the hundreds of houses that we entered in all parts of Mexico, we recollect no instance of not seeing either an oil-painting or an engraving of this Earthly Trinity. Rude wood cuts of Joseph, Mary and Jesus, are sold by thousands in the streets of all the villages, towns and cities. The beggar asks alms for the sake of Joseph, Mary and Jesus. The criminal deprecates justice by an appeal to the same personages. The sick pray for restoration to health in the name of the same holy Three. Yea, so intimately are the Reputed Father, Mother and Son connected in the minds of the people in our sister Republic, that it is no uncommon thing to hear the names of Jesus, Maria and José applied to the members of a family.— Sometimes, too, parents carry their religious zeal so far as to give two of the names of the Trinity of Earth to one of their children. We have seen many a man who was called José Maria, (Joseph Mary.)

It may not be amiss to mention that the ascription of praise to the Trinity of Earth occurs seven times in the first Septenary. Well did the most excellent Doctor say, "The number seven is a very plausible number."

CARTA DE ESCLAVITUD.

LETTER OF SERVITUDE.

O José, Padre y Señor mio, yo N. N. prostrado à vuestros pies me ofresco y constituyo por

O Joseph, my Father and Lord, I, N. N. prostrate at your feet offer myself and constitute

Esclavo vuestro, como lo soy de Jesus Sacramentado, y de Maria santissima concebida sin culpa original, en el primar instante de su ser, para que asi tenga siempre en mi corazon, à todos tres Señores, Jesus, Maria, y José, y en señal de esta esclavitud os pagaré Dulcísimo Padre y Señor mio, el tributo diario, rezando siete veces, el Padre nuestro y Ave Maria, &c.

myself your slave, as I am that of the sacramented Jesus and of Mary, Most Holy, conceived without any original sin, in the first instant of her Being, so that I may always thus hold in my heart, all three Lords, Jesus, Mary and Joseph, and in sign of this servitude, I will pay you, Most sweet Father, and my Lord, daily tribute, reciting seven times, the Pater Noster and Ave Maria, &c.

The plausible number seven comes up again in this offering of Señor N. N. to the Most Sweet Joseph. The Señor evidently belongs to the order of Franciscans, since he believes in the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary.

Some of our newspapers have fallen into the strange error of supposing that the recent Bull of the Pope promulgates a new dogma. So far from this being so, a deadly feud has existed between the Dominicans and Franciscans for several hundred years, in reference to the very question, which the Holy Father has attempted so lately to settle. The Order of St. Francis prevails in the Mexican Republic, and it is no uncommon thing to see written over the church doors: "Let no one enter here who does not believe in the Immaculate Conception of the Most Holy Virgin." The same inscription is sometimes found over the arch-ways leading into the Courts of Haciendas.

OFRECIMIENTO.

O José Santísimo, hijo del Eterno Padre, Padre legal del Hijo, substituto del Espiritu Santo, Esposo de Maria Purísima, obedecido de Jesus, respetado de Maria, Tutor de Jesus, florida vara de virtudes, Tesorero del Arca viva de la Gracia, Mediano de los hombres para con Dios, y abrazado ethna de a-

OFFERING.

O Most Holy Joseph, son of the Eternal Father, legal Father of the Son, substitute of the Holy Spirit. Husband of Mary Most Pure, obeyed by Jesus, respected by Mary. Tutor of Jesus, budding (flourishing,) rod of virtue, Treasurer of the living Ark of grace, Mediator between men and God, and burning flame of

mor à Jesus, y a Maria Santisima, amparo de pobres, remedio de los tentades, guia de los que caminan, protector de los que navegan, salud de los enfermos, y Patron universal de los Christianos; alcanzanos, pues eres tan poderoso delante de Dios, buena vida, y buena muerte. Amen. Jesus, Maria y José.

love to Jesus and Mary Most Holy, shelter of the poor, remedy of those who are tempted, guide of those who travel by land, protector of those who navigate, health of the sick, and universal Patron of Christians, grant unto us, since you are so powerful before God, a good life and a good death. Amen. Jesus, Mary and Joseph.

No comments are needed upon this remarkable offering. The offices of the Holy Spirit and Mediator are here plainly attributed to a frail worm of the dust. Joseph is made more than one of the Trinity of Earth. He is made to assume the functions of Two of the Triune Deity.

In the second chapter, page 30, we have the following prayer:

ORACION.

O José Santisimo, par estas felicidades que gozaste viviendo, te pedimos nos defiendas de tempestades, rayos y terre motos, dandonos buenos temporales, para que se logren los frutos de la tierra, favoriciendonos en todas nuestras necesidades, tu proteccion y patrocinio. Amen. Jesus Maria, y José.

PRAYER.

O Most Holy Joseph, by these felicities, which thou didst enjoy in this life, we pray thee that thou wilt defend us against tempests, lightnings and earthquakes, giving us temporal success, so that we may obtain the fruits of the earth, favoring us in all of our necessities, with thy protection and thy patronage. Amen. Jesus, Mary and Joseph.

This wonderful prayer contains seven petitions. Truly, the number seven is a very plausible number.

Again, in the third chapter, we have seven prayers and seven doxologies to the Trinity of Earth.

We subjoin a few extracts:

ORACION PRIMERA.

Patron Gloriosisimo, Señor S. José: pues el Todo Poderoso os elevó á ser honra de su Santisimo

FIRST PRAYER.

Most Glorious Patron, Señor St. Joseph: since the Almighty has elevated you to be the hon-

mo Nombre, y os hizo Patrono de la Militante Iglesia, y depositó en vos el tesoro de los Divinos Dones, &c.

our of his Most Holy Name, and made you the Patron of the Church Militant, and has placed in you the treasury of Divine gifts, &c.

The invocation in the fourth prayer is still more remarkable :

CUARTA ORACION.

Patron Gloriosísimo Señor S. José: pues vuestro admirable nombre en lengua Egypciana significa Salvador del mundo, &c. &c.

FOURTH PRAYER.

Most Glorious Patron, Señor St. Joseph: since your admirable name in the Egyptian tongue signifies the Saviour of the world, &c. &c.

The third chapter contains like the other two, seven prayers. One of these is quite curious :

SESTA ORACION.

Castísimo José, mil placemes os doy porque tuvisteis por esposa aquella Aguila grande que remonto su vuelo hasta el Desierto, y quebrantó con sus planas la Serpiente, que queria tragarse al Hijo, que tenia en su vientre, quien, cual pelicano amoroso, nos habia de redimir alimentar con su preciosa Sangre: per este privilegio, os suplico me alcanceis que purificada mi alma con la sangre del Pelicano Jesus, levante con las alas de vuestra proteccion el vuelo desde el desierto del mundo hasta llegar à la gloria. Amen. Pater nost. y Ave Maria.

SIXTH PRAYER.

Most Chaste Joseph, I give unto you a thousand congratulations upon having taken to wife that great Eagle, which carried its flight even to the Desert and destroyed (broke,) with its talons the Serpent which wished to swallow up the Son that she had in her womb, who, like a loving pelican, had to redeem and nourish us with his precious blood: for this privilege I supplicate you that it may be granted unto me that my soul, being purified with the blood of the Pelican Jesus, may raise its flight upon the wing of your protection from the desert of this world until it attain unto glory. Amen. Our Father and Hail Mary.

The specimens go on increasing in richness throughout the book, but the foregoing will suffice to show what sort of devotions Catholics are accustomed to use in their own country.

ARTICLE VII.

INTRODUCTION TO PAUL'S EPISTLES,

By Johann Friedrich von Flatt, D. D., Professor of Theology in Tübingen. Translated from the German.

Concerning Paul's Epistles in General.

I. Short Review of the Life and Character of Paul.

Life of Paul—

(a) His native town, his parents and his Roman citizenship.

Paul was "born in Tarsus."—(Acts xxii: 3; xxi: 39; ix: 11. We must regard as incorrect, the tradition which Jerome adduces *de scriptor, ecclesiast.* "*Natum fuisse Paulum Gischali, oppido Judaeae, quo a Romanis capto, totaque provincia vastato cum dispergerentur Judaei, cum parentibus suis Tarsum Ciliciae commigrasse.*")

If there is at the bottom of this theory any truth at all, then it is, perhaps, this, that Paul's parents dwelt first at Giscalis in Judea, and removed from that place to Tarsus in Cilicia, before the birth of Paul. But of course, this cannot be received as certain.

"His native city was a flourishing seat of philosophy and polite literature." Strabo (l. xiv.) says, that Tarsus in this respect, disputed the palm with Athens and Alexandria, and that even Rome was indebted to Tarsus for its very distinguished teachers. It is certain from Acts xxii., that Paul was a Roman citizen by birth. But whether that citizenship was a special hereditary prerogative of his family, or whether at that time all the citizens of Tarsus had a title to the burghership of Rome cannot be decided. (Vide Witsii meletem, p. 4, &c. Mori praelect. in acta apost. ad act. 22, 28.

"He was born of Jewish parents," and indeed, of such as were not proselytes but native Jews.—Phil. iii: 5; 2 Cor. ii: 22.

That his father was a Pharisee is very probable, since Paul was well versed in the principles of that sect. (Comp. Acts xii: 3, with v: 34; xxvi: 5; Phil. iii: 5.)

A sister of Paul is mentioned, Acts xxiii: 16.

That he was a Jew by birth, was so far important, for the purpose of his call to the apostleship, as he, for this very reason, from his early youth, had been made acquainted with some of the vital truths of religion, and the prophecies concerning the Messiah. And this gave also, occasion to his being educated for a Jewish scholar.

(6) Paul's education in his youth.

"Paul went to Jerusalem,* where he received instruction in the law and Rabbinical literature, from Gamaliel, a celebrated Jewish Doctor, and where he made remarkable progress, (Comp. Acts xxii: 3, with v., 34.) There he became acquainted with the spirit of the Jewish system, and with the Jewish method of expounding the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament. This advantage which he had over the other apostles, was certainly very useful to him in his office as an apostle. The clearer he could discern the defectiveness and the faults of that system, and the great prerogatives of Christianity, the better he could recommend it to others, and the more effectually contend with learned Jewish opponents.

He learned, besides this, a trade.—Acts xviii: 3, (*σκηνοποιος*) Comp. Wits. l. c. p. 11, &c. What trade it was cannot be decided, (Comp. Michaelis Einleitung ii., Th. § 216, S. 1536 ff; Hänlein's Einleitung ii., Th. S. 328 ff. According to some, *σκηνοποιος* is a maker of tapestry; and according to others, one who makes tents, or a maker of leather tent coverings and camel's saddles. According to Michaelis (after a passage in Julius Pollux. L. vii., § 189,) a *μηχανοποιος*, a machine, or instrument-maker, a mechanical artisan†. By this means he provided for his

* When this happened can only be conjecturally determined. The assertion that Paul first studied the Humaniora and learned tent making before he came to Jerusalem, K. Schrader shows (in the book, "The apostle Paul," 1 Part, Leipa. 1830, p. 44,) with reference to Acts xxii: 3; xxvi: 4, according to which passages, Paul was not merely instructed at Jerusalem, but also, was brought up and had lived there, and, that *ἐκ νεότητος, ἀπ' ἄρτης*,—indeed, from about 12 years of age, at which time they begin to instruct boys in the traditions.

† Hug explains this as a misunderstanding, since in Pollux the phrase is used of the theatre and its machinery, such as Paul could not have manufactured. He, as well as Eichorn, explains it of the making of coarse cloth of the hair of the shaggy he-goat of Cilicia, which they used on ships and for tent-cloths, for the covering of the tents, both of soldiers and

future sustenance.—(1 Cor. iv : 12 ; ix : 15 ; Acts xviii : 5 ; 1 Thes. ii : 9 ; Acts xx : 34.) Even this was advantageous for the discharge of his official duties as an apostle. He could, by this, show the more easily, his disinterestedness, and at the same time expose to shame the selfishness of his opponents.—(2 Cor. xi : 20 ; Phil. iii : 19 ; 2 Cor. xi : 7 ; xii : 13 ; 1 Cor. ix : 15 ; 1 Thes. ii : 5.)

(c) Paul's conduct before his conversion to Christianity.

“From zeal for the religion of his fathers, he resisted with a raging eagerness the then spreading religion of Christ, (Acts vii : 60, viii : 3 ; xix : 1, xxii : 4 ; xxvi : 11 ; 1 Cor. xv : 9 ; Gal. i : 13 ; 1 Tim. i : 13.) This was partly owing to his lively and active character, and his zeal for that which seemed to him to be the truth, and partly to his prejudice and ignorance, (1 Tim. i : 13 ;) but, however, an ignorance not inoffensive, (v. 15.) That good quality, which was the cause of his emulation against Christianity, was of great importance to his usefulness as an apostle. That a man who had been such a furious, but at the same time such a talented opponent of Christianity, became a Christian, was very advantageous to the cause of Christianity. The painful recollection of his previous offences against Christians served to keep him from pride, and caused him to look with more reverence upon the Christian faith concerning the grace of God and the doctrines of Christ, (1 Tim. i : 14 ; 1 Cor. xv : 8-10 ; Eph. iii : 8.)

(d) Transition to Christianity.—(Acts ix : 3, &c., xxii : 6, &c., xxvi : 12, &c.)

Reference is made to this in several passages of his Epistles. (f. i. Gal. i : 15.) Remark concerning the manner in which the conversion of Paul was effected. The *συναρτοπαρεια* in Acts ix : 7, compared with xxii : 9, is easily removed, if we render the term *αχουσιβ* in the last passage by, “to understand.” (Compare *αχουσιβ* in Is. xxxvi : 11 ; 2 Kings xviii : 26 ; Gen. xi : 7 ; 1 Cor. xiv : 2.)

(1) The vision recorded in Acts ix : 3-6, was certainly the first occasion of change in Paul's mode of thinking ;

shepherds.—(Vegetius, de re Milet 4, 6, Plin. Hist. Nat. 6, 28.) According to them Paul was a tent-maker. De Wette finds this restriction to the Cilician hair-cloth incorrect, and explains *σκηνοποιος* generally by tent-maker.

and the conviction that it was a Divine phenomenon, was also a principal cause of the change of Paul's convictions, and of his entire manner of life. But there is no reason to think, that this great change, with its great consequences, (Acts ix: 20 &c.,) was effected in a moment, and solely by that external vision. During a period of three days, (Comp. v. 9,) several circumstances happened, (Acts ix: 1-19,) to effect that change,—to produce in Paul a firm conviction of the Divine origin, and of the object, of that vision. Several circumstances which coincided with that phenomenon (Comp. v. 6, and vs. xii: 17,) and with themselves harmonized in promoting the same object. To this we may add his feeling of conviction of the Divinity of that vision which was wrought in an extraordinary way by God in him, both at the time when the vision appeared and afterwards. And there was also, undoubtedly, a series of internal changes in the soul of the apostle during the period of his blindness, (v. 9,) besides other thoughts, that of the impossibility of convicting the apostles of falsity in their narratives concerning Jesus, and especially, his resurrection; the recollection of the conduct of the apostles and other Christians, especially of Stephen, (Acts vii., &c.,) might have been aroused in him,—and finally may be added to it, his consciousness of an extraordinary internal change,—his consciousness of a higher power, or of an elevation of his own powers, without which, he would not have been fit for the office of an apostle.

(2) The vision in question, and the particulars connected with it, must be unitedly considered as that which could not only have been looked upon by Paul himself, as a credential of his divine mission, but as that also which had been indeed effected by God, for the purpose of producing those conceptions and resolutions which were aroused in him,—for the purpose of convincing him, not only of the divinity of the Christian religion, but also of his call to the apostolic office, of being an extraordinary messenger of God and Christ.—(Comp. Kleuker's *New Investigation of the Evidences of the Divinity and Truth of Christianity*, vol. ii., or, *The Credibility of the Scriptural Documents of Christianity*, p. 140, x. r. h. or, Lyttleton on the Conversion of Paul.)

Short exhibition of the principal occurrences upon which the proof of this depends :

(*a*) Paul, in relating the process by which he had come to the apostolic office, did not consciously deceive,—nor did he devise the matter of fact ; but he was most overwhelmingly convinced of his call to the apostleship by God and Christ. This proves all that, whence we may infer that he was no impostor ; the unmistakeable evidences of his veracity and religiousness, which are manifested in his speeches and epistles, and the character of which shows the abhorrence he had against any manner of deception, (1 Cor. xv : 15 ; 2 Tim. iv : 1, &c. &c.) ; the acknowledgment as an apostle, which he received from Peter and other colleagues ; his miracles [which (*a*) could have been neither devised by him, nor effected by the means of fraud, and (*b*) which were to him, as well as to other apostles, credentials of a divine mission.]

Even a *pious* fraud would have been incompatible with his character.

(*b*) Paul was not deceived in the process by which he had come to the apostolic office. His conviction was not founded upon a fraud unknown to him. The supposition that the very fact, (Acts ix : 3, &c.) or at least Paul's conviction of the divine origin and object of that fact, rested upon an arbitrary passive deception, cannot be maintained. For (*a*) it would be irreconcilable in connection with the circumstances of the narrative itself.—(vs. 3-19.) Because (*aa*) they do not agree with the supposition, that what Paul experienced, should have been effected by the fraud of others. (It is very improbable that the vision, (vs. 3-8,) should have been brought about through the agency of men.—(Comp. vs. 12, 18.)

(*bb*) They do not correspond with the presumption, that it was a mere illusion of fancy, or something merely accidental, undesignedly caused by God, though it was partly an external phenomenon. We may argue against the first from vs. 7, and against the first and the second from the accidental concert of several circumstances as to one aim.)—(Comp. vs. 6, 10, 12, 17.)

(*β*) Still less reconcilable is that presumption with the consequences of this fact, with the ability of Paul to

teach the Gospel from that time on, independently of any human instruction, and especially with his miracles.

(c) Results of his transition to Christianity,—his apostolic functions and zeal in spreading the Christian religion, notwithstanding his numerous persecutions.

The chief originators of his external sufferings were the Jews, by whom he was detested and hated, as an apostate from the law, and as a propagator of a doctrine which was opposed to their political and fanatic expectations, who attempted to provoke all civil authorities against him, and rested not till he was brought as prisoner to Rome. In regard to his sufferings, we refer to 2 Cor. xi: 23, &c.; 1 Cor. iv: 9, &c.; 2 Cor. iv: 8; 1 Thess. ii: 2; 2 Tim. iii: 11; Col. i: 24; Gal. vi: 17.

That the Jews were the chief originators, is evident from 1 Thess. ii: 14, &c.; Acts xiii: 50; xiv: 2, 19-27; v: 13, &c. As far as we know from the book of Acts, we see that the Gentiles never attacked him without having been irritated by the Jews, two cases excepted, when those who made the first attack were immediately interested in his expulsion from the place.—(Acts xvi: 19, &c., xix: 24, &c.)

Object and favourable consequences of the sufferings of Paul in regard to the management of his apostolic functions. There were (1) occasions for him to advance in Christian perfection, (1 Cor. iv: 16,) especially to strengthen his faith in the excellency of Christianity, and by that means to increase his usefulness as an apostle, (2 Cor. i: 4;) occasions of exhibiting his disinterestedness, the purity of his motives, and the firmness of his convictions; occasions of giving to others an example of the stability of his courage and patience.

(2) Occasions of many especial proofs of an extraordinary divine support.—(2 Cor. iv: 8, &c., xii: 9; 2 Tim. iii: 11.)

His travels which extended almost over the whole region of the Roman empire, were means of propagating Christianity in a very large compass. (Rom. xv: 19.) His travels served at the same time to enlarge his knowledge of men and the most current opinions of that age. The rapid and great success of his apostolic labour is not

reasonably explicable, if we exclude a special divine co-operation, and especially, the miracles wrought by Paul:

(B) *The preëminent qualities of Paul.*

(1) "He possessed the deepest conviction concerning the truth of the Christian religion and its excellency, communicated to him by the celestial appearance of its founder." The first and chief cause of this, however, was the heavenly vision vouchsafed to him. But there were also, several other circumstances which contributed to preserve and to strengthen his conviction; the favourable effects of Christian doctrines, which he had partly experienced in himself, and partly perceived in others, (1 Cor. i: 18, 24; 2 Cor. iii: 3;—the manifold proofs of an unmistakable especial coöperation of God in the discharge and success of his official duties, especially wonders, (2 Cor. xii: 12; Rom. xv: 18, &c.,) new revelations, which were made to him from time to time. (Acts xxvi: 16 *οφθησομαι*; xxii: 17, &c.; xviii: 9; xxvii: 23; 2 Cor. xii: 1, &c.)

(2) "He possessed a restless zeal to expose himself always to new difficulties for the sake of the glory of Christ and his gospel."

(a) The source of this was, in part, his ardour for that which he acknowledged to be the truth, his piety and his courage, and in part, his conviction of the divinity of Christianity, and his reverence and love towards Christ, which were the effects of that conviction, and which shine forth in his writings.—(2 Cor. v: 14; Gal. ii: 20; Phil. iii: 7; 1 Tim. i: 12, &c.) Compare Niemeyer's *Characteristics*, 1 vol., 4th ed., p. 206, &c.

(b) But his zeal was not the savage passion of a fancy-monger. His activity was guided by a clear understanding of the truth, and by wise considerations. (Compare Niemeyer, 1 part, p. 323.) Not unnecessarily did he precipitate himself into dangers. He avoided persecutions, he attempted to avert sufferings, when it could be done without infraction of duty.—(Acts xvii: 10; xxii: 25; xxvii., &c.) He never pressed himself to martyrdom, he never exhibited in his sufferings an affected, stoical indifference. In his apologies, he manifested just as little defiance as despondency.—(Acts xxii: 23, 26.)

(3) "He possessed great vivacity," which shows itself very clearly in his oral and written discourses, in his mode of writing, &c.

(4) He possessed an unusual power of mind.—(Seelen-Stärke.)

This quality comprehends the courage to undertake enterprises that are connected with great and many difficulties, and the firmness and the stability of will to meet external dangers with intrepidity, and hindrances from within with a continual attack.

We trace the proofs of this quality in the biography of Paul.—Comp. Niemeyer, p. 295, &c.

(a) Partly in his determination to become a Christian and a teacher of Christianity, in spite of the situation in which he had been.

(b) Partly in the manner in which he executed this determination with decision and stability, notwithstanding all the hindrances from without, which had been placed in his way by the prejudices and the moral corruption of the Gentiles, and the pre-conceived opinions, and inflexible malignancy of the Jews, notwithstanding the continual dangers, persecutions and blasphemies,—notwithstanding the seeming fruitlessness of many of his endeavours,—and in spite of all, the misgivings which the conditions of particular congregations occasioned.—(2 Cor. iv : 1, 16 ; Acts xx : 24.)

(5) "He possessed a great readiness in the Greek, as it was spoken by the Jews." That he had a knowledge of the pure Greek is evident, not only from the single terms and phrases which he uses, but also from the construction of periods, and the arrangement of words and expressions which are not unfrequently pure Greek.

(6) "He possessed Jewish learning."—(Acts xxii : 3.) The question arises, whether he was acquainted with Greek authors, and was versed in Greek learning.—(Comp. Michaelis Einl. 1 Th. 25, S. 162, &c.; Paley's Hor. Paul; Henker's Annark. S. 449, &c.; Haenlein's Enl. 2 Th. S. 550, &c.)

(a) Many like Thalemann, and Ernesti, (vide Ernesti's Theol. Bibl. X. B. S. 852, &c. &c.) deny his acquaintance with Greek literature. Thalemann, in his Dissert. de eruditione Pauli Iudaica, non Graeca, ascribes to him,

besides his Jewish learning, only so much knowledge of the Greek, as any Jew had at that time, necessarily arising from intercourse with the Greeks, amongst whom he lived. The reasons given for this opinion are:

(*aa*) Paul's own confession.—(2 Cor. xi: 6.) That Paul was reluctant to show his Greek learning, is a groundless assumption. However, the *λογος* in that passage, has reference only to elegance of speech, eloquence after a Greek fashion.—(1 Cor. ii: 4.) This could not have been wanting in Paul, even if he had not been entirely without a knowledge of Greek authors.

(*bb*) Paul's style of writing. He would have perhaps taken Greeks for models. But:

(1) He might have read good Greek writers without having been able himself to write well.

(2) It cannot be proved that Paul could not either speak or write better, than he has manifested in his Epistles. He did not avail himself in his Epistles, of his extensive grammatical knowledge of the Greek, for fear that it might have been offensive to the Jews, because he looked upon it as being derogatory and disadvantageous for the cause of religion, to present the doctrines of Christianity in a mere elegance of style, and not in a faithfully, firmly and determinately expressive language, because he would not give occasion to the illusion, that Christianity had need to be recommended by an artificial style, (1. Cor. ii: 4,) and that the effects of its doctrines partly depended upon it.

From the reason under (*bb*) it can therefore not be concluded that Paul was entirely destitute of a knowledge of Greek literature.

(*a*) The sect of the Pharisees detested Greek learning, and proclaimed it as profane, even to learn Greek according to grammar and rhetoric.—Josephus (*Antiq.* l. xx. c. xi. sub. finem.) The example of Josephus does not prove anything against it, for he abandoned this rule and applied himself to these studies, after he had reached Rome. There can be no counter-evidence in the case of Philo; for he was a Jew of Alexandria, and not an ardent Pharisee. Now Paul's parents were members of that sect, and he himself, was a zealous Pharisee. We cannot, therefore, reasonably assume that Paul had re-

ceived instruction in Greek learning, in his youth,—nor that he after that time, had applied himself to the polite literature of the Greeks.

It is, however, besides the testimony of Josephus, very probable, that the Pharisees despised Greek Philology and learning. But

(1) The testimony of Josephus does not strictly prove, that the Pharisees in Palestine considered the reading of Greek authors as sinful,—nor does it, in the least degree, prove that the perusal of Greek authors was prohibited to Jews, who spoke the Greek language, and lived at Jerusalem, to which class Paul belonged.

(2) Paul, as soon as he embraced Christianity, ceased to be one of that sect; and then he had opportunities to make himself acquainted with Greek writers,—partly by means of his long abode in Greek provinces and cities, and partly through his frequent intercourse with Greeks.

(*ad*) It was the purpose of God, that the Gospel be propagated over the whole earth without the aid of human learning and wisdom.—(Comp. 1 Cor. i: 27, with 2 Cor. i: 4, 17.) Though Paul had been the apostle of the Gentiles, yet there was no exception to this rule in his case. He preached, not only to the Gentiles, but also to the Jews, who dwelt amongst them. He used but one method in his addresses to both—he told them that Gentiles as well as Jews, were brought to Christianity, only through the power of its doctrine and its miracles, as the external evidences of its divinity.—(1 Cor. ii: 4; Rom. xv: 18, &c. &c.)

We must, however, assume, that Paul preached not in a learned way, not according to the style of Greek philosophers and orators. It is my opinion according to the passages which have been quoted, that he was not an exact man of letters. But from this it does not follow that he was entirely destitute of Greek reading.

(B) Reasons given by those, who ascribe to the apostle Greek learning:

(A) His abode at Tarsus, the seat of Greek learning.*

* We might add his subsequent frequent residence among the Greeks, united with his principle of prizing everything good and true wherever he found it, and to make himself agreeable to others as far it could be done without injury to truth.—(1 Cor. ix: 19, seq.) But (1) those more

But this does not prove anything beyond the fact, that he had opportunities in his youth, to become acquainted with the literary productions of the Greeks. We must, however, on the other hand, take into consideration, what has been said under *a, cc,*) and also that he was a *σκηνοποιός*, a trade which he probably commences to learn at Tarsus * *.

The perspicuous traces of his being well read in Greek, which we find in his discourses. For these we refer:

(aa) To the citation of some passages from Greek poets.—Acts xvii: 28; Tit. i: 12, &c., (from Epimenedes of Crete;) 1 Cor. xv: 33,—since these sentences are so skillfully quoted,—since he knew that the idea (Acts xviii: 28,) was one of several of Greek poets, and that the author of the sentence in Tit. i: 12, was a Crete; it is, therefore, not probable, that he had become acquainted with these sentences through a mere hearsay.—(Paley 455, &c.) But still, from this circumstance, we cannot infer with certainty, that he himself read the quoted passages, and much less, that he read entire works of these poets, or that he possessed an extensive knowledge of Greek learning.

(BB) His style of writing, and the fact, that he was capable of developing ideas clearly, of reducing questions of morals to general principles, of proving and refuting propositions in the ingenious form of a syllogism, of prosecuting systematically a dogmatical subject, &c. &c. But:

(1) From all this it does not follow that we are authorized to attribute to him close study of Greek philosophers, orators, and poets.

(2) It is questionable, whether all these appearances might not be explained, by his natural talents, connected with the influence, which his intercourse with learn-

important occupations which the chief end of his office required, might hinder him from making himself acquainted with the Greek literature, and he certainly found little or no time for it during his apostolic labours. 2. As an apostle he was not compelled to learn those truths which he used for his discourses from the Greeks, nor certainly did he learn them from these. The reading of the works of polished Greeks might have served him somewhat in illustration, costume, and argument *καὶ ἀνθρώπων*.

ed Greeks had on his education, and partly by the necessary exercise of his mental powers in the study of Jewish Theology.

After a comparison of all these statements, we must come to the conclusion, that Paul was not entirely destitute of an acquaintance with Greek authors; but that we have still less authority to ascribe to him an accurate and extensive knowledge of Greek literature.

(7) "His knowledge of human nature—his peculiar dexterity in penetrating into the sentiments, dispositions, inclinations, prejudices and wants of others,—in adjusting his diction according to the times, persons and circumstances, and in selecting always such arguments as were the most convincing and effectual for the occasion." Paul possessed a preëminently practical wisdom.

(a) This consisted in general, in his readiness to choose for the promotion of good designs such lawful means as were, under given circumstances, most conducive to these designs, and most conformable to the circumstances of time, locality and persons. All this required an extensive and accurate knowledge of human nature. This wisdom was essentially different from any kind of mere moral sagacity; partly in regard of the design, and partly in respect of means.—(2 Cor. iv: 2; i: 12; vii: 2.) There is no doubt that the naturally intellectual powers of the apostle, (especially also, his capability of judging accurately and rapidly,—his peculiarly acute observation,—his vivid imagination, guided by the understanding,)—the culture which he acquired through intercourse with various classes, with the learned and the ignorant, with Jews and Greeks, &c., and the judicious use he made of it to gain a knowledge of the human heart,—his accurate and nice self-observation, connected with a conscientious activity, and a living interest for the object, which he, as a Christian and an apostle, should promote on the one hand, as well also the particular Divine assistance which he, as an apostle enjoyed, have greatly contributed to this wisdom.

(b) This practical wisdom manifested itself:

(a) In his actions and discourses in general.

(aa) In his actions: He avoided very carefully every thing which would have impeded his main object, and

brought reproach to religion, (Vide Niemeyer, 256,)—he accommodated himself, so far as his duty would permit, in indifferent things to the weakness of others, (1 Cor. ix: 19, &c.; viii: 13,)—he availed himself of every opportunity that offered itself to do something for his main object, with a strict consideration of persons and circumstances.

(bb) In his discourses. We find examples of this

(*Aleph*) In his oral statements as they are recorded in the book of Acts. His speeches in defence of Christianity, his instructing discourses.—(Acts xxii: 25, 26; xvii: 23, &c.; xiv: 15, &c.; xiii: 16, &c.; xxiv: 24, &c.)

(*Beth*) In his Epistles.

(aa) From the choice which he in them makes, of such truths as were best adapted to his first readers.

(BB) From the variety of methods which he uses in proposing, turning, elucidating, proving, and employing the same truths; as well as from the comparison of the manner of delivery with known and unknown historical *dates*, we infer that his manner of delivery was suited to the peculiar relations of his readers.

(B) His wisdom is especially exhibited in the choice of his demonstrations and reasons for action.

(*Aleph*) Many of the proofs which he uses are of equal evidence to all Christians. The most are of this kind,—they are taken from certain fundamental truths of religion in general, and of Christianity in particular, or from some decided and generally assumed truths of reason or experience: f. v. 1 Cor. xv: 36, &c.

(*Beth*) But we find also, in his discourses, especially in his Epistles, argumentations which contain particular evidences for his first readers, or for a part of them, (especially for the Jews,) or which were particularly effectual with them, (proofs from the Old Test.,) or which were calculated for a certain class of readers.

(aa) Arguments *κατ' ἀνθρώπων*, such e. g. which have reference to particular notions of the Jews (e. g. Gal. iv.,) yet such as do not derogate from the truth, such as do not confirm any error.—Comp. Storr's Diss. de sensu histor. § xx. Opusc. vol. i., pp. 63, 64, (sub finem) seq.)

(BB) Encouraging arguments, that were applicable to individual circumstances of his readers, or to his peculiar

relation to them.—(2. Cor. viii: 7, 10; ix: 2-4; Rom. xiii: 11; Eph. iv: 1; 1 Tim. i: 18, &c.)

(8) "His skill in touching disagreeable truths in a forbearing and pleasant manner."

(a) He frequently mentions unpleasant things, but very slightly, by giving mere hints of them; he often presents them in a kind of general way, leaving the application to the readers, (1 Cor. xiii.) or he couches them in the garb of an exhortation.—1 Thes. iv: 1, 10.

(b) After unpleasant truths, he usually follows with expressions of grateful joy concerning some good of his readers, that was known to him, and with assurances of his love and confidence, (1 Cor. i.; 2 Cor. i.; Col. i.; 2 Cor. vi: 11, &c.; 1 Thess. i: 4, 10, or at least with some mitigating adjunction, (2 Cor. xii: 14; Rom. x: 1,) or he interpolates such an one.—Gal. iv: 14, &c.; Comp. Paley, p. 49, &c. The reason of all this was his wisdom, love, and his cultivated sense of that which was becoming.

(9) His free and noble conscientiousness.

(a) He was even before his transition to Christianity, certainly not void of conscience, though his conscientiousness was limited by the severity of his passions, and received in some cases an oblique direction, through the instrumentality of prejudices. But he exhibited this noble trait in a higher degree from the time when he became a Christian, in the very fact, that he did not resist (from weakness or selfishness,) a better connection respecting religion, nor the conviction concerning his own destination, which God had produced in him, and that he followed firmly this better conviction till the end of his life, without suffering himself to be misled from this acknowledged path of truth, by pleasures or advantages on the one hand, or by sufferings or disadvantages on the other,—or by any regard of the judgment of the larger crowd of Jews or Gentiles.

(b) His liberal conscientiousness was manifested, in that he sacrificed many deeply rooted prejudices respecting a better conviction of Christianity, that in his convictions and actions he was independent of anything that had a merely human appearance, that he never suffered himself to be restrained from free speeches by an

anxious regard of the decision of others, (1 Cor. iv: 3, &c.) or by any other like thing, or that he never hesitated to speak frankly even about himself, (2 Cor. xi.) when his calling, when the honour of Christianity required it.—Compare Niemeyer 1 B. S. 112, &c.

(10) "His tender anxiety for the preservation and the growth of organized congregations. We see proofs of this in his Epistles generally, and in many circumstances, journeys, &c., recorded in the book of Acts.—(Comp. 2 Cor. xi: 28.)

(11) "His much-compassing intellect, and his steadfastness, to make salutary plans and provisions for the whole and for all parts."

And if it was even impossible to discriminate accurately between the peculiar share which Paul's natural gifts had, in his religious discourses and arrangements, and that what God effected by his special influence then:

(a) A comparison of his discourses with those of other apostles, will make it appear very probable, that Paul stood above the rest, in regard to mental faculties and improvement. Thus, we notice in his discourses, especially in his Epistles, a greater acuteness in the developing of religious ideas and propositions, and in his manner of proving and refuting, also his presentation of the same truth in various ways, &c., &c. The very wise teachings and prescriptions in 1 Cor. vii: 12, &c., may indeed, be considered with great probability, as the results of his own reflections. This holds good even in the case of some of the other apostles,—an assumption not repugnant to a true notion of inspiration.—Comp. Griesinger, p. 12.

(b) It is very likely that God gave to this apostle a larger sphere of activity, because of his greater powers.

Niemeyer, in his 1st. vol., shews several other characteristics of the apostle. His philanthropy (p. 345, &c.) his humility, (p. 329, &c.)

(A) Remarks concerning Paul's philanthropy and humility—each of them separately considered.

(a) Philanthropy—inmost sympathy with the situation of others—affectionate joy at the good which he found even in churches, that were not organized by himself, (Comp. Epist. to the Rom. and Col.)—deep emotions of

sadness for all that was or might become injurious to the perfection and prosperity of any congregation, or of individuals, (Comp. Cor. and Gal., especially 2 Cor. 2.)—deep emotion at the decline and ruin of those who even resisted his doctrine, (Phil. iii, 18: Rom. ix. 1, &c.; x. 1: 2 Tim. iv. 16); his remoteness from all envy, (Phil. i. 15-18); his inclination to hope for good,—his forbearance and tenderness where even in connection with those unpleasant considerations which he was compelled to make,—his indefatigable and self-sacrificing activity for the weal of others,—his willingness to suffer for the best good of others, (Col. i. 24: Phil. ii. 17: 2 Cor. xii. 17.)

(b) Humility—

(a) With respect to God and Christ: a deep feeling of those offences which he brought upon himself by his previous conduct, (1 Tim. i. 12, &c.); of the insufficiency of his own *δικαιοσύνη*, (Phil. iii. 8.)—of the defectiveness of his virtue, (Phil. iii. 12-14.)

He considered one of his afflictions, as a means used by God, to keep him from self-exaltation, (2 Cor. xii. 7); thus he thinks that there is a possibility of his becoming proud,—a trait not usually found with those in whom haughtiness and self-confidence prevails,—and then the dependence of all his preferences, and of the success of all his labours upon God and Christ, (2 Cor. iii. 5-4 6: Eph. iii. 7: 1 Cor. iii. 15, &c.; xv. 10.)

(β) With respect to men:

He was far from disesteeming the good which he found in others; far from awakening or entertaining in others a too high opinion of himself, (1 Cor. iii. 5, &c.: iv. 1, 6.) He speaks but reluctantly, and only when impelled by duty, of his own merits, (2 Cor. 11, &c.) Notwithstanding all his prerogatives, he considers himself merely as an instrument in the hands of God, to serve his brethren.

By taking this view, Paul appears so much more venerable, since he, even when compared with other apostles, made himself so eminently useful to such a large number of churches and individuals,—since he effected so much by his labours,—and since it might have been so very easy for him, to give to his disciples a highly exalted opinion of himself, or to cherish the like in them.

These remarks lead us naturally to answer the question :

(B) What influence had Christianity upon the change of his sentiments, and upon his character ?

This change did not merely consist, as Niemeyer assumes, in new inclinations, determinations and motives. Though, if this had been the only effect of Christianity upon him, it would have had a mighty influence upon his improvement. But we may justly maintain, that it effected a still greater change, that by it he gained an ascendancy over certain passions and affections, and Christian virtues became in him predominant.

(a) This is especially true in regard to the virtues mentioned under Letter A.

(a) His Philanthropy. His prevailing inclinations and feelings before he embraced Christianity were greatly opposed to this. They were such as generally belong to a choleric temper. We see in Paul the Jew, a turbulent, an austere, and almost cruel man, a blood-thirsty zealot and persecutor. But let us look upon Paul the Christian, and we see in him a decided, enterprising and active man, strict in those cases only where duty requires, but, moreover, a man inspired with noblest philanthropy, and susceptible of tender emotions. The source of this love for his fellow men, was that ennobled and elevated love towards God and Christ, which was purified through Christianity. For Christ was the model, to imitate which was his constant endeavour.

(β) His humility. His constitutional qualities, as well as his intimation in 2 Cor. xii. 7, make it very probable that he had naturally a peculiar inclination to pride. It is likely that he could not master this propensity before his transition to Christianity. It is certain that he was then wanting in that humility which is opposed to pride of one's own merits, or self-righteousness.—Phil. iii : 8, &c. It was only by the power of Christianity, that this virtue became the prevailing disposition in him.

(b) With the more certainty may we suppose that what Paul says in Rom. vii : 5, &c., and viii : 2, &c., has been deduced from his own experience.

Everything that was exceptionable in the natural character of Paul, was amended by Christianity. Every

good quality which he previously possessed was improved through Christianity, and made subservient to most excellent purposes; the talents which he possessed, to become a great man, were perfected through Christianity.

ARTICLE IX.

CORRESPONDENCE.

In an article on "the early history of Presbyterianism in South Carolina, published in the January number, we alluded to what we then supposed to be a fact, that Hall county, in Georgia, was named in honour of the Rev. James Hall, of North Carolina, a statement which we had often heard made orally; and which we find also in Foote's Sketches of North Carolina, on p. 328, in the following words:

"When it was necessary for the American forces to march into the Cherokee country, in Georgia, to quell the Indians, a company was raised in Iredell for that expedition, and Mr. Hall went with his friends as chaplain to the army. During the expedition, which lasted about two months, the chaplain offered public prayers very regularly morning and evening; but had but one opportunity of preaching. On that occasion he took his stand under a large shady tree; the army, consisting of about four thousand men, was drawn up around him; the soldiers brought from the neighboring woods, each a young sapling, or long branch of a tree, with all the foliage, and as they were drawn up around in close ranks, seating themselves on the ground, and resting their shady branches upon the earth, they formed a dense shade, and under this novel shelter from the sun listened to the sermon. In honor of that first gospel sermon in the Indian territories, the adjacent country was named after the chaplain, Hall county, of which Gainsville is the seat of justice."

A valued friend was disposed to call the statement in question, and this led eventually to the following communication which appears in the pages of the Southern Presbyterian, published in Charleston.

HALL COUNTY, GEORGIA: FOR WHOM WAS IT NAMED?

We mentioned last week, that we had received several communications in answer to the above question, propounded by Quaero. We publish the following letter, which was the first that came to hand, and gives a more detailed account of the matter than any of the others. It is proper to state that all of our correspondents agree with the writer below, whose name is familiar to a large class of our readers, and carries with it an authority which needs no support.

Dear Sir: I see a writer in your paper of the 17th inst., signed "Quaero," asks you a question about the origin of the name of "Hall county," in Georgia—saying that the Rev. W. H. Foote, in his sketches of North Carolina, had supposed the county had been named after Rev. Dr. Hall, of North Carolina, &c. In "White's Statistics of Georgia," pages 308, 309, is a full statement of this affair. The Rev. James Hall, from Iredell county, North Carolina, accompanied a party of 4,000 troops, during the American Revolution, into the upper part of Georgia, then inhabited by the Cherokee Indians, and the troops, in honor of this divine, named *all that section of country* after their Chaplain, Rev. James Hall.

The Rev. Mr. White, the historian alluded to above, says, "This is a mistake. The county was named after Dr. Lyman Hall, a sturdy and inflexible patriot of the Revolution. He was born in Connecticut in 1731, and graduated at Yale College in 1747. After his collegiate course he studied medicine, and removed to Dorchester, in South Carolina, and came to Georgia, accompanied by several others, to whom a grant of land, 31,950 acres, was made in what was then known as St. John's Parish, South of the Ogechee River. The people of this Parish were early and decided advocates of the cause of liberty, and before any general measures had been adopted by the Colony, had sent a delegate to the Continental Congress. That delegate was Lyman Hall. Upon taking his seat in the Congress at Philadelphia in 1775, a difficulty arose as to whether the Parish of St. John's should be considered as representing the Colony of Georgia. Mr. Hall stated his wish merely to hear and assist in the debates, as he only represented a part of Georgia, and to vote only when the sentiments of Congress were not taken by Colonies. Soon after this, Georgia, by her Provincial Assembly, determined to join the other Colonies, and Lyman Hall, in conjunction with others, was selected to represent the whole Province. Owing to several causes, only three members from Georgia were present in

the Congress at the signing of the Declaration. Dr. Hall was one of these, and his name stands among those noble men who proclaimed the independence of America.

Mr. Hall was compelled to remove his family to the North; when the British took possession of Georgia, his property was confiscated. He returned to Georgia in 1782, and in the succeeding year was elected Governor of that State. He afterwards removed to Burke county, where he died in the 67th year of his age," &c. &c.

I have no doubt that this statement of the Rev. Mr. White is strictly correct. Hall county was organized [taken principally from Jackson and Franklin counties] in 1818.

This information I furnish to you, and you can, of course, make what use of it you please. Your ob't. serv't.,

A. PORTER.

Savannah, 17th March, 1855.

The following was sent us by an esteemed friend, who has repeatedly contributed to our pages, as a translation of the description of the "virtuous woman," which the mother of King Lemuel taught to her son. It belongs to the class of Alphabetic compositions, and was written in the acrostic form, that it might be easily learned by heart, and retained in memory. It is, as it were, a monumental description of what was regarded as a virtuous, i. e. an *energetic, able* woman, 2500 years ago, and was probably given to the youthful king to aid him in his search after one worthy to share his affections, his palace, and his throne. As a composition, it is marked with a noble and beautiful simplicity, and introduces us to the rural life and manners of Palestine at an early age.

THE WOMAN OF ENERGY.

PROV. XXXI: 10-31.

- Alph.*—V. 10. A woman of energy who, then, shall find?
One who leaves, in her value, the pearl far behind.
- Beth.*—" 11. Bound firm to his heart-strings, her lord can confide
That nought shall be lacking where she may preside.
- Gimel.*—" 12. Good, various as pure, will she pour from her hand,
And steady as sunbeams return o'er the land.
- Daleth.*—" 13. Diligent, cheerful, with exquisite skill,
Her wool and her flax are combined at her will.
- He.*—" 14. Her labor is freighted and purchased afar,
And brings its returns from the westernmost star.

- Vav.**—" 15. With the dawn she will rise and with gentlest sway
Food, labor adjust, where all love and obey.
- Zayin.*—" 16. Zeal seeks a new sphere;—and the fruit of her toil
Yields now a new vineyard, its wines and its oil.
- Hheth.*—" 17. Cheer on then her efforts! Her frame as her mind
Developes in duty, robust as refined.
- Tet.*—" 18. Test her not by a trick! This sweet daughter of light
Is wise as unwearied by day and by night—
- Yodh.*—" 19. Just as generous; Her spindle unceasingly flies,
And fills and returns to the idler's surprise.
- Kaph.*—" 20. Kindest cares are her glory—for, wise *in* her cares,
For those who do neither she spends and she spares.
- Lamech.*—" 21. Let the cold snows appear and the dark blasts appal,
Rich and warm as her heart's-love her clothing for all.
- Mem.*—" 22. Mark well the fair couch of love's innermost shrine,
Where beauty and use shall in all things combine;
Silks, linen, as costly, as well as wrought and fine.
- Nun.*—" 23. Nor pass her beloved, as he sits at the gate,
In a pride she makes just, as in wisdom elate.
- Lamech.*—" 24. See, she rivals old Egypt, she emulates Tyre
Her girdles Arabia and Scythia admire!
- Hayin.*—" 25. Eden's strength, Eden's beauty unite round her home,
And she smiles, in sweet hope, at all trouble to come.
- Pe.*—" 26. Perspicuous her speech, for 'tis wisdom's own flow,
And the one law—of kindness—greet high-born and low.
- Tsadeh.*—" 27. Zidon's watchmen not keener a foe to descry,
A vigil all womanly wakes in her eye:—
Her food is meek industry's constant supply.
- Koph.*—" 28. Quote her oft as a mother; her children her pride,
And she their's!—But her husband's, of all praise beside
Are the loved commendations her fame that decide.
- Resh.*—" 29. Rival daughters, he tells you, may others enthral,
But the joy of his heart is the queen of them all.
- Shin.*—" 30. She, artless as graceful, and truthful as fair,
Crowns all with her piety, constant as rare.
- Tav.*—" 31. Throne her highest in praise—where'er justice is found,
Her desert, her true honors o'er all shall abound!

* The Arab sounds it like our W, which most probably, was the Hebrew usage.—PROFESSOR STUART.

ARTICLE X.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *College Discipline: An Inaugural Address, delivered at Davidson College, N. C., on the 28th February, 1855.* By Major D. H. HILL, Professor of Mathematics and Civil Engineering.

This is an opportune and excellent address. As we gather from a cursory perusal, the subject was assigned to the learned

Professor by the Board of Trustees. The discussion is conducted with signal ability, and in a felicitous style characteristic of the author. Though all his views may not appear to be, in every point, practicable, nor to commend themselves to indulgent parents, yet are they eminently wise and judicious, and manifestly indicate that the Professor has not only been an experienced teacher, but bestowed upon College government much patient and earnest thought. He is an able advocate of the "grading system," and fortifies his position by a reference to its success in elevating Yale, Nassau Hall, Washington and other Colleges, and in making the Military Academy at West Point the first school of science in America.

Instead of a ruinous and demoralizing espionage, he proposes to locate every riot that may occur in the College buildings, and to hold all in the vicinity responsible for the disorder, and thus the rioters will be compelled to inform on themselves; or, if the disturbance should take place in the campus, he regards an inspection of the rooms as sufficient to detect at least some of the offenders.

The practical application of all the principles and rules which he recommends must be attended with difficulties, and will sometimes implicate the innocent with the guilty; but in those Colleges in which such obstacles do not exist, and where the students prefer to maintain and establish their innocence, or an alibi, to being criminated with the accused, the system may answer a most valuable end of discipline.

The remarks of the Professor on the duty of parents, and especially of mothers, in instructing and restraining children at home, are worthy of being engraved on the tablets of their memory, in characters of gold.

Whilst we would not be understood as endorsing every idea, expression, or rule which the Professor has enforced, we think he has handled a difficult subject as well as it could be treated in so limited a compass, and express our hope of seeing some further contributions from his vigorous pen.

2. *The Monumental History of Egypt, as recorded on the ruins of her Temples, Palaces, and Tombs.* By WILLIAM OSBURN, R. S. L., author of "The Antiquities of Egypt," "Ancient Egypt, her testimony to the Truth," "Israel in Egypt," etc., vol. 1. From the first Colonization of the valley to the visit of the Patriarch Abram, pp. 461, 8 vo., vol. 2. From the visit of Abram to the Exodus, pp. 643, 8 vo.

This is an elaborate and independent work on the history of Egypt, drawn from monumental inscriptions, and giving the results of long and well considered study. In researches so intricate, and requiring such skill in hieroglyphic interpretation, it will be wonderful if no mistakes have been committed. The number of scholars versed in Egyptian studies in this country is so small, we presume that these errors will escape detection here. The main results the author has reached, place Egyptian history altogether in harmony with that of other ancient nations. The immense antiquity which has been claimed for India, China, and Assyria, has disappeared when subjected to the scrutiny of impartial investigation. So have we always believed it would prove with Egypt. The dates claimed by Lepsius and Bunsen for the reign of Menes, we have had no doubt would, some day, be shown to be erroneous; and Egypt, which our skeptics are now pointing to, as a standing refutation of Moses, we have not doubted, would show from her temples, pyramids, and catacombs, the entire truth of Scripture history. The tactics of infidel writers will be to scoff at their opponents yet some time longer. But the hour of their defeat will not be long delayed. The path is marked out by the author now before us, by which perhaps, the labyrinth of Egyptian Dynasties will be revealed. The first settlers of Egypt he shows were a company of persons in a high state of civilization, who, by some strange anomaly, had been deprived of a great part of their language, and their entire written system. They had journeyed thither across the Isthmus of Suez, bringing with them the worship of the setting sun. The Dynasties of Manetho were, to a large extent, cotemporary dynasties.

Abram visited Egypt, he thinks, in the reign of Aethoes, about the time that the war for the scattered members of Osiris terminated; Joseph was prime minister during the reign of Aphophis; Thonoris was the daughter of Pharaoh, who adopted Moses; Sethos II., the Pharaoh who oppressed the Israelites, and who perished in the Dead Sea. The duration of the kingdom of Egypt, from its foundation to the Exode, he finds to be 1115 years; and the foundation of Memphis by Menes, 2429 B. C., a date nearly approximating that assigned by the Mosaic history for the foundation of the primitive kingdoms of the earth. The volumes are filled with costly illustrations, and the translations offered are submitted to the judgment of others by very copious re-productions of the original text. The author felt that there was no other mode of dealing justly with those engaged in the same pursuits. If there has been error in judgment, the means are furnished to those able to use them, of correction or refutation.

-
3. *Uhlemann's Syriac Grammar*: Translated from the German by ENOCH HUTCHINSON, with a course of exercises in Syriac Grammar, and a Chrestomathy and brief Lexicon, prepared by the Translator. New York: D. APPLETON & Co. Edinburg: T. & G. CLARK: 1855: pp. 367, 8 vo.

We are glad to see the Syriac Grammar of Uhlemann in an English dress. Its publication by an American house augurs well for the progress of Biblical studies in our land. Until of late, we have been dependent on foreign markets for our books in the Oriental tongues. Of Hebrew Grammars we have now had many editions, and the best one of all, Nordheimer's, was prepared and first published in this country. Of Winer's Grammar of the Chaldee, there have been two translations, of two different editions, prepared and published. And we now have the excellent manual of Uhlemann, brief and less elaborate than the Grammar of Hoffmann, yet adequate for all the purposes of the student, furnished to our hand. It is to be hoped that the enterprising pub-

lishers will find a sufficient demand for the work, and that it will contribute largely to advance the knowledge of the scientific languages, and of the original Scriptures.

-
4. *The Miscellaneous Works of the Rev. Matthew Henry, V. D.*
M: Containing in addition to those heretofore published, numerous Sermons and Papers, now first printed from the original manuscripts, with Forty Sermons on what Christ is made to believers, by PHILIP HENRY, Funeral Sermons for Mr. and Mrs. Henry, by W. TONG, JOHN REYNOLDS, and Dr. WILLIAMS, in 2 vols. ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS. New York: 1855.

These works we can most heartily commend to every class of readers. The memoir of *Philip Henry*, is one of the most interesting pieces of religious biography that we have ever read, and we wish that it were in the hands of every head of a family, as illustrating the importance and the true spirit of family religion. The Sermons are evangelical and sprightly, as full of vivacity as of piety. They are books for the family as well as the closet, and money could not be better spent than in purchasing them. We advise each of our readers to procure a copy forthwith.

MESSRS. CARTER & BROTHERS have also re-published, without abridgment, *Baxter's Saint's Rest*. We are glad to see that a very rare book has been rendered cheaply accessible, and we take it for granted that those who have studied the Compend will need no arguments to induce them to purchase the full work. They will find it answering the title of *Baxter's Body of Divinity*.

The same publishers have also issued, in a handsome form, *Watson's Body of Divinity*, a book of standard worth.

Also, *Fleetwood's History of the Bible*, of which, we cannot speak, as we have not yet read it.

They have also published, *The Truth and Life*, by Bishop McILVAINE. A work thoroughly protestant and evangelical.

The Rich and Poor, by KYLE. A series of valuable Tracts,

written with earnestness, simplicity and Christian zeal. We take pleasure in commending all the works of this author, and we believe that the Carters have re-published them all.

Preces Paulinæ, is the title of a spirited little volume on the Prayers of St. Paul.

Footsteps of Paul, is the title of a large work which has all the attractions of a novel. It is Conybeare and Howson on a small scale.

The Mind of Jesus—The Dead in Jesus, and *The Memoir of Oberlin*, are books from the same house, of which we cannot speak with certainty. But to us, it is a commendation of any book that the CARTERS have published it. They are conscientious Christian men, who use the press only for the glory of God. They feel their responsibility to the Head of the Church, and when they put their names upon the title page of a volume, the community may feel assured that it contains nothing injurious to the faith, or hurtful to the manners of a Christian.

5. We have received from the Presbyterian Board of Publication, the following Books, which we take great pleasure in advertising to our readers :

1. *Minutes of the General Assembly from 1821 to 1835*. No minister should be without this.

2. *Memoirs of the Rev. Walter M. Lowrie, Missionary to China*. Edited by his Father. This neat volume is adorned with an engraving of the young martyr. He being dead, yet speaketh, and his blood cries to the ground, not for vengeance, but for mercy. God grant that it may be a seed from which a most abundant harvest, to the glory of God's grace, shall be speedily gathered.

3. *Monitory Letters to Church Members*. These we have not yet read, but the subject is full of interest, and cannot be discussed by a Christian man without profit to his readers.

4. *Sketches of the Presbyterian Church*, containing a brief summary of arguments in favour of its primitive and apostolical character, and a view of its principles, order and history, design-

ed especially for the youth of the church. By the Rev. J. E. ROCKWELL. The book is ornamented with a cut of John Knox, and a *fac-simile* of his writing. It is a kind of work very much needed.

5. *The Book of Popery*, a Manual for Protestants, descriptive of the origin, progress, doctrines, rites and ceremonies of the Papal Church. By INGRAHAM COBBIN, M. A., author of the condensed Commentary.

6. *The Bohemian Martyrs*, or Sketches of the Lives of John Huss and Jerome of Prague. Just the thing to give children a relish for gospel truth and church history.

7. *The Perseverance of the Saints*, a small Tract: pp. 78, 18 mo.

8. *The Youth's Casket of Gems and Pearls*, selected and arranged by the Editor: pp. 127, 18 mo.

9. *Lily among Thorns and Old Gabriel*: pp. 64, 24 mo.

10. *The Boat and the Drowned Officer*. By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH: pp. 36, 18 mo.

11. *Fear not, and Rest in Christ*: pp. 64, 32 mo.

12. *Adam and Christ*, or the Doctrine of Representation, stated and explained by E. C. WINES, D. D. A very judicious discussion of the subject.

13. *Mary Searching for Jesus*. By Rev. JAMES DRUMMOND.

14. *A Warning Cry from Niagara*. A striking and impressive Tract.

15. *Child's Catechism of Scripture History*. We have received three volumes.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER II.

OCTOBER, MDCCLV.

ARTICLE I.

THE INFLUENCE OF PRESBYTERIANISM ON THE CULTURE OF THE HUMAN INTELLECT AND THE PROGRESS OF PIETY.

The influence of the Presbyterian system on the culture and progress of the human intellect well deserves attention and investigation on the part of the philosopher and the Christian. We doubt not that the influence alluded to will be discovered, on careful and candid inquiry, to have been deep, wide-spread and salutary. A system so thoroughly organized as Presbyterianism, so powerful, so far-reaching, and so abiding in its general workings, cannot fail to exert a vast influence in elevating the human mind, or else in debasing it. Every political system, carried into practical operation, has an influence on mind, and every religious system, since no subject agitates man's soul so profoundly as that of religion, must exert at least as marked an influence, in proportion to the area over which it operates. Fetichism, the lowest form of religion, arising from a low condition of the human intellect, serves to fetter it in debasement and darkness. Christianity, the noblest form of religion, elevates, expands and ennobles the intellect of man.

It is, in every respect, important to ascertain the influence of any religious system on the human mind. That influence, according to the nature and degree of it, furnishes presumptive proof of the truth or falsity of the system itself. Whatever debases the intellect, tends also to ~~debase the~~ heart: whatever improves the intellect, tends also to ~~elevate~~ and purify man's moral nature; so

close is the sympathy between the various powers of man's nature, so great their coöperation, so decided their reciprocal influence. It is true, indeed, that in man's fallen nature, we often discover a disproportion between the moral and the intellectual culture of individuals. But the philosopher has no other instrument for raising the moral character of a people except mental education. The gospel too, operates, in purifying the affections, through the instrumentality of truth, conveyed to the understanding.

Beyond a doubt, Christianity in general, tends to elevate men in the scale of intellectual being. It has actually attained the result of so elevating mankind. The intellectual superiority of Christian nations over nations that lie under the dominion of other religions than Christianity, is not only affirmed in all Christian lands, but admitted in all others, except that which calls itself celestial. To show how the Christian religion has a tendency to improve the human intellect, were to prepare the way for the investigation of the subject proposed to your consideration now,—were to go far towards showing that the intellectual influence of Presbyterianism must be, to a peculiar degree, salutary. Christianity, in presenting to men the Bible, furnishes to them the noblest literature, and secures to them the most effective means of intellectual culture. As the body acquires vigour by violent exercise, so the mind acquires strength by the effort to grasp great truths: and Christianity certainly discloses truths of the very greatest breadth and magnitude. It improves every class of man's intellectual powers: not merely his memory, and imagination, and taste, but his reasoning faculty. Even those truths of our religion, which a man cannot comprehend on account of their vastness, may exercise and invigorate his intellect, because he can apprehend them. Christianity has advanced the interests of human science by teaching men to bow to the mysteries of revelation—thus leading them to expect mysteries in nature, to study the true limits of the human understanding, and to devote to the discovery of ascertainable truth, that mental strength that might otherwise have been experienced in a profitless attempt to pierce the inscrutable. Nothing

is more profitable to the mind than to recognize the mysterious as mysterious—to receive the mysterious sometimes as true, instead of disbelieving it because our limited minds are unable to fathom it. Christianity also, promotes man's intellectual welfare, by producing an honesty and earnestness of character, which leads to the thorough investigation of valuable truth. It does not allow its votary to be a trifler. To him the responsibilities of every human being seem awfully vast. He does not act from motives of petty vanity, but with a careful regard to his account at the divine tribunal, and with a view to promote the interests of that humanity, whose welfare, because it is recognized by him, as destined to immortality, seems worthy of his best exertions. The Christian religion, by infusing a spirit of benevolence, has advanced the physical services and practical arts, and thus promoted the intellectual culture of mankind. We refer for information on this subject, to MacCaulley's splendid criticism on Lord Bacon's works. That brilliant essayist states that "it is chiefly to the great reformation of religion that we owe the great reformation of philosophy." He states it as the peculiarity of Bacon's philosophy, that "its object was the good of mankind, in the sense in which the mass of mankind always have understood, and always will understand, the word good." The ancients regarded everything practical as unworthy the attention of a philosopher, because the learned among them, were destitute of that sincere desire to promote the happiness of the people, which the Christian religion inspires. Christians are, indeed, induced to cultivate all sciences, moral, intellectual and physical, with the hope of deriving from them confirmation of the truths of their own blessed system of religion. The political influences of Christianity have been also favourable to the developement and progress of the human intellect. Presbyterianism, as one form of the Christian religion, must be admitted to have something of the intellectual tendencies that belong to that religion in general, and to have had some share in promoting that intellectual growth among men which Christianity has so signally secured.

We hope to escape the charge of arrogance when we

affirm that Christianity, in none of its various forms, is more adapted to promote the mental improvement of men than is Presbyterianism. It may be, that the careful and candid inquirer will conclude, after a full investigation of the subject, that the Presbyterian system is, above all systems of religion, the best suited to expand and give impulse to the general mind of a people. We must admit, however, that Congregationalism, as it has existed in this country and Great Britain, is so much akin to Presbyterianism as closely to resemble it, as far as its influence over intellect is to be regarded. If the Presbyterian system has the advantage in this matter, it must result from the conservative influence of leading minds which, without oppressing the intellects they have controlled, have guarded against the formation of wild and extravagant opinions.

It has never been objected against the Calvinistic faith that it is not intellectual in its nature, and that it does not address itself to men's intellects. On the contrary, it is often objected to it, that it is too metaphysical, too purely and coldly intellectual. It is not our purpose now, to defend it from the charge of extreme intellectuality. The objection to it of excess in intellectuality, is at least an admission that it is intellectual.

In the Presbyterian system are found certain doctrines, of a profound nature, which some men affirm to be purely philosophic, but which we believe to be subjects of revelation, the study of which is well adapted to call into exercise the powers of the mind. Among these are the doctrines of the imputation of Adam's sin, and the substitutionary sacrifice of the divine Redeemer. We know of no subjects better adapted to call in active operation a man's intellectual energies, as well as his affections. That mysterious doctrine of predestination, which is peculiar to the Calvinistic system, has the healthful intellectual influence of restraining the mind when it becomes presumptuous, and of teaching it that there are limits, beyond which it would in vain essay to pass. Although this doctrine is inscrutable, we know no better intellectual exercise than that of ascertaining from the careful comparison of different portions of the Scriptures, the fact of the consistency of the divine Sove-

reignty with the moral responsibility of man. We admit that a niceness of discrimination is necessary to the reception of the Calvinistic system, but the very effort which the mind makes in its close analysis of truth, both sharpens and invigorates it. Hugh Miller, the great geologist, a careful observer of men and of systems, ascribes the intellectual superiority of his countrymen to the influence which the study of the Calvinistic system has exerted upon them. In reply to the question of Englishman, as to "what good all the theology of Scotland does," Miller, in his "First impressions of England and its People," represents himself as saying, "Independently altogether of religious considerations, it has done for our people what all your societies for the diffusion of useful knowledge, and all your Penny and Saturday Magazines, will never do for yours; it has awakened their intellect, and taught them how to think. The developement of the popular mind in Scotland, is the result of its theology." Some may imagine that it is no argument for a religious system that it is intellectual, but it ought not to surprise us that God has chosen to develope *all* the powers of the human soul, through the instrumentality of his revealed truth.

According to the Presbyterian system, great prominence is given to the influence of truth in the sanctification of the heart. It does not recommend mere forms or mere excitement, as the great means of spiritual progress, but the discovery, and love, and constant survey of the truth. Whether the opinions of Presbyterians on this subject, be right or wrong, it is certain that they tend to promote the study of the truth, and in the same ratio, to secure mental developement. To Presbyterians, the sole rule of faith is the Bible—a book, more than any other, adapted to improve the intellect as well as the heart. The very fact that Presbyterians have no pompous and splendid ritualistic collection, serves to fix their minds more steadfastly on the great doctrines of their religion. Any system of religion that withholds the Bible from the common people, or, in any respect, undervalues it as a rule of faith, must deprive men of one of the surest means of intellectual, as well as of spiritual improvement. In this respect, how greatly Pres-

byterianism has the advantage over Romanism, or even Puseyism. Presbyterians claim and exercise the right of searching the Scriptures for themselves, of forming their own religious opinions, without dictation from any human being; and we certainly know nothing which gives more vigour to the mind than the unchecked and unfettered investigation of religious truth.

The study of truth always improves the understanding. Error warps the mind. Presbyterianism is not only truth, but divine truth. It is not only divine truth, but a large portion of that truth. It includes truth that many Christians regard as unessential to salvation, but that is not unimportant as an instrument of mental discipline. To leave out of a religious system, any great Scriptural truth, is to impair its power as an agent of intellectual improvement. Presbyterianism is truth in its harmony, truth reaching high and deep, and spreading itself far and wide.

The importance that Presbyterians attach to the Pulpit evinces the intellectual power of their system. They have always demanded that their religious teachers be men of thorough education and respectable learning, thus securing to the country of their residence, a class of intellectual men, as well as a class of teachers for the people. Were these men engaged in instructing on any scientific subject, their influence in elevating the popular mind would be, necessarily, immense. Especially is it so, when the science which they teach is the sublimest of all sciences, that which, more than all others, gives mind to the soul,—that to which the study of all other sciences ought to be as a threshold, itself, as Lord Bacon has said, “the haven and Sabbath of all man’s contemplations.” It will, perhaps, not be denied that Presbyterian Churches have been almost everywhere distinguished by the thoroughness of the instruction given from their pulpits. No where have the doctrines of the Gospel been more fully unfolded than among them. In this respect, they have presented a striking contrast to the Church of Rome, in which the public exposition of the Divine word has been sadly neglected, and the altar has been raised far above the pulpit. In many of our Protestant Churches, a very inferior position is assign-

ed to the preaching of the divine truth. The liturgy and the music of the deep-toned organ are regarded as of primary and of almost exclusive importance, and a small proportion of the season of religious service is allowed for the exposition of God's word. We can hardly think that this is as it should be; it is certainly not the state of things best adapted to lead to the intellectual improvement of the preacher, or to the best instruction of his audience. The preaching of the distinguishing doctrines of Calvinism, in English pulpits, was prohibited in the reigns of several of the kings of England: nor have those doctrines, which are best adapted to give vigour to the mind, usually been the favourite themes of the Episcopal clergy generally, either in Great Britain, or the United States of America. When mere fervid appeals, however necessary they may be in themselves, are substituted for constant and careful doctrinal instructions, men must fail to derive through the pulpit, that intellectual improvement which it may confer without any diversion from its great designs, and even while engaged most directly in the fulfilment of them. Taste-ful and elegant composition, that contains no robust thought, can only at best, cultivate the taste. The mode of exhibiting truth, which the Presbyterian system encourages, not to say imposes, may not always be the most pleasing or popular. It often displeases, from the very fact that it tasks the intellect. It becomes us to consider, however, that it is not the lesson which is most easily learned that is always the most profitable in any respect, or that usually imparts most vigour or discipline to the mind of the learner. It were idle to deny that many of the most eloquent preachers of the word, men whose productions are lit up with the fire of genius, and are destined to be admired through all coming ages, have been found in the Romish Church. The names of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, and Massillon, are immortal. It were uncandid and vain to refuse to the Church of England, the credit of producing scores of able preachers, men of genius, piety, and profound learning. Jeremy Taylor, Lowth, Butler, and Henry Melville, are in the memories of all men. All the Protestant denominations have had their preachers, over whom

none in the Presbyterian Church can claim preëminence. In every church the ministers of religion have accomplished much towards elevating and enlightening the public mind. Notwithstanding, we give utterance to the conviction, that the mode of instruction adopted by Calvinistic ministers is peculiarly adapted to train and invigorate the minds of their hearers.

Presbyterians have been distinguished by their attention to the religious education of their children. As the parent presents his child, in the house of God, that he may have administered to it, the holy rite of baptism, he promises to teach it to read God's holy oracles. Some have supposed that the children of Presbyterian families are well instructed in religion, mainly in consequence of the promise made by parents, at the season of their presenting their children for baptism. For centuries the children of Presbyterians have been taught the shorter catechism of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. That catechism contains a summary of the doctrines of the Scriptures. It was composed by men of superior intellectual attainments and endowments, and is one of the most valuable productions of the human mind. It is not understood, indeed, but is retained by the mind of childhood. Once lodged in the memory, however, it comes more and more within the reach of the understanding, and to say nothing of its religious effects, cannot fail to exert a constant and powerful influence in developing the minds of those who have learned it. Religious truth exerts as real a disciplinary influence on the human intellect as truth of any other sort. The Bible is not inferior to any other book of literature, as a means of mental culture: and that Catechism which was the joint product of many of the greatest minds of the seventeenth century—that era during which there were giants in the earth, may at least, favourably compare with most of the school books of this nineteenth century. Never has any society existed, whose members had been thoroughly instructed from their childhood, in the great truths of the Christian religion, and richly imbued with the love of the Bible, that did not possess a degree of intelligence and mental discipline far greater than is usually found among mankind.

Presbyterians have usually been the warm advocates of mental education and general learning. So uniform, so almost invariable has been their attention to education, that we cannot regard it as accidental; it has resulted from the influence of their religious system. The system can never act healthfully without producing an attention to learning. It is not something that may exist, or may not exist, while the system continue to act. It flows inevitably from the system, when in practical operation. We may fear that genuine Presbyterianism may cease to live in any particular country or neighbourhood, but are assured that, wherever it shall live, there shall be found in alliance with it a love of learning that poverty may indeed repress, but can never wholly extinguish.

The Academy which John Calvin established at Geneva, and to which so many of the young of all Europe resorted for the purpose of acquiring a literary education, is known to fame. The first General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, made provision for the establishment of schools all over the kingdom. Hetherington, writing about the formation of the Church of Scotland, informs us, (p. 55,) that, "Education was justly regarded as of the utmost importance, and deserving every possible encouragement. It was stated as imperatively necessary, that there should be a school in every parish, for the instruction of youth in the principles of religion, grammar, and the Latin tongue; and it was further proposed, that a college should be erected in every notable town, in which logic and rhetoric should be taught, along with the learned languages. It was even suggested that parents should not be permitted to neglect the education of their children; but that the nobility and gentry should be obliged to do so at their own expense; and that a fund should be provided for the education of the children of the poor, who discovered talents and aptitude for learning." After the second reformation in Scotland, or the overthrow of prelatical power in that land, Hetherington informs us, that "Presbyteries were directed to see that schools were established in every landward parish, and such support secured to school-masters as should render education easily accessible to the whole

population of the kingdom." After the revolution, as our historian informs us, "Some direct countenance began to be given to the exertions of the Church of Scotland, by the king; the most valuable proof of which was the act of Parliament respecting schools, realizing what had been long and earnestly sought by the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and no other church in Christendom,—a school in every Parish throughout the whole kingdom, so far supported by the public funds as to render education accessible to the poorest in the community." In Scotland, the kirk and the school have ever stood side by side. But, not only in Geneva and Scotland, have Presbyterians been the patrons of education: everywhere have they shown a similar love for learning, a similar solicitude about the instruction of their offspring. In the establishment of many of the Colleges of this American land, they have had an important agency. They have established primary schools everywhere over the face of the country. Nor do we rightly estimate their intellectual influence if we fail to consider to what an extent their example has awakened and fostered in other denominations a zeal for education, until in the work of establishing schools and colleges, they are beginning to rival,—we trust that they will never be able to excel Presbyterians. It deserves to be mentioned that the intellectual influence of Presbyterian Ministers, as teachers of secular schools, has been immense. Who can calculate the influence of such men as Caldwell, of North Carolina, and Waddell, of South Carolina, in training noble minds which have given an impulse to the intellect of the entire country! There are many of these ministers, teachers of primary schools; and unknown to fame, who have contributed as much towards the intellectual advancement of our people, as those more distinguished ministers of our church who have presided over literary institutions of a higher grade.

The observance of the Sabbath, not merely as a day of recreation and rest, but as a day of religious reading and reflection, tends greatly to awaken up the thought and promote the intellectual culture of a people. Whatever may be denied to the Presbyterians of Great Bri-

tain and Ireland, and the United States, this will be conceded to them that they have always been the unyielding advocates of a serious observance of the Sabbath,—that they have always entertained lofty views of its sanctity. The Presbyterians of Great Britain and Ireland (and let it be remembered that the first Puritans were generally, in all their views, Presbyterians,) restored the Christian Sabbath to the Christian Church, as really as Luther restored to it the doctrine of justification by faith; expelled from the church unworthy views of the Sabbath, as really as the Reformers of Switzerland expelled from it unworthy notions of the sacraments. To secure to a people every seventh day, for meditation on the themes which are best fitted to give scope to the understanding,—to keep alive the remembrance of that day, is to confer on that people one of the highest intellectual advantages.

We shall speak, at some other time, of the agency of Presbyterianism in the diffusion of civil liberty. Denying the claims of a lordly priesthood, it asserts the rights of conscience, the rights of private judgment, and men who are accustomed to think for themselves on the great subject of religion, soon claim independence of thought on all questions of political interest: they will be politically free. We may say of Presbyterians, in the language of Burke, “The people are Protestants; and of that kind, which is the most adverse to all implicit submission of mind and opinion, this is a persuasion, not only favourable to liberty, but built upon it.” He that does not recognize the influence of Presbyterianism on the establishment of civil liberty in Great Britain and the United States of America, is either ignorant of the history of those countries, or had read it to very little purpose. Shall we be required to prove that civil freedom is favourable to the development of the human mind, that it gives scope and exercise to its faculties? Think of Athens, at once the seat of learning and freedom; of Rome, the influence of whose free institutions on learning, abided for years after the Republic itself had perished; of Great Britain and our own native land which, as far as the general intelligence of the people is concerned, stand preëminent in modern history. It has

been discovered in all ages, that despotism crushes the intellect of a people, and that wherever there is liberty, there is thought. The taste may not, indeed, always be cultivated in free countries, in proportion to the culture of the other powers of the mind, but from their development must result, ultimately, the culture of the taste.

If the Presbyterian system exhibits most clearly the evil of sin, and displays most fully the beauty of holiness, and tends to diffuse among a people the principles of a lofty morality, then is it apparent that it is favourable, in no common degree, to the development of the human intellect. Madam de Stael has told us that, "The sentiment of the intellectual *beautiful*, while it is employed upon literary objects, must inspire a repugnance for everything mean and ferocious." With equal truth may we affirm, that the sentiment of the moral beautiful must lift the human intellect from its degradation, and animate it to thought. That it does is true, if not in the case of every individual, at least where communities and society at large are concerned.

It is an historic fact that the people, who have been brought up under the influence of Presbyterianism, have been distinguished, in the aggregate, by their intelligence and intellectual acumen. This has been the case in all countries, and we may even say, in all communities, in which the system has prevailed. In countries, where other systems of religion have been established by law, Presbyterians have not, indeed, from the very necessity of the case, generally occupied the most exalted stations in society. But such is the control of their system over intellect, that they become intelligent and thoughtful, despite every disadvantage as to fortune and rank. We doubt whether any population, however debased, can be brought under the control of this system, without undergoing a rapid intellectual advancement. Before the Reformation, the people of Scotland were sunk exceedingly low in the scale of intellectual being; since that period, they have been intellectually superior to any people on the earth. Hugh Miller affirms, doubtless with truth, that, "Intellectual character does not by several degrees, sink so low in Scotland as in England." Compare those portions of Ireland, in which

Presbyterianism has the ascendancy, with those portions of that unhappy land that are under the dominion of Popery, and consider the superiority of the inhabitants of the former in mental education and intelligence, as well as in almost every thing that can adorn human character, and render human beings happy. So much does the congregationalism of New England resemble the Presbyterian system, that we may properly appeal to the intellectual influence of the former to illustrate and confirm the truth which we are now endeavouring to establish. We fear no contradiction when we affirm that, in the United States of America, no congregations assembled for religious worship are composed of men of more intellectual vigour, or greater general intelligence, than those that assemble under the Presbyterian banner.

It has, sometimes, been affirmed, that the Presbyterian Church has made but a stinted contribution to the literature and science of the world. We are, by no means, prepared to admit the truth of this affirmation. The ministers of this church have not, indeed, devoted themselves to mere literary and scientific pursuits, for the reason that they have been engaged in fulfilling the arduous and sacred duties of their important and holy office, and yet the contributions of Presbyterian ministers to theological literature can receive contempt from no man acquainted with the literary history of the world, either on account of the smallness of their number, or the inferiority of their nature. As theological writers, John Calvin, Francis Turretin, and Jonathan Edwards, (whom we claim as a Presbyterian, because he was a Presbyterian in *all* his opinions,) have never been equaled in any age, in any country, or church. Few more able writers have ever existed than Daillé and Blondel, of the Reformed Church of France. Who has more eloquently defended the principles of the Reformation than the Hugonot Claude? Wherever Presbyterianism has flourished, it has produced able theological scholars, who have left their writings as a legacy to the world. Scotland has had her Hugh Binning, her Samuel Rutherford, her William Guthrie, her John Livingstone, her Thomas Boston, her John McLaurin, her Thomas Chal-

mers, her McCosh. To say nothing further of her early divines, Switzerland has lately produced her Gausson, her D'Aubigné, her Vinet, the latter called the Chalmers of Switzerland, but who seems to us more to resemble Blaise Pascal than any man, who has lived since Pascal's day. In beauty and purity of style, as well as in richness of thought, these writers have, perhaps, no superiors among writers of the present age. Few divines have written with more power than Holland's Presbyterian Voetius and Witsius. In the United States, the Presbyterian Church has produced many theological writers, whose works are esteemed in every Protestant land, and which have done as much as any writings which have come from the pens of Americans to establish a literary reputation for our nation. The sermons of Samuel Davies are regarded by many judicious persons as the best that have been published in any land. The most esteemed theological writer that Germany has produced for centuries, Neander, was Presbyterian in his faith. England, since the non-conformists were silenced, has given birth to such able writers as Richard Baxter, Philip Dodridge and Isaac Watts, who may be fairly regarded as Presbyterian. Were you to survey a list of the works on practical religion, which have been issued by the American Tract Society, you would discover that a vast proportion of them are the products of Presbyterian ministers. He that examines the publications of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, will discover from the books that it has published, whose origin was Presbyterian, that Presbyterianism has borne a noble part in producing a religious literature for the world.

Works of a purely literary and scientific character have also been produced in no inconsiderable numbers by Presbyterians. We need only refer you to the writings of the historian, Robertson; of the rhetoricians, Campbell and Blair; of the moral philosopher, Beattie; of the metaphysicians, Reid, Stewart, Brown and Sir Wm. Hamilton; of the geologist, Hugh Miller, and the natural philosopher, Sir D. Brewster. If general admiration can confer a high niche in the temple of poetic fame, Robert Pollock has secured it. You need not to be reminded of the vast amount of literature of every

sort, that Scotland has produced during the last fifty years,—a literature, produced mainly by men reared under the influence of Presbyterianism,—a literature unsurpassed by any that has grown up any where in these latter ages of the world. The most finished poem in the English language, the “Burial of Sir John Moore,” was produced by Wolfe, a young Presbyterian clergyman of Ireland. It is understood that Guizot, the great statesman and the gifted writer of France, was brought up under the influence of a religious system substantially Presbyterian.

In illustrating our subject, we have taken only a few names from the long list of distinguished Presbyterian writers. We could present before your memories names not less illustrious, if we were permitted to claim, as we may to a degree, all those great writers whose religious creed and ceremonies have been identical with, and whose views of church government have nearly resembled our own. Jown Howe, a man who was surpassed by no Englishman, even in the 17th century, as a theological writer, who has been pronounced superior to all writers on Divinity, by one of the most gifted men of the 19th century. John Owen, whose works constitute an inexhaustible store-house of theology, and John Milton, the great epic poet of the world, were all, at least, Puritans. The literature that has been produced by the Independents of Great Britain during the last half century, has been large in amount and noble in character: so also, the Congregationalists of New England have furnished some of the finest writers that this or any other country has produced.

We are to bear in mind that all this vast amount of Presbyterian literature has been produced with the aid of comparatively little patronage from governments,—such as has been lavished on writers of those religious opinions,—which are more agreeable to the monarchs of the world.

We shall offer now, some reflections on the influence of Presbyterianism in the formation and culture of piety. By piety, we mean love to God, and obedience to his commandments. We use the term so broadly as to in-

clude morality, as it is ordinarily understood, although we shall have chiefly in view man's dispositions to the Creator. We need not tell you that we recognize no piety as genuine, except that which is produced by the special influence of the Divine Spirit, and which, as far we know, is, in adults at least, associated with a belief of revealed truth.

What is the influence of any religious system on piety, is the question which we are most interested to agitate in regard to it. Piety is the especial avowed object of every religious system: without the attainment of which the most ardent of its admirers would pronounce it unworthy of being confided in or maintained. It is easy to see that it is a matter of little importance what may be the political influence of a religious system, or what its influence in promoting good morals, or securing æsthetical culture, compared with its influence in advancing holiness among mankind, and preparing immortal man for an immortality of moral purity and of peace. We are too prone to consider only those benefits of religion that belong to this life: and we fear that there are many who give their approbation to Christianity more because they see all its advantages to human society, as it now exists, than because they have any true faith in its everlasting results. But, let us consider how soon all the things of this world shall vanish from before us, and that the very world we inhabit shall dissolve: while the soul of man shall continue, through an endless duration in the condition in which it shall be left from the absence of religion, as it shall have departed from the world, or in that condition in which piety shall have placed it. Better were it to forego all the advantages which we can possess in this world—immeasurably better—than to lose sight of that system of religious truth, which is best adapted to prepare us for an estate of perpetual holiness and felicity beyond the narrow horizon of our earthly life.

Some have affirmed that the Calvinistic system has a tendency to encourage men in sin and impenitence. We know, however, that the same objection has been urged by infidels against our divine Christianity: and we believe with as much reason and as little force. Few,

however, have had the effrontery to affirm that the practical effects of Calvinism had been otherwise than salutary. Whether we reason from the nature of our system, or from its palpable effects, we shall see that, as much as any system of religion ever known among mankind, it has a tendency to produce the fruits of holiness.

Presbyterianism tends to produce holiness, because it is truth. To affirm that Divine truth has a tendency to produce holiness in God's intelligent and moral creatures may be, in your opinion, only to utter a truism,—a proposition so palpably true, as not to demand, or to admit of discussion. Yet men, whose aims seem to have been virtuous, have evinced a surprising indifference to Divine truth. Many have set themselves to work to produce right action, without the inculcation of right principles. Some have gone even further—have treated with contempt the opinions of those who have insisted on the importance of imparting rigid instruction in the Christian doctrines, charging them with narrowness of mind and coldness of heart. We hear constantly the words of one of our most admired poets quoted with approbation :

“He can't be wrong, whose life is in the right,”

—words that imply that the attainment of truth is a matter of indifference, as regards moral action. There are even those, in these latter days, who, while they profess Christianity, deny the very existence of an *objective* revelation. We are justified, then, in offering you a few reflections on the sanctifying tendencies of truth.

We do not affirm that revealed truth necessarily produces holiness, but that holiness is the natural and legitimate fruit of truth. Lord Bacon has told us that, “certain it is that *veritas* and *bonitas* (truth and goodness,) are as the seal and the print: for truth prints goodness.” Abercrombie says, “A primary and essential element, in the regulation of the will, is a correct knowledge of the truths and motives which tend to influence its determination. The highest class of these comprehends the truths of religious belief, a series of moral causes, the tendencies of which are of the most important kind, and calculated to exert an uniform in-

fluence on every man who surrenders himself to them. For this purpose a correct knowledge of them is required." Truth leads us to the attainment of our worldly interests, and is equally important to our acquisition of an immortal welfare. The history of those nations with which we have been directly, or through our ancestors connected, convinces us of the importance of Divine truth to the preservation among us of every thing which has even the semblance of holiness. The history of all lands proves the indispensableness of Divine truth to the existence of moral excellence. Truth is after godliness. All Scripture is profitable. We say, in the words of Sir James McIntosh, that "they who have insisted on right belief, have produced a higher morality than those who have merely presented moral precepts."

Truth is favourable to the cultivation of piety, because it has a tranquilizing and soothing effect on the mind. Bacon says, "Certainly, it is Heaven on earth, to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in Providence, and turn upon the poles of truth." Faith is founded on truth: and we are sanctified by faith. Our faith ought to have not merely intensity, but breadth: it ought to receive, not merely some things most cordially, but to grasp all that Heaven has disclosed to us. Truth is also indispensable to holiness, because necessary as the regulator of conscience, upon whose healthful operations all right moral action depends. We are not to be told that the knowledge of the peculiar doctrines of Presbyterianism is not necessary at all, because the belief of them is not essential to salvation; as portions of revealed truth, they are important in the work of human sanctification.

The evangelical system has proved itself adapted to secure holiness. "The grace of God hath appeared unto all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly, in this present life." "Truth, as it is in Jesus," is of all truth the most promotive of holiness, because it is the noblest of all. It secures a pure and lofty morality, and a deep and fervid spirituality, which seem altogether alien to our curse-smitten world. Philosophy may despise, and infidelity may deride this truth, but we have witnessed its results in a world whose situation, without

it, would seem desperate. It has been achieving its triumphs for eighteen hundred years. Let the apostles of Christ, let the martyrs amid the flames, let the Reformers, let the missionaries in heathen lands, let the dying believers in every age, let all the redeemed in Heaven tell us, whether the evangelic doctrines are not sanctifying truth. Now, Calvinism not merely embraces these evangelical doctrines, but presents them before the world more prominently; we believe, than any other religious system. No other system but the evangelical, however it may restrain and direct men's outward action, can produce that love to God which is essential to true piety and accepted obedience.

Presbyterianism has a tendency to disclose, with peculiar vividness, the Divine justice and the evil of sin, by the views it presents of the great atonement, especially by the doctrine it holds up of the imputation of man's guilt to the blessed Redeemer. We need only remind you that these views of the Divine justice and the evil of sin tend to the production and promotion of piety. You well know that piety is always proportioned to our consciousness of our sinfulness, and to our abhorrence of it. It is when we see its magnitude and evil, that we ask and obtain its forgiveness, and seek to escape its power, by placing ourselves under the dominion of a positive holiness. Nor can any man possess any just conceptions of the sinfulness of sin, who does not see the inflexibility of Heaven's justice so great that the violation of His law can never go unavenged, that sin can never go unpunished, even when Divine mercy interposes to rescue and uphold the sinner himself.

It is objected to the doctrine of Predestination that it is unfavourable to piety, tending to prevent both its formation and its progress in the soul. There can be no doubt that many advance this objection with the most honest purpose. It may be that these objectors have not placed this subject before them in all its possible attitudes, and viewed it in all its possible aspects. Ignorant and short-sighted creatures as we are, we may easily imagine those doctrines to be disastrous, which infinite wisdom has published for the most beneficent purposes. Had men been left to the guidance of their own discre-

tion in making the Holy Scriptures, doubtless many facts, which are therein recorded, would have been omitted, and many doctrines which are therein made known, would have been concealed from human vision. There are those, however, who think that the doctrine of Predestination may be most salutary in its influence, alike on the formation, the preservation and the progress of piety: that it has been the instrument of humbling hearts which nothing else seemed able to humble, and that it has furnished consolation to many a tempest-tost spirit, when ready to sink into despair. Without lofty views of the Deity, it is not possible to attain a lofty piety: and to represent the Deity as acting without a purpose, as having brought into existence an universe whose destinies he could not controul, or as being thwarted in His plans by the obstinacy of human wills, and thus shorn of His omnipotence,—is, in the estimation of many, to make an unworthy and degrading representation of His nature. There are many, who can not conceive of the Deity as really omniscient, while future things are beyond His controul, and are to be regulated altogether by the caprices of human beings. A belief in the Divine providence certainly serves to foster piety; and there are those who can not conceive of a Divine providence that has no purposes to fulfil; and who can not believe that a Divine providence can exist in human affairs at all, unless it has controul over the volitions of men as well as over the waves of the sea. To limit Divine providence to mere material affairs, seems to restrict it too much for the conscious wants of the Christian. To extend the control of God over the wills of men, is to affirm what necessarily implies the doctrine of Predestination in all its fulness. We know that patience under the afflictions of this life is eminently favourable to the growth of piety: and certainly nothing is better adapted to reconcile a Christian to the apparent ills he endures than the belief that Heaven has ordained them—than the belief that all things are so arranged by infinite wisdom as to work together for good to those that love God, and are the called according to His purpose. Humility is a Christian grace of the highest beauty: it has been affirmed of it that it is the chief grace of the Christian: and

we know nothing better adapted to humble the soul before God, than a survey of his absolute sovereignty,—than the conviction that our destinies are completely in His hands, that, in the language of St. Paul, “He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and that whom he will He hardeneth.” This truth, fully apprehended, has been the instrument of making multitudes of proud souls bow in submission at the cross, by whom all the other truths of revelation seemed to have been unheeded. It strikes terror into the heart, which nothing else seems able to waken to conviction. It is conceded that the Christian, who perceives that his salvation is wholly of grace, is apt to make the most rapid and exalted attainments in piety. And who perceives that his salvation is a gratuitous gift, so fully as the man who sees that it was not conferred in consideration of good works foreseen in him, but without regard to any excellence of his own, and for the purpose that he might attain holiness before God? One of the greatest stimulants to piety in the Christian heart is gratitude: but whose gratitude can be so great as his, who knows that God’s love to him is peculiar and distinguishing, and has been specially designed for him from everlasting ages? This gratitude of itself, will impel him along a career of heavenly obedience, when it anchors itself on the atonement. It is said that a man, who believes himself predestinated to eternal life, will become careless about his salvation and indifferent to sin. But we reply, that the child of God will be preserved from this carelessness—from this indifference as a thing habitual. No man has a right to suppose himself predestinated to eternal life, for no man has a right to suppose himself a Christian, who is indifferent to sin. The Christian knows that he is as really predestined to the exercise of faith and repentance, and to the practice of good works, as to the attainment of Heaven. He knows that God hath chosen him in Christ before the foundation of the world, that he should be holy and without blame before him in love, (Ex. xi: 4,) that God hath chosen him to salvation, through the sanctification of the Spirit and the belief of the truth.—2 Thess. 2: 12. He knows that he is elect unto obedience.—1 Pet. i: 2. To suppose that a doctrine, which

presents the noblest views of God's nature, that inspires the highest confidence in his providence, that is best adapted to humble the soul and exclude all boasting and self-righteousness,—that produces patience, and nerves the heart to fortitude, and awakens gratitude and love to God,—to suppose that such a doctrine can be detrimental to piety seems to us altogether unreasonable. On the other hand, it must be eminently favourable to it. We are speaking of the natural effect of this doctrine: we do not deny that men may wrest it to their destruction, as also the other Scriptures. There is nothing so good that human deformity may not pervert and misapply it.

Presbyterianism, in as much as it exhibits the Scriptures as the only rule of conduct and belief, fosters the study of the pure and unadulterated word of truth, and in the same proportion, tends to nourish piety, and thus has the advantage over all those systems of religious faith, which do not give the same preëminence to the word of God. Certainly a system which relies on the Divine truth mainly, as the instrument of sanctification, must be more favourable to piety than one which places an undue confidence in human traditions, or in rites and ceremonies, or one that looks to mere excited feelings, as the great means of spiritual improvement.

In showing you that our system is well adapted to promote intellectual culture and good morals, we have furnished you at least presumptive proof of its favourable influence on piety. Certainly, no one will deny, that where intelligence and good morals prevail, the Gospel, in its regenerating and sanctifying influences, is most likely to find a welcome and a home.

We have said already, that Presbyterians in Great Britain, Ireland and America, have ever regarded the Christian Sabbath with the deepest reverence, and ever observed it with something of the spirit that is congenial to the purposes of the hallowed day,—that they have indeed, preserved it from being trampled into dishonour in the dust. There is something poetic and something sacred in the very thought of the sabbatic peacefulness that every seventh day reigns over the hills and valleys of favoured Scotland. The holy observance of the Sab-

bath, (as we have shown,) is good for the intellect of a people; equally favourable is it to the nurture of hallowed devotion, of genuine piety. To spend a Sabbath in the public devotions of religion, and in secret communion with God, in meditation on Divine mercies and in anticipation of human rest, diffuses a hallowed fragrance over the heart, and at the same time prepares it for the conflicts which, during the ensuing week, it must encounter, amid the business transactions of an ungodly world. Unless the sanctity of the Sabbath be recognized in all its fulness, the public duties of the day will be performed in a careless and irreverent spirit: and that portion of the day, which is not allotted to public worship, will be spent, if not in positive festivity, in idle visiting and conversation, or in meditating on the secular business of the week. Happy are we when we hail the coming of the Sabbath with hearts of fervid devotion—when we use its early hours in preparation for the services of the Sanctuary—when we feel that all its moments are consecrated to God, employing its afternoons and its evenings in secret supplication, in religious discourse, in heaven-directed meditation, and in songs of praise to the Giver of our salvation! Honour to the memories of the men, who have effected for us the reformation of the Christian Sabbath.

Presbyterians have ever been the advocates of the rigid administration of ecclesiastical discipline. That they have discharged their whole duty in reference to this matter, we are far from affirming, but they have acquitted themselves here as faithfully as any, more faithfully than most. We know how exact the early church in Geneva, when its Presbyterianism was pure, was in guarding the purity of its members. The Puritans, who were chiefly Presbyterians, while they remained in the Church of England, insisted that not merely those whose lives were scandalous, but those also who gave no evidence of sincere piety, should be excluded from the communion of the church. We believe that few things tend more directly to the enlargement of piety among a people than the faithful administration of ecclesiastical discipline.

Presbyterians have never adopted those Erastian prin-

ciples which are so detrimental to the piety of a church. It is true that Presbyterian churches have, sometimes, been more closely united to the States in which they flourished, than we can approve or could have desired. Still they have acknowledged no head of the church except the Lord Jesus Christ, and have rarely failed to claim that independence of civil authority to which they were entitled.

That faithful instruction of their children in religious truth, for which Presbyterians have ever been distinguished, is eminently favourable to the nurture of piety. Experience has ever proved that the piety is most mature and fervent of those, who are most deeply imbued in the Scriptures: and they are such, who, like Timothy, have learned the Scriptures from their childhood. The instructions of early life may indeed be disregarded, and without special grace none secure salvation. It will be discovered, however, that the largest number of the consistently and fervently pious are among those who have been early familiar with Divine truth.

It is an historical fact, that a very large proportion of those who have adorned by their piety the visible church of the Redeemer, have been brought up under the influence of the Calvinistic system of faith, dissociated from a prelatical form of church government. In the Church of England, the persons who have been most eminent in piety, such as Newton and Scott, have been Calvinists. They may not be regarded as fair illustrations of the influence of our system: and yet, who can doubt that Calvinism had more to do than prelacy in the formation of their religious character? We do not doubt, however, that the sincerely and profoundly pious have been reared under other systems than Calvinism. To show you the influence of the Calvinistic system on piety, we quote the following passage from the Reflections of Jonathan Edwards on the Memoirs of David Brainard: "The preceding history serves to confirm those doctrines usually called the doctrines of grace. For, if it be allowed that there is truth, substance or value in the main, of Mr. Brainard's religion, it will undoubtedly follow that those doctrines are divine: since it is evident, that the whole of it, from beginning to end, is according to that

scheme of things : all built on those apprehensions, notions, and views, that are produced and established in the mind by those doctrines. He was brought by doctrines of this kind to his awakening, and deep concern about things of a spiritual and eternal nature ; and by these doctrines his convictions were maintained and carried on ; and his conversation was evidently altogether agreeable to this scheme, but by no means agreeing with the contrary ; and utterly inconsistent with the Arminian notion of conviction or repentance. His conversion was plainly founded in a clear, strong conviction, and undoubting persuasion of the truth of those things appertaining to these doctrines, which Arminians most object against, and his own mind had contended most about, and his conversion was no confirming and perfecting of moral principles and habits, by use and practice, and his own labour in an industrious disciplining himself, together with the concurring suggestions and conspiring aids of God's Spirit ; but entirely a supernatural work, at once turning him from darkness to marvellous light, and from the power of sin to the dominion of divine and holy principles ; an effect, in no regard produced by his own strength or labour, or obtained by his virtue ; and not accomplished until he was first brought to a full conviction that all his own virtue, strength, labours and endeavours, could never avail anything to the procuring or producing this effect." After further remarks of a similar nature, Mr. Edwards asks, "Can the Arminians produce an instance, within this age, and so plainly within our reach and view, of such a reformation, such a transformation of a man, to scriptural devotion, heavenly-mindedness, and true Christian morality, in one that before lived without these things, on the foot of their principles, and through the influence of their doctrines ?" However pleasing the office might be, it would require much time for its faithful discharge, that of describing the individuals of extraordinary piety, who, for centuries, have adorned the annals of the Presbyterian church. Their record is on high.

No societies of men have ever been more distinguished for sincere and ardent piety than those which have been constituted by Presbyterians. In this respect, be-

fore the Reformation, how favourably the Caldees and Waldenses, and the followers of Wickliffe, and the Bohemians, may be contrasted with all the contemporary professors of the Christian faith! Piety among the Hugonots, notwithstanding their implication with political questions, was decided and fervent, even so much so as to kindle the flame of devotion beneath the cold ribs of the Roman Catholic Church in France. So long as the Presbyterians of Switzerland retained their system of faith in its primitive purity, it produced among them the genuine fruits of holiness. We know how exactly the decline of piety in Geneva has corresponded with the decline of Calvinism there: and that the revival of Calvinism there, during the present century, has been attended by a corresponding rise of piety. Holland, where the Puritans were nurtured so far as to have acquired faith to cross the Atlantic, has long possessed much real spiritual religion. No man can doubt that Scotland has possessed, for three hundred years, an unusual share of piety. The Puritans of England, alike those who preferred a Presbyterian form of church government, and those who preferred independency, (they were all Calvinists,) have ever enjoyed the highest reputation for firmness of faith and fervour of devotion.— In the United States of America, the various bodies of Presbyterians have evinced as sincere and profound a piety as any other denominations in the land.

Martyrdom is regarded as a proof of at least religious sincerity and earnestness. Presbyterianism has its martyrs. What numbers who have held this persecuted faith in Bohemia, in France, in the Alpine valleys, in England and Scotland, have sealed their testimony to its saving power with their life's blood! We need only remind you of John Huss, Jerome of Prague, Patrick Hamilton, George Wishart and Hugh MacKail. No other faith, in modern ages, has offered so much blood in martyrdom. There are large religious denominations that can not praise God for a single martyr. Presbyterianism has proved its sanctifying influence, by the voluntary sacrifices which its votaries have encountered. Think of the hundreds of thousands of dollars, which the ministers of Scotland lately relinquished for conscience

sake—of their giving up their manse—the scenes of their domestic joys, and the birth-places of their children, and in many cases their own,—and of their quitting forever their churches, dear to them from ten thousand hallowed historic and personal associations. If a missionary spirit furnishes any proof of piety, we can claim this proof of it for Presbyterian churches, which have been distinguished by a missionary as well as a martyr spirit. God has also granted to Presbyterian churches the spirit of revivals. He has bestowed on them times of refreshing from his presence. Witness that extraordinary revival in the kirk of Shotts, on Monday, 21st of June, 1630, when about five hundred gave evidence of their conversion, through the instrumentality of a single sermon. Let no man, who has read the history of Revivals under the influence of such men as Edwards and Nettleton, doubt that the preaching of Calvinistic doctrines may secure the most glorious effusions of God's Spirit. And here we quote again from the Reflections of Jonathan Edwards on the Memoirs of Brainard: "And here is worthy to be considered, not only the effect of Calvinistic doctrines, as they are called, on Mr. Brainard himself, but also the effect of the same doctrines, as taught and inculcated by him, on others. It is abundantly pretended and asserted of late, that these doctrines tend to undermine the very foundations of all morality and religion, and to enervate and vacate all reasonable motives to the exercise and practice of them, and lay invincible stumbling-blocks before infidels, and to hinder their embracing Christianity; and that the contrary doctrines are the fruitful principles of virtue and goodness, set religion on its right basis, represent it in an amiable light, give its motives their full force, and recommend it to the reason and common sense of mankind. But where can they find an instance of so great and signal effect of their doctrines, in bringing infidels, who were at such a distance from all that is civil, humane, sober, rational, and Christian, and so full of inveterate prejudices against these things, to such a degree of humanity, civility, exercise of reason, self-denial, and Christian virtue? Arminians place religion in morality: let them bring an instance of their

doctrines producing such a transformation of a people in point of morality."

Mr. Bancroft informs us, "that the English nation became Protestants is due to the Puritans." We may confidently affirm, that but for the influence of Calvinism, the people of England, Scotland and Ireland, and their descendants in the United States of America, would now possess a piety no better than that which is nourished by the Roman Catholic religion. The friends of evangelical piety in every denomination are indebted to Presbyterians mainly for the preservation of that pure scriptural faith, from which flows the spiritual piety which they hold in so high esteem. Take away from the Reformation the influence of Presbyterianism on piety, and you have shorn that great religious revolution of more than half of its glory and success.

ARTICLE II.

PHILOSOPHY OF UTILITY.

Two British vessels weighed anchor on the 25th May, 1845, with a picked crew, and a noble band of officers, and were met by a whaler on the 26th July following, in the upper waters of Baffins Bay, moored to an iceberg.* They have not been seen since; and the only trace that has been discovered of the lost navigators are a few utensils, with some spoons bearing the initials of Sir John Franklin. The exploration of a North-west passage from the Arctic ocean, has been forgotten in the zeal that has been manifested in search of those who went forth upon this perilous undertaking; and the sympathies of the civilized world have been enlisted for that true-hearted and courageous woman, who has appealed in behalf of her lost husband and his associates, to the gallantry and generosity of English and American seamen. Expedition after expedition has failed, and an

* Kane's Expedition.

other heroic band is lost, and an expedition is undertaken to reclaim them. Further search only involves others in the same desperate calamity; and yet, many of our citizens commend the measure.

This affords a striking illustration of the spirit of enterprise which characterizes the present age; and is opposed in all its aspects to the old regime of utilitarian philosophy. The latter is strictly conservative, in all its operations; whereas the former would launch forth into new adventures, and explore new regions, even if danger and disappointment should attend them. The lesson of experience may be learned by failure, as well as by success; and because a thing was never attempted, is no reason why it should not be undertaken; or because a certain end has always been attained in an indirect way, is no objection to pursuing a direct route to the same. Yet, many things are really improved by age, and there is much in the reverence for old things, which is praise-worthy, and it is well that a people should not abandon familiar customs for new forms, which bring no improvement with them. It is still most unfortunate that nothing should be considered worthy of regard, unless it has the sanction of our forefathers. There are many things in our day, which were not dreamed of in their philosophy; and we find much to admire, with something to condemn, in those features in which they had no lot or part.

Taking a hasty glance at the various avocations of mankind, we will not fail to discover indications of the different elements to which we have alluded. As the farmer, or planter, should be considered the primary type of the business class, let us enquire: who lives in that log-house, covered with rough clap-boards, and the cracks filled with dry mud, with one door, and one small window, without glass? He is a man of some means, and has money at interest, but continues to labour with his own hands, and pounds his corn in a mortar, instead of paying toll to a miller to grind it into meal. Besides his corn and potatoes, he plants enough cotton for his wife to spin, and make into thread; to be converted into cloth on a loom;—which will employ every moment she can spare from cooking and washing. He uses the tools

and farming utensils, which many generations before have employed, and therefore feels satisfied to make no change for those new-fangled implements, which book-farmers have introduced. As to the rows in his fields, he considers their adaptation for carrying off the superfluity of water that may fall in a heavy shower, and directs them from the ridge to the base of the slopes, having a great aversion to any curves or angles which would cross the declivity of the hill, and thus retard the free flow of water from its summit. If a fine soil is soon washed away, and rendered impracticable by gullies, he cuts the timber from a new spot of land, and burns most of the wood on it, that the ashes may enrich it, and carries out his favourite mode of conducting off the water, during the few years it is fit for cultivation. We need scarcely say that this individual has a rule for doing every thing, and that he is able, like many of our families of rank, to trace the regulations of his household back to the third and fourth generation. After these particulars, we may pass him by, to take a glance at the premises of another, who resides some distance off, but whose mansion glitters in the sunbeams as we approach. The enclosure is of the most fanciful order, and the gate is swung on patent hinges, opening and closing on either side, with a spring, which performs its office upon the slightest touch. Having entered through this portal, we find a circular carriage-way, surrounding a rich parterre of choice shrubs and roses, with meandering paths, and here and there a bower of evergreens, most tastefully fitted up to accommodate a group, or throw a spell of enchantment around fond hearts that might meet together there. But the porch of that elegant mansion is now reached, and a servant in livery ushers us into its richly furnished drawing room, where the lady of the house is waiting, in full dress, to receive company. Her husband is absent, she knows not where, and may be gone several days, but is sure to return by a given time, when a grand reception is to make many pleased with themselves and their entertaining friends. This gentleman has a plantation adjoining this delightful retreat, and he occasionally rides through the fields, and talks with his overseer, in reference to the result of the guano,

for which he paid fifty dollars a ton ; or the rare specimen of Jethro cotton-seed, which cost him ten or fifteen dollars per bushel. His experiments with muck brought from the river banks, or marl from a bed near by, are also descanted on, while his latest style of plough, and the newly received cotton planter, are not overlooked. These labour-saving contrivances are the great boast of this refined and gentlemanly planter : but he rarely, if ever, dwells upon the yield of his grounds ; and then, with some adroit explanation of his recent shortcoming, and a new device by which such a result shall be obviated for the future. This same planter is a prominent member in a neighbouring agricultural society, and sends the best specimens of stock, and rare products, to the fairs in his own State, and to other parts of the world. He is doubtless represented in the exhibition of the industry of all nations in Paris, if he is not present in person to recommend the claims of America to the consideration of the world.

Such is the difference in tillers of the earth ; and a similar diversity may be observed amongst mechanics and tradesmen. One will be found plodding along, in the old beaten path ; and with the motto—

“Early to bed and early to rise,
Makes a man healthy, wealthy and wise,”

he passes through life unnoticed, and dies with a legacy of his tools, and perhaps a feather-bed and a milch cow to his family ; while another, who is less worthy, perhaps, makes professions of great capacity and tact, in his particular sphere, and has an extra touch for all things, which has the attraction of novelty, if there is nothing else to recommend it. There are still those, who would carry corn in one end of a bag, and a rock in the other to balance it, or even on their own shoulders, to save the poor animal on which they are seated from the burden. There are also those, who would employ the whip-saw and the jack-plane, even in full view of a saw-mill, and a planing machine. A few will adhere to the ox-cart, and the four-horse wagon, to transport their products to market, with all the wear and tear of rough roads and mud-holes, and the exposure of camping out

on the way-side at night. The breaking down of running gear, the death of a horse, or of a servant, from the harsh labour, is not thought of, when the direct outlay of a few dollars for conveyance by rail-road is before the mind. "A penny saved is a penny earned," strikes all such as a most sage aphorism; and though two dollars might be made, while one is saved, there is a satisfaction in thinking that nothing has gone out of the purse.— There is such a thing as being "penny wise and pound foolish"; and that is poor economy which does not employ the talent in hand, to add others unto it. But we must leave this, for another phase of our subject.

Let us submit literature to an examination, and decant upon some of its most obvious characteristics.— There have been as many orders of literary productions as the ages and varieties of the human race. We look back upon the ancients with a kind of reverence for their classic taste and energetic diction, and many are disposed to trace all that is meritorious in composition since the days of Homer, to the grandeur and pathos of the *Iliad*, while others see in Horace and in Virgil the germs of all thought and sentiment. Greece and Rome have been a fruitful theme for historians, poets and orators of the nineteenth century; and until very recently, it would have been considered indicative of deficient mental training, for an individual to undertake any literary effort without drawing upon the fountain of antiquity for the materials which he used. Heathen mythology has furnished more illustrations for a certain class of writers than all the histories of real life which the world has presented. The gods and goddesses, the demons, the muses, the graces, and the myths of fabulous conception, are brought forth to embody qualities, and to delineate characters, in the productions of literary men, and yet, common sense tells us that such fictitious and unnatural personifications can have no just relation to the practical affairs of life. These things may serve as records of the delusions of past ages, and may be instructive to the curious, but the frequent allusions which are made to them by writers of the present day, savours of pedantry, or of a spirit which is very inconsistent with true progress.

Leaving antiquity, and coming down to an early period in the history of the English nation, we find somewhat of the same sanctity thrown around their customs of living and their uses of language, by many of our men of learning. Because, forsooth, a thing was done in a certain way in England, two hundred years ago, we are called upon to lend our sanction to it, without considering whether another mode is not equally adapted to our purposes. From the cooking of a duck, to the preaching of a sermon, the old English style is of paramount importance with such persons, and it matters not if the same thing can be effected more promptly or completely by a different process, the departure from the English custom will be a most effectual bar to such a connection. This feeling is carried into every department of letters, and even a word cannot be introduced to express a new idea, without a challenge founded on its absence from the writings of old English authors. These writers may never have conceived of the thought, which the word is designed to express; and yet, we must enquire if it was used by them, and used in the exact sense in which it is now proposed to apply it. They had no use for such a word,—they had no idea to convey by it,—and yet they must be presumed to have it, or it is improper to use it. This mode of studying philology would make us indebted entirely to old English authors for our vocabulary, and they should have been more than mortal, to fulfil all the requisitions of their own age, and all future generations, in the department of language.—While the Anglo-Saxon race is progressive in every thing beside, it must be kept nailed to the version of the English language used by standard authors at a particular era; and thus no improvement in the use or pronunciation of words can ever be expected. Ideas and sentiments are frequently attributed to writers of a former generation, which had never been conceived by them, and it requires much ingenious liberty with their words to make the inference. All know that Shakspeare is regarded as a writer of gigantic conceptions; and yet, the annotations which have been written to explain his meaning, and develope his ideas, would fill more volumes than the productions themselves: and even with

his terse and pointed style of expression, there is much that critics consider doubtful, as to the true intent and scope of many of his passages. He may have intended in some instances to convey ideas different from the usual construction of readers, but we have no thought that his reputation has ever sustained any *detriment*, by a mistake of this kind, made by scholars of the nineteenth century. Their very exalted estimate of his powers of thought, would always inspire them with the most lofty sentiment, which could be associated with the words of the writer. A good understanding is important to secure a favourable impression from the hearer of any composition, but more important still, is a high appreciation of the author's capacity of thought. Many fine speeches, from humble sources, have been lost, because the hearer expected nothing, and gave no heed to what was said; and again, many meagre sentiments, from noted characters, have been lauded, because of a prepossession of the mind of the hearer in favour of the speaker, which precluded discrimination. An individual who is accustomed to say witty things will get credit for what he never thought of; and one who jests, will raise a laugh when he least expects it. So it is with the high estimate of the writings of former ages; an arrangement of words, because peculiar, may be considered superior to what has succeeded, and because not clearly understood, may be supposed to contain the germs of thought, while the authors were unconscious of the same. We read much, in other words, that never was written; and it is enough to award the writers the merit of stimulating the mind of the reader to new combinations of ideas, and new conceptions, far superior to those which are presented. We have an abiding faith in the benefits conferred by the experience of what has preceded us in literature; and we would fain believe, that some writers of the present day, had not only profited by what others wrote, long ago, but that they had improved upon the pattern which has been handed down to them, and are now better qualified to erect a standard of taste, and substantial merit, than to lean upon a by-gone sentiment in literature. We have the benefit of all that has been effected, and should be more competent to ar-

rive at correct conclusions. It is not the length of time, which may be spent in ransacking old literary rubbish, that makes the scholar; nor is it grey hairs that gives experience; but it is giving the mind a proper impulse in its investigations, and discriminating the true from the false in the acquisition of knowledge. Assuming, then, that there exists, at present, a capacity of intellect equal to that of former times, and an energy of will, not in any respect inferior, we hold that the mental developments should, and do, transcend those of by-gone ages, in a proportion directly, as our experience is seconded by industry in literary pursuits. Thus, we trust, the presumption, that whatever has been, must continue to be, is set aside; and that we may be prepared to examine the proposition, that "whatever is, is right"; which brings us to another view of the subject of literature, as a progressive development.

Here we have to encounter difficulties of quite a different character, from those already adverted to.—Instead of a strict adherence to precedent, we find a striking tendency to adopt *ex post facto* rules; and, cutting loose from all the precepts and maxims which have been given to us, to go forth upon new principles of self-sufficiency. The inhabitant of a tropical climate refused to believe that water could ever become a solid mass, in the form of ice, and the same incredulity has been enacted in our day, as to any advance in literature; but this does not justify the other extreme of credulity in all things *being new*, that are seen for the first time.

A large portion of our race are entirely occupied with the busy scenes around us, and conclude that this is a great age,—this is a great country,—and we are a great people, without a thought as to the opinions of others, and without any just comparison with other periods in our history, or the history of other nations. They feel their independence, and manifest it, in the freedom of their speech and actions from all restraint. They imagine that the supreme power to will and to do, to think and to plan, belongs to them, and although results may be adverse, there is no doubting but that the end will ultimately be secured; while their guardian angel whispers in their ears—"go ahead"!

This is undoubtedly a fast age, and people experience sudden transitions in every department of life. Travel and intelligence are so speedy, that every day brings a change in our prospects, and what seemed fixed to-day, may be undone to-morrow. That surrounding circumstances should impress the mental characteristics of a people, is in accordance with our nature; and we find that there is a growing tendency to a new order of things in the world of literature. From the plurality of the race in the physical creation, to transcendentalism, in spiritual philosophy, we observe all kinds of wild fancies are espoused by those who aspire to distinction. The Bible is too old a book to satisfy the refined literary taste of such persons, while nature's God does not conform sufficiently to their nature; and they must needs strike out for themselves a religion, which will admit of a less humiliating view of self. In the more circumscribed doctrine of Christianity, there are too many trammels for those who profess such freedom of inquiry; and they would first prove there is no God, and then make a God within themselves. It must be observed, that all such have no use for any of the ordinary modes of intelligence, and rely upon their own intuitions, in every emergency, with inclination as the guide of their lives. We need scarcely say, that they are in a quagmire, with a will-o-the-wisp to render their confusion worse confounded.

But mankind will stare at those who call upon them with a loud voice, and proclaim their own merits; and there is something dazzling in a great name, even when egotism is the father of it. In proportion as a character is invested with importance, the influence of the individual for good or evil is enhanced; and it is particularly unfortunate at the present day, that vicious propensities should have the ascendancy. There is such an eagerness for excitement, such a restless activity of spirit, that persons are readily led astray. In this point of view, romances and other highly-wrought fictions, are to be deprecated. Too many of our young men and young ladies of literary pretensions, are engaging in this vast field, which is overgrown with rank weeds and noxious flowers. It is true that they undertake to delineate

character ; but, most frequently, it is terribly distorted by passions, or by crimes of deepest dye ; and the reader is indoctrinated in the vices of life, rather than guarded against them. "Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise ;" and we must think, that the knowledge imparted by the light literature of the present day, is destructive of happiness, as well as injurious to the minds of those who receive it, to the exclusion of more substantial acquirements. Show us a novelist, and we will warrant him a creature of circumstance, and liable to be blown about by every wind of doctrine. He does not view life as a great reality, in which he is called to act out in good faith a true and definite part, but rather as a farce, in which he thinks to amuse those around him, by performing with a disguise of natural character.—Such a career unfits an individual for participation in the practical duties of life, and he becomes a victim to his incessant desire for something new. Show us a novel reader, and it will require no rigid examination to prove that his or her attainments are superficial, and that the mind is incapable of grappling with any subject requiring acumen and research. The very *relish* for fiction, springs from an *indisposition* to mental effort ; and the want of proper, vigorous, exercise of the faculties, leaves them in a state of impotency, which will prove an effectual barrier to the accomplishment of any important literary undertaking.

In the flights of fancy, which are so frequently indulged by writers of fiction, there is a tension and excitement of feeling for the time, which is followed by a corresponding depression, and the mind is thus unfitted for any continuous or arduous effort, of a less attractive nature. Such productions cause the mind to look for exaggeration in other departments of literature, which is inconsistent with truth and reason. But to dismiss from our view altogether, the erroneous representations of character, how little is there in the style of our works of fiction, which can recommend them to the more refined and educated class of society. If there was grace in the diction, or force in the delineations, this would offer some redeeming feature ; but they are most frequently wanting in every thing elegant, and marked by

a redundancy and tautology, which should exclude them from occupying our attention, even as pastime, from more severe literary employments. We are aware that some exceptions exist to this allegation against the style of novelists; and we are pleased to think, that a few who have entered this department of composition, have added to the beauties of literature,—at the same time, that the chasteness of their pictures, have served to render virtue more attractive. But, we allude to the predominant tendency amongst those who have entered the domain of fiction; and we are satisfied that our statements cannot be considered inapplicable. With all the aversion that we feel to reckless dissipation, we believe it may sometimes be indulged with less injury to the mental tone of a young man, than the incessant poring over the literary trash which floods our book-stores at the present day. But, if there must be excitement, let neither furnish the material for it. There are many investigations which the enterprise of genius may undertake, and keep up a healthful glow of mind and feeling, without resorting to revelry, or the seductive influences of literary fiction. This period in the world's history, is characterized by invention, in thought as well as in science; and he who fails to find a congenial pursuit, must be vastly fastidious. In all the departments of literary labour, new fields of inquiry have been opened up within a few years: and a young man who does not seek notoriety, can still find a place as an essayist or reviewer, which will shield him from the public eye, until he may make a name. Instruction may be derived from the past as well as the present, and reason and attention are the great requisite for the acquisition of true knowledge. There may be a happy blending of knowledge and investigation for new truths, which indicates the well-balanced mind, and it is only by using what has been acquired, in the search for truth, that learning confers real advantage upon its possessor. An individual cannot remain stationary in letters, and if he would not retrograde, he must add to the data which he has, or develop them in new forms and combinations. Few, perhaps, have a creative talent, yet all can enlarge upon the facts and principles which have been imparted to

them; and thus, mankind may, and should, advance constantly in intellectual acquirements, while the faculties of the mind should become improved and refined by exercise.

The tone of feeling, and the manners of a people, are always under the sway of some predominant principle, and a high standard of honour is considered essential to all properly constituted society. But there are many lesser influences, which serve to modify the character, and mould the customs of mankind. Of this nature is the sentiment which prompts to change, where there is a prospect of improvement; as opposed to the stand-still policy, which would let well enough alone. He who tries all things and holds fast to the good, will of course effect more than one who waits until he is entirely assured that his end is available. The chief element of progress is perhaps impulse, and it has a fascination, which requires to be corrected by judgment. A calculating policy has something forbidding in its aspect; yet we should act as reason dictates, and exercise a calm and deliberate forethought as to our conduct. If we analyse the two elements of society of which we have spoken, the one will be found to have a large ingredient of impulse, with a small proportion of common sense, while the other is deeply imbued with reason and consideration as to the future, but is based on a false standard of life. Hence, each aspect is very defective, and must be modified to render them consistent with our views of the true destiny of man. There is a fastidiousness manifested by the former class, which would affect modesty when there is no cause for sensibility. Such would decline to hold intercourse with a plain man, because they would consider him not an equal in rank; and yet, perhaps, he is very far superior in his sense of propriety, and in his mental capacity. The same class would hesitate to designate common things by their appropriate names, lest they should be thought vulgar; and their very search for an epithet to suit their taste, convicts them of the thing which they are trying to avoid. There are certain associations, on the part of such persons, with the terms which are ordinarily applied to certain objects, which induces them to avoid them;

and the vulgarity consists in this association, and not in applying the term in its strict and proper signification. The name which is applied to any animal, or to any part of the same, can never be indecent, if the circumstances require an allusion to it. The squeamishness which would avoid the use of words that are requisite to render ourselves understood, should be discarded from polite circles of society; and indeed, we find that those who affect this mawkish nicety, are not usually the best bred people. It always gives us an elevated impression of the refinement of a lady who speaks of familiar things in familiar terms, and treats matters of fact as realities, in her expressions. If false delicacy was rebuked, and we could get ladies amongst us to look upon all things in nature as they are, disconnected with the associations thrown around them, it would most assuredly be a favourable indication of the virtuous principle in society. But the new-light sensibility revolts at the thought of being plain-spoken, as to certain things, and would even call a horse a beast, a cow an animal, and a sheep a quadruped, rather than give them their proper names; and, although they speak of ladies and gentlemen, it is with much ado that the terms man and woman are used, and if the sex of inferior animals is to be distinguished, their vocabulary fails to furnish suitable terms. It has impressed us, on many occasions, that the embarrassment caused by the avoidance, is much greater than could result from the use of such terms; and we would gladly see a change in regard to it. We find, in this respect, that under the old regime, there is no hesitation in employing the plainest and most impressive phraseology, to express whatever is desired; and, instead of producing any embarrassment, it divests their whole speech of any improper construction whatever.

There are other features of this affected modesty which might be adverted to, but we would merely allude to that sensitiveness which is always jealous of the intentions of others, and would stand aloof, ostensibly to avoid an unwelcome presence, but really from an overweening self-pride and desire of esteem. With some, this would pass for diffidence; but, if it must have a name indicative of reserve, let it be bashfulness. Dif-

confidence may exist, and never be noticed by others, if it is connected with proper refinement; but the feeling to which we allude, would show itself in blushes and recoils, under circumstances not calculated to induce such conduct. Much of this sensitiveness results from a want of independence of the opinions of others, and the sooner propriety is considered, apart from the mere acquiescence with the notions of those around us, will a change of feeling and of conduct in this respect ensue. We should be prepared to think, and say, and do, what is our duty, without enquiring or caring for the estimate of others; and our conviction is, that the first lesson to be learned, for intercourse with the world, is that "honesty is the best policy," and that a straight-forward course will eventually be more satisfactory to ourselves, and command more respect and regard from those with whom we associate.

To be just, to be true, to be charitable, is not always to be useful. We have no reference to the technical signification of utilitarianism; but utility is spoken of in its ordinary acceptation of usefulness, or adaptation to some valuable end. In this sense, it may qualify the old or the new regime of society. It is the professed aim of the former, but frequently fails to be attained; while we can only predicate it of the results of the latter, as it seems to form no part of the motive in the various movements which are undertaken. The extreme conservative hoards his resources and thus prevents them from being available to any useful purpose, while the bold speculator loses all in some wild scheme, and thus, neither conduces to a good result. But if the contracted views of the one be blended with the extensive plans of the other, they may produce a proper discretion in the practical affairs of life. The best results are not attainable by either separately, but by coöperation we may have the most favourable illustration of utility. An individual may invest his means for his own advantage, and yet confer benefits thereby upon others; and we are pleased to observe, that in some instances, the projectors of large business operations, have not been unmindful of the general good, while they made arrangements for their own interest. All the generosity and

enthusiasm which are compatible with a proper precaution, must be advantageous in life; but while industry and enterprise are requisite for success in any department of business, utility is the touch-stone by which measures should be tested, and if found wanting in this, they should not receive attention.

ARTICLE III.

THE POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY OF AUGUST COMTE.

Freely translated and condensed by HARRIET MARTINEAU. N. York: Published by CALVIN BLANCHARD, 82 Nassau street. 1855.

Man, according to M. August Comte, is "a theologian in his childhood, a metaphysician in his youth, and a natural philosopher in his manhood." This is the universal and unchangeable law of human development. Through each stage of this upward progress, every one must pass who would come to the full stature of a perfect man. To pause in the first stage, is to be satisfied with the awe-inspiring, but baseless stories of the nursery. To stop in the second, is to amuse and perplex ourselves with insoluble questions—with those enigmas which engross youthful, immature or unscientific minds. We must rise to the ultimate step of the series, or be content with partial knowledge, and condemn our minds to a stunted and dwarfish growth.

This law of individual development is furthermore visible in humanity at large. The individual is the type of the race. Every advance in general knowledge is made by a passage through the successive stages described above. Each science must have its theological, its metaphysical, and its positive state, and can reach the last only by a transit through the first and second. Certain of the sciences have completed the ascent, and abide in the serene elevation of the positive state. Others linger in the state of transition called the metaphysi-

cal, while others have hardly risen above the crudities and follies of the theological condition. But the process of purification and exaltation is going on, and the prophecy is not a rash one, which predicts the day when all science shall be "positive," and, to that extent, perfect.

Such is the fundamental theory of the book introduced to the English reader by Miss Harriet Martineau, and such the basis of a system of Philosophy, of which she accounts it a signal honour to be the herald. The book before us, however, is not M. Comte's book, nor does it purport to be. It is his original work, "freely translated and condensed." The freedom of the translation, and especially the extent of the condensation, may be judged of by the fact that the six volumes of the French edition are here boiled down into one tolerably thick octavo. Still, from the evident admiration in which the disciple holds her master, and her sincere desire to place the system which she has most ardently embraced before the minds of England and America, in the fullest and most favourable light, we may argue, without any opportunity of comparison, that this literary cookery has been fairly done, and that criticism founded upon this book can do no injustice to the Positive Philosophy or to its founder. Meanwhile, as we gather from the preface that the learned Professor is gifted with a fluency beyond the lot even of ordinary Frenchmen, our thanks are due to Miss Martineau for preserving us from his redundant "enunciations" and "wearisome repetitions."

The name of Comte is gradually becoming familiar to all who take pleasure in philosophical discussions. His quiet and uneventful life may be soon sketched. He was born, according to the only authority to which we have had access, in the year 1797, of a family "eminently Catholic and monarchical." His vocation seems to have come at an early period, for while at college, and when only fifteen years of age, he felt "the necessity of an entire renovation in Philosophy." This early tendency of his mind may have led him to the St. Simonians, as we find his name, among others mentioned by Louis Blanc in his "*Historie de Dix Ans*," as composing that sect of Social Reformers. How long he remained

with them, or what degree of prominence he attained among his *confrères*, we know not. It may be inferred that he had left them before the year 1832, or was then one of the more obscure of the company, as he was not one of those who figured at the memorable trial, in that year, before the "Cour d'Assizes." He next appears as a Professor at the Ecole Polytechnique, from which position he was soon displaced by a hostility, arising out of the mean jealousy, as he affirms, of other members of the same Faculty. He is thus left, embarrassed by nothing but poverty, to fulfil his early and special vocation, and sets himself in earnest to establish, defend and perfect the Positive Philosophy. What is included in this Philosophy, and, more important still, what is rejected by it, we will endeavour, in part, to set forth.

The general law which underlies this system, we have already stated. Discarding all theological and metaphysical conceptions, it accepts as true only those things which, in its own terminology, may be called positive. When we ask what are the truths, or what the sciences which merit this title, we find an immense subtraction from what has hitherto been supposed to be the sum of human knowledge. The objects of philosophy, according to M. Comte, are simply the *laws* to which all phenomena are subjected. The business of the philosopher is to observe facts—to collect and co-ordinate these facts, so that he may discover the laws which regulate their succession. When these laws are discovered, reduced to their smallest possible number, and firmly established, the philosopher's work is done. It is not permitted that he inquire further, or, if he does, it is not to be supposed that he will gain any real or definite knowledge. Especially is all speculation concerning the *causes* of phenomena strictly prohibited. An inference of this kind is a logical offence. "Our business is," says M. Comte, "seeing how vain is any research into what are called *causes*, whether first or final,—to pursue an accurate discovery of these laws, with a view of reducing them to the smallest possible number. By speculating upon causes, we could solve no difficulty about origin and purpose. Our real business is to analyze accurately the circumstances of phenomena, and to connect them

by the natural relations of succession and resemblance.”*

To these fundamental principles of his philosophy, M. Comte does not adhere with a strictness corresponding to the definiteness and dogmatism with which he announces them. We verily believe that he cannot adhere to them. The positive philosopher, strive he ever so earnestly, cannot divest himself of the original, universal and necessary belief that an effect must have a cause, or refrain, however inconsistent it may be with his previous enunciations, from the inquiry into causes. The old proverb is again amply justified—

“Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret.”

An instance in point is found in the chapter on “Celestial Statics,” in which we find a section treating of the Tides. The phenomena of tidal action, and the laws controlling this action, would be all that our author, according to his own principles, need state. The successive ebb and flow of the tides, and their variation in different latitudes, with facts similar to these, would be all that we could expect to see. Indeed we can discern no reason why the whole section might not be filled up by the transference of a page from any respectable Nautical Almanac. But M. Comte stops not with barren statements of dry details. He cannot refrain from speaking of those potent and subtle influences, which, pervading the wide ocean, throw its surf high upon the shore, or far inland, cause the bosom of mighty rivers to swell. The words “cause,” and “causes,” figure, not unfrequently, throughout the section. Tidal action is due, we are informed, to the combined influence of the sun and moon, the influence of the latter being from two and a half to three times more powerful than the sun, owing to its greater proximity. Now, granting that all these statements are correct, and that the true theory of the tides has been attained, what business has the positive philosopher with them? Having settled that we have nothing to do with causes, why does he go about to tell us of the causes which produce tides, and of the relative force and various combinations of these causes? Is not

* Page 38.

this proof of a very damaging inconsistency, and yet, of an inconsistency not at all marvellous, seeing that the most determined "positivity" must be vanquished by that natural and irresistible tendency to speculate upon the causes of every change which is a part of the mental structure of every man.

In the discovery and establishment of the Laws of Phenomena, to which M. Comte would confine all study, and from which he sometimes thus singularly wanders, he relies chiefly upon mathematical science. So decided is he in his estimate of the value of mathematics as an instrument in the investigation of nature, that over the doors of the temple of Philosophy which he claims to have erected, there might be written the old inscription, "Let no one ignorant of Geometry enter here." And this he ought to do the more cheerfully, inasmuch as, since one of the metaphysicians of our day has shown that these words were never written by Plato over his academy, this famous inscription has been running at large, without any owner. No one in our age, has a clearer title to it than our author. For, to none that we have read, does mathematical science appear so necessary, and so immensely valuable. It is true that, in his first enumeration of the sciences, he omits the mathematics. But this is a mere rhetorical feint, and the other sciences are introduced only as Peers and Peeresses at a coronation, to await the advent of the King. He apologises for the "prodigious omission" by saying, that it was intentional, and made in order to signalize the vast importance of the mathematics. Then he proceeds to place this science "in the first place in the hierarchy of the sciences," making it the point of departure of all education, whether general or special, and characterising it, first, as a constituent part of natural philosophy,—then, as the true basis of all natural philosophy, and ending by affirming it to be "the most valuable and powerful instrument that the human mind can employ in the investigation of the laws of natural phenomena."

To mathematics are due, says M. Comte, "both the origin of Positive Philosophy and its Method." The question will naturally arise, are the mathematics applicable to all parts of this philosophy? For example,

will mathematical analysis give us the laws of Sociology or Biology, two of the positive sciences? The author leaves us in no doubt upon this part of the subject. He says that in a logical view this science is necessarily and rigorously universal. "There is no inquiry which is not finally reducible to a question of numbers."* He mentions the Kantian division of human ideas into two categories of quantity and quality, and repudiating the latter, resolves all ideas of quality into ideas of quantity. He puts an extreme case, as if to indicate his own opinion in a manner which would prevent the possibility of a mistake. "Nothing can appear less like a mathematical inquiry than the study of living bodies in a state of disease, yet, in studying the cure of diseases, we are simply endeavouring to ascertain the *quantities* of the different agents which are to modify the organism." If this is meant only as an illustration of the extreme to which M. Comte would carry his mathematical fervour, we have nought to object to it. But if any of the Faculty should proceed to "modify our organism," by computations of quantities, and doses arithmetically adjusted, we would certainly raise a question touching the quality and nature of the remedies used. And if he demurred to this, we should surely feel ourselves justified in seeking for one less skilled in mathematical therapeutics, and with whom the first question was not how much? but, of what kind? Sydney Smith's saying, "that the sixth commandment was suspended by every medical diploma," would be gravely and sadly true, were the next generation of physicians to become positive philosophers.

The reader need not, however, anticipate any great and sudden revolution in the mode of establishing those sciences which have hitherto rested upon observation and experience. Mathematical analyses cannot give us as yet, and will never give us the laws which regulate epidemics, or furnish us with the data from which to construct a faultless theory of government. For this science is, with the positive philosopher, only *logically* universal. *Practically*, it is a science which is limited.

* Page 28.

The limitations are first in man's intelligence, and are therefore likely to remain. But in the phenomena submitted to us, there is also so much of complexity and so much of variation, that mathematicians can only partially apply these processes, and the universal science is thus both objectively and subjectively limited. All vital phenomena eludes its grasp. "Social phenomena, being more complicated still, are even more out of the question as subjects for mathematical analysis." The mathematical basis, our author claims, exists in all these cases as truly as in phenomena which exhibit in all its clearness, the law of gravitation, only we cannot see it. If our vision was clearer or more piercing,—or, if the conditions to be studied in each case, were not so manifold, we might discover the mathematical laws which underlie every division of human knowledge, but at present we must rest quietly in the faith that they are there.

That these limitations to the application of mathematical processes are correct, will be acknowledged, we presume, by all, and the only remark we would make is to express our surprise at the rash general assertions which the author first makes, and then is afterwards forced to limit and qualify. It is surely somewhat strange to see him on one page describing the mathematics as rigorously universal, and on the next describing the limitations and complexities which hinder its application to all but the simplest classes of phenomena. A more serious objection also occurs to us, for which we crave a solution. In a quotation given above, it is said, "we owe both the origin of Positive Philosophy and its method to mathematics." But what is the worth of a method, rigorously mathematical, which cannot be applied? Is that positive philosophy which is not established by the positive method? M. Comte's mutterings about pushing the method too far, will not do. Either his philosophy must be established by the positive method, or it must cease to claim that pretentious title. As it appears at present, it is a hybrid, boasting of a pure paternity, or a mongrel system, vaunting its perfect unity.

But the most signal and obvious characteristic of this

new Philosophy, is the contemptuous air with which it rejects all truth, that does not come appropriately under the name "positive." The extent of this rejection may be inferred by our readers, when we say, that all mental and moral science,—all logic, and all rhetoric, save so much as may be included under the term æsthetics,—with all theology, and the various branches of learning connected with it, are summarily and scornfully dismissed. The rout among old and hitherto well-established sciences seems well-nigh universal. Subjects which have exercised the wit and subtlety of man ever since his creation—upon which his keenest scrutiny has been fixed for ages, and which the profoundest of human intellects have thought worthy of long-continued investigation, suddenly cease to be important, and disappear forever from the field of human knowledge. The wand of a Parisian *petit-maitre* has been waved over them, and they are gone. They have been weighed in the balances of the Laboratory, and been found wanting. Their ardent students have wasted their lives, consumed their days in fruitless toil, and reaped no harvest but the mere chaff of words,—of visionary speculations and unstable hypotheses. Aristotle and Plato, Bacon and Descartes, were only great and useful as they assisted to lead the mind of the race through the lower theological and metaphysical stages of knowledge, and prepare it for the brightness and certainty of the positive state. All their speculations, considered in themselves, and not as forming the transition states to the true Philosophy, are now utterly worthless, and they must be considered as simply the forerunners of one greater and wiser than themselves—the heralds of a Philosopher who will guide men up from the mist-wreathed and broken valleys in which they have stumbled, to the eminences of pure and irrefragable truth.

That we do not misrepresent the author in our statements concerning the amount rejected by him, will be evident to every one who will examine his book. We must be allowed to justify ourselves, and fulfil the intention with which we set out, by setting forth some of those positions taken by him, which impinge upon scientific or sacred truths.

1. M. Comte evidently regards the study of Man as inferior in dignity and usefulness to the study of Nature. "The positive philosophy," says he, "subordinates the conception of man to that of the external world. If the consideration of man is to prevail over that of the universe, all phenomena are inevitably attributed to *will*—first natural, and then outside of nature: and this is the theological system. On the contrary, the direct study of the universe suggests and develops the great idea of the laws of nature; which is the basis of all positive philosophy, and capable of extension to the whole of phenomena, including, at last, those of man and society. The one point of agreement among all schools of theology and metaphysics, which otherwise differ, without limit, is that they regard the study of man as primary, and that of the universe as secondary,—usually neglecting the latter entirely. . . Whereas, the most marked characteristic of the positive school is that it founds the study of man on the prior knowledge of the external world."* This extract sheds much light upon the character of the positive philosophy. M. Comte is strangely fearful lest any phenomena should be attributed to will, simply lest this might bring on the field the overruling action of a Divine providence. To prevent this, he confines all science to the discovery of general laws, at which he stops. They are to him in the place of Providence—in the place of God. . . Man can not, and need not, go beyond them. The reference of all phenomena to them concludes the whole work of the investigator. Inexorable and unchangeable, they control the movements and changes of the visible universe, the fluctuations of human society, and the manifold thoughts of man. Thus, by exalting the study of external nature above the study of man and his nature, and dexterously extending the comprehension of the term "nature," a vast and compact system of materialism is built up; and the universe, with the dwellers therein, are all thrown under the sway of fixed and immutable laws.

As a consequence of this subordination of man to nature, the study of man's intellectual constitution becomes a matter of inferior importance. It loses its rightful po-

* Page 301.

sition in the front rank of those subjects which claim investigation. In the Positive Philosophy, it is made part of the general subject, known as Biology, one chapter under this division being allotted to "Intellectual and Moral, or (and we beg the reader to mark how the materialistic tendency shows itself in the language,) *cerebral* functions." And nowhere in the book is the supercilious tone affected by M. Comte more prevalent than in this chapter. Rhadamanthus could not be more oracular in his decisions, or more prompt in his condemnation. Hear him: "The great philosophical cause is tried and judged; and the metaphysicians have passed from a state of domination to a state of protestation—in the learned world at least, where their opposition would obtain no attention, but for the inconvenience of their still impeding the progress of popular reason."* This is very much in the vein of Nott and Gliddon, who, by the way, always mention the name of Comte with due ascriptions of praise. A little surly insolence would be far more easily borne by patient men, than the presumptuous vanity with which this dapper *philosophe* shuts the door of the "learned world," upon better and greater men than himself.

We forbear to give other quotations, in which the grave absurdity of the judgements delivered are quite as manifest. But there is one sentence so fully illustrative of the spirit and intellectual scope of this new philosophy, that we feel that we must not pass it by. "As to their (*i. e.* the metaphysicians') fundamental principle of *interior observation*, it would certainly be superfluous to add anything to what I have already said about the absurdity of the supposition of a man *seeing himself think*." We confess that we read this sentence several times before we could well assure ourselves that it was truly in the book. Nor are we sure now that we understand him. The earnestness of his manner forbids the thought that he was attempting to be facetious, and sorry would the wit be. But did he ever hear of any human being who seriously contended that thought is visible as a tree is visible, or that we can look upon the changes of matter? The author cannot have meant to

* Page 382.

palm off such a bald absurdity, even upon the despised metaphysicians. The fundamental principle, then, which he scorns as absurd, and to which he gives the unusual title of the "principle of interior observation, must be nothing more or less than consciousness, and he must intend to deny that we have any such endowment, either as a distinct and special faculty of the mind, or as the universal condition of thought. We may think, but we cannot know that we think. Consciousness, which gives us the knowledge of thought as the accompaniment of the act of thought,—reflection, by which we detain our thoughts, and subject them to analysis, are both dreams of the metaphysician. We have no power to observe what passes our minds. Consciousness teaches us nothing—exists not itself.

This denial is of course fundamental, and removes the basis of all intellectual philosophy. As that philosophy consists in the development and application of the intuitive principles given us in consciousness, it is subverted when consciousness is formally abnegated. This denial makes it impossible also for any discussion to arise between M. Comte and the metaphysicians. They rest upon consciousness, and the veracity of its utterances. They find in it the fundamental laws of thought, and follow these laws in the construction of their science. Positive Philosophy ignores consciousness as the source of any definite knowledge, and holds that "interior observation" is an impossibility and an absurdity. The common ground, upon which all discussions touching man's intellectual nature must proceed, is thus broken down, and all controversy is at end. Whether M. Comte meant to accomplish this or not, we cannot tell; but it is certain that his broad denial of the existence of consciousness has made the gulf between himself and the metaphysicians as deep and as wide as even he could desire.

We have carefully examined the book to discover the arguments which were so conclusive against the principle of interior observation that any addition would be plainly "superfluous," but we have failed to find them. If they were of the staple of some which follow this bold denial, their suppression would be no loss to the world.

One of the most remarkable of these, is the argument by which he supports his position, that all intellectual philosophy, founded simply upon human consciousness, lacks comprehension, owing to the narrowness of its basis. It is this—that animals, not having the faculty of interior observation, or not being able to communicate what passes within them, the field of study must necessarily be limited, and no comparison can be instituted between their intellectual faculties, and those of man.—In other words, we cannot study man with any certainty, or comprehensiveness, because we cannot describe the process by which an elephant may reason, or translate into articulate language the chatterings of a monkey. Passing by the question how far the animals are possessed of intellectual capacities, it may be sufficient to say in reply to this, that if our systems of mental philosophy fail to take in any thing but the data given by human consciousness, these data may still be a sure basis for a correct psychology. M. Comte has never witnessed all the operations of the law of gravitation; yet he claims universality for it, and postulates it as the basis of the entire science of astronomy. We may not be able to survey all the manifestations of intellect either in the ranks of creatures above us, or in those beneath us, and yet be justified in attempting to erect a philosophy of the mind. Let us but give faith to our own consciousness and its intuitions, and the foundations of the science are secured. Cautious induction, founded upon wide and accurate observations, will enable us to build wisely, and a fair and beautiful structure reward our labours.

Some of our readers will doubtless learn with surprise that after all these very contemptuous rejections and denials, and especially the denial that we possess any power of observing mental phenomena, M. Comte still continues to treat of man's intellectual functions. These, however, are synonymous with "cerebral functions," and in place of the "psychologies" and "metaphysics" of the older writers, we have, as the positive theory of the human mind, what is called, in this book, "phrenological physiology." "The proper object of "phrenological physiology consists," says the author, "in deter-

mining the cerebral organ appropriate to each clearly marked, simple disposition; affective or intellectual; or, reciprocally, which is more difficult, what function is fulfilled by any portion of the mass of the brain which exhibits the anatomical conditions of a distinct organ." This, stripped of its verbiage, is simply the materialistic proposition that thought is a function of the brain, and particular classes of thought, the productions of particular and definite portions of the brain. This, with the special honour which is rendered to the names of Cabanis and Gall, will indicate to the reader the stand-point from which M. Comte surveys the intellectual world, and justify us in asserting that he is openly and unquestionably a materialist,—a title he would doubtless receive as a term of honour. His very great scientific acquirements, and his fine powers of analysis, preserve him from the crudities and the nonsense of travelling phrenologists, (whose occupation, we are glad to see, is well-nigh gone,) and he rejects with unusual decision, the maps of the human brain as given by Gall and Spurzheim; but his radical principles are materialistic, and to follow him would be simply to return to the days described in the terse language of Sir William Hamilton, as the days in which "the philosophy of mind was viewed as correlative to the physiology of organization," and to the dreamy speculations "in which the moral nature of man was at last formally abolished in its identification with his physical; mind became a reflex of matter; thought, a secretion of the brain."* How near he has already drifted to these atheistic speculators, may be determined by the fact, that he suffers himself, in one place, to speak of "men who may be said to *think with the hinder part of the head.*"—(P. 548.) We humbly submit, whether the Positive Philosophy may not have sprung from that quarter.

2. Positivism ignores entirely, and with its usual complacency, all that has hitherto gone under the name of Moral Philosophy. Man, it is true, considered as an animal, has certain moral functions. But these, like the intellectual functions, are entirely *cerebral*. Their study

* Sir Wm. Hamilton's *Discussions*, &c., p. 3, London edition.

is a part of phrenological physiology, while the observation of moral acts forms a part of natural history, properly so called.* Divided thus, between the man who feels "bumps," and the man who studies the habits and instincts of birds, beasts, and fishes, moral science, the delight of many a great and pure mind, disappears forever. M. Comte, while vacating the niche it has always occupied in the temple of knowledge, does not do it the poor honour of naming it. Psychology and Metaphysics are dismissed by their titles. Even the celebrated German theory of the "Ego," receives the compliment of a curt refutation. The French school, the German school, and the Scotch school of metaphysicians, (the special characteristic of the last being "*impotence*,") are all mentioned, if it is to be condemned. But, for aught we can find in the book, one might read it without ever dreaming that profound questions in morals had ever agitated the mind of man, or that different systems of moral science had invited the study and the support of ardent disciples. Not an author is quoted, not a principle discussed. None of the speculators upon subjects embraced under this science are named, save Adam Smith; to whom, with Hume, our author acknowledges himself much indebted for aid in his early philosophical education. But Smith's name is mentioned, not as a moral philosopher, but as a historian of the sciences, and particularly of astronomy. Thus the whole subject is quietly ignored. It is not discussed. There is no refutation of any part of it attempted. It is coolly regarded as in a tomb, upon which M. Comte is not even concerned to write an epitaph.

Nor can we find, after somewhat diligent examination, that any of the great principles of morals are incorporated in the new philosophy. We have looked in vain for some recognition of the existence of conscience. The author talks of public and of personal morals, but he does not mention that great judge, solemnly enthroned in every man's breast, which decides upon all moral acts, and determines their moral quality. Neither does M. Comte condescend to say aught concerning the free-

* Page 383.

dom or the necessity of man's moral actions. Yet, no subject might be more fitly discussed by him than this one, for his whole philosophy leads directly to the most rigid Fatalism. His general laws control all phenomena, and are in themselves immutable. The stars are guided by them. The tides ebb and flow: the flowers bloom and wither: man grows up into maturity and dies: nations flourish and decay: society dissolves, and then crystallizes into new forms, all in obedience to these laws. The spontaneous acts of man: for aught we can see, the flow of man's thoughts, and the current of his affections, are under the same control, and acknowledge the same rule. All is law—iron, inflexible, despotic law,—law, without a law-giver,—from which there is no possibility of escape, and which no one can change.

From this conclusion, which fixes the charge of fatalism upon his doctrines, M. Comte escapes by an inconsistency which is quite as hurtful to his philosophy. It is the acknowledgement that his "general" and "invariable" laws, to which men and events are both subject, are neither general nor invariable. "The most general and simple of all laws," says he, plainly implying that none are entirely general or simple, is the law which determines the weight of bodies. The phenomena of life, and acts of the mind, are so highly complex as to admit of modification beyond all estimate."* Thus, just where we need most the control of general laws, viz: in complex phenomena, we find that they do not exist.—Yet, this is called philosophy,—a positive philosophy,—and the author talks of the "vain-dreams of the *Meta*-physicians."

3. Logic, as that term has hitherto been understood, is also wanting in the hierarchy of the sciences, as arranged by M. Comte. Positivism deals with this science somewhat differently from the manner which it affects when treating of others. Some of these it dignifies with an attempted overthrow; others, it casts away, scornfully and promptly; others, again, it passes over unnamed; logic it quietly absorbs. It acknowledges, in a patronizing way, that some advantage is to be attributed to it

* Page 390.

in "directing and strengthening the action of the understanding;" but with a coolness that is inimitable, proceeds to say that "the positive method being every where identical, is as much at home in the art of reasoning, as any where else; and this is why no science, whether biology, or any other, can offer any kind of reasoning, of which mathematics does not supply a simpler and purer counterpart. Thus, we are enabled to eliminate the only remaining portion of the old philosophy, which could even appear to offer any real utility; the logical part, the value of which is irrevocably *absorbed* by mathematical science." *Per contra*, and as an offset to these boastful pretensions, we direct our readers' attention to the sturdy zeal, and the dialectic skill with which Sir William Hamilton sets himself to prove the mathematics, not a logical exercise at all,—and the joy with which he records the decision of Warburton, that "the oldest mathematician in England is the worst reasoner in it."*

4. *Positive Philosophy has no Science of God, and of Man's relations to God.* It discards all Theology, and all those branches of learning which have grown up around this most important, and to man, most intensely interesting subject. Its fundamental principle necessitates this rejection of all theology. If the theological condition is the lowest from which all the sciences must rise ere they can claim any scientific character, then there can be no truth there, or no truth which we must not abandon when we enter upon the higher stage. Its value is simply the value of a starting point. He that is starting, may esteem it as his place of departure, but he that has ascended above it may forget it, or look back upon it with indifference. The value of theological speculation to us now consists just in the fact that it did once minister to the awakening of human thought. That office accomplished, it became as futile and vain as the researches of the astrologers after they had led men on to the splendid science of astronomy. Thus does Positivism, by its fundamental principle, degrade Theology, and subordinate it to each nascent science,—

* *Discussions, &c.*, pp. 285-302.

to Phrenology, and Biology, and others as baseless and unformed.

Another principle, held by M. Comte, and made fundamental, in the scheme of Positive Philosophy, is, that being limited in our researches to laws, we can institute no inquiry into causes,—either, says our author, as if to make emphatic, what no one could misinterpret, “either first or final.” This subverts Theology at its foundations, by making it impossible to institute any argument by which we can demonstrate the existence of God.—We are walled around, and shut in, by these laws, and cannot get beyond them, to see, if haply, in our gropings, we cannot find One, of whom we may say, that all laws are but the expression of his over-ruling will,—all beings the creations of His infinite power. To the height of this great argument, Positive Philosophy does not aspire. Nay, it forbids us to attempt it. We can look out upon nature, and admire its wondrous beauty, and study its various mechanism, but we dare not look up to see who wove its robe of beauty, or gave the impulse to its orderly and stupendous movements. An ancient king, in the fervours of a devotion which was wiser than all philosophy, could say, as he surveyed the starry heavens, or the sun shining in his strength, “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork.” “Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge.” A Parisian philosopher, profanely sneering at the sweet Psalmist, can write, “To those unfamiliar with a study of the celestial bodies, astronomy has still the character of being a science pre-eminently religious; as if the famous text ‘the heavens declare the glory of God,’ retained its old significance.” But, to minds familiar with true philosophical astronomy, the heavens declare no other glory than that of Hipparchus, of Kepler, of Newton,—in a word, of all those who have aided in establishing their laws.” We beg pardon of our readers for inflicting upon them the pain, with which every good man must read a sentence so portentously profane. And we record, to the praise of Miss Martineau, that she has had the good taste to suppress it. It must be sought for in the French edition of M. Comte’s Works.

After an avowal so unmistakeable as the above, we are amazed to find that M. Comte rejects Atheism as decidedly as he rejects Theism, and actually classes it under the soft name of "a negative doctrine," with doctrines which shrink from the contact. "It is simply a final phase," says he, "of the ancient philosophy, first theological, and then metaphysical." It will do to disorganize old systems with, is his opinion, but it will never construct the new and lasting systems of philosophy. This must be done by the Philosophy which recognizes nothing but universal natural laws, to wit: by materialism, under the name of Positivism.

We begin to grow weary of a book, in which error draws out its length through many consecutive pages, and will pass briefly over what remains. The attitude which the Positive Philosophy assumes to Revealed Religion, may be readily inferred from what precedes. As to the radical question, whether there has been any religion revealed to man by means of supernatural inspiration,—any system of faith and practice, now existing, which is prescribed to man by Divine authority, there is in the book no attempt to determine,—no attempt even to discuss it. The silence, however, is ominous. We suppose that M. Comte's opinion is, that the Bible is a specimen of the earlier and the later literature of the Hebrews, in which the only thing worthy of observation is that the law of Jesus is superior to the law of Moses, and all of which is now valuable only as indicating the stage of progress to which the Jews had attained. Some things in the old book still attract his attention and admiration, among which are the "fine theocratic natures of early antiquity, of whom Moses is the most familiar, if not the most accurate type."* But our gravity has been somewhat disturbed to find these men of "fine theocratic natures," suddenly brought down to our own level, and to learn that the type and model of them all was, with many better things, a capital "*engineer*."

But there are other reasons why we must esteem M. Comte to be a rejecter of Divine Revelation. The fundamental principles of his philosophy are inconsistent

* Page 586.

with the possibility of such a revelation, or at least with the evidences by which it must be accredited to the world. A miracle is an impossibility in a universe governed by inflexible general laws. A prophecy is an equal impossibility. Man cannot infringe these laws, and cannot repeal them. God, if there be a God, will not: for in a system so constituted, any thing abnormal or exceptional, would be destructive of the whole system. The existence of all the positive sciences thus depends upon the discredit of the two great witnesses for the Inspiration of the Bible. And strange to say, M. Comte actually compliments the Romish Catholic Church, by attributing to it the "suppression of inspiration, with all its train of oracles and prophecies, apparitions and miracles,"—this very equivocal compliment being founded on the fact that inspiration ceased in the Church, the moment that the entire system of Christianity was fully revealed.

The question may be asked, how does the Positive Philosophy deal with Christianity as a fact in the world's history? Does it ignore all man's religious wants and aspirations? Does it forget, or pass by without notice, the palpable fact that the struggles and sufferings of the human race,—its profoundest studies, and its most heroic acts and sacrifices, have most of them had reference to the religious systems by which it was influenced?—Or, does Positivism think to establish a universal science, embracing under it special sciences, framed for the very purpose of giving us systematic theories of social and national life, and leave out of view that religion which preëminently makes modern civilized life what it is?

These questions may all be answered in the negative. M. Comte does not omit to give us his Theory of the Religious History of man,—nor to show how advantageously the positive philosopher may study that history. His theory is briefly as follows: Man begins with Fetichism. The theological dogma of the Fall is fundamentally erroneous. The race did not start from an elevated point. There was no brief bright period when man was perfect in himself, and dwelt in a world unvexed by disease or death. No. "Man has every where begun by being a fetich worshipper and a cannibal." The only

quality possessed by him, while in this condition, is the simple ability to raise himself out of it, and this is the specific difference between himself and the brute.— This is all that constitutes his superiority in organization. Thus our race entered upon the world it was destined to inhabit and rule. Timorous, weak, and ignorant, our rude forefathers beheld in every motion the effect of living power, and saw a living being in every tree, and flower,—in every dark cloud, and bright ray,—in the great sun, and every glittering star. A shadow startled them—a storm bursting upon them, was the visit of a revengeful power. They transferred the life stirring within them to inanimate objects without, and worshipped them. The passions struggling in their breasts they imagined moved also in the things around them, and they feared them, and trembled before them. Then, gradually attaining to some insight as to those things near, they still kept their fear and wonder for those remote and mysterious, and star-worship became the final point and culmination of Fetichism.

From Fetichism, by a natural derivation, came Polytheism. In it, the Gods worshipped by men are personified abstractions, gifted with life and power. One is the personification of Love, another of Wisdom, another of Virtue. To make these personifications, requires some power of abstraction, and in Polytheism we behold the dawning of the Metaphysical, or transitional condition of human knowledge. This was the first effort at speculative activity, and signalizes a great advance in the intellectual life of our race, while the great number of his gods, and their constant presence with him, as the superintendents of the various parts of the material world, made devotion an easy and familiar thing to the Polytheist. His Pantheon was around him continually. Polytheism also demanded a sacerdotal order, and in the priesthoods of all nations are to be found the germs of all intellectual and moral development. In every point of view, therefore, Polytheism must be regarded as an ascending step from Fetichism, while, as to what follows, it evidently leads, naturally and necessarily, to Monotheism.

Between Polytheism and Monotheism, the filiation is

complete, and easily authenticated. In the more advanced systems of Polytheism, Fate becomes gradually supreme. This supremacy is made the basis of a new spiritual *regime*. Fate slowly, but surely, absorbs the functions and prerogatives of all the other deities, and in the end, stands forth, under the name of Providence, as the one God of the Monotheist. "The transition," says M. Comte, "through the idea of Fate, to the conception of Providence, is clear enough, as effected by the metaphysical spirit in its growth."*

Having thus risen, by successive stages, from the lowest and most grovelling kind of Fetichism, in which, alas! is found the original and normal state of man, to pure and acknowledged Monotheism, it is time to look around us, and see whether we are in the presence of the God, whom we have been accustomed to worship as Creator, Upholder, and Lord of all. To our sorrow, we find that we have only an abstraction,—the product of metaphysical philosophy. God exists no more as one, than as many. The highest form of monotheism, to wit: Christianity, is not final,—is not the ultimate step in human progress. We must leave it behind, and, ascending to a loftier and serener elevation, we must breathe in the pure air, and see in the clear light of the Positive Philosophy. All beneath this is but temporary and transitional,—this is scientific, permanent, and eternal. True, we have no God, but we have a universe, wonderful in its order, and sublime in its extent. We have no worship by which our hearts may go out after the unseen and the eternal; but we have "animating displays of the beauty and glory of the everlasting laws."† We have no immortal life to which we may turn with hope and exultation. This is pure selfishness—the morality of Christianity, which turns wholly upon the desire for personal salvation, and is therefore unphilosophical and ungenerous. But we have the beauty of a present reality, over which inexorable law presides, inviting us to the study of invariable processes and unchangeable results. We have no Christ, bearing human guilt, and sympathising with human sorrows, but we

* Page 596.

† Preface, p. 10.

have a "positive" morality, consisting of "a complete expansion of benevolent acts and sympathetic emotions toward the whole of our race."

We can assure M. Comte that we have no hesitation in choosing between the old and contemned Theology, drawn from the Bible, which he is pleased to ignore, and his new and pretentious philosophy. With all its breadth and comprehensiveness—with all the scientific truth he has endeavoured to incorporate in it, and with all the persistent zeal and dexterous ingenuity he has shown in building it up, we must still say that "the old is better." And we thank God, that it is his pleasure, as it seems to us, to smite all systems which range themselves against his holy Word, with one incurable defect,—a defect which incapacitates them for any lasting or expanding dominion over the human mind. They all lack vital warmth. They are all cold, cheerless speculations. Disguised as they may be in philosophic robes, and garlanded by flowers, the heart of man always refuses to take them to itself. It finds in them no answer to its pressing needs—no relief for its intense anxieties. It can extract no hope out of their placid utterances, and find no motives for effort in their finely-spun theories.—And so it casts them from it, and turns back to the blessed Book, which contains within it a Gospel, warm with precious and immutable promises, and beaming with the light of sure and immortal hopes.

M. Comte may think this a small matter, compared with the width of view, and comprehensiveness of thought, which is promised in his Philosophy, and look with his customary contempt upon those who prefer the lowly places he has left, to the heights to which he would call all men. But M. Comte understands not the wants, as he evidently fails to see the causes of the woes of his fellow men. There is many a fair valley in Europe, the dwellers in which cannot see beyond the tops of the mountains which encircle them, and who look, day after day, upon the same fields, and the same homes. And there is one awful mountain, lifting itself above all its fellows, and piercing the heavens with its sharp, glittering, icy top. The adventurous traveller, who has reached the summit, over glaciers treacherous

and trembling, and over dark and unfathomable chasms, may look out upon a view, such as can be seen at no other spot of earth. From that eminence he may look down upon mountains that stretch far away on every side, all crowned with their thawless snows,—upon lakes that sleep in quiet beauty at their feet,—upon the forests at the north,—upon the rich vineyards of France,—and far to the southward, upon the golden haze overhanging Italy,—upon the historic plain of Marathon,—and upon the shores that are washed by the waters of the Mediterranean sea. But who would not rather live in the secluded valley, than upon the snowy summit of Mont Blanc! Who would not rather abide in the lowly vale, from which we could lift our eyes to the calm, pure heaven above us, and be cheered and warmed by rays from the great Sun of Righteousness, than to ascend the heights and breathe the rare and chilling air, to which a godless philosophy would lift us! In the vale, we could live,—live joyfully, and gladly, and peacefully: upon the mountain top, we would perish in a single night.

Of the Positive Philosophy we may then say, that while its author must be acknowledged to be a man of comprehensive scientific knowledge, and is evidently a master in the art of generalization, yet, the fundamental principles of his philosophy are so hopelessly wrong, as to ensure the downfall of the whole structure,—while the opposition which the system assumes towards the Religion of Christ, will only necessitate another fulfilment of the prediction, that upon whomsoever this stone “shall fall, it will grind him to powder.” Let him that is attracted by its specious generalizations and its scientific pretensions, beware.

ARTICLE IV.

ON ORGANS.

If we agitate this subject, and seek to expel from the house and worship of God, all the lovers and devotees of

Jubal, who was a descendant of that wicked one, Cain, it is simply because we know the beginning of evil is as the letting forth of water. The most deadly poisons are usually administered with the most pleasant and healthy food. The most dangerous errors and falsehoods on earth, are those presented with a large amount of truth. A scar, accidentally made, on the face, may afterwards be deemed an important element to a perfect portrait. So customs, formed without the shadow of authority, may, by consent, become as binding and solemn as law itself. Hence, upon the use of organs, as a regular part of the services of the sanctuary, we say, "*Obsta principis.*"—*"*Qui dat formam, dat consequentia ad formam.*" Let an error or evil, in any way, gain a foot-hold in the church, and how long will it be before tradition will bow down to it, as a relic of profoundest veneration? Like the long and angry controversy waged between the Eastern and Western Churches, as to whether the bread they used on sacramental occasions should be leavened or unleavened,—or of the amusing mistake mentioned by Herodotus, which occurred by a mere slip of the pen in transcribing the word *mumpsimus* for *sumpsimus*; at first it was regarded a mistake, but *time* soon gave to it a veneration, which a logomachy of years could not correct. For what we have to advance upon this subject, we would neither excite the hatred of Lavater, who says, "Never make that man your friend who hates music": nor the reproach of him who says:

"The man that hath not music in himself,
Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds,
Is fit for treasons, stratagems and spoils.
The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
And his affections dark as Erebus.
Let no such man be trusted."

Though not entirely destitute of musical taste, or musical knowledge, still we are free to admit, if our lot had fallen in the reign of queen Elizabeth, we might have been something of a wonder among men: For those who could not then, join in a madrigal, or take their part in a song for various voices, were treated as persons whose education had been neglected, and folks wondered where such people had been brought up!—

* Lex. Rex. p. 2.

We have no idea, if our life were suddenly terminated by death, the world would ever say of us, as was said of the celebrated musician, Paganini, "The whole man was an instrument,—a musical sensibility seemed to vibrate through every fibre of his frame." Or, as was said at the death of Pope: "The power of song and force of music died." But we confess, ours is a dull ear, for what some persons call "the luxuries" of public worship, viz: the organ, with its *attaché*, an operatic choir, which, too often, is no more, even on the Sabbath, in the house of God, than *ἀκροαματα*, (ear-sports.) Such a remark may subject us, in the estimation of many, to the charge of narrow-minded prejudice,—and the amateurs of the organ and dance, may denounce us as stiff-laced Puritan,—disturbers of the peace, and long-established good order in the worship of the Sanctuary. But shall we obey God, or please man? If ours be the work of men, it will come to nought; but if it be the work of God, ye cannot overthrow it. Hence "stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." We shall here only bear our testimony against evils which we have seen, or believe to exist, among the professed people of God. We are well aware that an argument, drawn merely from the silence of the Scriptures, is obviously inconclusive,—nothing would be a more dangerous or unwise conclusion than to maintain, what the Scriptures do not condemn, they approve. In this way, the praying to saints, or praying for the dead,—the use of oil, chrisam and spittle in baptism,—the belief in such places as limbo and purgatory, would soon find a place in our creed. For doctrinal knowledge, or the established order of public worship,—we are not willing to take the *ἀποψη εως*, of any individual, or sect,—we demand a—"Thus saith the Lord." "Salus Populi suprema Lex." It is not the sanctity which custom, or age, gives to any part of religion, that makes us respect it, but its Divine original. Music of any sort, is not to be held sacred by us, merely because it is performed in the house of God. Too much, we fear, is thus offered, of which the Lord may well say: "When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand

to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with: it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting." A "sin-offering hast thou not required." It is not because praise is a pleasant thing—pleases the ear—and stirs up the deep feelings of the soul, that we employ it in the worship of God: a much stronger reason than this enjoins its use upon us,—it is a "positive institution of God." "Sing ye praises with the spirit, and with the understanding also." "Let every thing that hath breath, praise the Lord."

If music—if praise, is a necessary and important part of our worship, and derives its efficacy from its appointment, and our method of performance,—surely, it is no vain enquiry, how? or with what, shall we praise God? The design of sacred music is to express our devout affections towards God, and make melody in the heart to the Lord." Says Dr. Fuller, "The intent of singing is, by a musical pronounciation of affecting truth, to render it still more affecting." "Singing" says Dr. Gill, "is speaking melodiously, musically, or with the modulation of the voice, for there is no such thing as mental singing, or singing in the heart without the voice." In its place, praise is as necessary and important a part of our worship, and should be as faithfully improved and performed, as the preaching of the word or prayer. For He who said "Hear the word at my mouth"—"preach the word,"—who hath taught us "how to pray," and "for what we should pray,"—with the same authority enjoins it upon us "to sing with the spirit, and with the understanding also." "Speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs: singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." "In this," *Emmons says, "the apostle did not address the Ephesians, as singers, but as men of piety, who would wish to express their holy love and gratitude to the Author of all their mercies." Speaking is the natural language of the understanding, and singing is the natural language of the heart. "We always use words to express our thoughts, but we do not always use words to express our feelings.

* Vol. 2, p. 391.

These we can clearly and forcibly express by simple sounds." Sound may arouse and excite the feelings, but will leave no deep or lasting impression on the heart. "Melodious sounds have only a mechanical operation upon the mind: but when they are connected with appropriate language, they produce a moral effect. For this reason, men have always connected music and poetry together." Music has no human father. It claims to have descended from the skies. It is no modern invention. For sacred song is as ancient as the creation, the eldest born of all the daughters of Music. So does instrumental music go back far in the history of man, for Jubal, the sixth from Cain, long before the deluge, taught men to play on instruments, and was called "the father of all such as handle the harp and organ. By the way, we here take occasion to remark, what was then called an organ, was not such as we now use, and call by that name. Parkhurst says, it denoted some fistular wind instrument with holes, resembling our flute: and answering to the "*fistula Panis*" of antiquity, whose invention was ascribed to Pan, the great sylvan god, who made it of the reeds which grew by the river banks, and played on it while his goats were feeding, which shows it was a pastoral instrument, and not such as we now use. Originally, the word *organum*, whence organ is derived, had a very extended acceptance, and designated all instruments, whatever their uses. By degrees it was applied solely to musical instruments: it was afterwards confined to wind instruments, and at last the word *organum* only signified the instrument we now call an organ. If we may rely on statements in the British Minstrel as authority,* "The first true indication of an organ is dated about the 8th century. At that period, the Greek Emperor, Constantine Eupronymus, presented an organ to Pepin, king of France. For a long time it was used only in princes' courts, and not thought of being introduced into churches." Elsewhere, the same historian informs us—From the French church proceeded the use of the organ—the first musical instrument employed in the church. Music in churches, is as old

* Neander, vol. iii: p. 128.

as the church itself: but not so with the use of instrumental music. Bingham says, "It is generally agreed by learned men that the use of organs came into the church since the time of Thomas Aquinas, (1250.) For he said, "Our church does not use musical instruments, as harps, and psalteries, to praise God." The gradual introduction of them was concurrent with the gradual corruption of the church in all other respects. So long as she retained her virgin purity, and was uncorrupted by the world, did she most sedulously keep aloof from all such innovations and improvements. Marinus Sannus, who lived about 1290, was the first who brought the use of wind organs into churches. In honour of which, he was called Torcellus,—the Italian name for an organ. Let it not be forgotten—the art of playing on the organ, and its use in Divine service, was first brought to perfection in the Church of Rome. Here it is, we ascertain the parentage of this so-called grand improvement in the praise of God. Whenever the church puts on the mask of the world, she is not only sure to lose something of her dignity, but of vital godliness.

But, to take up again the thread of Scriptural history upon this subject: Moses, the leader of God's ancient Israel, composed a song and sung it when he passed through the Red Sea. David was both a lover and great proficient in music—was called "the sweet singer in Israel." He was such a lover of it, and so enthusiastic in his performance, that in the eyes of his queen, Michal, he so far outstripped the bounds of decency, in dancing and playing before the ark, that she came out to meet him with the ironical reproach: "How glorious was the king of Israel to-day, who uncovered himself to-day in the eyes of the handmaids and his servants as one of the vain fellows shamelessly uncovereth himself."* For upwards of *six hundred* years after the deluge, the Scriptures do not record the practice of music, but in Genesis, chap. 31, where Laban says to Jacob, "wherefore didst thou flee away secretly, and steal away from me, and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth, and with songs, with

2. Sam. vi: 5-20.

tabret and with harp?" And during the period of the administration of Moses, no other musical instruments are mentioned than trumpets and timbrels,—the blowing of the ram's horns at the destruction of Jericho,—and the song of Deborah and Barak. From this, to the period when Saul was chosen king, about 1095 before Christ, the Bible has no reference to musical instruments, except the trumpet on military occasions. As there is no precept of Christ,—no example of the apostles, enjoining or enforcing the introduction of musical instruments into Divine worship, under the gospel,—no dictate of reason, and no sentiment of piety requiring their use,—it is devoutly to be wished that they may be entirely and universally excluded from the house of God. Justin Martyr says, "The singing with instrumental music was not received in the Christian churches, as it was among the Jews in their infant state; but only the use of plain song." Justinus remarks: "The use of instruments was granted the Jews for their imperfection, and that therefore such instruments have no place in the church."—Long after this, we learn from Gillespie: "The Jewish church, not as it was a church, but as it was Jewish, it had musicians to play upon harps, psalteries, cymbals, and other musical instruments, in the temple.

As David was known on different great occasions, both himself to use, and recommend the use of instruments to others, we may be asked, if it was proper for David to use them, under the law, why not, equally so, for us, under the gospel? The middle wall of partition is broken down. David submitted to the rite of circumcision—the offering of sacrifices: must we do the same under the gospel? But we would answer this question with the words of another,* "To this it may be sufficient to reply, that God appointed instrumental music in the temple service, for the same reason that he directed the temple to be decorated with the richest ornaments, the high priests to be arrayed in the most beautiful and costly robes, and all the sacred utensils to be made of solid silver and gold. This magnificence of the temple and all its appendages, was necessary to render it a pro-

* *Emmons*, vol. 2: p. 397.

per type of Christ, and an effectual bulwark against idolatry." The instruments of music used in the temple service, were all appointed by God, and separated from a profane to a sacred purpose. Since we have no such musical instruments of Divine appointment under the gospel, what right have we to appoint any, or to use any, without a Divine appointment? If we once introduce musical instruments into Divine service, we shall never know when, or where to stop. True, the ancient Hebrews had a great taste for music, such as they used in their religious services,—in their public and private rejoicings, feasts, and even at their mournings. God gave the pattern of the Temple, in which every piece of timber was described,—and all the utensils and ornaments, even to the tape-strings: where do we find the directions of its instruments, to be used on all ordinary occasions? And, on what private occasion do we find them mingling instrumental music with their songs of praise? Trumpets and horns are the only instruments concerning which any directions are given in the law, and these are scarcely mentioned as musical instruments; but as suited to, and employed for, making signals, calls, and conveying instructions during the religious solemnities. The trumpets sounded every morning at the opening of the court-gates (*i. e.* of the Temple. In the Temple, the trumpets were sounded exclusively by the priests, who stood, not in the Levitical, but apart and opposite to the Levites, on the other side of the altar, both parties looking toward it,—the priests on the west side, and the Levites on the east. The trumpets did not join in the concert; but were sounded during certain regulated pauses in the vocal and instrumental music. The song and music began not to sound, till the pouring out of the drink-offering: so we may understand the passage, (2 Chron. xxix: 27,) "And when the burnt-offering began, the song of the Lord began also, with the trumpets, and with the instruments *ordained* by David, the king." If instrumental music formed any part of the Jewish worship, it was at some religious festival, national jubilee, or to celebrate some great natural deliverance,—such as crossing of the Red Sea—deliverance from Egypt. When David ascended the throne of Is-

rael, we hear of many a sacred concert. When he brought the ark of the Lord from Kirjath-jearim, David and all Israel played before God, with all their might, and with singing and with harps, and with psalteries, and with timbrels, and with cymbals, and with trumpets." "And the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall blow with the trumpets: and they shall be to you for an ordinance forever throughout your generations. In the day of your gladness, and in your solemn days, and in the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with the trumpets, even your burnt-offerings: that they may be to you for a memorial before your God."* This was doubtless the origin of the choir of the Hebrew ritual. Asaph, Hedan and Jemuthun, were chiefs of the music of the Tabernacle, under David, and of the Temple, under Solomon. Asaph had *four* sons, Seduthun *six*, and Heman *fourteen*. These *twenty-four* Levites, sons of the three great masters of the Temple music, were at the head of *twenty-four* bands of musicians, which served in the Temple by turns. Ezra, in his enumeration of those whom he brought back with him from the captivity, reckons *two hundred* singing men and singing women. Lightfoot, † quoting from Maimonides, says, "The singers were Levites and Israelites together, and the song of the Temple was properly with voices, and not with instruments."

The fact that David so often speaks of instrumental music, and recommends them in the praise of God, is proof positive, to many, that instruments were of universal use in the Temple service. He speaks also of them in the heavenly state. Must we conclude from this, that any gross or material instrument will there be used?—or anything else than the sincere praise of the heart? "Even admit that the Jewish ritual was made up solely of instrumental music, and that the whole Jewish public worship consisted of performances on musical machinery, it would not prove that all that was even the smallest lawful part of our Christian worship." We would not even seem to speak lightly of revelation. But "it should be remembered, it was not Moses, nor the

* Numbers x: 8 & 10.

† Vol ix: 55.

Prophets," but it was David who arranged the whole musical economy of the Jews: whatever it may have been—David, the king, as well as David, the Psalmist, must be considered. Besides, we are not Jews; neither is our church Jewish. "The Jewish church was a church, but it never was *the* church of God."* And the fact that they did this, or that, does not now obligate us to do the same. Some things were restricted to the church in her infantile state. She was as a minor under governors and tutors. "These things are now done away."

Besides, take the Jews themselves, the most remarkable people that ever lived upon the face of the earth,—remarkable for their nationality,—for their undeviating adherence to the faith and form of worship of their forefathers. Nothing must be added to, or taken from. They hold to be the same now they were in the days of David or Moses. Is it not an argument strongly in our favour, *against the use of organs*, that "probably in the tens of thousands of Jewish synagogues which have covered the earth during the whole career of that wonderful people, not one can be found in which the congregation of (orthodox) enlightened Jews, who adhere to the institutions of their religion, and their race, allowed any instrument of music, much less an organ, to form any part of their system of the public worship of God?"—The Persian Jews have introduced organs into their synagogues, and the Greeks have done the same. By all others, this is held an innovation upon old customs, and they are no longer regarded as of the number of the faithful. But more than this: In "*Orach Chaim*," (the highest Jewish authority,) in a Treatise on the Sabbath, (Sec. 338,) there it is recorded as a law of the Medes and Persians, "It is improper to produce sounds from any musical instrument on the Sabbath day." Not only is the organ, but the use of all other instruments is prohibited. The reason of this prohibition, is founded on the written law,—particularly the fourth commandment in the Decalogue, which says: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour and do

* Dr. R. J. Breckinridge.

all thy work, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work," &c. Here is the express injunction, "*thou shalt not do any work.*" Hence the question is raised by the Jew, in his strict observance of the Law of Moses; whether the playing of an instrument is regarded *as work* or not? Every thing, not essential to the preservation of life, or health, was strictly prohibited on that day, as work,—consequently, the Jew maintains the proper definition of the word *work*, will show that any thing artificial must be avoided on the Sabbath. The sounds of an instrument are the result of a mechanical force, and is therefore *work*, and the playing of any instrument on that day, is a violation of the fourth commandment. And, in as much as no specific allusions are made, either directly or indirectly, that instrumental music formed any part of the actual service of the Temple, the Jew concludes, the introduction of such music into the synagogue must be regarded an innovation, sanctioned not even by the voice of tradition. They may now, as in the days of the Temple, permit the use of instrumental music in the synagogue; but it is only on some special occasions, such as on the night of the 8th day of the feast of Tabernacles, &c., but on no occasion to form any part of the regular service of the synagogue. In as much as the great services of the synagogue occur only on the Sabbath, and feast days, and as every kind of work was strictly forbidden on such days by the law of Moses, the conclusion is, the use of any, and *all* kinds of instrumental music, must be forbidden by the Law: hence, every Jewish community permitting the use of music, as a regular part of their synagogue service, are regarded as violators of God's Law,—and, accordingly, are cut off from the number of the orthodox and faithful. If there had been any thing requiring the use of organs, is it probable the Jew, with his strict regard for the Law of Moses, and the form of worship adopted by his forefathers, would so long and so universally have omitted it? Hence, we cannot but regard the introduction and use of instrumental music as an innovation,—and to be deprecated, as not being for the spirituality and prosperity of Zion. This is no *up-start* notion, or narrow-

minded prejudice of ours. For it should be remembered: "During the very sessions of the Westminster Assembly, which composed our standards, in their present form, the Long Parliament passed an act under advice of the leading members of the Westminster Assembly, declaring the use of organs in churches to be a part of idolatrous worship,—and ordering every one to be removed."* It is "the little foxes that destroy the vintage."—"Dead flies cause the precious ointment to send forth a stinking savour." Jonathan tasted but a little honey on the end of his rod, but for that he must die!—When we call to mind the insidious and unsuspecting manner in which errors and troubles have crept into the church,—and how long the wounds thus inflicted have been in healing, we cannot too soon shut down the gates against them,—we cannot be too stringent in walking in "the old paths,"—or in demanding a "thus saith the Lord."

No one, who carefully observes the tendency of things, or the excess to which things have already been carried upon this subject, but will admit it is time the tocsin should be sounded,—yea, that the axe should be laid at the root. It has been said, "The voice is the key which unlocks the heart." Heresies and divisions may creep into the church, through her praise, as well as by her prayers or preaching. Every one may have a psalm, as well as a doctrine. If we may, in one part of our worship, offer God action or sound for devotion, may we not give *attitude* for prayer? "The acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan under any visible representation, or any other way, not prescribed in the Holy Scripture." We can readily anticipate that ours will be regarded as an argument against the abuse, rather than the proper and lawful use of organs. If the law is produced in their favour, we have not a word more to say,—our difficulty is the want of a *ius Divinum*: for the abuse of a thing, can be no valid objection against

* Dr. R. J. Breckenridge.

its *lawful* use. Otherwise, we must give up all our physical comforts and Christian privileges. We must stay away from the sanctuary,—and shut our teeth against our daily bread,—for there are many backsliders and gluttons in the world. If you are disposed to set aside the necessity of a Divine appointment, and introduce the organ, merely on the score of *expediency*,—because it pleases the ear,—or will *probably* promote the interests of religion,—or plead its use because of its utility in sustaining and accompanying the voices in large congregations,—the solemn and sublime effect it produces on the feelings,—or should you, as others, regard it to be only a past-time amusement,—an interlude,—a mere superfluity in religious services,—if this is the light in which we are to regard it, and the only rule by which we are to regulate our praises,—this is, at once, throwing open the door for the greatest variety in practice, and the greatest confusion must ensue. For the *taste* of one congregation may lead them to prefer an organ—another may wish the viol and harp—the third the drum and trumpet—and where will it end?—How many churches are there, whose Sabbath services are now regularly celebrated every Sabbath with *three* or more instruments? At first, we *merely tolerate* a thing,—then, it *may* be done,—and lastly, it *must* be done. Habits grow upon us, and we scarce know how. How many things do we now tolerate, and regard as the *res sacræ* of the sanctuary, at whose introduction our forefathers felt the cause of religion to be greatly scandalized? For example: In the reign of Charles I., Francis Cornwell was imprisoned for refusing to wear the surplice, to kneel at the sacrament, and to use the sign of the cross in baptism. What has custom done in regard to these things? Are there not those who believe this was the apostolic mode? And should a minister appear before them, without his *officials*—without the robes, expressive of the services he is to perform,—they cannot suppress the feeling,—*there is something very important wanting!*—“that man’s religion is vain”! So, many feel in reference to the use of organs. With them, a church without an organ, is little different from a church without a minister. “A little leaven leavens the

whole lump." We may gaze upon the sun, till every thing about us appears as dark as midnight. Follow not the traditions of men, or the rudiments of the world, but "let praise be with grace in your hearts, making melody unto the Lord." "How is it, brethren? when ye come together every one hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done (not only decently and in order, but) unto edifying." In the church, I had rather speak five words with my understanding, *that by my voice* I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an *unknown* tongue. For, "even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?" Our objection, then, to the use of instrumental music, in Christian worship, is not on account of its *abuse*, but because it has no foundation in the Scriptures, particularly the New Testament, which is the standard of our faith and practice. For, if once we depart from this standard, there will be no end to innovations.

We are neither insensible to the charms of sweet and melodious sounds, nor ignorant of the power music is capable of exerting over the feelings and actions of men. It can arouse feelings which may have been dormant for years; and nerve for action the most timid and irresolute. This may be the reason why some would introduce instruments into the service of the sanctuary. But it is to this very fact, we would turn the public mind,—where there is the capacity for such power, so much greater the danger, when improperly or unlawfully used.

Its effects have not only been felt by individuals, and religious assemblies, but has been dreaded upon the tented field.

"Music the fiercest grief can charm,
And fate's severest rage disarm:
Music can soften pain and ease,
And make despair and madness please;
Our joys below it can improve,
And antedate the bliss above."

To one, it is the soul of inspiration,—stimulates thought; to others, quickens devotion; while in others,

it excites feelings utterly uncontrollable and desperate. Lord Bacon had music often played in the room adjoining his study, to excite his thoughts. Milton listened to the organ for his solemn inspiration; and it was even necessary to Warburton. Curran's favourite mode of meditation* was, to have his violin in his hand. Who has not heard of the wonderful effect of the Tyrolese song?—the Marseilles Hymn?—or of Hail Columbia?—National airs, or the music of every country has its direct influence on the passions of its inhabitants, than which a stronger instance cannot be adduced than that it was forbidden, under penalty of death, among the Swiss mercenaries employed on foreign service, to sing or play the celebrated "*Rans des Vaches*." "Napoleon† forbade this tune, because its melody had such an effect upon his Swiss soldiers that they deserted in dozens,—it excited an unconquerable home sickness by its associations with their native land." "The inhabitants of Abydos, (a city in Egypt,) hated mortally the sound of the trumpet, because there was inseparably associated in their minds with it, the horrors of war and bloodshed! So we might refer to "the magical influence the music of Farinelli exercised over Philip V. of Spain, whose singing lured the brain-sick monarch from his chamber, and who, by him, was rewarded by being raised to the highest dignities of the State."‡ So, no less, in the case of "the string of fiddlers introduced by Charles II. into the Chapel Royal,—in allusion to *which* the song of 'Four and twenty Fiddlers all in a row' was written, tended so little to make church music popular, that it only excited feelings of astonishment and dislike, and the music of the people became almost exclusively confined to simple ballad melodies. For such airs they always had an open ear, and ready voice, and the gay strains of Lilliburlers aided powerfully in bringing about the deposition of James II., and the glorious revolution, 1688.—"It made an impression," says Burnet, "on the king's army, that cannot be imagined by those who saw it not. The whole army, and at last the people, both in city and country, were singing it perpetually." Did not David,

* Pope. † British Minstrel, pp. 228 & 115.

‡ British Minstrel, p. 44.

by his harp, dispel the melancholy vapours from the mind of Saul? God's ancient Israel hung their harps upon the willows, and refused to sing the Lord's song in a strange land. Music sometimes has the effect of dispelling sorrow, and soothing sadness and melancholy. Hence "Elisha,* being put into a passion and disturbance at the sight of the king of Israel, called for temple-music, to pacify and allay his discomposed mind." Augustin ascribed his conversion, in part, to the influence of music. He says, he wept when he heard the heavenly singing of the Psalms by the church at Milan. And "it is the only other art (says Luther,) which, like Theology, can calm the agitation of the soul, and put the Devil to flight."

We have indulged ourselves in this digression, that we might cite particular instances, where music has exerted a happy and beneficial effect upon the mind, and also instances where it has been the most injurious. If mere national airs, or secular music, can produce such results on individuals and communities when performed in a natural way, what may not be the results when sacred music is performed by those who regard it only as a past-time amusement, and not as a necessary and divinely appointed part of the solemn worship of God. It is not the scientific skill, nor the sweet and soft modulations of the voice in which praise is sung, that makes it acceptable to God. No, you may have Handel, Hayden, Mozart and Beethoven, for your choir, whose music it is said, "did more than please the ear." Their performance, as to *time*, may equal the most perfect Pestillozian precision and accuracy, and their effects equal the fabled powers of Orpheus, who played "with such a masterly hand, that even the most rapid rivers ceased to flow, the savage beasts of the forest forgot their wildness, and the mountains moved to listen to his song;" or of Amphion, who by the power of his lyre, made the stones move, and in this way he was said to have built up the walls of Thebes. All this would be a poor and insufficient plea for our introducing them into the house of God, with such instruments, to build up the walls of

* 2 Kings, iii: 14-15.

Zion. We must not join together what God has put asunder.

Is it not the tendency of things—a very common result—that the employment of artificial helps, drives away the natural and proper means to be used? We put the question to any candid and careful observer—Is it not true, of at least *four-fifths* of the congregations where the organ is used, that the opening of its pipes is the stop-cock upon the voices of a large majority of the worshippers? There the praise of God is generally done by proxies,—entrusted in a great measure to the scientific organist and accompanying choir. Is this because there is no taste or fondness for music? No, the very employment of such a choir shows the contrary. But it is because the music is not adapted to the place. Very few persons wish to sing where they cannot hear the sound of their own voice, or where they may not feel able to accompany the music that is played. “Think,” (says Beethoven in his deafness,) “of the anguish of him who cannot hear his own music!” It has been said, a man cannot speak well unless he feels what he says,—no more can he sing well unless he feels what he sings. The sound of an organ may fill us with feelings of admiration, we may be overpowered by its grandeur, but it is all a lovely song, a something that plays upon the ear without improving the heart, it is *vox et præterea nihil*. For, in too many cases, instead of its kindling the fervour of devotional feeling, it serves rather to “freeze the genial current of the soul.” The public mind may not yet be sufficiently corrupt to admit it. How would it sound to hear that a certain congregation had engaged a man to preach for them because of his great oratorical powers, without any regard to his moral fitness, or other qualifications? May not the time come when such things may be done—when the house of God will be more of an opera, or of a place of acting, than of humble and sincere devotion? It is not sound alone that makes the deep and lasting impression upon the heart, but the sentiment that is conveyed with it. You may sound all the notes upon the scale, sound them with the voice of seven thunders, and yet convey no idea of the goodness and mercy of God. If there is no sentiment expressed, how

cold and formal our song! How little to inspire us with either love or praise! "How absurd would it be to celebrate the birth-day of Washington by mere music, without any ode or hymn adapted to the occasion?" "If anything on earth," says Baxter, "be like to Heaven, it is to have our delight in God; and therefore, if anything makes us heavenly it is that which raises us to such delights." And Willison asserts, "I know nothing in the world that more resembles Heaven than a company of God's people harmoniously singing his praises, *with grace in their hearts making melody to the Lord.*" This is the breath, the flame of love that actuates the angelic choir. It is grace that sweetens the voice in God's ear. "*Non vox, sed votum; non musica chordula, sed cor; Non clamans, sed amans psallit in aure Dei.*"

It may be, that our whole argument upon this subject, will be regarded by many as a sacrilegious handling of holy things, an envious assault upon the established usage of the church; but is it not time something should be done when we hear the utterance of such a sentiment as this?—"The deep-toned organ, as it peals through the grained and richly fretted arches of the lofty temple, wafts the soul to Heaven on the wings of melody, and elevates the devotional feeling of the sincere worshipper." How far this feeling may prevail we know not, but is this not the tendency of things, wherever *form* is substituted for *service* or *devotion*? In short, we hesitate not to assert,—To use the organ in place of the voice is to travesty the praise of God. You have a sound, but no sentiment of the soul expressed: The mere rhapsody of a momentary feeling that has nothing in it of what Aristotle stiles "a purification of the passions." Hence we say

"Strike up, my masters!

But touch the chords with a religious softness."

Our motto is—

"*Omnis ergo humilis verbi Dei discipulus, quid ille dicat, bona fide, excipere studens, acquiescat.*"**

As we have, in our argument, seemed to classify organs with choirs, we may by some be regarded as an Ish-

* Wardlaw on Socinian Controversy, p. 492.

maelite towards them also. Not necessarily. *Per se*, we are not opposed to choirs, but regard a choir of the *proper kind*, highly important in conducting the praises of the sanctuary. But there are choirs which we consider the mere *attachés*, or accompaniments of organs, against which we would enter our most decided and solemn protest. There are doubtless many honourable exceptions. One of the severest acts our Saviour did, while on earth, was to make a scourge of small chords, and drive the money-changers from the Sanctuary. He would not have his Father's house a place of merchandize. We do not forbid that a leader of the choir should be compensated. The labourer is worthy of his hire. "They which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple." We object to the employment of those who have no higher or holier motive than the "loaves and fishes,"—profane sabbath-breakers,—immoral men,—whose lives are a daily reproach to them,—and who, for the *penny*, will play six nights in the week, at the opera or theatre, and for *the same*, will play or sing the seventh, *just as devoutly*, in the house of God. So far as the morality of the thing is concerned, such men might just as well be paid for the performance of any other manual labour on the Sabbath. Is it any unusual thing to see a *Papist*, or *Infidel*, leading the praises in a Protestant and Christian congregation? In all such performances, there is more *pride* than *piety* displayed,—more man-worship than glory to God. Such music is only designed to please the ear, or excite the imagination. "The performers take the opportunity of showing the audience the extent of their abilities, by the most fantastic and unmeaning extravagance of execution." And, that they may not lose their full meed of praise, they either select new tunes, or those so difficult of performance as virtually to exclude the great congregation from uniting with them. Thus, multitudes are

"Content to hear
(O! wonderful effect of music's power!)
Messiah's eulogy—for Handel's sake."

What is the effect? How must the *praise* of God be regarded by the world, where it has such representatives?

It is putting the new wine into old bottles. Worse, it is "ploughing with the ox and ass." "Nullo delectu sacra profanaque, juxta habet (hæc gens) imò tam preposterò cultu divina curat, ut pios Ecclesiae usus nullis non semper insanientis sæculi ludis pervertat, sordibusque contamine."* How appropriate the words of Baxter: "I think it unlawful to use such strains of music as are light, or as the congregation cannot easily be brought to understand; much more on purpose to commit the whole work of singing to the choristers, and exclude the congregation. I am not willing to join in such a church, where I shall be shut out of this noble work of praise." What devout feelings would be excited, in our minds, or how *strongly* would we consider ourselves invited to attend upon the services of a particular church, where we saw *all its Sabbath tunes* placarded through the streets, on the Saturday previous! Yet, these things are not *so shocking* to the pious sensibilities of "all people that on earth do dwell." It may be seen in the land!—And when the organ has been carried to the same perfection and is managed by the *same spirit*, it may be seen among us. Pervert sacred music to a secular use, or destroy its sense, and it is no longer a devotional exercise; but a mere diversion or festival entertainment. Hence, says Jerome, "Let those who sing in the church, sing not merely with their voice, but with their heart, to the Lord; not like tragedians, physically preparing their throats and mouths, that they may sing after the fashion of the theatre in the church."† "But sing with grace in their hearts." As a choir performs a very important part of the Divine service, they ought to be Christians, or at least sober-minded persons, selected from the community in whose midst they worship,—persons of religious principles, so as to be capable of feeling what they sing,—and thus impart the fire of their devotion to the kindling of the same spirit in all around. They should possess sufficient musical knowledge to lead with ease and simplicity,—and sufficient knowledge of the force and power of language, to be capable of adapting

* Bayles' Dictionary, vol. vii: p. 467.

† Bingham, vol. 5: p. 22.

the sound to sentiment. How often is the effect of music completely destroyed, for the want of attention to these things? It is like smoke to the eyes, or vinegar to the teeth, to hear an epicede sung to a marriage hymn, or to have a thanksgiving song so sung as to express the feelings of one who mourns, and fasts. How often is the impression made by a sermon, completely obliterated by the performance of the concluding hymn! when some musical pretender, who understands music, and nothing else,—who has all the terms and technicalities of the art at his tongue's end, without the glimmering of an idea concerning the human passions, with a great flourish of *sounds*, of *rods*, and *nods*, concludes the religious ceremonies with some secular tune, or opera air. Much of the effect of music, depends upon the simplicity of the manner in which it is performed. It is the union of harmonious voices, that produces what Lightfoot calls a joint *κῆλευσμα*; where one takes mirth, life, and warmth from another; a holy fervour and emulation, as the seraphim,—who are thus described, “each one had six wings,—with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts—the earth is full of his glory,”—thus did they strive to out-vie one another in praising God.

There is in souls a sympathy of sounds—
Some chord in unison with what we hear
Is touched within us, and the heart replies.”

There are extremes on both sides, which we think should be equally avoided,—as neither makes for the edification of the church; viz: the excess and abuses of the present day, which we have ascribed to the introduction and use of instrumental music, and the ignorance (as it may be called) of our forefathers, whose musical knowledge was restricted to a few tunes. These, they held as most sacred. They were supposed to be holy,—“and that as much reverence should be shown to them as to the Psalms themselves.” “It was the custom of the people then,” says Geo. Hood,* “to put off their

* Hood, p. 144.

hats, and put on a great show of devotion and gravity, whenever psalm tunes were sung, though there was not one word of a psalm." We would not wish to be put back into a class with these *patres sancti*, although the evils hence to be apprehended, are less than from the present system of innovation and want of devotional feeling.

But, to bring our argument to a close. We should not under-value any ordinance or service, which God has appointed for the edification of his people, and the promotion of his own glory; and especially one which is to continue, and must subserve so important an end as *praise*. Praise, only, of all the services we perform to God here, goes along with us to Heaven. And, as it is in the church on earth we spend our apprenticeship, and make preparations for Heaven, let us remember—"Qui vult cantare in cœlo, discat cantare in terris." In Heaven, there is no praying, no preaching of sermons, no receiving of sacraments,—nothing but praising, lauding, and celebrating God, and that will be the work of saints and angels to all eternity. What must be the purity and elevation of the heavenly strains? To sing songs which none but angels sing! What a choir? That great multitude which no man can number—*small* and *great*, out of every kindred and tongue, and nation and people,—around the throne of God and the Lamb: Where the theme is love,—their song unceasing praise. There "Love breathes in every lip, burns in every heart, and bursts forth alike from every lyre."

"Ten thousand thousand are their tongues,
But all their *songs* are one."

Oh! glorious vision!—ennobling thought! That such worms of the dust, should hereafter become bright seraphs at the right hand of the Majesty in Heaven. That these stammering lips shall hereafter join in and lead the chorus. When the morning stars shall again sing together, and the sons of God shout for joy. The mountains and little hills shall break forth before him into singing; and the trees of the field shall clap their hands. The floods shall lift up their voice. Every tongue shall proclaim his praise. All shall unite in swelling the

grand diapason of Heaven. The angels with the four and twenty elders, shall fall down before Him, who sitteth upon the throne, and worship Him, who liveth forever and ever.

Thus, the heavens shall proclaim the song, and earth will echo back the notes till every place shall be full of the praise and glory of God.

“Praise God in his sanctuary; praise him in the firmament of his power. Praise him for his mighty acts; praise him according to his excellent greatness. Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord. Praise ye the Lord.”

ARTICLE V.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY EITHER THE OFFSPRING OF REASON OR OF PRIMITIVE REVELATION.

No argument, says Bishop Horsley,* can be drawn from any resemblance that may be imagined between the Trinity of the Christian Church, and the three principles of the Platonists, that the doctrine of the apostles was not rightly understood by their first converts; unless indeed it could be proved, which is the tacit assumption upon which this objection is founded, that the discoveries of revelation and the investigations of philosophy may never coincide. But why is it supposed that nothing can be a part of an inspired teacher's doctrine, which had been taught before by wise men who were not inspired? Were every iota of the gospel doctrine to be found in the writings of the Greek philosophers, this would not be sufficient to set aside the pretensions of the first preachers of christianity to a divine commission. The just conclusion from so perfect an agreement would only be, that for the great importance of these doctrines to the manners of mankind, it had pleased God to make discoveries to all men by revelation, to which a few only could obtain by abstract reasoning. The case indeed is far otherwise. It is ever to be remembered, for the mor-

* Horsley Tracts, pp. 45-50.

tification of man's pride, and to the praise of God's mercy, that "when the world by wisdom knew not God," when philosophy had made its utmost efforts not entirely without success, but with little general advantage, "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching," by a method of instruction, which in the article of religious information, hath abolished the distinction between the philosopher and the idiot "to save them that believe." But had our supposed case actually obtained, had revelation discovered nothing more to all than reason had previously taught a few, still to teach all, and to teach a few is so different a business, that the previous attainments of philosophers would have afforded no objection against the pretensions of the first preachers of the gospel, sufficient to overturn the evidence by which their claim to a divine commission is supported. Much less may a resemblance, more or less exact, between faith and philosophy in single articles, create a presumption that those articles of faith, of which certain philosophical opinions seem to carry a resemblance, made no part of the doctrine which those inspired teachers taught. The resemblance may seem indeed a wonderful fact, which may justly draw the attention of the serious and inquisitive. And if it should be deemed incredible,—as well it may,—that reason, in his utmost strength, should ever ascend so high, as to attain even to a distant glimpse of truths, which have ever been esteemed the most mysterious discourses of revelation; it will become a question of the highest curiosity and importance, to determine by what means the Platonic school came by those notions of the Godhead, which, had they been of later date than the commencement of christianity, might have passed for a very mild corruption of christian faith; but being in truth much older, have all the appearance of a near, though very imperfect view, of the doctrine which was afterwards current in the christian church.

The inquiry becomes more important when it is discovered that these notions were by no means peculiar to the Platonic school; that the Platonists pretended to be no more than the expositors of a more ancient doctrine; which is traced from Plato to Parmenides; from Par-

menides to his masters of the Pythagorean sect; from the Pythagoreans to Orpheus, the earliest of the Grecian mystagogues; from Orpheus to the secret lore of the Egyptian priest, in which the foundations of the Orphic theology were laid. Similar notions of a triple principle prevailed in the Persian and Chaldean theology, and vestiges even of the worship of a Trinity were discernible in the Roman superstition in a very late age. This worship the Romans had received from their Trojan ancestors. For the Trojans brought it with them into Italy from Phrygia. In Phrygia it was introduced by Dardanus so early as in the ninth century after Noah's flood. Dardanus carried it with him from Samothrace, where the personages that were the objects of it were worshipped under the Hebrew name of Cabirim. Who these Cabirim might be, has been matter of unsuccessful inquiry to many learned men. The utmost that is known with certainty is, that they were originally three, and were called by way of eminence, the great or mighty ones; for that is the import of the Hebrew name. And of the like import is their Latin appellation, Penates. *Dii per quos penitus spiramus, per quos rationem animi possidemus. Dii qui sunt intrinsecus atque intimis penetralibus cœli.* Thus the joint worship of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, the Triad of the Roman capitol, is traced to that of the three mighty ones in Samothrace; which was established in that island, at what precise time it is impossible to determine, but earlier if Eusebius may be credited, than the days of Abraham.

The notion of a Trinity therefore, more or less removed from the purity of the Christian faith, is found to have been a leading principle in all the ancient schools of philosophy, and in the religions of almost all nations; and traces of an early popular belief of it appear even in the abominable rites of idolatrous worship. If reason was insufficient for this great discovery, what could be the means of information but what the Platonists themselves assign: "a theology delivered from the Gods," i. e. a revelation. This is the account which Platonists who were no Christians, have given of the origin of their Master's doctrine. But from what reve-

lation could they derive their information, who lived before the Christian, and had no light from the Mosaic? For whatever some of the fathers may have imagined, there is no evidence that Plato or Pythagoras were at all acquainted with the Mosaic writings; not to insist that the worship of a Trinity is traced to an earlier age than that of Plato or Pythagoras, or even of Moses. Their information could only be drawn from traditions founded upon earlier revelations; from scattered fragments of the ancient patriarchal creed, which was universal before the defection of the first idolaters, which the corruptions of idolatry, gross and enormous as they were, could never totally obliterate. Thus the doctrine of the Trinity is rather confirmed than discredited by the suffrages of the heathen sages; since the resemblance of the Christian faith and the Pagan philosophy in this article, when fairly interpreted, appears to be nothing less than the consent of the latest and the earliest revelations.

Whence, asks Tholuck, came these melancholy aspirations, among the heathen, destitute of any special revelation? As we have before said, they might be the utterance of the most deep-seated feelings in human nature, which finds not perfection and harmony in the existing state of things, and therefore seeks them at the beginning and the end of the world. Their narratives, also, of the sufferings and conflicts of a Divine being with the miserable and wicked being, might equally be the expressions of the holiest feelings and deepest consciousness of men, (involving the sentiment) that all which is Divine in this world, corrupted and ruined with respect to them, can be maintained only by a severe conflict; yea, that in this world there is a hostile power, more mighty and more successful than the divine, which is thus compelled often to bow and submit; but that, notwithstanding this fearful struggle, what is born of God overcometh the world, and the final triumph awaits that which is divine. If those traditions and narratives represented nothing more than these ideas, they were the precious relics of the primeval world, the dearest heritage of the human race. But why should not those images and notions be much rather considered as drops

from the rich stream of Divine revelation, which at the beginning of the ages came down from Heaven to men? From that primitive source, might they not have descended to all nations? The remarkable unanimity of these traditions speaks strongly in favor of a common historical origin; and, therefore, that from the time in which man, fallen from his happy state, received the promise of an heroic deliverer, who should tread upon the serpent's head,—from that very time, longing desires and expectations of a future restoration, and a period of recovered happiness, were transmitted in the lines of families and nations, a beam of consoling light in the gloom of an unsatisfying and comfortless world.*

ARTICLE VI.

TYPES OF MANKIND.

Types of Mankind: or Ethnological researches, based upon the Ancient Monuments, Paintings, Sculptures, and Crania of Races, and upon their natural, Geographical, Philological, and Biblical History; illustrated by selections from the inedited papers of SAMUEL GEORGE MORTON, M. D., (late President, &c.) and by additional contributions from Prof. L. AGASSIZ, L.L.D.; W. USHER, M. D., and Prof. H. S. PATTERSON, M. D. By J. C. NOTT, M. D., Mobile, Alabama, and GEO. R. GLIDDON, formerly U. S. Consul at Cairo; Philadelphia: LIPPINCOTT, GRAMBO & Co.: 1854: pp. 738: 4to.

This ponderous quarto has been before our eyes for months past. But though we gave it an early perusal, with, we are sorry to say, a poor reward in the way of instruction and profit, we have not found time, amidst better and more congenial pursuits, to give utterance to our dissent from the positions it assumes. We do not deny to the chief authors the merit of untiring diligence and research, nor to the book itself the credit of being

* See in Smith's Messiah, vol. 1, p. 211.

brought out in the best style of typographical art. In paper, type, illustrations, in many instances repeated for various purposes, and in copious references to authorities, the book merits all praise. And if the authors had before them an object, good in itself, and pursued with truthful simplicity; if they turned not aside from their path to aim insidious blows at revealed religion, and to gratify personal animosities which have arisen from the opposition their views have encountered; however, we might dissent from their conclusions, we should have perused the result of their common labor with greater patience.

As it is, we know not how properly to speak of a work in *one* word, to which so many pens have contributed; since the names of Morton, Agassiz, Usher, Nott, and Gliddon are not yet equally illustrious; and we would fain hope that there is some distinction which can be made in the spirit and temper of the men themselves. It may be that some of these gentlemen would have shrunk, could they have known the company they would be made to keep, from the irreligion and shallow pedantry with which they have been brought into contact. The earlier portions of the book are better than the last; in better taste, and throughout in better keeping with that calm and philosophic spirit in which it should be the aim of science to conduct its research.

Professedly, the book is a discussion of the question of the Unity of the Human Race, maintaining the diverse origin of the family of man; but really is an attack on the historical veracity of the sacred Scriptures, which at least some portion of these writers have no strong desire to see believed and trusted in by their fellow men.

That these charges may be substantiated, and to regale the senses especially of our clerical friends—with little regard to order, and substituting ourselves some words of connection,—we cull the following fragrant blossoms among the flowers which adorn the pages of the last of these writers, whose finger however is present in many places where the pen seems to be held by others.

“*Exceter Hall* shudders even at the thought” [of a new translation of the Scriptures:] ‘Bible Societies,’ whine, The reign of Antichrist is come indeed. As positivists, we lament not that our brief span of life will

have been measured, long before a *new* English version may be 'authorized,' because, through the slow but unerring laws of human advancement in knowledge, by the time that *theologians* shall have accomplished their metaphysical transition and have awakened to the stern realities of the case, the development of science will have rendered any *new translation* altogether superogatory among the educated who are creating *new religions* for themselves." If any of "the biblical dunces in the United States, whom zeal in opposing the long pondered, long published views of Morton, Agassiz, Nott, Van Amringe, *myself*, (G. R. G.) and others, has been more remarkable than their literary courtesy" should have any doubt that this writer belongs to these "*educated* who are creating *new religions* for themselves," then let them know that, "Αυτοδιδασκτοι like Abderitan Democritus, in some branches of Oriental philology; and possessing furthermore, an apparatus tolerably complete of *continental* criticism in biblical matters; we prefer direct reference to the *Hebrew Text*, now rendered accessible in a very handy form, and illumined by Cahen's *most useful parallel French translation*." Let them know that we rely on no "Anglo-Saxon divinity," nor orthodox lexicography," that we "leave hagiography," and "hagiographers," "theologers" and "teologastri," "the lower scholarship of orthodoxy" and all others "among whom knowledge has not advanced beyond the theological grade," that we listen no longer "to the twaddling inanities of the unlettered missionary, or to the Egyptian hallucinations of the theological rhapsodist," to "clap-trap pretensions to acquaintance with hieroglyphic arcana recently made by theologers who speak not any continental tongue through which alone these subjects are accessible—no "ad captandum" figments of the possession of oriental knowledge when men cannot spell a monosyllable written in the Hebrew Alphabet." Indeed we have been exceedingly worried "by the incessant officiousness of theologers in the United States," by "Canton Missionaries," "the Rev. Dr. *This* or the Rev. Mr. *That*,"

"Mere youths in science and to fame unknown."

See Nott & Gliddon, pp. 595, 503, 592, 478, 518, 524, 535, 532, 568, 522, 605, 581, 674, 674, 675, 678, 691.

“the reverend authors of ‘Unity of the Human Races,’ 1850, of an article in the Princeton Review, 1851; and of a third article, the one prelauded [supra] as emanating from an Ass. of Min. at Col. S. C.” We have therefore risen in our might, and “the surpassing accuracy of the ancient compiler of Xth Genesis has now been triumphantly vindicated from a new quarter; and that which not a man of the ghostly schools, whence issued his reverence doctor Smythe, has ever possessed the knowledge to expound rationally, herein becomes comprehensible through ‘Gliddon skeptical views of;’”—Indeed “so far as the authors’ reading enables them to judge, here, for the first time, since Xth Genesis was composed, are tabulated, in a true *genealogical* form, all the ethnic and geographical names contained in that ancient document.” True, we did use Bochart’s “enormous erudition,” and “reverentially, in the piny woods of Alabama, on the rough, though beautiful shore of Mobile Bay, rebuild the edifice” he constructed, forgetting that he himself, was himself a “theologer”; and that those very researches proceeded from the studies he undertook in expounding Genesis to his congregation at Caen, forgetting too, that “the theological represents the least mature, the least educated, the most antiquated state of human intelligence. In consequence, the mere *supernaturalist* believes anything and everything, however impossible.” “In the days between Walton and Kennicott, a theological student who might have ventured to opine that the Chinese are mentioned in the Bible,” [softly! Gesenius, Arias Montanus, Junius, And. Mueller, Langlès, Lassen, Hitzig, Henderson, and your own “high Sinologue Pauthier,” are against you. Lower your lance,] “would have been sent incontinently to read the Hebrew text of Isaiah. When this task was executed, the young man would have found a place on the lowest form by command of the Professor of History, for ignorance of the rudiments of his class. Shame would soon have compelled an ingenuous youth, of those days gone by, to cram his head with simple facts, of which his elders in theology now seem unaware. Rev. Thomas Smyth, D. D., “Unity, &c. p. 43. Rev. Dr. Howe, S. Pres. Rev., Jan. 1850, a “Charlatan.” [Dr. J.

See pp, 643, 527, 541.

A. Alexander,] in the Princeton Review, Jan. 1851, &c. &c." "But we finish with orthodoxy's Chinese," and "those wretched theologists (teologastri,) who, in philological knowledge not surpassing the Hebrew alphabet, go hunting about through lexicons, in order thence to spit forth a doctoral decision in people's faces"; we, "hatchet away" "the briars planted in our way by commentators." And, "at whatever age, (probably *Esdras*, i. e. after return from captivity,) the fragmentary documents now called "Genesis" were put together," "they are the result of fancy and conjecture rather than of genuine historical investigation," whatever "sticklers for plenary inspiration" may maintain, equally so with that "ancient erotic ballad" the "so-called Song of Solomon," who "erected a little paganish temple (smaller than its duplicate at Hierapolis, that, although only 90 feet long by 30 feet front, is estimated to have cost about 4000 millions of dollars—United States currency." "The Hebrews ascribe all legislation to their noun of multitude Moses." "The compilers of *Genesis* antecede Abraham with symbolic names of mythic patriarchs, gifted with impossible longevity; and so do the Chinese place mythology before history." "Semitic historians (as Sheridan neatly observes,) draw upon memory for their wit, and upon imagination for their facts." "The whole of this Jewish chronology is unhistorical." "It would be affectation, if not duplicity, on the part of the authors of "Types of Mankind," after the variety of shocks which the plenary exactitude of Hebrew chronicles has received at their hands, not to place every thing Israelitish on precisely the same human footing as has been assigned to the more ancient time registers of Egypt and of China, to the more solid restorations of Assyria." "The chronicles [of Judea] in lieu of the first place still claimed for them by ignorance, now occupy, among archæologists, a fourth place in universal history." "Ignorance, absolute ignorance, is the only plea through which future sustainers of Genesiactal numerals can escape from the charge of knavery." "A pledge, too, has been incidentally made to him [the reader] that a future publication

See pp. 501, 496, 696, 695, 698, 710, 702, 767.

shall demonstrate why the 'ten patriarchs' from A-DaM to NoaKh, were no more *human beings*, in the idea of the original writers, than are the ethnogeographical names catalogued in the Xth Genesis." "Viewed as a literary work of ancient humanity's loftiest conception of Creative Power, it" [the production of "the genesiactal bard"] "is sublime beyond all cosmogonies known in the world's history. Viewed as a narrative inspired by the Most High, its conceits would be pitiful and its revelations false, because telescopic astronomy has ruined its celestial structure, physics have negatived its cosmic organism, and geology has stultified the fabulous terrestrial mechanism upon which its assumptions are based. How then are its crude and juvenile hypotheses about *Human Creation* to be viewed." "The only men Protestant, Catholic or Rabbinical, whose decisions (owing to their respectively minute collation of every printed edition or manuscript exemplar of the *Hebrew Text*) can be weighty in the premises, have pronounced the whole of them to be radically, enormously, and irretrievably corrupt." "The real question posited in logical shape is this: *Did the Hebrew Moses write the Hebrew Pentateuch? If the Hebrew Moses wrote the Hebrew Pentateuch, where is the Hebrew Pentateuch the Hebrew Moses wrote?* As to the English translators, "the reader" "will behold a little of the damning evidence produceable that these worthies could not construe a simple line of the Hebrew Text." The "contracted" "Egyptian chronology" of Mr. Samuel Sharpe, the "great Hellenist" has given us "pain;" "our knife must be applied to one of its many vital spots;" still more, "the illusory authority of an adolescent scholar" "John Stuart Poole in his *Horæ Egyptiacæ*, with whom the veteran Egyptologist, Sir Gardiner Wilkinson *fully agrees*, whose '*Horæ Egyptiacæ*' we dismiss as beneath scientific notice. With it we snap off the last published peg upon which short chronology can suspend its clerical hat." We have given a "Palaeographic excursus on the art of writing," a "subject, perhaps, the most vital in any

See pp. 603, 565, 625, 625, 614, 678, 679, 501.

researches into the antiquity of the *Pentateuch*." The earliest, partly "phonetic," we have placed at 1000 B. C. the earliest alphabetic at 650 B. C. the earliest extant Hebrew at 142 B. C., the earliest square letter at 200 A. C. "The proof will resile to our view, through archaeological deductions, with the force of an Euclidean demonstration if the *Pentateuch* was originally penned in the Mosaic Autograph." "This much" have we undertaken, "for the sake of furnishing our colleagues with practical means of rendering ecclesiastical opposers of "Types of Mankind" if not less supercilious; at least more malleable; whenever these may be pleased to obtrude Jewish "chronography" or as it is fashionably termed "the received chronology" into the rugged amphitheatre of Egyptian time measurement." "Resolved in my own mind to pursue enquiries into biblical questions, once for all, *usque ad necem*, I suppress about 300 of these pages, perhaps for the best; because the nature of this work may elicit some hostile comments; and he is the prudent soldier who 'keeps his powder dry.'"

We close for the present this Anthology. Sufficient this to show the *animus* of this circle of writers, and especially the lofty genius of this puissant man at arms, formerly consul, &c., more lately the pupil of Michael-Angelo Lanci, "the foremost amid living Semitic Lexicographers," and the diligent reader of Cahen's Bible, Traduction Nouvelle, avec l'Hebreu en regard.*

The work on which we enter is an enlargement of

*These writers give us fair notice. "There is nothing like it [Cahen] in the English language; nor shall we discuss Old Testament with those unacquainted with CAHEN and the *Hebrew Text*. Neither must the reader infer, from our general conformity with the ordinary mode of expression, that we regard the documents of Genesis any otherwise than from the scientific point of view."—p. 112. It seems from this that amid the universal ignorance of the Hebrew bible prevailing, these writers have at last found one author who has understood it—that they themselves are the profoundest of all Hebraists, and have a supreme contempt for every English and American scholar, though their *lives* should have been spent in this circle of studies.

what its authors have before put forth, an alluvium which has been washed up from every side, of every kind of material, good and bad, and deposited in this huge volume, with little regard to scientific arrangement, its stratifications constituting a strange conglomerate of constantly recurring drift, in which some little truth may perchance lie buried.

After we have passed the brief portion contributed by Agassiz, some twenty pages, the close and logical order of science disappears, and cautious deductions from acknowledged facts is hard to be found. In relation to the distinguished naturalist himself, his argument is rather the hint of an ingenious theory than a solid, conclusive demonstration, to which our judgment is bound to yield. "The singular fact," "that the earliest migrations recorded, in any form, show us man meeting man wherever he moves upon the inhabitable surface of the globe, small islands excepted," by which he prepares the way for the supposition that men were originally created in nations, loses its singularity when it is understood that the earth was overspread by man ere the earliest history was written, and that all that history records, is, and this only in passing allusions, the more recent migrations. If we reckon only by the shortest chronology, nearly one half of man's duration on this globe preceded the era of Moses, when the oldest history in existence was written, and a still longer time preceded the earliest descriptions on record, of the different types of men, (the monumental portraits of Egypt, *res non judicata*, alone excepted.) If there was at first any mutability of type in men, and varieties *could* spring up within certain limits which were soon reached in the human constitution, there was ample time, especially in the chronology of those who deny the universality of the deluge, for these changes to have occurred, ere those nations who have conveyed to us the earliest history could again come in contact with those who had wandered to wide distances from them. If the types of the human family have great permanence when once formed, there may have been greater mutability before the human constitution had run through its cycles of change. In an earlier period of human his-

tory, the tendencies to change, in a measure observable now, may have run their course with greater rapidity and force;* and if there *be* an agreement between the fauna of different regions and the barbarous races of men inhabiting them, this may have arisen in an early period of time, and yet these tribes reached those regions by migration from one common cradle of the human race. Agassiz and the authors of this volume have not *proved* that it *cannot* have been so; they never will be able to prove that it *was* not so. Their own theory of separate creations can never be *demonstrated*. Till it *is* demonstrated, it cannot overthrow the one to which it stands opposed, resting as it does upon the obvious sense of the Scriptures. It is one portion of this theory that "men must have originated in *nations*, as bees originated in swarms." †But if we take the only nations whose history we can trace in written records, it is evident that the reverse was the fact. Take the Jews, a people as strongly marked as any which can be found, and they can be historically traced to their home in Egypt, more than forty centuries ago; they can be traced up to the seventy-five persons who came into that country a few centuries before, and backwards to a single pair, a man and a woman in Ur of the Chaldees, from whom the *great body* of the people called the Jews—at this time, and perhaps for thirty centuries past, not less than 15,000,000 in number, have lineally descended. The same is true as to the entire Semitic race of men. Though doubtless increased by intermarriages with other stocks to a limited extent, the great body of the whole can be followed up, in the course of time, to one family—on the male side, to one individual—from whom they have lineally descended. The same is true of the descendants of Ham and of Japhet. Admit that the Bible

* "A short period of time is generally sufficient to effect nearly the whole change which the alteration of external circumstances can bring about in the habits of a species." The alterations in form and organization is often rapid during a short period, but when the circumstances are made to vary further, all modification ceases, indefinite divergence either in the way of improvement or deterioration being prevented." Lyell, *Geology*.

† See p. 78.

is not entitled to be regarded as a revelation, will it do to ignore it and set it aside as history? Is Agassiz prepared for this? Were those dusky Arabs created in a nation, "in the same numerical proportions and over the same area in which they now occur" in the peninsula of Arabia, or did the larger portion, as all their traditions, no less than the writings of Moses teach, descend from the family of Abraham? Is all history to be falsified by this new theory of the origination of men in nations? Or, if the contrary has been the law of national origin in nations whose history is patent, has there been another law for those who have no scribes, letters, nor historic monuments? The analogies between man and the animals by which he is surrounded, so far as there really are such,—but which it is plain enough this ingenious writer has greatly exaggerated,—are more to be ascribed to the effects of climate and manner of life upon both,—which are great in the extremes of heat and cold, or of higher and lower elevation, upon animal as well as vegetable life,—than to any other cause. If it be true again, as these writers have more than once maintained, that the savage nations, as, e. g. the American Indians, will shortly give way before the Caucassian variety of men, (it is likely to be so on the Sandwich Islands—it will be the same in New Holland,) there will then be on these continents and islands a thousand years hence, a Caucassian Asiatic race, which was not created in a "*nation*," found in conjunction with an American fauna, a Sandwich Island fauna, and Australian fauna, as there is an European race found now not only with a tropical African, but also with a North and South American fauna, and may possibly be, at some future day, still more widely spread, and yet remain unmingled with those of a different blood: What will be the speculations of the Agassiz of that day? That these were created in nations in the proportions and places in which they will then be found? Man is a cosmopolite, as this distinguished naturalist a few years since distinctly held; and not the mixed Caucassians only, as Dr. Nott would have us believe, but those varieties of man, which perfect degradation and the force of circumstances have long held in the lands they oc-

copy. Even as we write, the Mongolian is seeking the protection of our laws and claiming citizenship with ourselves, while the Hindoo from the Ganges, is becoming domesticated in the tropical islands of this continent. The changes of 500 or 1000 years, may thus scatter these theories to the winds. The circle of facts as to the *homo Americanus* testifies against this theory. The American Indian tribes, though not without some characteristic differences, exhibit a great uniformity of complexion, and other physical traits, throughout the two continents. The same characteristics for the most part are found in connection with the fauna of the Arctic, Temperate, and Tropical zones. It is not easy to distinguish the Indian of Brazil from the Indian of these Atlantic States. "The physical character of the American races from Cape Horn to Canada," says Dr. Morton, "is essentially the same."—Types, p. 32. But the fauna of that tropical country differs in many respects from our own, and to that degree, that the aboriginal man of that realm *should* differ widely from the aboriginal of this, the theory being true which is proposed.

We think Dr. Bachman has fully shewn that Agassiz has unwittingly selected those facts, as to the distribution of animals, which harmonise with his theory, and ignored those which make against it. In his Arctic realm, inhabited by the Esquimaux, his Arctic man is found the common wolf, which ranges over the northern half of Asia, the whole of Europe, and the whole of America, to the Isthmus of Panama; the ermine, which also exists where the wolf is found; the beaver; the otter, which ranges over the whole of North and South America, from the Arctic to the Antarctic ocean; the snow goose, the golden plover, the raven, the horned owl, the right whale, which last navigates all the oceans from pole to pole, and yet is made by Professor Agassiz to be one of the two marine representatives of his Arctic realm. These and other facts adduced in Dr. Bachman's able paper, show that the arrangements of the natural provinces of the animal world are arbitrary, and do not bear out the conclusions they were designed to substantiate. Man surely, created with a constitution adapted to all countries, endowed with all the powers of inven-

tion, "fond of navigation, omniverous in appetites, restless and migratory in his habits of locomotion, and subjecting the lower animals to his will," cannot be in any of his varieties, "restricted to a narrower range than the wolf, the ermine, and many others that might be named." Look to the wide diffusion of our well known domestic breeds, of "our horses, horned cattle, sheep, swine, poultry, pigeons, the products in this country of a few imported pairs, which in little more than two hundred years, have stocked all North and South America, notwithstanding the annual slaughter of millions." How does this wide diffusion of certain species of animals which has already taken place, and which may be carried to even a greater extent, speak for the diffusion over climes the most various, of one race of men of far higher powers of adaptation, proceeding from one common origin.

Dr. Bachman, with great force, contends against Agassiz, that the Arctic man could not have originated in the region where he is found. That "he was an autochthon there, and that his progenitors never possessed a southern home," he concludes, "is an utter impossibility." Without a miracle he could not have survived the severity of the climate, nor have provided himself with food, in the cold dark winter of the polar regions, for a single month. And that since, according to the author of this theory, there were no "farinaceous grains, no tubercles, no juicy fruits growing under these inhospitable latitudes, and they were entirely dependant upon animal food for sustenance," if the Arctic man is a peculiar species, destined to live only on flesh, he should not have been furnished with teeth belonging to omniverous animals, but, like the wolf and cat, only with those suited to his carnivorous destiny. These arguments we adduce not on our own authority, but on that of a naturalist, the most competent on our American soil.*

There is still another application of the historical argument which we were before pursuing. It has pleased Mr. Gliddon, whose very *eminent* scholarship in biblical

* See Bachman's Monograph, pp. 15, 26, 22, 27. *Types*, p. 61.

and oriental literature has adorned this volume, to *approve* of the correctness of the Xth of Genesis. It was compiled, he informs us, by "a *Chaldean* chorographer," "in some university of Chaldea," is an "invaluable chart;" he [Gliddon,] has applied his "oriental specialities" to its elucidation, has "reverentially rebuilt," the edifice reared by "Bochart's unsurpassable labours," and the validity of "the Genesiactal catalogue" stands forth confessed. "In every instance where monumental or written history has enabled us to check the writer's system," says he, "his accuracy has been vindicated. In not a few cases exactitudes so minute as to be relatively marvellous have been exhibited." As he is no "Caucasian missionary stipended to instil into the ill-furnished crania of African Hottentots," &c., it will perhaps be admitted that the truth of "the ethnic genesiactal chart will" now "resile to our view through archaeological deductions, with the force of an Euclidian demonstration."*

Now, by the concessions of the authors of this volume, there are at least three varieties of complexion included in Genesis X, the swarthy Hamites, the *yellow* Shemites, and the white Japetans, with many subordinate varieties under these. There are the dark, almost black, Cushite Arabs, the copper coloured Shemite Arab, the red Egyptian, the black Lybians, the brown Berbers, the yellow (?) Persians, Assyrians, Syrians and Hebrews, and the white Ionians and Medes. How did all these varieties of colour, and we might extend the inquiry too, to varieties of contour—originate among people allied to each other, as the Xth of Genesis shows, in blood; people descended so extensively, as G. R. G. admits, from a common ancestry. Here is no opportunity for distinct centres of creation. The admission of alliance and common descent, annihilates that theory, and brings us back to the common conviction, that all these varieties have sprung up in the family of man since their creation.

It is indeed the case that the author to whom we refer, in his abundant wisdom and research has discovered (?) that the Chaldean (?) "Genesiactal" cho-

* See Types, &c., pp. 543, 537, 539, 476, 580.

rographer of the Xth of Genesis, whom he admits to be so correct in every other portion of the table of national descent, from Jobab, the son of Joktan, up to Shem, Ham and Japheth, here takes a leap in the dark, and ascribes their parentage to Noah, which word means *repose* and *cessation*." We place the word "OBSCURITY beneath it," says he, "in our Genealogical Tableaux." "This name symbolized probably a point of time so remote from his own day, that he *ceased* to enquire further, and reposed from his labours in blissful ignorance, after having comprehended the vanity of human efforts to pierce that primordial gloom. If he did not, we do."

Such is the miserable shift resorted to, to get rid of a common parent for Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and a common descent for the varieties of men whom he acknowledges are found among their descendants. Noah, therefore, is no real personage, but wholly an imaginary character, an *obscurity*, looming up in the cloudy regions of the imagination, as a possible, nay *impossible*, ancestor of these three men, from whom the seventy-one tribes, the names of which, or of the founders of which, follow; and who themselves are the representatives of the "red, yellow and white races" have descended.

But there is every whit as much evidence in favour of every part of this chart, as there is of that portion to which Mr. Gliddon has given his sanction; as much reason for believing that Noah begat Shem, Ham and Japheth, as for believing that Ham begat Cush, Mizraim and Phut; that this truthful writer represents all these tribes of men as having had one common ancestry; and this is confirmed as much by ancient tradition as any part of the entire record. The father of Noah is as well known as the father of Cush. The reason of his significant name is a matter of historic record. At his birth, his father Lamech called him Noah, *resting, repose*, saying "this same shall comfort us concerning the work and toil of our hands, because of the ground the Lord hath cursed." Equally historic are all the generations up to Adam: though, since the deluge swept away the antediluvian nations descended from these men, the traces of them cannot be found, as can the traces of those of post-diluvian origin, in the countries, tribes,

traditions and histories of existing races of men. In spite of Mr. Gliddon's elaborations, the whole record in Genesis remains as unshaken and reliable as he acknowledges Gen. Xth to be. The memory of Noah seems to be preserved in the Kneph or Nu of the Egyptian mythology, as also the name of Ham in the Amun, and of Phut in the Phtha of their religion, which consisted chiefly in the worship of deified men.*

Another thing with which we have been forcibly struck is the fact that the same types of humanity which these writers have pictured from various ancient sources, chiefly from the sculptures of Egypt, are continually appearing among us in these days, and from a stock as remote as possible, historically considered, from that to which these types are assigned by our authors. We have seen for example their fig. 20, a Syrian captive, fig. 39, a citizen of Tyre, their Hindoo, fig. 48; their Tartar, fig. 50; their Jewish, fig. 47; their Cushite Arab, fig. 52; their Assyrian, fig. 73; their Himyarite Arab, fig. 76; their Egyptian, fig. 124, p. 220, and fig. 128, 154; Plate I. fig. 187, 189, in this country, among the descendants of Europeans. We have in our eye the counterpart of their Himyarite Arab, in a friend of ours, a native of this country, a descendant of Scotch ancestors. We are persuaded that these types of humanity are continually reproduced among ourselves; and these portraits only show that in ancient Egypt, and the oriental countries from whose monuments these sketches are taken, there were much the same varieties of features observable as among Europeans and their descendants. It assists us to trace their resemblance, that these figures are devoid of colour, so that the eye is fastened upon the features and contour rather than any thing else. Even their uncoloured specimens of the Mobile negro, figs. 179 and 180, p. 259, look far more like Irish grog-bruizers from Cork, than any negroes our eyes have seen; thus showing the truth of what the Edinburg Review was derided by these writers for asserting, that Ireland has many examples to shew that the prognathous type, by which the negro has been supposed to be exclusively marked, is

* Osburn Mon. Hist. of Egypt, vol. 1, p. 340.

originated also, amid the low life and inadequate supply of nutritious food, which are too characteristic of some of the most degraded districts of the Emerald Isle.

The whole series of illustrations taken together, show rather that the types of mankind, so far as features and cranial conformation are concerned, can and do arise within the limits of what is usually termed the Caucasian variety of man. And if these extremes of conformation could only be separated from the rest, the system of breeding in and in, would perpetuate and carry to a still more exaggerated extent, the varieties thus arising.

The most imposing point in the argument of this book, is the fact of the existence of the negro features and complexion among the sculptures of Egypt, at so high a date as these authors assign to these monuments: 2300 B. C. 20th Dynasty 1300 B. C. 17th, and 18th Dynasties 1500 B. C. "Probably 2400 or 2500 B. C." 1300 B. C.* From this fact they argue not merely the permanency of the negro type. They continually place these dates and others still more extreme, in direct antagonism with the chronology of the Bible. So frequently and so ostentatiously is this done, as to convey the impression that the object of these authors is, under the cover of a discussion on the unity of the race, to undermine altogether the foundations of revealed religion. To this end all their discussions tend. And this they seem, if possible, to have more at heart than the establishment of great principles of science. Therefore it is that the most extreme conclusions as to the antiquity of Egypt are greedily and summarily adopted. "The epoch of Menes is 2400 years before Abraham." "There are but *ten generations* between Abraham and Noah, to set off against no less than 17 dynasties of Egypt, each of which included many kings whose united ages exceed 2000 years."† Therefore probably the prominence given to the Geological and Palaeontologic fables of Dr. Usher, making the total age of the Delta of the Mississippi to be 158,400 years, and the skeleton of an aboriginal man, found in excavating for the gas works at New Orleans, beneath the roots of a cypress tree belonging, as is alleged,

* See pp. 259, 262, 263.

† 142, 143.

to the fourth forest level, and 16 feet below the surface, to have been buried there 57,600 years ago.*

That outward climatic influences, food, peculiar pursuits and modes of life, do produce changes on the human subject, none can doubt, and that man is subject to congenial variations which, under favourable circumstances, may be propagated and stereotyped in particular tribes of men, must also be admitted. If this is so, what do these men gain to their argument by their extreme hypothesis of the antiquity of the human race? If the Delta of the Mississippi has been forming for 158,400 years, and men were living on the banks of that stream 57,600 years ago, and perhaps 100,000 years before, there has been time enough surely, for the human constitution to have undergone all the changes of which it is capable, under the influences of natural and moral causes, and to have exhibited all the powers of various conformation which the Creator has hidden in the constitution of our race: so that the race should long ago have run its round of change, and come to exhibit before the historic period, all the modifications which have been permanent. Grant these authors their postulate as to the antiquity of man on our globe, it only renders the argument for the unity of the race more impregnable than before.

Grant that the negro is found represented in Egyptian sculptures of a date 1300, 1500, 2300, 2500 B. C. These dates fall more than 1300 years below the period these gentlemen adopt as the era of Menes, a considerable time in itself for changes to have occurred. But, how long before this earliest of Manetho's kings, man existed on the earth, and in Egypt itself, how many chiliads of years even, these writers do not pretend to say. If we may judge from the general deductions of the book, even when reasoning of Egyptian affairs alone, their belief is that men were found in Egypt as long before Menes as his period precedes ours. Time enough sure, for the varieties of men to have arisen under the overruling providence of their Creator.

* I have no doubt that man will yet be found in the fossil state as low down as the eocene deposits, and that he walked the earth with the Megalonyx and Palæotherium.—*Morton's inedited Mass. Types*, p. 326.

This long chronology manifestly is not adopted for this, but because it was believed to falsify the Scriptures, and to sink them from the character of books inspired by God, to the feeble, and often erroneous products of human industry or conjecture. For these extravagant hypotheses for the long continuance of man on the earth we have not a particle of respect. The very fact of the diversity of types in the human family, taken in connection with the alledged obliteration of peculiarities once found in certain tribes, such as the Hottentot and the Negro, itself disproves it. In vain, to carry out their theory, may they claim that the Caucasian alone is a cosmopolite. Man, as such, is so. The Ethiopian is found now in Europe, America, Asia, the islands of Oceanica, and once existed in Colchis of old, where now he is not. The Mongolian dwells on at least two continents. Man is not like an oyster, bound to his rock. Had the earth been inhabited by him as long as these writers pretend, the various types which they imagine to indicate diverse origins, would have been obliterated ages ago, by the process of amalgamation. And since they deny to climate or any natural influences the power of originating diversities of complexion and conformation, these would have long since ceased.

As to Dr. Usher's Mississippi man, interred beneath four forests by that grand old river, 57,600 years ago, and yet only 16 feet below the surface of the ground, we do not know who besides these authors has given credence to the ridiculous conceit. It has furnished its share of amusement to the populace,* and been listened to with a stare of credulity from all quarters.

* The following is clipped from a newspaper—

Wonderful Geological Discovery.—A fossil frog has been discovered in the Wabash bottom, several feet below the surface, with half a dozen strata of mud above him, to the formation of which, according to well-established geological principles, a period of 6,000 years each, may be attributed. When this astounding ante-Adamite fossil was brought to light, all the live old frogs gathered around it, and exclaimed: "Pentateuch! Pentateuch! Og! Humbug! Echo! Abimelech! Balek! Amalek! Amalek!" and the young frogs, startled at the discovery, cried: "Gliddon, Gliddon! Nott and Nott! Agassee! It is thought that this frog is several years older than the skeleton of a man found near New Orleans some time ago.

What the Mississippi river is able to do in its inundations, the quantities of sediment it brings down in its annual flow, the rafts of timber and trees driven before its impetuous current, the known changes of its channel within the memory of living men, could be but little taken into the account, in the arithmetic of these computations. In some four successive seasons in some past period of time, *might* these deposits have been made, and the remains of the homo Americanus received their burial. "The bed of the Mississippi river," said an aged but intelligent planter, who had spent his life upon its banks, "is a wonderful cleft in the earth, and the stream which has scooped it out has performed singular freaks in my day."*

As to Egypt, all *true* history is against the extravagant claim to antiquity which is set up for it. China has nothing but a fabulous, mythological period to run parallel with it. India absolutely nothing, as Mr. Gliddon himself now admits. Assyria absolutely nothing, as the researches of Layard, Botta, and Rawlinson show. Palestine nothing, Arabia and Syria nothing. How passing strange that Egyptian antiquity, confessedly high, should ascend by such wonderful cycles, and the narrow valley of the Nile hold men and organised governments, when those nations had not yet sprung into existence, or still remained in obscure and unnoticed barbarism. Is it possible that, for century upon century,

* In this instance, too, it turns out that the statement made respecting the fossil man, is at least questionable, if not altogether apocryphal. The editor of the *Orleanian*, in commenting upon it, says: "Strange that so startling a fact as that mentioned by Dr. Usher never reached us before, although resident here for many years. And, then, the fossil cypress, only fourteen thousand five hundred years old! Wonder if they were discovered on Moreau street, in the Third District, where a Dr. Usher dwelt? who is probably the doctor alluded to, as he was somewhat of a scientific literary gentleman."

Here is pretty strong negative proof of the incorrectness of the whole statement. It is not probable that facts so astounding and important to the scientific and theologic world could have transpired in New Orleans, and not be known to one of her most intelligent editors. Only the most positive and well-sustained evidence could attest so marvellous an occurrence, and it is therefore incumbent upon all who place any stress upon the theory it would teach, in the first place clearly to establish the fact. That being unauthenticated, away go all the fine-spun deductions of Agassiz and others as to the pre-Adamic existence of man.—*Mobile Register*.

when the arts flourished in Egypt, they should never have extended themselves three days' journey in the direction of any surrounding country.

We are persuaded that the day is not far remote when the extraordinary pretensions of the high antiquity of Egypt, as a people, will be brought down. It will be shown that it has been over estimated by both Lepsius and Bunsen, and that notwithstanding the sneers of Mr. Gliddon, the chronology of Champollion, Wilkinson, Poole and Osborn, are better proved by monumental evidence, than the computation of those distinguished scholars. The volumes of Osborn have certainly shown the way, even if his deductions shall not *all* stand the test of thorough examination, by which Egyptian chronology may come into harmony with that of other nations. He has so read the monuments that they tell a different tale from that which the writers of the *Types of Mankind* would desire. Doubtless there are specific positions taken by this writer which even he may be compelled to abandon. But as to the general results, we have but little solicitude. They are in accordance with the Scriptures, though not based upon them.—Throughout the whole discussion there is every appearance of independence of thought and a careful and conscientious use of the materials which the stony records of Egypt supply to the scholar. They are in accordance too with the reliable chronology of other ancient nations. According to this writer, the era of Menes is 2429 B. C., a date which nearly approximates to that assigned by the books of Moses for the foundation of the primitive kingdoms of the earth. The dynasties of Manetho, especially the earlier ones, were often cotemporaneous; many of the kings in Manetho's lists were co-regent. The lists were kept in double and triple by the priests for the purpose of aiding them in claiming an extravagant antiquity for their country. Thus the 2d dynasty he makes cotemporary with the first; the 5th an Abydan with the 4th, a Memphite dynasty; the 9th a Sebennyte, the 11th a Theban, with the 6th a Memphite; the 12th a Theban, cotemporary with the 10th, a Sebennyte and the 16th; the 18th a Theban, cotemporary with the 14th, a Xoite dynasty. Abram was in Egypt under Acthoes,

about 445 years after the era of Menes. Joseph came into Egypt under Aphophis. The Exodus took place under Sethos II. who was the Pharaoh who perished in the Red Sea. The Exodus occurred not far from 1314 B. C. Such are some of the conclusions to which this able and independent writer has come. All antagonism of Egyptian chronology from monumental history, in the light of these facts, entirely disappear. True, the negro is found sculptured and depicted on the monuments, first in the days of Thothmosis, which we suppose this chronology was put as early as 1416 B. C. or 102 years before the Exode, being about 900 years after Archbp. Usher's date for the deluge, and over 1700 according to the long chronology of the Septuagint, as followed by Hales.

The permanence of the Ethiopian type of man from that day to this, does not prove that it has been permanent through all preceding ages. At some period in the 9 or 17 centuries before, the providence of God overruling by favouring circumstances, the changes which were requisite to produce this diversity, took place through a longer or shorter period of time, till the varieties of the human race arose. This supposition is easier, far, than that maintained by these writers, that men were created in nations, in the several localities in which they are found, which, in relation to nations now covering near half the globe, *we know to be false.*

The chapter by J. C. N., on Hybridity, is a work of Sysiphus, a vain attempt to show that hybrids are fertile *inter se*, capable of perpetuating their own mongrel breed. The most that has yet been adduced, is a few exceptional cases, utterly insufficient to subvert the law that hybrids are incapable of propagating their kind, a law regarded as established hitherto by almost universal observation. *Exceptio probat regulam.*

"The quadrupeds, many of them of the same genus, that are so conveniently arranged opposite each other in the eight columns of this tableau, (the tableau of Agassiz,) have often been tamed and brought together in menageries, etc., and where these different species could be induced to have intercourse with each other, their progeny has become sterile, and not a single instance can be pro-

duced where these have propagated a race. The domestic sheep and goat have been running together for ages, in the same fields, both in Europe and America, but no new breed has been propagated. Such, indeed, is the repugnance which these two species have exhibited, that Dr. Morton informed the public, that experiments, on a large scale, had been instituted in Pennsylvania, to effect this object, but without success in a single instance.—Buffon, however, by patience, after a long trial, succeeded in obtaining a hybrid progeny, but no race could be produced. * * * The muscovy and common duck, which we have reared for many years, have produced hybrids, but here the race was at an end—so it is between the product of the mule and the horse. These are different species, and the Creator of species never intended to surrender his prerogative to man, who can only improve, not create.”*

As all the varieties of man are fruitful *inter se*, and as the progeny of these commixtures are also fruitful, the argument yet remains an irresistible one, that the race of man is one, and the varieties observable in it have sprung up since the original creation. “There is no more sterility in the mulatto,” says Dr. Bachman, “the half-breed Indian, or the product of the mongrel and Caucasian race than there is in the white or any other race.”

“We have collected some statistics from reliable sources that will place this matter in its true light.—Thus far we have found them equally, if not more prolific than the whites. We have, according to the last census, 405,751† mulattoes in the United States. The experiment, therefore, for good or for evil, has been conducted on a large scale. We have in Charleston a large number of respectable families of free mulattoes. They have received good English educations, and some of their daughters have even been taught drawing and music. Their sons are mechanics. Many of the members of this community of mulattoes, are upright, virtuous, and professors of religion. They have intermarried for several generations. We have ascertained that they continue to be, through every generation, on an average,

* Bachman on Agassiz's Nat. Provinces, p. 43.

† Statistical view of the U. S. Census, 1854, p. 83.

fully as prolific as either the whites or the blacks. These intermixtures have taken place among all the eight types of men to which Professor Agassiz has restricted the human family. It would be superfluous to prove that the German, English, French, Spanish, Slavonians and Hungarians, have intermixed for ages with the blood of the Celt, the Saxon, the Slavonic, the Turk and the Mongul. The Russians have mingled with the Siberian and Esquimo, and with the American Indians on our north-western coast. The Spaniards have multiplied with the Malays on the Phillipine Islands—in North America with the Mexican Indians, producing a new race called Mexicans, as also in South America with the Indians of Peru, Bueno Ayres, Guiana, etc. The French have produced a race of half breeds with the Indians in Canada, called Voyageurs, that are serviceable as boatmen, and efficient servants to the several fur companies. German blood is found among the Finns, and every one of Agassiz's types. The Dutch have multiplied with the natives of Guiana, with the Malays, the East Indians and the Chinese. The North American Indian has multiplied with the African, as well as with every variety of the so-called Caucasian family. The white race has been mingled with African blood in America, and with every one of the nations composing the types of Agassiz's eight realms. Where are the evidences of sterility? If the descendants from any two of these primitive types are hybrids, and, according to Knox, will soon "die out and out," then since the whole world is fast running into hybridism, since whole tribes of such men exist in every part of the world, the destiny of the human race is sealed by this strange interpretation of the laws of hybridity.*

The whole of this discussion but confirms the conclusion to which the greatest naturalists have arrived, and which Prof. Owen, the highest authority in such questions has expressed that "*man is the sole species of his genus, the sole representative of his order.*" Dr. Bachman has declared that "the varieties of man differ even less than the varieties of domestic animals and are far

*Bachman, pp. 44, 45.

more uniform in size. There are black, and brown, and white breeds, in all the varieties of domestic animals, as well as of poultry. There are greater differences in the skulls of the various breeds of domestic cattle, sheep and hogs, than in those of man." "The intelligence of the Arabian horse or the English racer is as far superior to the dray horse, and that of the spaniel to the bull dog, or that of the white man is to the negro."—Continuation of the Review of Nott and Gliddon's *Types of Mankind*, p. 7 and 10.*

Agassiz thus expresses himself on the argument for the unity of the race from the *affinity of languages*: "As for languages, their common structure, and even the analogy in the sounds of different languages, far from indicating a derivation of one from another, seem to us the necessary result of that similarity in the organs

*A striking fact on the question of Hybridity is recorded on p. 16, of Dr. Bachman's Review, which may be easily proved by a visit to the residence of Dr. Davis, in this vicinity. Note, p. 16 of continuation of the Review of Nott & Gliddon:

"A pair of Brahmin cattle and two pair of water-oxen, were imported by Dr. Davis, of Columbia, in 1849; the former, as admitted by naturalists, is a variety of our common domesticated cattle—the latter, of the eastern buffalo. The new theory, that our domesticated cattle have proceeded from a commixture of different species, was now to be tested. The male and female of the Brahmin cattle were placed in the same field with many of our common cows. The female Brahmin cow has produced a calf each year—and, at the same time, as we are informed by Colonel Hampton and Dr. Davis, the descendants from this same bull, by our common cows, amount to more than 1,500, having greatly improved the stocks of cattle in Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, and Louisiana. In the mean time, what has been the result in their efforts to produce hybrids from the male of the water cattle? The female had a calf annually—the male was running in the immense inclosure of Mr. Middleton, with from 1,000 to 1,500 common cattle, for several years past, and not a single hybrid has been produced. The same was the result at Dr. Davis' plantation." "There is another experiment going forward, at the latter place, which, we think, is calculated to peril Mr. Brown's new theory of designating species by the hair. Dr. Davis imported the Cashmere, Thibet shawl, the Malta milking, and the large pendulous eared goat of Syria—admitted by all naturalists, Hamilton Smith, and Dr. Morton included, to be varieties of the common goat. The product is now over 300. By interbreeding, the coarse hair of our common goat has been converted into wool, as fine as that of the Cashmere, and by crossing the Thibet with the Cashmere goat, the long coarse hair, which covers the down of the former has been converted into the soft wool of the cashmere goat."

of speech, which causes them naturally to produce the same sound. We would not deny that it is as natural for man to speak as it is for a dog to bark, for an ass to bray, for a lion to roar, for a wolf to howl, when we see that no nations are so barbarous, so deprived of all human character, as to be made to express in language their desires, their fears, their hopes." "Who ever thought that the robin learned his melody from the mocking bird, or the mocking bird from any other species of thrushes? Who ever fancied that the field crow learned his cawing from the jack-daw? Certainly, no one at all acquainted with the habits of birds. And should it be different with men? Why should not the different races of men have spoken distinct languages, as they do at present—differing as their organs of speech are variously modified? And why should not these modifications in their turn be indication of primitive differences among them?" "The evidence adduced from the affinities of the languages of different nations in favour of a community of origin is of no value, when we know that among vociferous animals, every species has its peculiar intonations, and that the different species of the same family produce sound as closely allied, and forming as natural combinations, as the so-called Indo-Germanic languages compared with one another."

We can but regard this as a striking instance of the fanciful analogies, which men of genius sometimes lay hold of to give substance to a baseless theory. The voice of man is controlled by reason; the voice of a bird by instinct. The one is capable of imitating all articulate sounds, and using them to express his own thoughts, the other, except in a few cases, as of the parrot and mocking bird, incapable of this imitation, and in these few, using the sounds without any perception of their significance. The one can forget his original language, and adopt another, transmitting it to his descendants; the other keeps ever his natural note, and transmits to its offspring no other. The hen perchance may hatch out the eggs of a duck thrust by the thrifty housewife into its own nest. The duckling learns not its fos-

See *Types, &c.*, pp. 282, 72.

ter mother's note, but grows up to maturity with its own expressive *quack*. Not so with man. However difficult it may be for adult persons to attain the just pronunciation of a tongue foreign to themselves, it arises from no natural difference in the organs of speech. The child of Anglo-Saxon parents, born and reared in the capital of France, speaks French with a Parisian accent. He could just as easily attain the mingled nasal-guttural sounds of the Arabic, or the harsh monosyllables of the Chinese, the peculiar *click* of the Hottentot, or the mellifluous melody of the Italian, or of some of the barbarous languages of Soudan. The negro can acquire with ease, the French accent, or the "inimitable" brogue of the sons of St. Patrick.* Differences of language do not arise therefore, from differences of physical organization, and do not point to different origins of the human family. No one can say that the resemblances in the vocables of speech, in grammatical forms, and in the structure of language, traceable throughout the Indo-Germanic family, spring from the sameness of vocal organs in the people speaking these tongues, who has at all traced these resemblances out. In no other way could they have originated but by the cohabitation of these people in the same community in a period which antedates all profane history, but by their having proceeded from some common origin. In the midst of the Indo-Germanic family of tongues, is that interesting nook in Spain where the Basque is spoken, the language of those ancient Iberians who migrated to Europe, before the other Indo-Germanic nations. The analogies are more and more discoverable which assign it to its home in the east. The affinities of the Semitic family of tongues are still more satisfactory, which extends from Persia over south-western Asia, and no small part of Africa, and was spoken alike by the descendants of Shem and a large portion of the descendants of Ham, and still more closely point out a common origin. Agassiz's conclusion is not that of Klapproth, who flattered himself "that, in his works, the universal affinity of language is placed in so strong a light, that it must be considered

* See Types, &c., p. 273.

by all as completely demonstrated." Nor of Humboldt, who asserts that with the increase of our knowledge in every direction, there is found less and less reason for the former belief, that the diversified races of men are separated from each other by insurmountable barriers." The very last results of ethnological research testify only with new strength and directness to the affinities of language and man's common origin. The last work of Chevalier Bunsen presents this in a peculiarly clear and interesting light. "Language bears," says he, "in itself the indestructible records of its own history and origin." "It would have been next to impossible to discover any traces of relationship between the swarthy nations of India and their conquerors, whether Alexander or Clive, but for the testimony borne by language? What authority would have been strong enough to persuade the Grecian army that their gods and their hero ancestors were the same as those of king Porus? and to convince the English soldier that the same blood was running in his veins and in the veins of the dark Bengalese? And yet there is not an English jury now-a-days, which, after examining the hoary documents of language, would reject the claim of a common descent and a legitimate relationship between Hindu, Greek and Teuton. Many words still live in India and England that have witnessed the first separation of the Northern and Southern Arians, and these are witnesses not to be shaken by any cross examination. The terms for God, for house, for father, for mother, son, daughter, for dog, cow, for heart and tears, for axe and tree, identical in all the European idioms, are like the watch-words of soldiers. We challenge the seeming stranger; and whether he answer with the lip of a Greek, a German, or an Indian, we recognize him as one of ourselves. "Nothing necessitates the admission of different independent beginnings for the material elements of the Turanian, Semitic, and Arian branches of speech—nay it is possible even now to point out radicals which, under various changes and disguises, have been current in these three branches ever since their first separation. Though the historian may shake his head, though the physiologist may doubt, and the poet scorn the idea, all must yield

before the facts furnished by language. There *was* a time when the ancestors of the Celts, the Germans, the Slavonians, the Greeks, the Italians, the Persians, and Hindoos, were living together beneath the same roof." "And now if we gaze from our native shores over that vast ocean of human speech, with its waves rolling on from continent to continent, rising under the fresh breezes of the morning of history, and slowly heaving in our own more sultry atmosphere,—with sails gliding over its surface, and many an oar plying through its surf, and the flags of all nations waving joyously together—with its rocks and wrecks, its storms and battles, yet reflecting serenely all that is beneath, and above and around it,—if we gaze, and hearken to the strange sounds rushing past our ears in unbroken strains, it seems no longer a wild tumult, or *ανηριθμὸν γέλασμα*, but we feel as if placed within some ancient cathedral, listening to a chorus of innumerable voices; and the more intensely we listen, the more all discords melt away into higher harmonies, till at last we hear but one majestic tricord, or a mighty unison, at the end of a sacred symphony.

Such visions will float through the study of the grammarian, and in the midst of toilsome researches his heart will suddenly beat, as he feels the conviction growing upon him that men are brethren in the simplest sense of the word—the children of the same father—whatever their country, their colour, their language, and their faith.*

Part II. of this volume Mr. Gliddon has made the theatre of his efforts at Biblical exegesis, and of that amazing oriental erudition which puts to the blush all other modern scholarship. If however the *theologian* Bochart, should arise from the dead and reclaim so much of his own as is found in chapter XIV. on the Xth of Genesis, the bulkiness of this portion of the work would very materially diminish. The moving cause of this elaborate essay is, to show that the writer of Genesis X. was acquainted only with the Caucasian variety of

* Bunson & Prof. Max Muller, in Bunson's Philosophy of Universal History, applied to Language & Religion. Vol. I. pp. 129, 130, 486. Vol. II. p. x.

men, and indeed that the geographical knowledge of the Scriptures was embraced within very narrow limits, and if they give to mankind a common descent, it was but the mankind of their own acquaintance, the Caucasians only. It never seems to be dreamt that there is a higher author of this book than the human penman, and that God himself must be acquainted with the men he has made, and in revealing his will to his creatures, can never permit error to be commingled with truth. It is impossible to follow the author through the multiplicity of his details, in many of which he is right, because his authorities were right. To those in which he strives to convict his opponents of error and want of scholarship, we are bound to pay some attention. The first point to which we refer is the signification of Cush in Gen. X. and elsewhere. Gliddon & Nott maintain that in the Scriptures it refers to Arabia, and not as has been commonly believed, to an African people. Mr. Gliddon is pleased to use the following language of those who maintain that it is not exclusively used of an Asiatic people. "Among the many who have felt themselves called upon to contravene our assertions, not having hitherto met with one person really acquainted with the Hebrew *Alphabet*, we may be excused by Hebraists as recognizing as 'biblical authorities' those teachers who (even the articulations Aleph, Beth, Gimel, being to them unknown,) are yet ignorant of the A. B. C. of Scripture language, meanings, and history."

"Bochart's words show that we were not the first by more than 1000 years to claim Arabia for Cush, instead of Ethiopia," &c.*

This caps the climax of effrontery, that a man, himself a mere smatterer in Hebrew learning, should characterize thus those who differ with him as to the residence of the Cushites of the Hebrew Bible, is carrying on war with weapons singularly chosen. Three portions of the earth appear to be denoted in the Scriptures under the name of Cush; an oriental Cush bordered by the Tigris, an Arabian Cush, and an African Cush. Our own belief has been expressed before in these pages, that Cush is the name both of an Asiatic and an African people;

* Types, &c. p. 480.

in other words, that the descendants of Cush, after peopling portions of Southern Asia, in which a part of Arabia is included, passed over from this latter country, probably across the straits of Babelmandel and the adjacent waters, into the regions of Nubia and Central Africa. We do not know why this opinion should indicate any want of Hebrew knowledge. Was Gesenius then ignorant, who says, *Thesaur* I. p. 672, that "Cush designates Ethiopia, a country inhabited by the black Hamites, surrounded by the Gihon, i. e. the Nile, very opulent, situated south from Egypt, and on this account named with Egypt, whose southern part (Pathros) in the times of Isaiah obeyed kings of the Ethiopic race?" He resorts to the Chaldee, Syriac, and Coptic, and to the hieroglyphics of Egypt as evidence of these assertions. In reference to the opinion which Mr. Gliddon has adopted after Bochart, Gesenius holds the following language: "What Bochart, (the Pseudo Jonathan on the Pentateuch preceding him,) maintained in his *Phaleg* IV. 2, whom Walton in *Prolegg* XV. 1, and Vitringa on *Is.* XI. 11, have followed, that none of the Cushites of the Old Testament were to be sought in Africa, but in Arabia Felix only, J. D. Michaelis refuted long since in *Spicel.*, T. I. p. 143, seqq. who nevertheless determined that some part of them dwelt in Arabia (*Comp. Vitring. De Cushæis*, *Is.* XVIII. 1,) and moreover that all had immigrated from Arabia Felix into Africa. And the present Ethiopians or Abyssinians, (*Geez*, *migratio s. libertas*,) are said to have originated in Southern Arabia, and the relationship of language and writing indicate this, for the Ethiopic and Himyaritic are very similar (v. Ludolf *Comment ad hist. æthiop.* p. 58, *Hall. Encyclopaedie*, art. *Aethiopisch Sprache und Schrift*.) But the state of the case as to the Cushites of the Old Testament is different, and Schultess has correctly remarked (*Paradies* p. 10, et seqq.) that there is no place at all in the Old Testament which convinces us that the Cushites were outside of the African Ethiopia; for *Numb.* XII. 1, the wife of Moses is certainly some other than Zippora the Midianite. *Heb.* III. 7, Cushan is indeed coupled with the Midianites, but elsewhere also with the Persians. *Jer.* XLVI. 9; *2 Chron.* XXI. 16. The Ara-

bians are represented as dwelling by the side of the Cushites, yet this could be said although a strait separated them; *ibid* XIV. 16. That the Cushites were Africans is understood from the way those who returned took. It may be added that the sons, i. e. the colonists of Cush Gen. X. 7, except Regma and Nimrod are all to be sought in Ethiopia, (v. Seba, Havilah, Sabtecha,) in which opinion all the ancient interpreters also concurred, (v. Bochart l. c. IV. 3.) Much less are they to be listened to, who seek Cush Gen. II. 13, out of Ethiopia, concerning whose conjectures see Reland Dissert. I. 19, J. D. Michaelis Suppl. 1231. Wahl Vorder- und Mittelasiens, p. 529."

From several of these conclusions of this distinguished Hebraist, we are compelled to dissent. But what we have adduced shows his strong conviction that the Cush of Gen. X. and of the rest of the Old Testament is to be found only in Africa.

Winer also in his *Biblischer Realwörterbuch* I. p. 235, says, "Cush, as a current and definite Geographical term, designated in most cases, the African country above Syene, the renowned Ethiopia (Ptolem. 4. 7, *ἡ ὑπερὸς Αἰγυπτίου Αἰθιοπία*,) which, besides Ethiopia proper, embraces also at the present time Nubia and Cordofan, (although Meroe commonly is distinguished from Cush, comp. also Knobel on Is. 18, 1. "These African Cushites were black, (Jer. 13:23 Strabo 15; 695,) of large stature (Is. 45, 14, Herod. 3.20, Solin 30,) had curly hair, Aristol. problem 14,) and reached an extreme old age (Herod. 3:23 Philostrat. Apoll. 6, 4.)"

We might greatly extend these quotations and give the opinions of many eminent scholars who have considered the Cush of the Scriptures the name of an African people. We may name Rosenmueller, in *Geography and Antiquities* a high authority, Henderson, Knobel, Morren in *Kitto's Cyclopædia*, Hitzig, and Mr. Birch of the British Museum, whom Mr. Gliddon is bound to respect, and who says of the African Kesh, Kesh, Kish, Kush, which he spells in all these ways, "its identity with the Biblical Cush is universally admitted."—Types, p. 259. "The Bible mentions but one Kush, Ethiopia: an Asiatic Kush exists only in the im-

agination of interpreters, and is the child of their despair."—Bunsen *Philosophy of Univ. Hist.*, Vol. I. p. 191.

The grounds given by Mr. Gliddon, from Bochart, Patrick, and others, for supposing Cush to be Arabia, are singular.

1. "Moses' wife is termed a Cushean."—Numb. xii: 13. Zippora, the wife of Moses, was a daughter of Jethro, priest of Midian. No other wife of Moses is mentioned in the Pentateuch. The Cusheans were descended from Ham. But the Midianites from Shem, being descendants of Abraham, by Keturah. It is difficult, too, to conceive that a quarrel should have arisen between Miriam and Moses about his wife Zipporah, because she was a Midianite of Arabia, after they had lived together for forty years.

2. "I will make the land of Mitzraim a waste of wastes, from the tower of Syene even unto the frontier of Kush."—Ezk. xxix: 10. Syene being Assouan, at the first cataract, on the border line of (Ethiopia) Nubia and Egypt, the writer cannot mean from Ethiopia to Ethiopia, but from Syene to Kush, beyond the isthmus of Suez." Another signal instance of the great scholarship of G. R. G. The true translation is: "I will make the land of Mitzraim waste, from Migdol to Syene, even to the border of Cush." So also, xxx: 6, where, see the translation of the lxx: ἀπὸ Μαγδαλοῦ εἰς Συήνην. Migdol was a city of Lower Egypt, on its extreme northern verge. Compare Jerem. xiv: 1; xlv: 14. Herodotus says, "Necho overpowered the Syrians in Magdol;" and the Itiner. Anton., p. 171, speaks of it as twelve Roman miles from Pelusium. Compare Exod. xiv: 2; Numb. xxxiii: 7. And see Rosenmueller, Hitzig, Gesenius, and Winer. So that the passage in Ezekiel is a signal instance to show that Cush was the name in that prophet of a country south of Egypt.

Much ado is made of the *u* being a radical "mater lectionis" in the Hebrew word Cush, while the African name is Ksh,—never written with a medial *u*. True, it is never written with a medial vowel at all, and the substitution of the *i*, *e*, *a*, or *u*, is according to the fancy of

the reader. Now, what tyro in the Hebrew language does not know that this word belongs to that class of Hebrew vocables which constantly undergoes contraction; that the vav, quiescent in the vowel *shureq*, is a feeble letter, and is omitted now, and now exchanged for another feeble letter. Thus Kūm (Qūm) becomes Kām, Kōm, Tsūr becomes Tsōr, Tsēr, Tsār, Tsār. Dūn becomes Dīn, Dān; Mūth, Mēth; and so with large families of words, which are the same term, varying its vocalization in a variety of ways within the precincts of one and the same language. If such masters in Philology as Gesenius, can have no difficulty in finding in the Cush of the Hieroglyphics the Cush of the Hebrew Bible, what but his own wilfulness, or shallow learning, should lead Mr. Gliddon to hesitate!

Yet, Mr. Gliddon himself admits that, after the captivity, Cush may have had a less restricted sense. In some of "the later biblical books, where geographical precision is sacrificed to poetic license." Especially when "the Jews of Alexandria, (having forgotten not only their parental Hebrew, but even the Chaldee dialect subsequently acquired through the captivity,) caused the books of the Old Testament to be translated" out of the Hebrew,—which they had utterly forgotten, which forgetting extended not only to the Hebrew proper, but to the Chaldee, a cognate sister dialect,—by *men who had forgotten the language they translated from*, and who did not foresee that Dr. Nott and Gliddon, on this continent then never dreamed of, would write "Types of Mankind," and detect their blundering,—these same men, who could not read a word of Hebrew, "when they meet with the Hebrew word Kush, simply transcribed it into the Greek characters as Κους, ΚΩΟ, or ΚΩΣ, or translated it by *Αιδιοπια*, (see p. 487.) The special nonsense of all which story we commend to our readers as one of the wonders of this most rare, ripe, and unparalleled writer; and the special miracle of which translating surpasses even the story of Aristeas and Justin, with their 72 *inspired* translators.*

Types, 484, 488.

* As might be expected, all the sons of Cush are by Mr. G. located in Arabia. Thus Seba is Oman in S. Arabia. Gesenius, on the other hand,

But of what colour were these Cushites? The Asiatic Cushites of Mr. Gliddon are *dark, almost black*.^{*} The Monumental Cushites, "*Africans* in hue, dark-coloured Nubians." "The table of Ahmes-Pensuben, (says Mr. Birch,) records that he had killed two negroes in Kish or Æthiopia." "The first promoters of the Disc worship, (says Osburn,) were negroes, and gloried in the personal peculiarities of the sons of Phut and Cush." In an inscription in the temple of Phre, at Amada, in upper Nubia, commemorating the glories of Amenophis II., it is said "He brought along with them also, prisoners of the land of Nubia, who dwelt afar off, beyond the precincts of the Phutim, [the blacks of the western desert]; that they may see his conquests are for ever and ever, over all the plains, and over all the mountains, and over all the districts of the Nahasi, [the Negroes.]"—Osburn II. 313.

Lepsius is of the opinion that the ancient Nubians, or Ethiopians, were a red brown people, similar to the Egyptians, but darker, as they are at the present day. He places them rather with the Caucasian, than the Nigritian race. Authorities here differ. But they are at least intermediate between the two extremes of human complexion, approaching the darkest negro rather than the white man, so far indeed, in many instances, as not to be distinguishable from many examples of native Africans domesticated among us. And yet, according to Mr. Gliddon, and the truthful author of Genesis x., the Cushite, as far as he is found in Arabia,—we also believe as far as he is found in Africa, too,—is descended from Ham, who was the common father of the Canaanites, the Phenicians, the Assyrians and Chaldeans, the Egyptians, the Philistines, the Libyans, a portion of these nations being of light complexion, and the other portion of various dusky hues, even, in many examples, to the black of the negro. By what process was this change? Here is diversity, and great diversity, among

Josephus, Casaubon, Ludolf, Heeren, Bruce, Burkhardt, Leake, Ruppell, Hoskins, Russegger, Tuch, Knobel, Winer, Rosenmueller, refer Seba to the ancient Meroe. Havilah is Haulan in Arabia; but Gesenius, Winer and Schulthess, find it in Zeila, south of the straits of Bab-el-Mandel, in Africa. The same difference is observable in Sabtah, Raamah, and Sabtecha.

* Page 492.

nations in descent confessedly one. A diversity in the family of Ham itself approximating the widest varieties in the whole family of man.

We note, in passing, Mr. G's. translation of Gen. x: 8, 9, by the help of Lanci. "And Kush begat NMRD, (Nem-Rud—he whose royal-actions corresponded to the good-odour-of-his-fame); he first began to be mighty on the earth. He was a great landed proprietor before (the face of) IeHOuaH." In the Casluhim and Philistim of Gen. x: 14, after Quatremère, Mr. Gliddon finds the Shillouhs of the Barbary coast. This position we will not stop to controvert; but we do not see how the name of the port of Gaza, *Mûrûma*, should be necessarily derived from a Coptic source, from MA *place*, and IOM, *sea*. It may have been so derived. But the Hebrew furnishes just as apt a derivation. Mah, *that which is*, Yamah *at the sea*. The difference between the Hebrew and Coptic words is very slight. But there is little reason for his trifling about the English version, as representing "a man yclept *Casluhim*, being delivered of another called Philistim, as if the translators took these plural names of tribes as the names of individuals. The word translated *begat*, is used in an extended sense in the Hebrew language, and he who begets the founder of a tribe, or people, begets that tribe or people. Though Jacob begat Judah, Benjamin, &c., directly, he begat, in the extended use of the term, the Jews, the Benjaminites, &c. The same is true of Mitsraim. Though it is the name of all Egypt, including Matsor, Lower Egypt, and Pathros, Upper Egypt, and therefore of the dual form, it is here used of the people of the country, who were so called from Metser, their founder, whose name probably was first used of the country, then of that country as existing in two great parts, to designate which the dual came in use, and then was used of the people of the two Egypts, descended from Metser. The plurals subsequently used are names of people descended from individual founders. Heth is the name of the descendants of Heth. Mr. Gliddon makes much sport of Mr. Arphaxad, his merriment being founded on Michaelis' explanation of Arphaxad, as signifying "the boundary of Chaldea." That Arphaxad was understood by the

Jews to be a personal name, is evident from Judith i: 1, where it is given as a name of a certain king of the Medes. If the derivation of Michaelis has any foundation, the present orthography may have sprung from some very slight modification of the name as used of the descendants of Arphaxad, in reference to the geographical position they occupied. Small is the basis for Mr. Gliddon's humour. "To the 'late Mr.' Arphaxad, 'aged 438 years,' we repeat our valedictory, 'requiescat pace.'" All want of correctness in the language of Gen. x., if there be any, is due to the "Chaldean compiler" (?)

According to the views we have expressed, we would be obliged to alter the shading of the Map of the World on p. 553, to indicate that the writer of Genesis x. was acquainted with the countries known to us as Nubia and Abyssinia. If Moses wrote it, as we believe, educated as he was in Egypt, how could he be ignorant of those lands. The story of his march at the head of Egyptian armies into Ethiopia, as told by Josephus, is not impossible. It is not inconsistent with other facts in Egyptian history. But, if this story be rejected, how could the Israelites fail of seeing the Egyptian sculptures, on some of which they may even have been employed? If they are so ancient, as has been maintained,—if the Tartar (p. 140,) and Mongolian, (p. 153,) and Negro, are there represented, if they had eyes to see, they must have beheld the sculptured Negroes, and other distant and strange nations. Their knowledge of men must have been as extensive at least as that of the Egyptians. If the Tartar was known to the Egyptian, why may not the Chinese have been known by name, and by physiognomy, to the coterminous, but nearer Jew, who lived on the very pathway of nations? And where is "the theological ignorance, when Chinese are asserted to be referred to in the Sinim of Isaiah?" xlix: 14? We are aware that it is to ourselves, in particular, that Mr. Gliddon refers, in his very complimentary language, which we have quoted on p. 253 of this article. His attack upon the hypothesis that the Sinim of Isaiah refers to the

* See *Types, &c.*, pp. 479, 477.

Chinese, breaks down in several particulars. In the first place, Mr. G. declares that the whole context of the prophet refers to the return of the Jews from bondage in Babylonia. It is therefore in Mesopotamian vicinities that the people here designated are to be sought. Mr. Gliddon proposes the city at the mouth of the Lycus, called by the Greeks *Kava*, by the Romans *Cœnae*, by the Arabs *Senn*; *Sin*, fifty miles north of Mosul, and the large mounds called *Sen*, on the Euphrates opposite *Dair*. Here are three localities which will go to make up the plural form *Sinim*, "the cities, districts, localities of *Sin*."

Now, in the first place, all this is founded on a misapprehension as to the subject of *Is. 49*. It is not the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon to which reference is had, but their teaching other nations the true religion, when the sceptre of the Messiah should go forth from Zion and the law from Jerusalem. It is the period of Christianity to which reference is made, as usual in the prophets, in language taken from the condition and hopes of the Jewish church, from whose bosom the true religion has gone forth. From the most distant parts of the earth should converts gather. No proximate regions, no narrow Mesopotamia are in the prophet's eye. From distant regions do the converts come. "Behold, these shall come from far; and lo, these from the north and from the west and these from the land of *Sinim*. Sing, O heavens and be joyful, O earth," &c. The concinnity and beauty of the passage is gone, the poetry killed by the frigid interpretation of Mr. Gliddon. There is also a reference in these words, more or less definite, to the four quarters of the globe. "From far" is indeed wholly indefinite; "from the north," is otherwise; "and from the west," (literally,) "*from the sea*," viz: the Mediterranean, which, as it lies west from Palestine, is the ordinary designation of the western quarter. Two terms being definite and indicating distinctly two quarters of the heavens, the fourth term, which is also definite, would distinctly point to some other quarter, which must, in this case, be south or east, so that we are bound to find *Sinim* either in the distant south or the distant east. *Sinim* can indicate no small

place or country, but one so considerable as to represent a distant quarter of the earth. And none so appropriately answers to these postulates as China. It is also an argument of no small weight that the strong demonstratives, "Behold these," "lo! these," "and these," do, in the Hebrew usage, indicate distribution; in this case, regions marked by strong contrasts, the contrast viz: of being in opposite directions from each other. We can as little accept Mr. Gliddon's suggestion that the plural form of *Sinim* is used because many places of the name *Sin* are induced. Such a use of plurals in proper names we believe to be without example.

The opinions in reference to this word have been various. The Targum translates "from the South Country." Bochart refers *Sinim* to the inhabitants of Pelusium, i. e. the Egyptians, Michaelis to the inhabitants of Syene. Neither is probable. The LXX. translate *ex γῆς παρσων*. Manasseh Ben Israel, Arias Montanus, Junius, Calmet, and Mueller, Langles, Lassen, Hitzig, Henderson, Gesenius, Hitzig, Knobel, Alexander, and others, understand the name, with greater reason, of the Chinese. Mr. Gliddon contends, however, that the name comes from the founder of the *Tshin* dynasty, and that it was not used before 221 B. C.

"But we finish," says he, "with orthodoxy's Chinese:

"From a previously small feud of the Celestial Gates, called *Tshin*, given by Hiao-Wang, about B. C. 909, to one of his jockeys, issued a line of princes whose constant acquistiveness had enabled them, by the year B. C. 249, to incorporate a fifth part of the Chinese realm, and to extend over it their patronymic title of *Tshin*. Out of this stock sprung Tshin-Chi-Hoang-Ti, at once the the Augustus and the Napoleon of China—founder of the fourth or *Tshin* dynasty, whose name signifies 'the first absolute sovereign of the dynasty of *Tshin*.'—About B. C. 221, all the principalities of China were consolidated under his supreme sway; and, as a consequence, the name *Tshin* became, in common parlance, synonymous with the whole empire. Proud of his mighty exploits, although detesting the individual, the Chinese, from and after his day, adopting the word

Tshin as typical of China itself, originated the Hindoo appellative 'Tchina,' whence we inherit our corrupt designation 'China.' Under these circumstances we tender to future sustainers of Chinese in Scripture a many-horned (?) dilemma:—

“Either the Prophet Isaiah (whose meaning is so naturally explained above) by the word SINIM does not refer to the Chinese, or inasmuch as the Chinese empire was not called *Tshin* previously to B. C. 221—which is about 450 years after Isaiah wrote—the verse 12 of chapter xlix of the book called “Isaiah” cannot possibly have been penned by Isaiah, but is the addition of some nameless interpolator: who must have lived, too, later than the first century after Christ, when the existence of China first became known, under its recent name *Tshin*, to nations dwelling west of the Euphrates. The writers called the ‘Seventy’ knew nothing of this absurd Chinese attribution, as their ‘Land of the Persians’ attests.”

See also how the whole is set aside by Mr. Gliddon and his authorities:

“And if that explanation does not satisfy theological exigencies, then let some people bear in mind that the word SINIM occurs in the forty-ninth chapter of Isaiah; and that, according to the highest biblical critics of Germany, whose mouth-piece is the eminent Professor of Theology at Basle, ‘the whole of the second part of the collection of oracles under Isaiah’s name (xl.—lxvi.) is spurious.’”

We will not stop here to defend the genuineness of Is. 40—66, but refer the reader to the admirable proof of the same by Kleinert, Hengstenberg and Alexander.

To prove that China was so called by the Western Asiatics long before the commencement of the Tschin dynasty, we quote Mr. Gliddon’s “high Sinologue” against him:

“Le nom de *Tshin* fut celui que lui donnèrent toutes les nations orientales de souche *sémitique* ou *arabe*; les Indiens l’ont nommé *Tchina*, dans les vieilles lois de MANOU, où il est dit que ce furent des *Kchatriyas*, ou

*Types, &c., p. 646.

guerriers indiens dégénérés, qui commencèrent à le peupler. Cependant, si, comme on l'a prétendu, le nom de *Thsin* n'a été connu hors des limites occidentales de la Chine qu'à l'époque où l'armée navale de l'empereur HOANG-TI, fondateur de la dynastie de *Thsin*, se rendit dans les ports du Bengale, selon l'histoire chinoise, environ 280 ans avant notre ère, il s'ensuivrait que les lois de MANOU, auxquelles on attribue une antiquité de 1500 ans avant J. C., auraient été interpolées, ou que leur rédaction serait beaucoup moins ancienne: ces deux suppositions ne peuvent être admises, et nous prouverons ailleurs que l'assertion contenue dans les lois de MANOU est en partie vraie; que les Indiens allèrent dans le *Chen-si*, province occidentale de la Chine, plus de mille ans avant notre ère, et qu'à cette époque ils y firent partie d'un état du nom de *Thsin*, mot identique à celui de *Tchina*. C'est ce dernier nom qui a cours dans toute la vaste contrée de l'Inde, et même dans la presque île transgangaïque; il a aussi prévalu en Europe depuis que les Portugais pénétrèrent dans l'empire chinois par les mers de l'Inde. Mais ce n'est pas la dénomination nationale que les Chinois eux-mêmes donnent à leur empire. Celle-ci est: '*Royaume du milieu.*'"

"The name of *Thsin* was that which all the oriental nations of the *Semitic* or *Arabic* stock gave to it; the Indians called it *Tchina*, in the ancient laws of Manou [Manu,] where it is said that it was the *Kebatriyas*, or degenerate Indian warriors who began to people it. Meanwhile, if, as they have pretended, the name of *Thsin* was not known beyond the western boundaries of China until the naval armament of the emperor HOANG-TI, founder of the dynasty of *Thsin*, appeared in the port of Bengal, according to Chinese history, about 280 years before our era, it will follow that the laws of MANOU, to which they attribute an antiquity of 1500 years before Jesus Christ, have been interpolated, or that their compilation must have been much less ancient. These two suppositions cannot be admitted, and we will prove elsewhere, that the assertion contained in the laws of Manou is in part true; that the Indians went into *Chen-si*, the western province of China, more than a thousand years before our era, and at this epoch, they constituted

part of a state by the name of Thsin, a word identical with that of China. It is this last name which has run through all the Ind, and even into the Trans-Gangetic peninsula; it has also prevailed in Europe since the Portuguese penetrated into the Chinese empire by the seas of India. But it is not the national denomination which the Chinese themselves give to their empire. This is '*the middle kingdom.*'"

It is the conjecture of Guil. Schott, in which Gesenius concurs,* that the name China among the people of India was derived from the name of the fourth dynasty, but that it also could have arisen long before the third century B. C. For the princes or kings of Tschin, long before they assumed the empire of all China, for 651 years ruled over their native province Tschin, in the western part of China. With this province, the inhabitants of India were connected in commerce, and they extended the name to the whole people before those princes obtained rule over the entire country now known as China. Even if the Chinese vases said to be found in Egyptian catacombs, and the ruins of Nineveh, should prove modern, and not be evidence of Chinese connection with Egypt and Assyria at so early a period of time, as has been supposed, the arguments in favor of the occurrence of the name of China in the Jewish Scriptures is not by this destroyed. "Why should they not have known China" asks Gesenius [Comm. ueber Jesaias] "in the country where our prophet lived, as well as India, and Scythia, [Magog] at least, as the name of a distant land?"

Unquestionably the sacred writers did know of more than the white races of men. By the admission of these writers, the Cushites, Phutim, and others, were dark in complexion even to blackness, at least to a dark mahogany colour. Unquestionably they knew of the negro, if as these writers maintain there is monumental proof of the negro complexion and feature before the Exode in Egypt, always a country conterminous with Palestine. The Tartar portrayed (p. 163, fig. 87,) the Mongolian in the group, (fig. 91, p. 153,) the Hindoo, (fig. 48, p. 140,) show

* Thesaurus, p. 949.

Egypt's acquaintance with oriental physiognomy. Israel could not be less acquainted. And yet it is the Bible doctrine that all are descended from one origin.

Page 587, Mr. Gliddon still perseveres in adducing Kennicott's passing remark, in his Dissert. 1, on the state of the printed Hebrew Text, "that the study of the Hebrew language has been only reviving during the last 100 years," in disparagement of the English version. This version, he argues, must necessarily have been made by incompetent men. The drift of Dr. Kennicott's remark depends wholly upon the horizon in the field of his mental vision. Did he think of the whole period since the Babylonish captivity, and say of it, that the study of the Hebrew language has only been reviving during the last 100 years. If he did not, then this quotation could never justify Dr. Nott in conveying the impression that the Hebrew has been unknown, because a dead language for more than 2000 years. It could be only of comparative neglect of this tongue that Kennicott spoke. What Mr. Gliddon's talk about its resuscitation after twenty centuries of burial can mean, we cannot tell. With all *he* knows about it now, as a language it is as dead as ever, and so will probably remain to the end of the world.

Of the authority relied upon by Mr. Gliddon as to the English translators, Bellamy, the London Quarterly, No. xxxviii., p. 455, uses this language:

"He has no relish or perception of the exquisite simplicity of the Original, no touch of that fine feeling, that pious awe, which led his venerable predecessors to infuse into their version as much of the Hebrew idiom as was consistent with the perfect purity of our own; a taste and feeling which have given perennial beauty and majesty to the English tongue."

Another competent witness, Prof. Stuart, says of our translation and its translators:

"Ours is, on the whole, a most noble production for the time in which it was made. The divines of that day were very different Hebrew scholars from what most

of their successors have been, in England or Scotland. With the exception of Bishop Lowth's classic work upon Isaiah, no other effort at translating, among the English divines, will compare, either with respect to taste, judgment, or sound understanding of the Hebrew, with the authorized version."*

That the English version is immaculate, we do not believe. Often are we compelled to differ from it in the rendering of particular words. In many places might it be greatly improved. But it presents correctly every doctrine and historic fact of the original, and no translation aiming to be just, can vary from it in these respects. It is hard to see what object the writers of this book can have in their depreciation of the English version, except to insinuate doubt, as they studiously do against revealed religion in any form, and against the documents of the Jewish and Christian faith, whether in the translation or the original. If translations are spoken of, they are derided, Cahen's always excepted, as often erroneous as any; if it be the manuscript, their readings are so various that they cannot be depended upon; if the original transcript, it is most often spurious, the conjectural and erroneous fabrication of some lying, speculating theorist of a time ages posterior to the supposed or preferred author.

As to the exegetical evidence Mr. Gliddon brings, of the mistranslations of the English version, we are obliged to say, if these are proofs of its errors, the venerable translation will yet retain its hold of the affections of the people and the good opinion of scholars through many decades to come. Few of them have won the approbation of the distinguished Hebraists of the present or past ages. And we fear that even Lanci, Mr. Gliddon's preceptor, whom he pronounces "the profoundest Semitic savant of our generation, the affable Professor (for thirty-nine years,) of sacred Philology, at the Roman Vatican," must be regarded as anything but a *sober* critic of the sacred writings. We had intended to ex-

* Dissertation on Studying the Original Languages of the Bible. Page 61.

hibit some of these novelties to the consideration of our readers; but the extent to which these remarks have already reached forbid. One thing is certain, that Mr. Gliddon would be the last person chosen by the Christian, or the true scholar, to amend the version of the Scriptures or produce another. Scarcely one of the emendations proposed by him are adopted by De Wette, Van Ess, Luther, Hengstenberg, Gesenius, or other scholars of reputation.*

We have need only to refer to Mr. Gliddon's *section F.* on the structure of Genesis, p. 561, to exhibit his wonderful skill in Hebrew Exegesis. Of these chapters he

* Among the ten translators assembled by king James' order, at Westminster, who translated from Genesis I. to II. Kings, there are the names of Dr. Lancelot Andrews, then Dean of Westminster, afterwards bishop successively of Chichester, of Ely, and of Winchester, "acquainted with fifteen languages." Dr. Robert Teigle, a "profound linguist," Dr. Geoffrey King, afterwards Regius Professor of Hebrew. Richard Thompson, "an admirable philologist." William Badwell, the best Arabic scholar of his time, tutor of Erpenius and Pocoke. "The industrious and thrice learned" said Lightfoot, "to whom I would rather be a scholar, than take on me to teach others."

Assembled at Cambridge, and translating from I. Chronicles to Ecclesiastes inclusive, eight, of whom Edward Livlie, Regius Prof. of Hebrew, an eminent linguist, highly esteemed by Usher and Pocoke. Dr. Laurence Chaderton, first master of Emmanuel Colleges, distinguished for Hebrew and Rabbinical learning. Francis Dillingham, "an eminent Grecian." Thomas Harrison, vice Chancellor of Trinity, "eminently skilled in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew." Dr. Robert Spalding, successor of Livlie as Professor of Hebrew. Dr. Andrew Byng, successor of King as Professor of Hebrew.

Assembled at Oxford, seven, who translated from Isaiah to Malachi inclusive, among whom were John Harding, then Regius Professor of Hebrew. Dr. John Rainold "the memory and reading of whom were almost miraculous." Thomas Holland, afterwards Regius Professor of Hebrew. Wrote commentary on Exodus, "drawn from the Rabbins and Hebrew interpreters." Dr. Miles Smith, "a Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic, and Syriac scholar." Dr. Richard Brett, "eminent as a linguist in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, to which he added Chaldee, Ethiopic, and Arabic."

Assembled at Oxford, and translated from Matthew to Acts inclusive and the Apocalypse, eight persons. Of whom were, besides others, high dignitaries, Dr. John Aglionby, Principal of St. Edmund's Hall, "accomplished in learning and an exact linguist." Sir Henry Savile, Greek Tutor to Elizabeth and Provost of Eton. Editor of the fine Oxford edition of Chrysostom. Dr. John Harmar, Professor of Greek, and a noted Latin and Greek scholar.

Assembled at Westminster, Romans to Jude inclusive, eight persons, the names of whom, though highly distinguished, we need not repeat. Enough this to show from what hands the English version proceeded.

says, "our archaeological introduction, in Part III., has pointed out their Esdraic age, and the *Persic* origin of some of the mythes they contain." "To understand the structural analogies of the book of Genesis, according to exegetical principles now universally recognised by Hebraists (?) we refer the reader to the *masterly* (?) critique by Luke Burke, and the *solid* (?) evidences supplied by Dr. Wette." Would that the man would read and follow step by step, would that he could do it with an intelligent and unprejudiced mind, the elaborate argument of Hävernick and Hengstenberg, by which their fanciful opinions respecting the book of Genesis have been triumphantly overthrown. We have no doubt he would then find unnecessary "the publication of a volume of results which, obtained through two years incessant travel and study, G. R. G's. *manuscripts* embrace." Of the analysis of Genesis, Mr. Gliddon only gives us the following introductory specimen :

Pagan Saxon names of the week-days.
 Sux's daeg. }
 SOL. }
 E. }
 mi. }
 Ancient Oriental Planetary System.
 MUSICAL NOTE.

DOCUMENT No. I.
 GEN. I.; II. 3.
 "Elohim."
Harmonical Ode of Creative cosmogony—antique and scientific.

DOCUMENT No. II.
 GENESIS II. 4; III. 24.
 "Jehovah."
Popular Creation of the World—later, and Persic.

"In the beginning, ELOHIM created the (universality of) skies, and the (universality of) earth. And the earth was TtoHU—and—BoHU (literally—masculine and feminine principles dislocated, or confounded; paraphrastically—"without form and a confused mass"), and darkness was upon the face of the abyss, and the (breath) spirit of ELOHIM hovered (like a descending bird) over the face of the waters—

"Such (the) generations (literally, *bringing-forths*) of the skies and the earth according to their creation, on (the) day IeHOuah-ELoHIM made earth and skies.

[V. 5, 6.]

[V. 3, 4.]
 "And it was eReB (western twilight) and it was BeKR (early dawn)—Day ONE!

"And IeHOuah-ELoHIM formed the (universality of) A-DaM (THE-RED-man) of dust from the A-DaMaH (THE-RED-earth) and breathed in (his) nostrils breath of life, and the A-DaM (THE-RED-man) became (a) living creature. And IeHOuah-ELoHIM planted

<p>Moon's daeg. LUNA.</p>	<p>{ A la.</p>	<p>(Chorus 2d.) [V. 6, 7.] " And it was eReB (western twilight) and it was BeKR (early dawn) —Day SECOND! [V. 9—12.]</p>	<p>(a) garden in eDeN (or, in-DELIGHT) to (the) East, and there placed the (u-ni-versality of) A-DaM (THE-RED-man) whom he had formed.</p>
<p>TWES'S daeg. MARS.</p>	<p>{ D re.</p>	<p>(Chorus 3d.) [V. 14—18.] " And it was eReB (western twilight) and it was BeKR (early dawn) —Day THIRD!</p>	<p>[V. 9—14.]</p>
<p>WOOD'S daeg. MERCURY.</p>	<p>{ G sol.</p>	<p>(Chorus 4th.) [V. 20—22.] " And it was eReB (western twilight) and it was BeKR (early dawn) —Day FOURTH!</p>	<p>" And IeHOuaH-ELoHIM took the (universal-ity of) A-DaM and placed him in (the) garden of eDeN (or, DELIGHT) to cul-tivate it and to guard it.</p>
<p>THOR'S daeg. JUPITER.</p>	<p>{ C ut.</p>	<p>(Chorus 5th.) [V. 21—23.] " And it was eReB (western twilight) and it was BeKR (early dawn) —Day FIFTH!</p>	<p>[V. 16—20.]</p>
		<p>"And ELoHIM said, 'Let us make (the uni-versality of) the A-DaM (THE-RED-man) after our image, like our likeness, and let him rule over the fish of the seas and over the bird of the skies and over the cattle and over all the [whole] earth and over all the crawler crawling upon the earth.' And ELoHIM created (the universality of) the A-DaM (THE-RED-man) after his image, after the image of ELoHIM created (he) them. And ELoHIM blessed them and ELoHIM said to them 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the (universality of) earth and subject it, and rule over fish of the seas and over bird of the skies and over all the living that crawls upon the earth.'</p>	<p>"And IeHOuaH-ELoHIM made the A-DaM (THE-RED-man) to fall (in-to a) great drowsiness, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs and filled in flesh in place thereof. And IeHOuaH-ELoHIM constructed the rib which he had taken from the A-DaM (THE-RED-man) in-to AiShiTU (woman—or ISE, ISIS) and brought her to the A-DaM (THE-RED-man).</p>
		<p>[V. 20. Ch. iii. v. 19.]</p>	<p>[V. 20. Ch. iii. v. 19.]</p>
		<p>"And the A-DaM (THE-RED-man) called (the) name of AiShiTU (his wife, or ISE, ISIS) KHiUaH (life), because she was (the) mother of all KhaLa (living).</p>	<p>[V. 21—23.]</p>
<p>FRIGA'S daeg. VENUS.</p>	<p>{ F fa.</p>	<p>(Chorus 6th.) [V. 29—30.] " And it was eReB (western twilight) and it was BeKR (early dawn) —Day SIXTH!</p>	<p>"So he drove-out the (universality of) A-DaM</p>

SATURN'S daeg. SATURN.	{	(Benediction.)	[Ch. ii. v. 1, 2.]	(THE-RED-man); and he
		B	"And ELoHIM blessed	placed at (the) East to
		si.	the (universality of) day-	(the) garden of eDeN
			the-SEVENTH and saneti-	(delight) the universality
			fied it, because he Sha-	of) KeRuBIM (FIERY-
			BaTt (rested, and sev-	DISKS), of which he made
			enthed from all his work	the CENTRAL-FLAME re-
			which ELoHIM created	volve to guard the road
			to act"—(i. e. by its own	to (the) tree of the
			organism henceforward),	KhaIaIM (lives).
			FINIS.	FINIS.

"SABBATH," Saturday; commencing at sunset on Friday, and ending at sunset on Saturday.

"The Hebraists will concede that we have adhered with rigid fidelity to the Text; and that suffices until we resume biblical mysteries on a future occasion, when *authority* enough shall be forthcoming. Yet, to the curious investigator, we feel tempted to offer the 'Air' of the *Music of the Spheres*:"

[Here follows a bar of music which we omit, not having appropriate type.]

"If he be a musician, he can play it on a piano; if he is a geometrician, he will find its corresponding notes on the sides of an *equilateral triangle* added to the angles of a *square*; if he loves metaphysics, Plato will explain the import of *unity, matter, logos, perfection, imperfect, justice, repose*; while Pythagoras will class for him *monad, duad, triad, quaternary, quinary, senary, and septenary*. We hope to strike the *OCTAVE* note some day ourselves; but, in the meanwhile, should the reader be profound in astronomical history, and if he can determine the exact time when the ancients possessed *neither more nor less* than 'five planets, besides the Sun and Moon,' there are two archæological problems his acumen will have solved—1st, the arithmetico-harmonical antiquity of the *number 7*; and 2d, the precise era beyond which it will thenceforward be impossible to carry back the composition of that ancient *Ode* we term '*Genesis i—ii. 3.*'"

We must indeed say that this is wonderful! Equal are these mysteries to any contained in the Vedas and Puranas! Passing wonderful the hierophant, who has now lifted the veil which has hitherto covered them! Exquis-

itely tuned, the ear, by listening to the tom-toms of Buddhist priests, or the intonations of the worshippers of Brahma, which has discovered these harmonies.

The conception of Herder that Gen. I. is a poem upon the creation, false though it be, is developed with all the genius of that remarkable man. The exposition is itself a beautiful poem, but the record on which it is founded is a historic fact. But this notion of Mr. Gliddon is whimsical, and foolish in the extreme. Of how little worth and weight, after this, are the sentiments expressed page 565 :

“Viewed as a literary work of ancient humanity’s loftiest conception of Creative Power, it (Gen. I.) is sublime beyond all cosmogonies known in the world’s history. Viewed as a narrative inspired by the Most High, its conceits would be pitiful and its revelations false; because telescopic astronomy has ruined its celestial structure, physics have negatived its cosmic organism, and geology has stultified the fabulous terrestrial mechanism upon which its assumptions are based. How, then, are its crude and juvenile hypothesis about *Human Creation* to be received?”

We have time and space only to notice Mr. Gliddon’s Palæographic excursus on the art of writing, p. 628: “This subject,” he says, “perhaps the most vital in any researches into the antiquity of the Hebrew Pentateuch, has never yet publicly received adequate attention from modern scholarship.” We are at a loss to know what is the force of the words “publicly” and “adequate,” in this declaration. No writer who has entered fully into the question of the genuineness of the Pentateuch but has discussed the question of the antiquity of writing, and considered “Whether the Hebrew Moses could have written the Hebrew Pentateuch” p. 632. It has been considered at length by Hävernicks and Hengstenberg, by Seyffarth, Kopp, Gesenius, Ewald, Hupfeld, Kreuser, and Mueller. What Mr. Gliddon has added to the labours of his predecessors we have been unable to see. The conclusion to which every one must come on this point is, “that the Hebrew Moses *could* have written the Hebrew Pentateuch. The very fact on p. 632, “that

as early at least as Thotmes III. of the XVIIIth dynasty, about the XVIth century B. C., record is made that the Pharaohs had overrun 'Naharaina' or Mesopotamia, with their armies, is proof positive of this. Mr. Gliddon may tabulate the writing of that period as hieroglyphic, but except by a phonetic alphabet, this "Naharaina" could not be spelled, and in this, if one of Hebrew origin did not exist, Moses, learned in all the wisdom of Egypt, *could* have written the Hebrew Pentateuch. Mr. Gliddon says the Hebrew square letter was invented after A. D. 200. Our Saviour's words, Matthew v. 18, prove that the square letter was in existence when he spoke, A. D. 30. "One jot, [Yodh] or one tittle [$\mu\iota\alpha$ $\kappa\epsilon\gamma\alpha\iota\alpha$] shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." In no other than the square letter is the Yodh a minute character, or do the $\kappa\epsilon\gamma\alpha\iota\alpha$ or pinnacles, such as are seen on the horizontal part of Daleth and Resh, exist. It is evident that in the days of Christ the law was commonly written in this character, how long it had been in use, cannot be proved other than by Jewish tradition. The Hebrew character of the Macabean coins is placed by him at 142 B. C. This however, is but the date of the coins themselves. It is not improbable that when these coins were struck they bore the *ancient* character of the sacred shekel of the sanctuary, in preference to the more modern Assyrian writing. And how many ages this character had been in use there is no monument to shew. The Assyrian inscriptions found by Layard at Nineveh of the age of Senacherib, pp. 636, 638, and bearing a great resemblance to early Hebrew and Phenician character, is of the age of 690 to 703 B. C. The Pentateuch itself is full of allusions to the art of writing as in existence in the Mosaic and Patriarchal age. In former pages we have adduced evidence *ex abundantia* of the early existence of this art.* Vain is the effort to throw suspicion on the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch from the alleged low period at which the art of writing came into vogue. Writing is the instrument of civilization, and is as early as this state of human society. We have almost done with this huge and abortive volume. One word only as to the sneer which Mr. Glid-

* S. P. Review, vol. iv. 261.

don casts at Sir Gardiner Wilkinson and all other writers whose computations of Egyptian Chronology are in harmony with the Scriptures. That any respect should be had to the Scripture date of the flood, either that of the Hebrew or Greek text, fills him with unutterable disgust. To him the Scriptures have no historic basis. To him they are attended by no divine evidence, either internal or external. He even presses Professor Stuart into his service, whether honestly, others shall say, to affirm the impossibility of a miracle. "The late Rev. Moses Stuart, than whom as a Hebraist, and upright champion of theology, none has appeared in the United States, supplies this definition of a 'miracle:' 'I have it before me from one of the first philologists and antiquarians Germany has produced. It is this: 'The laws of nature are merely developments of the Godhead. God cannot contradict or be inconsistent with himself. But inasmuch as a miracle is a contradiction of the laws of nature, or at least an inconsistency with them, *therefore a miracle is impossible.*'" How does Mr. Stuart *supply* this definition? To condemn it, and contend against the conclusion the extract contains. If creation is possible, a miracle is possible. If a miracle is possible, and has occurred, it can be established by human testimony; the eyes can see it without mistake, and the lips can tell the story. The story, when told by honest witnesses, must be believed. This testimony we have; miracles wrought in attestation of the Divine commission of the apostles and prophets, the penmen of the Scriptures. No Egyptian records, nor human history has the same evidence. Honest men have to respect it. This is true, if all things else are false. The God of Nature is the God of the Bible, and of Providence. The years hasten on where the researches of scholars will vindicate each declaration of the inspired Scriptures. Every spade full of earth thrown up at Korasabad, or in Egypt, will yet, when false theories are laid aside, redound to the honour of the Scriptures. That which hath been is that which shall be. The time will come, we yet believe, when it will be said of these modern princes of Zoan, who glory that they have stood on the pyramids, "They are become fools, the princes of Noph are deceived."

ARTICLE VII:

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *A Body of Divinity*: Wherein the doctrines of the Christian Religion are explained and defended. Being the substance of several lectures on the Assembly's Larger Catechism. By THOMAS RIDGLEY, D. D. A new edition, revised, corrected and illustrated with notes, by the Rev. JOHN M. WILSON. New York: ROBT. CARTER & BROS.: 1855. 2 vols. Royal 8 vo. pp. 647 and 646.

In this publication of the Carters we have a new edition of one of the most valuable treatises of didactic and polemic theology in our English literature. It was first published in two folio volumes in 1731. It has been several times re-printed, and once in this country, with notes original and selected, by James P. Wilson, D. D., of Philadelphia, in 1814. The style of Dr. Ridgley is extremely rough, inelegant, and obscure. It has been the endeavour of the editor, whom we suppose to be a Scotchman, from his use of the word "desiderate," to modernize his antiquated expressions, to prune his style from its more prominent redundances, and rescue it from the numerous blemishes which destroy its perspicuity. The multiplied and intricate divisions, redivisions, subdivisions, and re-subdivisions, so bewildering to the reader, he has in some manner dispensed with, by introducing sectional titles, making minor heads by transitional particles, and by various other devices, which he judged suited to render luminous what otherwise seemed involved in obscurity. He has appended also about one hundred notes to various parts of Dr. Ridgley's work, some of which extend to the length of essays or short dissertations on topics which either in the view of the editor Dr. Ridgley had handled less wisely, or which needed to be supplemented by the aids of modern learning. The object of the editor being, as he tell us, to impart saving knowledge to youthful inquirers, and to guide mature Christians, and candidates for the pastoral office, into a course of scriptural, devout, studious

theological investigation. The prelections of Dr. Ridgley were delivered before the students of the oldest Theological Academy of the English Independents, and at a time when Arianism was rife in the English Presbyterian church, which it has nearly destroyed, and when it threatened to extinguish the whole body of the non-conformist churches. On the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship and the procession of the Holy Ghost, Ridgley made concessions which the present editor has corrected, though he himself does not scruple to reject the terms and distinction of scholastic theology, as his note on p. 385 shows.

2. *Which: the Right or the Left?* GARRETT & Co.: New York. 1855: pp. 536.

Though not addicted to the reading of fiction, we were induced to purchase this volume from the high encomiums pronounced upon it by the religious press of this country; but we have risen from its approval with the most entire disappointment. The object of the writer is to exhibit the contrast between "Church of Christ" and "the Church of Society," or to show how the fashions of this world have invaded and corrupted the practice of true religion. It is a delicate undertaking, which calls for careful analysis and truthful delineation of character. We are more than ever convinced that fiction is wholly unsafe as a vehicle for conveying religious truth. The temptation is too irresistible to exaggeration to hope for that equal exhibition of sacred truth which is truth only when seen in its fair proportions. In the book before us, all the characters are overdrawn. Those selected to represent "the Church of Society" are conscious hypocrites, who whine and pray behind the masks which disguise their villainy. No one would incline to over estimate the literary and moral culture even of the pious Parvenus of New York Society; but really the author need not unvail their deformity in conversations, which for coarseness and vulgarity would disgrace a bear garden. As to the Hero of the tale, his religious discourses be-

tray a very curious theology ; while his practical measures, for the most part, are thoroughly radical and disorganizing. The book was evidently written with a good intention, and we, on that account, regret the more its utter failure. It was designed to meet one of the greatest evils and perils of the age, the prevalence of a defective and fashionable religion. We can only say in behalf of true goodness "non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis."

-
3. *Christian Theism : the testimony of Reason and Revelation to the Existence and Character of the Supreme Being.* By ROBERT ANCHOR THOMPSON, M. A.: pp. 477: 12 mo. HARPER & BROTHERS, N. Y. 1855.
 4. *Theism : the Witness of Reason and Nature to an all-wise and beneficent Creator.* By Rev. JOHN TULLOCH, D. D., Professor of Theology, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews: pp. 431: 12 mo. ROBT. CARTER & BROTHERS, N. Y. 1855.

In 1774, Mr. Burnett, a merchant in Aberdeen, bequeathed a sum of money, sufficient, at intervals of forty years, for two premiums of £1800, and of £600, for two Essays, designed "particularly to obviate difficulties regarding the wisdom and goodness of the Deity." The first prizes were awarded in 1814, to Dr. William Lawrence Brown, for an Essay on "the Existence of a Supreme Creator," and to Rev. John Bird Sumner, for his treatise on "the Records of Creation." The two books, whose titles are given above, received the premiums in 1854, under the adjudication of such men as Rev. Baden Powell, Messrs. Henry Rogers, and Isaac Taylor, whose authority will be received as sufficient guarantee for the treatises they endorse. A brief glance at the contents of each volume will satisfy any one of the justice of the award, assigning the precedence to the essay of Mr. Thompson; as it takes a far wider range than its competitor, which is more closely confined to the Physical part of the argument. The whole literature of the subject appears to be carried, and a sifting

examination instituted of all the systems of Atheism. The Theism of Christianity is distinctly brought out in opposition to mere natural Theism: hence the titles assumed. These volumes will be heartily devoured by all students in Theology, as presenting the whole Theistic controversy in its modern aspects, and the diligent reader will be put abreast of all the recent speculations on this subject.

5. *Alleghan: A Poem, in nine books*: by N. M. GORDON: pp. 343, 12mo. 1855. MOORE, WILSTACH, KEYS & Co., Cincinnati.

An Epic Poem in nine books in this bustling, practical age, will strike the reader as daring an enterprise as the exploration by Sir John Franklin of the Arctic seas. Well! we read through the first book, and finding not one poetic thought, we became weary of reading prose measured out on a yard stick, and turned to reading one page of Milton that we might have faith once more in an Epic.

The theme is worthy of a nobler song: we pray that some bard may arise who *can* sing "a song of early missions."

6. *Select Works of the late Rev. Thomas Boston, Minister of Ettrick*: With a memoir of his life and writings. Edited by the Rev. ALEXANDER S. PATTERSON, Minister of Hutchesontown Free Church, Glasgow: New York: ROBT. CARTER & Bros.: 1855. pp. 784, Royal 8vo.

The Messrs. Carter are attracted by a special affinity to those works of our old divines which have strengthened the faith and stimulated the piety of God's people in former times. Of all their publications none probably are more enthroned in the affections of the pious heart than some of those embraced in this volume. The "Fourfold State," and the "Crook in the Lot," have spoken

to the conscience of the thousands of Israel for four generations. They may lack the elegancies of style found in more recent writers, but are rich in golden ore, and reach with wonderful directness, the conscience of the believer and the unbeliever. The present volume embraces, besides the two treatises already mentioned, *A Memorial concerning Personal and Family Fasting*; *A View of this and the orther World*; *Discourses on Prayer*, and others more miscellaneous on important topics of personal religion. No better service can be done to truth and piety, than to render such treatises accessible to all classes of man.

7. *The Acts and Monuments of the Church*: Containing the history and sufferings of the Martyrs; with a preliminary dissertation on the difference between the Church of Rome that now is, and the ancient Church of Rome that then was. By JOHN FOXE. ROBT. CARTER & BROS.: New York: 1855: pp. 1082, 8vo.

This is an excellent Family Edition of a venerable work; one of the early productions of the Reformation, and which for two hundred years has nourished the Protestant feeling of so many hearts and homes. The chief characteristics of the present edition, is the stripping off a large mass of official documents incorporated by the author, not for general perusal, but, simply for preservation as records,—the expunging of Latin and Greek quotations, as well of those narrations which Foxe himself regarded as apocryphal,—the correction of dates, and the expurgation of those indelicacies, which, in the judgment of the editor, have contributed, in this age of fastidious refinement, to consign this work to oblivion. These liberties, while they may render the book popular and readable, will abridge its value to the historian and scholar. This disadvantage, however, is small; since those who desire, may gain access to the original work of the author, with all its incumbrances. These need not, therefore, exclaim against an edition which is prepared for the million.

8. *Russia, as it is*: by Count A. DE GAROWSKI: second edition: pp. 412, 12 mo. 1855. D. APPLETON & Co.

The terrible conflict now raging in the Crimea has drawn attention strongly to that Colossal power of the North, which has successfully withstood the combined attack of the two greatest nations of Europe. The work of Count Garowski has been received as a reliable authority. The introduction giving an account of the origin of the Slavic race is referred to by Koeppen in his Historical Atlas. The author urges with great enthusiasm that the last act in the drama of history is reserved to this Slavic race, whose chief representative Russia is: and bating a good many transcendental and radical theories in the closing chapters of the books, he succeeds in awaking no little sympathy in the bosoms of his readers. The body of his work is occupied with a description of the different members of the Russian State, Czarism, the Army and Navy, the Nobility, the Clergy, the Bourgeoisie, the Cossacks, Serfdom, &c. &c. His theory is that Czarism has turned aside from its proper mission, and that while all classes press down upon each other from the highest to the lowest, there is still a real and secret sympathy between all ranks against the nobility and the government, which will in time work out the emancipation of Russia from political and social thralldom, and the great Slavic race make its contribution to the History of the World. The book is worthy of perusal, if only that it fills the mind with great ideas concerning the destiny of a large branch of the human race which has hitherto been torpid and dormant in history.

9. *The Southern Cross and Southern Crown*: or the Gospel in New Zealand: by Miss JACKSON: pp. 263, 18 mo. 1855. ROBT. CARTER & BRO'S. New York.

A full and interesting History of the New Zealand Mission, showing the obstacles it encountered, and the success it has attained. The multiplication of such works is rapidly swelling
VOL. IX.—No. 2. 10

the missionary literature of the Church; which will doubtless contribute to foster a true evangelical zeal in the hearts of the rising generation. Let our Sabbath school teachers, and Christian parents and pastors, use proper diligence to secure their perusal: and the faith of the pious will grow stronger as to the ultimate conversion of the world.

10. *Sermons and Essays by the Tennents and their Cotemporaries*: compiled for the Board: Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board of Publication: pp. 374: 12 mo.

This volume embraces four sermons of Gilbert Tennent, a Treatise on Predestination by Samuel Blair, two Essays by John Blair, a Sermon by William Tennent, Jr., one by John Tennent, two by Dr. Robert Smith, and one by Dr. Samuel Finley. They were selected by the venerable Dr. Alexander, and designed by him as a supplement to "The Log College," which was published before his death. It places within our reach, writings almost inaccessible otherwise, of those worthies of the early Presbyterian Church in this country, to whom their own generation owed so much, and whom we are bound to hold in lasting remembrance.

11. *Church Music*: with selections for the ordinary occasions of public and social worship, from the psalms and hymns of the Presbyterian Church: adopted and recommended by St. Peter's Church, Rochester: pp. 158: 1855. E. DARROW & BRO.: Rochester, New York.

We have nothing to say in commendation of the efforts by this church in Rochester in the construction of a quasi Liturgy. A movement so foreign to the whole genius of Presbyterianism, will, we doubt not, be distinctly and universally repudiated. But of this little volume, and of the great principle which underlies it,

we can speak with hearty approval. The selection of hymns appears to us judicious, and the tunes, such as Old Hundred, Monmouth, Hebron, Dundee, Mear, Peterboro, &c., fall upon the ear with sweet, familiar sound, like the voices of our childhood's friends. We confess that we watch with deep interest the recent indications, in different quarters, of a reaction against the artistic opera-style of church music, which has driven nearly all worship out of the sanctuary. We heartily subscribe the sentiment expressed in the Preface of this unpretending volume, which is the Key to all the selections: "Devotional Music is not a proper subject for criticism. It is not intended to be impressive upon those of the congregation who listen to it in silence, but to be the means of expressing the feelings of those who engage in it." May God speed all efforts to bring back the old, hearty congregational singing of our fathers, when the voices of a great multitude, like the noise of many waters, were wont to "make a joyful noise to the Rock of their Salvation."

12. *Memoirs*: including letters and select remains of John Urquhart, late of the University of St. Andrews: by WILLIAM ORME: with a prefatory notice and recommendation, by ALEXANDER DUFF, D. D., L. L. D. Philadelphia: Board of Publication: pp. 420, 12 mo.

We are glad to see a reprint of the memoirs of this talented, lovely, and pious youth, under the auspices of Dr. Duff, his early classmate and friend. We well remember with what interest and profit it was read by us in earlier days, amid scenes of Academic life similar to those in which his course was run. Entering the University of St. Andrews, at the early age of fourteen, he immediately took the highest rank in his class, winning the esteem of all, and especially of Dr. Chalmers, with whom he was a favourite pupil. After a life of earnest study, and still more earnest piety and devotedness, having consecrated himself to the missionary work, he was called away at the early age of 18, leaving

his shining example to stimulate the loiterer in the ways of learning, and the paths of heavenly wisdom. To students seeking the holy ministry, such an example cannot be lost. Though it was not his privilege to preach the gospel on pagan shores, the exercises of his mind on this and other cherished purposes, may find their echo in many whom God is now calling to lives of self-denying effort.

-
13. *The Footsteps of St. Paul*: by the author of "Morning and Night Watches," &c. &c. &c. New York: ROBT. CARTER & Bro's.: 1855: pp. 416, 12 mo.

The author of this charming volume has had the young especially in view. It is suitable, as he desired it should be, for youths from ten to seventeen years of age. And we confess that it has beguiled the hours which might otherwise have been weary, of a riper age, and left a livelier impression of the noble character of "the greatest benefactor of our race," the Apostle PAUL. "What are we," we exclaim with Monod, "What are we, preachers or missionaries of a day, before such a man?"

-
14. *A Memorial of Christian Life and Character of Francis S. Sampson, D. D.*: By ROBERT L. DABNEY, D. D. Richmond, Va. 1855: pp. 122, 8 vo.

This book is printed under the auspices of the Board of Directors of the Union Theological Seminary, Prince Edwards, Va., and was prepared as an affectionate tribute to the memory of a beloved teacher and colleague, by an admiring pupil and associate. As a memorial of one valued and loved by all who knew him, it does credit to the pen and heart of the biographer. And it enables those who knew him not with the eyes of the flesh, to appreciate the scholarship, the retired studies, the consuming

toil, the shrinking modesty, and yet the firmness and fervid piety of one who deserved well of his generation, and who in his mid career, was withdrawn from his earthly labours to that more blessed society, and those surer rewards held out in the gospel. When such a man, so pure in purpose, so ripe in learning, and so admirably fitted to adorn the sphere in which he moved, is taken away, it is fit that his memory be cherished, and his example be held forth as an encouragement to others, who toil on in their chosen work till the morning shall dawn.

15. *Learning to Converse.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board: pp. 180, 18 mo.

A sequel to the little books "Learning to think," "Learning to Feel," and "Learning to Act," and in the same vein of sound wisdom, and practical piety.

16. *The Christ of History: an argument grounded in the facts of his life on earth:* by JOHN YOUNG, M. A. 12 mo. pp. 260: ROBT. CARTER & Bro's.: 1855. New York.

This book is a substantive addition to our literature on the Evidences of Christianity. The argument is novel, ingenious, and conclusive. Its chief value consists in its starting from the lowest possible ground, which few opposers will refuse to concede, and conducting the reader by successive steps to a great and certain conclusion. The author simply assumes the Evangelical history to be *true*, and lays aside even the question of the inspiration of the record; and then attempts to show that these admitted facts in the human life of Christ cannot be psychologically explained or understood, without recognising also his supreme divinity. The work is divided into three books; of which the first presents an argument from the outer conditions of

Christ's life, such as His lowly social position, the shortness of his earthly course, the age and place in which he appeared ; the second, reasons from the work of Christ among men, the marked character of his public appearance, his teaching on the soul, on God, on the reconciliation of the soul and God ; the third, which is perhaps the most striking and interesting of all, discusses his oneness with God, and the forms of his consciousness.

The argument, though cumulative, is condensed and brief ; and may be recommended as an antidote to the rationalism and infidelity of the school of Strauss.

17. *Of Temptation* : the nature and power of it, the danger of entering into it, and the means of preventing that danger : by JOHN OWEN, D. D. : pp. 306, 12 mo. Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia.

One of the great and good works of Dr. Owen, which like old wine, gain a rich flavour with increase of age. The Board of Publication have put it into one of their new bottles, that it may circulate through the church, and cheer the hearts of God's saints.

18. *An Introduction to Physiology* : Designed for the use of students and of the general reader : by M. LA BORDE, M. D., Professor of Metaphysics, Logic, and Physiology, in the South Carolina College. New York. ROBT. B. COLLINS : 1855 : pp. 393, 12 mo.

We step aside perhaps, from our special sphere as religious journalists, to notice this work.

A knowledge of Physiology, which has respect to the phenomena of living beings, is of great importance, especially in that restricted view of it which relates to man. In these modern times, it has occupied largely the attention of scientific and reflecting men,

who have watched with great intentness all the operations and functions of life. Their experiments and observations have contributed much to advance the aggregate of knowledge in this department of research. This knowledge, however, lies scattered piecemeal through a multitude of books which medical men are expected to read. To those not connected with that profession, it is of no small advantage to have the most important and practical part of this knowledge brought together by one competent to the task, and to obtain, at little cost of time, a decision on mooted points on which doctors disagree. To such this volume will be acceptable. It will go far to meet the wants of colleges and high schools, in which physiology should be taught as a branch of general education. The style is free from all stiffness, and enlivened by frequent anecdote, and the whole volume is pervaded by a healthy moral and religious sentiment.

We chronicle the following important publications of Clark's Foreign Theological Library :

19. *The Acts of the Apostles ; or the History of the Church in the Apostolic Age* : by M. BAUMGARTEN, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology, and Professor in the University of Rostock : vols. i. and ii. translated from the German by the Rev. A. J. MORRISON. Vol. iii. translated by the Rev. THEOD. MEYER, Hebrew Tutor in the New College, Edinburgh : T. & S. CLARK. 1854.

Baumgarten is a disciple of Hengstenberg, and has commenced a commentary on the Old Testament on the plan of Olshausen's work on the New Testament. His commentary on the Acts of the Apostles has been regarded as one of great value. It abounds less in verbal and philological commentary, than it does in philosophic views of the events recorded in the book of Acts. His commentary on Zechariah, *Die Nachtgesichte Sacharias*, the second volume of which, (Braunschweig : 1855,) has just reached us, is announced by the Clarks as in hand for translation.

20. *The Words of the Lord Jesus*: By RUDOLF STIER, Doctor of Theology, Chief Pastor and Superintendent of Schkeuditz. Volume first: translated from the second revised and enlarged German edition, by the Rev. WILLIAM B. POPE, London. Edinburgh: 1855: pp. 414, 8 vo.

One of the most deeply spiritual interpretations of our Saviour's discourses. A word which speaks from heart to heart.

21. *Reformers before the Reformation, principally in Germany and the Netherlands*: depicted by Dr. C. ULLMANN: The translation by Rev. ROBERT MENZIES. *Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona multi*: Horace. Vol. i. Edinburgh: T. & S. CLARK: pp. 416, 8 vo.

This volume is the commencement of the great historical work on which the fame of Ullmann chiefly rests. It is a work of great ability and full of instruction, but of a different type of Protestantism from that which we are disposed to advocate.

22. *Ezekiel, and the Book of his Prophecy*: an Exposition: by PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D. D., Professor of Theology in the Free Church College, Aberdeen, author of *Typology of Scripture*, &c. Second Edition; Edinburgh: T. & S. CLARK: 1855: pp. 504.

An excellent book on the prophecies of Ezekiel, *paraenetic*, more than *exegetical*, yet not overlooking difficulties of the text, nor neglecting the labours of Ewald, Hitzig, Rosenmueller, Maurer, and Hävernick. The present edition is accompanied with a new translation of the entire prophecies.

Erratum.—For "Hrrodotus" p. 225, read *Bentley*. The word Herodotus should have occurred in a foot note—"Beloe's Herodotus, p. 38." 8th line, p. 270, for "disappear" read *disappears*. 11th. line, for "was" read *would*.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER III.

JANUARY, MDCCCLVI.

ARTICLE I.

TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY FATHERS TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

We have assumed, in our whole discussion, the truth, the Divine inspiration, and the authority of the sacred Scriptures. From this it follows that the teaching of Scripture, in all questions of doctrine, when clearly ascertained, is the infallible rule and judge of what is to be believed as true.

Widely different interpretations, however, have been and are put, upon various passages of Scripture. It is therefore necessary, while every man must, for himself, search the Scriptures, and be fully persuaded in his own mind, that he should avail himself of all proper assistance in confirming himself in the correctness of his conclusions. This assistance is to be found, in the most eminent manner, in the promised influences of that Holy Spirit, who alone can infallibly guide into all truth.—Next to this, however, is the confirmation given to our opinions by the judgment of others, whose ability and character render them capable judges of the true meaning of the sacred Scriptures.

Now, among those who must be regarded as, beyond controversy, most eminently capable of knowing what our Lord and his apostles really taught, orally, and in writing, the Christians who lived contemporaneously and immediately after them, must be enrolled. If, therefore, we can ascertain those views which were held by the *primitive* church, on the subject of the Trinity,

we have the highest assurance that these must have been delivered by Christ and his apostles, and must contain the real doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. And if we find that those views are not those of the Unitarians, but are, in all that is essential, those of Trinitarians, then we may safely conclude that the Trinitarian, and not the Unitarian doctrine, is that taught in the word of God. In a very important sense, Tertullian's declaration is correct, as it regards Christian doctrine: "Whatever is first, is true,—whatever is later, is adulterate." And the rule of Vincentius will apply, that whatever Christian doctrine was held by all, every where in the first age of Christianity, must be true. The question is not one regarding the opinions of the early Christians, but as to the simple fact of their holding certain opinions because they believed them to be those taught in the word of God, and by Christ and his apostles. Christianity being undoubtedly a revelation from God, and this revelation being now contained in the sacred writings, what views on the subject of the Trinity did the primitive Christians consider to be enforced in those writings, and to have been taught by Christ and his inspired apostles? We appeal to the primitive Christians therefore, not as judges, but simply as credible and fully qualified witnesses of what was held and believed in the churches in their day, as the undoubted doctrine of Christianity. We do not, therefore, constitute them either judges or interpreters of the faith; but most reliable witnesses of facts, and most capable translators of language, which, to many of them, was vernacular, who were also most likely to know the views and opinions of the inspired penmen.

At the period of the Reformation, as we shall afterwards prove, the doctrine of the Trinity was every where and by all the reformed churches, adopted as the undoubted teaching of Scripture, and as of primary and fundamental importance. This was done while the same judgment was delivered by the Romish church, from whose tenets and practices they would naturally have been disposed to recede, as far as Scripture warranted. Such also, was the doctrine held by the churches of Rome, of Britain, of the Greek and Oriental churches,

with a very partial exception, and that under the pressure of very severe persecutions, up to the time of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325. To constitute this general council, or assembly of the representatives of the Christian world, more than 300* were present.

These ministers were representatives of the various churches of Spain, Italy, Egypt, the Thebais, Libya, Palestine, Phœnicia, Cœlo-Syria, Lydia, Phrygia, Psididi, Lycia, Pamphylia, the Greek Islands, Caria, Isauria, Cyprus, Bithynia, Europa, Dacia, Mysia, Macedonia, Achaia, Thessaly, Calabria, Africa, Dardania, Dalmatia, Pannonia, the Gauls, Gothia, Bosphorus. It is thus made certain, as a matter of fact, that the Trinitarian doctrine was held by nearly all the clergy, when the controversy first began. Alexander mentions only three bishops, five presbyters, and six deacons, who supported the Arian heresy: and without supposing these persons to be actuated by improper motives, (a suspicion, which is more than insinuated against some of them,) it is only reasonable to decide, that the sentiments of so small a minority are not to be weighed against the deliberate declaration of the whole catholic church.

The creed adopted by this council was as follows:

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten, only-begotten from the Father, that is, from the substance of the Father; God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not created; consubstantial with the Father: through whom were all things made, both things in heaven and things in earth; who, on account of us men, and of our salvation, descended, and became incarnate, and was made man: suffered, was buried, and rose again on the third day: ascended into the heavens: is coming to judge the quick and the dead.

We believe also in the Holy Ghost.

But those who say there was a time when the Son existed not, and that he existed not before he was begotten, and that he was made out of things which are not,

* 318 or 320, besides, as Eusebius says, "an infinite number" of other clergy and officers.

or who say that he was from any person or substance, or who teach that the Son of God was created, or was vertible, or was mutable; these persons the apostolic and catholic church anathematizes.

This council was called on account of the views of the Trinity broached by Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, which denied the absolute consubstantiality, coequality, and divinity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, though he admitted the personality and divine nature of each.

The creed thus adopted was declared by these various representatives of churches in Asia, Africa and Europe, to be that which had invariably been the doctrine of the Catholic Church, from the very age, and by the very teaching of the Apostles themselves.

In his historical epistle to his own church of Cesarià, Eusebius unequivocally states, that the Nicene Fathers avowedly proceeded in their definition of sound Christian doctrine, on this principle: "As" says he, "we have received from the Bishops, our predecessors, both in our first catechumenical instruction, and, afterwards, at the time of our baptism; and as we have learned from the Holy Scriptures; and as, both in our Presbyterate, and in our Episcopate itself, we have both believed and taught, this also, now believing, we expound to your faith."* Concerning which things, we firmly pronounce,

* Eusebius introduced a creed, or confession of faith, to the Council assembled at Nice. The creed is as follows:

"I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Maker of all things visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, the first born of every creature, begotten of God the Father before all the worlds: by whom all things were made; who, for our salvation, was incarnate, and lived among men, and suffered and rose again the third day, and returned to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the quick and dead. I believe also in one Holy Ghost, believing that each of these has a being and existence, the Father really the Father, the Son really the Son, and the Holy Ghost really the Holy Ghost. As our Lord, when he sent his disciples to preach, said, Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Ghost: concerning whom I affirm, that I hold and think in this manner, and that I long ago held thus, and shall hold so until death, and perish in this faith, anathematizing every impious heresy. I declare in the presence of Almighty God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, that I have held all these sentiments from my heart and soul, from the time that I know myself; and that I now think and express them sincerely, being able to show by demonstration,

anathematizing every godless heresy, both that they thus are; and that we thus think; and, again, that we have always thus thought; and yet, additionally, that we will insist upon this faith, even until death. Furthermore, in the presence of God Almighty, and our Lord Jesus Christ, we testify, that ever since we knew ourselves, we have always, from our heart and from our soul, thus thought, respecting these matters; and that we now think the same; and that we speak truly. For, by sure demonstrations, we are able to show, and to persuade you, that in times past also, we thus believed and preached. This faith, accordingly, having been by us expounded, there was no room for contradiction."

Hence, the Nicene fathers alleged, *as a notorious fact*, that they propounded no doctrine, save what they themselves had learned in the course of their catechumenical institution; save what had been handed down to them from their predecessors; save what they had always taught to their several flocks during the times of their Presbyterate and their Episcopate. Into the more ancient creed, the single word *consubstantial* they acknowledge themselves to have introduced: and this addition they avowedly and openly made, for the purpose of effectually meeting the endless subterfuges of the Arians.

But, though the precise word *consubstantial* might not hitherto have appeared in any symbol formally adopted by the whole Catholic church, the doctrine set forth in that word was distinctly propounded in the older universally recognised symbols. Accordingly, they themselves adduced one of those ancient symbols, as containing the theological system handed down to them from their predecessors.

and to persuade you, that my belief was thus, and my preaching likewise, in time past."

Eusebius was born about the year 270, so that a creed which he recited at his baptism would carry us back to at least ten years before the end of the third century; and though we are not bound to suppose that this creed was actually recited, word for word, by Eusebius, at the time of his baptism, we must at least believe that the doctrines contained in it were in accordance with those which every catechumen was expected to possess, at the end of the third century. The words of Eusebius might allow us to refer to a still earlier period.

Their assertion, as expressed in their own precise words, runs in manner following: "This is the apostolic and blameless faith of the church; which faith, ultimately derived from the Lord himself, through the apostles, and handed down from our forefathers to their predecessors, the church religiously preserves and maintains the same, both now and forever: inasmuch as the Lord said to the disciples—Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."*

Thus, says Mr. Faber, in two several passages, we have the attestation of full three hundred responsible individuals, collected out of all parts of the world, little more than three centuries after the Christian era, and little more than two centuries after the death of the apostle John, to a naked historical fact: the fact, namely, that the doctrines maintained in the first council of Nice, were the doctrines which they themselves had always taught, which, in the course of their catechumenical institution they had learned from predecessors, which they had openly professed at the time of their baptism, which, in the several lines of their respective churches, had invariably been handed from one spiritual generation to another, which had been received on the authority of the apostles, and which the apostles had ultimately derived from the Lord himself.

How more than three hundred men could have ventured to hazard such an assertion, unless the facts affirmed were almost universally admitted, and how otherwise such an assertion could have completely escaped contradiction, may be deemed extraordinary, and indeed impossible. It must, therefore, be regarded an established fact, that the Trinitarian doctrine was held by nearly all the churches, when the controversy respecting it first began. Alexander mentions only three bishops, five presbyters, and six deacons, who supported Arius in his heresy; and without supposing these persons to have been actuated by improper motives, (a suspicion which is more than insinuated against some of them,) it is only

* *Gelaa. Cyric. Hist. Council Nic. prim, lib. ii, c. 28. Labb. Council, vol. ii, p. 224.*

reasonable to decide, that the sentiments of so small a minority are not to be weighed against the deliberate declaration of the whole catholic church.

This creed, it will also be remembered, was adopted after a long and careful inquiry and discussion. "All things" said the Emperor Constantine, in his circular epistle to the churches, "obtained a suitable examination."* He makes the same assertion in his particular epistle to the Church of Alexandria. "All things which might seem to give any handle for dispute or dissention, were argued and accurately examined."† On this assertion of the Emperor, the remark of the historian Socrates runs as follows: "Constantine, indeed, wrote these things to the people of Alexandria, signifying that the definition of the faith was made, not lightly, nor at pure hazard; but they laid it down with much inquiry and examination; and not that some things were mentioned, while other things were suppressed; but that all things were agitated, whatsoever were meet to be spoken for the establishment of the dogma; and that the definition was not made lightly; but that it was preceded by an accurate discussion."‡ Here then is proof positive that in A. D. 325, the Trinitarian doctrine was, beyond the possibility of contradiction, the almost universal doctrine of the Christian church, and declared to have been such from the beginning. In confirmation of this position, we may, however, present many strong and conclusive arguments.

1. It will here be proper, as our first line of argument, to introduce the testimony afforded by the heathen, as to the opinions at this period, and previously, entertained in the Christian church. From the very nature of the objections constantly put forward by the heathen, it is evident that they regarded, and that the Christians admitted, the worship of Christ, as God essentially with the Father, to be a fundamental part of the faith and practice of Christians.

These objections, as given by Arnobius, A. D. 303, are thus stated: "The gods" as Arnobius represents the

* Euseb. de vit. Constant. lib. ii., c. 17.

† Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i., c. 9.—‡ Ib.

pagans enemies of the gospel as saying, "are not angry at you Christians, because you worship the omnipotent God. But they are indignant: both because you contend that one who was born a man, and who was put to death by the ignominious punishment of crucifixion, is God; and because you believe him still to survive, and because you adore him with daily supplications."*—Now the answer made to this charge by Arnobius in part, after a sarcastic allusion to the Gentile deities, is this: "You tell us that we worship one who was born a man, * * * * *. Now, even if it were true that we did worship a mere man, yet, on account of all the blessings which we have derived from him, he might, on your own principles, well deserve to be styled a divinity. But, since he is God in reality, and without the slightest ambiguity or doubt, do you imagine us inclined ever to deny that he is worshipped by us in the highest possible degree, and that he is called the President of our community? * * * * *. Some one, maddened and enraged, will say: what then—is that Christ God? Yes, we answer, and God of the very innermost potency. We further profess, however it may irritate unbelievers, that for ends of the last importance, he was sent to us by the Supreme Sovereign. He was the high God; God radically and essentially. From unknown realms, by the Prince of the universe, he was sent, God, God the Saviour."

We find the same familiar allegation urged again and again, almost to absolute satiety, by the Epicurean Celsus, who flourished about the middle of the second century; and his testimony is peculiarly valuable, not only for its antiquity, but also because, like that of the Pagan in Arnobius, it unequivocally tends to show, that the Christians of that period supposed their Lord to be God essentially.

"Well, therefore," says Origen, in his reply to Celsus and to his fictitious Jew, "do we censure the Jews for not deeming Him to be God, who is by the Prophets so often testified of, as being the great power and God, according to the God and Father of all things. For we

* Arnob. adv. gent, lib. i., pp. 19, 20. Lugdun, Batar, 1651.

assert, that, in the Mosaic cosmogony, the Father addressed to Him the command, Let there be light,—and Let there be a firmament,—and whatsoever other things God commanded to be made. He moreover said to him: Let us make man after our own image, and our likeness; and THE WORD, having these commands, did all the things the Father enjoined him. But we speak thus, not as separating the Son of God from the man Jesus; for, after the economy, the soul and the body of Jesus became most intimately one with the word of God.*

“On the whole,” says Origen, “since he (Celsus) objects to us, I know not how often, concerning Jesus; that from a mortal body we esteem him to be God, and that in doing so, we conceive to act piously; it were superfluous, so much having already been said, to give him any further answer: yet, let these objectors know, that this person, whom, with full persuasion, we believe to be from the beginning, God and the Son of God, is the very Word, and the very Wisdom, and the very Truth; and we assert, that this mortal body, and the human soul in him, not only by fellowship, but likewise by absolute union and commixture, having participated of his divinity, have passed into the Deity.”†

It will be observed, says Faber, that the allegations of Celsus, while they are throughout, constructed upon the express ground that Christ was believed to be strictly and properly the Supreme God, respect not only a few visionary individuals, but the whole collective body of the Church. *As such*, accordingly, they are understood and answered by Origen. Hence, whatever in the abstract we may think of the arguments on either side, we have the positive and admitted testimony of Celsus, to the evidently well-known and familiar circumstance,—that The Catholic Church, about the middle of the second century, or some fifty or sixty years after the death of St. John, held and maintained the essential divinity of Christ, viewed under the aspect of God the Word, the eternal Son of the Father, co-existent with him from the beginning, in the inseparable unity of the Godhead.”

* Orig. Cont Cels, lib. i., p. 54.

† Cels. lib. iii., pp. 135, 136. See also lib. ii., p. 100: lib. vii., p. 368: lib. viii., p. 404.

Similar proof of the Trinitarian views of the Church will be found in the similar objections of Trypho, the Jew, in his celebrated argument with Justin Martyr, some years earlier, *i. e.* in the year 136; that is only thirty-six years after the death of the apostle John.

"With regard to what you assert," says Trypho, "that this Christ, in as much as he is God, pre-existed before all ages, and that he endured to be born a created man, and that he was not a mere man, born from man, in the ordinary course of nature; such an assertion, seems to me, not only a paradox, but even a downright absurdity." "To this" says Justin, "I replied: I know that my discourse is paradoxical, more especially to those of your race, who were never willing, either to understand or to perform the things of God. And Trypho said: You attempt to show a matter incredible and well nigh impossible,—that God endured to be born, and to become a man. My reply was: If I attempt to show this by mere human arguments, there were no need that you should bear with me; but, if I bring my proofs from repeated Scriptural authorities, you will then be convicted of hard-heartedness in regard to understanding the mind and the will of God."*

The exactly concurring testimony of Pliny, regularly founded upon the strictness of legal depositions, will bring this testimony within three years after the death of the apostle John; and in the next instance, will carry it back, even seventeen years before his death. For St. John died in the year 100; and from the Bithynian Nicomedia, in the year 103, was written the well known letter of Pliny to Trajan.

"Some of the Asiatic Christians affirmed before me," says Pliny, in his official report to Trajan, "that the sum total of their fault or error was this: On a stated day, they were wont to assemble together before sunrise, and alternately to sing among themselves a hymn to Christ, as to God." On this evidence, says Faber, it is important to remark, that the persecutor does not speak from vague hearsay. He officially reports to the Emperor the depositions of the prisoners themselves,

* Justin, Dial. Cum. Trypho, Oper., p. 228.

regularly taken down from their own mouths, at a public examination. On the face of the depositions, therefore, it appears that in the age of Trajan, at the very beginning of the second century, and therefore, immediately after the death of St. John, the Catholic Church, in her ordinary stated assemblies, and through the medium of her familiar appointed ritual, was regularly accustomed to worship Christ as God. This divine adoration of Christ as God prevailed, it will be observed, not in some remote corner of the world which might have been less under the apostle's superintendence, but in a province of Asia Minor, which may justly be deemed to have specially appertained to his own Patriarchate.

Nor yet, is even such the whole result of the evidence now under consideration. Pliny tells the Emperor, that of the persons who were brought before him, and who all made the deposition in question, some professed to have abjured Christ, or have ceased to be Christians, three years; some more than three years; and some even twenty years, previous to their appearance at his tribunal.* Our evidence, therefore, now specifies, on the personal knowledge of the deponents, that full seventeen years before the death of St. John, no less than three years after it, the Catholic Church, in the apostle's own immediate jurisdiction, was liturgically accustomed to worship Christ as God."

"How *numerous*, moreover," says Eusebius, "are the hymns and the songs of the brethren, written by the faithful, from the beginning, which celebrate Christ the Word of God, ascribing to him divinity."† Such hymns, as we learn from Origen, still continued to be used by the faithful, in the middle of the third century. "We recite hymns" says he, "to the alone God, who is over all, and to his only begotten Son, God the Word; and thus we hymn God and his only begotten.‡

The faith of the primitive church is also attested by the early apologies. In the composition of these works, some accredited champion of the common faith stepped

* Plin. Epist., lib. x., epist. 97. † Euseb. Hist. Eccles., lib. v., c. 28.

‡ Orig. Cont. Cels., lib. viii., p. 422.

forth: and appearing as the acknowledged representative of his brethren, described and vindicated, in the general name of the Church, those doctrines which, by common consent, were universally taught and believed. In the same class with the ancient Apology, may be fitly arranged all evidence of a kindred description.

According to this arrangement, let us now first hear Arnobius, who flourished about the year 303, and who has left us a controversial work in defence of Christianity against Paganism. "If Christ were God, they object: why was he put to death after the manner of a man?"—To this I reply: Could that Power, which is invisible, and which has no bodily substance, introduce itself into the world, and be present at the councils of men, in any other way, than by assuming some integument of more solid matter, which, even to the dullest eyesight, might be capable of visibility? He assumed, therefore, the form of man, and shut up his power under the similitude of our race, in order that he might be viewed and seen; in order that he might utter words and teach; in order that he might execute all these matters, for the sake of performing which he had come into the world, by the command and disposition of the highest Sovereign. "But they further object, that Christ was put to death after the manner of a man." * * * * *. Not in absolute strictness of speech, Christ himself, I reply: for that which is divine, cannot be liable to death; nor can that which possesses the attribute of perfect unity and simplicity, fall asunder by the dissolution of destruction. Who, then, was seen to hang upon the cross?—Who was the person that died? Doubtless, the human being, whom he had put on, and whom he himself bore in conjunction with his own proper self."*

We may next hear the official letter addressed to Paul of Samosata, by the fathers of the Council of Antioch, in the year 269.

"This, the begotten Son, the only begotten Son, who is the image of the invisible God; begotten before the whole creation; the Wisdom, and the Word, and the Power of God; who existed before the worlds; not by

* *Arnor. Adv. Gent.*, lib. i., pp. 37, 38. See also lib. i., p. 41.

mere foreknowledge, but in substance and in person, God, the Son of God; him having known, both in the old and in the new covenant, we confess, and we preach," &c.

From the public letter of the Antiochian Fathers, let us pass to the Elenchus and Apology of Dionysius of Alexandria, as we find some fragments of that work preserved by Athanasius, A. D. 260.

"There never was a time when God was not a Father." * * * * *. "Christ, in as much as he is the Word, and the Wisdom, and the Power, always existed. For God did not at length beget a Son, as being originally ungenerative of these; but only the Son was not of himself; for he derives his being from out of the Father," &c. "He, then, is the eternal Son of the eternal Father, in as much as he is light from light. For, since there is a Father, there is also a Son. But, if there were no Son, how, and of whom could the Father be a Father? Both, however, exist; and both exist eternally."

Contemporary with Dionysius of Alexandria, was Dionysius of Rome. Part of a controversial work, written by this author against the patripassianising Sabellians, has been preserved by Athanasius. "I hear" he says, "that there are among you some teachers of the Divine word, who run into an error diametrically opposite to that of Sabellius. For he blasphemously asserts the Son to be identical with the Father: but they, in a manner, set forth three Gods in three alien-essences altogether separate from each; thus dividing the sacred unity.—Now, the divine Word must inevitably be united with the God of all things; and the Holy Ghost must inevitably cohere and dwell in the Deity. Thus is it altogether necessary, that the divine Trinity should unite and coalesce in one, as it were in a certain head, namely, the Almighty God of the universe."

Cyprian was elected bishop of Carthage, A. D. 248, and suffered martyrdom in 258. In the numerous writings put forth in this interval, he has much that bears on our subject. I only quote a few passages.

"The Lord says, I and the Father are one thing.—And again, concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, it is written, And these three are one

thing.”* “The Lord, after his resurrection, sending forth his disciples, instructed and taught them how they ought to baptize, saying: Go, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. He insinuates the Trinity, in whose sacrament the nations should be baptized.” “How, then,” he asks, “do some assert, both without the Church and against the Church, that a Gentile, provided he be baptized anywhere, and any how, in the name of Christ, can obtain remission of sins; when Christ himself commanded that the nations should be baptized in the full and united Trinity?”†

Hippolytus, the pupil of Ireneus, who received his theology from the apostle John, through the medium of Polycarp, flourished about the year 220. He asks, “Why was the temple desolated? Because the Jews put to death the Son of the Benefactor: for he is co-eternal with the Father. This, then, is the Word, who was openly shown to us. Wherefore we behold the incarnate Word; we apprehend the Father through him: we believe in the Son: we adore the Holy Ghost.”‡

“The Father,” says this same writer, “is indeed one: but, there are two persons, because here is also the Son; and the third person is the Holy Spirit: for the Father commands; the Son obeys; the Holy Spirit teaches. The Father is over all; the Son is through all; the Holy Spirit is in all. We cannot understand the one God, otherwise than as we truly believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit.”

Tertullian, A. D. 200, composed, in the name of the suffering Church at large, a public Apology, addressed to the reigning Emperors. In this he says: “the Word, we say, was produced out of God; and, in his prolation, was generated from the unity of substance; therefore, he is called both God and The Son: for God is a Spirit, * * * * *; what hath proceeded from God, is both God, and the Son of God; and they two are one God.”

From the controversial works of this author, it were

* Cyprian, de Unit. Eccles. Oper., vol. i., p. 109.

† Cyprian, Epist. lxxiii.

‡ Hippol. Cont. Noet. § xii., Oper. vol. ii., pp. 14, 15.

easy to produce testimonies to the same effect, enough to fill a volume. But these will suffice.

We now adduce the testimony of Clement, of Alexandria. This ancient Father professed to be a scholar of Pantænus: who, by some of the early theologians, is said to have been a disciple of the apostles; and who, doubtless, conversed with the Fathers denominated Apostolical. Clement is thought to have died about the year 220; and those who had been taught by the apostles might have been alive in the year 150. "Because" he says, "the Word was from above, he both was and is the Divine principle of all things. This Word, the Christ, was both the cause of our original existence, for he was God; and also the cause of our well-existence, for this very Word hath now appeared unto men, he alone being both God and man." * * * * * Believe, then, O, man, in him who is both man and God; believe, O, man, in the living God, who suffered and who is adored.**

From the attestation of Clement of Alexandria, we may proceed to that of Ireneus, of Lyons, the scholar of Polycarp, the disciple of the apostle John. This, we shall find in the controversial work, which, with the approbation of the Catholic Church, that eminent writer, about the year 175, published against the existing heresies. "Man," he says, "was formed according to the likeness of God; and he was fashioned by his hands. That is to say, he was fashioned through his Son, and through his Spirit: to whom also he said, Let us make man." † "Therefore, in all, and through all, there is one God, the Father, and one Word, and one Son, and one Spirit, and one faith and salvation to all who believe in him." ‡ "With him, *i. e.* God, are ever present, his Word and his Wisdom, his Son and his Spirit, through whom, and in whom, he freely and spontaneously made all things; to whom, likewise, he spoke, when he said, Let us make man after our own image and likeness." § "Man was made and fashioned after the image and like-

* Clem. Alex. *Protrepa*. Oper. p. 66.

† *Iren. Adv. haer.*, lib. iv., c. 8, p. 237. ‡ *Ib.* c. 14, § 6, p. 242.

‡ *Ib.* c. 27, § 2, p. 266.

ness of God, who is uncreated: the Father approving: the Son ministering and forming: the Spirit nourishing and augmenting.”*

Let us now proceed still higher, in the list of primitive writers, and adduce the testimony of Athenagoras. This writer lived contemporaneously with Irenæus. His Apology or Legation is thought to have been addressed to the Emperors Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus.

“For by him, and through him, were all things made, the Father and the Son being one; since the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son, through the unity and power of the Spirit. The Son of God is the Mind and the Word of the Father.”† In this he says, “That *we* are not Atheists, has been sufficiently demonstrated by me; inasmuch as *we* worship one unproduced and eternal and invisible and impassable Being, who, by the mind and reason alone, can be comprehended, and who, through the agency of his own Word, created and arranged and compacted the universe; for *we* receive also the Son of God.”

“Who, then,” says Athenagoras, “would not wonder that we should hear ourselves called Atheists, when we profess our belief in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, shewing both their power in unity, and their distinction in order.‡ To this only do we strenuously apply ourselves, that we may know God and the Word, who is from him; what is the unity of the Son with the Father; what is the communion of the Father with the Son; what is the Spirit; what is the unity and the distinction of these who are such; inasmuch as the Spirit, and the Son, and the Father, are united.”|| “We say that there is a God, and the Son his Word, and the Holy Ghost, united in power; namely, the Father, the Son, the Spirit. For the Son is the Mind, the Word, the Wisdom, of the Father: and the Spirit is an emanation from him, as light flows from fire. But, if I thus accurately set forth *the doctrine which is received among*

* Iren. Adv. haer., lib. iv., c. 75, § 3, p. 310.

† Ateenag. Legat. pro. Christian., c. ix., pp. 37, 38, Oxon. 1706.

‡ Athen. Legat. c. x., p. 40.

|| Athen. Legat. cxi., p. 46.

us, do not wonder. For lest you should be carried away by the silly, vulgar opinion which is entertained of *us*, and in order that you may be able to know the *real truth*, I thus carefully *study accuracy*."

Our next witness is Melito, of Sardis, who lived about the year 170. Of his Apology, nothing remains save a fragment; but that fragment abundantly indicates the doctrine and practice of the Christians, his contemporaries. "We are worshippers," says he, "not of insensible stones, but of the only God who is before all things, and above all things; and we are worshippers likewise of his Christ, truly God, the Word before the worlds."*

In the next year, 168, lived Theophilus, of Antioch, who will be our next witness. He wrote a defence of Christianity, in three books, addressed to Antolycus; and from this work, we learn that the Christian Church of that age maintained the doctrine of a Trinity of persons in the Deity. "The three days" says he, "before the creation of the sun and moon, are types of the Trinity, God and his Word and his Wisdom."† "In the person of God, the Son came into the garden, and conversed with Adam."‡

Still earlier flourished Tatian, who lived about the year 165, and who, in his Oration against the Greeks, which was written before the death of Justin, says: "We do not speak foolishly, nor do we relate mere idle tales, when we affirm that God was born in the form of man."§

From Tatian we pass to Justin Martyr, whose conversion occurred prior to the year 136, and whose Apologies, therefore, will exhibit the received doctrine of the Church, during the earliest part of the second century. "Him, the Father says; and his Son who came forth from him; and the prophetic Spirit; these we worship and we adore, honouring them in word and in truth, and, to every person who wishes to learn, ungrudgingly delivering them as *we ourselves* have been taught. Athe-

* Melit. Apol. See above, Book I., chap. 4, § x.

† Theoph. Ad. Autol., lib. ii., c. 15. ‡ Ibid., c. 22.

‡ Tatian Orat. Cont. Græc., § xxxv., p. 77, Worth.

ists, then, we are not, inasmuch as we worship the Creator of the universe; and having learned that Jesus Christ is the Son of him who is truly God, and holding him in the second place, we will shew that, in the third degree, we honour also the prophetic Spirit, in conjunction with the Word.* For the Word, who is born from the unborn and ineffable God, we worship and we love, next in order after God the Father; since, also, on our account, he became man, in order that, being a joint partaker of our sufferings, he might also effect our healing."†

Two Apologies by Quadratus and Aristides, addressed to the Emperor Adrian, in the year 125, are unfortunately lost. But they are spoken of, both by Eusebius and Jerome, as being "defences of the worship of God which prevails among," and "as conducted by, Christians," "as setting forth the right principles of our dogmatic theology," and as being imitated by Justin Martyr.‡

Ignatius, who is our next witness, was a disciple of the apostle John, who died in the year 100, and he suffered martyrdom at Rome, either in the year 107, or (as some think,) in the year 116. "There is" he says, "one physician, fleshly and spiritual, made and not made. God became incarnate, true life in death, both from Mary and from God, first passible, and then impassible." "Our God Jesus Christ was conceived by Mary according to the economy of God, from the seed indeed of David; but from the Holy Ghost." "Permit me to be an imitator of the passion of my God. I glorify Jesus Christ, the God who has thus endued you with wisdom." "Expect him who is beyond all time, the eternal, the invisible; even him who on our account became visible; him, who is intangible and impassible; who yet, on our account, suffered; who yet, on our account, endured after every manner."||

The very short Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, which alone has survived him, is chiefly practical.

* Justin Apol. 1. Oper. pp. 46, 47.

† Ibid, 11 Oper., p. 40.

‡ Euseb. B. IV., c. 3: B. L., c. 2, § 2. Heer. Script. Eccl., Ep. lxxxiv.

|| Ignat. Epist. ad, Polya., § iii., p. 40.

Hence we cannot expect there to find any very precise doctrinal statement. Yet, even in this document, which appears to have been written almost immediately after the martyrdom of his friend and fellow disciple Ignatius, about the year 107, we may observe an incidental recognition of the divine nature of our Saviour. "May the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and may he himself, the eternal High-priest, the Son of God, Jesus Christ; build you up in faith and truth, and grant unto you a lot and portion among his saints, and to us also along with you, and to all who are under heaven, and who hereafter shall believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and in his Father, who raised him up from the dead."*

We can as little expect, from the plan of their composition, any very copious and precise statement of doctrine in either of the two epistles to the Corinthians, written from 67 to 96, by the venerable Clement of Rome; yet, in both of them, do the recognised opinions of the early Church show themselves with abundantly sufficient distinctness, and by one to whom St. Paul himself bears testimony, as being one of his fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life. "Ye were all humble-minded, in no wise boastful, subject rather than subjecting, giving rather than receiving. Being satisfied with the supplies which God has furnished for your journey, and diligently attending to his words, you receive them into your very breast and bowels; and before your eyes were his sufferings. Thus was there given unto all, a deep and glorious peace, and an insatiable desire of doing good; and, over all, there was a full effusion of the Holy Ghost."† "For Christ is of the number of the humble-minded, not of those who exalt themselves above his flock. The sceptre of the majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ came not in the pride of pomp and circumstance, though he was able to have done so; but with humbleness of mind, as the Holy Ghost spake concerning him. Ye see, beloved, what an example has been given unto us. For, if the Lord bore himself thus hum-

* Polycarp. Epist. ad. Philipp., § xii. Cotel. Patr. Apost., vol. ii., p. 191.

† Clem. Rom. Epist., 1, ad. Corinth., § ii. Patr. Apost. Cotel., vol. i., pp. 147, 148.

bly, what ought we to do, who have come under the yoke of his grace?"*

Similar phraseology occurs in the very ancient Epistle, which is ascribed to the Apostle Barnabas, but which really seems to have been written by a Hebrew Christian of that name, about the year 137. "When he chose his apostles," says this writer, "who were about to preach his gospel, then he manifested himself to be the Son of God. For, unless he had come in the flesh, how could we men, when looking upon him, have been saved? For they, who look even upon the perishable sun, which is the work of his hands, are unable to gaze upon its beams. Wherefore, the Son of God came in the flesh."†

The second Epistle of Clement opens with what is equivalent to a direct assertion of Christ's Godhead: "Brethren," says he, "we ought thus to think concerning Jesus Christ, as concerning God, as concerning the Judge of both the quick and the dead. And we ought not to think small things concerning our salvation: for, in thinking small things concerning him, we are hoping to receive small things."‡

We have thus been enabled, in the first place, by the testimony of the heathen, to establish the doctrine of the Trinity, as having been the doctrine of Christians up to the very age of the Apostles.

A second line of argument, by which the Trinitarian views of the early Christians has been established, is by the public apologies, epistles, and other documents published by them, in their name, and with their concurrence, during the same period.

A THIRD line of proof that the doctrine of the early Christian church was Trinitarian, will be found in the creeds which remain.

These creeds were most familiarly known and received, as indeed their very name imports, by the whole assembly of the baptized, whether ministers or people. They formed also the basis of lectures to the catechumens, and were publicly recited at the time of baptism.

* Clem. Rom. Epist. I, ad Corinth., § xvi., Patr. Apost. Cotel., vol. i., pp. 156, 157.

† Barnab. Epist. Cathol., § v., Patr. Apost. Cotel. vol. i., pp. 15, 16.

‡ Clem. Rom. Epist. ii., ad Corinth., § i., p. 185.

Such being the case, as the creed of each church was communicated to every catechumen, and was received by every catechumen, and at the font, in answer to the interrogation of the Bishop, or Presbyter, was recited by every catechumen, if adult, or by the parents, if a child. It, of course, and by absolute necessity, expressed the faith of every baptized member of the Christian church.

When any individual was suspected of holding doctrines contrary to the creed, he was called to account, and if found guilty, was solemnly excommunicated.— Thus, when Theodotus, at the close of the second century, attempted to propagate, at Rome, the doctrine that Christ was a mere man, and that there is no distinction of persons in the unity of the Godhead, he was called to account by Victor, the Bishop of that city, in order that he might have an opportunity of vindicating or explaining his conduct. This, however, he could not do; for he persisted in maintaining the scheme of doctrine which he had taken up; and the consequence was, that, having avowedly departed from the well-known faith of the church, he was, by excommunication, visibly separated from the society of the faithful.*

But as we have examined these creeds, and presented their evidence in the chapter on the Baptismal Commission, we will not dwell on their invariable and concurrent testimony to the doctrine of the Trinity at this time.† We will only remark that Ireneus asserts the unity of the Catholic faith, as exhibited in its creeds, throughout the whole world; and the various symbols of the three first centuries, whether Latin or Greek, or African, fully bear him out in his assertion. For the most part, even their phraseology is the same; but, invariably, their arrangement and their doctrine are identical.— Now, this is a mere naked fact, of which each individual may form a complete judgment. The doctrine taught in the Symbols, he may receive, or he may reject. But the bare fact itself will remain unaltered, whatever may be his own personal opinion, as to the abstract truth or

* Euseb. Hist. Eccles., lib. v., c. 28.

† See them fully collected, and historically presented, by Mr. Faber, vol. i., B. 1., chap. vi., pp. 156-198.

falsehood of the doctrine in question, and must be considered an undeniable proof of the Trinitarianism of the church, up to the time when the earliest of these, "the creed of the Trinity," must be supposed to have existed, that is, the very age of the Apostles.

A FOURTH line of testimony in proof of the fact that the early Christian Church believed the doctrine of the Trinity, is found in the earliest existing liturgies. As Bishop Bull well observes, all the ancient Liturgies extant, in whatever part of the world they may have been used, contain, under one modification or another, that solemn concluding Doxology to the Blessed Trinity, with which, in some form, every Christian is so abundantly familiar: "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; both now and alway, and to all eternity."*— This Doxology is evidently built upon that brief and most remotely ancient creed, which was familiarly denominated the Symbol of the Trinity: "I believe in God: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." And the symbol of the Trinity again, is manifestly founded upon the formula of baptism enjoined and appointed by our Lord himself. Baptize them in, or into, the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.†

Now, although no liturgy was committed to writing until the fifth century, yet the primeval existence and public use of the Doxology has been fully determined by the concurrent attestation of a series of witnesses, all chronologically prior to the first Nicene Council. About the year 220, we may observe it employed by Hippolytus, as the most proper conclusion of his Treatise against Noetus.‡ About the year 200, Tertullian refers to it as a clear proof of the universal reception of the doctrine of Christ's divinity.¶ About the year 194, we find it used by Clement of Alexandria.§ About the year 175, Irenæus incidentally remarks, that it was employed by the Catholic Church in the course of her ordinary thanks-

* Athan. de. Virginit. Oper.. vol. i., p. 829.

† Matt. xxviii: 19.

‡ Cont. Noet., c. xviii., vol. 2, p. 20.

¶ De Spectat., p. 700.

§ Clem. Alex. Poedag, lib. iii., c. 12, Oper. p. 266.

givings. In the year 147, it was used at the stake by the venerable Polycarp, and at the same time it was attached by the collective members of the church of Smyrna, to the Epistle in which they communicated the account of his martyrdom.* Finally, we have the direct attestation of Justin Martyr, that, in his days, the prayers and thanksgivings of the church invariably terminated with some one or other modification of it. "In all that we offer up," says he, "we bless the Creator of all things, through his Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost."†

We now proceed to a FIFTH line of proof for the Trinitarianism of the primitive Christian church. "Having observed" as Athanasius remarks, "the great wisdom of the Apostles, in not prematurely communicating the doctrine of Christ's divinity to those who were unprepared to receive it; the Church, from a very early period, adopted a mode of institution, reasonable and natural in itself, but singular on account of its attendant phraseology." During the first part of their theological education, therefore, to use the language of Faber, nothing more than the general truths of Christianity was communicated to the catechumens; and so slowly was the divine light suffered to beam upon what Tertullian calls the preparatory schools of the auditors, that it was not until the very eve of their baptism, that its particular truths, viewed as universally depending upon one pre-eminent truth, were at length distinctly propounded. To their instruction in these particular truths, of which they had hitherto been kept, (so far as it was possible to keep them,) in a state of profound ignorance, were devoted the forty days which immediately preceded their baptism; and this studied concealment was rendered the more easy, because, in the primitive church, the sacrament of Baptism was administered only at the two great festivals of Easter and Whitsuntide.

"The institution of the Catechumens was spoken of as an initiation into the Christian Mysteries; and the communication of what was deemed the pre-eminent, parti-

* Epist. Eccles. Smyrna, § xiv., Patr. Apost. Cotel., vol. ii., p. 201.

† Justin Apol. i. Oper. p. 77.

cular truth of Revelation, with its subordinate and dependent particular truths, was considered and technically mentioned as the final enunciation of the grand secret.

Mr. Faber adduces abundant evidence to prove that the secret of the mysteries was the doctrine of the Trinity, running into the doctrine of the Incarnation. To this secret, Ireneus, the scholar of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, who wrote in the year 175, but who was born in the year 97, alludes: "This" says he, "is THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD. Such is the mystery, which Paul declares to have been manifested to him by revelation; namely, that he who suffered under Pontius Pilate, is the Lord and King, and God and Judge of all, receiving power from him who is God of all, since he became subject unto death, even the death of the cross."

To this testimony may be added that of the ancient author of the Epistle to Diognetus; whether he were Justin Martyr himself, or whether (according to his own descriptive statement of his character,) he were some apostolical man, a contemporary of Justin Martyr. In the course of a very long, and very fine passage, while this writer styles the Christian worship of God the mystery which man can never discover, he teaches us, when largely treating of the nature and offices of Christ, that "the Word, though to-day called a Son, existed, nevertheless, eternally."

Such was the doctrine communicated from a very early period, to every catechumen, before he was admitted to the sacrament of Baptism,—certainly as early as the age of Justin and Ireneus.*

A FIFTH line of testimony in proof of the fact that the early Christians believed in the doctrine of the Trinity, is found in the unanimous primitive interpretation of those texts, the true import of which is now litigated between modern Trinitarians and modern Anti-Trinitarians.

If the primitive church, up to the Apostolic age, were Anti-Trinitarian, the system of Scriptural interpretation uniformly adopted by the Fathers of that church, must

* See Faber, vol. i., B. I., ch. viii., pp. 206-230.

plainly have been Anti-Trinitarian likewise; and conversely, if the primitive church, up to the Apostolic age, were Trinitarian; the system of Scriptural interpretation uniformly adopted by the Fathers of that church, must also have been Trinitarian; since a church collectively cannot hold one set of doctrines, while all the leading teachers, and writers, and divines, and bishops, in direct and full communion with it, openly and avowedly maintain quite another set of doctrines. The unanimous system of exposition adopted by the Fathers of the three first centuries, is evidence as to what system of exposition was familiarly received in the church of the three first centuries, as setting forth the undoubted mind of Holy Scripture. For, though the insulated exposition of an insulated writer, might justly be deemed nothing more than the unauthoritative speculation of his own private judgment; it is morally impossible that all the writers of a church should be unanimous in their system of Scriptural interpretation; if, in point of systematic Scriptural interpretation, the church itself, collectively, differed from them utterly, and radically, and essentially.

“So far as my own reading and observation extend,” says Mr. Faber, “the early fathers invariably and unanimously interpret the texts now litigated between Trinitarians and Anti-Trinitarians, not after the mode recommended by the latter, but precisely after the mode adopted by the former. In no one instance, which, in the course of a tolerably wide investigation, I have been able to discover, do they ever interpret a single text, so as to bring out the result, that *that* text does not teach the doctrine of the Trinity, or the doctrine of Christ's Godhead. If, among the Fathers of the three first centuries there be an exception, I can only say, that I have inadvertently overlooked it. To this general rule, I myself, at least, am unable to produce a single exception.”* This argument acquires a tenfold force, when we consider that heretics, in order to get rid of these texts, rejected the Books of Scripture in which they are

* See Faber, 1 B. I., ch. ix., pp. 231-244, and App. I., pp. 299-377, where these texts and the explanations are given at length.

found,* and also the strict harmony of the present line of evidence, with all the other lines of evidence which have now in review successively passed before us; and that force, so far as I can judge, becomes absolutely irresistible, when we bear in mind that the present position is established, not merely by a single testimony, or by a single class of testimonies, but by a concurrence of numerous distinct classes of testimonies, all vouching for the same fact, and all tending to the same purpose. As, in regard to Scripture, the early Doctors expounded, so, in point of fact, without any contradiction, on the part of Christians, did the enemies of Christianity allege; so, from generation to generation, did the primitive Christians worship; so, with one mouth, to be the universally received doctrine of the Church Catholic, did the ancient apologists profess; so, with rare and striking concord, did all the early creeds or symbols propound; so were all the ancient liturgies constructed; so were all the catechumens instituted. If the church of the first ages had been Anti-Trinitarian, this accordance, in so many different points, could never have existed. By all the laws of evidence, therefore, the inevitable result from it is, that the primitive church, up to the age of the Apostles, held and taught, as vitally essential truths, the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Godhead of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

A SIXTH line of testimony, in corroboration of the fact that the early Christians were believers in the doctrine of the Trinity, is found in the argument from prescription and universality, as this was urged by them. About the year 175, when the then aged Irenæus wrote; and about the year 200, when Tertullian flourished; that is

* Instead of the litigated texts being read by these religionists, without suggesting to them any such notions of the divinity or the pre-existence of Christ, as are now supposed to be clearly contained in them, the truth is, that they allowed to those texts no voice whatever in the decision of the question, whether Christ was a mere man, or whether he is very God, mysteriously united to very man; for they cut the matter short by the compendious process of utterly rejecting the whole of St. Paul's writings, and all the Gospels, save that of St. Matthew, or rather what they pleased to call that of St. Matthew. So incorrigible, indeed, were the Ebionites, in their error, and so completely did they proceed upon the plan of total rejection, rather than on the plan of perverse misinterpretation, that they actually disregarded even Apostolical authority itself.

to say, about 75 years, and about 100 years after the death of St. John, when, through chronological necessity, and agreeably to positive attestation, no particular church could have been separated from the Apostolic age, by more than two intervening steps of communication; ALL the then existing churches mutually in communion with each other, though variously deriving their succession from twelve different apostles, held precisely the same system of doctrine respecting the nature of the Deity, or respecting the mode in which the Deity exists; and, on this point, their harmony was such, that not a single church could be found which held any other system than what is now called Trinitarian. That is to say, it was a system which asserted the existence of the one Deity in three persons; and which maintained that the second of these three persons became incarnate, and appeared upon earth, as the man Christ Jesus. Such, however, is not the whole amount of the fact publicly appealed to by Ireneus and Tertullian. While, without a single exception, they all concurred in holding that peculiar doctrine, which is briefly denominated the doctrine of the Trinity; they all, moreover, without a single exception, concurred in declaring, that, through one, or at the most, through two intermediate channels, they had received this doctrine from some one or other of the twelve Apostles, up to whom they severally carried their ecclesiastical succession; that, the Rule of Faith, which propounded this doctrine, was ultimately derived from Christ himself, and that, as it was universal in point of reception, throughout all the provincial churches in mutual communion with each other, so it was questioned by none save heretics, who, in parties of scattered individuals, had gone out from the great, and more ancient body of the Church Catholic.*

Mr. Faber quotes, in confirmation of this position, Ireneus, Tertullian, Hegesippus, and urges in confirmation, all the previous lines of proof, and the fact that it never was denied by the ancient heretics, † “and hence, all heretics, says Ireneus, are much later than the Bishops,

* See *Iren. Adv. haer.*, lib. i., c. 2, pp. 34-36: lib. iii., c. 4, § 2, p. 172. *Tertul. de praescript. ad haer.*, § 4, *Oper.*, p. 100.

† See vol. i., B. I., ch. x., pp. 245-271.

to whom the Apostles delivered the churches." "Whatever is first," says Tertullian, "is true; whatever is later, is spurious."

Now, when this argument was originally used, the fundamental fact, it will be observed, required no historical establishment. Without an effort, it was palpable and obvious to every individual throughout the entire world of Christianity. Each person was himself an eye-witness. In the days of Ireneus and Tertullian, the fact of the universal Trinitarianism of the whole Catholic Church in all its mutually symbolizing and mutually communicating branches, no more demanded the formality of a grave historic demonstration, than the fact of the universal Trinitarianism of the entire reformed Church would now demand such a substantiation. Those two early Fathers appealed to what was then familiarly known to every Christian; and upon the notorious fact, thus appealed to, they framed their celebrated argument, from universality and prescription.

A SEVENTH line of proof of the Trinitarianism of the early Christians, is the certain connection which can be proved to subsist between that system of doctrine and the Apostles, as its first promulgators. Ireneus of Lyons, was born in the year 97; and he wrote or published his work against the Heresies of the Age, in the year 175. While a young man, as he himself teaches us, he was a pupil of Polycarp; which Polycarp was himself the disciple of the Apostles, and eminently so of their last survivor, the apostle St. John. Hence, though he actually wrote or published, not earlier than the year 175; yet his strictly proper evidence is, in truth, much more ancient; for, it may justly be deemed the personal evidence of his youth; that is to say, the personal evidence of a witness, who was living, and learning, and observing, about the year 120, or only about twenty years after St. John's departure. And hence, on the principle already laid down, the church of Lyons, over which he presided as Bishop, stood, through his instrumentality, though toward the latter end of the second century, separated only by a single descent, from the Apostles themselves.

Let us again consider one of the several statements of

doctrine made by Irenæus. Speaking of this doctrine of the Trinity, and its kindred topics, he says: "The Church, though dispersed through the whole world to the ends of the earth, hath received this Faith from the Apostles and their disciples. She believes in one God, the Father Almighty; who hath made the heavens and the earth, and the seas, and all things in them: And in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God; who became incarnate for our salvation: And in the Holy Ghost; who, through the prophets, preached the dispensations, and the advents, and the birth from the virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the incarnate ascension to heaven of our beloved Lord Jesus Christ; and his coming from heaven in the glory of the Father, to recapitulate all things, and to raise up all flesh of all mankind, in order that to Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, and Saviour, and King, according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father, every knee may bow, of things in heaven and things on earth, and things under the earth: and in order that he may in all things execute just judgment." "Having" he adds, "received this declaration and this faith, the church, though scattered throughout the whole world, diligently guards it, as if inhabiting only a single house; and, in like manner, she believes these matters, as having one soul and the same heart; and she harmoniously preaches and declares and believes them, as possessing only one mouth. For through the world, there are indeed dissimilar languages; but the force of this tradition is one and the same. And neither do the churches, which are founded in Germany, believe otherwise, or deliver otherwise; nor do those, which are founded in the Iberias, or among the Celts, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Libya, or in the central regions of the earth. But as God's creature, the sun is one and the same in the whole world; so, likewise the preaching of the truth everywhere shines, and enlightens all men who are willing to come to the knowledge of the truth."*

Such is the testimony of Irenæus: and that this was also taught by Polycarp, who formed the intervening

* Iren. Adv. haer. lib. i., c. 2, 3, pp. 34-36.

link between Ireneus and the Apostles, Ireneus distinctly affirms. "Polycarp also," he says, "who was not only instructed by the Apostles, and conversed with many of them, but who was likewise by the Apostles made Bishop of the Church of Smyrna, in Asia: this Polycarp always taught us those things which he had learned from the Apostles themselves, which he also delivered to the church, and which alone are true. All the churches in Asia, and they who succeeded Polycarp, down to the present day, give testimony to these things.*

Now, among the Asiatic churches thus appealed to, Polycarp had been a burning and a shining light, for the space of more than half a century; which period of more than half a century had expired only twenty-eight years previous to the making of the appeal on the part of Ireneus. Therefore, the churches of Asia, and the successors of Polycarp, could not possibly have then been ignorant as to the mere naked *fact* of what doctrines were really preached by Polycarp.

The justice of the appeal is however directly evinced by the testimony, both of Polycarp himself, and of the members of his church who witnessed his martyrdom, which has been already quoted, and by the testimony of Justin Martyr, whose conversion† took place shortly after the year 130, or but little more than thirty years subsequent to the death of St. John. Hence, the doctrinal testimony contained in any of his writings, is, in fact, the doctrinal testimony of the year 130; for, about that time it was, that Justin was catechetically instructed in the principles of Christianity. About the year 130, therefore, the whole Christian Church, in doctrine and in worship, was avowedly Trinitarian.

The testimony of Justin Martyr, be it also observed, vouches for the yet additional fact, that the Christians of that day were ready to deliver their faith and their practice to all who should wish to learn them, even as they themselves had been previously taught the same faith, and the same practice, by the regularly appointed catechists, their own ecclesiastically authorized instructors

* Iren. Adv. haer., lib. iii., c. 3, p. 171.

† See Faber, vol. i., B. I., ch. xi. pp. 272-286.

and predecessors. The whole body of Christians, in the year 130, therefore, both themselves held, and were ready to teach to others, the doctrine and adoration of God, even the Father, and the Son, and the prophetic Spirit.

The conclusion to which we have thus been regularly brought, perfectly agrees with the testimony of Ireneus; and so far as I can judge, the final result, on the legitimate principles of historical evidence, is the positive Apostolical antiquity of the doctrine of the Trinity.

There are many works in which the opinions of the early fathers on this doctrine will be found collated. Of these, the principal one was, *A Vindication of the worship of the Son and the Holy Ghost against the exceptions of Mr. Theophilus Lindsey, from Scripture and Antiquity*: by Thomas Randolph, D. D., President of C. C. C.; and Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, Oxford, 1775. Bishop Bull's works: 1. *Defence of the Nicene Creed.* 2. *The Judgment of the Catholic Church of the three first centuries, concerning the necessity of believing that our Lord Jesus Christ is true God, asserted against M. Simon Episcopus and others.* 3. *The Primitive and Apostolical Tradition concerning the received doctrine in the Catholic Church of our Saviour Jesus Christ's Divinity, asserted and plainly proved against Daniel Zuicker, a Prussian, and his late disciples in England.* Of these, Dr. Burton's *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost*, which is already very scarce, is eminently full, candid and satisfactory.*

* Dr. Burton's *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost*, published in Oxford, 1831. It contains the names of the following writers: Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Lucian, Ireneus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Eppian, Novatian, Dionysius, Alexandrinus, Romanus, Theognostus, Alexander, Athanasius, Eusebius, Council of Nice. In every case, also, he gives the original, as well as the translation. See also his *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of the Son of God*.

Besides these distinct works on the subject, are the works of Dr. Waterland, in ten vols. 8 vo. Oxford, 1833, chiefly occupied with voluminous and full discussions, including the testimony of the Fathers, on the subject of the Trinity. See also Cary's *Testimonies of the Fathers of the first four centuries, to the doctrine of the XXXIX Articles, Art. 1.* Welchman on the same subject. Smith's *Testimony to the Messiah, Appendix.* Suiceri

From this I will quote the following declaration: "The first question for inquiry is, whether the writers of the first three centuries were unanimous; whether one uniform system of belief concerning the Son and the Holy Ghost can be expected from their writings, or whether they opposed and contradicted each other. Even if we should adopt the latter conclusion, it would by no means follow that they held the Socinian or Unitarian notions. Pains have been taken to rescue some of them from an inclination to Arianism; and the present work may shew whether the attempt has not been successful; but there is not even a shadow of proof, that any one of these writers approach to the Socinian or Unitarian tenets. It will however be seen, that the Fathers of the first three centuries were perfectly unanimous. There are no signs of doubt, or dissension, in any of their writings. Some of them were engaged in controversy, while others merely illustrated Scripture, or applied themselves to practical theology. In all of them, we find the same uniform mode of expression concerning the Son and the Holy Ghost. The testimony is collected with equal plainness from the casual and incidental remarks, as from the laboured conclusion of the apologist and the polemic."

I had myself proceeded some length, in the perusal of the early Fathers, in order to be able to give their testimony on this and other subjects from personal and original examination. Having, however, become possessed of the work of Mr. Faber, based upon his careful perusal of the early Fathers, I found his method of presenting their testimony so clear and conclusive, not only as having their undivided opinions, but the views also of the entire church, in their days, that I have concluded to adopt it, and to present a summary of the arguments he so ably and elaborately maintained.*

Theaurus. Eccl. sub. nom. τριας, &c. Hagenbach's *Hist. of Christian Doctrine*, vol. i., pp. 49, 50, 222, 123. And in a variety of other works.

* The work is entitled, *The Apostolicity of Trinitarianism*, (or, see copy Title Page.) The first vol. contains the positive testimony, with a discussion respecting the Primitive Hebrew Church of Jerusalem, the Nazarenes of Ebionites, &c. The second vol. is occupied with a full and elaborate reply to all the objections which have been made against the Trinitarianism of that testimony.

ARTICLE II.

SLAVERY.

SLAVERY, as it appears in THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, is a man's being owned as a man by his fellow man : Job 31 : 13-15 ; Gen. 18 : 17-19 ; Col. 4 : 1 ; Eph. 6 : 9 ; Gen. 17 : 11-13 ; 23 : 24-27 ; and in the sense that his person is under the control, and his services at the command and for the benefit of the owner : Gen. 14 : 14-24 ; 2 : 35 ; Levit. 25 : 44-46 ; Job, 19 : 16 ; Exod. 20 : 17 ; Deut. 15 : 18 ; Matt. 8 : 9 ; Luke 17 : 7-9 ; Eph. 6 : 5-8 ; Col. 3 : 22-25 ; 1 Tim. 6 : 1-2 ; Titus 2 : 9-12 ; and such control of his person for service, may be transferred to another : Gen. 20 : 14-24 ; 34 : 36 ; 25 : 5, and 26 : 12-14 ; Levit. 25 : 44-46. The owner has also authority, not only to punish the servant for transgressions, but also to compel his obedience and service : Gen. 16 : 6 ; Exod. 21 : 20-21 ; Prov. 29 : 19 ; Luke 12 : 47 ; 1 Sam. 25 : 10 ; 1 Kings, 2 : 39-40 ; Gen. 16 : 8-9 ; Philemon, vs. 1-25 ; Ps. 123 : 2 ; 1 Pet. 2 : 20 ; Rom. 13 : 1-5.

The right of ownership was created in various ways, as follows :

By Conquest.—Prisoners taken in war, instead of being destroyed, might be reduced to slavery ; they were divided among the conquerors, who, at their pleasure, either retained them for their own use, or sold them into servitude to others.—Gen. 14 : 21 ; Deut. 20 : 11-14 ; 21 : 10-14 ; 1 Kings, 9 : 20-21 ; Deut. 28 : 68 ; Levit. 25 : 44-46 ; Joshua, 9 : 1-27.

By Purchase.—An equivalent in money, or anything else, being given to the owner for his slave : Gen. 17 : 12-13 ; 23 : 27 ; Exod. 12 : 44 ; Gen. 37 : 26-36 ; 39 : 1 ; Exod. 21 : 2 ; Matt. 18 : 25 ; Levit. 25 : 44-46 ; Deut. 15 : 12 ; Levit. 22 : 11. Or the poor, unable to support himself, sold himself or part of his family for a support, into slavery.—Levit. 25 : 38-54 ; Neh. 5 : 5. (The price—Exod. 21 : 32 ; Levit. 27 : 1-8 ; Ezek. 27 : 13.)

By Debt.—The creditor seizing the person of the debtor, and holding him in bondage for the debt : 2 Kings, 4 : 1 ; or selling the debtor for the debt : Matt. 18 : 25.

By Crime.—The thief, when unable to make restitution, was sold for his theft. Exod. 22: 3.

By Birth.—The children of slaves followed the condition of their parents; or if born of a free-man and of a slave mother, they followed the condition of the mother. Gen. 14: 14; 15: 3; 17: 12-13, 27; Levit. 25: 44-46; Exod. 21: 1-6; Eccl. 2: 7.

By Gift.—An owner making a present of bond-men and bond-women to another: Gen. 20: 14. Comp. 12: 16.

By Inheritance.—Bond-men and bond-women being willed away with other property by parents to children. Gen. 25: 5; 24: 35-36.

And by Voluntary Act: the Hebrew servant refusing to go out free when legally entitled so to do. Exod. 21: 1-8; Deut. 15: 12-17.

The right of ownership in the slave, being created in either one of the forms now stated, was as perfect and valid in law, as the right to any other sort of property whatever.

In the inventories of property, they are reckoned as property: Gen. 24: 35; 12: 16; 20: 14; Exod. 20: 10, 17. They are also called an "inheritance," a "possession," and "money."—Levit. 25: 44-46; Exod. 21: 21; Eccl. 2: 4-7.

When lost, the slave could be sought after, and claimed, and recovered, as any other property.

The angel who found Hagar in the wilderness, escaped from her mistress, directed her to return, and to submit herself to her mistress: Gen. 16: 6-9. When a servant ran away from his master, within the territories of the twelve tribes, or countries subject to them, the masters might pursue after and recover him: 1 Kings, 2: 39-40, and 1 Sam. 25: 10. And this right of property is recognized by the apostle Paul, by his sending back the runaway slave Onesimus to his lawful master, Philemon. Epistle to Philemon.

Slaves were protected in law, as property, from abuse and oppression, on the part of their own masters, who, when guilty of either one or the other, rendered themselves liable to punishment before the judges.—Exod. 21: 20-21; 26-27; Gen. 9: 6; Numb. 35: 30-33. And in

cases of maiming, to the loss of their slaves altogether : and masters, as the representatives of their servants, could seek redress for them in all cases of injury (Exod. 21 : 32,) from others.

Nor did the law allow slaves to be gotten and held, except in such manner as the law itself prescribed. No Hebrew was permitted to acquire a slave, either by violence or fraud : otherwise, he should be put to death.— It constituted the crime of “ man-stealing,” whether the man stolen were a Hebrew or a foreigner : Exod. 21 : 16 ; Comp. Gen. 40 : 15 ; Dent. 24 : 7 ; 1 Tim. 1 : 10.

While the law thus protected the master in the possession of his servants within the commonwealth of Israel ; yet, a law was enacted for the protection of slaves escaping into Judea from foreign countries. In such cases, the fugitives were not to be delivered up again to their masters, (Dent. 23 : 15-16 ; Comp. 1 Sam. 30 : 15,) which law has become the law of nations on the point. No reference is had in this law (as a proper interpretation of Dent. 23 : 15-16, taken in connection with all the laws relating to the institution of slavery in Israel will show,) to slaves within the territories of Israel, escaping from one tribe or city to another. If such were not to be given up, there would have been an end speedily put to servitude among the people of God. If the foreign slave were a criminal fleeing from justice, in that case, we presume, he would be given up : and upon the principle embraced in the laws requiring no protection to be given to criminals. Exod. 21 : 14 ; Dent. 19 : 11-13 ; 1 Kings, 2 : 29-34.

And to conclude under this head, so far from permitting the right of the ownership of slaves to be invaded, in any way or form ; so far from permitting slaves to be injured or decoyed or stolen away, or in any manner rendered unprofitable to masters, all men were and are by the command of God in the Decalogue forbidden, so much as to “ covet their neighbor’s man-servant, or his maid-servant.” Exod. 20 : 17.

The right of ownership in the slave, according to the Scriptures, respects *the service* of the slave. The control of his person being necessary, in order to secure his service, is lodged with the master in the first instance, and

when he is unable to exercise it efficiently, with the civil power in the second, which comes in to his aid. The exercise of this power of control is necessarily left to the discretion of the master, both as to time, the means, and the extent: but he is required to act benevolently and humanely, not only for interest and for conscience sake, but also for fear of the civil power, which casts its arms of protection around the slave, as part of the body politic.

This right of ownership, we may further remark, according to the Scriptures, is in man *as man*. While the slave is reckoned as property, yet, by the manner in which he is spoken of, and by all the laws regulating his religious instruction and training, and his treatment, he is not viewed in the light of a mere dumb animal, nor a mere chattel: but he is a man; a fellow being; having the attributes, the connections, the hopes, the fears, the joys and sorrows common to humanity, although in a subordinate condition in society, and not upon a social or civil equality with his master. In his station and circumstances, he is to be respected and treated as a man; and have accorded to him all the rights, privileges, protection and enjoyments, which are compatible with that station, and with those circumstances. The authority of the master over him is perfect within his appropriate sphere as a master. He cannot command, nor in any manner require his servant either to do or to suffer that which would be criminal before God and man; or injurious to him in mind, body, family or estate. He is under obligation to do to him as he would wish to be done by, were he in the like condition and circumstances. On the other hand, the obligations and duties of the slave are pressed upon him as a man. The Scriptures do not sit in judgment upon the justice of the origin or nature of the governments under which men live; nor upon the righteousness or unrighteousness of their administration: but they uniformly recognize "the powers that be as ordained of God," and therefore, because of Divine ordination and authority, are to be obeyed under penalty of Divine displeasure. Servants are rational and accountable creatures of God, and are to render obedience to those who are set in authority

over them: not only that they may approve themselves to God, and to the consciences of men, but that they may also escape wrath. Herein are they regarded by God, although in a servile and dependent condition, as "the possession," "the money" of their masters, yet not as the brutes that perish, nor as mere senseless goods and chattels, but as men. Whatever changes and vicissitudes they may pass through as "the possession" or "money" of men, they are "bond-men" and "bond-women," and are so considered and treated all the Bible through.

Slavery among the people of God was both *temporary* and *perpetual*, according to the national character of the slaves themselves.

The temporary slaves were of *Hebrew* origin; and made slaves by poverty, crime, or voluntary act. They could be held in servitude by their brethren, but six years only: in the seventh year they were to be set free; and with special rewards and gifts on the score not only of brotherhood, according to the flesh, but also of justice, since the labour of a slave was more profitable to the master than that of an hired servant, for the master paid him no wages for his work.—Dent. 15: 12-18. If the slave was unmarried, he should be set free unmarried: if married, and his wife had shared his servitude with him, then he should go out with his wife and family. But if, during the period of his servitude, he married a perpetual slave, belonging to his master, he alone should go out free: and his family would remain as they were, the perpetual possession of their master. In this case, however, should the Hebrew husband and father, from affection to his master and his wife and children, refuse his right of going out free, and prefer remaining in his condition, his master should bring him before the judges, and the fact of his voluntary subjection being established, in lasting evidence of it, he should bore his ear through with an awl; and he should then serve him forever, and have no more right to go out free at the end of every six years.—Exod. 21: 1-6. And this law applied equally to female slaves in like circumstances.—Dent. 15: 17.

But a servant of this sort, it appears, after all, should,

together with his family, be set free at the year of Jubilee: and for the reason that a Hebrew should never be viewed in the light of a "bond-man" or "bond-servant," but as an "hired servant," a sojourner, a temporary slave, by his brethren. Levit. 25: 39-43.

The Lord says, "They are my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, they shall not be sold as bond-men," or with the sale of a bond-man, Levit. 25: 1-46; that is, to be held in perpetual bondage, as the Lord immediately explains: "But thy bond-men and thy bond-maids which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen round about you: of them shall ye buy bond-men and bond-maids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession: they shall be your bond-men forever; but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigour."—Levit. 25: 44-46. In this passage, a distinction is drawn between Hebrew and foreign slaves; and between the terms which they severally could be held to service: the Hebrew for six years only at a time; and under no circumstances beyond the year of Jubilee: while slaves of foreign nations might be held as a possession in perpetual bondage, and become the inheritance of parents and children from generation to generation. The year of Jubilee had, in its provisions of liberty to the enslaved, no reference whatever to them. They never went out free.

In accordance with this law, that Israelites should not be held in perpetual bondage, provision is made of a right of redemption to any Hebrew who had waxed poor and sold himself to a stranger or a foreigner dwelling in Judea. If unable to redeem himself, any one near of kin might redeem him, and at any time previous to the year of Jubilee: and if not redeemed before then, at the Jubilee, he should have his freedom: and for the reason that he is the servant of God, redeemed out of Egypt, and therefore must never be ruled over with rigour, and held in perpetual bondage.—Levit. 25: 47-55.

And because the children of Israel disregarded the law regulating the enslavement of their brethren; and would not release them at the times appointed, but endeavoured to keep them in perpetual bondage, the anger of the Lord was kindled against them in the days of Jeremiah the Prophet, 34: 8-17; and for this great sin, among many others, He visited them with the sword, with pestilence and famine, and removed them out of their good land and made them captives in all kingdoms of the earth!

The perpetual slaves were of foreign origin, obtained from the heathen nations round about. These, according to Levit. 25: 44, 46, already referred to, might be, and were held in perpetual servitude from father to son, and descended in families, like any other property, from generation to generation. They were bought, sold, given, and willed away like any other property. They were the possession, the money of their owners, as were their silver and gold, and flocks and herds. The idea that the Scriptures make a difference between servants and other property, and so were not accounted property, is puerile, and in the face of positive declarations to the contrary. Exod. 12: 5, 16; 20: 14; 24: 35; 26: 13, 14; 32: 1-5; 36: 6-7. Job, 1: 1-13; 31: 13-15.

The increase of servants born in the house and bought with money is reckoned among the special blessings of God upon the possessions of men. Gen. 23: 35; Job 1: 1-3; Gen. 32: 1-5; 33: 10-11; 26: 12-14.

The foreign slaves, in all religiously trained households in Israel, were circumcised and brought up in the knowledge and worship of God, but their profession of religion and membership with the church had no effect upon their civil condition. They remained in perpetual servitude. This fact obtained also with slaves in the time of our Lord and his Apostles.

The Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament—the oldest records in the world, furnish no information of *the precise period* in the history of our race *in which the institution of slavery took its rise*. Slavery is first mentioned as a curse: a curse to be visited in the lapse of time upon Ham and his descendants, and not long after the flood. Gen. 9: 20-29.

The institution sprang up between the uttering of this curse and the age of Job. It existed in the age of Job, 1: 1-3; 3: 19; 19: 16; 31: 13-15. We believe Job to have been cotemporary with Serug, and Serug was born 193 years after the flood. If we are right in our chronology then slavery was introduced about 200 years after the flood.

The precise manner is as much unknown as the precise time of its introduction. It owed its origin no doubt to the weaknesses and necessities of men, which placed them either voluntarily or involuntarily in the power, and finally into the absolute possession of those more mighty and more independent than themselves.

It was extensively prevalent in the days of Abraham; indeed, it is a form of government which has prevailed almost in all nations, and in every quarter of the world from his time to the present. Once introduced, it spread on every hand. Such is the testimony of history.

Since the days of Job the Church of God has had connection with this institution. It has never known an hour in its existence that it did not embrace in its membership masters and servants.

The visible Church of God, set up in the family and household of Abraham, held slaves in its communion down to the coming of the Lord. They appear in that same visible Church after Christ ascended to Heaven; in the churches gathered by the Apostles wherever they went preaching the Gospel to every creature. They met the system in all climes. It prevailed over the Roman Empire. It survived the division of that Empire, and when both the Eastern and Western Empires were broken into many kingdoms it survived in them all, and finally passed away by slow and almost imperceptible degrees from all the kingdoms of Europe except Russia and Turkey. It exists in Asia. Africa is an house of bondage. Not long after the discovery of America in 1492, it was introduced both into North and South America, and while it has ceased in many portions of South America, it still covers vast areas of territory in both North and South America.

Christianity has met with the institution wherever it has gone, and in her progress must continue to meet it.

She has carried her message of salvation alike to servant and master, and of both classes has the Great Head of the Church gathered multitudes into his kingdom to be with him in glory forever.

The institution of slavery is sanctioned in both the *Old and the New Testament*.

For in neither the one nor the other is it in any manner condemned by God. Had the institution been in itself sinful, the condemnation of the Holy One would have fallen, and with distinctness, upon it, as upon all sin; and on the just principle that all sin should be abandoned, He would have required his people, as much as in them lay, immediately or prospectively to put an end to the institution, or rid themselves of all connection with it. If the relation of master and servant is in itself sinful, it is incredible that the Holy One, who hates sin in every form, should in no single instance in all His Word declare it to be so. It is incredible that our Lord who made known the way of God in truth, and cared for no man, should never condemn it. No, nor his holy Apostles and ministers who partook of His bold and fearless spirit, and even laid down their lives for the truth.

On the contrary, the institution is recognized as existing among men, and the Lord sanctioned it both in its temporal and perpetual form. He regulated the temporary servitude of his own people, and not only permitted, but commanded his people, if they desired slave property, to purchase slaves from foreign nations, and to hold them for a perpetual possession, for themselves and their children after them.

The institution is recognized in the fourth, and again in the tenth commandment, and the Lord secures the lawful possession and use of the slave to his master by forbidding, upon penalty of his displeasure, even the "coveting" of that slave by his neighbor.

If marriage is recognized in those commands, and the relation of husband and wife, parent and child, as lawful, so is slavery and the relation of master and servant recognized as lawful. We repeat it, that if slavery be in itself sinful, it is incredible that the Holy and Just One should give His unreserved sanction to and per-

petuation of it, both in the common law given to his people and in the ten commandments, which are binding for all time upon the whole race of men.

There is, moreover, no condemnation of any one child of God, or man of the world, for holding the relation either of master or servant. No one is condemned, nor abused, nor threatened, nor unchurched, for being connected with the institution.

On the contrary, some of the most eminent saints were slaveholders. They were accounted the friends of God, the patterns of faith and holiness, and the lights of the world. Such men were Job, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the people of God in the Church down to the coming of our Lord. The churches which held in their communion masters and servants, and which were gathered by the Apostles, are most highly commended for "their faith in Jesus Christ and love to all the saints." Col. 1: 3-5; 3: 22; 4: 1; and Eph. 1: 15-23; 6: 5, 9. They were those who had experienced "the grace of God which is given us by Jesus Christ:" they were "enriched by him in all utterance and in all knowledge:" they "came behind" other churches "in no gift." 1 Cor. 1: 3-7; 7: 21. And would be "the rejoicing" of the Apostles "in the day of the Lord Jesus." 2 Cor. 1: 13-16. They were brethren beloved: "the elect of God." 1 Pet. 1: 2; 2: 18. And of Philemon the master and owner of Onesimus, what commendation have we? The Apostle Paul calls him, in the ardour of his affection, "our dearly beloved and fellow labourer." He "thanked God" for him and "mentioned him always in his prayers," "hearing of his love and faith which he had toward the Lord Jesus and toward all saints." He was one of the Apostle's own converts—v. 19. It is probable that at his master's house Onesimus became acquainted with the Apostle, and when he ran away and went to Rome he searched Paul out and renewed the acquaintance and became a convert to Christ under his faithful preaching and admonitions. Philemon, although he had an unprofitable servant, yet was a truly Christian master, and had a "Church in his house:" whose "love refreshed the saints," and in whom the Apostle had every "confidence,"—v. 21. Philemon, vs. 1-25.

Masters and servants were admitted to full and lasting membership with the Church of God in all ages. In fact the original members of the visible church as organized and set up in the family and household of Abraham, were the bond and the free, masters and servants. The mere fact of holding slaves never excluded any man from the church. No question of this sort was ever mooted. Not a word is said to masters of the injustice and sinfulness of holding men in bondage, nor to servants of their right to freedom, and to break away from servitude whenever they might be able to do so. No complaints are made of the system as injurious to the graces of Christians: or as subversive of religion, and consequently detrimental to the spirituality and purity of churches. As already observed, the churches which embraced in their communion masters and servants are approved and commended by the Apostles.—1 Cor. 12: 13; Gal. 3: 27-28; Col. 3: 10-11; Eph. 6: 5-9. Even the very Priests themselves, the sacred ministers of God, who served at the altar in all holy things, owned slaves, who were both “bought with their money,” and “born in their house.” Levit. 22: 11; Judges 19: 3-9; 1 Sam. 2: 13.

The relations of master and servant are recognized as are those of husband and wife, parent and child, king and subject; and being members of the church, they are exhorted and commanded upon evangelical motives faithfully and truly to perform towards each other the duties growing out of those relations, if they would approve themselves the true disciples of Christ. Eph. 6: 1-9; Col. 3: 22-25; 4: 1; 1 Tim. 6: 1-5; Titus 2: 9-15; 1 Pet. 2: 18-25.

We may add that our Lord himself met with the institution of slavery in his ministry on earth, and has left no condemnation of it as in itself unjust towards men and sinful towards God. The Centurion is praised for his remarkable humility and faith: the Saviour heals his sick servant and gives him all the comfort and advantage of his services, once more restored to health and strength. Matt. 8: 6-13; Luke 7: 1-10. In his preaching and teaching he at certain times had it in his eye, and some of his most impressive illustrations are drawn from it.

Matt. 18: 21-35; Luke 12: 47; 17: 7-9; John 13: 16; 15: 15.

The Apostle Paul, immediately encountering the institution in his ministry, has trodden in the footsteps of the master. In a part of his first Epistle to the Corinthians 7: 17-24, he exhorts every Christian to glorify God in that particular condition in which he is placed by His Providence. "Art thou called?" that is, to the gracious state and exalted privileges of the Christian, "being a servant" or slave? What then? Does Christianity oblige your master to free you? No. Does it absolve you from your civil obligations to your master? No. Your condition is unchanged: you are a servant still. What then? "Art thou called being a servant? Care not for it." Let not this humble and dependent state disturb you. All I say in relation to it is this: "If thou mayest be free, use it rather." Be free if you lawfully can and desire to do so, but if not, then care not for it. Your servitude is temporary only: it will not prevent your saving your soul in it. "The time" allotted for us here on earth "is short." "The fashion of this world passeth away,"—vs. 29-31. Bond or free, you are Christ's, and all the benefits of his salvation are yours. "For he that is called in the Lord, being his servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise he that is called being free is Christ's servant." Ye are bought with a price." Christ has purchased you with a price—even his precious blood. He now and forever is your Lord and Master in Heaven. "Be not the servants" or slaves "of men;" that is to say, in your condition discharge not your duties as the slaves of men simply, looking no higher for approbation and reward than the hand of the master. "Ye are bought with a price." Ye are Christ's freemen, therefore with good will do your service as unto the Lord and not unto men only. Col. 3: 22-25; Eph. 6: 5-8. And ye shall, for the good that ye do, receive a reward of the Lord. How does the Apostle conclude? "Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God." How could he exhort servants to abide in servitude, serving God therein, if that condition was unjust and sinful? Was not this the time and the place for him to have given other views and other coun-

sels of a perfectly opposite character to the church and the world, if he had believed slavery to be in itself sinful? He has not done it?

He comes in contact—direct contact with the system again in the case of the runaway slave Onesimus already mentioned. Does he condemn the system as unlawful? and Philemon a guilty man because a master? No. By the laws of God given to his people anciently, and by the Roman laws under which Philemon lived, he could pursue Onesimus and recover him wherever he should find him within the boundaries of the Empire: and it was the duty of all authorities to give him aid in his apprehension and recovery. Does Paul deny the justice of these laws? Does he refuse to deliver up Onesimus? Does he advise him never to return to his master, and aid and abet his final escape? No. He acknowledges the right of Philemon, as a master, to the control of the person, and to the benefit of the labors of Onesimus his slave: and he sends him back to his master with a letter of kind intercession and commendation.

Thus have we the institution, which existed in the family of Abraham, sanctioned both in the Old and in the New Testaments.

The Duties growing out of the relation of master and servant are clearly defined and enjoined in the Word of God.

In the constitution of His visible church in Abraham, the Lord included the servants, as well as the children of believing parents. The sign of the covenant was made in their flesh, and all the privileges and blessings of that covenant was opened to them. They were to be trained up within the pale of the church in the knowledge and fear of God. "He that is born in the house, or bought with the money of the stranger, which is not of thy seed, must needs be circumcised."—Gen. 17: 12-23. Abraham "in the self-same day circumcised his son Ishmael and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money." He apprehended the will of God as expressed toward children and servants in the covenant, and performed it well. He received the approbation of God: "for I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and they

shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."—Gen. 18 : 19. Abraham is the example of all masters of families in all ages.

The rest of the Sabbath was secured in the fourth commandment to servants: to the "man servant" and "the maid servant:" and by consequence all the spiritual privileges and instruction of a private and of a public nature. They were to meet around the family altar of sacrifice and prayer and praise, and they were to attend the synagogue, and when possible the temple service. Exod. 20 : 8-11.

They were required to be present at the sacred feasts and festivals of the church with the rest of the family. For example, at the Passover. The command of God to his people was, "Every man servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, shall eat of it."—Exod. 12 : 44. And again at the "Feast of weeks" or "Pentecost."—Deut. 16 : 9-12. And at the "Feast of Tabernacles."—Deut. 16 : 13-16. "Thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thou and thy son and thy daughter, and thy man servant and thy maid servant: vs. 11-14. Moreover, servants were to accompany their owners to public worship whenever they went up to worship God in the appointed place, to present and eat before the Lord, "the tithe of thy corn and of thy wine and of thy oil; or the firstlings of thy herds or of thy flocks; thy free-will offerings or heave-offerings of thine hand. Thou shalt eat them before the Lord, thou and thy son and thy daughter, and thy man servant and thy maid servant." Deut. 12 : 13-18.

At the renewing of the covenant, just before Israel crossed the Jordan and took possession of the promised land, the whole congregation was present, as well the stranger as the hewer of wood and the drawer of water. Deut. 29 : 1-13; 2 Chron. 34 : 30-31. And in those vast and solemn assemblies, convened every seven years at the feast of Tabernacles, to hear the whole law of the Lord read and explained and enforced, servants were present with the families to which they belonged.—Deut. 31 : 10-13.

According to these statements of the Old Testament,

servants were reckoned a part of the household and a part of the church : they were the immortal and accountable creatures of God. And one of the first duties of masters was that they should recognize and feel towards them as such. They were "brethren in the flesh, and also in the Lord,"—Phil. v. 16. Alike "partakers of the benefit" of grace and eternal life. 1 Tim. 6 : 1-2. The same God is the Creator, Saviour and Judge of both masters and servants, and there is no respect of persons with Him. Job 31 : 13-15. Masters should, therefore, faithfully, in their households, command their servants : bring them authoritatively under religious instruction and the law of God ; that they might learn and keep the way of the Lord ; and understand also and do their duty to men in their station with all justice and fidelity. Gen. 18 : 19. The unbroken rest of the Sabbath should be allowed them ; and free access to every means of grace ; and no obstacles thrown in the way of their spiritual instruction and improvement : and no commands be laid upon them, nor duties required of them inconsistent with the law of the Lord.

Servants are recognized also as a part of the household and of civil society ; and therefore claiming at the hands of their masters, in all temporal affairs, protection from all oppression, and abuse, and injury in person or family, or in property ; (masters are their representatives and guardians :) also provision in dwellings, raiment, food ; opportunities and means of making something of their own for their comfort and enjoyment ; and provision for them in seasons of sickness and distress, and in time of old age. They claim from their masters also considerate and kind and forbearing treatment ; that the labors exacted of them be not oppressive, nor consuming to the spirits, nor destructive to life, but such as are just and easily and safely performed ; that their intercourse with them be not distant, disdainful, and morose, but condescending and kind ; that they forbear threatening and frequent and cruel punishments, and temper their justice with mercy ; that they take a true interest in the families of their servants, and preserve them from invasion of wicked men ; and from being separated as husbands and wives, parents and children, and finally, see that all ser-

vants of the household dwell together virtuously, temperately, justly and peaceably.

All these duties of masters are distinctly, or by implication and direct inference, repeated in the New Testament. Therein are servants reckoned as members of the household of the church, and of civil society: and therein are duties required of masters, according to these different lights in which their servants are viewed.—Gal. 3: 26-28; Eph. 6: 8; Col. 3: 10-11; Eph. 6: 9; Col. 4: 1; Luke 17: 7-9; 13: 47-48; 7: 2-10.

The duties of servants to their masters are defined with equal precision in both Testaments. And those duties are Reverential Fear and Honour, as to a Ruler, Law-giver and Judge.—Mal. 1: 6; Eccl. 7: 21; 1 Tim. 6: 1-2; 1 Pet. 2: 18.

Affection, as to a Father and friend: Exod. 21: 5.

Cheerful obedience: Gen. 16: 9; 24: 1-65; Job 19: 16; Matt. 8: 9; Eph. 6: 5-8; Col. 3: 22-25; Titus 2: 2.

Fidelity: Gen. 24: 1-65; 39: 1-6; Eph. 6: 6; Col. 3: 22; 1 Tim. 6: 2; Titus 2: 10; 1 Pet. 2: 39; Philemon.

And Honesty: 2 Kings, 5: 20-27; Titus 2: 10.

The inculcation of these duties upon masters and servants is made the business of the Ministers of God. And the fulfilment of these duties is essential to the Christian character of masters and servants.

The apostle Paul affirms that to teach servants their duties is "consenting to wholesome words; the words of our Lord Jesus Christ; and to the doctrine which is according to godliness." And "if any man teach otherwise"—deny and absolve servants from their duties, the apostle brands him as "proud, knowing nothing; but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings: perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness": and he commands Timothy, and through him, all godly ministers and persons, "From such withdraw thyself."—1 Tim. 6: 1-5.

The Church of God has been in connection with the institution of slavery from the days of Abraham to the days of the Apostles, over 2000 years: and has had

since the Apostles, and still has, in some parts of the world, a connection with it. It is, therefore, very proper for us to learn from the word of God itself, which we have now been carefully examining, what are *the duties of the church towards the institution and towards those involved in it.*

It is the duty of the church then, according to the teachings of God's Holy Word :

To maintain the lawfulness of the institution of slavery as one of the forms of civil government, ordained of God in His providential government over the world.

To abstain from pronouncing that institution to be sinful which God has everywhere sustained : and from making a renunciation of all connection with it a term of church membership and a test of Christian character to mankind, which God has no where done.

To abstain from all denial of, or interference in the right of the property of masters in their servants, which is perfect, both under the Divine and civil law : and from inciting servants to acts of infidelity, dishonesty, or rebellion, or enticing them from service, and in any way or form preventing their return to their duty, and thereby robbing masters of their property.

To obey all the laws and regulations of the State, enacted in relation to the institution.

To maintain the perfect compatibility of the relation of master and servant with true religion and with a credible profession of Christianity.

To receive upon a credible profession, both the bond and the free into the communion of the church, as brethren beloved in Christ Jesus, and equally entitled to all the privileges of His people.

To make a just and necessary distinction between the abuses of the institution and the institution itself : between the abuses of the relation of master and servant and the relation itself : as we are compelled to do in all other civil institutions and relations of life.

To insist upon the faithful discharge of the mutual duties of master and servant in order to the maintenance of a good standing in the church : and in cases of delinquency, to administer discipline without respect of persons.

To have the Gospel freely and fully preached to them: their ignorance removed by sound instruction: their spiritual wants searched out and supplied: their access to the Holy Scriptures granted and secured: and finally, to have them included with their masters in a common pastoral charge.

In performing these duties the church fulfils her mission, which is to take care of the higher, the eternal interests of men: and to carry the glad tidings of salvation to every creature under Heaven.

The Holy Scriptures, as we have seen, 1 Cor. 7: 21, pronounce a state of freedom to be preferable to a state of slavery. Slavery, as one of the many forms of civil government ordained of God, Rom. 13: 1-7; is not as desirable as some others: yet while it exists, it must be honored and supported by all who live under it: the church is required so to do whenever she comes into contact with it. Her chief concern is with the religious and not the civil condition of men. "Fear God, honour the king," (1 Pet. 2: 17,) is the command of the Apostle. The command of our Lord, whom he follows, is, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's." Matt. 22: 21. And the instance is yet to be adduced from the Holy Scriptures wherein the church has arrayed herself in hostile attitude against any form of civil government whatever, as a form of civil government. She has never received any command of God, neither has she been self-moved by either her own wisdom or philosophy at any time, so to do. She founds religion, not empires. She dethrones iniquity, not kings. She comes not with observation to establish her dominion with fire and sword; but she comes in meekness and in love, and with the unseen and irresistible leaven of grace: and thus she leavens and purifies the corrupt masses of mankind, and the fruit is righteousness and peace. "Jesus answered, my kingdom is not of this world." John 18: 36.

The government in slavery, on the part of the master, partakes of what is ordinarily called "the Patriarchal form." The head of the household occupies the place of a father, master, minister, lawgiver, and judge. A great amount of power, absolute and discretionary, is lodged

in his hands : and consequently he is able to make that power felt either for good or for evil : for good, when the master is a son of Abraham : Gen. 18 : 19. And for evil when the master is Nabal and a son of Belial. 1 Sam. 25 : 14-25. The happiness of the slave is bound up in the character of the master. Herein he resembles the child whose happiness is bound up in the character of its parent. And on the other hand the character of the slave, and of the child, has much to do with the happiness of the master and the father.

Slavery, therefore, is liable to abuse, as are all other civil institutions which concentrate power in a high degree in the hands of rulers. But masters themselves are under him. They are not irresponsible for their treatment of their servants.

Their servants also are under law, and are not left to become a prey to violence, injustice, and cruel oppression. They are recognized as persons : as an important class in the body politic, to whom rights, privileges and protection are guaranteed by law.

The institution has been abused through the lust of wealth, the lust of power, and through the love of ease and of pleasure on the part of owners : and also through the idleness, the rebellion, and immorality of servants, who have provoked and drawn down upon themselves " buffetings for their faults," 1 Pet. 2 : 20, and many sorrows. But, as already remarked, a distinction must be made between the institution and its abuses. While the Holy Scriptures uphold the institution as lawful, they warn men against its abuses : and inculcate the duties of masters and servants in the plainest manner : and condemn every unjust exercise of power on the one hand, and every evasion of duty on the other.

The song of the angels proclaims the object of the advent of the Son of God : " Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men." The religion of the Lord Jesus Christ originates those principles of benevolence and justice in the breasts of masters and servants, which legitimately tend to a higher standard of perfection in their character and life, and to a greater measure of happiness in the relations which they sustain towards each other. As servants become improved by

Christianity and by that pure civilization which flows from it, and so fitted for the reception and proper use of higher privileges, the spirit of Christianity in the masters, and of enlightened policy and legislation in civil government, will award those privileges to them. Progress may be upward and onward and peaceful. *Modifications*, and even *changes* in the system, which justice and mercy may require, may be happily effected by the tranquil yet powerful and conservative influences of the Gospel. The Gospel will certainly improve this, as it will every other defective form of government in the world. The work of the church, as she stands connected with this and every other form of government, is to "preach the Gospel to every creature," and "to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's." In the performance of this duty, blessed be God, the Church will ever find her happiness, her prosperity, and her peace.

ARTICLE III.

VARIOUS READINGS OF JOHN, 10: 28, 29.

"And I give unto them eternal life: and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."

Some time since, when preaching in the country, we had occasion to introduce and comment upon this passage; remarking that it was not limited to *man*, but that the terms were universal; that Christ asserted the security of his "sheep" from the assaults of all creatures. That no one in heaven, earth, or hell, could wrest them from his hands.

What then was our surprise, on coming home, and referring to the passage, in the copy of the Scriptures in daily use in the family, to find the word "*man*" inserted in both verses; and that too not even printed in italics, the usual mark of words employed by the translators to

fill out the English idiom, where the original languages literally rendered do not complete the sense.*

This led to a comparison of the various readings of the passage in all the copies that have fallen within our reach, and with the following result.† The Greek, in verse 28, is οὐχίς, and in 29, οὐδείς, and we have met with no various readings in any critical edition of the Greek Testament, such as Knapp's, Griesebach's, Hahn's, &c.

In the English Bibles we find chiefly four classes of readings:

1. The word "man" inserted in both verses, *not in italics.*
2. The word "man" inserted in both verses, but in italics.
3. The word "man" not in italics in verse 28, and "none" in 29.
4. The word "man" not inserted in either verse, but "neither any man" in 28, and "none" in 29.

We will mention a few of the editions examined in each class:

1. Quarto Ed. of American Bible Society,	1838.
Royal Oct. of " "	1838.
" " " "	1839.
Large Oct. of " "	1853.
Pocket Ed. of " "	1841.
Pocket Ed., published in London,	1698.
Townsend's Arrangement, Boston,	1840.
Whitly's Paraphrase, London,	1741.
Old Edition of King James, (the first,)	1611.
2. Quarto, Edinburgh, Kincaid,	1785.
Bagster's English Polyglott, London,	1826.
Coit's Arrangement, Boston,	1834.
Cottage Bible, Hartford,	1841.
Scott's Com., Quarto Ed., Hartford,	1816.
Adam Clarke's Com., N. Y.,	1826.
Pocket Ed., University Press, Edinburg,	1850.
" Lippincot & Grambo, Phila.,	1854.
" E. Bliss and E. White, N. Y.,	1822.

*Royal Oct., A. B. Society Edition, 1855.

†We sometimes find these varieties in the same house.

This is found in all editions of the American Bible Society printed since the report of "the Committee on versions, to whom the subject of collating the editions of the English Bible published by this Society, with those issued in Great Britain, was referred in 1848."* This report was made in 1851.

It would seem that in some of the former editions the B. S. had omitted the word "man," but as the Oxford Edition, which this Committee had adopted for their standard, contained that word in italics, they restored it: for, page 24 of their report, they say, "The Oxford copy rightly reads: 'any man,' 'no man;' the Edinburgh and American have: 'any,' 'none,' corrected like the Oxford, 'any *man*,' 'no *man*.'"†

They have no reference to the original; to the sense of the passage, to the "mind of the spirit;" they do not inquire whether the word "*man*" is necessary to "fill out the English idiom," but they insert it according to the Oxford copy, which of course is regarded as correct.

This is the edition of Dr. Blaney of 1769, which the Committee, page 10 of their report, say, "has been regarded ever since its publication as the standard copy;" a similar remark is found in Robinson's edition of Calmet's Dictionary, page 184.

But notwithstanding, "In 1806 Eyre and Strahan published a quarto edition of the Bible *superior in point of accuracy* to the 'standard edition' of 1769, and a second edition in 1813 equally accurate with that of 1806. It has been recommended by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, to be adopted as their standard edition."—Lownde's Brit. Lib., 1839.

3. Where "any man" is found in 28 and "none" in 29.

In almost every case the word "man" is found alike in both or omitted in both. One copy only has fallen under my notice of this class, a Pocket Ed., which appears to have been printed in Edinburgh in 1698.

*See Report, page 1. The Committee consisted of Gardiner Spring, Thomas Cock, Samuel H. Turner, Edward Robinson, Thos. E. Vermilye, John McLintock, R. S. Storrs, Jr.

This appears to be the opposite of Wicliffe who, 1380, has in 28 "noon" and in 29 "no man."

4. Quarto Ed., Phila., Carey & Son,	1818.
Pocket Ed., Edinburgh, Kincaid,	1764.
Burkitt's Paraphrase, Eng.,	1790.
Oct. Ed., stereotyped for B. S. of Phila., by T. Rutt, London,	1812.
Paragraph Bible by J. Nourse, Phila.,	1829.
Pocket Ed., Belfast, Ireland,	1718.
" A. B. S.,	1850.
Coke's Com., N. Y.,	1812.
Quarto Ed., T. R. Collins, Phila.,	1853.
" S. Audnis & Son, Hartford,	1847.

Who say on the title page, "Corrected according to the Standard Ed. of A. B. S."

Quarto Ed., Sumner and Goodman, Hartford, 1846.

The publisher says that he has made this impression from the Oxford Ed. of 1784, by Jackson & Hamilton, and that he has been particularly attentive in the revision and correction of the proof sheets with the Cambridge Ed. of 1668, by John Field, with the Edinburgh Ed. of 1775, by Kincaid, and in all variations with the London Ed. of 1775, by Eyre; that when there was any difference in words, or in the omission or addition of words among these, he followed that which appeared to be most agreeable to the Hebrew of Arias Montanus, and to the Greek of the same and of Leusden; and always adopted some one of the above mentioned English copies as his authority.

Campell, on the Gospels, has "any one" in 28, and "none" in 29; and the editor of the Cottage Bible, in loco, remarks that the word "man" is certainly improperly supplied here as in many other places. Whitby and Lowman's Commentary, Phila., 1846, has "any man" in 28, "no man" in 29.*

*This is a singular case, for generally they are alike, with or without italics.

It is not found, or any word answering to it, in either version. The Latin of Arias Montanus is: "Et ego vitam æternam do eis, et non peribunt in æternum, et non rapiet quisquam eas de manu mea.

Pater meus qui dedit mihi major omnibus est; et nemo potest rapere de manu patris mei.

The vulgate, according to Popes Sixtus V. and Clement VIII., 1852: "Et ego vitam æternam do eis; et non peribunt in æternum, et non rapiet eas quisquam de manu mea. Pater meus quod dedit mihi majus est omnibus, et nemo potest rapere de manu patris mei." In neither of which is any word for "man:" *non quisquam* and *nemo* are equal to "none."

The Latin translation of Castalio, his most important work, about 1550, has: Et eis vitam do sempiternam, nec possent unquam perire; nec mihi quisquam eas de manu eripuerit.

Meus pater qui mihi dedit eas maximus est omnium, nec quisquam possit ex manu mei patris extorquere.

The German of Luther has: Und ich gebe ihnen das ewiges leben: und sie werden nimmermehr unkommen: und niemand wird sie mir aus meiner hand reissen. Mein vater der sie mir gegeben hat ist grosser denn alles; und niemand kann sie aus meines vaters hand reissen. Here we have niemand, no one; nobody, in both verses.

The French of DeSacy, Paris, 1821, (Catholic): Je leur donne la vie eternelle, et elles ne perissent jamais: et nul ne les ravira d'entre mes mains.

Ce que mon Père m'a donné, est plus grand que toutes choses; et personne ne peut le ravir de la main de mon père.

That of the Pastors and Teachers of the Church of Geneva, 1712: Et je leur donne la vie eternelle, et elles ne periront jamais et nul ne les ravira de ma main.

Mon Père que me les a donné est plus grand que tout; et personne ne les peut ravir de la main de mon Père.

The same in an edition printed at London, 1817. Here "personne ne" and "nul ne" mean no one, nobody, in a general sense.

There are several other French Translations; one by

David Martin, and one by Ostervalt.* The last is the best translation, but that of DeSacy is the best French.

The supplied word "man" then, in these verses, is not necessary to complete the sense, or in the language of the Committee of revision, to "fill out the English idiom." Those Bibles that omit it convey the full meaning of the words in the original chosen by the Holy Spirit.

Not only so, it gives a wrong sense and makes the passage inconsistent with the object of the evangelist.

Christ's people are sheep given him by the Father, in whom he is, and with whom he is one: he gives them eternal life, and (or *καὶ* like Heb. *vav*, in many cases denoting the end, so that :†)

(a.) They shall not by any means perish forever. A double negative, making a strong assertion. They shall not separate themselves from the fold; wander astray in the wilderness and get lost and perish, ἀπολώσκει, the word used in reference to the Prodigal Son, Luke 15: 24, to the "lost sheep" in the same chapter, and in Matt. 10: 6. See also Luke 19: 10; Ps. 119: 179; Jer. 50: 6.

(b.) No one shall rob them, or wrest them from the hands of Christ, and of His Father. In 12th verse he says, "the wolf cometh and catcheth the sheep:" and he contrasts himself "the Good Shepherd," with the hireling, who deserts his post and leaves the sheep a prey to the wolf, the natural enemy of sheep.‡ And

*Adopted in Bagster's Polyglott.

†Nord. Heb. Gram. §1093, b, b and d. Gesenius Lex., sub voce, b, b.

‡The wolf is everywhere recognized as the enemy of the sheep.

Hor. Ep. 4: 1:

Lupis et agnis quanta sortito obtigit
Tecum mihi discordia est.

Odes Lib. iii: 18, 13:

Inter audaces lupus errat agnos.

Virgil Æn. ix: 60:

Pleno lupus insidiatus ovili.

Ec. iii: 80:

Triste lupus stabullis.

"In the sacred writings the wolf is everywhere opposed to sheep and

just as the good shepherd, in a literal sense, protects his sheep from their great natural foe, so he protects his people from their great natural foe, represented by the wolf: and "who goeth about seeking whom he may devour." When, then, he says "no one can pluck them out of his hands," so far from limiting this to *men*, he would seem primarily to refer to Satan; and if *he* cannot wrest them from him, then no inferior foe.

When, then, Christ means to assert the security of his people in his hands from every enemy, even their greatest, "who desires to have them," it weakens the force of the passage to insert the word "man."

The following is from Poole's Synopsis:*

28. *Non rapiet eas* (per vim, vel dolum, etc.), *quisquam* (nulla vis, ne ipse Diabolus quidem, qui habet imperium mortis, Heb. 2: 14. Non latro, non mundus, non caro, non adversa, non prospera, non vos Pharisei.)

De manu (i. e. potentia) *mea*, quâ custodiuntur:

29. *Pater meus* (exponit quod dixerat, neminem posse rapere eas e manu sua:) *qui mihi dedit eas* (Pater dat credentes filio servandos ac vivificandos;) *major* (i. e. fortior sive potentior) *omnibus* (creaturis, et angelis, et hominibus, et morte, et diabolis) *est*. Potentior est ad servandum quam adversarius ad eripiendum. Comparativus pro superlativo, fortissimus, potentissimus, maximus omnium, æternus et omnipotens. *Et* (vel ideo, quia Pater illis potentior est) *nemo potest rapere de manu Patris mei*, utpote Omnipotentis. Sub. ergo nec de meâ. Ideo illi nihil possunt eripere Patris potestati.

28. *Shall not wrest them*, (by force, or fraud, etc.) *any one*, (not even the Devil himself, indeed, who has the power of death. Heb. 2: 15. Not a robber, not the

goats, as if his cruelty and rage were reserved especially for these creatures."

"He is cunning, cruel, and rapacious; he is called 'the wolf of the evening' because he chooses to conceal his movements under the veil of night; this is indeed common to all beasts of prey, but is more proper to him than to the lion, the bear, or the leopard." See Paxton's Illustrations, vol. 1, pp. 536-543; Pliny Nat. Hist. Lib. 10; Cap. 74; Isa. 11: 6.

Bochart Hieroz, part 1, lib. 3, ch. 10.—He is said not to be gregarious. How well then Satan answers in character to "the wolf!"

*Ed. 1674, London: the references mostly to Beza, Piscator, and Lucas Brugensia.

world, not the flesh, neither adversity, nor prosperity, nor you Pharises,) *from my hand*, (that is my power,) by which they are guarded.

29. *My Father*, (He explains what he had said, that no one could snatch them from his hand,) *who gave them me*, (the Father gives believers to the Son to be kept and raised to life,) *is greater*, (that is stronger, or more powerful) *than all*, (creatures, both angels and men, and death and devils.) He is stronger to keep than the adversary to seize. The comparison for the superlative,* the strongest, most powerful, the greatest of all, eternal and omnipotent. *And*, (or therefore, because the Father is greater than they,) *no one can pluck them out of my Father's hand*, since he is omnipotent.

Understand, *nor from my hand therefore*. They then, can take nothing out of the power of the Father. And he adds in verse 30, "I and My Father are one."† *Comp. vv. 36, 38.*

The doctrine of the passage agrees with what we are taught in other parts of the Holy Scriptures, with regard to the power of Christ over the universe, and the consequent security of His church. Eph. 1: 21, 22. He is raised far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come.

All things are put under his feet; he is made head over all things for the benefit of the church, which is his body.

And what can exceed the enumeration that Paul makes in Rom. 8: 35-39? "Though the whole universe were encamped against the solitary Christian, he would still come off more than conqueror." "They are enclosed in the arms of everlasting love." Christ came to destroy the works of the devil: he enters the strong man's house

**Comp. for super. in Greek, see Mat. 18: 32; Mark 4: 32; 1 Cor. 15: 12. Winer's Idioms, Ed. 1850, sec. 36, p. 192.*

† *Lit. "one thing," one in nature, power, etc. "In the Apocalypse, not less than in the Gospel.[of John,] there is found a disposition to represent Christ as of one nature with the Father, to exhibit him as like God in power and honor. The Gospel of John and the Apocalypse are the two books of the New Testament in which this disposition most strikingly displays itself."*—Hengst. Apoc., vol. ii, p. 535.

to spoil his goods. Many of his miracles were intended to show his dominion over the infernal world, which he fully conquered when he ascended on high.* Eph. 4: 8; Luke 19: 18; Rev. 5: 11-14. And how much out of place—what a weakening of the effect, if at the close of these strong declarations—these outbursts of exultation and triumph, it is added, “no *man*, then, can deliver out of his hand.”

After showing in the clearest manner that no one of any class of creatures can deliver his sheep out of his hands; that the wolf may prowl around the fold in any guise, even in sheep’s clothing; that the thief and robber may attempt to force the door, or attempt to climb up some other way without success, it is absurd to limit “none,” οὐδεις, coextensive in meaning with the individuals that make up “all,” παντων, to one class of creatures, “man:” Christ’s argument may be thrown into the form of a hypothetical syllogism:

My sheep are safe; my Father, one with me, protects them:
To take them from Him, requires one stronger than He;
But no one is stronger than He.
Therefore, no one can take them from Him.†

*The Devil and his “legions” of unclean spirits had encroached upon the domain of mind and voluntary action in this world: they had “possessed” men, and entirely controlled them.

“If there was any thing that marked the period of the Lord’s coming in the flesh, and that immediately succeeding it, it was the wreck and confusion of men’s spiritual life. The sense of utter disharmony. * * * The whole period was the hour and power of darkness: of a darkness which then, before the dawn of day, was the thickest. It was exactly the crisis for such soul maladies as these, in which the spiritual and bodily should be thus strangely interlinked: and it is nothing wonderful that they should have abounded at that time.”—Trench on Mir., ed. 1850, p. 134. See also Art. Demoniaes in Kitto’s Cyclop. Bib. Lit. The following most solemn thought is found in Townsend’s Notes on the Gospel, page 77: “It appears to me, also, that the demoniacs powerfully represent to us the state to which all the sons of Adam would have been reduced forever, if the Son of God had not descended from Heaven, to accomplish the wonderful plan of redemption which is revealed in the inspired writings. * * We seldom sufficiently appreciate the incalculable benefit which has already accrued to the world from the influence of the Christian religion.”

† Verse 29, is like many other passages that contain both a positive and a negative statement, “My Father is stronger than all, none can overcome Him.” Ch. 1: 3, “All things were made by him; nothing was made without him.” 1: 20, “He confessed and denied not.” 1 John, 1: 5, “God is light, no darkness is in him.” See Ps. 92: 15; Sam. 3: 2.

This matter of supplied words, not found in the original, but added by the translator, "to express in intelligible English what they believed to be the full signification of a sentence," which are sometimes indicated by Italics, and sometimes not, seems to have made a difficulty, from the edition of 1611, down to the recent thorough revision of the A. B. Society, completed in 1851. And from an investigation instituted on this head, (before 1838,) by the same Society, it was found "that the italicising process had been introduced in as many as eight, to ten thousand instances over and above those which had originated with the translators."*

They all seem to have regarded it as a matter of course to supply "man," not in italics when translating *ουδεις*, "not even one, not the least," emphatic; "no one, no person;" and *Μηδεις*, "not even one, no one, i. e. no one, whoever he may be, from the indefinite and hypothetic power of *μη*."†

But even the revised edition of A. B. S. is not consistent on this point. In a copy before us, dated 1853, the passage now under consideration, has "*man*" in italics, but there are scores of instances probably, where the same word is rendered "no man," not in italics. If Matt. 34: 36, and Mark 12: 32, be compared, (the Greek being almost exactly identical,) we shall see an inconsistency.

Matt. "But of that day and hour knoweth no *man*, no, not the angels," etc. Mark, "But of that day and *that* hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels," etc. 2 Tim. 4: 16, "No man (*ουδεις*) stood with me, but all *men* (*παντες*) forsook me." Is not "man" as much a supplied word as "*men*"? The same thing is found in Heb. 12: 14.

Luke 2: 15, "all men mused in their hearts," *καυρων*.

John 2: 24, "because he knew all *men*," *παντας*.

In Rev. 5: 3, When the *whole universe* was challenged to produce one able to open the book with seven seals, "and no man, *ουδεις*, in Heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able," etc., and when we hear

* Bush's Notes, on Gen., vol. 1., Int. pp. 28, 28.

† Rob. Greek and Eng. Lex.

the grand chorus of "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands" of angels; and when "every creature in Heaven, in the earth and under the earth, and in the sea, ascribe such glory to Christ, for so far exceeding them all, we see the utter inconsistency of rendering *οὐδείς* "no man," as if that were the sense of the original, and Christ were only put in comparison, in this contest, with the *human race*.*

In Rom. 14: 7, the rendering is not consistent in the same verse: "none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself," as if the "no man," was not included in, "none of us." It would be literally "none of us liveth to himself, and none (of us) dieth to himself." Or, "For not unto himself, does any one of us either live or die."†

Nor let it be objected to this discussion that it is hypercritical: that if, in some cases, a word is supplied where it ought not to be; and bears not the mark of such a word where it ought, that is a small matter; that we ought not to find fault with what is in general a good translation, and for the most part perfect.

But it is admitted on all hands that *some* imperfections exist: that these obscure the sense, and constitute a hindrance to the right understanding of the Holy Scriptures, and prevent men from reading, for they will hardly read what is obscure. Every thing then, that tends to remove these imperfections, should be encouraged.—That which was made plain in the words, not of man's wisdom, but of the Holy Ghost, should not be put under a cover in a translation. "The meaning of the Bible is the Bible"; this meaning is in the text. "But it is the text, and strictly nothing but the text, that constitutes the Bible," as the Committee say.‡ We are not to add to the Word of God; nor diminish from it.

Words become things: "words are the daughters of earth, things are sons of Heaven." The changing of a word, however small, in a deed, a bond, or any instrument of writing, or even the removal of a point, by a forger, is a great crime, and may essentially alter the

* Winer's Idioma, 358.

† Life and Ep. of Paul, by Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii., p. 188.

‡ Report, p. 26.

sense: How much, then, may depend upon human admixtures in the Word of God! Great events often follow from insignificant causes*—a minute portion of poison taken by a man may be instantly fatal.

Why should we entertain such a reverence for antiquity, as will prevent us from correcting a few small errors and mistakes, that disfigure our excellent version? Words that have become obsolete; that have changed their meaning, or, as is the case with *let*, to *hinder*, *have reversed it*, might give place to others that have been introduced in the progress of the language. Every field of knowledge has been explored; discoveries have been made in science: investigations in geography and history have been pursued to a great extent; and why should not the stores thus accumulated be applied to improve what might be altered for the better?

But we have neither the ability, nor the desire to discuss the subject of a new English version of the Bible, upon which so much has been long since written, by men of learning on every side. Much may be said for it, and much against it. Dr. Davidson remarks that "the time, learning and labour spent upon the present version were well bestowed. It far surpasses every other English version of the entire Bible in the characteristic qualities of simplicity, energy and purity of style, as also in uniform fidelity to the original."†

But yet, "The obscurity of some passages, especially in the Old Testament; the infelicity and almost ludicrous effect of certain of the modes of expression employed, and the striking indelicacy of others; the arbitrary rendering of certain terms; and the unnecessary introduction, in some instances, of the words distinguished by italics, are blemishes that have been so frequently pointed out as to require no further notice."—English Translations and Translators in Bagster's Hexapla, page 110.

We find errors in the copies of the classic authors that have come down to us from antiquity, and when they are brought to light we do not hesitate to correct them.

* "It is said that a single drop of water falling into a furnace of melted copper, will blow up the whole building."—Bakewell's Geology, p. 254.

† Kitto's Bib. Cyc. Art. Versions, p. 319.

How much labor has been spent upon the text of Homer.

The same is true of the standard English Classics; into which, in the course of successive editions in this country and in England, unauthorized words will creep, disfiguring the text, and affecting the sense. We recur to the original copies and restore the true reading.

How much has been done to remove the mistakes of transcribers, and to correct the errors of the editions of Shakspeare, "nature's darling." What a vast amount of verbal criticism in the various editions of Pope, Theobald, Hamner, Warburton, Dr. Johnson, Stevens, Malone, Rowe, &c. And it is said that Johnson esteemed any correction of the text, whereby the sense of this great author was better illustrated, as a great achievement.

We lately saw a minute correction of this kind in Cowper's notice of the

"Ingenious dreamer, in whose well told tale
Sweet fiction and sweet truth alike prevail."

In all the common copies we read :

"And not with curses on his heart who stole
The gem of truth from his unguarded soul;"

While it should read "on his *art* who stole;" and this correction of only *half a syllable* is now made in the best editions. But what shall we say to the misprint, as all must admit, in Mat. 23: 24, in the phrase, "strain *at* a gnat and swallow a camel," where the sense of the evangelist evidently is, that they strained out of the liquor drank a small insect, but yet would swallow down a camel. "Spoken of those who are formal and diligent in the observance of lesser duties, but negligent in the discharge of higher ones." This, however, is not the sense at present in our translation, but the word "strain" is altogether different from "strain" of the original. We have the idea of great effort in swallowing a gnat in the liquor by the same persons who could swallow a camel.

This error, having been left uncorrected in the first edition of King James' version of 1611, has stood so ever since, though known to be an error. The previous translators had it correct, such as Tyndale's, Cranmer's &c.*

The following instance, furnished by Rev. Justin Perkins, Missionary at Ooroomiah, Persia, will show how much adding or removing a *dot* will affect the meaning. When speaking of the translation of the Scriptures, he remarks: "By the different location of a *dot* new light and vividness are thrown upon a passage of Scripture. A case of this kind occurred a day or two ago. It was in Luke 24: 32, in relation to the conversation between Christ and his two disciples on the way to Emmans: "Did not our hearts *burn* within us?"

In the printed version it is *yakeed, burn*, the same as in English. But my translator, a Nestorian Priest, questioned the correctness of this reading; and on referring to a manuscript copy of the New Testament, about five hundred years old, instead of "*yakeed,*" "*burn,*" we found "*yakeer,*" *heavy* or *dull*; the difference being simply in the location of a point, which, in one case, being placed *below* the final letter of the word, made it *Daled*, and in the other case, placed above it, made it *Raish*. According to the ancient manuscript, the verse in question would read: "And they said one to another, were not our hearts *heavy* (or *dull*—reproaching themselves for being slow of understanding,) while he talked to us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures: a reading which certainly loses nothing of beauty

* See note in Adam Clarke's Com., remarks of N. Websters, in Knickerbocker, April, 1836.

As it may be a matter of interest to some we will give the passage as it stands in some of the previous translations:

1. Wicklif, 1380: "Blinde leders clensing a gnat, but swolowinge a camel."
2. Tyndale, 1534: "Ye blinde gydes which strayne out a gnat and swallow a cammyl."
3. Crammer, 1539: "Ye blynde gydes which strayne out a gnat and swalowe a camell."
4. Geneva, 1557: "Ye blynde guydes which strayne out a gnate and swallow a cammel."
5. Rheims, 1582: "Blinde guides that straine a gnat and swallow a camel." (This is the Catholic version.)

and force when compared with our own version."—A. B. Repository, January, 1841, page 15.

Dr. Perkins does not seem to know that there is any authority in the Greek manuscripts for the ancient Syriac reading. But Beza found in one manuscript instead of *καιομένη*, *burning*, *κακαλυμμένη*, covered, veiled.

In favor of this it might be said: 1. It agrees with verse 16, "their eyes were hidden." 2. It is only an acknowledgment of what Christ said in verse 25, "O fools (without understanding,) and slow of heart:" q. d. "How blind we were," etc. "How true was what he said unto us 'fools,' etc." 3. It agrees with what is said of opening their eyes in verse 31, (eye, mind and heart, all being spoken of as veiled, covered, blinded, dull, or opened.) This blindness was now removed, perhaps by their seeing in his hands the print of the nails, while he "brake the bread and gave it to them." 4. It agrees with what Paul says of the Jews: 2 Cor. 3: 15. These disciples were dull of mind when Christ "opened to them the Scriptures;" when of course, (verse 27,) he expounded the prophecies of the Testament. And Paul says, "when Moses is read, the veil, *καλυμμα*, is upon their heart."—See Poole's Synopsis in loco. and *Biblia Sacra Quadrilingua* of Reineccius.

Since the above was written we have been favored with a history of the passage that has been the main subject of this discussion, and of the changes it has undergone. Dr. McLane, who was employed by the A. B. Society in the late revision, and who is now engaged in re-writing the record of the results of that recension, has through a friend, furnished the following valuable information:

In John x: 28, 29:

The translators, 1611, put, - - - - - { 28, no man.
29, no man.

The four copies collated by the Committee:

1. London, ed. 1845.	} - - - - -	28, any man.
2. Oxford, ed. 1846.		29, no man.
3. Cambridge, ed. 1844.		
4. Edinburgh, ed. 1845,	- - - - -	{ 28, any. 29, none.

The A. B. Society, previous to the late revision, followed the Edinburgh. Of the translations before King James', 1611,

Wickliffe, 1380, has	- - - - -	{ 28, noon.
		{ 29, no man.
Tyndale, 1534,	- - - - -	{ 28, any man.
		{ 29, no man.
Cranmer, 1539,	- - - - -	{ 28, eny man.
		{ 29, no man.
Genevan ed. 1557,	- - - - -	{ 28, any man.
		{ 29, no man.
Rheims, 1582,	- - - - -	{ 28, no man.
		{ 29, no man.*

The reading of the Edinburgh ed. was introduced at an early period. We find it in the London copy of 1660: and so it continued in the English copies till the revision of Dr. Blaney in 1767, when it was fixed as now printed by A. B. Society, viz: 28, "any *man*;" 29, "no *man*."

* These readings are given in Bagster's English Hexapa; where it is remarked, in the introduction, page 83, that the Genevan N. T., 1557, has the advantage of "the insertion in italics of all words introduced to develop the meaning, but which have no corresponding words in the original." That is, this is the first translation which was marked with this feature: the whole Bible was not printed till 1560.

ARTICLE IV.

LIFE OUT OF DEATH.

One of the most striking, solemn and instructive facts in the whole history of the redemption is this:—that Christ's eternal victory was won through apparent defeat. What an easy, ready triumph his foes obtained! They had long held back, plotting and failing—attempting and retreating—because "they feared the people." They had gnashed their teeth in helpless rage at the displays of his mighty power, because they saw in it a possibility of defeat, even if they stole away the heart of

the people. So many things had to combine, before they could gain their end, that it was after many consultations that they resolved to commit themselves by an attempt. The caprice of the populace must run for the hour with them; their own two hostile parties must agree together; the wilful, despotic Roman Governor must join in the work and condemn without cause; and miracle must hold its bright and terrible hand.

All did combine. The serpent's head was reared; his eyes glittered with expectation and rage; the sharp fang was buried in the sacred flesh! It shuddered: that patient, lofty head dropped down in anguish; the heart that "loved the world" gave a deep groan and a cry of more than mortal pain, whereat the earth trembled and rent her garment of rock, and the bright sun veiled himself in sorrow. That heart burst with mingled pity and agony, and poured out its blood.

Thus had Satan and sin *conquered*.

Yet one might almost wonder that the very *ease* of the victory had not awakened their fears. *Too much* consented to the deed; God had too large a hand in it for their safety. So, at least, it proved. Within that earthen vessel stood a lamp of heavenly fire; when that broke beneath their blows, this shone forth upon them—dazzled and discomfited them. They smote those frail, cumbrous human defences, and they yielded and fell down—only that the King, invulnerable, almighty, might look them into ruin. That which fell, fell upon the serpent's head and crushed it: He who stood needed not to strike a blow—He lived, and that destroyed them.

Thus there was an apparent defeat here, in that Christ died by their conspiracy; but within that was a real, a perfect, an eternal victory; for the death of the man was the life of the Saviour. But note here, that not only did the two thus go together; the one was necessary to the other. If Jesus had not so died, Christ could not so have lived and reigned. "Without shedding of blood," saith the Scripture, "there is no *remission of sin*." In that dread sacrifice was infolded *the atonement*. So slight, comparatively, was the discharge, and so mighty the recoil! The adversary did but strike one *weak and perishing human frame*; and from the wound poured

forth balm for multitudes of sick, imperilled souls. All his strength was brought together for that contest; and our dear Lord, gathering all the spears into his own breast, fixed them there; and the enemy, disarmed and vanquished, began to perish utterly and forever, from the day of his seeming victory.*

By his dying, the Lord Jesus Christ made atonement for sin—he purchased the Holy Spirit—he ransomed innumerable souls—he magnified God's law—he glorified the Father—he prepared a human body to sit upon the mediatorial throne—in a word, he wrote the Gospel and built a new heaven. And to all that, an apparent failure was necessary.

Now Paul, the profoundest and weightiest thinker, perhaps, that ever lived, saw that this was only the most illustrious example of a great law; that just as we must bury the seed to reap the harvest, the best successes must be won through a temporary and seeming defeat. And he declares that he—and all such as he—lived on that great principle,—consenting to disappointments, hardships, and the appearance of subjection and defeat, that the same kind of victory might follow. He knew the imperishableness of good; he knew it was its way to break through clouds and darkness with its beam of peace. He rejoiced to remember that the Gospel, though it walked in a disguise of weakness—though it veiled its ministers in a show of inferiority to human weakness—was yet “the power of God and the wisdom of God,” not defeated, but advancing, with swift invisible banner, “unto salvation.” They bore about with them, as the apparel of the spirit, the dying of the Lord Jesus, knowing that thus they made it sure that the life of Jesus would be made manifest in them.—2 Cor. 4: 10.

* There is a likeness here, and an infinite contrast within the likeness, which suggests the story of Arnold Winkelried, the patriot-martyr of Switzerland. The reader will hardly need to be reminded, how—when the Swiss army had thrown itself in vain, though desperately upon the solid spear-front of the Austrians, and had been nearly defeated by its passive strength—Winkelried, feeling in his rough and gallant heart, that one man must sacrifice himself for his country, sprang forward, crying “Make way for liberty,” caught the points of six spears in his hand and drew them together into his breast. While they were entangled and detained in his dying body, his comrades rushed through the gap he had made, defeated the Austrians, and saved Switzerland.

Let us look a little into this matter; let us consider whether this is indeed a law of nature, that apparent defeat must usually infold real spiritual victories: and if we find it so, we shall have some important inferences to draw, touching both truth and duty. As it is a question of spiritual life, it may apply either to the individual Christian, or to the church.

Looking now to the Christian himself, we remark first; that this truth is seen in his *conversion*. He has had a kind of life before. A heart and mind have lived and wrought in him. He has thought, and known, and judged, many things; the child's experiments, enlarged and corrected, have built up the man's experience. The eye that once saw only external facts, has come to understand principles—has turned within and begun to comprehend itself. The power of reasoning unfolds and grows strong by exercise; prudence and self-command appear among the restless passions, and wield them; taste forms, and speaks, in fine and delicate discrimination, the pleasures of the man. *Affections* live in him. Parents, family and friends are cherished; he takes delight in them, and in ministering to them. Generosity, patience, courage, friendship—these are the outshoots of a large and a living heart.

No wonder, with such a spirit—made glad with such graces—that life is dear and beautiful. The manly heart, unfolding slow and shapely, builds up its plans, lays out its riches of youthful strength, confers its confidences, sets its affections. Its very dreams are light and airy—its hopes buoyant—it rises elastic under the pressure of wholesome toil and difficulty.

But look closer: right in the centre of this garden-plot of manhood, is there not a barren—yea, a cursed and blasted spot? Thickly was all sown; human virtues, joys, and powers, came up and flourished; but the seed of heaven that fell here, lies numb and sightless beneath the soil. *The love of God has not a solitary fibre in that heart!* It can look out upon the world of beauty, order and delight, and not swell with praise—or, at the utmost, with barren, unobedient praise alone. It can acknowledge its life preserved amid innumerable perils, without one burst of gratitude—one hearty purpose to repay its

debt. *The affections of a God are lavished here without the smallest return.* This we call death in life.

And now, the blight that rested only here, has spread—not, perhaps, to the world's knowledge, but to his own dismay. He is convicted of sin. The strength and wisdom that were to have secured his happiness, fail of that end, and grow some way weak or foolish in his sight. The beauty and the grace of life are fled; its pleasures weary; its danger alarms him. An offended God shines out upon him, terrible exceedingly. Conscientious at last of sin—broken in pride—tired of his idols and despising them, he turns away, resolved to be a new creature. But alas, his heart is not in his hand. It does not obey his feeble wish. His nature rebels against him. This again kindles his fears; he sees the wrath of God flame out against him; he is appalled by his guilt, danger, and helplessness combined. Hope dies out, his heart faints with shame and sorrow: and at the word of God the old nature expires.

But see! all is not dead. While the gloom and chill of ruin fall around, see in the once dark centre a light shines. In the very death-agony of that nature which perished, a new nature was born within. The graces that were there before, reappear. The hopes and joys that can survive the surrender of the soul to God, adorn the new man, as they sustained the old. But chief of all is this, where death reigned, in that central temple where God should have been, *God is*. The love of God has sprung up there at His word, who said: Let light be, and light was. And from that seed of light unfold the heavenly, the saintly faculties, that never lived in him before. In his dying, he was born again. And this dying had to be, that the regeneration might be. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." The old heart perished and sloughed off; and under its clay throbbed a new heart, whose life and joys are everlasting. Now the terms are reversed; we have here life in death.

Chastenings bless us, secondly, on the same principle. Afflictions are just the breaking down under us of some plan, or some hope, or some confidence, or some affection, for which we cared too much. Too much of our

life was bound up in it. Our worldly successes and pleasures were absorbing the strength of our hearts and hopes and feelings. Prayer, meekness, Christian charity, spiritual-mindedness, pined and weakened daily, being sacrificed to this pampered, favorite passion. Or our parental pride and joy shot up and spread out, crowding out and killing the better plants of faith, love, holiness. Through the deep shadow God shone not; religion began to fail and perish. The wrong life—the lower life—was thriving; the true life was dying out.

But behold, the pillar of our pride is fallen: reverses overtake us; friends desert and denounce us; the child of too wild and blind affections is snatched out of our arms. Like rank weeds plucked up in the morning, the heart's strong passions collapse and wither. The deformed remnants of the old nature that would not die before, now crumble; and with them is cut away the crest of pride, the hand of avarice, or the eye of wrath and revenge. And see, as the hard and leprous crust dissolves and disappears—see the childlike tenderness, softness, meekness and faith, which God has made to live again! A timid hope shines in the tearful eye. The face that was dark with sordid human thoughts and cares, is lighted up with a heavenly reconciliation. The functions of the Christian nature are fulfilled—prayer, praise, confession, covenant—all are entered with new life. Every faculty awakes and works and prospers. Peace, like a river, flows through his heart. Under the pressure of sorrow, and the influence of the Holy Spirit, he has crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts; and he has strengthened the good that remaineth in him, which was ready to die.

But most strikingly do we see the working of the law, thirdly, in that event which closes life below for us. These frames, so delicate, yet so enduring; so complicated and weak, yet quickened from within with a vitality so fine and strong, these frames do perish day by day. Some particles of the dust knit up to man are every hour wrested from their place and borne away: but the strong life within replaces them according to some subtle and yet undiscovered laws. Thus, continually, do death and life contend for us, whose we shall be!

Having obtained help of God, we continue until now. The seasons, the toils, and the diseases that distract a sinful world, make their assaults upon us, and we have not fallen under them. Gradually, we wear out, and our resources, once so abundant, grow scanty and meagre, and chill. The heart must economise its failing blood. The warmth which once visited our very fingertips with a quiet glow, is gathered frugally into the weak body. The flesh shrivels; the mellow voice forgets its music; the exquisite senses are dulled, or dead.

Where now is that victorious strength of life, from which all shocks, toils, injuries, seemed to rebound without hurt to us? Where is the high heart that laughed at risks and efforts? Where is the youthful pride that counted all things possible to courage, energy and patience? The shadows lengthen; the frosts of winter evening silver the scattered hairs; happy—happy, if Heaven's stars begin to shine, as the sun of human life descends! As for man's body in this world, it is encompassed with destructions: its enemies are like the waves of the sea, and it is the poor wrecked and helpless sailor that buffets them for a while, and then is seen no more! Death, to this physical frame, is a *defeat*.

But it is with a few only that Death waits for this descent of the worn body into the grave of age—this, his natural harvest-time. He comes upon the greater part of men in a sudden combat, and discomfits them. We thought we walked firmly in health and safety; and here we are, drifted far out into the dark and hungry ocean! The heart beats breathless—desperately; the coursing blood doubles its speed; the eye gleams with wasted strength and fire. Friends help us, their little utmost. We ply the remedies; there is a running to and fro; a little rally—a great fall. The pulse flickers—stops—begins again—obeys the pressure of a mighty hand, and is still. In this form also, death is a defeat.

And yet, to the Christian, it is only that last swerve in the unbroken course of life which perfects his victory. Look at this frame-work—this empty tabernacle—this clay, that retains a certain sacredness, even in the dust; this is Death's conquest—only this. In all his wide domain, there is not one bound or conquered spirit of a

believer—not one. So far as concerns them, his trophies are all these wrecks. The frail vessels he has seized; but the lading, the precious jewelry, you must seek elsewhere. While the stricken and prone body confessed his might, the invulnerable soul stood up before him, and defied it; then, without an effort—not so much as spreading a pinion for flight, it—no—he—he took his swift straight flight into his Saviour's joy. Thither let your faith follow him—consider the safety, the holiness, the light of heavenly favour, the immortal health, and love, and joy, in which he dwells—see his bright companions, and the glory they wear—look up to Jesus, our King, welcoming the tried heart to its rest in him, and crowning it with ever-new delights,—walk by that river of life, clear as crystal, and know the healing sweetness of its waters, and listen to its music;—the tears are wiped away; the guilty stains are vanished; the deformed and wicked heart is *perfect*:—and then say if it is not almost irony to ask with Paul—“Oh death, where is thy sting?”

Even that house of clay that lies tenantless for a time, shall be desolate only for a time: the strong and living spirit shall recapture it, in the resurrection, and dwell in it again, made pure and immortal. Not even that poor trophy shall death retain. In our flesh shall we see God; and death and hell shall be cast into the lake of fire. Is it not true, now, that this apparent discomfiture which we call death, is only the harsh, strong wrappage of our greatest victory? The one is necessary to the other; our real triumph grows out of our seeming defeat.

Before we leave this, notice *what that is* on which defeat, calamity and death are wreaked, and what that is which conquers. If you look out into the world of nature, you find examples of this same law in lower kinds. The chrysalis is destroyed that the butterfly may have being. “The seed is not quickened, except it die;” *i. e.* the mass perishes that the germ may shoot forth and grow. Just thus, in a far higher form, is it with the Christian, as we have seen. That which once had a life of its own, becomes the mere envelope of a *seed-life*; bears the germ of a finer and better life within. When its day to be born shall come, the old must burst and

shrivel and pass away. The first and carnal nature, with all its evil, served us to grow up, and receive our characters, and be impressed with heavenly truth,—endured, until God's day to quicken us from above with a new life; and then, under His hand it died. The believer being still tainted with sin, in his daily contact with worldly interests and temptations, becomes incrustated with a hard, unheavenly temper: but God in his goodness, creates and hides beneath it *a new man*—the elements of a better, happier, truer believer; and in His own season, when all is ready, He strikes with the hand of affliction the old shell—and lo! the lost saint reappears. Thus is it also, in the death of the body. Everywhere, that which perishes has become a mere envelope—the seed's husk—the soul's tabernacle; and the life which is secreted within shines out instead.

The second aspect of our subject concerns the life of the church; it may be far more briefly disposed of.

The greatest blessings and victories of the church have always come upon her in *persecutions*. The death of Christ, which was indeed the first persecution, was the travail and birth-hour of the church; and in that likeness stands all her best history. Let us turn to the Acts of the Apostles and see, viii: 1, “And at that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout Judea and Samaria, except the Apostles. 4. Therefore they that were scattered abroad *went everywhere preaching the word,*” at first (xi: 19,) “to the Jews only. 20. And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come to Antioch, *spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus.* 21. And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord.” Now, let us compare the defeat and the victory—the life and the death.

The church at Jerusalem was scattered; homes were broken up—friends and kindred parted for a time—plans of usefulness disappointed—privileges lost; and one Apostle and several believers laid down their lives for the testimony of Jesus. Their foes rejoiced, and they sorrowed, each for “a little while.” On the other hand, hundreds of churches, to speak moderately, were found-

ed, for the one that was obscured; nations heard for the first time the Gospel; thousands of souls were enlightened and redeemed; and above all, the real, practical conversion of the masses of the Gentile world began and prospered. Which was the greatest—the dying, or the living, of the church at Jerusalem?

So has it ever been. How many churches of the old world had to die this temporary and seeming death, that religion might live in this land as it has never lived in a nation before! The covenanters must be scattered on their hills—their martyrs kneel and die before the musket—their pastors languish in exile and sorrow—and a show of triumph crown the king's cruel plans. The Puritans, assembled in stern and secret conclave, must forswear the shores of England. The bloodiest massacre in modern history must stain the soil of France. Everywhere, travail, sorrow and defeat begun the liberty and light of America.

And these things are not finished. As soon as a new element is wanted here, a new ferocity breaks out somewhere, and seems to conquer. Ireland, Germany, Norway, share the history of Scotland, England and France. Last of all, the bigotry of Portugal has smitten Madeira with the same sword; and from her peasantry comes forth a new church, to fill up the measure of prayer and religion that must shine here. These simple pious hearts have borne in their bodies the dying of the Lord Jesus, and the life also of Jesus is made manifest in them.

Once more; it seems to be the fate of every church organization to die outwardly, and renew its life from above, in apparent disaster.

There forms, in the course of its commerce with an obstinate and guilty world,—there forms a shell of evil customs, formalities,—a thread-bare, lifeless doctrinality,—that has to perish, that the real church within may live. That shell may continue in being, but it is cast off from the true body of the church, and is confessed and seen to be, not a living, but a dead body. The Reformation is the most illustrious case in point. The pomps and vain shows of Rome, covered no throbbing heart of Christ's church, but a mass of festering infidelity and vice. The life-centre was transferred, and in Germany

the living church burst through the painted husk, and grew up into Protestantism.

The same thing is seen now in Persia, Turkey, and Syria. The Nestorian and Armenian are ancient Christian churches; but the whole organization is dead; the service and Scripture are in a dead language; the doctrine is a form of dead words; the priesthood is dead to duty and to zeal. But the little life-seed is there; and God's blessing on the missionaries' labour is bringing it to germinate and put forth, fresh and beautiful. The missionaries tried to preserve the old churches, but God's counsel was not so. He has driven them forth, saying "Come out from them, and be ye separate."

The hand of bigotry has driven them out, man by man, and thus constrained them to organize new churches. Out of death sprung life.

Is not this to be, in great measure, the history of the Church? What we call Revolutions, are they not *evolutions*?—unfoldings of young life out of the exhausted and decaying body? Is it not thus that principles are to maintain their immortality, by surviving what once sheltered them, and in forming other frames with life?—"Heaven and earth"—though they were made by the word of the Lord—"shall pass away; but the word of the Lord" itself, "shall never pass away."

The length of this article constrains us to content ourselves with two remarks. The first relates to the Christian; the second to the Church.

We have here the key to the Christian's various discouragements, and the true argument against his despondency. When afflictions or spiritual darkness beset him, we are entitled to say: "Faint not! it is not thou that art dying or canst die. Something about thee, no doubt, is coming to an end;" we die daily; but it is only the envelope, the tabernacle of the soul. The flesh shall be consumed away, but the spirit that has loved God lives forever. "Give up that which is evidently departing, though it seems to be giving up life. Death is a release from the toil, the protracted strife of agony, of dying. Whether it be in this world or another, as dying ends, a better life begins."

Perhaps no other error has cost the church so many

tears and sins, as fixing her eye on outward prosperity. The outward life is, for her, "the flesh." When her funds increase, when her discord and jealousies die away, when the world's respect takes shape and voice to praise her, she is prone to say, "I am rich, and have need of nothing." Precisely then is the chill of death coming upon the prosperous frame, and the life-lamp is drawn away by a silent hand into some humble corner of it, to quicken a little germ that shall grow up to strength and beauty some day. One of two things must be: either she must take warning in time and renew her purely spiritual life by repentance and prayer—her *purely spiritual* life, not the mere life of action, but the life of love;—or the hand of Providence must part the dead mass and the living particle, and bring that particle through throes and sorrows to independent existence.

Let not the afflicted church be discouraged; let her see to it that it is the dying of *the Lord Jesus* that is manifest in her, and the life of Jesus shall soon spread and triumph there. If she will not, He must.

ARTICLE V.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

The Book of Job is of inestimable value in the history of the church. It is justly considered, perhaps, *the oldest* of the inspired writings, and it seems to have been composed and preserved with the express design of unfolding to all succeeding ages what was the amount of religious knowledge—what was the perfection of religious character, and what was the private and public walks of the sons of God: and what was the association which they held with each other, and with the people of the world in these early times, covered with the mists of far distant ages.

It sets the men of God before us, living, moving, and having their being in the church and in the world, just as they appear now. In this book the world of the Pa-

triarchs is made bare to our eye. Christians appear in life before us in all the New Testament, and then in the Old; running back from Ezra and Nehemiah, through Prophets, Priests and Kings up to the Judges, to Moses, and Aaron and Miriam—to the twelve Patriarchs—to Jacob, Isaac, Abram, and finally to Noah and Job, and Enoch: thus making known the same God, the same Saviour, the same spirit, the same faith, the same practice—the same blessed covenant of grace, working its mercies in the church and in the world, even from the beginning.

The character—the life of Job is, beyond all the Patriarchs previous to the life time of Abraham, drawn out in the greatest minuteness and force, and serves as an example and illustration of all the rest. He who reads Job, reads of all the early saints of God in him. With what delight then do we open this ancient book?—this book that speaks to us out of these early ages, otherwise needing light and illustration drawn from the men that lived in them? Well has the Book of Job been called a “Depository of Patriarchal Religion.” Not that the religion of the Patriarchs differed in faith and substance from the religion of Prophets and Apostles, for it was the same, but because this book shows us that it *was* the same, and makes the word of God one harmonious whole: one continuous revelation and development of the Covenant of Grace.

Job was an inspired Prophet of God: reckoned by God Himself worthy of a place with Noah and Daniel. Ezek. 14: 14, 20; and set forth as an example of patience to the church. James 5: 11. So far as the testimony of the Word of God goes, we see no reason to suppose that his Book was written by any other than *Job himself*: the few words recording his death were added of course by another hand. No book admitted into the Bible is written by any but inspired men.

He was an inhabitant of the land of *Uz*: that portion of country no doubt first occupied by Uz, the son of Aram. Gen. 10: 23. We have no record to guide us in fixing the position of the land of Uz, but the Bible. And in three places only is the land of Uz spoken of. Here in the Book of Job, 1: 1; again in Jeremiah 25:

20, in immediate connection with Egypt on the one hand and Philistia on the other: and it must have been of some extent, as Jeremiah says, "And all the Kings of the land of Uz," and again by Jeremiah in Lam. 4: 21, "Rejoice and be glad, O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz." Uz originally included Edom. How far eastward into Arabia it extended, is not said. None of the boundaries of the land are given. It lay southward of and inclusive of Edom, extending eastward. Hence Job is called one of "the sons of the East." How far east it extended, how near Chaldea, we do not know.

Job lived after his afflictions 143 years, and then died old and full of days, 42: 16-17. How old he was when they fell upon him, is not revealed: but we may conjecture, from the fact that he was the father of seven sons and three daughters—that he was in his possessions "the greatest of all the sons of the East"—and was a man highly honored, and of note and fame—he could not have been less than 70 years of age. This would make him at the time of his death 210 years old: which age throws him fully up to the time of Abraham, who lived but 175 years, Gen. 25: 7-8, and it is said "he died in a good old age—an old man and full of years:" nay, it throws Job beyond Abraham, and beyond Nahor.—Abraham's grand-father, who lived only 148 years, even to the times of *Serug*, the father of Nahor, who lived 230 years.—Gen. 11: 22-25. The age of Job is an important consideration in fixing the period in which he lived.

He was at least cotemporary with Abraham; most probably before him, as he makes no mention of Abraham, nor any of the circumstances of his life, nor of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. He lived before the Church of God went into captivity in Egypt, and before its deliverance and settlement in Canaan; for in all the Book of Job there is no conclusive mention of any of these facts, nor of God's wonders in Egypt, and in the Desert, and in the Promised Land, and no reference to any of the institutions, rites, ceremonies, or officers of the church. His Book belongs to a period anterior to this.

We have indulged in these brief remarks upon this

interesting book for the sole purpose of directing attention to its antiquity, which makes it, aside from many other considerations, of so great value in the history of the church.

Although, perhaps, the oldest book in the world, (and the great body of it is *poetry*!) it is not exceeded by any in the Scriptures in the purity of its language, in the simplicity, the force, and point of its style; in the closeness of its reasonings—the variety and magnificence of its imagery: the grandeur of its conceptions and descriptions, nor in its depth of pathos and fervour of piety. It forever shames into silence the presumptuous folly of men, who, with a boast of learning, and full of an overweening self-sufficiency, pretend to speak of the ages in which the Patriarchs lived, as the infancy of the church and of the world, and who are forever prating of progress and of development, and fastening upon the Scriptures their heartless, Christless, and Godless theories of religion and of the church.

The moral of the book—aside from its being a depository of Patriarchal religion, and filling up a chasm otherwise left open—is to teach, that God sometimes permits the best of men, the most upright and perfect of his children, to be led into afflictions, temptations and trials: for the manifestations of their characters, and for the illustration of the power of His grace, and of his own unflinching faithfulness—that this world is one of trial, and not a world in which perfect retributions are meted out to the evil and the good: nor are the reasons of the afflictions of God always immediately or certainly known—that all God's dispensations and the mysteries of His government will be fully explained to His glory in the world to come: and, therefore, we are to judge nothing before the time: but steadfast in the faith, exercise submission and patience, looking forward to final redemption and glory through Him, who is the promised Redeemer of his people.

The main objects of inquiry with us at present are, first, *the doctrines of religion as made known to us in the Book of Job:—his own religious character:—and the light which is thereby thrown on the religious intelligence and piety of the times in which he lived.*

Of the doctrines, we observe that Job teaches of *God*. That he is a Spirit—invisible.—9: 11; 23: 8-9.

The only true God, and proper object of all religious homage and worship.—28: 12-28.

Omniscient and omnipresent—the Searcher of hearts. 9: 13-18; 13: 19; 21: 22; 26: 6; 34: 21-22.

The Almighty—doing wonders, executing His will in heaven above and in the earth beneath.—9: 1-19; 11: 10; 26: 6-14; 34: 29.

The Great Ruler and Governor of the Universe, which He has made, 37: 1-22, and exercising a special and controlling Providence over all angels and men and creatures, both animate and inanimate.—1: 6, 22; 2: 1-10; 12: 9-25. See the whole book.

Just—9: 1-2; 10: 14-15; 13: 8; 34: 19, 28, rendering to every man according to his works.

Independent.—33: 13; 35: 5-11.

Immense, unsearchable.—11: 1-9.

Self-existent, unchangeable.—23: 13; 36: 22; 37: 23.

Most Holy.—25: 4-6; 34: 10-12.

A prayer-hearing and sin-pardoning God, through the merits of the Redeemer to come.—1: 5; 42: 8-10; 19: 25-27.

The descriptions of God and of His works, and of His Providence are not exceeded for awful majesty, sublimity and glory in any other portion of the Word of God.—Chapters 38-41.

He teaches that *the Redeemer of men* ever-liveth their hope and confidence, and to appear at the last day for the final redemption of soul and body, 19: 24-27, and herein we recognize the teachings of Enoch on this subject. Jude, vs. 14-15.

He also makes us acquainted with the existence and agency of *the Holy Spirit*: 26: 13; 33: 4, working efficiently, and giving life and power to the works of God.

He thus reveals the persons in the Godhead:

Of Angels, he affirms the existence and agency of both those which are evil and those which are good.—1: 6-19; 2: 1-8; 38: 7. We have in Job for the first time the name of Satan given—the Prince of the fallen angels, the Devil. He is called by way of eminence, as we say,

The Adversary—Satan. Comp. Job 1: 6; 2: 1, with Zech. 3: 1-2, and Rev. 12: 10. The idea that Satan in Job 1: 6, and 2: 1, is one of the angels, the good angels, waiting around the Throne of God, who proposes the trial of Job, is, to say the least, ridiculous. Satan is now brought to view as "going to and fro in the earth, and walking up and down in it" by the permission of God, "considering" the characters of men, and putting them to the proof by his temptations and trials.

Of man, Job teaches that our first father, Adam, sinned and endeavored to hide his transgressions—31: 33—that man is formed out of clay and returns at death to dust—33: 6; 34: 1-5; 19: 26—that he is born in sin—25: 1-4; 14: 4: 15; 14-16—altogether depraved and defiled before a Holy God: destitute of all righteousness for justification before Him—9: 20-21. His most perfect works and best endeavors are all defective and defiled, and neither to be boasted of nor trusted in—9: 30-31; 10: 15, and man needs only to have just views of the majesty, holiness and justice of God, to be overwhelmed with a sense of his weakness and vileness, and to abhor himself and repent in dust and ashes—40: 1-5; 42: 1-6.

He teaches that true wisdom or religion is "the one thing needful" to man: of priceless value, above gold, the gold of Ophir: above silver, and above the precious stones and jewels. It is not to be found by human effort either in the land or in the sea, it is not perceived by the eyes of living men: and that God only prepares it and bestows it upon men—28: 12-28. "Behold the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding."—v. 28.

He teaches that repentance is commanded of God—36: 10—that it precedes forgiveness—11: 14-20; 22: 21-23; 33: 27-28,—and forgiveness comes through faith: 1: 5; 42: 8-10, in that atoning blood to be shed by the coming Redeemer—19: 25. We are consequently accepted, forgiven, justified, through faith. Impenitency is ruin—34: 24-28. That it was the unbelief and wicked impenitency and rebellion of mankind that drew upon the world the awful judgment of the Flood—22: 15-18. The wicked shall be destroyed—21: 1-34; ch. 24, etc.

He teaches that those who are righteous before God, who are His true worshippers, shall never fall from their high profession; but their sanctification being a progressive work in them, shall be carried on unto perfection—17: 9.

That the child of God walks by faith: that an habitual reliance upon, and a looking forward to the glorious appearing of the Lord, from Heaven, our Redeemer, sustains him in all duty, and under every trial—19: 25-27.

That there is to be in the last day, when the heavens shall be removed out of their place, a resurrection of the dead: 14: 10-15; 19: 25-27, of the same bodies, destroyed by worms, and returned back to dust, but changed to behold God in glory.

And that resurrection followed by a judgment: and that judgment by the blessedness of the righteous, which shall consist in the full vision and fruition of God: and the contrary is involved, the destruction of the wicked and their banishment from the presence of God! 19: 25-27.

Job understood, and by the grace of God, embraced all these fundamental and saving doctrines. What now, may we inquire, was *the religious character of Job*, as discovered in his book? The Holy Searcher of hearts calls him "My servant Job: there is none like him in the earth—a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil." 1: 8; 2: 3; 28: 28.

His religious character is identified with that of all the true saints of God in all ages of the world: although in greater perfection than is to be met with in multitudes. He was born of the Spirit, through the word, and all the fruits of the Spirit appeared in his heart and life. His piety was that of the Covenant of Grace.

Briefly then,—he was a believer. By faith he embraced the great Redeemer of Sinners, promised of God from the beginning: typified in sacrifices—preached by Patriarchs before him, and commended by their own examples of faith in Him.—1: 5; 42: 8-9; 19: 25-27.

The fruits of this faith appeared in his prayerful, 1: 5, watchful, 31: 1-40, holy life, Ezk. 14: 14-20.

He faithfully discharged his duty as a man of God,

in his family—towards his wife: 2: 9-10, his children: 1: 5, his servants: 31: 13-15,—towards his brethren in the Lord: 42: 8-9, and towards all men with whom he stood in any way connected.

He was an upright and just man: 29: 14; ch. 31. Charitable: 29: 15-16; ch. 31. Merciful: 30: 25; 31: 29-31. Hospitable: 31: 32. The friend and benefactor of the poor: 29: 12; ch. 31. Visiting and protecting the fatherless and widows in their affliction: 29: 12-13; ch. 31. The defender of the weak and oppressed: 29: 17. Of perfect morality in all the relations of life. Sincere and upright in his profession: ch. 31: 1-23, he served God, not from selfish and worldly considerations, but out of supreme affection: 1: 9-22; 2: 4-10. In the day of his greatest prosperity he never made gold his trust, but abhorred covetousness: 1: 21: ch. 31, and turned in horror from idolatry: 31: 24-28. He ever felt his own dependence and sinfulness and unworthiness before God: 13: 23, etc., and used the world as though he used it not: ch. 31. He loved the law of God more than his necessary food: 23: 12, and submitted with patient resignation to his darkest and deepest afflictions, reposing an unshaken trust in God: 1: 21-22; 2: 9-10; 13: 15, and strengthening himself in his living Redeemer and looking beyond his present sorrow to the resurrection and to final happiness with God: 19: 25-27.

Under his overwhelming afflictions he gave way to his grief and lamented that ever he was born: yea, he cursed the day of his birth and contended with his friends that he could charge himself with no particular transgressions for which he was justly suffering, and felt willing to appeal to God for his justification. Yet when God revealed his sovereignty, holiness and glory; he humbled himself beneath his mighty hand, and owned his righteous judgments: yea, he abhorred himself in his sinfulness and repented in dust and ashes: 40: 1-5; 42: 1-6. He forgave his friends their unkindness, and sacrificed and made prevalent intercessions for them: 42: 8-9. In like manner when it pleased God to remove his hand from him, and to turn the hearts of his relations and friends (who had forsaken him in his days of sorrow,) in affectionate sympathy towards him, and inclined them

to contribute to his comfort, and the repair of his fortunes, Job received them back to his embraces, without reproaches, and accepted gratefully the assistance which they offered him. (42 : 10. 11.)

The Lord brought his afflictions to a happy end ; he was very pitiful, and of tender mercy to his servant, who had, when tried, so well endured. James 5 : 11. He added unto him double his former wealth : the same number of sons and of daughters which he had before, and a further life of one hundred and forty years, and finally, when old and full of days, he peacefully died, and was gathered to his fathers.

The Book of Job, now very briefly considered, casts *great light upon the faith and piety of the people of God in the ages immediately succeeding the flood*, and we may well believe its light shines across that flood, and illumines the world that went before it.

That Faith, and that Piety, were the same then, that they have been ever since : the Faith and Piety peculiar to the Covenant of Grace : the whole Word of God recognizes none other.

Faith in Christ—"the seed of the woman"—to come—was the same living principle then, that it is now : its transforming, powerful, permanent effects, the same then as now. The same clear view and conception of the whole Person and work of the Redeemer, was not so fully enjoyed then as now : but enough was known, enough was understood, to draw the souls of men to Him, and the same spirit that now seals Christ and all his benefits to believers, sealed them then. There was but one true Religion then, on earth, as now : the religion of the Covenant of Grace. The people of God were known and read of all men : and were as distinct from the world then as now. They sympathized and consorted with, and aided each other, then as now : and worshipped and sacrificed and prayed together. The world was much the same then as now, and had its distinct nations—its kings and nobles—and subjects. They understood, and practiced themselves in the art of war. 39 : 19-25. There were masters and servants, rich and poor : the oppressors and the oppressed : the proud and the lowly : the husbandman and the artist : the righte-

ous and the wicked: the idolater and the worshipper of the true God: the hypocrite and the sound believer. 8: 13-18; 13: 16; 27: 8-10. And there were Judges in the land, set for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that did well. 31: 26-28; 31: 9-12.— And in this moving world, the men of God did walk by faith, and did let their light shine to the glory of God, and the good of men; they had then, as now, to contend with “the world, the flesh, and the devil.” The same covenant-keeping God was over them then as now, and taught them by His Spirit, and divided unto them their days of prosperity and of adversity, and caused all things to work together for their good. 34: 31-32; 26: 8-9. The righteous held on his way, and he that had clean hands, grew stronger and stronger. 17: 19.

We close this view of the Book of Job, with an observation of two facts. First, *the existence of Idolatry*,—which Job characterizes as “a denial of the God who is above,” and the Idolatry of which he speaks, is that of the worship of the heavenly bodies: of the sun and the moon, called Sabianism, 31: 26-28. Idolatry first appears in the time of Serug. Joshua 24: 1-2. With Serug, we suppose that Job was cotemporary. It is probable that there were other gods worshipped besides the heavenly bodies. Of Idolatry, Job says, “This also were an iniquity to be punished by the Judge.” The same remark he makes of adultery, “It is an iniquity to be punished by the Judges.” 31: 10-12.

The inference is, that Idolatry was viewed as an offence against the well-being of society, as was adultery, and, like that heinous wickedness, called for judicial investigation and punishment. If ever kept in check by punishment, it could not have been of long duration. After the visible church was placed under a civil constitution, it was viewed as treason against God, and in the purer times of the church, punished accordingly.

Second—*the existence of writing*.—Job, in several places, speaks of writing and of books. “For thou writest bitter things against me.” 13: 26. “Oh! that my words were now written! oh, that they were printed in a book! (or graven)—that they were graven with an

iron pen, and lead in the rock for ever!" 19: 23-24. "Oh, that mine adversary had written a book." 31: 35. What were the materials, and with what instrument writing was committed to them, we shall not inquire. What we learn from the passages is, that the art of writing was known: and there were records or books. And from the manner in which Job speaks, we infer that writing was common, and resorted to on important occasions. This fact may throw some light on the following passage: "My feet have held his steps; his way have I kept, and not declined. Neither have I gone back from the commandments of his lips. I have esteemed the words of his mouth more than my necessary food." 23: 11-12. Here is plain reference to the word or law of the Lord, which Job loved, and made the rule of his duty. "A lamp unto his feet, and a light unto his path."—A law to which, it would seem, he had constant reference: to which he could come for support and direction. The very terms which he uses, are those which we afterwards find applied to the *written Law*—the *written Revelation* of God.

There is nothing improbable,—nay, many things rendering it the contrary,—that the Revelations of God, and his wonderful dealings toward men, and all the history of the Creation and Fall—of the Flood—and re-peopling of the world: and the genealogy of Christ, the promised seed of the woman,—the lines of spiritual and promised descent,—were all committed to writing, and formed the Bible,—the Word of God, to his Church, in these early days. And to which, we may add the Ten Commandments,—if not set down in the order observed at Sinai,—then embraced in substance.

Job refers to the creation and to Adam's sin, and the circumstances of it: he refers to the flood, and the causes which brought it about: to the Ceremonial Law of Sacrifices: and also to the Moral Law. Job condemns Idolatry, which comes under the first and second commandments; and adultery, which comes under the seventh. The penalty of death is visited upon the murderer, which comes under the sixth: and, in short, there is not one of the commandments, which does not appear exerting a controlling influence over Job, in his life and

character,—a sketch of which he gives us in different places, but very particularly in the 31st chapter.

It is by no means denied, that all these things might have safely and surely been transmitted by tradition to Noah, to Job, and to Abraham, and to Moses, and that by Moses all were committed to writing, and that infallibly, by the inspiration of God. Nor is it denied, that in the absence of all reliable tradition, Moses might, by the immediate inspiration of God, have written all we have in the Bible, from the creation to his day. But, in as much as Job asserts the existence of the art of writing: and refers to the Law of God, as something known and fixed, it is not an improbable supposition that sacred writings existed in the earliest ages of the world, *and that God has never left His people without a written revelation*: and that Moses has added the revelations of God, to his Church, made through himself, to those which had existed before his time.

That this appears more than probable, is evident from Exod. 18: 14-27. Moses, as the appointed deliverer, was also the Law-giver, and Judge of Israel. In capacity of Judge, he was acting, when Jethro, his father-in-law, visited him in Horeb, *before* the giving of the Law: and he explained to Jethro the reason why he sat, from morning to night, with the people standing by him: "Because the people come unto me to inquire of God. When they have a matter, they come unto me: and I judge between one and another, and I do make them know, (or instruct, cause them to understand,) the Statutes of God, and his Laws."

What Statutes and Laws of God were these? Doubtless, all the Divine communications of God with his people, from Adam to Noah, and from Noah down to Abraham, and to Moses himself: all which had respect to the faith and practice of men, as well in reference to God, and the things of eternity, as to men and the things of time. These "Statutes and Laws," from the creation to Moses, were very numerous. Were they written, or unwritten? They could, indeed, have been transmitted orally, by tradition: but the remark of Moses to Jethro resembles that of a Judge, who expounds and explains statutes and laws which were *in some settled and fixed*

form, to which he could refer, and to which, as the accredited word of the Lord, he could appeal, and say to the people in his decisions: "Thus is it *written*—and thus saith *the Lord*."

ARTICLE VI.

Philosophy of Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON, Bart., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in Edinburgh University; arranged and edited by O. W. WIGHT, Translator of Cousin's "History of Modern Philosophy." For the use of Schools and Colleges. New York: 1853.

No metaphysician now living enjoys a higher reputation than Sir William Hamilton. He is unquestionably an extraordinary man. In the extensive and accurate knowledge of books, he has, perhaps, no equal; and as a profound and original thinker, very few superiors. It is not often that the same person greatly excels in both these qualifications. Judging from the book before us—and we have no other means of judging—we trust he is likewise, a sincere and humble Christian. The subjects discussed are, indeed, but remotely connected with religion; but it must afford pleasure to every pious reader, to observe the emphasis with which the writer recognizes the narrow limits of the human understanding, the reverence with which he mentions the Holy Scriptures, and the evident delight with which he contemplates the harmony which he believes to subsist between the doctrines of his philosophy "and those of revealed truth."

We by no means affirm that the harmony actually extends to every particular. From some of the positions taken, might, we think, be logically deduced inferences destructive of all religion. But, let it not be forgotten, these are not the inferences of Sir William Hamilton. It is not enough to say that he has not deduced them. They are directly opposite to doctrines which he has emphatically declared. If legitimately deduced, they

overthrow the positions from which they flow; but they furnish no grounds for suspecting *him* of unfriendliness to religion.

This volume is highly valuable on two accounts—

1. For the light it throws on the history of speculation. The writer seems to have every possible theory perfectly at command; and to know concerning every theory, by whom it was first propounded; who have been its advocates, and who its opponents; what has been said for it, and what against it. Moreover, he is just as familiar with the history of words and phrases, as with the history of theories. In these respects, this is probably the most wonderful book ever printed.

2. As an aid in learning the art of thinking. The reasoning is always able; often masterly. But to understand it, the student must exert his own reasoning powers, vigorously and in a manner well adapted to their improvement. We wish, indeed, that some points had been more fully illustrated; and that a more sparing use had been made of technical and unusual phraseology. To some, it may appear that it would then have been less fit for the use here specified. We are of a different opinion. The writer is a teacher; and the same general principles which apply to other teachers, apply to him. To the writer, then, as to any other teacher, we would recommend, not obscurity of statement, but a careful discrimination between those points which require to be explained, and those which may properly be left to the reflections of the reader or hearer. Every point which is explained at all, should, we think, be made as clear as possible,—not only so clear that it can be understood; but so clear, if possible, that it cannot but be understood; but, then, let him not attempt to tell all that the learner is expected to know. In few words, we would have the student exert his faculties on the subject he is professedly studying, and not on questions of interpretation presented by the phraseology of his instructor. We are of opinion, that every correct metaphysical theory, and every sound metaphysical argument, admits of being made easily intelligible to every reader of common understanding, on the sole condition of a moderate amount of patient attention; and

this must continue true, till the science of mind shall have advanced very far beyond its present state; nor ought any metaphysical writer to satisfy himself with anything short of this degree of perspicuity. The practical adoption of this rule would tend greatly to the ascertainment of truth, and the detection of error. Many a theory recommended by distinguished names; and which has imposed on many an acute and vigorous intellect, would be at once exploded by a mere translation out of technical into common language.

To return to the book before us: Of the subjects on which we find it impossible to concur with the author, only one can be discussed in this article; and we select the most important. We mean that which relates to

THE ORIGIN OF THE JUDGMENT OF CAUSALITY.

According to universal experience, he who contemplates an event, is under the necessity of concluding that it is connected with some cause. This is the phenomenon; and the question is, *Whence arises this necessity?*

Hamilton describes the phenomenon thus:

“When aware of a new appearance, we are *unable* to conceive that therein has originated any new existence, and are therefore constrained to think that what now appears to us under a new form, had previously an existence under others. These *others*, (for they are always plural,) are called its causes; and a cause (or more properly, causes,) we cannot but suppose; for a cause is simply every thing without which the effect would not result, and all such concurring, the effect cannot but result. We are utterly unable to construe it in thought as possible, that the complement of existence has been increased or diminished,” &c. (Page 493.)

On the next page, he says, “The mind is thus compelled to recognize an absolute identity of existence in the effect, and in the complement of its causes, between the *causatum* and the *causa*.” He afterwards remarks, “If we make the experiment, we shall find the mental annihilation of an object, equally impossible, under time past, and present, and future. To obviate, however, misapprehension, a very simple observation may be proper. In saying that it is impossible to annihilate an object in thought, in other words, to conceive as non-

existent, what had been conceived as existent, it is of course not meant, that it is impossible to conceive the objects wholly changed in form. We can represent to ourselves the elements of which it is composed, divided, dissipated, modified in any way; we can imagine anything of it short of annihilation."

We understand him, then, as maintaining that cause and effect are always and only, the same thing, existing under different forms; and that the necessity of the judgment of causality consists in the impossibility of thinking that the complement of existence has been increased or diminished. We, on the contrary, deny that there is any such universal impossibility as is here asserted; and, moreover, maintain that such impossibility, even if admitted, will not cover all cases in which the human mind is necessitated to form the judgment of causality.

To unfold the first branch of the objection, our author's account of the matter implies that the belief of a proper creation is impossible. Let us hear him. "We cannot conceive," he says, "either, on the one hand, nothing becoming something, or, on the other, something becoming nothing. When God is said to create the universe *out of nothing*, we think this, by supposing he evolves the universe out of himself."—(pp. 493, 494.) Now, what are we to understand by this last sentence? Do we conceive of God as nothing? If not, what connexion is there between conceiving that he made the universe *out of nothing*, and conceiving that he evolved it *out of himself*? God is certainly the cause of existence to all creatures. Now, is it true, that the aggregate of all creatures is God existing under a new form? To affirm, is Pantheism; to deny, is to contradict the statement already quoted, that the mind is compelled to recognize an absolute identity of existence in the effect and in the complement of its causes, between the *causatum* and the *causa*." Would it be a correct account of the creation to say that God was transformed, or transformed himself, into a multitude of creatures? If not, here is a manifest distinction of existence between cause and effect; and the recognition of a Creator will not relieve us from the necessity of conceiving of nothing becoming

something. It will, indeed, relieve us from the necessity of conceiving of an event without a cause; but this is now seen to be a very different matter.

On page 502, our author expresses himself thus:—
 “We are able to conceive, indeed, the creation of a world; this indeed as easily as the creation of an atom. But what is our thought of creation. It is not a thought of the mere springing of nothing into something. On the contrary, creation is conceived, and is by us conceivable, only as the evolution of existence from possibility into actuality, by the fiat of deity. Let us place ourselves in imagination at its very crisis. Now can we construe it to thought, that the moment after the universe flashed into material reality, into manifested being, there was a larger complement of being in the universe and its author together, than, the moment before, there subsisted in the deity alone? This we are unable to imagine.”

What, now, is to be understood by “*the evolution of existence from possibility into actuality?* Is possibility the *material* out of which the universe was formed? Did the elements of which the universe consists, exist previously in a different form, making up something which our author calls *possibility?* If this is not intended, the illustration fails; the case adduced bears no relation to the doctrine asserted. If this is intended, the illustration proves the position untenable. Possibility is neither existence, nor a form of existence. When we affirm a thing to be possible, we merely affirm the existence of what may become its cause. In many instances, as in the one now under consideration, there is reference to the *will* of some being; and, then, the affirmation amounts to this, that his *will*, if favourable, will be a cause, of which the thing said to be possible will be the effect. But it never implies that such *will* and the effect are the same thing subsisting under different forms. The relation of cause and effect is one thing; identity of existence is another.

Do we affirm, then, that the creation of the world increased the complement of existence? We do not; but for this reason solely—the Creator is an infinite being; and infinity admits of no increase. It is always decep-

tive to conceive of *Him* as a part of any aggregate whatsoever; because, the part, in the only sense in which we can employ the term, is necessarily less than the whole; but no aggregate can be greater than God. But we do say, creatures *began* to exist; they did not exist before, nor were they formed out of pre-existent elements. If there is here an apparent inconsistency, it is easily accounted for: We are finite, and therefore can form no adequate conception of the Infinite One. Hence, where he is concerned, a proposition may be demonstrably true, though *we* may be unable to rescue it from the appearance of inconsistency.

The infinity of God presents the only objection to the assertion of an increase in the complement of existence. But assuredly, the necessity for the judgment of causality does not result from this consideration; for human beings uniformly experience the necessity before they have any notion of an Infinite Creator. Indeed, it is not probable that one man in a million ever derives from the infinity of God the inference here suggested. Hence it is evident that the necessity for the causal judgment does not arise from any impossibility, or even difficulty, in admitting an increase in the complement of existence.

The other branch of the objection does not require so extended a statement. Admit the fact as stated by our author; it is still obvious, that the necessity of the judgment of causality extends to many cases not included in his description. He tells us that the necessity consists in the impossibility of supposing an increase in the complement of existence; and that the effect is simply the cause, or rather, the complement of the causes, existing in a new form. But the change of form is itself an effect, for which we must believe there is a cause. And the necessity of demanding a cause, in this instance, cannot be resolved into the impossibility of believing that the complement of existence is greater or less than it was before. It may be admitted, that all the elements involved did formerly exist, and that they still exist; but they did exist in one form, and they now exist in another form. Why this change? Their present form cannot be either identical with their existence, or inseparable from it; for they have existed in a different form. That

other form was neither identical with their existence, nor inseparable from it; for they have lost that form, but they still retain their existence. Whence, then, this change of form? Hamilton's description overlooks the possibility of such a question.

If he is right, then, a statement of the causes of anything must consist exclusively in a description of the former state of the elements of which that thing consists. The necessity for admitting a cause consists solely in the necessity of admitting, that what we now perceive to exist did formerly exist, though in a different form. Such is the amount of the description. Suppose it true, and there can be no question about a cause which does not resolve itself into this: "What was the form in which that thing formerly existed?" But this conclusion is contradicted by universal experience. A man, for example, looks at a house. He may easily satisfy himself that the elements of which it is composed have existed ever since the creation. But this is no answer to the question, "why do these elements now exist *in the form of a house*?" It is conceivable that he may be able to trace them through many changes; but for every change he requires some cause, distinct from the mere existence of the elements themselves. He easily believes that in bringing them into the form of a house, human power and skill must have been concerned. But the power and skill of man are not among the elements of which the house is composed. They are properties of beings distinct from the house; which properties an examination of the house proves to have been exerted. In this case, therefore, it cannot be justly said, "the mind is compelled to recognize an absolute identity of existence in the effect and in the complement of its causes—between the *causatum* and the *causa*." So far is this from being true, that the mind cannot possibly recognize such identity.

These, then, are the grounds on which we reject our author's description of the phenomenon in question. He resolves it into what he alleges to be a universal fact; we deny the fact alleged; and maintain, further, that even if true, it will not cover the whole ground of the phenomenon. Happy it is for mankind that the fact

is not as he has stated it. Were it so, every man would be shut up, by the constitution of his nature, to the alternative of Pantheism, on the one hand; or Atheism, or its equivalent, on the other. There is One Being, and One only, who exists without having begun to be; and He is the cause of existence to all other beings. To deny this, is Atheism or its equivalent. Now combine this truth with the supposed necessity of believing, that whatever exists at any time must, at least in its constituent elements, have existed at all times; and you are reduced to the necessity of believing that God and the universe are, in essence one; that there is really but one being, and every creature is a part of God. This is Pantheism; and, indeed, Pantheism is a form of Atheism. If there is but one being, and there can never be more, it is a matter of no consequence whatever, whether you call that being *God* or not.

But in fact, the law of the human mind is far otherwise. Men may lose themselves in the mists of speculation; but, *in practice*, every man necessarily recognizes a distinction between cause and effect; and that distinction reaches far beyond the mere fact that the same thing may exist in different forms, at different times. The causal relation, we know, involves much more than mere priority in time. It involves a correspondence, or congruity between cause and effect. The effect must manifest some property or properties of the cause. But the relation is very far from implying identity of existence or essence.

The reader can now anticipate, how far we concur with Sir William Hamilton, in thinking the mental annihilation of any object impossible. No man can believe that there ever was a time when absolutely nothing existed; or that a time will ever come when absolutely nothing will exist. The present existence of any given object being supposed, no man can believe there ever was a time when there did not exist either that object, or some other to which it stands, *either directly or remotely*, in the relation of an effect. But this is widely different from an irresistible conviction that the object itself must always have existed, if not in its present form, at least in the elements of which it consists. The rela-

tion of cause and effect, is one thing; identity of existence, is another.

Thus we have examined our author's description of the phenomenon. We shall next attend to his mode of accounting for it. The explanation rests on a principle previously asserted.

"Time is positively inconceivable, if we attempt to construe it in thought,—either, on the one hand, as absolutely commencing or absolutely terminating, or on the other, as infinite or eternal, whether *ab ante* or *a post*; and it is no less inconceivable, if we attempt to fix an absolute minimum, or to follow out an infinite division."—Page 488.

This passage will serve to fix the meaning of some phrases which will be important in the further progress of the discussion. We shall, of course, accommodate our phraseology, to a considerable extent, to that of our author; and if in doing so, we should be led to employ some unusual expressions, we trust no further apology will be needed. Let it be remembered, then, that *eternity is infinite, or unlimited time*; and that, *time absolutely commencing, is the opposite of eternity ab ante, or, (as it is commonly expressed,) a past eternity.*

The explanation is as follows:—"In reference to the present question, it need only be recapitulated, that we must think under the condition of *existence*,—existence *relative*, and existence relative in *time*. But what does existence *relative in time* imply? It implies: 1st. That we are unable to realize in thought; on the one pole of the irrelative, either an absolute commencement, or an infinite non-termination of time. It implies, 2d. That we can think, neither on the one pole, an absolute minimum, nor, on the other, an *infinite* divisibility of time. Yet these constitute two pairs of contradictory propositions; which, if our intelligence be not all a lie, cannot both be true, whilst, at the same time, either the one or the other necessarily must. But as not relatives, they are not cogitables."

"Now the phenomenon of causality seems nothing more than a corollary of the law of the conditioned, in its application to a thing thought under the form or mental category of *existence relative in time*. We can-

not think of a thing, except under the attribute of *existence*; we cannot know or think a thing to exist, except in *time*: and we cannot know or think a thing to exist in time, and think it *absolutely to commence*. Now this at once imposes on us the judgment of causality. And thus:—An object is given us, either by our presentative or our representative faculty. As given, we cannot but think it existent, and existent in time. But to say that we cannot but think it to exist, is to say that we are unable to think it non-existent,—to think it away,—to annihilate it in thought. And this we cannot do.”—Page 501.

It is, doubtless, true in some sense, that we must think under the condition of existence, and of existence in time. We know things only through their properties; and non-existence has no properties. But it follows not that, a description being given, we cannot sincerely deny that anything exists to which that description applies. Nor does it follow that, its *present* existence being known, we cannot sincerely deny its existence, as connected with either a past or a future time.

We wish our author had been more explicit; but we understand him as maintaining that, since an absolute commencement of time is inconceivable and inadmissible; it follows necessarily, that man cannot admit the commencement of existence to any one being, if by the commencement of existence he meant anything more than a new form or arrangement of pre-existent elements. It is, of course, implied, that the admission of a commencement of existence in any higher sense, would involve the admission of an absolute commencement of time. We are of a different opinion.

In order to accommodate our phraseology to his, we take the liberty of using the word *time*, in the large sense already indicated, to express an inseparable adjunct of existence. The difference between *time* and *eternity*, as these terms are commonly understood, is, that the one is limited, and the other unlimited. No error, therefore, need arise from speaking of eternity as *unlimited time*. To affirm “an absolute commencement of time,” as that phrase is employed by our author, is to affirm that there was a moment before which no being

existed. That is, it is to deny that there is any being who *never began to be*. If there is *one* such being, then there never was an absolute commencement of time. We need not stop here to inquire, whether it is possible for the human mind to admit the proposition, that there was an absolute commencement of time. That the proposition, if asserted, would be false, can be easily proved. In other words, there is certainly one being who never began to exist, but who has always existed. Now, suppose that this is not only susceptible of abundant proof, but that man is debarred by the constitution of his nature from thinking the contrary: Will it follow that, "when aware of any new appearance, we are *unable* to conceive that therein has originated any new existence?" Is this conclusion so obvious as absolutely to compel the assent of every human mind? Is it self-evident that, if there is one eternal being, there is no being which is not eternal? If this is not self-evident, then, though our author's description of the phenomenon were admitted as correct, his explanation of it must be rejected as utterly unsatisfactory.

There is but one conceivable mode of vindicating the explanation: and that is by showing it to be impossible to believe in the existence of more beings than one. If there are a plurality of beings, distinct from one another as to their existence, then, there is neither inconsistency nor contradiction, in affirming that one of them has always existed; that there is one who never began to exist, and all the rest did begin to exist; and so, the impossibility of conceiving of an absolute commencement of time, cannot make it either impossible or difficult to believe that there "has originated any new existence." Of any being, except the first cause, it can never be absurd to say, some other beings existed before him.—Hence, the impossibility of believing in an absolute commencement of time, can never prevent us from believing concerning any being, essentially distinct from God, that his existence commenced. Hence, to make our author's explanation satisfactory, it is indispensable to demonstrate that man is necessitated, by the constitution of his nature, to be either a Pantheist or an Atheist; and, on that supposition, as we have already re-

marked, the difference between the two systems is only verbal.

In another view, Sir William's speculations tend to Atheism; as they imply that the truth of the causal judgment is, at best, uncertain. As preparatory to what we have to offer under this head, we ask attention to the following passage: "Fatalism and Atheism are, indeed, convertible terms. The only valid arguments for the existence of a God and for the immortality of the human soul, rests on the moral nature of man; consequently, if that moral nature be annihilated, which in every scheme of thorough-going necessity it is, every conclusion, established on such a nature, is annihilated likewise."—Page 506.

It is here stated, that the only valid arguments for the existence of a God, rest on the moral nature of man. To this we object. It is true, if man were not a moral being, he could know nothing about God. But, evidently, this is not what our author means. The faculty which makes us capable of understanding an argument, is one thing; the principle on which an argument rests, is another. The evident meaning is, that there can be no valid argument for the being of a God, unless it be first either proved or assumed, that man is a moral being. Now, supposing this foundation laid, we know not how our author would construct his argument. Would he argue, would he hold it competent to argue from effect to cause, or would he not? If he would not, we are utterly at a loss to conjecture how he would establish his conclusion; but we know the argument must be one which has hitherto escaped the notice of the ablest writers on the subject. And does this description apply to the only valid arguments? Then, the belief in God which has hitherto prevailed in the world, if not wrong, is right by chance only. But if he would argue from effect to cause, then, his arguments from the moral nature of man must be, simply, a part of the common argument from the proofs of design, wisdom, and power, in the works of God; and to claim validity, as belonging to that part, *exclusively*, is obviously rash and unauthorized. But we must now mention a consideration of still greater importance: *HAMILTON cannot consistently maintain the*

validity of any argument from effect to cause. To exhibit only a part of the evidence on which this statement is made, on page 517, he expresses himself, in reference to his own doctrine, as follows: "It does not maintain that the judgment of causality is dependent on a *power* of the mind, imposing, as necessary in thought, what is necessary in the universe of existence. On the contrary, it resolves this judgment into a mere mental *impotence*,—an impotence to conceive either of two contradictions. And as the one or the other of the contradictories must be true, but both cannot, it proves that there is no ground for inferring a certain fact to be impossible, merely from *our inability to conceive it possible.*"

A proposition believed through mere weakness of mind, must surely be a very unsafe foundation for reasoning. Why do men believe there is such a relation as that of cause and effect? We are here told that it is through a mere mental impotence—because they cannot conceive the contrary—and this is no ground for inferring that the contrary is impossible. On these principles, it is evident that the argument from effect to cause, cannot be valid in any case whatsoever. If this be true, the existence of God has never been proved; every argument ever urged for this purpose was mere sophistry; and the belief of it, even by the wisest of men, has hitherto been mere superstition. Whether it will be otherwise, when the argument, now hidden in the mind of Sir William Hamilton, shall have been published to the world, future experience, and future reasoners must determine.

But there is yet another passage on which we must remark, before quitting this part of the subject. On page 505, the author thus contrasts his own theory with that which refers the judgment of causality to an original and positive law of the human mind:

"But, in the second place, if there be postulated an express and positive affirmation of intelligence, to account for the mental deliverance,—that existence cannot absolutely commence; we must equally postulate a counter affirmation of intelligence, to explain the counter mental deliverance, that existence cannot infinitely not commence. The one necessity of mind is equally as

strong as the other. But they are contradictories; and as contradictories they cannot both be true. On this theory, therefore, the root of our nature is a lie. By the doctrine, on the contrary, which I propose, these contradictory phenomena are carried up into the common principle of a limitation of our faculties. Intelligence is shown to be feeble, but not false; our nature is, thus, not a lie, nor the author of our nature a deceiver."

If the expression, "*existence cannot absolutely commence,*" means that every being now existing has always existed, we deny it utterly; we maintain, moreover, that its only relation to the judgment of causality, is the relation of inconsistency, virtual contradiction. If it means that there must be One whose existence never began, we maintain it:—not, however, as either the ground, or the direct purport of the judgment of causality; but merely as an inference legitimately deducible from that judgment. But to enlarge on this point, would be to repeat much that we have already said.

In the passage before us, the judgment of causality is represented (whether correctly or otherwise,) as amounting, precisely, to this proposition—"that *existence cannot absolutely commence;*" its opposite as amounting to this, "*that existence cannot infinitely not commence.*" According to our author, the necessity of the judgment of causality consists simply in the fact that, *though a mental impotence*, the thing denied in the former proposition is, *to us*, inconceivable; but he tells us, that the thing denied in the second proposition, is equally inconceivable, and on the same ground, namely, *mental impotence*. Now, if these things be so, it follows that there is just as much necessity for believing, that causation never takes place in any instance; as there is for believing, that events are connected with cause. How happens it, then, that every human being uniformly adopts the latter conclusion, and rejects the former? It is manifest that, on our author's own principles, this uniform judgment of causality still remains unaccounted for. For ourselves, we maintain that neither the relation of cause and effect, nor the existence of an Eternal Being, (as opposed to what our author denominates, *an absolute commencement*

of time), is inconceivable, in any sense which implies either incredibility or uncertainty. Both may be known to be true. Both *are* actually known to be true. Both are inconceivable in this sense only, that they include something which we cannot distinctly realize—something that the human mind cannot grasp. It is one thing, to know a proposition to be true; it is quite another thing, to be able to exhaust its meaning, enumerating and defining *all* the particulars it comprehends.

According to our author, men believe in causation, because the reverse is inconceivable. Why is the reverse inconceivable? because it violates “the condition of non-contradiction?” This he is very far from admitting; he distinctly denies that there is any ground for inferring it “to be impossible, merely from our inability to conceive it possible.” It seems, then, that men are necessitated to believe one thing, by the inconceivability of the reverse, though that inconceivability involves nothing inconsistent with the truth of the thing to which it attaches. Now, to this view we oppose a general proposition, on which we will leave our readers to decide without an argument. We say, then, that some things are inconceivable, because it is impossible they should be true; and he who perceives a proposition to be inconceivable in this respect, necessarily believes the reverse; *but the fact that a thing is inconceivable in any other respect, never creates a necessity for believing the contrary.* You may believe a thing, because you regard its opposite as false; but you never believe a thing because the opposite is inconceivable or mysterious, unless you regard that mystery as proving it false. To fail of forming an adequate, or even a distinct conception of the purport of a proposition, is very different from rejecting that proposition as false; and the former never necessitates the latter. A thing is inconceivable, *absolutely or in itself*, when it either contains, within itself, a contradiction, or contradicts any primary or necessary law of human belief. On perceiving a thing to be inconceivable in this respect, man necessarily rejects it as false. Whatever is inconceivable in any other respect, is said to be mysterious—a very different idea from *falsehood*. Now, there are two ways in which a thing,

not *absolutely* inconceivable, that is, not impossible, may be inconceivable *to us*.

First. A thing may be, *to us*, inconceivable *in kind*; it may include some element or elements differing, *in kind*, from all that have ever been brought within the reach of our intelligence. If man had one sense more, or one faculty more, it can hardly be doubted that he would know many things of which, at present, he can form no conception. Even now, it is matter of daily experience, that he recognizes the fact that many things exist; recognizes it on the ground of their relation to certain things that he knows; while, of the things themselves,—of the things, apart from these relations, he has no conception. In this respect, *existence* itself, is inconceivable. No man has any notion of *existence*, except in its relations to properties and operations; and yet, no man can believe that properties and operations are identical with existence. It is obvious, then, that the circumstance of a thing being inconceivable in this respect, can never necessitate man to believe the contrary.

Secondly. A thing may be *to us*, inconceivable in degree. Surely, this does not necessitate the belief of the contrary. For example: Man can conceive of benevolence; but, as his faculties are limited, infinite benevolence is, *to him*, inconceivable in degree. In other words, he can form no *adequate* conception of it. But it follows not, that he is compelled by the constitution of his nature, to believe that the benevolence of his Creator is limited. And on just the same principle, though he cannot conceive of an infinite non-commencement of time; in other words, though he can form no adequate conception of eternity, he is under no necessity of either disbelieving the existence of his Maker, or believing that his Maker ever began to be.

Thus we have stated our objections to the theory under consideration. We do not, by any means, say that it is liable to no more; but, if these are well-founded, as to us they seem, there is no need of adducing more.

1. To the description of the phenomenon in question, the necessity of referring effects to causes,—we object, on two grounds—

First. It contradicts experience; inasmuch as it im-

plies that the belief of a proper creation is impossible. Second. It likewise contradicts experience, by implying that, admitting the previous existence of the elements of which any thing is composed, the human mind requires no further cause to account for any change of form which those elements may undergo.

2. To the explanation of the phenomenon—even supposing the description of it to be correct,—we object on four grounds—

First. It implies that the human mind is incapable of admitting the commencement of existence to any being, without admitting “an absolute commencement of time;” in other words, that it is incapable of recognizing a plurality of beings, so distinct from each other, that one or more may have existed before the rest: which is contrary to experience, as is proved by the common belief in a multitude of distinct creatures, and in a Creator, distinct, in existence, from all his creatures.

Second. It assumes, contrary to experience, that if a thing is inconceivable to the human mind, even though it neither involve a contradiction within itself, nor contradict any necessary law of human belief, such inconceivableness in one proposition necessitates the belief of the opposite.

Third. It represents, as lying in the way of the belief of causation, an obstacle of the same kind and equal magnitude with that which prevents the disbelief of it. And this is contrary to experience, which shows that the belief of causation is necessary, and the disbelief of it impossible.

Our last objection rests on principles which, though not strictly metaphysical, are common to our author and ourselves. He, like ourselves, believes in one God, essentially distinct from his creatures, and in the Christian revelation, as of Divine authority.

Fourth. By representing the connexion of cause and effect as uncertain, it virtually denies the validity of the ground on which the existence of God has been commonly believed; which ground the Christian Scriptures declare to be so decisive, as to render inexcusable all who fail of drawing the obvious conclusion. (See, for example, Romans i: 19, 20.)

Such, then, are our objections to Sir William Hamilton's theory. And now, our readers are ready to ask, "Have you a better?" Whether we have, or not, we insist that *this* theory ought to be rejected, unconditionally, as obviously incorrect and absolutely untenable. If the alternative be, to embrace such a theory, or to reject all theories on the subject, there ought to be no difficulty in making a choice. It is better to confess ignorance, than to cling to error.

But to answer the question: We have, at any rate, a *different* theory, which, *as at present informed*, we conceive to be correct; of the rest, others must judge. That theory shall now be propounded.

Many have erred, we think, in their attempts to reduce the dictates of the causal judgment to a general proposition. It is not true, that the human mind unconditionally demands a cause for all that exists. Exclude the idea of a *beginning*, and you preclude the demand for a cause. This, we think, experience abundantly shows. Admit that God is eternal, and you at once perceive that it would be absurd to inquire for a cause of his existence. It has sometimes been debated, whether this world, or at least the matter of which it is composed, has not existed from eternity; and with few or no exceptions, this has been regarded by both parties as equivalent to the question, whether its existence depends on a cause? In other words, it has been held by both parties, that if the world ever *began* to exist, then, it must have had a cause; then, it must have been created: but, if it never began to exist, then, so far as this subject is concerned, there is no room for the notion of either creation or cause. Being, then, requires a cause, in all those cases in which we can ascertain that it had a beginning, and in no other. Every change of relation, or of form or mode of existence, requires a cause; and implies a beginning. If we admit annihilation, we must admit a cause of annihilation. In few words, nothing can *take place*,—there can be nothing to which the word *event*, or any term of similar import is applicable, without a cause. To prevent misapprehension, however, it may be proper to observe, that if, in any case, the continuance of anything—whether existence, mode, form,

relation, or circumstance,—depends on the constant operation of a cause, the cessation of the operation is sufficient to explain the discontinuance of the effect. This principle has given rise to the phrase, *negative causes*.

We have now stated the general truth to which, as we conceive, all the decisions of the judgment of causality, when viewed collectively, amount. And our explanation of the phenomenon consists in referring it to the direct operation of a positive and original law of the human mind. If there is such a law of mind, it will not operate before there arises an occasion for its operation; but it will operate as soon as such an occasion arises. Prior to experience, we have no notion of such a thing as a change or event; but as soon as we have that notion, we have likewise the notion of a cause. So far as the human mind is concerned, the latter notion is inseparable from the former. We do not conclude that all changes must have causes, merely because it has been so in all changes which we have ever observed or experienced; for, not to mention other objections, the causal judgment takes place before we have either the experience or the observation on which such a process of generalization must be founded. The judgment of causation does not imply a knowledge of a general truth on this subject, logically deduced from some abstract proposition; for, not to say that no such logical process has yet been discovered, it is certain that millions are under the necessity of constantly referring effects to causes, who are utterly incapable of reasoning in the manner here supposed.

That the judgment of causality rests directly on an original law of human nature, seems to us evident from this: that an exercise of it is involved in every act of perception. Man knows matter only through its properties; and he knows those properties only by their operation; but to know a property through its operation, is the same thing as to know it by its effects. Hence, man would know nothing about matter, did he not know it under the relation of a cause. We experience certain sensations, which the law of our minds compels us to refer to external objects as their cause. This is what we call perception. We perceive, moreover, effects produced by one external object upon another. Here are

effects without us, which, in turn, become, to us, causes of sensation; and hence, objects of perception. But, in every case, so far as the human mind can reach, the operation of a quality, or qualities, is identical with causation.

In this connexion, we will notice some passages in that part of the volume before us which relates to the theory of Perception. Let it be borne in mind, our only aim is to show that it results, as a legitimate conclusion, from the views of our author, that man could know nothing of matter, did he not recognize it under the relation of a cause; which recognition, of course, and in every instance, involves an exercise of the judgment of causality. He divides the qualities of body into Primary, Secundo-Primary, and Secondary. Let us begin with the last class.

The Secondary qualities, then, are such "as Colour, Sound, Flavor, Savor, and Factual sensation," &c. It is obvious that all qualities of this class are recognized merely as causes of our own sensations; and, therefore, cannot be recognized at all without an exercise of the judgment of causality. Accordingly, our author says, they "are conceived only as latent causes to account for manifest effects."

As Secundo-primary qualities, he mentions, "Heavy, Light, Hard, Soft," &c. Of these, he tells us they "are all comprehended under the category of Resistance or Pressure—and the sources in external nature from which the resistance or pressure springs "are, in all, three:—that of *Co-Attraction*; that of *Repulsion*; that of *Inertia*." Here, it will be observed, that each of these implies the action or influence of one portion or particle of matter on another; two are such that they can be manifested only in their effects; and the last can be manifested only in the failure or difficulty of an effect which might have been expected. It is clear, then, that every recognition of a Secundo-Primary quality involves an exercise of the judgment of causality.

The qualities enumerated by our author as primary, are eight: "Extension, Divisibility, Size, Density, or Rarity, Figure, Incompressibility absolute, Mobility, Situation." Now, it is perfectly clear that we could never

acquire the notion of any one of these qualities as belonging to matter, but for sensation. Such knowledge, therefore, is denied to us, through the connection of primary qualities with secondary; that is, with those qualities which we recognize as the immediate causes of our sensations. Accordingly, our author tells us, that "it is only under condition of the sensation of a secondary that we are percipient of any primary quality." Primary qualities, therefore, are known to men, only because they are the remote causes of those sensations of which secondary qualities are the immediate causes. Of course, but for the law of causality, we should know nothing of either.

Thus it is apparent that, for all our knowledge of the properties of matter—and, of course, for all our knowledge of matter itself—we are indebted to that law of mind which necessitates the judgment of causality; from which there can be no difficulty in inferring, that this must be an original law of the human mind.

From matter, let us pass on to mind. Of the latter, as of the former, human knowledge is confined to the properties; and for our knowledge of the properties of mind we are entirely indebted to those diversified operations comprehended under the generic term *thought*. It follows that for his knowledge of the existence of his own mind, man is indebted to his necessary judgment of causality; he recognizes his mind as a cause, of which his thoughts are the effects. And he needs no *argument* to convince him of his own existence—for this reason only, that being conscious of the effect, *thought*, an irresistible law compels him to refer it to its cause, *mind*. In coming to the conclusion that there are other minds besides his own, the operation of the same law is equally manifest, but the process is somewhat more complicated. You have no immediate knowledge of any thoughts but your own. Certain effects become known to you by means of your bodily senses. These you refer to thoughts as their causes, and then refer these thoughts to minds as *their* causes. Here, then, is at least, a double operation of the judgment of causality. The argument might easily be pursued much further; but it is surely unnecessary. We have seen that the exercise of the judg-

ment of causality is involved in the very first perception of any property of matter, and in the very first recognition of the existence of mind. Nothing further, we presume, is necessary to prove that this judgment is necessitated by a primary law of human nature.

These remarks naturally conduct us to a conclusion already mentioned, though distinct from the one which they were directly intended to establish—that, so far as the human mind can reach, the operation of properties is identical with causation. No matter whether you have witnessed the operation, or not; if you can be assured that it has really taken place, you are at once under the necessity of referring it to a cause; in other words, you are compelled to admit that the properties which have operated must have inhered in some subject. Of course, the properties manifested as having belonged to the cause, are distinct from those belonging to the effect. Thus, when you examine a watch, you find unequivocal proofs of mechanical skill; but you never think of saying that the watch is skilful. The skill belongs to the man who was the maker of the watch—the cause of its existence as a watch. The book before us gives evidence of a vast amount of knowledge; but it would be absurd to say that the book knows anything. The knowledge belongs to its cause, its author; and though he should lose his knowledge, the book would still exhibit to every reader abundant proof that he once possessed it.

The human mind, then, asserts a cause for every event, for every change, for everything to which the idea of a *beginning* applies; and hence, for *existence* wherever it is ascertained that existence *began*; but she rejects the notion of a cause of anything that exists, without ever having begun to exist. Everything, then, that ever began to exist, must have had a cause. Hence it follows, that there must always have existed some uncaused being; otherwise, no being could ever have existed. Thus it appears that there is a first cause, and his existence is underived and eternal.

Further, existence without beginning necessarily implies immutability. In any being already existing, the notion of change involves the notion of succession of

time. Drop this idea of succession, and there can be no possible ground for the remark, "He was formerly in one state, and he is now in another." Of every mutable being, therefore, it must be true, that the duration of his existence is made up of successive portions of time. At a later period, he must be older than he formerly was; at an earlier period, he must have been younger than he now is. But, to say that he was younger than he now is, is to say that he was nearer to the *commencement* of his existence; which cannot be true, if his existence never commenced. Since, therefore, it is demonstrable concerning every mutable being, that his existence began, it must be true of the being whose existence never began, that he is immutable. It follows that nothing visible; neither this world, nor the elements of which it is composed, nor any of the beings that inhabit it, or that ever did inhabit it, have always existed. All these began to be; and, therefore, all these were caused—were created.

Thus, the judgment of causality, which is inseparable from the human mind, leads by a legitimate process, to the following important conclusion:—*There is an uncreated, eternal, invisible, and immutable Being, who is the Creator of the world and of all that it contains; and to whom belong all the power, wisdom, and goodness, manifested in the works of creation and the laws of nature.* But we must close this article.

Nothing could be further from our intention, in any thing we have said, than to call in question either the piety or the religious orthodoxy of Sir William Hamilton. We give him full credit for the purity of his intentions; but pure intentions, even when connected, as in his case, with consummate abilities, are no unfailing security against mischievous consequences. No man is aware of all the consequences which may be logically deduced from his opinions. We think we may safely go further, and say, no man is aware of all the consequences that may be logically deduced from any one opinion he holds.

These splendid talents and unrivalled fame of the author make it extremely probable that his theory will be extensively adopted. And if, as we apprehend, the theory

can, by a strictly process of reasoning, be converted into a weapon with which to assail religion in general, and Christianity in particular, no doubt, in the event here contemplated, it will be so employed. This is the evil we fear. A note of warning, sounded thus early, even by a voice so feeble as ours, may, perhaps, do something towards preventing it. At least, it may, possibly, attract the attention of those who are capable of doing more. And, in that event, we shall not have labored in vain.

ARTICLE VII.

THOUGHTS ON ORIGINAL SIN.

THE FACT.

Men are "by nature the children of wrath." In the sight of God they are sinners from the womb, and the subjects of a just displeasure and condemnation. This is supported by a compass of evidence by no means narrow, and which it is strange that any should gainsay. And yet in different ages master minds have arisen into public view, who, in originating new phases of error, or in modifying old ones, have incorporated in their creed a positive denial, more or less directly, of this fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion. Pelagius in the fifth century, Socinus in the sixteenth, and Arminius in the seventeenth, occupy a prominent position in this class.

What is the language of the Scripture on this subject? A multitude of passages might be cited, all precisely adapted to our purpose—all expressing the same idea, but in different words, and with different degrees of directness and force. But a few *specimens* only shall be given. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."—Psalm li: 5. Here David, in bewailing an actual transgression, traces his

conduct to the fountain, to that moral corruption in which he was conceived and born. He is not attaching blame to his parents—he is not referring to their sinfulness, because it was over his own iniquities, and not over those of another, that he was shedding the hot tear of deep contrition. He means that he, from his very earliest existence, was thoroughly defiled with sin. Hence he uses the words *shapen* and *conceived*. “The wicked are estranged from the womb.”—Psalm lviii: 3. Here is an expression somewhat similar, and the idea it conveys is the same, that men from their earliest being, from the very womb, are estranged from God, enemies to his government, and the subject of his disapprobation. “That which is born of the flesh is flesh.—John iii: 6. The term *flesh* has several significations in the Scriptures. Here, as in Gal. v: 19, it signifies depraved or corrupt human nature. And if “that which is born of the flesh is flesh”—if that which is born of corrupt human nature is corrupt, of course all men are morally corrupt from their very birth. There can be no exception to this general statement. In using the word *flesh* the apostle could not have referred to human nature merely, it seems, without any allusion to its corrupt condition; because, to state that that which is born of human nature is human nature, that that which is born of man is man, would be to talk childishly, we imagine, and impart very little instruction. “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?”—Job xiv: 4. How can man be born morally clean of parents who are morally unclean? These passages will serve as illustrations of the manner in which, in a multitude of places, this subject is referred to in the Word of God. And does it not then appear strange that any should make it a question, (not to say *deny*,) whether the Scriptures hold forth this doctrine.

If infants are free from sin, they have no need of a Saviour. From what are they to be saved? Where is the demand for an atonement? And is not this contrary to the Scriptures? There is not a passage which will conduct us to the conclusion, if legitimately interpreted, that infants do not need to be washed in the blood of Christ—that he did not die for them, as well as for any other class of the human family. They are embraced in

all those denunciations of divine wrath, and in all those representations of the ruin which sin has wrought, which abound in the Scriptures, and which so forcibly exhibit the necessity of an atonement, and an introduction of divine power and grace.

Again, why did infants receive the rite of circumcision under the old dispensation? And what meaneth baptism, as administered to them under the new? What do these ordinances represent? What is their design? They signify the cleansing of the soul by the blood of Jesus Christ, and by the sanctifying agency of the Holy Ghost. And if infants need no cleansing, if they are not from the womb defiled with sin, they should not receive these symbolical ordinances. There is no propriety, no fitness in administering baptism to them; nor was it appropriate to extend to them, to these sinless beings, the rite of circumcision under the old dispensation.

Again, the curse of death rests upon us from our earliest existence. How is this? Are we not informed that "death is the wages of sin?" Why then should infants receive "the wages of sin," when they have no sin? But we know that God is just—that he will not afflict without a cause. Surely, therefore, from the very womb, man is a sinner. If he dies, and is thus made a partaker of "the wages of sin," his soul must be defiled; we can arrive at no other conclusion.

And may not this doctrine be inferred from the teachings of the Scriptures in regard to the necessity of regeneration. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again." Man is "saved by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost."—"God hath begotten us again unto a lively hope." Such passages very distinctly intimate, if they do not pointedly and directly teach, that man's nature is thoroughly depraved from his very birth, dead in sin, and needs to be quickened and sanctified by a power from on high. It is implied in passages like these that all men are naturally, or as born into the world, in need of regenerating grace; and how can that be quickened into life and sensibility which is not dead, or how can that be sanctified or made holy which is not sinful? Hence it is that those

who deny the doctrine of original sin, also torture and corrupt the doctrine of regeneration. The two are so intimately connected, that an infringement of the one is an infringement of the other; they must stand or fall together.

How early, too, do infants begin to manifest symptoms of a sin-defiled nature! They betray *selfishness* and *wrath* remarkably soon. Their predilections, when first discovered, are uniformly on the side of sin and error. Place a newly born infant in the most favorable situation possible—set before it a strict, constant, and uninterrupted example of uprightness and virtue—let its ears be familiar with the sound of pious conversation, and its eyes rest continually upon scenes of piety and devotion; and after all, the very first glimpses you obtain of its true character and disposition, will convince you of its native depravity. It seems hardly possible that one can be a close observer of infants, and yet escape the conviction that they are “estranged from the womb, and go astray as soon as they be born.” Augustine has said: “I have seen a child that could not speak, full of envy, and turn pale with anger at another that was suckled along with it.” And this is what every one may observe at any time. Even a heathen, (Cicero,) who had not the light of revelation to guide him, could testify, that “man is introduced into life by his step-mother nature, with a body naked, frail, and weak, with a mind anxious at troubles, dejected by fears, effeminate to labours, prone to evil passions, in which the celestial fire of genius and intellect is smothered.” This is what his own observation taught him.

Another proof is afforded by the universal depravity of mankind. That all men are sinners, and there is none that doeth good, no, not one, is evident to all who will but look around them, and take a sober and deliberate view of human society in different lands, and under every variety of circumstances. And how comes this, if it may not be attributed to the original and deep-seated corruption of human nature? Why is it so universal? Why is it that we can find no class of mankind, not even a single individual of the race in any land or age, free from this wide-spread depravity? When we

see that men are everywhere, and at all times corrupt, we are driven to the conclusion that they are all born with a corrupt nature, that turns them in the same direction; that they all come into the world with every imagination of the thoughts of their hearts only evil continually.

There also seems to be a consciousness in every believer that his sins are all to be traced to the native corruption of his heart. David is not the only one who has given utterance to the plaintive sentiment, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity." Paul says: "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." In the Diary of Dr. Edward Payson, of New England, we find the following language, and it was the strong conviction of his soul at all times: "I feel that my deepest humiliation is rank pride, and all that I am or can do, is sin. Yet, blessed be God, I can plead the sufferings and perfect obedience of Jesus Christ, in whom, though weak in myself, I am strong. There is no vice, of which I do not see the seeds in myself, and which would bear fruit did not grace prevent." We have the following testimony from Dr. William Gordon, in "The Christian Philosopher Triumphant over Death:" "I saw there was no good deed in myself. Though I had spent hours in examining my conduct, I found nothing I had done would give me real satisfaction. It was always mixed up with something selfish. But when I come to the Gospel as a child, the Holy Spirit seemed to fill my heart. I then saw my selfishness in all its deformity, and I found there was no acceptance with God, and no happiness, except through the blessed Redeemer." Col. Gardiner, as we learn from his life, by Dr. Doddridge, expressed himself thus: "I am but as a beast before him—a miserable, hell-deserving sinner. I am persuaded, that when I join the glorious company above, where there will be no drawbacks, none will outsing me there, because I shall not find any that will be more indebted to the wonderful riches of divine grace than I." Such are the strong and sincere convictions of all true believers. This is so universally the language of converted souls, that one needs no better evidence of his unrenewed state than a disinclination to express himself thus. And if these strong and

heartfelt expressions are the effects of the Holy Spirit's operations upon the soul in all cases, without a single exception, and if they are deepened and strengthened in exact proportion to the believer's maturity in the divine life, we can hardly come to any other conclusion than that they are correct and just, and that human nature is deeply and thoroughly depraved, as they represent, from the very womb. When such convictions are so strong, decided, and universal, and invariably increase with the increase of the Holy Spirit's dominion in the soul, it is surely very strange if they are wild, visionary, and unfounded. Having directed our attention to a few arguments that seem to establish *the fact*, let us now proceed to consider briefly *the source* of original sin.

THE SOURCE.

Ever since the days of Ptolemy, an anxiety has been manifested to discover the source of the river Nile. To solve this problem, has been the earnest aim of not a few of the sons of adventure. But there is a far more important inquiry. Where rises that stream of moral evil which flows down through the generations of men, bathing every soul in its noxious waters? To what mountain range, or rocky ledge, or weedy spot, can we trace this dark and polluting current? While the Nile question has excited the curiosity of many, among whom we find a Cæsar, an Alexander, and a Bonaparte, this has employed the thoughts and baffled the researches of its thousands on thousands of penetrating minds in every age. Proud philosophy has summoned her ablest sons into the field, to struggle with this giant problem, but she sighs over the inefficiency of their efforts. The most benighted heathen seem conscious of the existence of moral evil in the world. The Hindoo performs his ablutions in the waters of the Ganges, to cleanse himself from the impurities of sin. He sacrifices the fruit of his loins to the bloody Kalee, to absolve himself from guilt. The Buddhist of China, with his shorn crown, observes one hundred and sixty-two fast days annually, and mumbles the name of Buddha, claiming his attention by bells and drums with unwearied constancy. And yet

they are incompetent to demonstrate the necessity of such offerings and atonements, by pointing to the original source of moral evil. They know that crime and guilt exist, (although their views as to what constitutes crime are diversified, and often strangely erroneous,) but they cannot tell why it is so; the origin, the primary source, of sin and guilt, is shrouded from their perplexed and wondering minds.

But is there no key to this mystery? Is there no way to unbind the gordian knot? There is,—light from on high has visited the earth. A glorious beam from heaven's portals has fallen upon certain parts of our dark world. When men are struggling with perplexity and doubt, and human wisdom is put to the blush, revelation, like a dove-eyed angel of love from a brighter sphere, comes under divine commission to their relief. With the utmost simplicity, and without the least symptom of that parade of wisdom which characterizes human philosophy, does the Word of God unlock in few words this stupendous secret. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."—Romans v: 12. "Through the offence of one many be dead."—Romans v: 15. "By one man's offence death reigned."—Romans v: 17. "By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation."—Romans v: 18. "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners."—Romans v: 19. "In Adam all die."—1 Corinthians, xv: 22. And we are not only directed to Adam, to the first man of our race, but to a single offence committed by him, as the starting point of sin and misery in our world. The original term denoting Adam's transgression, whether it be the original of *disobedience*, *offence*, or *sin*, is found in every instance in the singular number. Where it is said, "by the offence of one," and "by one man's offence," the original, some suppose, might be more justly rendered, "by one offence." This translation some learned commentators have adopted. We are also precisely informed as to what this transgression was, and the circumstances connected with it. We hear the voice of God proclaiming, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die"—temporally, spi-

ritually, and eternally die.—See Genesis, first and second chapters. According to revelation, therefore, one transgression, and that transgression the eating of the forbidden fruit, and that transgression perpetrated by Adam, our primitive father, brought sin, misery, and death upon the whole race of mankind. How simple the story! Human reason has toiled age after age in pursuit of this great truth, but all in vain; it is left to revelation to unfold it to those who, in the Providence of God, enjoy the music of her celestial voice.

There are also facts, which come within the reach of human observation, attesting the truth of the divine word—facts that come to the support of revelation in her instructions on this subject. We have already advanced various arguments to prove that infants, from their very birth, are sinners before God—that they all, without exception, are introduced into the world with a nature defiled and corrupt. The legitimate inference from these arguments is, in our honest judgment, that every infant born since the days of Adam, appeared upon the stage of life with a dēpraved nature. Now, if this be true, we are driven to the conclusion that all human depravity may be traced to Adam. If every infant, without qualification or exception, enters the world with a sin-defiled nature, and “goeth astray as soon as born,” evidently this extensive moral corruption, like a stream, must proceed from the first man. Whatever may have been the originating cause, it may be traced from generation to generation to that point.

Again, we all suffer from the sad effects of that curse, pronounced upon the earth in consequence of Adam’s disobedience. “Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it thou wast taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.”—Genesis iii: 17, 18, 19. All their posterity are punished by this sentence, as well as Adam and Eve. Every human being suffers inconvenience and distress from this curse. And is it reasonable now to suppose that all mankind would share punish-

ishment consequent upon Adam's sin, when they were no way concerned in it? Does not the fact that we are all *punished with Adam*, very distinctly indicate that we all *become sinful and guilty with him*?

It is evident from facts like these, taken in connection with the plain and pointed testimony of revelation, that it was by Adam's transgression that all men were made sinners. Here, then, is the source to which we may trace the deep and wide-spread depravity of mankind. Here we have discovered the fountain-head of this filthy and destructive tide. And this will account for its universal diffusion. The root being poisoned, the deadly venom found its way through all the various branches of the human family. The European and the African, the Sandwich Islander and the New Zealander, "the shivering Icelander and the sun-burnt Moor," the savage of the woods and the polished son of civilization, the Turk and Hottentot—all are alike infected with this all-pervading moral virus. "By one man's disobedience *the many* (oi polloi) were made sinners."

HOW DERIVED?

Here is a question which has elicited no small amount of fruitless discussion, and that discussion not always of the most peaceable character. Men of might approach it with diffidence, and seem conscious, when they enter upon the consideration of it, that they are in a region of shadows and gloom, and that an undeniable perplexity must attend the investigation. Augustine makes the following confession: "What is the truth, I would more willingly learn, than say, lest I should say what I know not." In Dwight's "Theology," we have this frank acknowledgment from that great mind: "I am unable to explain it." Our aim now is to present in the clearest light possible the results of the researches of learned and penetrating men on this subject, not presuming, nor promising to afford complete satisfaction on all points. Intelligent piety is humble, and will not expect to comprehend perfectly everything connected with the divine government.

We do not derive from Adam solely by *imitation*. Our

arguments to establish the fact of original sin we consider a refutation of this doctrine. Are we not informed that man is *shapen in iniquity* and *conceived in sin*? Why do infants display a bad temper, before they are old enough to imitate the conduct of others? Why do they *sicken* and *die*, and thus suffer the punishment due to sin, as soon as they be born? When Adam transgressed, and incurred the penalty, he became penitent, and his conduct was calculated to dissuade his children from a similar course. His sorrow on account of his disobedience would have a tendency to make sin appear odious in the sight of his offspring, and would incline them to a life of piety and virtue, were they as ready to copy a good example as a bad one. But his very first son was envious, ambitious, and blood-thirsty. He slew his brother. And in the course of years the posterity of Adam became so outrageously wicked, that the Lord sent a mighty deluge upon the earth, to sweep them all, save Noah and his family, from his presence. Is it not true now, as in the days of Adam, that men are more apt to imitate a bad example than a good and virtuous one? Is it not a fact that children are more ready to copy the vices than the virtues of their parents? We have only to look around upon the movements of our busy race, to find evidence enough that there exists in every human heart a decided inclination towards things sinful. For additional proof, see Genesis v: 3, where it is said that Adam "begat a son in his own likeness, after his image." We understand that Seth was born in the moral likeness, or after the moral image, of apostate Adam; as Adam is said to have been created in the moral likeness of God. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."—Genesis i: 26. This may be inferred from the language of Paul in 1 Corinthians xv: 49, "We have borne the image of the earthly." If, then, Adam *begat* Seth in his own likeness, he did not *acquire his likeness by imitation*. This doctrine of *imitation* is really an argument in our favour. Those who would account for the wide-spread depravity of our race in this manner, virtually acknowledge that bad example is very extensive, and is very readily followed. How can all men become sinners by imitation,

unless all men have bad examples before them to imitate, and a heart within them inclined to conform to such examples? And what better evidence do we want of the depravity of man's nature? If bad example is so very general, and so very generally followed, human nature from the very womb must surely be corrupt. Dr. Dick remarks: "If it were only here and there that bad example is exhibited, it would be only here and there that corruption would be diffused. It follows, therefore, that there has been a bad example in all ages and nations, in all provinces, cities, villages, and families." Again he observes: "The general imitation of bad example demonstrates an innate propensity to evil."*

We observe again, that we are not made sinners by Adam's disobedience according to the Arminian system. This represents man as having inherited natural mortality from Adam, and all his sinful habits and dispositions are said to arise from his natural frailty and mortality. When Adam transgressed, he was separated from the tree of life, and so became subject to death. And his posterity, inheriting his natural mortality, are exposed to many evils and temptations in consequence of their frail and dying condition. "The fear of death enfeebles and enslaves the mind; the pursuit of those things which are necessary to support a frail, perishing life, engrosses and contracts the soul; and the desire of sensual pleasure are rendered more eager and ungovernable, by the knowledge that the time of enjoying them soon passes away. Hence arise envying of those who have a larger share of the good things of this life—strife with those who interfere in our enjoyments—impatience under restraint—and sorrow and repining when pleasure is abridged. And to this variety of turbulent passions, the natural fruits of the punishment of Adam's transgression, there are also to be added, all the fretfulness and disquietude occasioned by the diseases and pains which are inseparable from the condition of a mortal being."† This is the doctrine of Arminius, and Whitby,

* Lecture on Theology, 47th.

† Hill's Lectures in Divinity, book iv, chap. i, see ii.

and others, and a neatly constructed one it is. But is it correct? Why, then, do men exhibit a disposition to sin with so much uniformity? Why are those who have the most natural frailties and infirmities often the most humble, meek, and correct in their lives? How comes it that the most profligate and wicked are often those who are in the bloom of health, and basking in the sunshine of prosperity? Why does not the wickedness of men vary on every hand precisely in proportion to their physical strength and outward circumstances? Why do infants discover such striking symptoms of depravity before they are old enough to exercise their minds concerning their frail and mortal nature, and the rapid flight of their days? Why are the Scriptures so earnest and explicit in their teachings in regard to the deep corruption of man's nature, and the necessity of regeneration by the Spirit of God? Why do they speak in accents so severe, and so mortifying to the pride of man, of the innate depravity of the human heart? Do we not perceive from our own experience, and from a careful observation of the conduct of men around us, that man's heart is set in him to do evil; that it is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, so that none can know it? Are not those believers very few who are satisfied to account for that powerful and constant proneness to evil with which they have to contend with such powerful vigilance, and which gives them so many anxious thoughts, in the poor and imperfect way here indicated? Such iniquities are sufficient to show the utter inadequacy of this doctrine to meet the demands of the case. This will satisfy very few enlightened and unbiassed minds, who have an honest desire to arrive at the truth, and are determined not to rein up their investigations any where short of it.

But still the question is before us, How are we made sinners by Adam's disobedience? How do we all derive sin from this source? The most orthodox divines, as we feel disposed to pronounce them, answer with one mind and voice, By *natural generation*, and by *imputation*. To each of these let us now devote the most solemn and prayerful attention, that we may not go astray on a subject so interesting and important.

NATURAL GENERATION.

Here we are immediately enveloped in mystery. Oh, how narrow the sphere in which the mind of man must move! We are overwhelmed with questions like the following: Do we only derive our corporeal or material parts from our natural progenitors? How, then, can moral corruption be predicated of matter, considered apart from the soul? How can the soul, having the hand of its Creator pure and innocent, become morally contaminated by its contact with matter? Is it possible that the spirit can be propagated, as the body is? These questions, to use a familiar phrase of Dr. Dick, are "more curious than useful." It is not profitable, nor edifying, to spend our precious time upon them. Our aim is now, not to fully explain the subject before us, (for this would be a foolish and unsuccessful aim, and would indicate the most arrogant presumption,) but simply to present a few suggestions, founded upon the prayerful researches of able and candid minds, and, adapted, we think, to afford some small measure of satisfaction to the honest inquirer.

We are not compelled to go beyond the doctrine of imputation, to account for that corrupt nature with which man is born into the world. Sin inherent may be the immediate effect of sin imputed. Death *spiritual*, is part of the penalty of Adam's transgression. When this transgression is imputed to us, or accounted ours, the penalty of course falls upon us. When the soul and body are united, the new being is then complete, and regarded as one of Adam's represented posterity; and may instantly become spiritually dead, in consequence of imputed guilt. Halyburton observes, when making the most humble confessions in regard to the deep depravity of his nature, "Penal this corruption must be, as death and diseases are. And whereof can it be a punishment, if not of Adam's sin.)*" It is worthy of remark, that although Eve was a root of propagation as well as Adam, sin and death, in every instance, are said to be derived from him. "In Adam all die." "By one

* Halyburton's Memoirs, Part I., Reflections.

man's disobedience many were made sinners." "By one man's offence, death reigned by one."

But we shall not stop here. Let us give a moment's attention to other facts. The language of the Scriptures on all subjects should be carefully considered. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?"—Job xiv: 4. Here the fact that our parents are morally unclean, is assigned as a reason why we must necessarily be polluted. "How can he be clean that is born of a woman?" Job xxvi: 4. This is precisely of the same character and import. "That which is born of flesh is flesh."—John iii: 6. That which is born of corrupt human nature, is corrupt human nature. "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."—Psalm li: 5. From the very commencement of my formation was I defiled with sin. Such are the humiliating and mysterious representations of the Scriptures.

The brain and heart of an infant in the womb are said to be affected by whatever affects the brain and heart of the mother. The impressions produced upon the one are produced upon the other. And as the body and soul are closely united, and mutually affect each other in a most wonderful manner, this may possibly have an important connection in some way with the hereditary transmission of moral impurity. On this point Pictet, in his excellent work on Christian Theology, expresses himself in the following language: "All that we may venture to advance on this subject is, that an infant, while in the womb of its mother, and therefore most intimately united to her, has the same impression made upon its brain or heart by different objects, as are made upon the brain or heart of its mother. We know that the soul and body are so closely united, that the ideas of the former, and the motions of the latter, mutually affect each other; whence it may follow, that the motions which take place in the brain of infants, and make impressions on it, have the same influence on them as they have on their mothers, namely, bind down their newly-created souls to sensual and carnal objects. This may be illustrated by the following example: supposing God to place a body, into which he intended to breathe also a soul, in the midst of some burning liquid; the

very moment the soul entered that body, it would be sensible of a very grievous pain. Thus it is that the body of the infant in its mother's womb is moved in the same way as the body of its mother, who sins every moment; and, therefore, from the time that the soul enters the body so affected, the same affections or inclinations are stirred up within it, as are stirred up in the mother, according to the corresponding motions of the body. In some such way as this we imagine that sin is propagated."*

We often speak of "family traits." By this we mean that there are certain traits of character by which particular families, or connexions of people, are distinguished. There are family vices. Eminent intellectual powers also, seem to run in families. So do various infirmities, both of mind and temper. How shall we account for all this? How are these transmitted from parent to child? May not the general depravity of human nature be propagated in something like the same manner? Is it not possible that an explanation of the one might be an explanation of the other?

It may be well to direct attention very briefly, in this connection, to the character or nature of original sin,—that sin in which man is conceived and born. It implies not merely "the want of original righteousness," but also "the corruption of our whole nature; by which we are to understand, in the language of a worthy writer, "not the infusion of anything in itself sinful, but an actual tendency or disposition to evil, resulting from the loss of righteousness." It is not the corruption of the very substance of the soul, but a derangement and perversion of its powers. Pictet remarks: "With respect to the nature of original sin, we must observe that it does not consist in the corruption of the very substance of the soul, because every substance is created by God, (who is not the author of sin,) and because the Scripture makes a distinction between our nature and the sin that is inherent in it; and moreover, if this were the case, Christ would have taken sin upon himself, when he took our nature. And it would also follow that man,

* Pictet's Christian Theology, Book iv., chap. 5.

when he is regenerated, becomes essentially different from the being he was before.* Neither is original sin the substance of human nature, as Flaccus Illyricus of the 17th century taught. This is ridiculously absurd. It is neither the substance of human nature, nor the corruption of the substance of human nature, but simply "a defect and perversion of its qualities." Neither is it voluntary, in the sense in which this word is mostly used. It is not against the will, compulsory, but it does not imply a choosing exercise of the will. There can be no sin without this, says the church of Rome. Concupiscence, or that natural propensity to evil with which we are born, is our nature, and man was originally created with it, and surely we can not be condemned for it. But our Saviour, in his sermon on the mount, pronounced impurity of heart, an inward inclination to evil, sinful in the sight of God. Paul speaks of the "sin that dwelleth in me." There are also sins of ignorance. And hence we conclude that sin is not always, and from necessity, the offspring of the will.

IMPUTATION.

"And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of knowledge, of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die."—Genesis ii: 16, 17. Here we have a covenant: the parties, God and Adam; the condition, perfect obedience; the penalty, death; the implied promise, eternal life. Does any one say that Adam did not consent to the terms? We are informed that he was made in the moral image of God, and had his law written upon his heart. Surely, then, there could be no disagreement between them. Whatever terms God might propose, Adam might promptly accept. And the terms would have been binding upon Adam any way, as a creature of God. His consent was not necessary to make them obligatory.

In this covenant Adam stood as the federal head and

*Book iv, chap. v.

representative of his posterity. He had been addressed as their representative before the fall, and why should we conclude that he was not addressed as such in this instance? When God said, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth," he did not address Adam and Eve alone, but also their descendants. Neither did he address them alone when he said, "Behold I have given you the herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree on the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed, to you it shall be for meat." When the covenant was made with Adam, therefore, we may justly suppose that his posterity were included, and that he acted in the capacity of a representative. And this may be inferred from the execution of the penalty upon all mankind. Indications of this may be seen every where around us. Adam, then, in the "covenant of works," stood as the representative of his posterity, so that they all sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression. His sin is imputed to them, is accounted theirs, and therefore the curse fell upon them all. But what are we to understand by *imputation*, as the word is here used. President Edwards defines the imputation of Adam's sin to be "liability to punishment on account of his sin." Dr. Hodge says, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: "This doctrine merely teaches that in virtue of the union, representative and natural, between Adam and his posterity, his sin is the ground of their condemnation, that is, of their subjection to penal evils." Turretine observes: "Imputation is either of something foreign to us, or of something properly our own. Sometimes that is imputed to us which is personally ours; in which sense God imputes to sinners their transgressions. Sometimes that is imputed to us which is without us, and not performed by ourselves; thus the righteousness of Christ is said to be imputed to us, and our sins are imputed to him, although he has neither sin in himself, nor we righteousness. Here we speak of the latter kind of imputation, not the former, because we are talking of a sin committed by Adam, and not by us." And we have the following language from Dr. Owen: "Things which are not our own originally, inherently, may yet be imputed to us,

by the rule of righteousness. And this may be done upon a double relation unto those whose they are, 1st. federal, 2d. natural." And again he says: "Nothing is intended by the imputation of sin unto any, but the rendering them justly obnoxious unto the punishment due unto that sin." According to Dr. Hodge, in the imputation of Adam's sin, there is "no transfer of the moral turpitude of his sin to his descendants," and "no ground to us of remorse."* These quotations from different authors will enable us to form as clear a conception as can be formed of what is meant by the imputation of Adam's sin. They teach, and very correctly and scripturally, we think, that Adam's transgression is not ours personally, or by our own act, and that the moral turpitude of it is not transferred to us, so that it cannot properly be to us an occasion of remorse; but that, in consequence of our connection with him, as a federal head and natural root, his sin is reckoned or accounted ours, and we become liable to the punishment due to it. Now, can it be shown that this doctrine is taught in the Scriptures? See Romans v: 19. "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Here it is plainly intimated that we are made sinners by Adam's disobedience, in the very manner in which we are made righteous by Christ's obedience. The apostle invites attention to the analogy between Christ and Adam. How, then, are we made righteous by the Saviour's obedience? Surely not by imitation. He is not personally and visibly present with us, that we may be the spectators of his holy conduct; and when we read the story of his life and death, as recorded by the evangelists, we find ourselves entirely unable to imitate him. We have naturally an utter aversion to such an eminently holy example. Neither can we derive righteousness from him by natural generation, because we are not descended from him, as we are from Adam. It must be by imputation. His obedience is imputed to us, or set down to our account; and in consequence of our interest in him, the Holy Spirit is sent, to renew and sanctify

* Old and New Theology, chapter ii.

our moral nature, and thus fit us for the enjoyment of God. He was the representative of his elect people in the covenant of grace, and when he fulfilled all righteousness, it was received as satisfactory in their name. And now we understand the apostle to say, that as Adam was the federal head and representative of his posterity in the covenant of works, and by his imputed disobedience they were made sinners, so that Christ is the federal head and representative of his people in the covenant of grace, and by his imputed obedience they are made righteous. Our Saviour's obedience can only make men righteous by imputation, and as Adam is here compared with him, we infer that his disobedience makes men sinners in the same manner.— And that this is the apostle's idea, the strict import of his language appears to teach. The words *katestathesan amartolois*, made sinners, signify that we are *constituted sinners—made sinners by a judicial act*. As by Adam's disobedience many were *constituted sinners*, accounted sinners by the divine government, so by the obedience of Christ shall many be *constituted* righteous.

See also the 18th verse of the same chapter. “As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” Justification and condemnation are legal or forensic terms. They do not imply a change of character, so much as a change of state. If all men were condemned for Adam's offence, that offence must have been imputed to all men. We did not commit that offence actually or personally, and God cannot condemn us on account of it, unless it be made ours by imputation. The argument from this passage is conclusive. The statement is clear and distinct, and so easily understood as to render an exposition unnecessary.

Again, in the 14th verse, Adam is called “the figure of him that was to come.” Here the allusion is evidently to Christ. This may be inferred from the connection in which the words occur, and from similar expressions elsewhere. And how was Adam the figure or type of Christ? Not because he consisted of soul and body, because every man resembles Christ in this particular. He is called *the* figure of Christ; and he was

therefore like him in some way peculiar to himself—in a way in which no other man ever could resemble him. How was that? He was a covenant-head, the representative of mankind in a federal transaction, and so was Christ. There can be no other satisfactory explanation of Paul's language. It cannot be shown that Adam was in any other respect *the one and only figure* or type of Christ.

See also the 12th verse. "By one man entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,"—sinned in Adam. They reap the wages of Adam's sin, because they are considered in law as having transgressed in him.

In 1 Corinthians xv : 22, we have the following language : "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Here again we have a comparison instituted between Christ and Adam. Here it is implied, that as we are made alive by Christ, so we die by Adam. And since we are made alive by Christ by the imputation of his obedience, we must die by Adam by the imputation of his disobedience.

In the 45th verse it is said : "The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam a quickening spirit." Here Christ is called the second Adam. And what can Paul mean by referring so often to the analogy between Christ and Adam, if the imputation of Adam's sin is not taught? He plainly intimates that there is one great and striking point of similarity between the two; and what can it be, if there is no reference to their covenant-headships?

And we find that our views and reasoning are in harmony with facts. Admitting that Adam did represent his posterity in the covenant of works, and that his offence is imputed to them, we have precisely the results that would be expected to follow. We can all feel them, and see them with our own eyes. The curse that fell upon Adam, in consequence of his transgression, fell in all its power upon his descendants, as though it had been committed by them. They all became subject to affliction, sorrow, pain, and death. They were all compelled to labour and sweat for their daily food. They all found thorns and thistles in their path, and vile, tumultuous, and tormenting passions in their breasts.—They all experienced the bitterness of sinning against

God. And as they suffered punishment for Adam's offence, equally with Adam, that offence must have been charged upon them. They must have been so represented in him, that when he transgressed, his transgression was accounted theirs, and the punishment due to it inflicted upon them.

EQUITY AND REASONABLENESS OF THE DOCTRINE OF
REPRESENTATION.

There are questions connected with the great apostasy, and questions not unfrequently proposed, which can only be silenced by a reference to the sovereignty of God. Why were the angels left to stand or fall each for himself, while mankind were to stand or fall together in a covenant-head? Why was Adam left in a state in which he was liable to fall? When he had fallen, why was he not destroyed immediately, why did not the curse instantly take effect upon him, that he might not propagate a race of doomed sinners? These questions, and others like them, are evidently beyond the proper sphere of human inquiry. We know that God intended man's happiness in the covenant of works. The scheme of redemption was prepared to meet the demands of the fall, and not the fall to meet the demands of the scheme of redemption. We are absolutely sure that God will not do evil that good may come. There is much which infinite wisdom has not been pleased to reveal. And indeed, in our present state, we are unable to comprehend the adorable counsels of eternity, were they even recorded in the sacred volume. But there are some points upon which human judgment can be profitably exercised, even in connection with the imputation of Adam's sin. While it is not man's prerogative to arraign his brother at the bar of his own blind reason, and approve or condemn according to his pleasure, he may nevertheless humbly, and in the exercise of a trusting faith, inquire into the wisdom and equity of his proceedings, in the light of inspired truth. If God was pleased to enter into a covenant with the human family, he had a sovereign right to appoint the father of all our covenant-head. And we cannot complain that he did not assign to that solemn and important post a proper and

suitable person. Adam was our father, and he could not have sustained a dearer and more intimate relation to mankind. He was also created pure and innocent, and endowed with ability to keep the divine law perfectly. He was happy in communion with his adored Creator, and loved to execute his will. Neither was the condition of the covenant grievous or oppressive. Obedience, independent of the covenant, was due unto God. This was an obligation imposed by his very creation. And the test of his obedience—how mild and kind! It was remarkably simple and easy. He was merely forbidden to eat the fruit of a certain tree, while an abundance of other fruit was provided for his use. And not only was the requirement so mild and gentle, and he endowed with ability to keep the divine law, but the most powerful inducements to obedience were set before him. He was sweetly enticed by a precious promise, and strongly urged by an awful threatening, and by a deep sense of his responsibility as a representative, to obey the divine command. Was there any injustice in God's dealings with man thus far? Do we not rather perceive the most distinct and pleasing indications of benevolence? But let us trace the progress of the divine administration a little farther. Did Adam stand or fall? Suppose he obeyed the injunction, and thus entailed the blessings of the promise upon the human family. Would his posterity have complained? Not a murmur would then have escaped our lips. The goodness of God would have been the theme of perpetual praise. But the affair resulted differently. The covenant was broken, and the curse fell upon man. And now shall we speak of God in tones of peevish dissatisfaction? Shall we complain that he did not violate his word? "Think for a moment," says Dr. Green, in his "Lectures on the Shorter Catechism," "that if Adam had retained his holiness, all his offspring, like himself, would have been holy and happy. Would not this have been equitable. If it would, it must be equitable that his offspring should be unholy, when he became so. The principle is the same, however it may affect the actual condition of our race."*

* Lecture 17th.

We should, then, reflect with love upon God's unbending faithfulness. We should remember that "he is not man, that he should die, nor the son of man, that he should repent."

How shall we reconcile the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity with Ezekiel xviii: 20: "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son." We have no right to apply this to the case before us. We are considering a covenant transaction. It may not be universally true that children must bear the iniquities of the father, and yet in a peculiar case like this, in which a covenant is formed, and in which the father acts as the federal head of his offspring, it may be true. There is no allusion to covenanting in the passage we have cited. In it we are simply taught, that in ordinary cases, when a child rejects the wicked habits and example of an ungodly father, and lives an upright life, he shall not bear his father's iniquities. This is for the encouragement of virtuous children who have wicked parents.

If it were unjust for God, in the case of Adam, to charge his offence upon his posterity, or to hold them liable to the punishment due to it, it does seem that he has erred repeatedly. And this we know to be impossible. In his covenants with men, it has been a general rule with God to include their unborn offspring. This not only evinces the justice of imputation, but is presumptive evidence that all mankind are represented in the covenant of works. When God made a covenant with Noah, he said, "I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you."—Genesis ix: 9. Noah's descendants, even those who were not then in being, shared with him the consequences of that transaction. When God entered into a covenant with Abraham, his language was, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."—Genesis xviii: 7. Abraham's unborn posterity were to receive the sign or seal of this covenant, and enjoy the privileges and blessings flowing from it, or suffer the results of its violation, as well as himself. And when God covenanted with the

children of Israel in the land of Moab, he said, by the mouth of his servant Moses, "Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath, but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not with us here this day."—Deuteronomy xxix: 14, 15. Here we are taught that this covenant was made with those whom Moses addressed, yet to be born. We learn from such examples that God does not consider it unjust to enter into a covenant with men, and bind their unborn posterity, who are represented by them, to the conditions, sending upon them the evils of its violation, or the happy fruits growing out of it, as the result may be, without their personal consent.

Instances of one person being punished on account of the sins of another, or of many being punished on account of sins which they did not personally commit, are not at all rare in the Scriptures. On account of Achan's sin, who coveted and took the goodly Babylonish garment, and two hundred shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold of fifty shekels weight, and hid them in the earth, an army of three thousand of the men of Israel were made to flee before the men of Ai, and many of them were slain. And the Lord said, "Israel hath sinned, and they have also transgressed my covenant which I commanded them; for they have even taken of the accursed thing, and have also stolen, and dissembled also, and they have put it even among their own stuff. Therefore the children of Israel could not stand before their enemies, but turned their backs before their enemies, because they were accused; neither will I be with you any more, except ye destroy the accursed from among you." Joshua vii: 11, 12. All the first born in the families of the Egyptians were slain in consequence of Pharaoh's hardness of heart. "And it came to pass, that at midnight the Lord smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne, unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon, and all the first-born of the cattle. And Pharaoh rose up in the night, he and all his servants, and all the Egyptians, and there was a great cry in Egypt, for there was not a house where there was not one dead."

Exodus xii : 29, 30. The Amalekites, four centuries after they had given battle to the people of God in their journey from Egypt, were, by divine command, sorely punished for the act. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid in wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both men and women, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass. And Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah until thou comest to Shur, that is over against Egypt. And he took Agag the king of the Amalekites alive, and utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword."—1 Samuel xv : 2, 3, 7, 8. The Jews are now suffering the sore judgment of heaven in consequence of their father's iniquities. And many more similar illustrations might readily be pointed out, were it necessary.

The equity of this principle of representation is recognized in the legal transactions of men. In the transfer of property by deeds and bonds, parents bargain and contract for their offspring without their consent. For the crime of high treason, in some countries, men forfeit their worldly estates, and entail poverty and contempt upon their descendants for many generations. We could show, by an appeal to the writings of philosophers, historians, and poets, that mankind naturally regard this principle as just. It is approved by the heathen mind, whose views of right and wrong have never come under the sway of revelation. We have the following language from the Delphic oracle of the ancient Romans, the original Latin being translated into English :

"Justice divine pursues the guilty head;
Nor can they escape, not e'en if sprung from love;
O'er them it hangs, and o'er their guiltless sons—
Stroke after stroke falls on the hapless race."

And we might adduce the testimony of eminent jurists, skilled in the intricacies of human law, in defence of our doctrine. Chief Justice Hale has said: "God made man righteous at first, and gave him a righteous law; and, inasmuch as man owed an infinite subjection to the author of his being, he owed an exact obedience to the law of

his Maker. Yet God was pleased to give him this law, not only as the rule of his obedience, but as a covenant of life and death, wherein the first man made a stipulation for himself and his posterity; and this was just, for he had in himself the race of all mankind. All succeeding generations are but pieces of Adam, who had not, nor could have, their being but from him, and so it was but reasonable and just for him to contract for all his posterity.*

ORIGINAL SIN NO EXCUSE.

Many are ready to argue, that if man's moral condition, as born into the world, be such as we have represented, it is a good excuse for his sinful conduct, and of course God will look with an indulgent eye upon every wayward act. This is an incorrect and dangerous view of the subject. One who may be under the influence of such an impression, should endeavor to obtain more enlightened conceptions of the divine government, that he may be delivered from this ruinous delusion. There are several facts to which his attention ought to be directed. Man has reduced himself to this low estate. This is not the work of God. In Adam, our holy father, we were lawfully and very favorably represented. And having broken covenant with God, and fallen into a state of moral defilement and death, in the person of our representative, no blame attaches to the divine government, nor is its original right to rule, command, and punish in the least impaired. We have not made the divine law less binding upon us by violating it, and by incurring its penalty. And as to Adam acting as our federal head, be assured all is right here; there is not one of Adam's posterity who would not have broken the covenant, had he been left to stand or fall for himself—especially when destitute of that solemn and powerful sense of responsibility which must have rested upon Adam's mind, as the representative of all his dear children to the remotest generation. We have already shown how many things, and some of them very strong in their influence, con-

* Hale's Meditation on the Lord's Prayer.

spired to fortify and strengthen our federal head. Dr. Ashbel Green, in his "Lectures on the Shorter Catechism," says: "Let it further be considered, that men were to be born in a state of infantile weakness. Now, during this state, would they, I ask, have been as competent to resist temptation, as Adam was in the perfection of his powers? It has been often said on this subject, and I think with truth, that every individual had a fairer prospect of a favorable issue to a state of probation, by being represented in Adam, than if he had stood for himself, that is, if he had stood for himself, he would have been far more likely to fall than Adam was. The high responsibility of Adam—the knowledge that he stood for his posterity—was doubtless a strong inducement to him to maintain his integrity."*

It should also be remembered that no man, in sinning against God, does violence to his will, or acts under compulsion. He may act contrary to a divine and holy principle implanted within him, if he be a converted soul, as Paul intimates in Romans, 7th chapter, but he cannot sin in opposition to that corrupt will in which he is born. He has a certain freedom of will, in the full exercise of which he transgresses the law of God. But what is the nature of this freedom of will which he enjoys? His will is not at liberty to determine itself, or "to determine its own determinations," for this would be making an effect its own cause, which seems to us to be most unphilosophical and absurd. And yet this idea of liberty is advocated by many, and is regarded as indispensable to constitute one a moral agent. We have the following language from Dr. Reid, in his *Essays on the Active Powers*: "By the liberty of a moral agent, I understand a power over the determinations of his own will. If, in any action, he had power to will what he did, or not to will it, in that action he is free. But if, in every voluntary action, the determination of his will be the necessary consequence of something involuntary in the state of his mind, or of something in his external circumstances, he is not free; he has not what I call the liberty of a moral agent, but is subject to necessity."†

* Lecture 17th. † *Essay iv, chap. i.*

This is the favorite Philosophy of Arminians. But the liberty of a moral agent, is the liberty of the agent in the exercise of his will, and not the liberty of the will in the exercise of itself. If man is at liberty to act from choice, or according to his own free determinations, without any foreign compulsion, he is free, and he has a consciousness of his freedom. In Hill's "Lectures in Divinity," we find the following definition of the liberty of a moral agent: "The liberty of a moral agent consists in the power of acting according to his choice; and those actions are free, which are performed without any external compulsion or restraint, in consequence of the determinations of his own mind.* Now this liberty man enjoys, notwithstanding he is the subject of original corruption. He acts freely, according to his own will, and he is conscious of it. His accountability, therefore, cannot be questioned.

We shall not forget, moreover, that the grace and Spirit of God are promised, and offered to us in Christ. "Is the Spirit of the Lord straitened?"—Micah. ii: 7. We are informed that the Spirit of the Lord *striveth* with men: "The Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man."—Genesis vi: 3. "Thou gavest thy good Spirit to instruct them."—Nehemiah ix: 20. "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost."—Acts vii: 51. "God is the Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."—2 Corinthians v: 17. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life."—John iii: 14. "Christ has suffered for sin, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God."—1 Peter iii: 18. "This is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness."—Jeremiah xxiii: 6. There is, then, a way of escape for man, even although born under the curse and dominion of sin.—Hope pours her cheering light upon him. Help is proclaimed in sweet accents from the skies. He is not permitted, therefore, to make the doctrine of original sin, as taught in the Scriptures, an excuse for his iniquities.

*. Book iv., chap. ix., sec. iii.

Pardon is offered—sanctification is offered—the favour and friendship of God, and a holy and happy heaven, are offered. Indeed they are pressed upon us. Then let us not reason thus: Alas! I am “a child of wrath,” “condemned already,” and “dead in trespasses and sins,”—I was born under the frowns of heaven, with a nature deeply defiled with the dark stain of iniquity; and, therefore, why need I trouble myself? what can I do?—if God will pardon and save, well and good, but if not, I must perish. My hands are tied. Therefore, I will live as I list, and take whatever may come. No, sinner, you have something to do; and why standest thou all the day idle? The way of salvation is open before you—pardon, peace, and holiness are presented to you, to be received or rejected. If you sin, you do it freely, and from choice,—if you perish, it is because you would have it so. Do not blame your Maker, to encourage your heart in iniquity. Do not vainly attempt to throw off all responsibility from your own shoulders.

FRIENDLY INQUIRIES.

To those who hesitate to believe the doctrine of original sin, or who positively deny that it is true, we wish to address a few respectful but searching questions.—Are you certain that your judgment is uncontrolled by that selfish pride which is common to us all? This doctrine is evidently very mortifying to our natural vanity and self-esteem. There is nothing in it flattering to our hearts. Man loves to consider himself as influential, able to accomplish anything, admired by all, of great worth, and an individual of great importance in God's dominions. He is inclined to regard himself as under no special obligations to God; and whatever he may do in the way of glorifying him in his body and spirit, is a gratuity, a favour done him, for which he is eternally bound to remember and bless him. He is reluctant, therefore, to believe such a doctrine as the one we have been discussing,—a doctrine which strips him of his imaginary worth, power, and importance, and describes him as naturally “poor, and wretched, and miserable, and blind, and naked,” and in a state of dependence

upon divine and sovereign grace. This gives him a view of himself entirely too humiliating to be satisfactory. Now, if you declare that this doctrine does not commend itself to your judgment, even after a careful examination of the Scriptures, we beg you to make sure that pride is not at the bottom of your unbelief,—a secret, and yet powerful opposition of soul to every message that comes to mortify and condemn, rather than to flatter and extol. We are informed that “the wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God.” And no doubt the pride of man’s countenance prevents him often from looking rightly at his true condition, which is a necessary preparation for seeking after God.

But let us persuade you to devote some attention to another point. Are you not robbing your blessed Redeemer of his glory? Does not this doctrine present the great work of redemption in a most engaging light? If it be true, has not Christ an infinite right to the heart’s purest and richest offerings? Are not his claims upon our gratitude and love exceedingly strong? But, suppose it be false, what then? Is the Redeemer still as glorious and adorable as ever in our eyes? Will our deep sense of obligation remain unabated? Shall we be as ready to shout forth joyously, “Salvation unto our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.” If it be not true that man is born under the curse of the law, and with a nature deeply depraved, we are much mistaken if it will not degrade our ideas of the Saviour’s glorious mediation. Who deny the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ? Who deny the doctrine of justification by faith in a Saviour’s blood, as proclaimed and vindicated by Luther, and Calvin, and other noble defenders of the cross? Who lay the greatest stress upon good works, and the least upon the unmerited kindness of God? Who glorify man the most, and God the least, in their views of salvation? Who are most indifferent to the great and good missionary cause, contributing the least money, furnishing the fewest labourers, and offering the fewest prayers, to support and carry it on? We should not judge hastily, and without much calm deliberation, on a subject so serious; but we must be permitted to

express our honest conviction, when we say, in answer to all these grave interrogatories, they, just they, wherever they may be, and by whatever name called, who utterly discard the doctrine of original sin, and will give it no place in their religious creed. If, then, we would not detract from the glory of the cross, and from the loveliness of our blessed Mediator, we must not renounce this Scriptural and fundamental doctrine. The scheme of redemption gives a deeper dye to original sin, and original sin gives a brighter lustre to the scheme of redemption. They should ever be viewed in connection, if we would have the most exalted views possible of a Saviour's worth, and the most lively feelings of gratitude and love.

But another question: How, do you approach the sacred oracles, to learn what God has taught? With your views of a subject already unchangeably fixed, or with a willing and teachable spirit? With the determination that every thing must yield to your preconceived opinions, or with the determination that whatever God has cleansed you will not call common or unclean? With a mind unconquerably resolved not to be defeated in a controversy, or with an humble desire to know what the Lord has revealed, and to receive it as immutable truth, and act upon it, however mortifying it may be to human pride? There would be less error in the world, were men more inclined to approach the oracles of eternal wisdom with a right spirit, and with proper intentions. Men too often make the Bible a servant to them, to carry out their will, instead of making themselves obedient servants to it, to maintain and carry out its precepts. This point, then, should be well guarded, if we wish to arrive at the truth. We must open the sacred volume with honest and sincere hearts, bowing humbly, and with all the simplicity and confidence of little children, at the feet of our Heavenly Father,—not as stubborn and self-willed polemics, determined to maintain a position too hastily taken—not as worshippers of blind and perverted human reason, which is evidently not able to comprehend everything connected with the divine government; but as those who only wish to see that a doctrine is plainly revealed, to believe it, and to

frame their faith and practice according to it, regardless of its connection with any previously formed but false theory, and without waiting to force it into a state of entire harmony with a narrow and sin-distorted judgment. "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven, what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth and broader than the sea." "How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"

CHRIST FREE FROM ORIGINAL SIN.

He did not descend from Adam by ordinary generation. Hence Adam's sin was not imputed to him. He was not one of his represented posterity. And although his body was formed out of the substance of the virgin, that he might be one with us, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, yet it was formed by the overshadowing power of the Holy Ghost; and "the moment the soul was united to the body, both soul and body subsisted in the person of the Son of God." Therefore he was born entirely free from all moral corruption. In the Westminster "Shorter Catechism," the question, "How did Christ, being the Son of God, become man?" is answered in these words, "Christ, the Son of God, became man, by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and born of her, yet without sin." Neither by natural generation, nor by imputation, could Christ be subject to original sin. The angel said unto Mary, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also, that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."—Luke i: 35. Thus was his body formed. And the soul—it could not be created sinful, nor could Adam's transgression have any effect upon it. The Son of God, then, when "he took on him the seed of Abraham," or assumed the entire human nature, did not become subject in any degree to that original corruption which characterizes all who descend from Adam by ordinary generation. And this was

necessary, 1st. "because the human nature was to subsist in union with the Son of God;" 2d. "because it was to be a sacrifice for sin, and therefore behoved to be without blemish," Hebrews vii: 26, 1 Peter i: 19; 3d. because "the spotless holiness of his human nature was to be imputed to us as a part of his righteousness," 1 Corinthians i: 30, Jeremiah xxxiii: 15, 2 Corinthians v: 21. Then let us rejoice that we have such an High Priest as became us, one who was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, who needed not daily, as other high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity, but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated forevermore.

MAN'S DEPENDENCE ON GOD.

When we reflect upon such truths as have been presented, our spiritual pride should be mortified, and our sense of dependence deepened and strengthened. Infinitely absurd and ill-conceived are the aspirations and efforts of that legalist who would work his way to heaven by his own unaided energy. He thinks not of the old sore. He has forgotten that he came into the world under the sentence of condemnation. Not only is his nature depraved, but the covenant is violated, that "one man's disobedience" is accounted his, and ever since his birth he has been exposed to the sword of retributive justice. He labors and watches to avoid the condemnation of the law, with a view to salvation, forgetting that he is "condemned already." If Christ is not desirable in his sight, his hopes are baseless, visionary fabrics, and doomed to perish. His mind must undergo a thorough revolution, his views and feelings must be entirely changed, before he can enter "the golden city," and appear in glory's robes before his God. There is no virtue in self-inflicted tortures—"in beads, and holy water, and crossings, and bowings,"—"in pilgrimages to holy places, and superstitious reverence for dead men's bones,"—in long prayers, long fastings, and long, heartless ceremonies. These are well styled "the inven-

tions of a blind zeal, and the injunctions of a tyrannical priesthood." A deep sense of his own impotency, and dependence upon divine grace, is fallen man's loveliest ornament. He should earnestly consider the humiliating truths we have discussed, until he is ready to exclaim, "Arise, O Lord; save me, O my God." He should feel that he is utterly incompetent either to obey fully the divine law, or to render an atonement for sin; that he is prostrate under mountains of guilt, and ready to perish, unless the Saviour will come to his rescue. While self-reliance is the way to success in worldly pursuits, it is the way to misery and death in the scheme of redemption. Here we must look away from ourselves for an object on which to fix our confidence and hope. And this we find exceedingly difficult. Selfishness will figure largely in all our calculations. We are anxious to share the honours of a spiritual heroism. We are inclined to fix a complacent eye on our own moral valor.

Men are accustomed to form too high an estimate of human worth. Genius, learning, family nobility, religious zeal, military fame, eloquence, and royalty, are all supposed to have claims, more or less upon the divine admiration and regard. The orator, when pronouncing high-wrought eulogies upon the lives of deceased authors, statesmen, and warriors, unhesitatingly declares that they are reaping heaven's joys as the reward of their labors. The amateurs of poetry have long ago enrolled the names of Homer, Shakspeare, Byron, and Burns in the register of the redeemed. And those ancient philosophers who were wise beyond their day, and who framed curious systems of morality, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and others, are represented as being, without doubt, in the world of glory, where their brows are wreathed with imperishable laurel. In an address delivered at the dedication of a cemetery in the environs of New York, a distinguished literary gentleman of our day, after summoning around him the spirits of departed saints, thus describes the heavenly troop: "In that white robed company of winged beings who would cluster around us, would be the half-divine form of Homer, who gave Greece her heroism and her poetry, and flung over the tombs of her great children the wreath of undying

fame—of Phidias, Cleomines, and Praxitiles, who filled their cemeteries and temples with breathing marbles—of the divine Plato, who revealed to the spiritual-minded Greeks the immortality of the soul,—of Cicero and Virgil, who infused into the civilization of Rome the elegant taste of the Greek—in a word, of all the great and good who, amidst the struggles and gloom of a working world, have directed mankind to the better life to come.” Such language betrays a deplorable want of correct religious knowledge, and a charity of judgment no where authorized in the Scriptures. The fancy of a poet, the chisel of an artist, and the eloquence of an orator, can never win them an entrance into the heavenly kingdom. They must have other *passports* than these, or they can never pass the portals of the New Jerusalem. There is but one way of salvation revealed, and that is through the mediation of Christ. That a Socrates or Cicero can be saved by any other method, we have no divine warrant. When we pronounce an individual an heir of heaven, without some assurance that he is united to Christ, we proceed entirely on our own responsibility. What but the blood of Jesus can “cleanse us from all sin?” What but the Spirit of God can sanctify the polluted soul? Man should never feel secure, until he has taken his stand upon that *tried* and *precious* corner-stone which God hath laid in Zion. “Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.”—1 Corinthians iii: 11. “Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.”—Acts iv: 12.

GRATITUDE TO CHRIST.

In view of such facts as have been mentioned, we should be exceedingly grateful for the gift of Christ, and should eagerly appropriate him as our only hope.—“Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift.” As by Adam’s disobedience we were made sinners, so by Christ’s obedience we may be made righteous. He has suffered the penalty of the law, and fully met all its requirements, and in his name we may stand accepted in the divine presence. By his blood we may be absolved

from guilt, and by his Spirit we may be delivered from all moral pollution, so that he is a complete and all-sufficient Redeemer. Hence the apostle's bold avowal of attachment to the Gospel: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."—Romans i: 16. We delight to trumpet the praises of those distinguished men whose names are identified with the cause of national liberty. Ballads are sung to their honour by a thousand tongues,—large assemblies are convened to hear their worth extolled,—banneted regiments attend their footsteps,—thundering ordnance salute their approach,—and anxious multitudes court a sight of their nodding plumes and streaming cockades. But what are the champions of political freedom, a Kosciusko, a Lafayette, or a Washington, compared with our great spiritual Deliverer! The former befriended mankind in the chains of a temporary human captivity, but the latter is the fast friend of the immortal soul, bleeding and languishing in the tightly riveted fetters of a grinding and eternal bondage. Our blessed Saviour has triumphed over the thrones and principalities of darkness,—he has taken a mighty and victorious grapple with the Prince of the power of the air,—he has valiantly contested the emperorship of this revolted and self-ruined province,—he has unlocked the barred and bolted dungeons of spiritual despotism; and now the sweet voice of Gospel grace announces to the captive the glad news of his emancipation. We should, then, listen with joyous hearts to the invitations of redeeming mercy. "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." If Christ be the object of our confiding love, we are no more under condemnation, but are under the process of preparation for the pure abodes of the eternal on high. We are the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty—heaven is our home—angels are our attendants—the Holy Spirit is our purifier, comforter, and tutor—glory has dawned upon us—and sweet antepasts of eternal joys are already ours. Where is the eloquence to describe, the soul to feel, the full extent of our indebtedness to the Prince of life! With a seraph's fervour, and a corresponding power of utterance, we could but half

declare his praise. His claims upon our gratitude can never be met.

“Were the whole realm of nature mine,
That were a present far too small;
Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all.”

THE MISSIONARY CAUSE.

The facts we have considered should exalt our estimate of the importance of the missionary cause. If by one man's disobedience all mankind were made sinners, we should earnestly desire that all men should become acquainted with him by whose obedience they may be made righteous. Poor heathen brother! we acknowledge with shame our culpable inattention to your welfare. You stand upon destruction's brink—damnation's billows roll beneath—your doom may soon be sealed forever; and yet we behold it all with comparative indifference. Heaven guard the vessel that bears a missionary of the cross to the regions of moral night. May propitious gales swell her canvass, and speed her over the briny wave to some benighted shore. May her precious charge be prospered in his work of love, and may a many-starred crown adorn his sainted brow in glory. Our contributions should be frequent and liberal, and our prayers numerous and fervent, in behalf of this heroic vanguard, this ever-daring detachment in the army of Christ. Never let us discourage those who have gone to labour in distant lands, by talking in reprehensive tones of their ill-directed zeal,—by asserting that they have foolishly forsaken the starving around the home of their youth, to feed those far away with the bread of life. There are many around us, 'tis true, who are in need of Gospel light. There will be enough left, however, to attend to them. We need not fear that the cause of missions will depopulate Christendom. There are so many disposed to “confer with flesh and blood,” as to render this forever impossible. Pray, deny not our perishing brethren beyond the seas a few morsels of that living bread we enjoy so abundantly. When God has put it into the heart of some missionary of rare de-

votion, to steer his course for India, China, Africa, or the Isles of Ocean on mercy's errand, let him go,—let him go, and may his life and health be precious in heaven's sight.

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church, from its origin in America to the present time; with Notes and Documents Explanatory and Historical.* Compiled for the Board of Publication by the Rev. SAMUEL J. BAIRD. 8 vo., pp. 856. Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia: 1856.

From the first announcement in the newspapers that this work was in preparation, we have looked for its appearance with eager expectation. Our knowledge of the author's characteristic earnestness, and of his great diligence in collecting materials for his work, gave assurance that we should at length possess a digest worthy of the name. Nor are we, upon a slight examination, at all disappointed. A good fat octavo is before us, containing a vast body of documentary information touching the early and forming period of our church's history in this country. The various important decisions which have been rendered at different times, are also judiciously arranged: and the whole book made easy of reference by means of a full index, and a complete table of contents. Apart from the full and reliable knowledge here afforded of the legislation of the church, the compendious and documentary form in which so much of her early history is given, showing the readiness with which she has adapted herself to a rapid extension over a large territory, imparts inestimable value to this volume.

Mr. Baird may not perhaps acquire great literary reputation by the production of this work; but he has the higher satisfaction of knowing that he has conferred a benefit upon the whole Presbyterian Church in this country, and thereby made all his brethren his debtors. His name will at least be a household word in our Church courts, and he will be remembered with affection and gratitude in the thousand libraries in which his book will be shelved as a part of their indispensable furniture.

2. *The Skeptical Era in Modern History*: or the Infidelity of the Eighteenth Century, the Product of Spiritual Despotism. By T. M. POST. CHARLES SCRIBNER: 145 Nassau-street, New York: 1856. 12 mo., pp. 264.

The apologetic design of this book is sufficiently indicated in its title. It aims to vindicate Protestantism from the charge of being "a religion of negations; its philosophy, that of doubt, denial, irreverence and insurrection; its triumphs, logical, economic, administrative, industrial, fiscal; its genius cold, hard, practical, materialistic; unheroic, unideal, undevout—the very antipodes of exalted religious passion or faith, which can find shelter alone under the shadow of ecclesiastical absolutism." The author cross-examines the witness brought forward to support this charge; and successfully turns the testimony against the accuser. He traces the infidelity of the eighteenth century not to the reformation of the sixteenth as its product, but to the preceding despotism, both secular and spiritual, as the "pons et origo malorum."

We are gratified with every new indication that the popular mind is setting in the direction of historical study, gathering up the important lessons of the past, and putting a right interpretation upon the facts which party interest seeks everywhere to pervert and misconstrue. History has been too long suborned into bearing testimony to a lie. Let a true philosophy detect and explain the secret causes which underlie and connect her facts, and she will bear an honest testimony for God and

truth. We cannot say much in praise of this author's style, which is anything but chaste, and full of new coined words. Indeed, the book bears the strongest internal evidence of being the publication of lectures delivered before some popular lyceum : against which we do not object, except that we could wish the author had re-written them, substituting the calm and dignified style of the historical essayist for the florid and often vapid declamation of the lecturer ; and if more historical details had been substituted for much of the author's " agonizing " and repetitious amplifications, the arguments would have told with tenfold greater power.

3. *Modern Pilgrims* : Showing the improvements in travel, and the newest methods of reaching the Celestial City. By GEORGE WOOD, author of *Peter Schlemihl in America*. PHILLIPS, SAMPSON & Co. Boston : 1855. 2 vols., 12 mo., pp. 396, 396.

We were first attracted to these volumes by the title, wondering at the boldness of an author venturing thus into the lists with the famous old dreamer. An allegory sustained through two mortal volumes of eight hundred pages would achieve for any man an immortal reputation. Unfortunately, the wing which attempts this soaring flight, wearies in mid-air, and there is many a sudden descent from the figurative to the literal, and the commingling of the two presents combinations that are often grotesque enough. But while it fails as an allegory, it is for the most part capital as a satire. Few follies of the time escape the sharp thrust of the writer, from the rose-water philanthropy of Faneuil Hall and the Tabernacle, to Puseyism converting into farce the hoary superstitions of Rome. There is, however, a coarseness in some of these pictures particularly offensive, and the exhibition of socialism in " life at the Phalanstery," as well as the scene at the Opera, we could wish had been entirely omitted, or else treated with greater delicacy.

Perhaps one of the most infelicitous passages in the work, con-

sidered simply artistically, is the only one in which the author betrays his strong Baptist prejudice. We can afford, however, to forgive it for its harmlessness, if not for the better reason that he so heartily buffets the wickedness and foolery of those who pervert the Gospel and "turn the grace of God into licentiousness."

-
4. *Suggestions on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes in the Southern States*: Together with an Appendix, containing Forms of Church Registers, Form of a Constitution, and Plans of Different Denominations of Christians. By CHARLES COLCOCK JONES, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

The preceding is a new edition of the little volume of Dr. Jones, for many years the indefatigable missionary to the negroes on our plantations. It embraces the results of his long experience in that capacity, and with his catechism for the religious instruction of the colored people, which has been translated by our foreign missionaries into other languages, furnishes those aids so much needed by him who turns his attention to the spiritual improvement of our servile population. That one, whose early life was thus spent, has been twice called to occupy a Professor's Chair in one of our Theological Schools, and then to hold the office of Secretary of our Board of Missions, shows that the man of ability does not cease to be regarded, when he turns himself away from the society of the intelligent and refined, to labour for the lowly and the neglected, and that labours of love and self-denial will receive their reward. We ascribe much of that special attention which is paid to the religious improvement of the slave, to Dr. Jones' example and labours. From him the abolitionist, were he not past instruction, might learn a lesson of *true* humanity, and true kindness to the sons of Africa. It is to preach *spiritual* deliverance to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to those bound in the *thralldom of sin*. The outward social condition of men is temporary, their relations to

God eternal, and he who leads a bendman to a saving knowledge of Christ, has conferred a lasting benefit, while the man-stealer who has enticed him away to the frozen regions of Canada has committed a felony, which can result in good to the victim of his deception, only by the overruling Providence of God.

5. *The Priest, the Puritan, and the Preacher.* By the Rev. J. C. RYLE, author of "Living and Dead," &c. &c. New York: CARTER'S. 1855: pp. 360, 16 mo.

Lectures, addressed to the Young Men's Christian Association, on Bishop Latimer, Baxter and his Times, and Whitfield, with three other brief practical tracts: The whole exhibiting that remarkable plainness and directness of style characteristic of the author. He does not spare the Papistic tendencies of his own church, nor mince matters about "the good old times" of the 18th century. They were in his view "bad old times" unmistakably! precisely "the darkest age England has passed through in the last three hundred years."

6. *Union Bible Dictionary*, for the use of Schools, Bible Classes, and Families. New edition, improved and enlarged, with entirely new engravings. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. pp. 691, 12 mo.

This is one of the most valuable issues of the Sunday School Union. It is not a reprint of the former edition published by the Society, but has been carefully re-written by the laborious and able editor. Mr. Packard has availed himself of those sources of information which modern scholarship and enterprise have furnished to his hand, and has spared no pains to render the whole accurate and complete, as far as the moderate limits to which it was necessary to confine such a work would allow. The work is illustrated with numerous cuts, many of which are lively

and spirited. The map on page 61 would be better, we would suggest, if when turned by the reader so that the north side should be uppermost, the names had been so arranged as to be read in that position. We do not receive the statement on page 596, respecting the proselyted servant. This does not prevent us from saying that the work, as a whole, is admirably adapted in its design as a Bible Dictionary for the use of Schools, Bible Classes, and families.

7. *Old and New Theology*: or the Doctrinal Differences which have agitated and divided the Presbyterian Church. By JAMES WOOD, D. D. "The old is better."—Luke v: 29. A new and enlarged edition. Philadelphia: Board of Publication. pp. 262, 12 mo.

This book has passed through three previous editions, viz: in 1838, 1845, 1853, and has now reached the fourth. This of itself shows its substantial value. To any one who wishes to know the difference between the Old and New Schools in Theology, and the causes which divided the Presbyterian church in 1838, it will render satisfactory aid. It is well for the student of Theology to inform himself on these points, and to accustom himself to clear and well defined statements respecting the doctrines revealed in the Scriptures, and expressed in our symbols.

8. *India, Ancient and Modern*; Geographical, Historical, Political, Social and Religious: with a particular account of the state and prospects of Christianity. By DAVID O. ALLEN, D. D. JEWETT & Co.: Boston: 1856. pp. 618, 8 vo.

Dr. Allen, the author of this portly volume, was for twenty-five years a missionary in India, of the American Board. He has, therefore, enjoyed the largest opportunity for knowing the character and history of the people whom he undertakes to describe, and his testimony on many points must be received as that of an unimpeachable witness. The numerous inquiries addressed to

him evincing great ignorance of this country, and the fact that no work existed affording to the general reader recent and reliable information, suggested the publication of this volume. The slight examination we have been able as yet to give it, leads us to regard it as a valuable acquisition, and filling an important gap in our Christian literature. It is indeed less full and elaborate upon the philosophy and religion of the Hindoos than we had hoped to find it; which, however it may be considered a fault by a select class of readers, doubtless arises from its being designed for general circulation. The book is divided into six parts. The first treats of the geography of India, illustrated with a full and beautiful map; the second recites the history of the country, during the Hindoo, Mahomedan and European periods; the third describes the government of India; the fourth treats of the European population; the fifth of the native, with an account of religion, science, manners and customs; while the sixth is devoted to the history of Christianity and its propagation. In the appendix several topics of considerable interest, upon philological and other subjects, are well discussed.

9. *Documentary History of the American Revolution*: Consisting of Letters and Papers relating to the contests for liberty, chiefly in South Carolina, from originals in possession of the Editor, and from other sources. 1764-1776. By R. W. GIBBES, M. D., Member, &c. &c. New York: D. APPLETON & Co.: 1855. pp. 292, 8 vo.

Dr. Gibbes is performing a valuable public service in rescuing from oblivion the documents he has collected, bearing on our Revolutionary history. The above is the second volume he has issued. One of the most interesting documents in it is the despatches respecting the Battle of Lexington, forwarded from one Committee of Safety to another, along the sea coast from Wallingford, Conn., to Charleston. Each Committee encloses the despatches of the preceding Committees in its own, until the

packet, increased as it goes, reaches its destination. The first date is April 24, 1775, the last at Georgetown in this State, Wednesday evening, half-past 6 o'clock, May 10, 1775, making 17 days from Wallingford to Charleston, the greatest speed attainable in the heroic period of our history. We have read the originals with deep interest. Some of the papers are exceedingly brief. Such as the following :

ONSLow, Sunday Morning, 10 o'clock, May 7th.

Gentlemen : About an hour past, I received the enclosed papers. Disperse them to your adjoining county. Keep a copy of James Lockwood's letter. And pray write us what to do. We are for Onslow.

WM. CRAY,
SETH WARD,
JOS. FRENCH,
EDW'D WARD,
ROB'T. SNEAD.

Inclosed in the last gazette for Brunswick.

To the Wilmington and Brunswick Committee.

For Cornelius Harnett, Esq., Col. John Ash, or any of the Committee for Wilmington. Express.

NEW RIVER, May 7th, 1775. Received and forwarded by
WILL'M CRAY.

Dear Sir : I take the liberty to forward you by express, the enclosed papers, which were received at 3 o'clock this afternoon. If you should be at a loss for a man and horse, the bearer will proceed as far as the Boundary House. You'll please direct to Mr. Marion, or any other gentleman, to forward the packet immediately to the Southward, with the greatest possible despatch.

I am, with esteem, dear sir, your most ob't. serv't.

CORN'S. HARNETT.

WILMINGTON, May 8th, 1775, 4 o'clock, afternoon.

P. S.—For God sake send the man on without the least delay, and write to Mr. Marion to forward it by night and by day.

To Richard Quince, Esq., Brunswick.

Another very interesting portion of this volume is the mission of William Henry Drayton, and Rev. William Tennent, through the middle and up-country of South Carolina, to stir up the people and organize them in defence of their rights. Mr. Tennent seems so have regarded himself called in this emergency to act the part of the citizen soldier, as well as the Minister of the Gospel. On the Sabbath we find him preaching, and after religious exercises harranguing the people on the dangers of the country; during the week assiduously engaged in winning over the disaffected and confirming the wavering, or issuing occasionally military orders for the public defence. His short life was one of energy and spirit.

-
10. *Glances over the Field of Faith and Reason*; or Christianity in its Idea and Development, in connection with human progress and unity. By Rev. R. K. ASHLEY. CROCKER & BREWSTER: Boston: 1855. pp. 430, 12 mo.

This book is a capital illustration of that "dim magnificence of style," as Macaulay terms it, "that transparent haze more dangerous than utter darkness," where "language grave and majestic but of vague and uncertain import" deceives writer and reader alike, cheating both of the thought which seems to be, and is not. We doubt very much if the author himself could give an intelligible account of the aim and argument of his own book. Like those Nebulæ which a certain scientific school tells us are waiting to be condensed into worlds, the vague generalities of this volume, if we could subject them to something like hydrostatic pressure, might be solidified into a thought or two: at present, they must remain "vox et præterea nihil." Even Milton, we think, would allow "envious Juno to sit cross-legged over the nativity of" some "men's brains."

-
11. *The Presbyterian Family Almanac for 1856*. Philadelphia: Board of Publication.

12. *Slaveholding not Sinful.* An argument before the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church, October, 1855. By Samuel How, D. D., Pastor of the First Reformed Dutch Church, New Brunswick, N. J. pp. 32. The circumstances under which this address was delivered are doubtless known to our readers. The North Carolina Classis of the German Reformed Church sought an union with the General Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of North America. The Committee of Correspondence reported favorably. This union was opposed by two parties, one, who plead that it was inexpedient, as it would endanger the peace of the church, the other, who plead that slaveholding is a sin, and that communion with slaveholders ought not to be held. Under these circumstances, Dr. How, the Chairman of the Committee, delivered the address which is found in these pages. It is a just and able argument to show, 1. That the holding of slaves is not a sin, and 2. To point out the reason why slavery exists in the government of God. We have understood that in the celebrated controversy which resulted in the division of the Methodist Church, when one of the Southern members proceeded to prove the lawfulness of slaveholding from the Scriptures, the party in opposition almost exhibited the temper of the hearers of Stephen, who "gnashed on him with their teeth." We know not what was the spirit of decorum manifested by our brethren of the Dutch Reformed Church. But their vote shows how sadly they had departed from the precedents of their ancestors, and from the example of the Apostles. The whole subject was laid on the table by a vote of 50 to 47. Neither the Church of Corinth, nor of Rome, nor of Ephesus, nor the seven of Asia, whose names are perpetuated in the Apocalypse, and which were founded by the Apostles, could be received into the General Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of North America, if they could have been transferred as they were, to these shores, and these times.

13. *An Historical Address*, delivered at the Centennial Celebration of Thyatira Church, Rowan County, N. C., October 19, 1855. By Rev. S. C. Alexander, Pastor. Published, by request of the Session: 1855. pp. 27. This discourse gives a rapid historical

sketch of one of the oldest churches in the up-country of North Carolina. The earliest deed of gift for the church lot goes back to the year 1753, and there is evidence that the Gospel was preached in that settlement at least as early as this. The sermon before us seems to have spoken to the hearts of the congregation, and during the centennial celebration, thus introduced, and which continued for eight days, the Spirit was poured out from above, and a large increase was made to the membership of the church.

14. *A Dedication Sermon, preached at the opening of the New Presbyterian Church, in Chesterfield, S. C., by Rev. JOHN DOUGLASS, Jan. 21, 1855.* A discourse pervaded by an excellent spirit, and abounding in appropriate meditations.

15. *Our Obligations to God: A Sermon preached on Thanksgiving Day, Nov. 22, 1855, in the Seventh Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. By E. P. ROGERS, D. D., Pastor.* Published by request. A Sermon which brings forcibly before the mind the domestic, civil and religious blessings that call on the Christian and patriot for special and grateful remembrance.

16. *The Glory of Woman is the Fear of the Lord.* Published as Tract No. 174, and also as a small volume. One of Dr. Jones' most attractive discourses.

17. *The Exigencies of the Church. A Tract for the Times.* By a New England Pastor. Published by the Board as Tract 175. A timely plea for Doctrinal Purity.

18. *Campbellism: Its Rise, Progress, Character, and Influence.* By the Rev. J. L. RICE, D. D. No. 170 of the Tracts of the Presbyterian Board.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER IV.

APRIL, MDCCLVI.

ARTICLE I.

TESTIMONY OF THE REFORMERS TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

The reformers were men of eminent ability and scholarship, and familiar with the scriptures in their original languages. They were also familiar with all the controversies which had been agitated in the church respecting the doctrine of the Trinity, and were very soon called upon to engage in these controversies themselves. They acknowledged the right and duty of private judgment and the divine perfection and authority of the Scriptures as an infallible ground of faith and hope. To the bible, therefore, they appealed as the ground of their faith and hope, and with free, diligent and impartial investigation, relying on the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit, they sought to discover and present its meaning as the teaching of Him who cannot lie and who will not deceive, and who has assured us that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable to doctrine, for reproof and for correction."

Their testimony is not the opinion of one man, nor of a few, nor of those of one country, but of many, yea, of large bodies of men in various countries acting without concert, with many conflicting interests, as at present, in the face of persecution, danger and death, with much painful and laborious investigation and discussion, with every skill in languages, understanding the signification and force of words, the drift and scope of the divine

writings, and the laws and rules of just reasoning, and with every temptation, as they had broken away from popery, to avoid as far as possible, a concurrence with its received dogmas, which were, just about the same time, embodied and promulgated on the canons and decrees of the council of Trent.

Thus qualified to judge—thus distant and different, and differing from each other on those very points which now constitute the basis of denominational distinctions, and having actually abandoned, some more and some less, of the doctrines and forms and rules previously established—we must regard the unanimous agreement of all the reformed churches on the doctrine of the Trinity, both as to form and importance, as an irresistible assurance that their interpretation of the Bible is correct, and that this is verily the doctrine that is according to Godliness.

With them the doctrine of the Trinity constituted the very foundation of christianity both as a system of doctrine and of practice—both theoretically and experimentally—both as a guide from sin and misery and as a source of inward sanctification and fit preparation for death, judgment and eternity. The greatest demonstration of the evils of sin—of the love of God to man—the discovery of the possibility of a Mediator—of the suitability and efficiency of Christ for this purpose—of His merit and grace, satisfaction and powerful intercession—of the virtue and efficiency of His Spirit to renew and sanctify, to guide and bring souls to glory—all have their foundation in this doctrine of the blessed Trinity, and could not, as far as they could see, be accounted for without it. And as for gospel duties, such as faith, love, obedience, worship, &c., all, as christian, have this one God, who is, Father Son and Holy Ghost as their object! In this one name we are baptised, and to this God is all service and honor due, and by every true christian paid. All christian morality arises out of this belief. In a word, utter ignorance, and especially denial of this article, these reformers believed could not stand with a right christian profession, and they, therefore, censured impugnors of it as overthrowers of the christian foundation, and as not partakers in their communion.

True christian virtue and religion, according to their confessions, have resulted from this belief, and the composers of them did not think, nor can we, that a false faith can be productive of a good and holy life, either in the nature of the thing, or by the operation of God owning and accompanying of it. "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" The fruit will be agreeable to the root both in nature and morality. Wrong principles and opinions will have corrupting effects; nor will the God of truth and goodness make use of the former to the producing somewhat contrary in the latter.

The first of the reformed confessions to which we will advert is the Helvetic, which is the earliest of them all. It was first drawn up, though in a more concise form, by Bullinger, Myconius, and Grincœus; and in an assembly of the reformed cities of Helvetia, held at Araw, this confession was received by all the Helvetic churches. Thence it was sent to Wittemberg by Capito and Bucer, and highly approved by the divines there. It was also approved in some assemblies of most illustrious persons and protestant States. But the confession being originally brief, it was enlarged A. D., 1566, and was adopted by the reformed churches of Zurich, and Bern, Schaffhausen, St. Gall, the Grisons, Mulhausen, Biel, and Geneva; and also all the churches of England, Scotland, and France—also by the Belgic churches, and many in Poland, Hungary, and Germany. In reference to the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Confession has the following article:

OF GOD—HIS UNITY AND TRINITY.

We believe and teach that God is one in essence or nature, self-subsisting, independent, invisible, incorporeal, eternal, creator of all things, &c. But we abominate a plurality of Gods, because it is expressly written, The Lord thy God is one; Deut. vi. 4. Besides me there is no God; Is. xlii. 8, 10; Is. xlv. 14, 21, and xlvi. 9; Exodus xxxiv. 6.

Nevertheless, the same one undivided God, we believe and teach, is in Persons, without separation or con-

fusion, distinct Father, Son, and Holy Spirit ; I. John 5. 7. So that the Father from eternity begat the Son ; the Son by an ineffable generation is begotten ; the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, and that from eternity, and with both, is to be worshipped. So that indeed there are not three Gods, but three persons, consubstantial, co-eternal, and co-equal, distinct as to subsistencies, with a precedency of order, but with no inequality : for as to nature or essence, they are so conjunct, that they are one God ; and the divine essence is common to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Scripture hath delivered to us a manifest distinction of persons ; Luke i. 35 ; Matt. iii. 16, 17 ; Luke iii. 22 ; John i. 32 ; Matt. xxviii. 13 ; John xiv. 26 ; John xv. 26.

Briefly we receive the Apostles' Creed, which delivers to us the true faith. Therefore, we condemn Jews, Mahomitans and all that blaspheme this holy, and to be adored Trinity. We condemn likewise all heresies and heretics, who teach that the Son and Holy Spirit are God in name and title only, and created, and serving, or bearing office to another in the Trinity, or that there is in it anything unequal, greater or less, corporeal or in bodily shape, different in disposition or will, or confused or solitary ; as if the Son and Holy Spirit were affections and properties of one God the Father, as the Monarchists thought, Novatius, Praxeas, the Patripassians, Sabellius, Samosatenus, Aetius, Macedonius the Anthropomorphites, Arius, &c.

To the Helvetic confession is prefixed the Imperial edict by Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, out of the code of Justinian, and Tripart Hist. I. 9, c. 7, describing "who are to be accounted Catholics; who Heretics."

"We would have all people under our government," say they, "live in that religion which was delivered by St. Peter, and from him taught to this time, and which it is known Pope Damasus, and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of Apostolic sanctity, do follow, viz: That we should believe according to the doctrine of the Apostles and Evangelists, one Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, of equal ma-

jefty, and in an Holy Trinity. We would have the name of Catholic christians comprehend those who follow this rule, but that others bear the brand of heresy," &c.

What the faith and doctrine of the above mentioned Damasus was, appears by his creed, which is this:

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty; and in one Jesus Christ our Lord, the Son of God; and in the Holy Spirit. We worship and confess God, not three Gods, but Father, Son, and Spirit, one God; not so one as if solitary, not as if the same were Father to himself, and himself the Son; but that he is the Father who hath begotten, and he is the Son who is begotten; but that the Holy Spirit is neither begotten nor the unbegotten, not created, nor made, but proceeding from the Father and the Son, co-eternal, co-equal, and co-operator with the Father and the Son; because it is written, By the word of the Lord the Heavens were established, i. e. by the Son of God, and their virtue by the breath of his mouth. And elsewhere: send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth. Therefore in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, we confess one God, which is a name of power, not property; the name proper to the Father is Father, and the name proper to the Son is Son, and the name proper to the Holy Spirit is Holy Spirit. In this Trinity we worship one God, because he who is of the one father is of one nature with the Father, of one substance, and of one power. The Father begat the Son, not by His will nor by necessity, but by nature. The Son, in the last times came down from the Father, to save us, and to fulfil the Scriptures, who never ceased to be with the Father. He was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and born of a virgin, took flesh and spirit, and sense, i. e. perfect man: lost not what he was, but began to be what he was not; so yet that he was perfect in his own nature, and truly in ours. For he who was God, was born man; and he who was born man works as God; and he who works as God, dies as man; and he who dies as man, riseth as God, who, having overcome the powers of death with that flesh wherein he was born, and suffered and died, and rose, ascended unto the Father, and sitteth at his

right hand in glory, which he always had and hath. By his death and blood we believe that we are cleansed, and that we shall be raised by him at the last day in this flesh wherein we now live; and expect that we shall receive the reward of good works or suffer eternal punishment for our sins. Read these things, believe them, retain them, bring thy soul to this faith, and thou shalt have life and a reward from Christ."

Whether this was the work of Damasus, whose name it bears, is doubted; the writings attributed to Jerome, whence it is cited, being regarded by some as none of his. Du Pin thinks this a confession of faith taken partly from Gregory, of Bœtica, who lived about the time of Damasus, viz: towards the end of the 4th century.

We proceed to the CONFESSION of Faith of the FRENCH CHURCHES, which was presented to Charles IX., A. D. 1561, translated into Latin A. D. 1566.

I. *Parag.* "We believe and acknowledge one only God, who is one only simple and spiritual essence, eternal, invisible, immutable, infinite, incomprehensible, &c., Deut. iv. 35, 39 and vi. 4; I Cor. viii. 4, 6; Gen. vi. 1; John iv. 24; Exod. iii. 15, 16; Rom, i. 20."

V. *Parag.* After acknowledging the authority of the Scriptures: "Wherefore we, for this reason, also approve the Apostles' Nicene and Athanasian creed, because they are agreeable to that written Word of God."

VI. *Parag.* "THIS Holy Scripture teacheth us, that in that singular and simple, divine essence, there subsist three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit; the Father the first in order, the cause and original of all things; the Son, His Wisdom and eternal Word; the Holy Spirit, his virtue, power and efficiency; the Son begotten of the Father from eternity, the Holy Spirit from eternity proceeding from the Father and the Son, which three persons are not confounded, but distinct; yet separate, but co-essential. Deut. iv. 14; Matt. xxviii. 19; I. John v. 7; I. John i., and xvii. 5, 10. Lastly, in this mystery we approve what those four ancient councils have determined; and we detest all sects condemned out of the Word of God by those ancient, holy doctors, as by Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, Ambrose, &c."

VII. *Parag.* "We believe that God, three persons co-

operating by incomprehensible power, wisdom and goodness, made all things."

We will advert to the *English Confession*. This was first presented in Bishop Jewel's Apology, printed A. D. 1562, with the authority of the Queen and advice of the Bishops and others. It was, therefore, drawn up as a public confession of the catholic and christian faith of all Englishmen. In which was shown their consent, with the German, Helvetian, French, Scotch, Genevan, and other reformed churches, as Dr. Humphrey informs us in his Life of Bishop Jewel, p. 177. This work was so valued, that being writ first in Latin, it was afterwards translated into the German, French, Italian, Spanish and Greek languages. It was designed to have been joined to the articles and put into all collegiate and cathedral churches. This confession on the subject of the Trinity is as follows :

"We believe that there is one certain divine nature and power which we call God, and that it is distinguished into the three persons, who are equal—into Father, Son and Holy Spirit; all of the same power, of the same majesty, of the same divinity, of the same substance, and though these three persons are so distinct that neither the Father is the Son, nor the Son the Holy Spirit, nor the Father; yet we believe that there is but one God, and that the same God created heaven and earth, and all things contained within the compass of the heavens.

"We believe that Jesus Christ, the only Son of the eternal Father,—took flesh, and the whole human nature.

"We believe the Holy Spirit, which is the third person in the sacred Trinity, is that true God, not made, not created, not begotten; but in a manner not known to mortals, and ineffable, proceeding from the Father and the Son."

This confession was subscribed by the bishops and clergy of both provinces at London, A. D., 1562.

Art. I. Of faith in the Holy Trinity.

"There is but one living and true God, ever-lasting, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible; and in the unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance,

power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

Art. II. Of the word or Son of God which was made very man.

"The Son, which is the word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin, of her substance; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is, the Godhead and the manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided; whereof is one Christ, very God and very man," &c.

Art. V. Of the Holy Ghost.

"The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God."

Art. VII. Of the three creeds.

"The three creeds, Nice creed, Athanasius' creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."

In other matters considered in this convocation there was diversity of opinions, and great debates; but in these points full agreement and unanimous consent. Indeed from the very beginning of the reformation these doctrines had been regarded as undoubted truths, grounded on the Holy Scriptures, and received by Christians in all ages. In convocation A. D., 1536, preachers were required to instruct the people in the Scriptures, and the three creeds as agreeable to them, viz: the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian, and heresies contrary thereto were condemned. The reformers rejoiced herein. It was the doctrine set forth in the Necessary Erudition of a Christian man, A. D., 1540; and in that elaborate work, the Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws, begun in the reign of Henry VIII., resumed and finished just before the death of Edward VI., a work in which, in the composition of this work, Cranmer co-operated in conjunction with thirty-two men of greatest ability, divines, and civil and common lawyers. What relates to the Trinity is as follows:

Chap. II. What is to be believed concerning the nature of God, and of the blessed Trinity.

“Let all the regenerate sons of God by Jesus Christ, out of a pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned, believe and confess that there is one living and true God, eternal and incorporeal, impassible, of immense power, &c., and that in unity of his divine nature there are three persons, of the same essence and eternity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that the Father is of himself, not of any other, either begotten or proceeding; and that the Son is begotten of the Father; and that the Holy Spirit does proceed from the Father and the Son. Not that there is any diversity or inequality of nature in that distinction of persons; but that as to the Divine substance or essence (as they speak) all among them are alike and equal.

In Queen Elizabeth’s time, before a convocation could meet, a profession of doctrine was ordered to be read, by all incumbents, to their people, wherein this article of the Trinity was the same as now.

The *Scotch confession* of faith, first published A. D. 1568, subscribed by the king and nobles, and States of the kingdom in parliament, A. D. 1580, on the subject of the Trinity, is as follows :

Art. I. Of God.

“We confess and acknowledge one only God, to whom alone we ought to cleave, whom only we must serve and worship, and in whom only we must put our trust, who is eternal, &c., one in essence, and yet distinguished into three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, by whom we confess all things in heaven and earth were made; Deut. vi. 4; Is. xlv. 6; Deut. iv. 34; Matt. xxviii. 19.

The *Belgio confession*, written first in French, A. D. 1561, confirmed in a synod of the Belgic churches, A. D. 1579.

Art. I. “We all with the heart believe, and with the mouth confess, that there is one only simple and spiritual essence, which we call God; and that he is eternal, incomprehensible, invisible, immutable, infinite,” &c.

Art. VIII. “We believe in this one God, who is one only essence, in which are three persons, truly and really distinguished from all eternity by incommunicable properties, viz: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Father

is the cause, origin and beginning of all things visible and invisible; the Son is the Word, wisdom and image of the Father; the Holy Spirit the Eternal virtue and power, proceeding from the Father and the Son. Nevertheless, this distinction doth not make God to be divided into three, seeing the Scripture teacheth us that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit have each an hypostasis, or subsistence, distinguished by its own properties; yet so as that these three persons are but that one only God. Therefore it is manifest that the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Father, and likewise that the Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son. And in the meantime those persons so distinguished are not divided, nor confounded, nor mixed among themselves; for the Father did not assume flesh, as neither the Holy Spirit, but the Son only; the Father never was without the Son, nor without his Holy Spirit; because these three are equal in one and the same essence and eternity; here is nothing former nor later, seeing all three are one, both in truth and power, and in goodness and mercy.

Art. IX. "We know all these things as well by the testimonies of the sacred Scriptures, as by the effects of the persons themselves, those especially which we perceive in ourselves. Testimonies of sacred Scripture, which teach us to believe this Holy Trinity, are extant in many places of the Old Testament, which are not so much to be numbered, as to be selected and weighed; Gen. i. 26, 27; iii. 22. But what is a little more obscure in the Old Testament, that is very clear in the new; Matt. iii. 16, 17; xxviii. 19, 20; Luke i. 35; II. Cor. xiii. 14; I. John v. 7. By all which places we are fully taught, there are three persons in the one essence of God. Though this doctrine far exceeds all reach of human understanding, nevertheless we now believe it from the Word of God, and expect the perfect knowledge and fruition of him in Heaven. And we may moreover observe the singular offices and effects of these three persons toward us. The Father is called our Creator by his power, the Son is our Saviour and Redeemer by his blood, and the Holy Spirit our Sanctifier by his dwelling in our hearts. And this doctrine of the Holy Trinity hath always been asserted and preserved in the true

church, down from the age of the Apostles unto this very day, against Jews, Mahometans, and some false christian heretics, viz: Marcion, Manes, Praxeas, Sabellius, Samosatenus, Arius, and others such like, who were rightly and deservedly condemned by the Orthodox Fathers. Therefore in this matter we willingly receive those three creeds, the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian, and those things that have been established by the ancient fathers according to the sense of those creeds."

The *Polish Confession* was unanimously adopted in a Synod held at Csongrad on the Theysse, and printed at Debresin, A. D. 1570.

Of the one and only God.

"We truly and sincerely confess, according to the Holy Scriptures, that the true God is one, and alone the author and preserver of all things; who hath manifested himself so, that he is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

Of the Trinity of the one Jehovah.

"This one and only God we believe to be three witnesses in Heaven, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; who, though they are three in their subsisting properties, and dispensatory offices, yet these three are also one, as the Apostle testifies; I. John v. 7.

Of the Eternal Father.

"From the Word of God, we call the Father God, and Jehovah; having life in himself, existing from none, and without all beginning, who of his own hypostasis or person, without all beginning or change, from eternity begat his only begotten Son, as the character and brightness of his glory, by whom from eternity he foreknew and ordered, and in the beginning created, and preserved all things, and justifying his elect, saves them, but condemns the wicked.

Of the Son of God.

"We believe that Christ is according to the flesh the son of David, in all things like unto his brethren, sin excepted. This same Christ, as to the *λογος* or word, we believe and confess, is the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, God, and Jehovah, equal to the Father; and that he is from the beginning begotten before all his works. Who when he was in the form of God,

equally with the Father, humbled himself, and took on him the form of a servant: so by the virtue and power of the eternal Spirit, in the flesh which he had taken, he paid the whole ransom, or equivalent price; because it pleased the Father that in him the whole fulness of the Godhead should bodily, or truly dwell, that so all things might be restored by him; Eph. i.; Col. ii. 2; II. Cor. v. Though to this Christ, according to the flesh, a beginning nativity be ascribed, as to a true man, in all things like his brethren, sin excepted; yet as the only begotten of the Father, subsisting in the form of God, so having life in himself, as the Father, he is without all beginning and change of time; because he is Jehovah, coming forth from Jehovah, and sent out from the days of eternity, by a mystical and ineffable generation, the only begotten of the Father; Matt. i. 3; Luke i. 2, 7; Rom. i. 6, 9; Heb. iii. 8, 9; John i. 3, 8, 10; Phil. ii.; Micah, v.; Zach. ii. 3, 10; Prov. viii.; Psal. ii.

Of the Holy Spirit.

“We also believe and confess, that the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and from the Son, sent out into the hearts of believers, is the Lord Jehovah, as the Holy Spirit calls himself in Ezekiel ii. 3, 6, 10, to whom all praises proper to the one only God are given, even as to the Father and the Son, viz: He is called Jehovah, Lord God, Psal. 95; Heb. iii.; God the Lord, that searches the hearts, and trieth the reins, God Almighty, the Creator, Preserver, Regenerator, and Sanctifier; Isa. vi. 1; I. Cor. i. 2, 3. He is the author and giver of all the gifts of God; I. Cor. xii.; Gal. v. 6; Eph. v. 6. The fruits of the Holy Spirit are faith, hope, charity; Rom. iii. 4, 6; Gal. iii. 4. He in the prophets foretold things to come, he chose, and sent out, apostles by his authority; Acts xiii. These three, Father, Word, and Spirit, because they are one in essential and eternal deity, will, counsel, and works, they are also one in worship; for as God the Father cannot elect, create, or sanctify without his Son and Holy Spirit; so the Father, without the Son and Holy Spirit, God, the Lord, cannot be worshipped.”

The *confession of the four cities*, viz: of Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen and Lindau.

Cap. II. Of the sacred Trinity, and the mystery of Christ Incarnate.

“Agreeable with the Scripture are those things, which the church of Christ hath hitherto believed concerning the Holy Trinity, viz: that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one God in substance, nor have any difference but that of persons; and that our Saviour Jesus Christ, the same true God, was also made man, the natures indeed unmixed, but so united in the same person, that they shall never be separated to all eternity. We acknowledge Him (viz. Christ,) to be present with his church to the end of time; that he restores, sanctifies, and as his only beloved spouse adorns it with all manner of beautifying virtues. In these things, because we vary nothing from the fathers, nothing from the common consent of christians, we think this may be enough to have testified our faith in this manner.”

This confession, written in German and Latin, Anno 1530, was exhibited to the Emperor Charles V. by the deputies of those four cities, in the diet of Augsburg, the same wherein the Augsburg confession was presented.

The *Augsburgh Confession*, exhibited to Charles V. in the diet held there, Anno 1530, was written by Philip Melancthon. It was revised, and again exhibited to the Emperor Ferdinand, in the diet of the Empire, A. D. 1558 and A. D. 1561.

Art. I. “The churches with us with great consent teach that the decree of the Council of Nice concerning the unity of the divine essence, and of three persons, is true, and without any doubting to be believed, viz. That there is one divine essence, which is both called, and is God, eternal, incorporeal, that cannot be divided into parts, &c.; and yet there are three persons of the same essence, and power, and co-eternal, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And the word person they use in that signification, wherein ecclesiastical writers in this cause have received it, that it signifies not a part, or quality in another, but what properly subsists.”

They condemn all heresies risen against this article, as of the Manichees, Valentinians, Arians, Ennomians, Mahometans, and all like these. They condemn also

the Samosatzenians, old and new, who, when they contend that there is but one person only, craftily and impiously cavil concerning the word, and the Holy Spirit, that they are not distinct persons; but that the word signifies a vocal word; and spirit, a created motion in all things.

The *Saxon confession* was written A. D. 1551, in the synod at Wittenburg, where the pastors of the Saxon and Misnian churches, with the doctors of their universities met together. This confession, which is substantially the Augsburg confession, was intended to be proposed, and was actually proposed to the Council of Trent. The most illustrious Brandenburg princes, and the most noble counts of Mansfeldt, the ministers of Strasburgh, and the doctors of the churches of Pomerania expressed their approbation of it by writings annexed to the confession. It was approved also by other churches, and was commended by the Polish churches in their agreement or pacification.

Art. of Doctrine.

“We affirm openly before God and the Universal Church, in heaven and in earth, that we embrace with a true faith all the writings of the prophets and apostles, and in that genuine sense which is expressed in the creeds of the apostles of Nice, and of Athanasius, and these creeds themselves, and their genuine meaning, without corruptions, we have always steadfastly embraced, and by God’s help shall ever embrace,—and we constantly condemn all errors repugnant to these creeds, as are the monstrous opinions of heathens, Jews, Mahometans, Marcionites, Manichees, Samosatzenians, Arians, Pneumatomachians, and others condemned by the true judgment of the church. Seeing the Divine Essence is but one, the eternal Father, the co-eternal Son, the image of the Father; and the co-eternal Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son; of immense wisdom, power, goodness, &c. We condemn the errors of Marcion, and the Manichees, and the like, that agree not with the sense of the church of God in this whole question.”

The *Wurtemberg confession* was proposed to the same

Council of Trent, A. D. 1552, by the deputies of the most illustrious Christopher, duke of Wirtemberg, as its excellent preface shews.

Of God, and of three persons in one Deity.

“ We believe and confess that there is only one true, eternal, immense God, Almighty, creator of all things, visible and invisible; and in this one and eternal Deity there are three properties, or persons subsisting of themselves, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as the Scriptures of the prophets and apostles teach; and the three creeds, the Apostolic, and Nicene, and Athanasian explain.”

Of the Holy Spirit :

We believe and confess that the Holy Spirit, from eternity, proceeds from God the Father and the Son, and is true and eternal God, of the same essence, majesty and glory, with the Father and the Son, as by authority of the sacred Scripture the holy fathers rightly explained it in the Council of Constantinople against Macedonius.”

The *The Palatine confession* is found in the last will of the most illustrious Prince Frederick VI., Count Palatine of the Rhine, elector of the Roman empire; printed A. D. 1577, by order of his son, Prince Casimire.

“ I believe and confess that the Holy Spirit, with the Father and the Son, is that true, eternal, and only God; and that he is given to us that he may make us, by true faith, partakers of Christ, and of all his benefits. In this confession of the true christian faith, both now and at any time, I commend my soul, whensoever it shall depart out of this body, to the holy and undivided Trinity; to God the Father, the Creator; to God the Son, the Redeemer, Mediator, and my only Saviour, Jesus Christ; and to God the Holy Spirit, my true comforter, &c. I exhort and affectionately intreat my most dear children, heirs and successors, and my subjects, committed by God to my trust; my counsellors and magistrates, and especially my university and school-masters, and ministers of churches, of whatever state and condition they be, and their posterity, that they keep the way of the Lord. And that, not in their private capacity only, they constantly persevere to their lives end in the said confession of faith, and without fear, courageously profess it before

God, and the whole world, nor ever decline from it; but also, as it becomes pious and christian princes and magistrates, to whom the defence and propagation of acknowledged divine truth is committed, as their chief duty, they would, with special care, study, and pains, faithfully and diligently apply thereto; that the sacred and saving gospel, and the truth of God, according to the scriptures of the prophets and apostles, may be purely, sincerely, and uncorruptedly taught and preached, and by the blessing of God may be propagated and transmitted in a continued succession down to posterity."

This admirable confession for clearness and soundness of judgment, and the extraordinary spirit of piety expressed therein, is well worthy of the most careful perusal. His dying expressions were: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." And, to those who stood about him: "Enough, now enough have I lived for you, it is time that at length I should also live for myself. Let my merciful Father call me hence whensoever he pleaseth, I enjoy a pleasant and joyful conscience in Christ my Lord, whom I have sincerely served, and through whose goodness I have lived to see this, that in the churches and schools under my government, my subjects, taken off from the authority of men, have been led to Christ alone. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith, henceforth is laid up for me a crown of righteousness."

The *Bohemian* or *Waldensian Confession* was framed out of their most ancient confessions, approved by Luther and of Melancthon, A. D., 1532, and by the University of Wittemburg. It was afterwards adopted by the free Barons, and other noblemen of the kingdom of Bohemia, presented to King Ferdinand, A. D. 1535.

Art. Of the faith of the Holy Trinity.

"They teach, from the Scriptures, that by faith God is known to be one in substance of Divinity, but three in persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. As to persons indeed they have distinction, but as to essence and substance, they have co-equality without distinction. The catholic faith, and the agreement of the Nicene Council,

and of others with this; their Decrees and Canons, and the confession or creed of Athanasius, plainly testify this, and hence they teach the supreme power, wisdom and goodness of this one God and his three most excellent works agreeing to him alone and to no other besides him, viz: the work of creation, of redemption, and of preservation, or sanctification. They also teach that this only true God, in one divine essence and blessed Trinity of persons is always to be adored and stood in awe of, and with greatest reverence honour and praise to be worshipped as the great Lord and King of all, reigning to all eternity; and that on him do all things depend, from him do they expect and seek all, to him alone is high subjection, obedience, fear and trust to be yielded, and for this all religious worship is sincerely to be paid him; and whosoever does not that, brings on himself damnation, Deut. vi., "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve;" and again: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and in some, "with all thy internal and external powers."

The Polish confession.—The consent in faith and religion between the churches of greater and lesser Poland and Dukedom of Lithuania, &c., at Sendomir, A. D. 1570.

PREFACE.

"They shun all heresies repugnant to the christian faith as revealed in the Scriptures, and to the Apostolic and Nicene and Athanasian creeds, as agreeable thereto. In the IV. act of the Syond of Cracow, 'tis said: When some Arian preachers and their hearers, of their own accord, came to our Synod, and would there discourse of their opinion: the Synod, after serious consideration of those things, refused conference and disputation with them and made this decree: Seeing these who went out from us, continue not in the doctrine of Christ, and faith concerning the true God, the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit, and so have not God; and having already been, by conferences and writings, very often admonished by us and yet pertinaciously continue in their error, we will have no further to do with them so long as they continue to defend their opinion, we will admit no more of their disputation, but will shun them

and their blasphemous books according to the command of the Holy Spirit; least otherwise we seem to shake the foundation of the christian religion, and to call in doubt the most firm faith concerning God in whose name we are baptized; and least we be partakers of their evil deeds, poisoned doctrines and blasphemies against the glory of our Lord.

To the above Confession may be added the *Confession of the Greek church*, given by Gennadius Scholarius, Patriarch of Constantinople, to Mahomet II., Emperor of the Turks, after his conquest of that city, &c., A. D. 1453, upon his demanding, what do you christians believe?

We believe that there are in God other three properties, which are, as it were, the principles and fountains of all His other properties, and by these three properties, God eternally lives in himself, and before the world was made by him; and by these he made the world, and by these he governs it. And these three properties we call three subsistencies, or persons. And because these three properties themselves do not divide into parts the one and most simple essence of God, therefore God, in these three properties, is one God; and there are not three Gods as some daringly speak.

The confession of Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople, known as *the Oriental Confession* of the christian faith.

*Cyri*l, Patriarch of Constantinople, to those who are inquisitive to understand concerning the religion of the Eastern, that is of the Greek church, what we believe and what we think of the articles of the Orthodox faith, in the name of all christians in common, offers this short confession, that it may be for a testimony before God and his whole church, without dissimulation, and with a good conscience.

We believe one true God, almighty and infinite; three in persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Father unbegotten; the Son begotten of the Father, before all ages, consubstantial with the Father; the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father by the Son, having the same essence as the Father and the Son. These three persons in one essence, we call the sacred Trinity, always to be blessed, glorified and worshipped by every creature.

Art. IV. We believe that this one God, in three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is the creator of things visible and invisible, &c.*

The *Presbyterian and Congregational Confession*, A. D. 1643 and 1658, known as *The Westminster Confession*, cap. iv., of God, and of the Holy Trinity.

There is but one living and true God, who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts or passions, immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, &c.

In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son. Which doctrine of the Trinity is the foundation of all our communion with God and comfortable dependence upon him.

The *Baptist Confession*, A. D. 1658, cap. ii. Of God and the Holy Trinity.

The Lord our God is but one living and true God, whose subsistence is in and of himself, infinite in being and perfection, whose essence cannot be comprehended by any but himself; a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts or passions; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; who is immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, every way infinite, &c.

In this divine and infinite being there are three subsistences, the Father, the Word (or Son) and the Holy Spirit, of one substance, power and eternity, each having the whole divine essence, yet the essence undivided. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the father and the Son; all infinite, without beginning, therefore, but one God; who is not to be divided in nature and being, but distinguished

*Cyril delivered this confession, written by himself in Latin, to the Dutch Ambassador at the Turkish Port, A. D. 1630. Afterward he put forth the same in the Greek language, confirmed by authority of the sacred Scripture, and enlarged with some additional matter.

by several peculiar relative properties and personal relations, which doctrine of the Trinity is the foundation of all our communion with God, and comfortable dependence on him.

ARTICLE II.

MODERN THEOLOGY—TAYLOR AND BLEDSOE

There is a very striking scene brought to view, by the testimony of Dr. Plumer, in the great Presbyterian Church case, tried in Philadelphia in the Spring of 1839, which has appeared to us vividly emblematical of the whole *epos* of the new divinity movement in this country. It relates to the position of persons and parties, at the time when the noted Dr. Cleveland effected that riotous, so-called, organization on which the New School have the modest claim that they are *the* Presbyterian church. This organization, as all know, was effected by simple riot and snatch. They ignored the regular moderator, the rules of order, and the regular course—set up a moderator in another part of the house—rallied round him like a rebel *corps* of bees, and thus left the house, buzzing in, at each door, the intelligence that the hive would swarm in another place. Dr. Cleveland was the Warwick that made the new schismatic president. He arose and addressed the regular moderator for form's sake, and then turned away. "I saw a little stir," and observed Dr. Beecher, and *Dr. Taylor*, who was a delegate to the Assembly from the General Association of Connecticut, seated together, I believe, in the pew behind Dr. Cleveland. They were moving their hands, and making gestures with their heads, and I thought I heard the words, "Go on! go on! I am certain they were making gestures, but I am not positive that I heard the words. The gestures could not be mistaken." There they were—an active, bold, restless, western man, in the act of rending that great denomination; and at the back of the king-maker sat Dr. Beecher—a man imported from Boston to teach theology in the Presbyterian church, who had been

tried for heresy, and Dr. Taylor!! who had been convulsing Connecticut with novel speculations for fifteen years; these two sat behind Cleveland, "moving their hands, and making gestures with their heads," and saying, or forcibly seeming to say, "Go on! go on!" This is the true emblem of the whole heroic age of the new divinity; restless men of daring nerve gave tongue, and did the deeds. They were the sword-arms, others did the thought and gave the impulse. Taylorism and Beecherism sat behind, making gestures with their heads, moving their hands and saying, "go on! go on!"

Gravely significant, too, is the present state of affairs among these parties. Taylorism and Beecherism have edged on the West with their "go on! go on!" until the West has gone, at least all that part of it which they could impel, hopelessly out of a sound conservative and Calvinistic influence. A re-union of the Old and the New School churches *en masse*, is clearly and positively out of the question. We believe that no good man on either side ought to seek it. Deep and vital doctrinal differences in relation to the atonement, the imputation of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness, and the influences of the Divine Spirit exist still, or, at least, have not been disavowed by either party. Separately these differences may exist peaceably; and, indeed, the two different denominations may, perhaps, be of service to each other by each making the other more conservative, theologically and socially. But there could be, and there would be, no more peace now, if the two were put together again, than there was from 1830 to 1835. Such is the effect, no doubt, mainly of the leaven of Taylorism. It has driven its votaries and its victims into an attitude of irreconcilable contrariety to the old, deep, religious Calvinism which did not hate Edwards and philosophy, but which revered Paul and inspiration more. Meanwhile, where now are New Haven and Taylorism themselves? We experienced, the other day, a species of pity, such as we have felt in boyhood's dreams, over the murdered Red Cummyn of Scottish story, who, though he died laden with treachery, yet died by the hand of an assassin, in the holy place of the Abbey of Dumfries—when we read that there were but twenty-five

divinity students at New Haven, and that a committee of conference had been appointed by the trustees of Yale College, to seek a union of their theological school, with that very East Windsor which was established as a testimony and a barrier against the incursions of Taylorism. Verily Doctor Taylor is now, probably, of other mind than when he sat in the General Assembly, "moving his hands, and making gestures with his head" that the separation should go on. And East Windsor and New Haven may unite. Such things are characteristic of the present state of New England; but the two branches of the old Presbyterian church cannot. The prompters of Warwick may retreat. He himself cannot. He has gone too far.

We know not whether the time has yet arrived to write the history of this peculiar new divinity as making a manifestation of itself in a settled Calvinistic church. Perhaps it has not yet come on account of the fact that there are yet among us good men—men of love and peace—the Lord Falklands of the church—who have not ceased to indulge the vain hope of a re-union, of the New and Old School; who hope this great schism may yet turn out to be like the great schism of the last century, which was eventually healed and forgotten, because they have not fairly looked at the deep moral, philosophical, and theological differences of the parties—differences, not only in theological views, but deep differences as to the rights and prerogatives of human philosophy; and differences deeper still, as to what is right and what is wrong; what is fair and what is unfair, what is candid and what is uncandid, in social and ecclesiastical manners and morality.

The history of the Taylorite new divinity, claiming to be sound and orthodox in an old fashioned Calvinistic church, and trading as deeply as a follower of Alexander Campbell himself, in the manufacture of capital, by the piteous cry of persecution, for being suspected of any heresy, or any over-reverence for philosophy, any under-reverence for revelation, or any peculiar tendency to bluntness of conscience in indirect ecclesiastical procedures,—this history will be a curious one indeed, when the time comes to write it, if it shall then fall into a fit-

ting and competent hand. Whoever the historian may be, he cannot be competent, unless he shall go back and examine especially the spiritual phenomena which surround the origin of all such movements. He must not only understand the theological doctrine of the fall of man, but he must see the deep applicability of that history to our days, in the tendency of all ambitious and speculative men to make repasts upon forbidden fruit. He must examine the prerogatives of religious philosophy, and see clearly where lies the land-mark between the things revealed, which rightfully belong to us and to our children, and the things secret, which belong to God; and which the "audax Japeti genus" may not meddle with, without worse consequences, than the

"Macies, et nova februm

Terris incubuit cohors,"

which punished the bringing down of stolen fire from heaven in the pagan myth. And he must profoundly study the arts of winning popular sympathy for deep and destructive innovations, by sneers and flings at the "jealousy" and the "bigotry" of old sound doctrine and its friends; the powerful captivation of appeals to the young, daring, and restless "who may possess both the desire and the capacity to think for themselves," to come out of the tame old sound systems which repress their "minds' aspirings," and keep them back from the happier auspices of the coming and better age. And especially must the historian of Taylorism thoroughly study the nature and the significance of that earnest effort with which the new divinity attempted to inaugurate itself, to cover every faithful man with odium, as a "heresy-hunter," who took alarm at any innovation, however bold, or thought the ark of God in danger from any shaking, however rude.

We would not persecute Professor Bledsoe, or his Theodicy, for a good deal: for two reasons—one is, that persecution is not right in itself; and the other is, that it often gives a kind of currency to a bad cause, or a bad book, which they would not otherwise obtain, through the sympathy of a certain class of minds, which seem to proceed on the principle, that when a watch-dog barks and bites, it is good and noble to sympathize deeply

with the marauder, and hang or chain the watch-dog. And yet we believe that the substantial identity of the scheme advanced in the Theodicy with Taylorism, or New Haven divinity will be disputed by no intelligent mind acquainted with the two things. There is, however, this difference between the two manifestations, that Taylorism made its appearance within the pale of Calvinism, fiercely claiming to be orthodox, quoting no authority more frequently than that of President Edwards, and indulging in loud accusations against those few faithful men who disputed its claim to unquestionable Calvinistic standing; while Bledsoism not only makes its appearance out of Calvinism, and assails the very doctrine of election itself with the old stale subterfuge of *national* election, but as we think will appear in the sequel, of God's providence at least, if not of our article, beyond the pale and the consistent possibility of any experimental religion at all.

Somewhere about the year of grace 1821, Dr. Nathaniel W. Taylor, being then either just made professor of christian theology in the divinity school, connected with Yale college at New Haven, or just about to be placed in that position—an atheistical hand-bill was reported to be in circulation in the streets of the city of New York, to about this effect:

“Sin is in the world—if God could have prevented the entrance of sin into the world, and did not do so, where then is the benevolence of God? But if God could not have prevented the entrance of sin into the world, where then is the omnipotence of God?”

Goaded by the sharp horns of this dilemma, Dr. Taylor felt impelled into a voyage on the sea of speculation, in search of a solution for the deep old riddle of the origin of evil. And about the year 1828 or 1829, returned with the following triumphant solution; after which, atheism, like the Theban Sphynx, was to brain itself upon a stone, and die.

“Moral beings must, from the nature of the case, have the *power* of sinning; and there is no evidence that God could have overruled that power, and entirely withheld them from its exercise by a direct interposition of his providence, *and yet have sustained a moral system*

in existence. Thus sin, as to God's preventing—not our committing it, is a necessary *incident* to a moral system.”—*Christian Spectator*, June, 1829, p. 378.

Now, with this, compare what Mr. Bledsoe gives, as the occasion of his embarking upon the high seas of this great speculation :

“If God were both willing and able to prevent sin, which is the only supposition consistent with the idea of God, says the atheist, he would certainly have prevented it, and sin would never have made its appearance in the world; but sin has made its appearance in the world; and hence, God must have been either unable or unwilling to prevent it. Now, if we take either term of this alternative, we must adopt a conclusion which is at war with the idea of a God.”—*Theodicy*, p. 22.

This is Professor Bledsoe's dilemma. And the solution which he brings is this: “On the supposition of such world, God did not permit sin at all; it could not have been prevented.”—*Theodicy*, p. 197, &c.

To change the figure: both Bledsoe and Taylor were defeated by the atheist, before their combat began. Both allowed the atheist fully to “beg the question,” and obtain the concession of much that he wanted, and which truth does not allow him, before they began to demolish him. The very facts of the world, as it stands to-day, together with *the Bible*, of which it is surprising that both Dr. Taylor and Mr. Bledsoe made so little use, in their great argument, show that God is neither unwilling to prevent sin, (if that means simply that he does not love it, but hates it,) and that he is not unable to prevent it, but permits it for reasons which he has not chosen to reveal. It is wonderful that the clear, simple account of the entrance of sin into this world, given in the third chapter of the book of Genesis, should be so thoroughly ignored as it usually is among such speculators. And it is wonderful too, that they feel themselves competent to judge of the decision of the very Divine mind itself, in matters in which the grounds of those decisions have not been revealed. Indeed we cannot but believe the author of the *Theodicy* to be the most deeply deluded man, in relation to the powers of the human mind over such subjects, whose productions we have, ever

perused: We have simply touched with pencil, the following incidental indications of the author's estimate of human powers; more in sorrow and surprise, than in any other feelings:

(1.) He claims the prerogative of judging and correcting the operations on this subject of "the mighty minds of the past." "It is no ground of despair, then, that the mighty minds of the past have failed to solve the problem in question, if the cause of their failure may be traced to the errors of their own systems, and not to the inherent difficulties of the subject."—*Theod.* p. 17.

(2.) He does not think the problem a hard one: "Though we have so spoken in accommodation with the views of others, the problem of the moral world is not, in reality, high and difficult *in itself*, like the great problem of the material universe. We repeat, it is simply to explode and refute the sophism of the atheist."—*Theod.* p. 23.

(We once heard a very wise worthy of Virginia declare that he thought he could solve any difficulty concerning the meaning of Scripture, that he ever heard raised; and he swept us down to silence, hour after hour, with a stream of easy wisdom, and perfectly conclusive divinity, till at last we commenced a sort of embankment, by the question: how come the hag-stirrups in a colt's mane? He could not answer *that*.)

(3.) The Professor is to make a mere morning's bit of explaining the nature of moral good and evil to the world: "It shall be our first object, then, to pull down and destroy 'the invented quibbles and sophisms which have so long darkened and confounded the light of reason and conscience, in relation to the nature of moral good and evil, to dispel the clouds which have been so industriously thrown around this subject, in order that the bright and shining light of nature may, free and unobstructed, find its way into our minds and hearts.'"—*Ibid.* p. 115.

(4.) He is to refute, like a flash, the pretended reasonings and demonstrations of such children, or fogies, as Augustine, Calvin, Leibnitz, and Edwards: "Let us see then, if we may not refute the pretended demonstration in favor of necessity, and thereby restore the mind to that internal satisfaction which it so earnestly desires,

and which it so constantly seeks in a perfect unity and harmony of principle."—*Ibid.* p. 132.

(5.) He will act the pedagogue over Jonathan Edwards (!) and show him the mistake in his work: "But lest we should be suspected of doing this great metaphysician injustice, we must point out the means by which he has so grossly deceived himself."—*Ibid.* p. 147.

(6.) He intends to do, with clearness and precision, what most other men have shrunk from attempting at all: "To describe these two spheres (of the human and of the divine agency) with clearness and precision, and to determine the precise point at which they come into contact without intersecting each other, is still a desideratum in the science of theology. We shall endeavour to define the human power and the divine sovereignty, and to exhibit the harmony subsisting between them, in such a manner as to supply, in some small degree at least, this great *desideratum* which has so long been the reproach of the most sublime of all the sciences."—*Ibid.* p. 168.

(7.) He intends to set to rights, easily, at once, and forever, all that clamor *de minimis* between Augustine and Pelagius: "We shall first stand on the same platform with Pelagius, and endeavour to view the subject with his eyes: to see all that he saw, as well as to correct the errors of his observations. And having done this, we shall then transport ourselves to the platform of Augustine; and contemplate the subject from his point of view, so as to possess ourselves of his great truths, and also to correct the errors of his observations."—*Ibid.* p. 171.

(8.) He easily sees the common error—(quære: a belief in the authority of Scripture?) of the Calvinists and the Arminians: "Now in this contest of arms (between the Arminian and the Calvinist) it is our humble opinion that each party gets the better of the other. Each overthrows the other; but neither perceives that he is himself overthrown. Hence, though each demolishes the other, neither is convinced, and the controversy still rages. Nor can there be an end of this wrangling and jangling, while the arguments of the opposite parties have their roots in a common error."—*Ibid.* p. 244.

(9.) What he has done to Leibnitz and Edwards, the Augustinians and the Pelagians, the Calvinists and the Arminians, is nothing when compared to what he means to do to the sceptic, or atheist: "The effects of the hypothesis of the sceptic may be neutralized by opposing to it the hypothesis of the theist. But we are not satisfied to stop at that point. We intend not merely to neutralize, but to explode, the theory of the sceptic. We intend to wrest from it the element of its strength, and grind it to atoms. We intend to lay our finger precisely upon the fallacy which lies deeply concealed in its bosom, and from which it derives all its apparent force and conclusiveness. We shall drag this false principle from its place of concealment into the open light of day, and thereby expose the utter futility, the inherent absurdity of the whole atheistical hypothesis, to which it has so long imparted its deceptive power."—*Ibid.* p. 188.

There! ye laudators of the past, take that! say, have we no giants in these days? Since our sophomore days, we have rarely encountered so great a man. A friend informs us that he has a very worthy servant man, with whom it is a point of honour, never to admit that any thing is too hard for him. He thinks that if he should address the servant thus: "Billy, can you make me a world?" The reply would be promptly rendered: "Yes, massa, certainly, massa."

Meanwhile, no body hears of a single atheist convinced, or of a single sceptic reclaimed by the works of Dr. Taylor, Professor Bledsoe, or by any such means. And we suppose indeed that those who have attended particularly to the history of such speculations, would generally concur in the remark, that it is really never the expectation of the writers of such works, to convince atheists or to reclaim sceptics; but scepticism and atheism are merely brought upon the stage as auxiliaries in dumb-show, and in the uniform only, of enemies, to create, by the undefined horrors of their forms, and especially their shadows, the pretended necessity, in order to escape them, of trampling upon the honours of Calvinism, and drawing away the minds of the young, from the authority of the Scriptures, and from humble dependence on God's grace, into those drear and tremen-

dous realms of self-idolatry, and assumed equality with God, where the upas waves, and the sirocco blows.

There is the same remarkable coincidence between the other parts of the two systems respectively of Dr. Taylor and Professor Bledsoe :

Both deny the sinfulness of *propensities, dispositions,* and *principles*; and make all sin consist in voluntary *acts*.

Both deny and revile the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness.

Professor Bledsoe takes away the whole doctrine of a vicarious atonement; making the Saviour's death a mere symbolical mode of instructing mankind concerning God's hatred of sin. The Taylorites, if not Dr. Taylor himself, and especially Jenkyn and Bedman, did about the same thing.

And in the Review of Dr. Harvey, published in the New Haven Christian Spectator for 1859, may be seen evident resemblances and foreshadowings of Professor Bledsoe's singular doctrine concerning the Human Will.

It is designed to offer here some suggestions concerning this New Haven phase of religious philosophy, and philosophizing, which may perhaps be of some advantage to other persons of more leisure and better abilities, in clearly evincing and exposing its errors, when it has thoroughly and fully developed itself, and when the true time has come for writing its history, and adding to the recorded sum of human knowledge, the contribution which its errors and the full detection of them will make.

1. Sometimes a *practical test* is the only one which is in the reach, especially of youthful minds, from a want of acquaintance with the history of such philosophizings; and in fact, from the want of any such a history, among all our religious books, as the history of theories and theorizers, on subjects unrevealed in Scripture. A good history of that kind, prepared by the proper hands, would be of vast service in guarding young and ambitious minds against the sins and errors of intellectual pride and presumption. In the absence of such a book, the only test, oftentimes, which will recall them to the truth, is something of this kind: Try whether you can

pray freely on that theory; try its power to give you comfort in darkness, in affliction, or in spiritual conflict; try whether it places you near to, or far from the Saviour; try whether its tendency is to induce you to rely more or less fully upon the grace of God; try whether it will do for your heart as well as your head; try whether it will do to live by; read the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, and see whether the spirit and tone of the philosophy accords practically with the spirit and tone of that Epistle.

2. It may be observed that such speculations, notwithstanding their high pretensions, almost always leave the victory at last, to the errorist, atheist or sceptic, as the case may be, against whom they specially profess to march out to fight. The doctrine, for instance, which is the main staple of the Theodicy, that the acts or volitions of the human will, take their rise in the world without any connection, as effects, with anything within or without the mind, as their cause, is itself a thoroughly atheistic doctrine. It concedes that there may be an effect without a cause. The atheist has but to reply: for aught we know, this earth, the sun, the moon, "the stars with all their shining frame," may have taken their rise in the same manner as the acts and volitions of the human will without any efficient cause.

And then, although the Theodicy distinctly pleads the testimony of consciousness (p. 135,) for the assertion that "the mind knows and feels that it is exempt from the power and efficacy of a producing cause in its volitions," yet it is one of the most distinct and definite of all the teachings of consciousness, of experience, and of observation, against both the Theodicy and Atheism, that our volitions *have* a causal connection with things within and things without. Let but the thoughtful mind turn its attention to the little circle of its own thoughts, or the little circle of society within its acquaintance, or to the social delineations of those writers who are accounted great masters of human nature, or to the pages of history, or more especially to the inspired pages of the Holy Scriptures, and the clear and certain light will come to him, that the great law of cause and effect reigns, and must reign, in mind, will, motive, action,

life—everywhere; and that God is really and truly on the throne of his own universe.

It may be proper to say here, that we confess that we are not a little jealous—we hope with a not ungodly jealousy—of the flippant vogue of the modern philosophy of consciousness, sound, clear, and reliable, as that witness may be in its place. But one man's consciousness will tell him one thing, and another's will tell him another thing. Men will ever find *their own* doctrines in their consciousness; as we have a writer here—and not the least gifted of writers by any means—professing to find “*dimly, at least,*” as he says, a doctrine in his consciousness totally different from what had before been conceded to be the universal consciousness of mankind. This consciousness ought to be required to produce *corroborating* testimony whenever that can be done. One would think, for example, that Dr. Chalmers of Scotland, had possessed quite as clear and legible a consciousness, and was quite as reliable a reader of the records inscribed by the finger of God upon the soul of man, as Professor Bledsøe, or any other person whom this age has known. And yet it is the only matter about which we remember to have met with any thing like indignant contempt in all the theological lectures of that great thinker. When he comes to speak of this theory, (*Institutes, vol. II, p. 328,*) of “an act of the will that comes of itself unbidden, and without any parentage whatever in the order of successive nature,” he says, “there is the revolt of all human sense and human experience against it.” Now, it is in relation to this very identical point that Professor Bledsøe says: “The mind clearly perceives, by due reflection, and at all times sees dimly, at least, that an act of volition is different in its nature from a passive impression or a produced effect; and hence it knows and feels that it is exempt from the power and efficacy of a producing cause in its volitions,” p. 135. Dr. Chalmers' consciousness is unequivocal on one side. Professor Bledsøe's “mind clearly perceives, by due reflection, and at all times sees dimly, at least,” exactly the reverse. Now, whose consciousness reflects the general truth of human nature on this point? We unhesitatingly say

that of Dr. Chalmers. But then we are not far from being in the same ecclesiastical connection in which Chalmers was, and this may warp our consciousness, or our interpretation of consciousness. We have not the pleasure to know what Professor Bledsoe's ecclesiastical connections are. We suppose that if they are Episcopalian, they cannot be very cordially so, from his "speaking from personal experience,"—*Theodicy*, p. 219,—of the Puseyites charging him with "pride and presumption," for setting up his individual opinion against "the decisions of the mother church;" unless, peradventure, he means, in that place, to distinguish between a class of Episcopalians with whom he does not range himself, and a class with whom he does; yet, the *Theodicy* itself will doubtless have followers; we hope and believe, not a great multitude, especially among those who ever attentively read the Epistle to the Ephesians. Yet, some it will doubtless have. They will follow Professor Bledsoe's views of consciousness—that volitions have no causes. Consciousness then, or the interpretation of consciousness, which is all the same, will become a party matter, and there can be no other arbiter than that which the great Scotchman refers to, and on account of his reference to which, chiefly, we follow him; that is; "all human sense and human experience," and he might have added: all human observation, language, science, history, implication of every kind.

There is not, perhaps, any cause for apprehension that the doctrines of the *Theodicy*, or of Taylorism, will prevail to any considerable extent beyond what they now do, with persons of mature judgment, after they come fully to understand those doctrines. But from the confidence with which consciousness, is appealed to in them, in direct opposition to the commonest and clearest mental conviction of nine tenths of educated mankind who do not, and cannot think their volition causeless, unhinged and fortuitous—we may derive a lesson not to be worthless, in a coming day, in our country. Those who are better acquainted with the German mental science than the present writer can either boast of, or lament, tell us that they have sometimes made a great deal, on the witness's stand, of what, in their

most expressively sounding language, they call the *Gefühl*—(we believe, however, that there should be another vowel, the ü.) And that a speculative mind will think itself justifiable in bringing out the wildest theories on the ground that his consciousness, his feelings or his aesthetic sentiments tell him this and this. These impulses may be entitled to some influence over the mind in which they arise; but if they have no necessary connection with memory, reflection, reason, and observation, as their *producing causes*, they are entitled to no weight whatever upon the minds of other people, and can never become the proper materials out of which to build metaphysical systems. We say nothing against a legitimate and guarded use of the testimony of consciousness; even the German *Gefühl* may have its place in mere matters of taste and sentiment, concerning which there is no such thing as positive objective truth. But we do object to the assumption of the imposing name of consciousness, by every new notion in philosophy, in behalf of which there happens not to be any other witness.

3. Our third observation upon this philosophical divinity is, that it is astonishing that it should proceed as quietly as it does upon the completely erroneous assumption that the action of the will under the influence of decisive motives, is not free action. Nothing can be more contrary to experience, observation, and every other testimony, than this assumption. All men see and know, in practical life, that they never act more freely, at any time, than when under the most powerful motives. The fallacy may be seen underlying this whole school of philosophy—Taylor, Fitch, Finney, Duffield, Bledsoe,—more or less—that the action of motives enslaves the mind. If they could prove this to be the case, as they assume it to be, if it could be proved to be true that motives of the most powerful description make slaves of the mind which they influence, then the result would be very different from that which is anticipated by the advocates of the new divinity. It would establish that distorted form of the doctrine of necessity, against which they so stoutly protest, beyond all possibility of escape: motives enslave the will. All mankind have ever been, are now,

and forever hereafter will be, under the influence of motives. Therefore, the wills of all mankind are enslaved, and not free. This syllogism, we submit, must follow the doctrine, that the action of motives takes away the freedom of the will. The truth is far otherwise, however. The will of no being in the universe is freer than that of the "wraught seraph" in heaven, "who adores and burns" so near to the throne of God, and in such full view of his glory, as to overwhelm every power within him with love and reverence.

There is no freer will than that of the holy man described in the hymn of Augustus Toplady, who finds daily that it is

Sweet in the confidence of faith
To trust His firm decrees;
Sweet to lie passive in His hands,
And know no will but His.

No man's will is, or can be, any freer than that of the ripe saint, who has served God so long, that the motives for the continuance of his service, as they appear to this man's view, are to those against the service of God, as preponderating and overwhelming as the proportion of one million to a unit; and who says with Payson, in his last days: "Hitherto I have viewed God as a fixed star, bright indeed, but often intercepted by clouds; but now he is coming nearer and nearer, and spreads into a sun so vast and glorious, that the light is too dazzling for flesh and blood to sustain."

On any other ground, there are but two possible conditions of free will that we can see; the one, when no motives are present to the mind at all, and then though it might have a free will, yet it never could be a rational agent; and the other, when motives are just balanced, one to one, five to five, an hundred to an hundred; and in that case, there could be no choice at all: Look at mankind every where, in history, in the drama, in all life-histories, in actual life, in every state and mode of action, each is conscious that he is free himself. Each perceives that others are free. Yet the influence of motives is universal. And in cases where motives of great power appear in operation, as in the case of the holy man near to God, in the case of the patriot dying for his

country, in the case of the youth following the lures of the prizes of life, the more powerful the motive, the more voluntary does the soul become in its compliance. It is surprising that systems of mental philosophy should ever have been constructed on any other hypothesis, for it would really appear that human nature cannot be regarded as rational nature on any other ground.

4. It is surprising that books should be written on religious subjects, in tones so bold and confident as some of these works in the philosophic divinity of the present century have been—and the remark applies in all its force to Mr. Bledsoe's Theodicy—and yet should so directly and awfully *contradict the Scriptures* on the subject of the power of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men—or the Divine efficiency, as it is technically called. With full heart, we say, that the God of Bledsoe's Theodicy is not our God. He is not the God of the Bible. He is not the God to whom pious men, in any age of the world, have looked up and addressed their prayers. Irrespective of the full, definite, unequivocal exhibitions of God, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, as one “who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will,” (of which epistle we are amazed that no notice should be taken in a work which professes to receive the Scriptures as inspired, and to refute the common views of divine efficiency based on them,) the God of the Bible is every where represented as possessing the very power over human wills which the Theodicy denies to him. Prayer is addressed to Him, simply because he possesses that power. Prophecies are made in his name, and fulfilled by his working, only because he has that power. And by far the more interesting part of the vast schemes of Providence, which he is exhibited as laying in his counsels, and conducting to their issue, necessarily depend on the very efficiency denied to him in Professor Bledsoe's Theodicy. He withholds Abimelech from sinning against him; *Gen. xx.* He promises the Hebrews that he will hold back the desires of their neighbours, “neither shall any man desire thy land when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice in the year;” *Exod. 34.* He says he will send faintness into the people's hearts in the land of their enemies, as a punish-

ment for their disobedience; *Lev.* 26. He says that he will take of the Spirit that is upon Moses, and put it upon the elders; *Numb.* xi. When Samson is ensnared by a woman of the Philistines, it is declared to be of the Lord, because "he sought on occasion against the Philistines; *Judges* 14. There is a vision of the Lord sitting on his throne, and calling for a Spirit to go and persuade Ahab to evil for a punishment." And there came forth a Spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him wherewith? And he said I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth and do so"; I *Kings*, xxii. Then when King Amaziah would not hear, "it came from God, that he might deliver them into the hands of their enemies;" II *Chron.* 25. The prophet Daniel says distinctly that it was the duty of the Jewish people to make their prayer to God, that they might turn from their iniquities and understand his truth. *Chap.* ix. Nor could Isaiah have spoken much differently from what he does in that sublime exaltation of the Divine efficient power in his 46th chap. of his prophecies, if he had had the Theodicy specially in view. "I am God, and there is none like me: declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times, the things which are not yet done, saying my counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure, calling a ravenous bird from the East, the man that executeth my counsel from a far country: yea, I have purposed, and I also will do it. I have spoken and I will bring it to pass."

And then ascending from particular declarations of the divine efficiency, of which the Scriptures are almost as full as the night-sky is of stars—look at the great facts which are ascribed to the power of the Spirit of God as the fundamental principles of all evangelical religion: the awaking of the soul from security in spiritual ruin; the inspiring in it of a desire for a better condition;—the preparation of the heart to seek God;—the convincing of the conscience;—the raising of the souls of individuals and of nations from the spiritually dead;—the renovation of the heart or will, or the creation and gift of a new

heart;—the authorship of the new birth;—the daily renewal of the spirit of the mind;—the authorship of daily grace and readiness for every trial, difficulty and duty of life; the re-forming of the lost image of God in the soul;—the actual preparation of the lost, by changes in their spiritual nature for the kingdom of heaven. How can men look such a book in the face and deny the efficiency of God?

Nor do the Scriptures anywhere, give any hint of the truth of the modern expedient, that though the feelings of our mind are necessitated, and though our judgments are necessary, yet, the connection of cause with effect has no existence between the judgment and the volition. If so, then there could be no such thing as mental science at all. There would be two lands, in each of which we could discover the operation of some laws which might be the objects of science, and then a great gulf between them, over which there would be, and could be, no bridge; through which a stream of the darkest and deepest waters of mental hap-hazard flows forever. The acts of the will, the volitions, the proceedings which make up human life, having no causal connection with feelings, motives, judgments, convictions, conscience, sense of duty, or any thing else of that kind, the intuitive conviction of every man that *there are laws of the mind*, would be constantly contradicted by the affirmation of the pretended science of mind, that there are no laws of the mind. The mental world would be one great bedlam, mental science would be a constant and necessary suicide. All religion would be an impossibility, because the only known principle on which it is possible—the efficient production of it by the divine Spirit would be denied and annulled. Having withdrawn our wills from under the control of the divine Spirit, we should seek to *account* for our conduct—such is the invincible inclination of our minds to look out mental causes for mental effects,—by omens, and signs and fates, and auspices. The spilling of the salt—the crowing of the cock—the flight of birds—the direction of the horns of the new moon—the appearances of the entrails of newly slain beasts, would again have to be consulted by the augurs and aruspex to account for the volition of individuals,

and the proceedings of bodies of men, and the shapings of the destinies of life; which would have been emancipated by the new philosophy from the causative influence of feelings, judgments and motion, and the efficient influence and government of the living God. There is a hideous darkness of discomfort in such philosophy. It is better that motive, truth, reason and God should govern the world; and that we should wait for the solution of riddles, till we see the whole unfolding of the scheme, than that the ape-gods of superstition, fatalism, chance, caprice, should again be enthroned in a world which professes to be rational and christian.

The Scriptures indeed positively contradict, expressly and impliedly, the doctrine that there is any link of certainty wanting, anywhere, between the purpose of God and the corresponding event, whether the alleged wanting link be that between feeling and judgment, or that between judgment and will, or that between will and volition. Wherever you may choose to locate the chasm it is equally unscriptural. The very clearest Scriptures, which it can hardly be necessary to cite further, except to refer to Romans viii. 28 and 29, in confirmation of the passage quoted from Isaiah—definitely guarantee the whole length of the chain. There is no link wanting. Some of the links lie between mere material and physical cause and effect; and are matters of necessity in the proper sense of that word. But other links lie between what we may call *free causes* and their effects. The main great difficulty in this department of the subject has been a failure to understand the nature of free causes; and to see that their efficiency does not take away mental freedom, but rather establishes it; that these causes are efficient and may be relied on as certain, just simply because the mind and will *are free*; and make their choices, and exercise their volitions, unconstrained by any real necessity. The word *necessity* is no doubt an unfortunate one for the certain influence of rational considerations over men according to their character. The *sound* of the word, as implying material fate and force, is the very breath which fills the sails of such schemes as Bledsoe's Theodicy. Explain that word clearly, and you explode such systems as infallibly as

they expect (but fail) to explode atheism and scepticism. Within the ambiguities of that single word lie their only grounds of existence. The love of truth is not a force, or a fate, or a compulsion over the nature of God; yet it is a necessity; for God cannot lie. Fidelity to the Redeemer is not a force, or a fate, or a compulsion over the soul of the martyr; and yet he cannot deny his master, and will rather die. The love of country is not a force, or a fate, or compulsion over the mind of the patriot; and yet it is "a ruling passion strong in death." Gold exercises no power of compulsion, force, or fate over the miser; and yet its power is a tremendous necessity. The most abandoned generations of men are under no force, fate, or compulsion to sin—else sin would not be sin—and yet, when the Ethiopian changes his skin and the leopard his spots, then may they who have accustomed themselves to do evil learn of their own selves, to do well. The certainty of the moral sequence is simply declared in the word of God to be as complete as the certainty of material necessity. The two things are simply compared in this one point. Now, if men will ever understand this moral certainty, the power of which is not force on the will, but on the contrary, the full current of the will in a given direction, then there will be light on the subject. If they will understand that this moral certainty consists in the very hearty, voluntary current of the human will, which, instead of taking away responsibility, as material necessity would do, does most thoroughly involve responsibility, then we shall cease to be teased with Theodicies which construct splendid and unreal theories on the ambiguities of necessity, moral and material.

And what a grotesque and strange whim of philosophy it is, to contend that causes of volitions destroy the freedom of volitions—that motives, inducements, reason, cannot make the mind willing—cannot cause its volitions—cannot ensure the putting of them forth; that no amount of the perceived glory of God could cause volitions in the mind of St. Paul; that no amount of perceived lustre to the reign of the Saints could have caused volitions in Cromwell's mind; that no military

glory could have infallibly lured Napoleon; and no future civil good to his country, could have made Washington willing to endure privation and hardship?

We feel, not "*dimly*," but clearly, that universal consciousness fairly contradicts the fundamental principles of this bad book. It matters little to us whether our Arminian brethren espouse it, as its bitter assaults on Calvinism may induce some of the less far-seeing and more passionate of them do. It may serve then for a while, as an auxiliary in hunting down Calvinism. But that is the vainest of all crusades. Calvinism can never die while the Epistles of St. Paul are regarded as inspired authority, and the spirit of God gives faith in his word, to new-born souls. All appeals to popular outcry, all accumulation of odium, all self-idolatrous and captivating philosophies together, can never destroy it while there is piety and faith in God's word on the earth. And if it were dead to-day, then given a new heart, and a Bible, to-morrow morning, in a solitary island; and Calvinism would again be alive as soon as the new heart had perused the Bible with the question in view; what saith God on these matters? Arminianism would not be born till the question was started: "Do I like what God says, or does it humble me?" And the damage which the cold and cheerless principles of the Theodicy would do to the truly pious Arminian branches of the church of Christ at the present day, in cutting man loose from dependence on God; in restraining prayer to God by the representation of his spiritual power as already exhausted; and in extinguishing that sun of the theological system, a vicarious atonement, would far more than counterbalance the temporary aid which it would derive from the book in hunting down that, on the principle of which, the lives of the more excellent of them are practically ordered; and of which, we believe, they always think the more kindly, as they learn the more candidly to distinguish the thing itself, from the horrible caricatures of it which form the staple of too many of their own authors.

ARTICLE III.

THE PROPHETS OF THE RESTORATION.

A Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi,
by Rev. T. V. MOORE, D. D., *Pastor of the first Pres-*
byterian church, Richmond, Va.

It may be safely affirmed that a new era has dawned on English Hermeneutic Theology, and the fact should be recorded with gratitude. For excellent as are the older commentaries in our language, (and they are so valuable that they cannot be dispensed with, even now, by any one who wishes to be imbued with the spirit of the sacred record,) it is an undeniable fact, one that presses itself on the attention of the student at every step of his progress, that they do not meet and satisfy the wants of the time.

We shall, perhaps, suggest what we conceive to be the new element that gives character to the commentaries, that are from time to time coming forth to meet the exigencies of the age, when we say that they are distinguished by a manly criticism that does not fear to look a difficulty full in the face. It is not satisfied with being copious and pious on the plain declarations of the living oracles, but the obscure utterings are pondered, and their hidden meaning sought after, and often found and brought forth to add to the priceless stores of the treasury of things, new and old, in which the church of God rejoices. And it is eminently practical as well as critical. It makes a minute, patient and learned examination of the sacred text the foundation of the development of doctrine and practical inference and remark. It seeks to ascertain the mind of the spirit in each enunciation of the great revealer, and thus put into the hand of the Christian warrior the sword of the Spirit, with its heavenly temper and keen edge uninjured.

The writing commentaries of this class is a work of herculean labour, and no one who has a due sense of the requirements of the case will think of attempting the exposition of the entire Scriptures. That honor is not

for any one man. The result, whenever attained, will be a composite one, and will consist of monographs from many hands. The incomparable work of Eadie on the Ephesians, and Hodges Exhaustive Commentary on the Romans, will be universally accepted as worthy contributions to this noble effort. And in this galaxy of interpreters of the word, that shall at once adorn and instruct the church in her later and better day, this work on the Prophets of the Restoration is entitled to, and we are confident will secure no mean place. We have no hesitation in saying that, as yet, there is no German work that we have seen that is entitled to a place in this assembly of worthies. No one can deny the great value and indispensable necessity of such works to every scholar, without exposing his own ignorance or presumption, and perhaps both. But the master works of such men as Tholuck and Hengstenberg and Olshausen, have defects both in criticism and in doctrinal exposition that are felt at every step. Nearly akin as we are, and much as we have in common, there is a radical difference between the Teutonic mind and ours. An argument that is demonstration to a German scholar is often very far from bringing conviction to us, and difficulties that seem insurmountable to him, make but very little obstruction in the progress of our reasoning. To use his own hackneyed expression, our "stand-point" is different.

And yet, as we have already said, the aid of our metaphysical and learned brethren is indispensable. The work is to be done by the Anglo-Saxon mind, enriched by German culture. It is a happy combination of the good sense and directness of the one with the patient and learned acuteness of the other that is needed. Nor are we willing to give this noble work exclusively to the hands of our Theological Professors and teachers of Biblical criticism. These men, with all their piety and learning, generally look at the world through the loophole of a study window, and have far too little acquaintance with the wants and modes of action of that great mass of mind that is to be redeemed and sanctified by the truth. And hence they are not so skillful as they might be in arresting and satisfying those who are engaged so eagerly in the actual struggle of life. Give a Pastor a

good degree of the Professor's learning, and his familiar acquaintance with the busy and fluctuating thoughts of men, as he meets them in the working-day-world will be of signal advantage in enabling him to guide the sword of the Spirit to the very point most vulnerable. In short, we suppose that the perfection of a commentary must combine the facts of learned research and practical dexterity. No one, we think, can read Eadie's works on Ephesians and Colossians without perceiving on every page that he is a Preacher as well as a Professor.

This same most desirable quality attaches, in a highly gratifying degree, to the work before us. While it is complimentary to the author's diligence and self-denial that such a work has been conceived and brought forth amid the exacting and exhausting labours of a large pastoral charge, it is also the better for that very reason. We see that he looks at truth and handles it not as a dead fossil but as a living, operative reality that must move as well as enlighten the hearts and consciences of men. Yet, were we in a critical mood, we might suggest that perhaps there is a little too much of the Preacher to be seen here. The style is too intense and epithetical and antithetical. There is a trifle too much of flourish and rhetoric for a Commentary. But we can readily pardon so slight a blemish when it is but the excess of so good a thing.

And we cannot but hope that the new style of criticism will develop a new style of preaching. We cannot find it in our hearts to deprecate those grand old divines and preachers who adorned and instructed the times (for there were giants in those days) and we bless God for them. But may we not suggest that they were too systematic and general, and that even they would have been improved by the modern culture. That a minuter criticism would have given greater definiteness and exactness of application, and that a closer study of the forms of belief developed by the time, would have fitted them for a more efficient application of the gospel remedy to the diseases of humanity. We trust that the ministry is getting more into sympathy with the actual world of hoping, pining, doubting, struggling men and women, and that this closer acquaintance with present wants

will enable the ministers of God more fully and triumphantly to vindicate the claim of the gospel to be rest for the weary and satisfaction for the doubting. At all events, we know that an exclusive attachment to the old forms of preaching truth would greatly disable the modern preacher in his attack on the powers of darkness. It is the same precious, unalterable truth, but its form of presentation and illustration may, and must, be diversified to meet the infinite varieties of ever changing error. Our science and our art must keep full abreast of all other arts and sciences. It will not do to go to work with the match-lock and cross-bow, when the enemy is using Minnie rifles and Paixhan guns.

Dr. Moore has been very happy, we think, in selecting his portion of the Word of God—the closing period of the Old Testament dispensation, that stretches from the return from Babylon to the five centuries of silence that intervened between the promise of the Messenger that was to prepare the way of Jehovah, and the startling announcement of one crying in the wilderness, “Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.” It was, as our author most appropriately and suggestively calls it, the period of restoration. It witnessed the rebuilding of the ruined temple amid the rejoicing hopes of the young and the tearful memories of the old. It was a twilight time—but it was morning twilight illumined by three bright day-stars which did not lose their gentle and cheering radiance, but were swallowed up by the full light of the perfect day of the Sun of Righteousness. This whole period has a peculiar and tender interest. It is all tremulous with hope and desire. It stood on the tiptoe of anxious and yet hopeful expectation. It is an old Scotch custom to announce the presence of royalty on the battle-field by a peculiar flourish of trumpets. We hear this in Malachi. “The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in: behold he shall come saith the Lord of hosts.” The shout of a king was in their camp.

And is there not a special fitness in the study of this portion just now, when we seem to be about to witness the dawn of a brighter day for the church? For much

as interpreters differ in particulars, they agree in the great hope that we are on the verge of great things—that a new era in the administration of Christ's kingdom is at the door.

But we must not vaticinate. We would rather express our acknowledgments to our author that he has not felt called to enlighten us on unfulfilled prophecy. We rejoice that he has not been bitten by the prophetic mania of the armageddonites, who not only locate the arena for the great battle, but call the combatants by name, and kindly suggest the military policy that will lead to victory. An act of forethought that all the expectant warriors should make a note of for future use.

But it is not simply in the selection of the theme that there is great felicity, but in the whole arrangement and execution of the work. The common version has its proper and yet rarely conceded place in critical commentaries, at the head of the page, without obtrusively taking up too large a portion of it: the new translation is accurate, preserving the Hebrew idiom with remarkable closeness, and not only prefaces each book, but is presented in full in the notes, so that the new and old version, with the commentary, can be seen at a glance. The arrangement of the page is incomparably better than in any other work we have ever seen. And then the notes preserve a happy medium between learned dulness and wearisome fulness of reference on the one hand, and pious but common-place remark on the other. Each portion is finished off by inferences, natural, pointed, apothegmatic and pregnant. Many of them will stick in the memory of the reader. And hence others than clergymen will find the book an interesting and profitable one. There is no small advantage to our author in the fact that, so far as English readers are concerned, he traverses an almost untrodden field. Those who have made this remarkable trio of Prophets a special study, have left their labors for the most part buried in a dead language. We may give information to some, even of our clerical readers, when we record the names of labourers in precisely the same field that Dr. Moore has chosen. Such works as *Nesi Breves Observationes in Comm., Rab. Davidis Kimchi in Aggem Zechariam et*

Malachima, Paris, 1557, and Willii Prophetæ Haggens, Zacharias, Malachias Comment, illustrati, Bremæ, 1638, and Varenii Trifolium Propheticum, Rostoch, 1662, though covering precisely the same ground with the present work will most assuredly never jostle it in the competition for public favour. We think, therefore, that this Commentary supplies a deficiency in our apparatus for study. Perhaps no part of the sacred Scriptures is less read than the Prophets of the Restoration, and yet they are full of hope and encouragement as well as reproof and warning for a church called to build the wall in troublous times—to hold the implements of labour in one hand and the weapons of war in the other, and finding it ever needful to keep alive a loving, trusting heart—in order to give energy and efficiency to both—in short of a church which, though now beset by enemies, looks with steadfast faith to the coming of a better day.

The publisher has done his part of the work well, with the exception of a few typographical errors and the very remarkable omission of an interclause of the new translation of ch. 1, vs. 7, of Haggai, and found on page 60. We are disposed, however, to enter our protest in behalf of the brethren who are low in purse, against the size and consequent cost of the work. It might have been published in a neat and handsome duodecimo, and thus have come within the means of a much larger circle of those who would greatly appreciate its perusal. The price of two dollars for a Commentary on three of the minor Prophets would suggest a painful question in the rule of three to many a poor clergyman.

But by far the most striking point in this work is found in the introduction. We have first, a discussion of the nature of the Prophetic gift, which is defined as “something bestowed by God on any one, by virtue of which he was qualified and authorized to speak authoritatively for him.” The Prophet is one who speaks instead of another, and that without reference to the question, whether the announcement refers to present, past or future. Then follows a new and very striking classification of the different modes of God’s manifestations to man. First, the theophanee, in which God revealed himself by visible appearances, and extending through

the Patriarchal dispensation, and closing with the mission of Moses. The Mosaic dispensation is termed theopneustic, because in it God revealed himself mediately through inspired men. The third dispensation is the Christian, and which is called theologic, because in it God reveals himself permanently by inspired writings. This classification deserves attention, and for a full comprehension of its character and bearings we refer the reader to the extended discussion of it, to be found in this excellent Introduction.

In discussing the literature of these three prophetic books, our author pays a deserved tribute to the wonderful genius, learning and services of John Calvin in revealing the mind of the Spirit as here recorded. Indeed it seems, that while many of the older commentaries are becoming mere library lumber or repositories of curious, exploded theories of interpretation, that the great thinker and theologian of the Reformation is getting a firmer hold on the reverence and affection of the most advanced minds amongst us. There are some statues so gigantic in proportions that they are not seen to advantage except at a distance. So it has been with him. For a time after the great impulse which he gave to the generation in which he lived it was fashionable to neglect him. But now he is again rising above the horizon, a luminary of the first magnitude, whose calm and serene radiance will, as we trust, shine on the way of life till the end of time.*

We close this work with a feeling of profound satisfaction and recommend it to all students of the Bible. And a reperusal of these three Prophets, with the lights that are now offered, is suggestive at once of hope and fear. For as we are cheered by promise of the speedy and glorious coming of the Son of God, we are reminded that when he comes he will inaugurate a day of searching scrutiny. He will be as refiner's fire and as fullers' soap. He brings, therefore, both blessings and cursings. And while we trace the first streaks of the morning

* We notice, with special pleasure, that Dr. Schaff, in his new work on Religion in America, acknowledges that Calvinism is the dominant influence in the American Church.

light we catch a glimpse of consuming fire that shall burn the enemies of God.

ARTICLE IV.

MICHAEL SERVETUS.

- I. *Calvin and Servetus: the Reformer's Share in the Trial of Michael Servetus historically ascertained. From the French: with Notes and Additions. By the Rev. W. R. TWEEDIE. JOHN JOHNSTONE, 15 Princess Street, Edinburgh, and 26, Pater Noster Row, London, 1846.*
- II. *A Short Account of the Ancient History, Present Government and Laws of the Republic of Geneva. By GEORGE REATE, Esq., London. Printed for R. & J. DODSLEY, in Pall Mall, 1761.*

Had Servetus been burned by the Romanists at Vienna, we should probably never have heard his name; or at most, his case would have excited no higher interest than the thousands of martyrs who have fallen victims to Inquisitorial power. His wild speculations in theology, together with his more useful discoveries in physiological science, would have been swept into oblivion by the flames of Papal justice.

We initiate our present effort with this (as some may think,) bold announcement, that our readers may bear in mind the proposition which we hope to demonstrate; and that they may fairly and fully weigh all the facts as they shall be given in detail. Rome had consigned myriads of God's most faithful ones to the rack, the fire, and the dungeons of the Inquisition, for the damning heresy of calling in question her dogmas and authority, until these things came to be considered matters of course; and until, from the vast numbers of her victims, a single name, unless one of marked eminence, was lost from public view.

But few of all the distinguished names connected with the great Reformation of the 16th century have obtained a more world-wide renown than that which stands at the head of this article. And for what reason? Not because, like Luther, Melancthon, Calvin and others, he battled manfully "for the faith once delivered to the saints," and contributed much to the purging of the church from error and delusion; not because of any signal service he rendered to the temporal interests of mankind; not even because he died a martyr at the stake, for the theological opinions he sought to promulgate to the world; but because he suffered at the hands of *those professing the Reformed faith under the walls of Geneva*. Men of every shade of faith, from the most orthodox to the most heretical, can easily perceive *now* that the practice of persecution for religious opinions but illy comports with the pure and correct Gospel precepts which were taught in that republican city. But then the chiefest Reformers had not so learned the doctrines of their Divine Master as to realize that the weapons of their warfare were not carnal. Those clouds of error and superstition, which had enveloped the church in their folds for a thousand years, had only begun to break away and admit the rays of the Sun of Righteousness to the minds of men. The whole system of truth, as revealed in the precepts of Christ and his Apostles, in faith and practice, was not yet fully grasped and clearly understood, even by the mightiest minds and the purest spirits of the Reformation. The consequence was that Servetus fell before the power of a Protestant tribunal, just as he would have done at the hands of Romanists a few months before, had not circumstances prevented.

But at whose door lies the sin of putting the heretic to death? We anticipate the answer which many, and perhaps the world generally, would give. Romanists, and many Protestants too, for generations past have unhesitatingly visited the crime on the great Genevan Reformer. By many, of whom we should have expected other sentiments, Calvin has been regarded as the vengeful and truculent murderer of Servetus. And from absence of the necessary testimony in the case, the most ardent professors of that system of faith so clearly set

forth in the immortal "Institutes," have been borne along by the tide of public opinion, and only enabled to offer a plausible defence for their adherence to his doctrines, by separating them from the life of Calvin himself.

But justice, though tardy, seems at last to have entered upon its perfect work. The errors of the writers upon this subject heretofore, seem now likely to be corrected. Not a few during the last hundred and fifty years, have professed to give correct narratives of this, at least one of the most remarkable trials ever had before a human tribunal. De la Roche, Mosheim, Alwoerden, and Jennebieur during the last century, and Fleury, Trechsel, Valayre and Audin of the present, have given the results of their labours. Some of these wrote with undisguised hostility to Calvin and his doctrines; and all, in the absence of the authentic data, which were absolutely necessary to a fair exposition of the solemn procedure. Audin, one of the most recent, and a Romanist, wrote his "*Vie de Calvin*," as a set off to D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation. Maunder too, represents the agency of Calvin in the death of Servetus as leaving an indelible stain on his character.

It is well known that the late Dr. Thos. McCrie contemplated giving the world a life of Calvin, as he had done that of Scotland's great Reformer, Knox; and for this purpose sent his son, John McCrie, to Geneva, to examine the registers of the city, and thus draw upon original sources for his materials. A biography of Calvin from a Scottish stand point, to be placed side by side with that of his "true yoke fellow" Knox, would be an invaluable contribution to Presbyterian literature. But the intentions of both father and son were frustrated by a wise Providence, which called them to go up higher; and the work is now in the hands of another of the same family, Rev. Thomas McCrie, who will, if God permit, ere long give the results of their united efforts to the world.

But our regrets for the loss of the labours of two eminently qualified friends of Calvin have been more than mitigated by the efforts that have been made by one of a different faith from the great Reformer, and whose testimony consequently comes to us divested of the suspicion of prejudice in his favour.

The original records of the trial of Servetus before the "Little Council of Geneva" were, until recently, supposed to be lost. We have now the satisfaction of announcing that this is not the fact. And the discovery of these records is due to the efforts of one not of Calvin's faith. We may then reasonably anticipate that he "will a plain, unvarnished tale deliver." In 1844, Mons. Albert Rilliet, whom we learn to be a Unitarian Clergyman of Geneva, published a brochure or treatise on this proceeding, which was based upon the original documents which had not been before published or examined. In this tractate we now have probably all the light that we ever can have until the secrets of all hearts shall be made known at the judgment bar.*

To present even a cursory view of the life of Calvin, would be both unnecessary, and far exceed our prescribed limits. But to do justice to the labours of Mons. Rilliet, we shall find it necessary to notice the principal events in the life of his antagonist before the tragic scene which closed with his death.

Michael Servetus, also called Reves, was a Spaniard, a native of Villanova in Arragon. He first saw the light about 1509, and was consequently of about the same age with Calvin. At an early age he exhibited a taste for religious speculations, and a decided aversion to the scholastic theology of the Romish Church. In consequence of these traits of character, his father, who is supposed to have designed him for the church, fearing that his speculations might expose him to the fury of the Inquisition, changed his purpose, and sent him to the University of Toulouse, to study law. Here he became associated with some young men who had imbibed the doctrines of Luther, and at their solicitations applied himself to the study of theology with them. Being now deeply interested in the new doctrines, and ambitious to distinguish himself in the work of the Reformation, he left Toulouse and travelled over Italy, where, in February, 1530, he was present at the coronation of Charles V.

* Its title in the original French is, "Relation du Proces Criminel Intente a Geneve, en 1553, contre Michel Servet, redigee d'apres les Documents Originaux, par Albert Rilliet."

Passing into Germany, he stopped at Bâle, the residence of Œcolampadius. The latter, who at first welcomed him, soon discovered that he abjured vastly more than the errors of Rome; and differed not less with the Reformed than with the adherents of the Pope. The discovery of his denial of the doctrine of the Trinity detached Œcolampadius from him, and he experienced the same cold reception from Bucer and Capito at Strasburg.

Denounced by these Reformers, he determined now to act for himself, and to form a party of his own through the influence of his writings. In 1531, he published his first work at Hagenau, entitled *De Trinitatis Erroribus*, Libri VII. This was succeeded by another work in the following year, entitled *Dialogorum de Trinitate*, Libri II. A copy of each of these books is now in the Angelic Library at Rome, in both of which the doctrine of the Trinity is rejected. These writings were not without their influence, both in arresting the progress of the Reformation and in promoting heresy and schism. To them Dr. McCrie traces the sources of the errors that prevailed in Italy in the 16th century.*

The publication of these opinions brought down upon Servetus a storm of opposition from the Reformers at Bâle and Strasburg, which he was illy able to encounter. And not meeting with the success which he had anticipated, he resolved to change both his name and profession. Assuming the name of Villeneuve, he went to Paris to pursue the study of medicine. As an indication of the brilliant, though ill-directed genius of the man, it appears evident that he made the first discovery of the circulation of the blood, more than seventy years before the announcement of Harvey.

During his stay in Paris, he still devoted himself to the study of Theology, and for the first time sought an interview with Calvin, who was then in the city, but failed in obtaining it. From Paris he went to Lyons, where, to earn the means of support, he became corrector of the press, and published an edition of the geography of Ptolemy with notes. Returning again to Paris in 1537, he taught mathematics, geography, and astrology; the

* *History of Reformation in Italy*, pp. 150, 151.

last of which drew down upon him the vengeance of the Sorbonne, and a sentence of Parliament. From Paris he went to Charlieu, where he practised medicine. In 1541, he took up his residence in Vienne in Dauphiné, a place destined to be little less memorable in his history than Geneva itself, where he engaged in the duties of his profession, and also in some literary labours.

It was at Vienne that he first entered into correspondence with Calvin. His acquaintance had been cut by the Reformers in Germany; and he now essayed the assimilation of a mind mightier than theirs to his peculiar theological tenets. But as might have been expected, he was foiled here in a more signal manner than before. So far from finding a pliant tool, on whom he should be able to impress his soul-destroying dogmas, he found himself all at once in the hands of an intellectual giant of unyielding principle, and was doomed to mourn over a bitter discomfiture, the mortification of which doubtless, at a later period, instigated him to a retaliation on the Reformer, in a manner which he hoped to find more effectual than a theological dispute. For about six years Calvin endured the discussion of the loathsome errors and the insulting language of his antagonist, in the vain hope of converting him to the truth. At last he denounced him as incorrigible; and in February, 1546, he wrote to Viret that famous letter, in which he avows his determination to render the heretic's visit to Geneva fatal to him, should he exercise the temerity to venture thither. "Nam si venerit, modo valeat mea auctoritas, vivam exire nunquam patiar."*

Meanwhile the Spaniard was not idle. He was laboriously engaged on the great work of his life—a work which was destined, ere long, to call forth the thunders of both Popish and Protestant tribunals, and wind up his earthly career. This book was entitled *Christianismi Restitutio*, not simply a refutation of one particular doctrine, but an entire system of theology, combatting alike "the monstrous absurdities of Rome, and the pretended reforms of Protestant doctors." "And had it been able,"

* Henry quotes this letter as written to Farel, then at Metz. Alex. Moras, a personal friend of Calvin, and others, reasoned strenuously against its genuineness. Henry's *Life of Calvin*, vol. 2, p. 181.

says Rilliet, "to force itself into publicity, the name of Servetus might not have awakened, as now, only the idea of anti-Trinitarian," p. 69. From a passage quoted from this work by Sigmond, Servetus must have been far from Unitarianism. Though rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity, he uses the following language:—speaking of Christ, he says, "ipse non sit creatura, nee finitae potentiae, sed vere adorandus verusque Deus." Thus he denied his humanity, and made him the absolute God. This conclusion he arrived at, however, from any other than exalted and correct views of God or the Son of God. He was a thorough Pantheist, with him every thing was a part of the Divine nature. The bench on which he sat, and even the devil himself, he avowed before the Council of Geneva, were parts of the Divine essence. Christ, therefore, was the "verus Deus," and to be adored in a no higher sense than blocks of wood, and fiends in the nether world. The Trinity he characterized on his trial as a three headed monster, a "Cerberus, the dreams of Augustine, and an invention of the devil."—p. 118.

After an ineffectual overture to a bookseller at Bâle, Servetus procured the printing of the "*Restitutio*" at Vienne, a printer of that place* having consented to construct a secret workshop for the purpose. The book appeared about the beginning of the year 1553. Five bales of copies were sent to Lyons; as many to Chatillon: still more to Frankfort; and others to Geneva. One of the copies fell into the hands of Calvin, by what means, does not appear. It is not probable, however, that he was the first in Geneva to get possession of the work; nor was he the person who furnished the information to the Viennese, which led to the arrest of the author. The paper warfare across the Swiss Alps had for some years ceased, and Calvin was amply occupied in settling the religious faith and political institutions of Geneva, though he doubtless kept a sleepless eye upon one whom he knew to be so dangerous an enemy, so long within less than a hundred miles of him.

How then was the discovery made? Who was the in-

* William Queroult, overseer of the Archbishop's press at Vienne.

former? There lived at this time, at Geneva, a French nobleman from Lyons, who had fled thither from persecution, by the name of William de Trie. De Trie had a near relation at Lyons still in the bosom of the Romish church, by the name of Arneys. A correspondence between these two persons first led to the disclosures which were followed by such tragical results. The blood of Protestant worthies had been ruthlessly shed in that part of France, and it seemed just ground of complaint on the part of De Trie, that a blasphemer like Servetus should be tolerated under the same authority. Hence, he wrote to Arneys, reproaching him and his church for suffering such evils to exist unmolested within its pale, and claiming that such crimes were more effectually punished in Protestant Geneva. Referring to Servetus and his book, he says, "Suppose now that a man should declare that the Trinity in which we believe is a Cerberus, a hellish monster, and should heap upon it all imaginable abuse, and make a mock at all which the ancient fathers have said thereon;—in what light would such a man appear among you? How base a thing it is that they should be led to death who acknowledge that there is one only God, and that prayer must be offered to him in the name of Jesus Christ, while such a man as this, (Servetus,) who regards Christ as an idol, who tramples on all the principles of faith, revives all the absurdities of the old heretics, condemns the baptism of children, calling it a devilish invention,—should be held in esteem among you, and treated as if he had done nothing amiss! The man to whom I refer is a Spaniard or Portuguese, Michael Servetus by name. But he is known by that of Villeneuve, plays the physician, and has just had a work printed at Arnoullet's office in Vienne." In this letter, De Trie enclosed the title, the register, and the first four leaves of the "Restitutio."*

This appeal stung Arneys to the quick, and he immediately placed the letter in the hands of Ory, the inquisitor of the diocese at Lyons. Servetus was forthwith arrested, and underwent an examination at Vienne before Montgiron, the general-lieutenant of Dauphiná. The

* Henry, vol. ii. p. 185.

result of this examination was a failure in fixing the authorship on Servetus. The examination of Queroult, and the operatives in the printing office was attended with no better success. De Trie was then written to for fuller information, and he was enabled to furnish it. It will be seen here that De Trie, who had brought the charge against Servetus, in a private letter to a friend, was now laid under the necessity of establishing it, or stand convicted of slandering his neighbor. He had asserted that the physician at Vienne, bearing the name of Villeneuve, was Servetus, and the author of the heretical book: he must make good the proof. His only resource was in the hands of Calvin. Servetus, in his letters to him, had acknowledged and explained his change of name, and sufficient testimony was found in this correspondence to satisfy the judges of the guilt of their prisoner, and finally render their verdict against him. It was with much difficulty, however, that De Trie prevailed on Calvin to allow the use of these letters, and a conscientious regard for the cause of truth, at last induced him to consent. Servetus, fully realizing the consequences that awaited him, when he saw his letters in the hands of his judges, took measures to effect his escape from the prisons of the palace at Vienne, while his trial was still pending. This was on the 7th of April. The process against him, however, was still continued, and on the 17th of June, a sentence was returned by the ordinary tribunal of the Bailiwick of Vienne, condemning him to the flames. The sentence was duly executed the same day, as far as it could be, on the "Place Charneve," by burning the effigy of the criminal, after hanging it on the gallows, together with a bale of his books,* in a slow fire.

For about three months after his escape, Servetus lay concealed in France. But fearing that he might fall into the power of his enemies, he resolved on fleeing to Naples, he himself said, for the purpose of pursuing the duties of his profession. Whether this was his real design or not, he took Geneva in his route, most probably

* Three copies of the "Restitutio" are still in existence, one of which is in the king's library at Paris, closing with the initials of the author, M. S. V.

with a view of trying his fortunes in a place, where the condition of affairs was not unknown to him.

We have now seen what Rome would have done with the heretic, could she have laid her hands on him. Though out of her grasp, her sentence of outlawry and death were still in force against him. Apprehension of his body would have consigned it to the same fate with his effigy and his books. And after he had been apprehended in Geneva, she formally demanded the rendition of the fugitive as the subject of an *auto da fe*, in the market place of Vienne. And if with her it is a solemn duty to burn heretics, let her and all others remember the precept, "let him that is without sin cast the first stone."

Let us now follow our hero on, and see how he will acquit himself when beyond the reach of the sentence that impended over him. One would have supposed that his recent dangers and hazardous escape would have rendered him weary of similar perils. But Servetus was one of those restless, fiery spirits that seemed to delight in fomenting strife and courting danger. Coleridge said, that "if any poor fanatic ever thrust himself into the flames, that man was Servetus."

But before proceeding to consider his case, in the hands of Protestant judges, we must recur for a little while to the state of affairs in the city where he sought an asylum. The Republic of Geneva is little more than a point on the map of Europe, with a few miles of detached territory, washed by the blue waters of the Rhone. And yet from this point, lying at the western extremity of Lemman lake, radiated full three hundred yeazs ago, those eternal principles of civilization, state policy, and religious trnth, to which we in this far distant age and clime, can never acknowledge ourselves too much indebted. One of the first cities of the Allobroges, in the time of Julius Cæsar, Geneva, fell successively under the dominion of the Emperors of Rome, France and Germany, and the kings of Burgundy, till the middle of the eleventh century. For about five hundred years afterwards, the government was exercised by the bishops, to whom the emperors had resigned their authority, but who were involved in almost ceaseless

contests with the counts of Geneva and Savoy, for the supreme authority. The inauguration of the reformation ended this quarrel, and in 1534 and 1535, Geneva became a republic, and by degrees obtained that form of government which exists substantially to this day. Consequently when Servetus entered the city in August, 1553, the people had lived in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty for about eighteen years. But with Geneva, the reformation was not a transition from a corrupt religion, to one conformed strictly to the pure precepts of the Gospel. The people had groaned under the tyranny of the Crosier, and longed to free themselves from Episcopal rule, long before they heard of the doctrines of Luther and Zuingle; and when these doctrines of abjuration of Rome were preached, they were received, partly at least, as a means of freeing them from the supremacy of the bishops, and securing the protective alliance of Berne. The love of independence, far more than a sincere desire to know and practice the truth—anti-catholicism, more than love of the pure principles of the Gospel, opened their hearts to the reception of the new faith, and ranged them on the side of the Reformation. Accustomed too to habits of unrestrained licentiousness, and all manner of sensual pleasures, it was no easy matter for them to reform their lives when they changed their constitution. The nobles of the city were, to a melancholy extent, the foremost and most shameless in these libertine practices. A few, and perhaps a few only of the native Genevese were truly converted to Christ, and realized that his yoke was easy and his burden light. But Geneva was a free city, and consequently an asylum for the people of God, who had been exiled for conscience sake from their own lands. Here, Scotland's great reformer Knox, in after years, found a refuge from the fury of persecution under the bloody Mary. And here, at the trying period of which we now speak, thousands had congregated from various popish kingdoms, and especially from France and Italy, that they might enjoy the pure worship of God in safety and peace. So great a number of these refugees hailed from France like Calvin, that they were commonly designated by the name of *French*, to distinguish them

from the native Genevese. Among these, true religion found its faithful adherents; among the latter were the libertines, who were restive and factious under any strict rule, whether civil or ecclesiastical. The latter being natives, citizens and Burgesses, constituted the "general council," and possessed the law-making power, to the entire exclusion of the stranger inhabitants.* To strike down high imaginations like these, and cleanse the city from all its impurities, was found a far more formidable undertaking than freeing it from the thralldom of the Vatican. Farel and Viret had been the instruments under God of initiating the work of reform. Farel had preached before the Council; the nuns of St. Clair had left the city, and the monks and all the monuments of Popish supremacy had been swept away. But a corrupt religion was banished, and not fully supplanted as yet by a better: and as a legitimate consequence, violence and faction reigned to a fearful extent.

This state of things prevailed in Geneva, when Calvin in 1536, flying from his native France to Germany, where he might labor in safety for the cause of God and truth, passed through the city. In no portion of Europe was a master-mind like his more needed; than at Geneva at this time. He would fain pass on in spite of the remonstrances of Farel; but the man of God, who had with his own hands, torn down the idols and crucifixes in Geneva, denounced the vengeance of heaven against him, unless he remained and gave himself to the establishment of the truth there. This solemn appeal changed his mind, and Calvin at once set about the arduous work of reforming the morals as well as settling the religious faith of Geneva. But mighty as were his efforts and his influence, he found "old Adam too strong for young Melancthon." Libertinism was yet too mighty to be brought under the pure and benign reign of the Gospel. But with Calvin, there was no alternative but the Christianity of the Bible. And for his faithfulness he was expelled the city, together with Farel and Cordeir, in less than two years after his entrance into it.

But Geneva,—like France at a subsequent period,—

* Reati, p. 65, et seq.

made the important discovery, that she could not be governed without religion; the morals of the libertines could not save the State. Faction followed faction, and murder succeeded murder; death by violence lessened the number of Calvin's enemies. An erring people, softened by calamities, now saw no way of saving themselves from destruction, but by recalling him whom they had exiled. Bâle, Berne, and Zurich added their influence; and the Council of Two Hundred unanimously voted to press his return from Strasburg, where he now resided. Calvin, with many fears, consented; and an embassy conducted him in triumph to Geneva, after an absence of more than two years.

But his return, in 1540, did not find the power of sin destroyed. And, for a period of near thirteen years, he was doomed to struggle with the same unholy influence. A powerful party in Geneva were incorrigible to the religious restraints which were imposed upon them. They would fain enjoy the peace and order secured by the Reformer's presence; but they must be exempted from a strict application of the laws of the Republic to themselves.

Among those who claimed admission to sealing ordinances was Amied Perrin, the Chief Syndic and Captain General of the Republic; adding to his official influence, wealth and family connections. His own morals, as well as those of several of his family, subjected them to the censures of the Consistory. This aroused Perrin's pride and resentment, as he had expected exemption for his rank, from penalties which he was entirely willing to see visited on others. The contest was fearful; the Magistrate arrayed a powerful party in his favor, in resistance to the authority of the Consistory. But Calvin was inflexible; with him the laws must be respected, even by those in power, or he will seek relief in a second exile. In this controversy justice triumphed; and Perrin was banished from the city.

But the serpent's head was not yet crushed. Perrin's faction was still alive; and a plan was laid for embroiling the city and banishing the Reformer. Popular tumults were excited; and into one of these Calvin rushed and bared his bosom to the swords of the rioters, if they

thirsted for blood. The appeal quelled the tumult for the time. But soon after, one of the leaders of the libertine faction, James Gruet, was brought to the block, to atone for crimes, which Spon and Jennebier show, were such as to outrage all the laws of the State.

In a spirit of pure benevolence, Calvin afterwards proposed to recall Perrin, and reinstate him in all the honors which he had lost, with a hope of allaying the fury of the parties in the city. For a time his efforts were rewarded with peace; but the ground of the evils was not removed. The carnal mind was enmity against God; and those who had long indulged in sin, without new natures, could no more love the rigid regime of Calvin than the Ethiopian could change his skin, or the leopard his spots.

The Spaniard, at Vienne, meantime was not ignorant of the state of parties in Geneva. He had ventured to measure swords across the Alps with the Reformer; to his own discomfiture, and he burned with revenge. In France he could now expect nothing better than concealment, with imminent danger of re-apprehension, and torture to death by a slow fire. In Geneva he could espouse the cause of the libertines, with whom, if reports be true, he but too fondly sympathized; and by gaining the ascendancy, overthrow the orthodox in Geneva, banish Calvin, revolutionize the government, and restore his fallen fortunes. If these were not his hopes and his designs, how can we account for his temerity in throwing himself into the power of enemies no less implacable than those whose vengeance he had just escaped. In Geneva he had friends, and he was aware of the fact. His prospects, then, were not desperate, of supplanting Calvin, reforming the Reformation as he had designed, and for the Institutes, embodying the form of sound doctrine, substitute the "Restitutio," and thus introduce at an early period those baleful heresies, which have since overrun that portion of Europe.

In July, 1553, Servetus entered Geneva, the residence of the man whom he firmly believed had been his accuser in his late trial at Vienne. Here he kept himself concealed for about a month, during which time it is next to impossible to believe, but that he was studying

more accurately the condition of parties, and holding secret correspondence with the Libertines. At this very juncture there was much to encourage him. Calvin was called to encounter greater difficulties than had ever occurred since his recall to Geneva. Perrin, at the head of his party, was using all his influence to counteract that of the Reformer; and he too fully succeeded. That year he procured the election, to seats in the "Little Council," of a number of his friends; and the exclusion of the adherents of Calvin. This election was an undisguised declaration of hostility to Calvin's administration, and he felt the result bitterly. In addition to this, the Genevese proceeded to take from the pious refugees in the city the arms which had been granted them the previous year to aid in maintaining the public safety. And to weaken still more the influence of the Calvinist party, the Ministers of the Gospel were prohibited from sitting in the "Council General," and from the enjoyment of all political rights, and placed in this respect on the same ground with the Romish Priests before the Reformation. These three acts of the dominant party,—the exclusion of Calvin's friends from the "Council of Twenty-Five," the disarming of the strangers who enjoyed no political rights, and the disfranchisement of the Ministers, were heavy blows struck at the cause of truth. And Calvin thus expressed his feelings at the result: "The factions have done all to lead, by degrees, to the overthrow of this Church, already very weak. Behold two years of our life have passed as if we lived among the avowed enemies of the Gospel."

And yet another storm bursts upon the head of the devoted servant of God. This was the contest which he was called to wage with the adverse party, on the subject of ecclesiastical power. Calvin and the Consistory; or Church Session, claimed rightly "the power of the keys"—the exclusive right to admit and to interdict from partaking of sealing ordinances. The Consistory had exercised the discipline of the Church on a leading member of the libertine party, Philibert Berthelier. The friends of the latter made a violent effort to get the civil power to cancel the sentence of excommunication; and in addition, to transfer the power of excommunication

from the Consistory to the Little Council. And, as we shall presently see, the plan for the time succeeded. During the very time when the trial of Servetus was progressing the unholy decision was made—and the civil power dared to trench on the sacred prerogative, revoked the sentence, and authorized Berthelier to partake of the Lord's Supper.

But exile, or even death, was a far preferable alternative to Calvin than yielding to this Erastian principle. And he took the bold and decided stand, to rebuke the unholy act of intrusion from the pulpit, and to refuse to administer the Sacrament on the appointed day altogether, willing to abide the consequences if Berthelier persisted in exercising his right. The Council, astounded at the boldness of the man of God, fearing the consequences of pushing their newly assumed prerogatives too far, and yet too proud to revoke their decision, continued to avoid the collision, by privately requesting the ex-cinded man to decline partaking of the ordinance at that time.

We have thought proper to present the details of this conflict at this place, that we may give due prominence to the fearful difficulties with which Calvin was called to contend, and do justice as far as possible to the motives by which he was actuated. The highest interests of the State, and the cause of God and the truth, were the holy motives that nerved his unyielding soul. His own private interests, his ease and popularity, even his personal safety, were as dust in the balance, when weighed against the immutable principles of the Word of God. These considerations too, are necessary to a proper estimate of Servetus' visit in disguise to Geneva, his secret sojourn there, and the action of Calvin in securing his arrest. "We have spoken of them now, because Calvin has told us that among the allies of Berthelier, Servetus found his chief patrons and supporters, while it was necessary to describe the position which Perrin and his adherents, mentioned under the name of *Libertines*, held in Geneva, because their hostility to the Reformer, enabling Servetus to meet such powerful allies at the side of his redoubtable opponent, probably drew him to Geneva, and turned his trial into

an episode in the struggle which distracted the republican city."—*Epist. Calv. ad Min., Tigur, 26th Novemb, 1553.**

At the inn, Servetus did not keep himself so entirely secluded as to prevent discovery. Mosheim says, he attended service at one of the churches on the Sabbath; was there identified and denounced before the sermon was concluded. The part that Calvin took in his arrest he boldly avowed. As soon as he was informed of the heretic's presence in Geneva, convinced that his intentions could not be anything else than inimical to the interests of the city, he applied to one of the Syndics for an order for his imprisonment. This occurred August 13th, 1553. The knowledge of the impious and pernicious blasphemies of Servetus, and the attacks which he had made on Calvin before, could not leave the latter for a moment undecided as to the course he should pursue. He was constrained to look upon him in a political as well as a religious aspect:—as an incendiary to the State as well as a deadly enemy to the reformed religion, "To tolerate Servetus at Geneva, would have been, in some measure, for Calvin to exile himself; it would have been to betray the cause of God without a struggle—to belie all the past, and render impossible the continuation of his work in Geneva, the rival of Rome."† "The man whom a Calvinist accusation had caused to be arrested, tried, and condemned to the flames in France could not find an asylum in the city from which that accusation had issued. The honor of Reform, as Calvin understood it, was pledged to that, and never, without a doubt, did he believe he was performing a work more in unison with the interests of a cause which he held so sacred, than when he determined to urge on the arrest of Servetus."‡

Servetus was committed to prison, in the manner prescribed by the criminal edicts of the State, and the regular steps were taken for his trial on the charge of heresy, before the Little Council.¶ The law required that the

* *Rilliet*, pp. 83, 84. † *Rilliet*, p. 88. ‡ *Rilliet*, p. 89.

¶ For a particular account of the Government of Geneva, we refer to *Reate*. The sovereign power was vested in a series of three Councils. First,—The large or General Council was composed of all citizens and

the accuser should be committed to prison, as well as the accused, so that if he failed to make out his case he was liable to suffer the penalty he had attempted to impose on the other.

As it was impossible for Calvin to comply with this requisition, a student of his, Nicholas de Fontaine, became the ostensible prosecutor, and was duly committed to the prisons of the Palace with Servetus, to abide the issue of the trial. Thirty-eight articles were drawn up by Calvin, in which charges were made against the prisoner, to which the latter was permitted to reply. The passages were not quoted from the book printed at Vienne, but from the MSS. work, which Servetus had some years before sent to Calvin. The small works on the Trinity, printed at Hagenau, were not used during the process, because the pursuers were not able to procure them. But the "Christianismi Restitutio" was deemed altogether sufficient for the prisoner's conviction. And it strengthened the cause of the accusing party, that Servetus soon began to display his bitter hostility to Calvin and his friends; by retorting on them charges which he could not substantiate; and even a disregard of truth, by denying at times his own statements. When charged with escaping from the hand of justice at Vienne, he replied by declaring Calvin and De Trie to have been the authors of his imprisonment there, while there were those in the place who wished him to escape. When required to answer the charge of having his book printed in the office of Geront, he admitted the fact;

Burgesses, who have attained the age of twenty-five. This body possessed the right of making all the laws, and electing the principal magistrates.

Secondly.—The Council of Two Hundred consisted of two hundred and fifty citizens and Burgesses, of the age of thirty years, and had its vacancies filled as soon as they amounted to fifty. The members held their office for life, unless they became bankrupt, or were degraded by a censure annually passed. This Council was the Supreme Court of Justice, and exercised the pardoning power.

Thirdly.—The Council of Twenty-Five, or Little Council, was composed of members chosen from the Council of Two Hundred. In this body was vested the right to try all criminal cases, from whose decision an appeal might be taken to the Council of Two Hundred. It created Burgesses; and from it the Syndics or Magistrates were annually chosen. The Government had no criminal code: and hence the verdicts of the Council must be arbitrary.

while the latter denied it. On the next day, fearing that the statements might prove prejudicial to his cause, Servetus denied his own assertions, and maintained to the last that no connection of the kind had ever existed between them.*

Two days after the arrest, the Little Council convened in the hall of the ancient Episcopal Palace, where they held their criminal courts, for the purpose of issuing the case. Before this body Servetus reiterated, even more keenly than before, his charge against Calvin, of procuring his prosecution at Vienne, evincing by no dubious testimony the object he had in view, of exciting sympathy among the Reformer's enemies, and striking down, if possible, the man who swayed the religious interests of Geneva. For this end he desired of the Court the privilege of a public disputation on some of the points in the charge,—one of which was that infant baptism was a diabolical invention—and which he acknowledged and offered to defend before a full congregation. The challenge Calvin would not decline, because it was in debate that he was mighty indeed. And he declared that “there was nothing that he more desired than to plead such a cause in the temple before all the people.” But the Council, from different motives, declined granting the request. The harsh declaration of Servetus on the baptism of infants operated unfavorably for him on the minds of the Council, as it associated him with the lawless principles of the Anabaptists. And his admissions went so far to the establishment of his guilt that the Council released Fontaine from prison under bail to attend to the prosecution of the case, whenever his presence might be needed.

The meeting of the Council on the following day was marked by the presence of two additional members ranging themselves on different sides. The one was P. Berthelier, whom we have already mentioned as one of the most violent enemies of Calvin and his rigorous discipline, and on whom the sword of ecclesiastical power had fallen. The object of his presence in the Court was soon

* Geroult was one of the Libertine party of Geneva, and had been expelled the city two years before.

made obvious. The other character was Germain Coladon; an Israelite indeed, and a friend in whom Calvin and true religion might confide. He appeared, as is supposed, at the request of Calvin, in order to assist Fontaine in the prosecution of the case; and being an able lawyer, and from principle deeply interested, the cause could not have been placed in better hands. The result of the collision of two such antagonists was such as might be expected. A stormy debate ensued, in which Calvin was more prominently the object of attack on the one hand and defence on the other than the prisoner at the bar; and the Court adjourned, after a short session, without advancing one step in the process. The momentous events of that day called out the Reformer himself. The hour had arrived when he deemed it necessary for him to appear in person. The attack commenced by Servetus, had been followed up by one of his most powerful advocates, and the gauntlet thus boldly thrown down was as readily taken up, by one who was in all respects the most able to wield it. And the following day, when the Court resumed its sessions, the two antagonists met face to face for the first time. Here a number of errors charged against the prisoner were proved by reference to his printed works, indisputably settling his guilt as "a sower of great heresies," in the minds of the judges. At this meeting were fully brought out, for the first time, the anti-trinitarian, rationalistic, and pantheistic principles of the accused. Here he avowed that none of the Christian fathers, before the Council of Nice, had ever used the word *Trinity*; called Trinitarians "Atheists," and admitted that he had used the blasphemous metaphor of "Cerberus" and "three headed monster" in reference to the three persons of the Godhead. And on this occasion, in reply to Calvin, he declared his belief that the bench and buffet, and even the devil, and all things else, were part and parcel of God.*

But the heretic learned, to his sorrow, that in this meeting he had presumed too far on the supposed sympathy of his friends in the Council. His shocking blas-

* Killiet, p. 119.

phemies were unfavorably received; and when this "first act of the trial ended," that day, the Court decided to liberate both Fontaine and his surety, "finding by the proofs and facts produced on the part of the pursuers that Servetus clearly appeared to be guilty."

The next sitting of the Council, on the 21st of August, clothed with a new aspect the now solemn affair in which it was engaged. In the process of inquiry testimony was elicited sufficient to render the prisoner, in the minds of the members, a dangerous person, both to the Church and the State. His case became less a theological battle with Calvin than a war waged against religion and liberty. And on that day the following was adopted as the opinion of the Court: "Inasmuch as the case of heresy of M. Servetus vitally affects the welfare of Christendom, it is resolved to proceed with his trial; and also to write to Vienne to know why he was imprisoned, and how he had escaped; and after that, when all is ascertained, to write to the Magistracy of Berne, of Bâle, of Zurich, of Schaffhausen, and other Churches of the Swiss, to acquaint them with the whole." Thus, at this early stage of the proceedings, we perceive that the Council resolved to act independently of Calvin, and also not to rest the responsibility of their verdict on themselves alone; but consult, with due deference, the Magistrates and Churches of the other Swiss Cantons. Rilliet tells us at the very outset, that Servetus was "condemned by Protestant Magistrates,"* and not by Calvin, or his influence. Calvin was now set aside; the Council undertook the case on their own account; and the Attorney-General, Claude Rigot, became the prosecutor in the name of the State. Calvin and the other Ministers were introduced "in order to maintain, according to the *process verbal*, the meaning opposed to that which Servetus had attached to the authors." And in the next meeting of the Council, the Reformer showed that Servetus had incorrectly interpreted the writings of the fathers in their use of the word *Trinity*, and quoted Justin Martyr to prove the use of the term anterior to the Council of Nice. Some discussion followed on the use of the title *Son of*

God; after which the Court adjourned, Calvin allowing the prisoner the use of some of his own books, and the Council granting him the privilege of purchasing others necessary for the preparation of his defence. His request for paper was limited to a single sheet, for the obvious purpose of preventing his communicating with those outside the prison, as it was known he had friends in the city, and the jailer was ordered to keep him close.

At the same time the Council carried out their design, of writing to the judges at Vienne, to obtain the particulars of the charges which led to his trial at that place, a copy of which letter, in obsolete French, is given by our author. Simultaneously with this movement, there was another executed on the part of the State, which demands special attention. The Attorney-General, laying aside the articles of Fontaine, containing the charges of heresy, now framed a new bill of indictment, embracing counts of an almost entirely political complexion. These referred to the prisoner's "previous history—his connection with other theologians—the printing of his book, and the fatal consequences that must follow its publication; and, finally, to his object in coming to Geneva, and his connections in that city."

"The details concerning his doctrines had disappeared:—the theological prosecution gave place to a trial whose tendency bore less on the actual heresy of the accused than on the dangerous results of his opinions, and of his persisting in spreading them." "Calvin disappeared before the general interests of the Reformed Churches." "In the public prosecution and condemnation of Servetus no account was taken of his altercations with the Reformer—the position of the latter had changed too much for any offence against him to be reckoned a crime. If Servetus had, in the eyes of Genevese justice, no other fault than that which De la Fontaine declared him guilty in regard to Calvin, his acquittal had been certain. The Reformer is no longer confounded with the Reformation, and if he alone had been concerned in the affair of Servetus, all his efforts would have been unavailing to secure the condemnation of his adversary." Servetus was "condemned by the majority of his judges, not at all as the opponent of Calvin—SCARCELY AS AN HERETIC—BUT ESSENTIALLY AS SEDITIOUS. POLITICS ACTED A

MUCH MORE IMPORTANT PART THAN THEOLOGY, TOWARDS THE CLOSE OF HIS TRIAL—THEY CAME ON THE STAGE WITH THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.”*

“These are the sentiments,” says the translator, “of one who has thoroughly examined the documentary and historical evidence in this melancholy affair.” Calvin was, in fact, no party to the trial in its closing and more painful stages. The charges preferred by Rigot viewed the prisoner, not in the light of a teacher of religious error, but as a dangerous and fiery spirit, whose constant endeavors had tended to the entire disorganizing of Christendom.† Except so far as religion was inseparably blended with the interests of the State, Servetus was tried exclusively as a political offender. In all governments where religion is established by law, it is impossible wholly to act in reference to the one without trenching on the prerogatives of the other. Such was the state of affairs in Geneva, at this transition period, that the impious errors and blasphemies of Servetus,—but little better than the most revolting forms of infidelity, could not be viewed in any other light than as seditious and revolutionary. His unsparing vituperations against the leading Reformers, and his low degrading views of the Godhead, and other errors, were eminently adapted to inspire the minds of men with a contempt and disbelief in all religion, and give a loose to all the more furious passions of their natures. To cast into contempt the religion of the Reformation, was to revolutionize the State. And though Servetus may have disavowed such intentions, the dangerous results of the success of his system of faith were clearly foreseen by the Genevese judges. To overthrow and supplant Calvinism, though many of them did not *ex animo* embrace it, they knew would be to superinduce a train of disasters, such as had followed the exile of the Reformer seventeen years before. Cardinal Sadolet had then endeavored to bring Geneva back to the bosom of holy mother, and the effort might be repeated. Faction and murder had reigned in the city,

* Rilliet, pp. 180, 131.

† Musculus said, in a letter to Bullinger, that Servetus was only wishing to make use of the bad feelings of some great men at Geneva, against Calvin, in order to obtain a position, whence he might be able to agitate other churches.—Henry, vol. ii. p. 198.

in the absence of one pure spirit, and the same bloody scenes might be re-enacted under the change that threatened them. Wicked men will endure some of the restraints which religion imposes, if it but secures to them temporal prosperity and safety. Viewing it as an old soldiery or a standing army, they will willingly be taxed for its support, while in their hearts they like it not.

These were undoubtedly the principles which prevailed in the Little Council of Geneva in 1553. A majority of that body were hostile to the Calvinistic faith;* yet, they remembered the scenes of 1537, and 1538, and they were unwilling to plunge the Republic again into a sea of troubles. Napoleon once said, that if left to choose between the tyranny of the Bourbons and the bloody reign of Jacobinism, he would infinitely prefer the former. So thought men two centuries and a half before. And though the counts in Rigot's indictment may have borne on their face that which seemed to savor of the *odium theologicum*, it is manifest that the court looked beyond this to results of a political character. They lost sight of the one, except so far as it was complicated with the other. Citations from the fathers and the inspired writers by Calvin and the other divines were *tolerated* and even called for, but with the prominent design of thwarting in theological combat, one whom they viewed as an enemy of their temporal peace. His defeat in the one field, they desired to be the end of his career in the other: His design in visiting Geneva was scrutinized with a careful eye; his repeated prevarications of the truth had lost for him the confidence of the judges; and official news from the late scene of his perils, Vienne, was soon to render the cause of Servetus disastrous indeed. That the prisoner himself viewed his trial as a civil rather than a religious one, is evident from his appeals to the magistrates in their official capacity.

During this term, the friends of Servetus in the city, were not idle in exciting public sympathy in his favor. And Calvin, on the other hand, nerved all the powers of his herculean mind to rebuke and denounce the

* We wish anti-Calvinists of every shade of opinion, would ponder the question, "who burned Servetus." Ans. anti-Calvinists.

errors of the heretic from the pulpit, to prevent the people being drawn by a false commiseration to favor his cause.

On the 31st of August, the Council received from the Court of Vienne, a reply to their communication of the 22d. The papers which they requested from Vienne were not granted, because trial had been had, and sentence passed; and it was deemed derogatory to the honor of the French Judiciary to recognize the necessity of another process. The officials at Vienne, however, sent a copy of the sentence of death, pronounced against Servetus, in his absence. And to strengthen the position they had assumed, they made a formal demand for the rendition of the prisoner, that the penalty might be duly executed on him, "in such a way that there would be no need to seek other charges against him." Thus, there was a convenient way opened to the Council to rid themselves of their prisoner, without imbruing their hands in his blood. The Viennese claimed it as *their right*, to kindle the flames of retribution round the heretic.

But the Genevese refused to comply with the request, for the reason that they felt themselves capable of doing justice to the cause of truth, as well as their Romanist neighbors. It was also contrary to their ancient usages, to deliver up prisoners whom they had arrested; but they were required to prosecute their cases to their termination.

Whether this course was the best or not, it is certain that it was the one preferred by Servetus. When he was confronted by his former jailor at Vienne, and asked whether he preferred to remain and stand his trial in Geneva, or return with those who had come to demand him, he threw himself on the ground weeping, and implored the privilege of being tried where he was. In Geneva, there was yet hope; in Vienne, the pile was, as it were, reared to consume him to ashes.

The Attorney-General had closed the prosecution, and nothing seemed now necessary but for the Council to render their verdict. But at this point in the proceeding, it was determined, whether at the instance of Calvin or his antagonist, is not certain, to grant Servetus another hearing in a written discussion with Calvin, on the theo-

logical points at issue. This was doubtless a decided advantage to the accused, as it gave him and his friends time for manœuvring, and complicated the affairs of Calvin. Calvin was to extract the exceptionable passages verbatim, from Servetus' book, and the accused was allowed to reply at length, that the whole discussion might be intelligible to the Swiss churches. Calvin, in his turn, was to reply.

At this juncture occurred the fearful contest, on the subject of excommunication, to which reference has already been made. In this struggle for the truth, we see the soul of that mighty man amplify its powers to the full extent of the difficulties with which he was called to grapple. In no instance in the whole of his mortal career, did he present so glorious a picture of the sublime, as when battling on the one hand with an insidious foe from abroad, he was called to encounter the determined opposition of the very court on which he was dependant for a favorable decision. To maintain his principles, he run the imminent risk of prejudicing the Council against him, and causing them to find in favor of Servetus. But he was inflexible, because he knew no course but that which the glory of God dictated.

On the 1st of September, P. Berthelier petitioned the Council to cancel the sentence of the Consistory, and admit him to the Lord's table, and his petition was favorably answered. The result has been given. But on the same day on which Calvin was thus defeated, he was called to enter the lists with Servetus, now flushed with the most brilliant hopes of success; supported by the presence of his friends, Perrin and Berthelier, both in the Council. Servetus did not fail to take advantage of this circumstance. He felt now well nigh certain of victory, and as was his wont—humble when his party seemed weak, and bold and defiant as they appeared strong,—he avowed his design to pursue his opponent, "till the cause be terminated by the death of him or me." But the Reformer was equal to the emergency, and the Spaniard gained nothing by the contest. He grappled with two adversaries at once, the Council and Berthelier in the pulpit, and with Servetus' replies, in the written debate which followed. This discussion was character-

ized by great asperity and invective on the part of Servetus, who believed himself on the eve of a triumph; and severity was not wanting in the replications of the Reformer. At length, the contest ended, and the articles extracted from the books of Servetus, his vindication, and Calvin's refutation, were presented to the Council on the 5th of September, in order that they might be presented to the Swiss churches. Calvin had opposed this reference, while Servetus desired it; and the wish of the latter was ultimately granted, after a delay of two weeks. But, pending this delay, Servetus, probably at the suggestion of friends in the city, claimed the assistance of an advocate, and the reference of his case to the Council of Two Hundred, to which he appealed, in hope of finding in a more popular body, a decision favorable to himself. The Council decided to grant neither request. And as the trial had now been protracted for a month, the longest period allowed by the criminal edicts, it was brought to a close, preparatory to referring the case to the Swiss churches for their decision.

During the interval that elapsed between the reference to the Swiss churches and the reception of their answers, Servetus was tossed between alternate hopes and fears, as to the result. For a time, he felt sure of being acquitted: It was known that both Berne and Bâle were not on the best terms with Calvin, and it was hoped that Zuingli might influence Zurich to favor toleration. Inflated with such prospects, Servetus even proceeded to institute an action against Calvin, asking the Council to put him on trial, professing himself willing to die, if he failed in convicting his enemy. A little while before he had contested the jurisdiction of the Civil Court in cases of heresy, (like his own,) but now it seems eminently proper that this same body should sit on the case of his rival, on precisely similar charges. This ebullition of passion closed with a tissue of invective against Calvin, styling him a magician, deserving to be condemned, exterminated, and hunted from the city. Servetus here avows the common opinions of the age, that it was right to put men to death for their opinions.

The reference of the case to the Swiss churches consumed near a month, and on the 18th October an answer was returned. These churches were unanimous in their judgment of the guilt of Servetus. Berne, to which the case was first presented, replied, "we pray the Lord that He may give you a spirit of prudence, and counsel, and strength, that you may put your own and other churches beyond the reach of this pest." This same church had, two years before, counselled moderation in the case of Jerome Bolsec, who had been arraigned for his attack on predestination. A different decision, in the present instance, obviously arose from the fact, that Berne made a wide difference between the nature of the offences, and the individual offenders. The heresy of Bolsec was not of so grave a character as to call for the intervention of the civil power: that of Servetus struck at the foundation of all religion, and the civil institutions based upon it.

The church of Zurich, after complimenting the faith and zeal of Calvin, said, "but the holy providence of God offers to you, at this hour, an opportunity of freeing yourselves and us from that injurious suspicion, if you know how to be vigilant and active in preventing the further spreading of that poison. We do not doubt but that your Lordships will act thus."

The church of Schaffhausen expressed itself thus: "We do not question but that you will repress the attempts of Servetus, according to your praiseworthy prudence, in order that his blasphemies may not waste like a gangrene, the members of Christ: for, to engage in long reasonings to overthrow his errors, would be to go mad with a fool."

The church of Bale, after exhorting the Council to endeavor to reclaim Servetus, concluded thus: "But if he show himself to be incurably wedded to his perverse opinions, check him according to your office, and the power which you hold from God, so that he may never more be able to trouble the church of Christ, and that the end may not be worse than the beginning."

The governments of Berne and Zurich contributed their influence to that of the churches, urging the Council of Geneva not to suffer so gross an offender to escape.

And Haller, the pastor of Berne, wrote to Bullinger, that so intense was the feeling against Servetus there, that if he had fallen into the hands of the Bernese magistrates, they would have committed him to the flames. "The Council of Geneva," says Rilliet, "had still too much the habit of yielding to that of Berne, to refuse a sentence which they prompted, though it was more with a view to their government, and as a matter of policy, than from purely theological motives."*

On the reception of these opinions, the Council met on the 26th October, to act definitively on the case. Perrin presided, and made a last and powerful effort in favor of the prisoner; first proposing his entire acquittal, which would have been equivalent to the exile of Calvin, and which the Syndic but too earnestly desired,—and then moving the reference of the case to the Council of Two Hundred, for a final decision. In both propositions he was baffled.

In this meeting of the Council, there were twenty members present, only seven of whom were decided Calvinists. But of the other party, only five, including Perrin, could be induced to sustain Servetus. Those very same persons who now cast their votes against him one month afterwards, took as firm a stand against Calvin, on the subject of excommunication. The solemn verdict was finally rendered, and the prisoner was sentenced to be led to the heights of Champel, outside the city, and burned alive, and his books with him. And on the following day, in full view of the beautiful waters of Leman, and the stupendous ramparts of the Jura, this melancholy *auto da fe* of Protestant Geneva, was duly executed. Farel was present, having come at the urgent solicitation of Calvin, and attended the prisoner to the place of execution, exhorting him to the last to renounce his errors and save his life.

And now, in conclusion, who was the murderer of Servetus? For, viewing the case as exclusively a religious one, as has generally been done—a trial for heresy—in the light of the 19th century, we can hardly characterize it by a milder term. Our proposition,

* Page 198.

which we now state, and to which we have constantly looked, is that IT WAS NOT CALVIN. The outline of the whole proceeding we have endeavored faithfully to give; and a minute examination of the evidence before us, drawn from the Registers of the Court, justifies us, we think, in taking this stand in favor of the Reformer.

First.—The Court which issued the case was a civil, and not an ecclesiastical tribunal. Had it been the Consistory instead of the Little Council of Geneva, the agency of Calvin would have appeared in a very different light. But it was not the Court of Jesus Christ that returned the verdict, and then delivered the prisoner over to Cæsar to execute the sentence. Calvin was not a member of the Council, and was even excluded from political rights with the other clergy, by being denied a seat in the “Council General.” Moreover, Servetus was not condemned by Calvin’s adherents in the “Little Council;” because they were a small minority and wholly unable to control the decisions of the body.

Secondly.—It was not on the ground of heresy mainly that Servetus was condemned. And we sustain this conclusion by still further reference to the testimony of an unprejudiced witness, who has carefully examined the authentic documents, the records of the Court, and a vast amount of historical evidence beside. “The heresy of Servetus had assumed, in the eyes of the Council of Geneva, the two-fold character of blasphemy and sedition. It was at once the outraged honour of God and the peace of society that they believed themselves to be defending while they punished him. The intimate union that existed in the State between religion and politics led men to regard in the same light errors which assailed the former and deeds which violated the principles of the latter. In both men saw a revolt against the established constitution, and by consequence a crime. The purely theological quarrel had disappeared before this motive for condemnation; and the judicial sentence, in the list of charges brought against Servetus, does not mention at all either the attacks against Calvin or those against the Ministers of Geneva. “The Magistracy being once thoroughly convinced, by the unprejudiced advice of the Helvetic Churches, that the opinions of

Servetus implied something more than a mere dissent from Calvin, and that they were most certainly pernicious to religion, the principles of public order, as then understood, did not permit them longer to hesitate as to whether or not they should see in them the crime of treason against society." They forgot "the theologian to think only of the criminal."* The majority of the Council, as we have seen, were not of Calvin's faith, and even the majority of those who voted the prisoner guilty belonged to the opposite party. Anti-Calvinists burned Servetus.

Thirdly.—It was not Calvin's personal influence that caused the Council to render a verdict of guilty, and especially the punishment of the stake. The old ordinances of the Emperors, particularly of Frederic II., were still in force in Geneva; according to which heretics were placed in the same rank, with regard to guilt and punishment, as traitors.† During the whole process Calvin was used more as an instrument to sustain preconceived opinions than as an adviser or counsellor. His gigantic mind and vast learning the Council found necessary to press into service to combat the subtle reasonings of Servetus. At that very time they set him at nought, even at the expense of violating the edicts of Geneva, by wresting from the Consistory the right of excommunication. And from the day of the arrest, to the final action of the Court, Calvin did not know whether the case would terminate in his own death or exile, or in that of his enemy. Geneva had no criminal code, and the decisions of her Courts were consequently arbitrary, being regulated by the general sentiments of other nations; and when Servetus was arrested, not only the finding of the Court was uncertain, but even the penalty, in the event of his being declared guilty.‡ Had the Reformer been the blood-thirsty monster that some have represented him, and had he possessed a controlling influence over the Council, the necessity of a reference to the Swiss Churches would have been obviated. The responsibility would have been thrown upon him

* Rilliet, pp. 204, 205. † Henry, vol. ii., p. 194.

‡ Vide Reate, pp. 82, 85.

and the conscientious scruples of the members set at rest.

Fourthly.—It will be said, that though the Court was a civil tribunal, the case a trial for sedition, and Calvin's influence did not procure the verdict,—still Calvin, like Saul of Tarsus, “was consenting unto his death.” The truth of this we freely admit. But are we to hold one man up as a solitary example of an erroneous belief long since exploded? This were in the highest degree invidious. And it were moreover, to do what too many of Calvin's enemies condemn *him* for doing. It were, if not to lead him to the stake, to load his memory with infamy, *not for the overt act of persecution, but for the exercise of an opinion.* One of the most recent attacks on Calvin's memory is by a man* who cherishes the dogma that man is not responsible for his belief. As an *argumentum ad hominem*, we must be allowed the privilege of exculpating Calvin for his belief that heretics might be lawfully punished by the sword. But did he stand alone in this belief, in the middle of the 16th century? Had this been so—had Romanists and Reformed—the Christian world generally—avowed the doctrine, of free toleration and the rights of conscience, then might the Reformer at Geneva been held up to the reprobation of the whole church. But to condemn Calvin for this opinion, is to take dangerous ground, both for Papists and Protestants. We have seen what Romanists did, and what they desired still further to do at Vienne; and we are not ignorant of what they have done in other ages and in other places. And we know what many Protestants have done, under the enjoyment of far greater light than shone on the world in Calvin's time. When Cornwallis was fighting the Battle of Guilford, and the veterans of Old England were giving way before the bayonets of the “Maryland Line,” his Lordship ordered his artillery to load with grape and fire on the contending masses, sweeping down friend and foe by the murderous storm. To reach his enemies, he fired through his own lines. In like manner, theological disputants of different shades of belief, who think it incumbent on

* Lord Brougham.

them to regard Calvin as the implacable persecutor of Servetus, are liable to be swept down by the discharges of their own artillery. Let it be established as a settled opinion that an indelible stain attaches to all those, who for the last thousand years, consciously believed in the punishment of heresy by the civil arm, and "who can be saved?" Rome and Reformation, Calvinist and Arminian, Socinian and Trinitarian, will fall under one common anathema. This indiscriminating artillery will sweep down for the Romanists, Cardinal Tournon, Inquisitor Ory, and the other functionaries at Vienne, and all other Inquisitors since the days of St. Dominic. It will lay under the same condemnation, almost without exception, the leading Reformers of Germany and the Swiss Cantons. They thought, "that of all crimes, the most atrocious is the spiritual murder of souls, while vengeance should not be left to God, since that would be, by postponing the punishment, to increase and prolong the influence of evil."* The impetuous Farel, and the benevolent Bullinger, both went further in the affair of Servetus than Calvin did. The latter opposed with all his might the punishment by fire, and plead for the substitution of the sword: the former were of one mind with the Council. "It is to him (Calvin) notwithstanding, that men have always imputed the guilt of that funeral pile, which he wished had never been reared."† The amiable Melancthon said, "that the Magistrates of Geneva did well to burn the heretic."‡ The Arminian, Bolsec, who had been expelled from Geneva for his attack on the doctrine of Predestination, holds this language regarding Servetus: "That he felt no displeasure at the death of so obstinate and monstrous an heretic, for he was utterly vile and unworthy of the society of men; and I would wish that all who aid him were exterminated and the Church of our Lord well purified from such vermin."|| And, as we have seen, Servetus himself avowed the same sentiments only a few days before his sentence was known.

Such indeed were the doctrines of all Christendom at that time, and not particularly of any man or class of

* Rilliet, page 179. † Page 209. ‡ Page 224. | Page 173.

men. And we are struck with the coincidence of the remarks of our Swiss author with those of a distinguished Christian Jurist and Statesman of our own country, Mr. Wirt, many years ago, that it was not Calvin, but the age in which he lived, that brought Servetus to the stake.

Montesquieu to some extent justifies the Council of Geneva, two ages after the melancholy event. And we can never cast the veil of oblivion over the actions of men claiming the true Apostolic succession more than a century after Calvin's death. The dragooning of Puritans and Covenanters may stand in the same category with the doings of St. Bartholemew's day. The revolting cruelties inflicted by Laud on Leighton, (the father of the Arch-Bishop,) Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, under the first Charles, alike with the missions of Claverhouse and Jeffries under the second, indicate that the doctrine was not obsolete then; and should seal the lips of many who esteem it God's service to hold the Genevese Reformer up as a monster to the world. How far the system of theology and ecclesiastical polity which have been embodied in his writings are really responsible for the odium entertained towards him, it would be well to inquire.

The estimation in which Calvin was held by the purest men who knew him personally, and those of succeeding ages, shows that he was not regarded as stained with innocent blood. The Reformers on the Continent, both Lutheran and Swiss, the Prefates of England, and the Presbyterians of Scotland, looked up to him as a guiding star in the galaxy of religious teachers. His correspondence shows that he kept the consciences of a large portion of Europe. Among his manuscripts is found a fasciculus with the title "Lettres par divers Rois, Princes, Seigneurs, et Dames pour consulter sur les cas de conscience epineaux, ou pour le remercier de ses ouvrages." Kings, Princes, Lords and Ladies consulted him on the most intricate and solemn questions connected with the piety of the heart. Arch-Bishop Parker, in Elizabeth's name, thanked him for the part he bore in the Reformation in England. His correspondence with Cranmer, and the reference of the Liturgy to him for

correction, are facts too well known to be repeated. Knox testified that Geneva was "the most perfect school of Christ that ever was in the earth since the days of the Apostles." Montesquieu's celebrated eulogium was, "The Genevese may bless the day that Calvin was born." Reate accords him the honour of founding a prosperous Church in Geneva, and of having "a great share in forming its political as well as spiritual legislation." To quote the favourable opinions of the most distinguished Divines of every age since Calvin's day, would exceed our limits, and only repeat what has been often given to the public. His influence is now enjoyed by millions, who know him only in the character of a bigotted sectarian and persecutor. In the Republic and in the Church, which received their cast under his moulding hand, and in the educational systems which now prevail throughout Protestant Christendom, we recognize the agency of one whom God raised up to be a benefactor to his race, and to transmit a hallowing influence down to far distant ages. A life of unremitted toil, self-denial, and suffering, which doubtless brought him prematurely to the grave,—a life into which is compressed the work of ordinary minds for centuries,—a life devoted wholly to the prosperity of the Church and the glory of God, should be sufficient to outweigh one erroneous opinion, which he held in common with all the world.

Viewing him in the light of a Minister of the Gospel, and devoted servant of the Most High, we cannot better characterize him, in closing our remarks, than in the words of his cotemporary and friend, Alex. Moras: "CHRISTUM PECTORE—CHRISTUM ORE—CHRISTUM OPERA SPIRAT."

ARTICLE V.

REVELATION AND INSPIRATION

"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God."—*Romans* x: 17. *

In the words before us, the Apostle first states in what the essence of a sinner's religion consists, and then how it is produced. The essence of this religion, as plainly appears from the context, he makes to be faith in Jesus Christ. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." As if anxious to avoid the imputation of novelty, and to show that he taught nothing but what was contained in the lively oracles of God, the Apostle appeals in confirmation of his doctrine to the testimony of an ancient Prophet. "For the Scripture saith, whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed." I must call your especial attention to the manner in which Paul applies this passage to the case of the Gentiles; as it furnishes a strong incidental proof of his profound conviction that the very words of Scripture were the words of the Holy Ghost. He knew nothing of an inspiration of the Spirit as contradistinguished from an inspiration of the letter, and consequently does not scruple to build an argument upon a single expression, when that expression is the language of a Prophet. Because the Scripture saith *whosoever*, without limitation or restriction, the Apostle concludes that there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek. This term equally includes them both, and he accordingly has no hesitation in drawing the inference, that "the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him." It is to be received as an universal proposition, true in all cases and under all circumstances, and that upon the force of a single term—that "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."

* Sermon Preached in Charleston before the Young Men's Christian Association.

The religion of a sinner being compendiously embraced by the Apostle under the head of faith, the question arises, how is this faith produced? The successive steps of the process are first expanded in a series of forcible and pungent interrogatories, and then recapitulated in the words of the text. "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent." That is, in order to the existence of faith there must be a Divine testimony. The Word of God is its standard and measure. That this testimony may produce faith, it must be known—it must be imparted from without—it is not the offspring of our own cogitations, nor the product of our own thoughts; it comes to us in the form of a report. But in order that it may be proposed and communicated, there must be persons commissioned for the purpose—there must be Apostles—men, in other words, to whom the word of the Lord is intrusted. This then is the Divine arrangement. A class of men is put in charge of that which is to be the object of faith. This is inspiration. They report to others as the word of the Lord—this is revelation—and this report is the medium through which a saving faith is engendered. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Inspiration gives rise to revelation, revelation to faith, and faith is the sum and substance of religion. If you ask the Apostle what it is to be inspired—he briefly answers that it is to be sent with a message from God—if you ask him what he means by revelation, he as promptly replies that it is the Divine message delivered; and if you inquire of him in regard to man's duty, it is compendiously to believe the report. This is his philosophy of religion. God sends—Apostles report—men believe.

But simple and consistent as it seems, this account, we are told, is in palpable contradiction to the very nature of religion and the fundamental laws of the human mind. We are accordingly furnished with a theory drawn from a deeper philosophy than Prophets or Apostles ever knew, which, under the pretence of emancipating us from the bondage of the letter and giving free scope to the

liberty of the Spirit, has left us nothing of Christianity but the name. A revelation which reports the testimony of God and the faith which believes it because it is his testimony, are both discarded as psychological absurdities, and as to the idea that any man or set of men have ever been commissioned to speak to others in the name of the Lord and to challenge submission to their message on the ground of the Divine authority which attests it, this is scouted as "of all our vanities the motliest, the merest word that ever fooled the ear from out the schoolman's jargon." The issues involved in this controversy are momentous. It is not a question about words and names—it is a question which involves the very foundations of Christianity. The insidious efforts to undermine the authority of the Bible and to remove an external, infallible standard of faith, however disguised in the covert of philosophy, are prompted by a deep and inveterate opposition to the doctrines of the cross. The design is to destroy the religion, and hence the fury of the efforts against the citadel in which it is lodged. It is not the casket but the jewel that has raised all this clamour of rancorous opposition—and when men cry down with the Bible, the real meaning of their rage is—away with Jesus and His cross. Vain is all their opposition—vain the combination of philosophers and sophists—He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh—the Lord shall have them in derision—He hath set His his Son upon the holy hill of Zion, and there he must reign until he has put down all his enemies under his feet.

The new theory of religion—I call it new, not because any of its fundamental principles are new—they are only old errors in a new dress—but because it is supported upon new grounds—this new theory of religion I propose briefly to consider in contrast with the testimony of Paul—so that it may be seen to be untenable, even on the principles of the metaphysical philosophy, behind which it has entrenched itself.

I. I shall begin with the new theory of Revelation, as the discussion of that will lead me say all that I deem important upon the present occasion on the nature and essence of religion.

"The idea of revelation," we are told by the writer

whom I have in view, "always implies a process by which knowledge, in some form or other, is communicated to an intelligent being. For a revelation at all to exist there must be an intelligent being, on the one hand, adapted to receive it, and there must be, on the other hand, a process by which this same intelligent being becomes cognizant of certain facts or ideas. Suppress either of these conditions, and no revelation can exist. The preaching of an angel would be no revelation to an idiot—a Bible in Chinese would offer none to an European. In the former case, there is no intelligence capable of receiving the ideas conveyed; in the latter case, the process of conveyance renders the whole thing practically a nonentity, by allowing no idea whatever to reach the mind. We may say then, in a few words, that a revelation always indicates *a mode of intelligence.*"*

From this passage we see the necessity of being on our guard against the ambiguity of words. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that a term, which in its strict and proper acceptation, applies only to a part of the contents of the sacred volume should, have been, as in the language of theology it confessedly has been, applied to the whole canon of faith. The Scriptures themselves denominate nothing revelations but those supernatural mysteries, which lie beyond the province of reason, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, and which could not be known, independently of the supernatural teaching of the Spirit. When they speak of themselves as a whole they are designated simply by some title which indicates that they are the word of God. This is the phrase which Paul employs in the text, and employs in the same sense in which popular usage applies revelation.

It is little worthy of the dignity and candour of philosophy to construct an argument upon a verbal quibble. Revelation is synonymous with the standard of faith and as covering the whole contents of Scripture, without reference to the distinction of the natural and supernatural, is not so much a mode of intelligence as a ground of belief. Its office is not subjective, but objective. It is not *in* the mind, but *to* the mind. The simplest notion that we can form of it is that it is a message from God.

* Morell's Phil. Rel., p. 123-4; Eng. Ed.

Its work is done when it reports what He says. What distinguishes *revealed* from every other species of truth—is not its nature—not its object-matter—but the immediate ground of credibility. It is the measure of faith and the argument of faith is, thus saith the Lord. The characteristic of revelation, in the generic sense in which it is applied to the canon is,—that it contains or rather is a Divine testimony and this testimony must be the immediate ground of belief—I say the *immediate ground* of belief—because the ultimate and final basis of truth in every case is the faithfulness of God in the structure of our mental constitution. We believe the reports of our senses and the data of consciousness, because the constitution of our nature is such that we cannot do otherwise—but when we are asked, how we know that our faculties do not deceive us, we can only appeal to the moral character of Him, who has wrought these laws of belief into the very texture of our frames. But in these cases the immediate grounds of belief are found in our faculties themselves. It is ourselves that we first trust and not God. Such truths may be discoveries, but they are not revelations—they may be clear, distinct, unquestionable, but they are not Divine. We receive them either because they are self-evident and need no proof, or because we are able to prove them, and not because God appears as a witness in their behalf. Revelation and a Divine testimony are one and the same thing. How this testimony shall be received and what effects it shall produce, whether men shall understand it or not, whether it shall really awaken any ideas in their minds or create any emotions in their hearts, these are matters, which, however important in themselves, do not at all affect the question whether it is really a message from God. It may be admitted that a revelation to an idiot or in an unknown tongue, where no adequate provision was made for removing the impediments to an apprehension of its contents, would be very senseless and absurd. But such a message being supposed, the question whether it is a revelation is one thing, and whether it is wise and judicious is another—and in a philosophical discussion things that are separate ought to be kept distinct.

This adroit play upon the ambiguity of the term reve-

lation, in which it is made to be a mode of intelligence rather than the measure of a Divine faith, is the cornerstone upon which the author's whole theory of the nature and grounds of religious truth is erected.

It is unnecessary to give a detailed account of the process by which revelation is distinguished—it will be enough to seize upon his fundamental principle and expose its fallacy. His doctrine is briefly this—that revelation is a species of intuition in which things authenticate themselves. The realities of religion are brought directly into contact with the mind and vouch for their own existence, just as the material world, or the forms of beauty and of virtue are their own witnesses. We know the things that are freely given us of God, not by the testimony of his Spirit, but the immediate consciousness of their presence. Revelation is a spiritual perception in which we see the invisible and stand face to face with the infinite and eternal. Its objects are presented to us by God, but in no other sense than He presents the objects of all other knowledge. The rocks, mountains, caves, and valleys of the material world, the heavens above us and the earth beneath, are as really and truly a revelation from Him and in the same essential sense, as the Person, offices and work of His Own Eternal Son.

Faith is vision and the actual presentation of its objects its only standard and measure. In conformity with these views, inspiration is represented as a subjective process in which God adapts the mind to the objects presented in revelation. It is a clearing of the spiritual sight—a strengthening of the spiritual eye—"an especial influence wrought upon the faculties of the subject, by virtue of which he is able to grasp these realities in their perfect fulness and integrity. Revelation and inspiration, then, indicate," we are told, "one united process, the result of which upon the human mind is, to produce a state of spiritual intuition, whose phenomena are so extraordinary that we at once separate the agency by which they are produced from any of the ordinary principles of human development. And yet this agency is applied in perfect consistency with the laws and natural operations of our spiritual nature. Inspiration does not imply anything generically new in

the actual processes of the human mind. It does not involve any form of intelligence, essentially different from what we already possess. It indicates rather the elevation of the religious consciousness, and with it, of course, the power of spiritual vision, to a degree of intensity peculiar to the individuals thus highly favoured by God.*

This might be taken as a caricature of the work of the Spirit in the effectual calling of God's children, were it not that the author has taken special pains to show that there can be no other kind of inspiration, without contradiction to the laws of mind, but that which he has described. His inspiration is, in many respects, analogous to the saving operations of the Spirit. It enables its subject to understand revelation; brings him into harmony with Divine truth; subdues the passions; represses the influence of sense, and sanctifies the heart. It evidently stands in the same relation to his revelation that the regenerating and enlightening influences of grace sustain to the Scriptures of God. But an inspiration which gives rise to a revelation—which commits a message from the Holy one to the hands of men—which ends in a divine testimony as the standard and measure of a Divine faith, he can by no means abide. The objects of religion must authenticate themselves. The consequence is, that every man, in so far as he is religious, is inspired, and every man has his doctrine and his psalm. The inconsistency of these views, with the uniform and pervading testimony of the Scriptures, must strike the dullest apprehension. Paul, in our text, solemnly declares that faith comes by hearing. This new philosophy affirms that it comes by vision. Paul declares that the immediate ground of belief is the testimony of God. This new philosophy, that it is found in the things themselves. Paul declares that inspiration imparts to men a Divine message. This new philosophy that it purges the mind. Paul declares that it is restricted to Apostles—the new philosophy, that it is the property of the race.

All these enormous and palpable contradictions of Scripture have sprung from the gratuitous assumption,

* Morill, p. 151.

that revelation is a mode of intelligence, a process of our own minds and not an extraordinary message of God. Taking it for granted that it is nothing more than an exercise of our natural faculties in some form of cognition, the author proceeds to conclude from the laws of the disjunctive syllogism that it must be intuitive. He acknowledges but two modes of intelligence, and to one or the other of these it must belong. It cannot be a process of ratiocination—no rules of logick, no powers of combination and analysis—no force of words, nor ingenuity of inference could ever have evolved the scheme of redemption or the sublime mysteries of the cross. There are elements embraced in religion, which it never could have entered the heart of man to conceive. It introduces us in a high and sublime sense, into a new world—exalts us to new conceptions, and unveils to us glories beyond the suggestion of mortal thought. It bears upon its face impressions of originality and novelty which remove it beyond the sphere of the logical understanding, and carry convincing evidence, that however it came, it never could have been excogitated. This reasoning has a show of plausibility—it labours, however, under one fatal defect—the disjunction can be easily retorted. It is as easy to show, on the one hand, that Christianity, as a whole, never could have been intuitive, as it is to prove on the other, that it never could have been the offspring of logic. It involves relations and dependencies which could only have been adjusted by powers of combination. It is not a single concrete reality, like a man, a mountain, or a tree, but a connected scheme of events, every one of them contingent in relation to our knowledge, and concatenated into a system which cannot be grasped without calling into play all the powers of the logical understanding. It is a system which preëminently requires reasoning—a comprehensive view of great moral principles as they are involved and illustrated in a wonderful series of facts. What then? It cannot be intuitional—it cannot be logical?—One would think that this obvious *reductio ad absurdum* would have been sufficient to open the mind of a philosopher to the fallacy of his fundamental principle. No wonder that subjective religionists hate logic—it makes sad havoc with their finest speculations.

The notion, that revelation is a mode of intelligence, which, in plainer terms, means that it is a faculty of the human mind, is the parent or child—it is hard to say which is first in the order of nature,—of a still more serious mistake in reference to the nature of religious truth, and the peculiarities of Christian experience. This double misconception has concealed from the author the palpable incongruities of his system, and induced him to believe that the doctrines of grace might be pressed to the support of an hypothesis, which, legitimately carried out, reduces them to nonsense. To refute his scheme, is simply to expose these errors. He has made religious truth essentially different from what it is, and therefore has had to postulate a faculty in order to cognize it. He has made the religious life essentially different from what it is, and therefore has had to fit the work of the Spirit to his assumptions.

1. His first error is a fundamental misconception of the nature of religious truth. To say nothing of his chapters upon the peculiar essence of religion in general—and christianity in particular—it is evident, from the manner in which he attempts to set aside the popular notion of revelation, that he looks upon religion as embracing a province of things, a class of realities, or, if you prefer an expression more in accordance with the theory of Locke, a collection of simple ideas, entirely distinct from every other department of knowledge, every other sphere of existence. It is a world to itself. And as all primitive conceptions must come through some original faculty to which they are adapted, there must be a peculiar faculty of religion analogous to taste, or the sensibility to beauty, and conscience, or the sensibility to right.

“Imagine yourself,” says the author, “by definitions and explications addressed to the understanding, attempting to make a blind man, who had never gazed upon nature, comprehend the exquisite beauties in form, true and graceful motion, presented to the eye by a summer’s landscape. It is needless to say that all your descriptions would fall infinitely short of the actual reality—that they would not convey the hundredth part of what one minute’s gaze upon the scene would spontaneously present—that he could only conceive, indeed, of any por-

tion of it by analogies taken from the other senses. The reason of this that he knows the thing only formally by logical exposition; he has never had the proper experiences, never the direct sense-perceptions, which are absolutely necessary to a full realization of it. And so it is, *mutatis mutandis*, with religious truth. You may expound, and define, and argue upon the high themes which christianity presents to the contemplation; but unless a man have the intuitions, on which all mere verbal exposition must be grounded, there is no revelation of the spiritual reality to his mind, and there can be no clearer perception of the actual truth, than there is to the blind man of the vision of beauty which lies veiled in darkness around him."

Improvement in religious knowledge accordingly, is represented as consisting in the education and development of the religious faculty, which, at every stage of its growth, enlarges the sphere of our actual experience, and expands the horizon of our mental vision. Religion, like taste, presupposes an original susceptibility to a particular class of ideas. It may be cultivated, ennobled, and refined—but the mind can never get beyond the fundamental data, which are given in this form of consciousness. All accessions to its knowledge are only new experiences—the faculty is the parent of all the truth we can know. Reflection may construct a science, presenting these data in their proper order, and showing their connections, dependencies, and consequences—but to him who is destitute of the data, the science is unmeaning and nugatory. All theology, consequently, is nothing but the product of analysis and synthesis, from the materials which are given in experience. As the science of optics to the blind, and the science of music to the deaf, can be little more than jargon, so any representative exhibitions of Divine truth to one whose religious faculty has not yet been awakened, would be worse than idle.

We meet this whole train of reasoning by a bold and confident denial of its fundamental assumption. Religion, in the sense asserted, is not a simple thing—it is not a collection of ideas at all analogous to the sensible properties of matter, or the original faculties of the mind. Neither is it exclusively confined to any one department

of our nature—so that we can say that this is the religious sense, as we affirm of conscience, that it is a moral sense, or of taste, that it is the sense of the beautiful and fair. I do not say that religion involves no simple ideas or primitive elements of thought—this would be an absurdity. But I do say that there are no intuitions peculiar to religion, requiring a separate and distinct faculty, in order to their cognition, and which could not and would not have been developed in the ordinary exercise of our powers. There are no things, no objects of thought which, as such, are simply and exclusively religious—which exist, in other words, only in so far as they are religious. There are no simple ideas characteristic of revelation, and which, without it, would never have found a lodgment in the mind. On the contrary, our faculties, in the sphere of their ordinary exercise, furnish us with all the materials out of which the whole fabric of revealed truth is constructed. Every stone in the sacred and august temple is hewn from the quarry of common experience. The Bible contains not a single simple idea, which, considered merely as an element of thought, may not be found in the consciousness of every human being, who has ever exercised his wits. It is not the elements, but the combination of these elements, that gives to revelation its peculiarity and grandeur. It is not the stones, but the order and arrangement of the stones that constitute the building. Revelation deals preëminently with complex ideas—particularly with what Locke denominates mixed modes, which, as they are mainly retained in the mind, by the force of words, would seem to refer revelation to the category from which our author excludes it, of verbal exposition.

But the fallacy of the notion of a peculiar religious faculty, with its characteristic cognitions will yet more fully appear from a brief investigation of the nature of religion itself. What, then, is religion? In whatever its peculiar essence may be said to consist, one thing is universally conceded, that it grows out of the relations betwixt moral and intelligent creatures and their God. Take away God—there can be no religion—because there is no object upon which it can fasten—take away moral and intelligent creatures, and there can be no religion,

because there are no subjects in whom it can inhere. Prosecute the analysis, and it will be found that the relations out of which religion arises, are those that are involved in moral government. They that come unto God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. It is not a little remarkable that this conception of moral government, without which religion is a term destitute of meaning, has wholly escaped the notice of our profound philosopher, and we need not be astonished that a system which dispenses with obedience and law, has no manner of use for the Bible. The essence of religion, as a subjective phenomenon, is made to consist in a state of feeling which a dog may have in common with his master. There is certainly nothing moral in a naked sense of dependence. Men may feel that they are in the hands of God, and hate His power. Devils feel it and blaspheme, although they tremble. Having settled the principle that religion grows out of the relations involved in moral government, we are prepared for a detailed consideration of its objective elements. These are obviously embraced in a history of the Divine administration—an account of the law to which obedience is exacted—of the rewards to which it shall be entitled, and of the doom to which transgressors shall be assigned. It is a history, in other words, of God's providence as unfolded in His dealings with the race. An account of God's purposes as already, or yet to be developed, in events.

Subjectively considered, it indicates the attitude in which men should stand to the Divine administration—a generic condition of the soul prompting to exercises in unison with the requisitions of the law. It extends not to a single faculty or power, but to the whole man; it is the loyalty of a subject to his prince; of a dutiful son to the father that begat him. God, the just and righteous Ruler—man, the subject, whether obedient or rebellious. These are the terms that must be given to understand religion. It is mainly conversant with relations, and those exclusively moral.

As it treats of the progress and conduct of a government, any account of it must, in the nature of the case, be, to a large degree, historical. Revelation, in regard

to it, must be analogous to an explanation of the laws, constitution and history of a kingdom in past ages, or in a distant quarter of the earth.

These things being so, no other intuitions are needed, in order to grasp the truths of religion, but those which are evolved by our circumstances in the world. The great idea of moral government is not only a primary dictum in its germ, of every human consciousness, but is daily and hourly exemplified in more or less completeness by the relations of the family, the school, the State. It meets us every where, and men can never efface it from their souls, until they have extinguished the light of conscience. Truth, justice, benevolence, mercy, all those moral attributes which adorn the character of God, and which are required to be found in us, demand nothing more than the ordinary operations of our moral nature, in order to be, in some measure, understood. Revelation consequently deals with no new and peculiar simple ideas. It is not, consequently, a faculty or mode of intelligence. Conversant about relations and historical in its form, it must be a presentation to our faculties of facts and events, involving combinations of simple ideas collected from all quarters, which can only be done by report. Philosophy confirms the apostle that faith comes by hearing.

But we may go a step farther, and show from a brief recapitulation of the distinctive doctrines of christianity, as they are unfolded in the Scriptures, that they turn upon events which could be known only by the testimony of God. The Gospel is a history of the conception and execution of God's purposes of grace to the fallen family of man. That there should exist such a purpose is, relatively to human knowledge, a contingent event. There were no principles from which we or any creature could demonstrate it a priori. How then shall we know it? By intuition? It is one of the deep things of God, and none can penetrate His counsels, but His own Spirit. He must reveal it, or it must remain locked up in eternal secrecy. The mediation of Christ, the grand agency by which redemption has been achieved, as actually interposed, is a history, involving a series of events deriving all their significancy and importance from relations

that the understanding alone can grasp. As God and man in one person—as prophet, priest and king of the church, he performed and still continues to perform, a work in which, what strikes the senses, is the shell—the substance lies within. How shall we know that He was the federal head and legal substitute of men. This was a sovereign and arbitrary appointment. How shall we know that he bore our sins in his own body on the tree; that he was bruised for our iniquities, and wounded for our transgressions. How shall we know that He was justified in the Spirit, and that he is now seated at God's right hand, and ever liveth to make intercession for us? Evidently these things must depend upon report. Faith must come by hearing. Either then such a religion as Christianity *cannot* be true—not only is not true, but *cannot* be true, or at least known by us to be true, or revelation is not a mode of intelligence. In this sense, such a religion cannot be revealed. The only species of revelation which it admits is, that of verbal exposition. It must be a history recited or recorded, or both. Faith must lean on report.

As a religion of moral government so obviously requires this species of revelation, if revealed at all, it is worthy of remark, that those who have been most malignant in their assaults against the bondage of the letter, have been left to exemplify in many painful and distressing instances, that they were also emancipated from the bondage of the law. Dealing in intuitions and rhapsodies, living in a world of impalpable shapes and airy forms, they soon learn to treat with contempt the tame and sober relations which are involved in the notions of husband, citizen, friend and subject. Mysticism is an intoxicating draught—a stimulus so powerful, not unfrequently, in particular directions, that all sense of responsibility is lost, and the darkest crimes are perpetrated with as little remorse as a drunkard belches forth his oaths, or insults the wife of his bosom, or the children of his loins. The letter is the guardian of morals as well of truth. It teaches men what they are often anxious to forget, that there is a law—holy, just, and good, and yet terrible to evil-doers, which supports the eternal throne. It unveils a judgment to come—a

day is appointed in which the world shall be judged in righteousness, and every man shall receive at the hands of impartial justice according to his deeds. This unflinching supremacy of right—this supreme dominion of law—this terrible responsibility for sin—is no doubt a grievous offence. But those who will not accept the provisions of grace—all in accordance with the immutable requisitions of right—may kindle a fire and walk in the light of their own sparks, but this shall they have at God's hands—they shall lie down in sorrow. Their intuitions and impulses, their dreams and inspirations, will not save them from the awful exactions of that government which was whispered in conscience, thundered on Sinai, and hallowed on Calvary. God will by no means clear the guilty.

But misapprehending, as he has done, the essential nature of religious truth, he has confounded two things that are entirely distinct—the process of giving a revelation and the process of making a Christian. Having made revelation a faculty in man, which, like every other faculty, is developed by exercise on its appropriate objects, he could find no other office for inspiration but that of stimulating and strengthening the natural organ of religious truth. Revelation itself is the Divine life. The possession of this faculty is what makes man a religious being—and he improves in religion just to the extent that this form of consciousness is developed, cultivated and refined. Inspiration is what quickens it into motion. Let it be granted that there is such a species of inspiration as that here described, it obviously does not exclude the inspiration which gives a message from God. If religious truth is of such a nature that in order to be known it must be reported, the fact that an influence may be necessary to enable a man to receive and understand the report, is not inconsistent with the other fact, that there must be some one to make the report. You can dispense with messengers, only upon the supposition that the knowledge to be conveyed, cannot be communicated by a message. It is this misconception which has led our author to confound inspiration with conversion. If he had been right as to what religion

is, he would have seen the necessity of inspiration in the sense of the Apostle, who makes it the sending of men with a testimony from God. What it is in its own nature, how God operated upon the minds of Apostles—and how far their own powers were called into play, are simply curious questions—about which the Bible has resolved nothing. The main thing is that those who were so sent spake not the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth—and as they spake, so also they wrote, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Their words and writings are equally and alike the testimony of God. The end of inspiration is to furnish the rule of faith. That comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. But apart from the abusive application of the term inspiration to the renewing and sanctifying operations of the Spirit, the author has misrepresented that work itself in consequence of his primary error in reference to revelation.

The notion that revelation is a faculty of peculiar intuitions the author has marvellously confounded with the evangelical doctrine of the agency of the Spirit in regeneration. "In making these statements," says he, "we are simply putting in a more definite form what almost all classes of Christians fully admit, and what they are perpetually asserting. Is it not allowed that men, even of intellect and learning, may read the Bible through and through again, and yet may have no spiritual perceptions of the realities to which it refers? Do we not constantly hear it asserted that Divine truth must be spiritually understood? Nay, does not St. Paul himself tell us that the things of the Spirit of God must be spiritually discerned? And what does all this amount to, but that there must be the awakening of the religious consciousness before the truth is actually revealed to us, and that it can only be revealed to us at all, essentially speaking, in the form of religious intuition."

I am willing to admit that if religious truth consisted of a collection of simple and primitive cognitions, the only conceivable mode of making them intelligible to men would be to produce them in their consciousness. If God designed to impart to the blind the idea of colours,

to the deaf the idea of sounds, or to those totally destitute of the senses, the glories of heaven and the beauties of earth, it would be necessary to impart the faculties that they wanted and bring them into contact with their appropriate objects. But if Divine truth, so far as it implies intuitional elements, lays under tribute the contributions of all our faculties in the ordinary sphere of their exercise—as it involves no elements requiring a peculiar and distinctive faculty of religion, as it appeals mainly and pre-eminently to the logical understanding—the difficulty which is obviated in regeneration and conversion must be something very different from the production of a new class of cognitions. Hence it has never been contended by Evangelical Divines that grace communicates new faculties to the soul. Man, since the fall, possesses all the original powers with which he was gifted when he came from the hands of God. Neither is it contended that the Spirit awakens any dormant susceptibilities—any latent capacities which have lacked the opportunity of development and exercise. This, nor anything like this, is the Scriptural theory of grace—and if our author had understood the real condition of man, he would have seen the true position of the word in the economy of salvation, and have assigned it its office without confounding it with the work of the Spirit.

2. I proceed to expose his misconception in relation to the end or design of Divine Revelation. He makes it, as we have seen, a faculty in man which God develops by the presentation of its appropriate objects, and occasionally stimulates by the special influence of inspiration. Revelation is, therefore, the Divine life. A man is religious just to the extent that this form of intuitional consciousness is developed, cultivated and refined. Now in opposition to this, Paul asserts that revelation is in order to the Divine life—the means of producing it, and rearing and expanding it to its full proportions. He makes faith to be the very essence of a sinner's religion, and the word of God to be its measure and its rule. The testimony of God without us supplies us with the credenda, the things to be believed. That exists independently of our own minds. But will the mere report of

the Divine testimony infallibly terminate in faith? Paul promptly replies that they have not all obeyed the Gospel, and Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? What, then, is the difficulty? Is it that the Gospel is naturally unintelligible? that it contains, I mean, verbal statements involving simple ideas or primitive elements of thought, which we have no faculties to grasp? Is it that it talks of colours to a blind man, or of sounds to a deaf one? By no means—the terms it uses are all in themselves intelligible, and intelligible by us with none but the faculties that we bring with us into the world. It speaks of a ruler—a judge—sin—guilt—condemnation—pardon and atonement—all things which, to some extent, we are able to conceive and to represent in thought. It is not, therefore, that its terms are senseless—it is not as if written in Chinese or Sanscrit—not like the preaching of an angel to an idiot.

The difficulty is one which intuition cannot reach. If the things revealed were actually present to the mind, the difficulty would still exist—it would still be true that the natural man would refuse to receive them, and that he could not spiritually discern them. Mr. Morell seems to think that all that is wanted is simply the faculty of apprehension—the power of knowing the things and perceiving them to be real. But this is not the case. The difficulty lies in the moral condition of the sinner. The sinner remaining as he is, no presence of spiritual realities, no contact of them with the mind, however immediate and direct, would give him a different kind of discernment from that which he obtains from the word. This moral condition is denominated in the Scriptures a state of death—and the term is happily chosen. It exactly describes depravity in its pervading influence upon all the powers and faculties of the man. Holiness is called a life—the life of God in the soul of man—and by pursuing the analogies which these terms suggest we may form some definite conceptions of the real hinderances among men to the cordial reception of the word. What, then, is life? It evidently belongs to that class of things which, incomprehensible in themselves and incapable of being represented in thought, are matters of necessary belief. We see its

affects—we witness its operations—we can seize upon the symptoms which distinguish its presence. But what it is in itself no mortal mind can conceive. We can only speak of it as the unknown cause of numberless phenomena which we notice. Where is life? is it here and not there? is it there and not here? Is it in the heart, the head, the hands, the feet? It evidently pervades the frame—it is the condition, the indispensable condition to the organic action of every part of the body. The body may be perfect in its structure—it may have every limb and nerve, and muscle—and foreign influences may be made to mimick the operations of life—but if life be not there, these actions; or rather motions, will be essentially distinct from those of the living man.

In like manner holiness is a generic condition of the soul. As a state or nature, it is incomprehensible in itself, we can no more represent it in thought than we can form an image of power or causation. It is a something which lies at the foundation of all its exercises and operations, and gives them a peculiar and distinctive cast. It is not itself a habit, nor a collection of habits, but the indispensable condition of all spiritual habits. It is not here nor there, but it pervades the whole man—the understanding, the will, the conscience, the affections—it underlies all the dispositions and habitudes and is felt in all the thoughts and desires. Natural life has its characteristic functions—so spiritual life has its distinguishing tendencies. They all point to God. He is holy, and where this quality exists in the creature it is attracted to Him and produces a communion—a fellowship—a familiarity, if I may so speak, which easily detects the impressions of God wherever they exist. It involves an union with Him, that renders His traces patient and obvious wherever they are found. Spiritual death or depravity is the opposite of all this—a generic condition of the soul in which these particular exercises are not possible. The same faculties may remain—the same ideas may be suggested—the same objective realities may be conceived—the same materials of thinking may exist—but that influence proceeding from holiness which distinguishes all the operations of the sanctified

mind is wanting. That union and fellowship with God, that mysterious familiarity which hears and knows His voice, even in its lowest whispers, is gone. The characteristic tendencies of the carnal mind are *from* God—it is even enmity against God, not subject to His law nor capable of becoming so. Now faith, in the Apostolic sense, involves the recognition of God in the word. It believes in consequence of the Divine testimony. It knows God's voice. When the Gospel is proclaimed, it is perceived to be a message of love and of mercy from the eternal throne.

This faith can only exist in a holy heart. An unconverted sinner can no more exercise it than the dead can rise and walk or the blind can see. Two men may receive a letter from the same person—or rather the same letter may be put into the hands of both. One is an intimate friend of the writer—the other an entire stranger. The stranger reads it, and apprehends exactly the same ideas, considered as mere thoughts—but he sees not the writer in it, and cannot enter into it with that sympathy, that cordiality and delight with which the friend peruses it. The Gospel is a message from God—all holy hearts see God in it, and rejoice in it because of His name—strangers and aliens have the word in their hands, but have not God in the word. They may be convinced by external arguments—and such arguments abound—that it is indeed His message—but they have not that witness within themselves upon which the heart reposes with assured confidence. Now here comes in the agency of the Spirit. He imparts that new nature, that generic condition of soul, which brings the heart into sympathy with God and all that is Divine, and enables it to believe. It throws a new light around the truth—gives a new direction to the heart, and imparts its influence to the whole soul. It creates an instinct for God, which infallibly recognizes His presence wherever He condescends to manifest it. There is no new faculty and there are no new ideas—but there is a new mode of exercising all the faculties and a new discernment of the old truths.

Just apprehensions, consequently, of the work of the Spirit, afford no manner of countenance to the doctrine that Divine revelation involves an intuitive perception

of spiritual realities. Place a sinner in Heaven—and he would be no nearer to a spiritual discernment of the glories of God and the Lamb—than he is, in his guilt and blindness on earth. He would there need as much as here to be born of water and the Spirit that his heart might magnify the Lord.

The apostolic theory of the relations of faith and revelation, indicates an appointment of God in regard to the Divine life, in beautiful analogy with his arrangements for the preservation and growth of animal existence. One thing, as Butler has forcibly illustrated, is set over against another. Life implies an inward state, and an external condition to correspond to it; and in the harmony of these conditions consists the healthfulness of being. Now, the Word is to the Spiritual man, the external condition to which his new nature is adapted—it is the element in which it moves, and grows and flourishes. It is milk to babes, and strong meat to those who have their senses exercised by reason of use. If God should regenerate a man, and leave him in the world without His truth, in some form or other, communicated; if, for example, He should renew a heathen, and yet give him no revelation of His will, except as He might gather it from the instincts and impulses of the new heart, how deplorable would be his condition! Conceive him pregnant with celestial fire? Upon what objects shall his mind be employed? Where shall he go to find the materials that are suited to his taste. He has cravings which earth cannot satisfy, and yet knows nothing of the bread which came down from heaven, nor of the streams which gush from Siloah's fount. He longs for God, but his soul cannot find Him; and as he feels for Him on the right, and he is not there—on the left, but he is gone, he sinks down in weariness and disappointment, to famish and die. He is in a world of enemies, of idolators, and will-worshippers, and children of the devil. Where is his panoply against the powers of darkness—the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit. What hopes shall support and dignify his soul. He knows nothing of Christ; nothing of the Spirit; nothing of the Divine promises; nothing of the glorious inheritance of the saints in life. There is

no element about him which corresponds to his disposition. No, my brethren, such an anomaly never takes place—it cannot be endured that God's children should be as orphans in the world, without food, or raiment, or shelter. As well might we suppose that fishes should be transferred to the air, and birds to the sea, as that God should new create a soul, and leave it without the external adaptations that its wants demand. These, in this life, are found in the Bible—faith makes them realities—makes them substantial. It opens from the Scriptures a new and glorious world, to which all the faculties of the new creature are proportioned, and when it has educated and trained them for a higher sphere, they pass from its discipline to the full fruition of the things themselves. We now learn in books. We shall hereafter study things. The appointments of God, in the kingdom of grace, are as one with this appointment in the kingdom of nature.

The argument does not apply to infants dying in infancy, because they may be translated instantly to a sphere in which a holy nature shall have ample opportunity of expansion. But the anomaly cannot be endured that God's children should be left as sheep without a shepherd—even worse, without food, raiment, or shelter.

The scriptural doctrine, moreover, guards against the absurd supposition that the life of religion consists in the developement and expansion of any single power of the soul. It is not confined to any one department of thought or feeling. The *whole* man must acknowledge its influence; it thinks in the head; feels in the heart, and acts in the will. It is the great pervading law of our being; leading us to find God every where, and whether we eat or drink, to do all to his glory. It is the religion of a moral creature under the dominion of a moral law; not the visions of a seer; the phantoms of a dreamer; but the inspiration of a soul pregnant with celestial fire. Body, soul, and spirit, all are the organs of the Divine life. It extends to all actions, to all impulses, to all ends. It reigns as well as lives—such is Bible religion. How stunted and dwarfish in comparison—a single faculty gazing on a single class of things! the

eye, playing with colors, or the ear, sporting with sounds.

II. HAVING shown that the theory in question mistakes the nature of religious truth, and the office of revelation in the economy of salvation, it only remains that the essence of religion should be more distinctly considered. In its subjective and objective aspects, a little has already been said, but only in reference to the argument then in hand. It is particularly in the subjective aspect that we propose to consider it now. The question is—what is it to be religious? Particularly, what is it to be a Christian? The word *essence* is very unfortunately applied to the subject, as it is apt to mislead by its vagueness and ambiguity. If it is supposed that there is some *one* formal quality, some simple and uniform idea, that enters into all the exercises that are distinctively religious, (the notion, evidently of our author,) it is a very great misapprehension. When we arrange things according to their colour, it is precisely the same quality of whiteness which characterizes all that we classify as white. But there is no single quality of actions and of thoughts that causes them to be ranked under the head of religion. Two emotions, entirely distinct in their own nature, having nothing in common, considered merely as phenomena, may yet be equally religious—hope and fear, for example. Upon what ground are they grouped together? The reason of the classification must evidently be sought, not in themselves, but in the state of mind from which they proceed. That state of mind which is truly religious, is the condition which we have previously described as spiritual life or holiness, but as a state, we have also seen that it belongs to the category of things which we are compelled to believe, without being able to represent in thought. It is, rather, in fact the condition of religion, than religion itself. That consists in the *exercises* which proceed from this state of the soul, and they are all distinguished by the circumstance that they are in harmony with our relations to God. These relations must be known before it can be determined that any given experiences are proper manifestations of religion. The subjective cannot be comprehended without the objective. An universal and perva-

ding disposition to comply with the will of God—a heart in sympathy with Him is the nearest approximation that we can make to a description of what constitutes religion—as a subjective phenomenon. This is the state in which angels are, the state in which man would have been, if man had never sinned. This is the state to which when men are exalted, they are said to be saved. This is religion in general. Now, Christianity is a scheme, through which, in conformity with the nature of moral government, man is recovered from his ruin and exalted to this condition. It is the immediate end which the mediation of Christ aims at; and the attainment of this end in the case of any sinner, is salvation. But the means by which Christianity produces its fruits in us, is faith. This is the great requirement of the Gospel, the only medium by which we can ever be brought into harmony and fellowship with God. Hence, faith may justly be described as embracing the whole religion of a sinner. He that believeth hath everlasting life—with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. It is not only the instrument by which through Christ we are justified, but the organ through which the whole Word of God operates upon the soul, and builds it up in holiness. It is the great and all comprehensive duty which springs from our relation to God under the Gospel.

I need not prosecute this inquiry any further. It is only necessary to put the two systems—that of the Gospel and that of the subjective philosophy, side by side, in order that you may perceive the immeasurable superiority of the former. Both admit the importance of revelation, and in developing its nature, the Gospel gives you three terms—the person *from* whom—the *persons* to whom, and the message itself. Its revelation professes to be the Word of God. The new philosophy gives us but two, a thinking mind and the things to be thought. There is no revealer, it is a message without an author, and without a messenger. Which is most reasonable? When you go a step further, and inquire into the characteristics of the things revealed, the Gospel unfolds a system of moral government, springing from the very nature of God, and His relations to His creatures, in-

volving a series of the sublimest events that the mind can conceive. It unveils the great drama of Providence, and shows how the Divine purposes have been working to their accomplishment from the beginning of all things. It spans the arch of time, explains to man his nature, his fall, his duty, and his destiny. Above all, it unveils a scheme of grace, an eternal purpose conceived in the bosom of infinite love, for the redemption of the guilt, and executed in the fulness of time by an agency so mysterious and amazing, that angels desire to look into it. Throughout the Bible holiness reigns. God appears there a holy God. His law, supreme; and the perfection of man is measured by his approach to the Divine excellence. Religion is there represented as a life into which we are quickened by Almighty grace, and which brings every faculty of the soul in sweet subjection to the authority of God. What are the revelations of the subjective philosophy. Echo answers what? There are no responses from the tripod, the oracles are yet dumb. He sits, and gazes, and feels—but what he sees, and how he feels, we are quietly told that mortal language is incompetent to describe.

One of the most offensive features in this system is the utter deceitfulness with which it avails itself of the ambiguity of language. From its free and familiar use of the language consecrated to evangelical religion—the unwary reader is insensibly beguiled from the contemplation of its real character. It pretends to be a *revealed* system. This sounds fair and well. But when you look a little deeper—it is a revelation as nature is a revelation, and when you express your astonishment at this abuse of words, you are told, for your comfort, God made the world and He made you with faculties capable of knowing its existence. He reveals the world to you by creating you with eyes to see it. The whole work is Divine. So He made a certain class of spiritual concretions, and made you with faculties capable of enjoying them. This is all surely Divine.

So again it speaks of a Divine life. But when you inquire into its meaning—you do not find the new birth—you do not recognize a holy nature—you do not discover an influence upon the whole soul of man which brings him into

harmony with Divine truth. There is nothing supernatural—there is nothing eminently gracious. On the contrary, you meet with nothing but what takes place in regard to every function of life—just the natural faculty developed and exercised by the presentation of its appropriate objects. The faculty of religion and the faculty of imagination are brought into activity in the same way—and there is as much grace and as much of God in the process by which a child learns to know that a stone is hard, as in the process by which a man passes from death to life. God may dispose circumstances so as to hasten the development—but all religion springs from the man himself. Such, without exaggeration or caricature, is the system for which we are called upon to surrender the Bible. We are to give up God's word and the hopes of the Gospel for the rhapsodies and ravings of every spirit who pretends to a higher development of the religious consciousness. Man must be supreme. He must be allowed to create his God, his law, his religion. The mind of every individual is the universe to him—intuition is his oracle, and he has but to look within to know his state, his prospects, and his destiny.

Behold I show you a more excellent way. God, who at sundry times and in divers manners—spake in times past unto the fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son. We have a message from the skies. We are not left, like the blind, to grope in the dark, but we have an excellent word to which we are exhorted to take heed as unto a light that shineth in a dark place. But remember that the word alone cannot save you—it is the means, but not the source of life. The Bible without the Spirit is a dead letter, as the Spirit without the Bible is a lying delusion. The Spirit and the Bible—this is the great principle of Protestant Christianity. "The doctrine which we defend is not only the testimony of the Scriptures, but still further, the testimony of the Holy Spirit. If we maintain the Scriptures against those who wish only for the Spirit, so do we also maintain the Spirit against those who wish for nothing but the Scriptures." The Bible without the Spirit can rise no higher than formalism—the Spirit

without the Bible will infallibly end in fanaticism. The Bible with the Spirit will conduct to Christ, to holiness and God. The times are threatening—with the earlier schools of infidelity, the main objection to the Scriptures was that they inculcated the necessity of a Divine life in the soul of man—they wanted to get quit of the Spirit—with the subjective philosophers, the great difficulty is that they are not all Spirit. Surely the men of this world are like children sitting in the market place—if you pipe to them, they refuse to dance—if you mourn, they refuse to weep.

I confess frankly my apprehensions that if the great doctrine of the supremacy of the Scriptures should be shaken in the popular mind, we have no security against the perpetration of the most enormous crimes in the hallowed name of religion. If men are to draw their faith from themselves, it will be like themselves—it will patronize their lusts and sanctify their most outrageous excesses. It is impossible to estimate the power of the Bible as a bit to curb, where it does not save. Of all ungovernable mobs, that is the most dangerous which acts under the frenzy of religious fanaticism. When men enthrone the Devil as their God, we may tremble for the interests of society. Give me storms, earthquakes and tornadoes, plague, pestilence and famine—any form of evil that springs from the Providence of God—but save me from that hell—the hearts of men, where the fiends of foul delusion have taken up their lodgment. The Bible, the Bible, is the great safe-guard of nations. Reverence its holy pages as you love your country, your homes, and yourselves. We must stand by the Scriptures or perish. Well did Luther say—“If we will not drink of the water of the fountain, so fresh and pure, God will cast us into ponds and sloughs, and there oblige us to swallow long draughts of a putrid and stinking water.”

NOTE.—In the passage “whosoever believeth,” &c., it may be well to remark, that the universality is implied in the $\delta \lambda \gamma \omega \nu$ —and that Paul introduces the $\epsilon \alpha \varsigma$ as interpretative.

ARTICLE VI.

IMPORT OF HEBREW HISTORY.

Post-Biblical History of the Jews; from the close of the Old Testament, about the year 420 B. C. E., till the destruction of the Second Temple in the year 70, C. E. By MORRIS J. RAPHAEL, Ph. D., Rabbi-Preacher at the Synagogue, Greene St., N. Y. 2 vols., 12 mo., pp. 405, 486. Moss & Bro., Phila.: 1855.

It is a significant confession of the author before us, that "from Josephus, who wrote in the first century of the Christian Era, to Jost, who within the last thirty years published his work in Germany, no Jew has written the history of his people in any other language than Hebrew."* This fact finds a partial explanation in the broken nationality of the Hebrews. Almost from the captivity in Babylon, their history becomes hopelessly implicated in that of the foreign nations by whom they have been successively overlaid; and it is a weary task to eliminate from the tangled web this single and continuous thread. Upon closing the book of Malachi, we must not only step down from the elevation and security of inspired documents into all the confusion and suspicion of merely human records, but are forced to dig about the ruins of obsolete empires and disinter this people, buried beneath the accumulated rubbish, whose history we desire to trace. The labor is intensely aggravated, when the unity of the nation was finally destroyed, and we are compelled to trace the wanderers into all the lands whither their restless feet have borne them.

Groaning under the oppression and calumny of eighteen centuries, no people ever had so much occasion to arraign its traducers before the bar of impartial History: which never has failed, upon sufficient evidence, to reverse the judgment of previous ages, and to render complete, though it may be tardy, justice to communities as well as to individuals. If, with the materials of triumphant

* Introduction, p. 14.

vindication locked up in the cipher of their sacred tongue, they have so long submitted to be "the jest of folly and the scorn of pride," then surely is "sufferance the badge of all their tribe." The prospect, however, of reading now a history written by a Hebrew, covering a most important period of their national existence, and enriched by these secret treasures, led us to open these volumes with an exceeding relish, rejoicing that at length the lions in the fable had found a painter.* But never was an author's promise more completely unredeemed. We close the book without finding a solitary addition to our previous store of knowledge. The references throughout are to writers perfectly accessible and familiar to English readers, with the exception of occasional quotations from the Talmud; which last are so utterly irrelevant and trivial, that we can discover no motive for their introduction beyond the mere pedantry of Hebrew learning.

We are far from denying all historical merit to these volumes, considered simply as a re-production of what may be found in older and quite accessible works. Dr. Raphall traces, with commendable clearness, the clue of Jewish history through the complicated period which followed upon the dismemberment of Alexander's great empire, until Palestine fell under the Græco-Egyptian dominion. He unfolds, sufficiently, for the purposes of historical narrative, though by no means with philosophic acuteness and fulness, the domestic and foreign policy of the Ptolemies and of the Seleucidæ. He records, with a patriotic fervour, quite winning and attractive, the truly heroic achievements of the Maccabean period. We sympathize with the pious indignation with which he exposes the treachery and cruelty of the Herodian dynasty. We subscribe to all his views of the artifices of Roman diplomacy, with its engraved motto "divide et impera." We are willing to abandon to his tender mercies that time-serving politician, Josephus, not forgetting, however, the severer castigation he has received from writers, not Jewish—De Quincy, for example. And we have tears of compassion, by no means hypocritical,

* Introduction, p. 16.

to mingle with his own over the fall of Jerusalem, and the horrors of that memorable siege. In short, if we are allowed to rank this work in that unpretending class of books with which our press is now teeming, written simply to render popular what is already known, and to diffuse information rather than to make any concrete addition, we can heartily contribute by commending to its free circulation. But then the author should not have flaunted in his introduction this pompous allusion to Hebrew archives, from which he has drawn no facts; and might even have spared his complaints of "monkish rancour and prejudice," since he has failed to re-write the history which these have tinged. A strong conviction, upon two points, will be produced however upon the mind of every intelligent reader of these two volumes. The first is, the substantial fidelity of the current Christian histories of the Jewish people; since we receive them back from the ordeal of Hebrew criticism, vouched as authorities upon which a Jewish Rabbi has been content himself to draw, the verity of which must therefore stand unimpeached. The second is, that the Jews themselves have nothing to add from all their secret and boasted stores, to what the world already knows of their various and painful fortunes. Indeed it is a mere subterfuge to appeal from the verdict of all history, upon the ground that the writers are Christians and not Jews, unless the appellants have resources from which to re-write that history; and it is in this view we said in the outset, that the death of Jewish historians during eighteen hundred years, was so significant a fact. The allegation that Christian writers are necessarily inimical to the Jew, is sheer cant. The books of the Old Testament form no small part of the Christian Canon, as they do the Jewish: and there is no adequate motive for a systematic perversion of the Biblical History with us more than with them. No one should know better than Dr. Raphall, that the earliest persecutions endured by the Christian church, were both inflicted and instigated by his own people. No one should know better than he, that those persecutions were not reciprocated by the church till she became corrupt, and a hierarchy was formed by union with the State; nor that the great-

est sufferings of his nation came from that anti-Christian power, which has always dipped its garments in the blood of the witnesses of the truth; nor that wherever the spirit of true Christianity has prevailed, the Hebrew has found an asylum. The tone therefore of his whole Introduction appears to us unworthy of this "master in Israel;" and the work itself, we accept as a judgment taken by confession of the truthfulness of our own historians.

We have been especially disappointed with our author's treatment of two subjects falling properly within the range of this history. These are the rise of the different religious parties among the Jews, and the advent of Christ. As to the former, Dr. Raphall simply introduces the Pharisees in the height of their influence and power, quietly assuming their existence from the beginning, as conservators of the traditions and customs received orally from Moses. Yet he could not be ignorant that the inspired records of his nation make no mention of such a party, nor that the existence of such traditions is stoutly denied as the fiction of a later and a corrupt age. It seems to us that here, if any where in the history, it was in his power to have thrown light from the secret records of his nation. It would have gratified us, if he had defined, with historic precision, the tenets of this popular party in the Jewish church; and especially if he had traced the circumstances under which, after the Babylonish captivity, it grew into position and power. Equally unsatisfactory is his brief account of the Sadducees. For while he represents them as a reactionary party, produced by the extravagances of the Pharisees, and moulded into form by the influence of Grecian Philosophy and culture, yet he does not state through what avenues the two systems were brought into contact, nor by what methods this Grecian influence was insinuated into the Hebrew mind. We by no means deny the connexion between Sadduceism and the skeptical schools of Greek Philosophy; but we regret that the author has failed to enrich his work by any researches in this direction.

Dr. Raphall, it is true, "disclaims for his work the title of learned," and promises that his "readers shall not

be wearied with long dissertations on Talmudic lore, or with uncalled-for polemics on points at issue between Church and Synagogue.* It is, however, a profound mistake to separate thus "longo intervallo" the facts of history from the philosophy which interprets them.— Human life is but a conflict of principles; and the ordinary reader cares for the details of history only so far as to enable him to generalize its great and final results. In the two most popular historical works of our own day, Mr. Macaulay's History of England and D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, the peculiar charm lies in the distinctness with which the principles are brought out, underlying the movements in both the periods respectively. The dramatic character of these two works depends largely upon this: inasmuch as the personages of the history become individual by representing the leading ideas of their age, and working them out concretely in the history of their times. Thus, if our author had exhibited fully the rise of all the religious parties in Judea, with the relations they sustained to each other; if he had drawn a picture of the daily life of the Hebrews, presenting their methods of common education under the labors of the Levitical Class; especially if he had admitted us to the inner religious life of this epoch, and the influence of the Synagogue worship, he would have rendered the history far more vivid, and afforded the key by which could be explained all the events leading to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the final expatriation of his people.

But most strange and unpardonable of all is the slight reference made by the author to the introduction of the Christian scheme. The reader will scarcely believe that one brief sentence comprises all that a Jewish Rabbi has to say upon a system holding the peculiar relations to Judaism which Christianity does: "at its origin, and during its infancy, Christianity has no claim upon the attention of the Jewish historian. It is in its day of power, when, full-grown, it chooses to abuse its strength and to emulate the worst deeds of those varnished Pharisees whom its founder so justly condemns;—it is then

* Introduction, p. 18.

that Christianity enforces its painful claim on the reluctant notice of him who relates the tear-bedewed and blood-stained events of the Jewish history.* Was ever a great issue so quietly and adroitly evaded? Why, it is precisely there—"at its origin and during its infancy"—that the Jewish historian should deal with Christianity. Dr. Raphall affects, however, to treat it as though it were a foreign system, like the old Paganism, providentially impinging upon Judaism and doing it harm; instead of being a system which claims to have come forth from Judaism, its predicted consummation and fulness. He plainly intends to avoid a discussion which might stir up Christian prejudice against his book. We can assure him that it would create no offence, but would rather gratify the Christian public to read a manly and honest avowal of Hebrew opinions on the subject of Christianity. The author, however, was certainly at liberty to determine how far he should enter into a polemical discussion: but we certainly have an equal right to object to the ground on which his evasion is put—to wit, that Christianity has nothing to do with Jewish history at the very point where it comes out from the pale of the Jewish Church, as an independent and organized system. And we do demur against this quiet way of ignoring the very problems which perplex the history, and upon the solution of which its just interpretation depends.

The closing sentence of this work, taken in connexion with this dexterous evasion of the whole subject of Christianity, awakened many reflections, which we propose in the following pages to share with the reader. After describing the siege of Titus, he adds: "No people were ever so completely ruined as the Jews; and yet they survived and maintained their importance in the history of the world, so that the destruction of Jerusalem forms but an epoch in their annals."† How incomprehensible is this great fact, if we seek to understand it by itself! And how utterly impossible is it to perceive and feel the significance of Jewish history, if viewed only from a Jewish ground! Dismissing, therefore, all further refer-

* Vol. 2, p. 274 † Vol. 2, p. 436

ence to the work before us, we propose to trace the import of Hebrew History, as viewed in its relations to the Christian Economy; with the hope of illustrating thereby the revelations of the two Dispensations.

If Christianity be true, then the incarnation of the Son of God, to achieve the redemption of a lost world, must be accepted as the central fact in that world's history. No other events are pregnant with such vast results. The rise and fall of empires—the world's commerce, politics, jurisprudence and civilization—the institution of governments—the drifting of barbarian hordes like a flood current, grinding out the life of effete kingdoms:—all these give but the staple of human history;—and when viewed in their highest significance, are only the outward administration of Divine Providence, from which we eliminate the ordinary and permanent rules of God's government over men. But the stupendous work of Christ *transformed* that government, engrafted upon it strange and foreign principles, placed the human race in new relations to God, and by it man is transfigured into another and a higher being.

It does not, therefore, surprise us to find this event rising up before us in the middle of the history of the world; nor that we ascend by the steps of four thousand years to the moment when this sublime scene was enacted. It certainly would be no difficult task to show the whole march of history to be tributary to the advent of Christ. It lies upon the face of all Grecian and Roman records; it is engraved upon the mausolea which entomb the remains of Babylonian and Assyrian greatness; it is deciphered upon the obelisks of monumental Egypt; it breathes in Persian philosophy and verse; as ancient prophecy throws its gleam backward into all the recesses of the past. When Eastern sages knelt before the babe in Bethlehem, it was the whole historic past doing homage to its own grand epoch—it was the world, at the end of its weary week, dressing itself to worship on the morning of its blessed Sabbath. But it is not our purpose to follow the guidance of this load-star back to the dim land of Chaldea, the land of magic and enchantments, from which these came; nor to trace the highway cast up for our God through all the mytholo-

gy and song, the philosophy and martial power of the proud empires of antiquity. Our station is rather beside those Judean Shepherds as they listen to the birth-song of their own Messiah, chanted by angel voices in the sky; and with them to see Judaism emptying its whole contents into the broad bosom of Christianity; or with aged Simeon and Anna in the chambers of the Temple, who had watched throughout the Hebrew night to greet the dawn, and with them to see that the evening and the morning are one day. Judaism was emphatically the John Baptist of Christianity; and found a true representative of its aim and spirit in that stern Nazarene who appeared in the wilderness of Judea preaching the baptism of repentance and proclaiming "the kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

The long novitiata of the Church, extending through four thousand years before the inauguration of Christianity, is very nearly bisected by the call of Abraham; in which, and in the covenants subsequently made with him, is laid the foundation of the Hebrew Economy. Up to this period, the form of government and religion known as Patriarchal, prevailed; the essential weakness of which was the entire want of concentration. From the nomadic habits of these times, the lines selected by God for the transmission of his truth were continually diverging, and were swallowed up in the surrounding idolatry. A new start is ever and anon required to be made, and there is little manifest progress. Thus in the Ante-Diluvian age, the descendants of Seth became thoroughly incorporated with those of Cain; the church was absorbed into the world, and an entire apostacy from God ensued, which could only be avenged by the appalling judgment of the flood. So again, from the days of Noah the degeneracy of the Church was such as to call for a third instauration in the household of Abraham. Manifestly, the wisdom of God would not be illustrated by a longer continuance of this system with such results. The history of the Church would be an impotent record, indeed, if it moved only in this endless cycle of renewal, apostacy, and exterminating judgments.—The Post-Diluvian defection was, moreover, not entire, like its predecessor. It was not an absolute denial and

rejection of sacrifice and atonement; but a perversion of grace, taking the form of idolatry rather than of atheism. Accordingly, the plan developed at this stage was to build up a compact and historical faith, embodied in an organized and visible Church, which, when completed, should encounter and break in pieces every system of falsehood. To this end, God chooses Abraham, with the intention that his family shall not expand as heretofore into many diverging tribes, but into a compact and homologous nation. It is remarkable, however, that at least one half this transition period of four hundred years is occupied with the personal memoirs of three successive Patriarchs, during which no progress is seemingly made towards this expansion. At length, simultaneously, within a very brief interval, the twelve stones are laid for this national structure in the birth of Jacob's twelve sons. All this is not without a meaning. This long delay, on the one hand, afforded opportunity for imbedding in the romantic and heroic age of this people that strong theoretic element which should become the law of the empire, its cardinal and constructive principle. On the other hand, the rapid outgrowth of a nation from twelve coordinate and primitive stocks anticipated those tendencies to divergence, which, under a gradual expansion, might with difficulty be counteracted. There was also a deeper purpose. The Hebrew nation was but the envelope of the Hebrew Church. When the moment should arrive that this Church must be stripped of its exclusiveness and become truly Catholic, the Hebrew nationality must, like the bark or rind of certain fruits, burst open to emancipate the Church it so long enclosed. Thus, at the very formation of this empire, provision must be made for its subsequent and spontaneous rending, which was precisely effected by this tribal derivation. The fatal schism under Rehoboam, which wrought finally the political ruin of the State, took its early rise in the jealousy and separation of the tribes,* the infatuation of this simple monarch being only the occasion, not its cause; nor was the central power ever strong enough

* Witness the conflicts between the tribes in the days of Gideon and Jephtha, and still later in the times of David.

in the Hebrew monarchy to counteract the centrifugal force arising from this tribal origin. This disturbing power must however be latent for many centuries, and therefore it lies beneath the surface of the early records we are now tracing. For a long period the influences must be such as to consolidate. Thus Jacob and his sons are soon removed to Egypt, whose fertile resources favoured a rapid growth of population. At the same time to prevent admixture of races, these are separated by the occupancy of a distinct territory, by opposition of manners, employment and religion, and still more by the power of caste which, as now in India, clearly defined and rendered impassable the boundaries of social life. Lest all this should be inadequate to fence in the Hebrews during a foreign residence of two centuries, they are placed under the pressure of a servile bondage, which had the double effect of dividing them from their task-masters, and of super-inducing common interests and sympathies among themselves. They are still farther compacted by the severe discipline and dependence of the wilderness, extinguishing their nomadic tastes: and when thus consolidated, they were hedged about with peculiar civil and religious institutions, and were continually guarded by a superintending and supernatural Providence. Thus ends the first chapter of Hebrew history: in which we trace the clue to its two fundamental and characteristic features—theocratic control, and that peculiar confederation which forever prevented it from sinking into a mere Asiatic despotism.

In the second chapter, the lesson is still more impressive. Judaism was a living protest against the Polytheism of the earth, and its special mission was the assertion of the unity and supremacy of Jehovah. In this way, though itself a national faith, and anchored by its own ritual to a single country, it paved the way for an absolute religion, adapted to all climes. Only because there is one God, can there be but one religion; and Judaism, by asserting the first, opened the way for the advent of the second in the Gospel of Christ. But how shall this monotheistic faith be engraved upon the Hebrew polity, so as to be worn in its phylacteries, and

as a frontlet between its eyes? Only by instituting a civil relation in which Jehovah shall be recognized as the real sovereign of this nation, to whom political allegiance, not less than religious homage, is due. This relation He sustained by the suffrages of the Hebrews themselves. Moses is summoned to the Mount, and commissioned to propose Jehovah to the people as their civil head and king; which is done in a solemn convention, and is ratified by its public and formal assent. This, then, is the great covenant between God and Israel, upon which the whole Mosaic polity is based, and which constitutes it a *theocracy*. It is difficult to see upon what other principle idolatry could become a crime, punishable by the civil magistrate, without introducing religious intolerance, and suppressing liberty of conscience. But as Jehovah was the civil head of this empire, in whom vested all regal and legislative supremacy—and that too by the solemn choice of the whole people in convention assembled—idolatry became an offence against the primary law of the Hebrew commonwealth, "*crimen læsæ majestatis*" against the State itself: and thus the whole civil history of this nation became a proclamation of the Divine unity, the most likely to be heeded in the midst of a polytheistic world.

With a constitution evolved out of this politico-religious idea, this people is now cradled in an insulated country, well suited as a nursery. The mountain range of Lebanon separated them from Asia Minor on the North, the Syrian and Arabian deserts shut them in on the East and South, while the great Mediterranean sea enclosed them on the West. Yet, while thus secluded, Palestine was in the very centre of the old world's activity. It lay between Egypt and the great Asiatic kingdoms that subsequently arose—it was stimulated by the commerce of Phenicia on its left, and was near all the channels in which the commerce of antiquity flowed, by land and by sea. So that while its insulation fitted it to be the nursery of a religious kingdom, its central position secured it from stagnation, and favoured its later mission of spreading abroad among all nations the faith committed to its trust. In this quiet seclusion, the Hebrew nation passed its infancy during a long prehistoric

period of four centuries, before the empires of the East had yet arisen, and while Egypt slept in the enjoyment of her own resources, unambitious either of commerce or conquest. Only a few Nomadic hordes who pastured their flocks in the deserts of Syria and Arabia, and the warlike Philistines on their western flank, vexed their repose; and by their predatory incursions, became the instruments of theocratic discipline, punishing their defections from the national covenant. The occasional rise, and the temporary rule of the Judges, who have been well described as "prophets in action," appearing only at some national crisis, fully proclaimed the civil supremacy of Jehovah: while the Patriarchal sway among the tribes themselves, overborne for a time by the military rule of Moses and Joshua, prevented that entire fusion of the people into one mass, which is a clue to much of their after history. In this chapter of their annals then, we have the isolation requisite for the cultivation of a monotheistic faith, and the centrality suited for its diffusion; with a long pre-historic period of theocratic discipline, under which their institutions were matured and a national character formed, before they were drawn into the vortex of political revolutions, and mingled their fortunes with the destinies of other nations.

The third chapter in this history opens with the introduction of monarchy. It cannot be questioned that this institution was designed from the beginning of the entire dispensation. To say nothing of many of the early promises and predictions which pointed distinctly to it, the typical significance of Judaism was incomplete without it, since one of the most important functions of the Messiah, his regal office, would not have been adumbrated; and accordingly a clear provision for its future introduction was inserted by Jehovah in the national covenant ratified at the foot of Sinai. Why then was it delayed nearly nine centuries after the call of Abraham, and five after the Mosaic legislation? This question is partly answered in preceding observations. The great principle of theocratic supremacy must first be engraved upon the public mind and conscience. It is not sufficient that it be engrossed in legal statutes, or embodied in public charters. It must be kneaded and pressed into the whole history of the nation.

and become a living and potential fact moulding the entire national character. This, as already stated, was the great design of the intermediate and preparatory jurisdiction of the Judges; who, raised up by special Divine appointment, would more readily be accepted as vicegerents of the sovereign, and thus prepared the way for the accession of a king who must equally reign as a representative and deputy. The institution of monarchy, before this principle became an actual element of Hebrew life and history, would have changed their whole destiny. They must have sunk down from their peculiar historic position among the other Asiatic kingdoms, to become as simple and as feeble a despotism as the rest. Further, the entire Hebrew system was gradually unfolded and matured. The essential feature of theocracy being first and slowly established, the monarchy arose to complete the symbolical import of Judaism, and to perfect the Hebrew ritual by the construction of the Temple and the arrangement of its gorgeous service. So gradual and steady were the steps of this progression that little more than the *principle* of royalty was initiated during the experimental reign of Saul: who at last was little more than a military hero, checked and rebuked by Samuel, standing by his side, clothed with the equal, if not superior, powers of the Prophet.

If, however, these causes postponed the Monarchy till the last Jewish Chiliad, other reasons were imperative for its introduction now. The want of coherence between the tribes—the rivalry between Ephraim and Judah flaming out occasionally into civil war,—must soon endanger the national existence. The barbarians which skirted their domain were as formidable as ever, and cruelly embittered by the feuds of so many centuries. More than all, the history of the world is soon to move with a grander step. Hitherto, the lawless raids of Arabian hordes have filled her chronicles: now colossal empires shall tread the stage and act the drama. Damascus-Syria, when Solomon's bright day sunk beneath its sombre clouds, rises like an evening star, the harbinger of brighter orbs in the more distant East. Assyria is soon to turn her eye of conquest towards the shores of the Mediterranean; and Egypt, at the approach of this

new assailant, must shake off her sluggish apathy to covet the land of the Jordan as a barrier to her valley of the Nile. The scythe-chariots of Babylon, and the Persian bowmen and slingers, are to go down before the impenetrable phalanxes of Greece—Palestine, to appropriate an expressive figure of her own Historian, is to “rock like a ship in the trough of the sea,” as she is tossed between the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ; till at length her life is trodden out under the heavy squadrons of Imperial Rome. Whether or not the statesmanship of Samuel’s day was equal to the prognostication of these events which fill the last seven centuries of Jewish story, He who sat crowned upon her throne and invisibly guided her destiny saw well that the Hebrews could only remain a free people by reviving their confederation, and giving to it greater vigor and unity.

We must be permitted here a brief digression upon two aspects in which this Hebrew History possesses great attractions for the philosophic historian; affording further illustration of the design of this whole economy. The first is the light it throws upon the rise out of Patriarchism of the ancient Despotisms. No one, who considers the moral relations of the family to civil government, should be surprised at tracing a historical connexion also. It can scarcely be questioned that if men were thrown together in the mass, according to the different theories of socialists, no laws could be enacted sufficiently stringent to restrain them within proper limits: and it is a striking proof of the Divine wisdom that society is broken up into these small and independent communities, where the human will is first subdued, and obedience to authority enforced, under the mild despotism of the family. Hence, in the original formation of society, the Patriarchal rule must be held as preceding every other: and the more elaborate and complicated systems of government were fashioned from this by gradual modifications. The natural influence possessed by the father of a family would easily extend to the various lines of his descendants, combining at length all of the same stock into a single clan; the successive generations forming concentric circles around the parent house. In the lapse of time, these nomadic clans will wander

from their original home, will settle in different districts, assume distinctive names, and exercise within their own bounds all the prerogatives of government. Still, at this advanced stage, when families have expanded into tribes, and tribes into nations, the lineal descendant of the original Patriarch will remain invested with a species of authority. His lineage is of unquestioned preëminence and his authority is derived by immediate inheritance. So that while the rights and freedom of each separate fraternity are not infringed, in all matters of public concern he can rally every kinsman to his banner and to his council.*

The transition from this Patriarchal supremacy to absolute monarchy may without difficulty be traced. The traditional reverence for a superior house and its legal representative, and the habit of submission within certain limits, as well as the necessity of a bond of union amidst conflicting interests, would insensibly concentrate power in a single person. It would require only the lapse of time, diminishing the sentiment of kindred and blood, to obliterate the last trace of Patriarchism, and to leave in its stead the ancient imperial despotisms which covered the massive and monotonous continent of Asia. This view of the gradual rise of monarchy out of Patriarchy harmonizes with all the hints gathered from the Pentateuch concerning the early nations of the world. Such Patriarchal Princes were the Dukes of Edom, and the Princes of Ammon and Moab, and the Lords of the Philistines, with whom Joshua and the Judges contended; and such Patriarchal Princes still are the Emirs and Sheiks of the modern Bedouins, who retain unchanged in the deserts of Arabia the usages of primitive times. This inherent tendency of Patriarchism to absolute power will perhaps explain what Dr. Kitto has remarked concerning the Eastern mind, "that it is so pervadingly regal that to be without a sovereign is scarcely an intelligible state of things to an oriental:" of which he gives a curious illustration—when the English and Dutch were competing for the commerce of the East, the English industriously circulated the report that the Dutch had no

* Russell's connexion of Sacred and Profane History, book 2, ch. 2d.

King: while the latter indignantly repelled this slur upon their respectability, and at once exalted the Stadt-holder to regal honors.* It may explain also the ambitious title of "King of Kings," assumed by the Babylonian and Assyrian monarchs; which may be construed, not as the inflated language of Eastern flattery, but as expressing the real supremacy of these potentates over inferior and vassal tribes and princes. It may account moreover for another political fact of greater importance, to wit, the slender control exercised by these colossal Asiatic governments over tributary nations. No one reads their history without surprise at the want of cohesion between the parts of these gigantic empires. At the touch of an ambitious or disaffected Satrap, whole provinces become suddenly detached; and in the height of their power, they crumble to pieces under causes which seem inadequate to work such speedy ruin. The Turks afford, at the present day, a striking exemplification of this: who, with all their absolutism, hold the reins of government with a slacker hand over their subject tribes, than their milder neighbors west of the Bosphorus.† Mr. Layard testifies that the present critical condition of Turkey is enhanced in no small degree by the efforts of recent Sultans to abolish the ancient system of military fiefs, and to consolidate the empire by bringing all its parts into immediate dependence and responsibility to the central power.

If now the theory just advocated be tenable, the history of the ancient Hebrews is exceedingly valuable as delineating the different stages of this development. We have no reliable history of any other Asiatic nation extending back to its origin, while the history of this is exceedingly minute and circumstantial, and every step in their progress is sharply defined. The lives of the early founders afford an exact portraiture of the original Patriarchism—during the first five centuries of their national existence, the government was pervadingly Patriarchal—all the influences which prompted them to engraft the principles of monarchy upon their existing constitution are clearly traceable in the record. If now

* Kitto's Daily Bible Illustrations: Saul and David, p. 117.

† Russell's Connexion, vol. 2, p. 185.

the Hebrews had given themselves to foreign conquest, and had they owned the paramount authority of the lineal descendant of Jacob's first-born son, their empire would doubtless have presented the features, and illustrated the formation, of all the surrounding monarchies.

The second aspect in which this history is specially attractive is, that it records the fortunes of the only constitutional monarchy in these early ages, and the only instance of regulated liberty among an Asiatic people. Indeed, one might almost be pardoned for venturing to affirm that it was one of the minor ends of the Hebrew economy to give testimony upon the great principles of civil freedom, as in its higher aim it bears witness to Divine truth. It had been well for the nations of antiquity if, without proposing detailed Judaism as a model to themselves, they had yet appropriated the great principles which lie imbedded in that system; and with proper combination and adjustment, had applied them in practice. They might not then have so soon gone, each in its turn, "slouching down on the wrong side of their crisis." It may well too be doubted whether the free governments of modern times have achieved their security and liberty upon any other principles than those substantially incorporated in the Jewish polity. The limitations upon royal prerogative were certainly very striking; and the most stringent of them not artificially imposed, but inhering in the very nature of the system. It is not possible to do more than indicate the most prominent of these, without penetrating into the details of their civil administration further than the limits of this essay will allow. *First*, the Hebrew monarch reigned as the vicegerent of Jehovah, and equally with the meanest subject was under the laws of the Theocracy, and bound to carry out its provisions—it was therefore strictly a constitutional monarchy. *Secondly*, he could reign only with the concurrence of the people formally expressed. While the succession was mainly decided by the oracle, and certainly was not elective on the part of the people, still several striking instances can be adduced where no jurisdiction was attempted to be exercised without the sanction of the popular will. *Thirdly*, upon his accession to the throne, the king gave a solemn charter secu-

ring the rights of the people; which instrument was laid up before Jehovah in the archives of the tabernacle. This was done by Saul and by David—it was omitted in the case of Solomon, who came somewhat prematurely to the throne—and it was Rehoboam's folly in refusing such charter that provoked the schism of the ten tribes. The elders of Israel, under the patriotic guidance of the prophet Samuel, were thus in advance of the British nobles who wrested from the hands of the feeble John, the Magna Charta of English freedom. *Fourthly*, the Jewish king was checked by the distinctly organized governments of the several tribes. The evidence is not a whit more perfect that the Hebrews had a united government, and were truly a State, than that each tribe was completely organized for self-government. The powers too, reserved to the tribes, were so great as scarcely to comport with a central control. They were all equal in political dignity, however unequal in wealth and numbers—they convened assemblies, waged war, declared peace, and concluded treaties. In the exercise of their reserved right, eleven tribes withheld their allegiance during seven years from the anointed David; and in deference to this, the Schismatics under Jeroboam were not coerced by the arms of Judah.

Fifthly. The civil polity of the Hebrews towers immeasurably above all the governments of Asia, in having what has been considered the great device of modern times, and the very palladium of constitutional liberty: we allude to the existence of two chambers in their legislative councils; the one consisting of the heads of families or elders, who formed the Senate, and the other of the body of the people, who constituted the congregation or commons.* If this important check does not stand forth with greater prominence in the course of their history, it is only because it was too far in advance of their age. But that it was imbedded in their system and exercised at certain great epochs, cannot be doubted by the careful student of their constitution.

Sixthly. The vast influence of the prophets must not

* Wine's Commentaries on the Laws of the ancient Hebrews. Book 2. Chapters 5 and 6.

be overlooked; whom Coleridge considers as discharging for the Hebrew state substantially the duties of the Roman Censor. They were the State moralists, guardians and orators of the republic. Indeed, in no one respect does the superiority of the Jewish over every other oriental theocracy more appear, than in the relations subsisting between the religious and civil departments. Every where throughout the East, except in Palestine, the Priesthood is in league with tyranny. The Cæsar is Pontifex Maximus: and the whole sacerdotal power is cast into the scale of prerogative rather than of privilege, against the people and for the throne. It is needless to show the contrary of this among the Jews—that through the entire range of their history, the religious orders, whether Prophets, Priests or Levites, stood together as conservators of popular rights against regal encroachments, for the stability of the constitution against the innovations of wicked rulers.

Seventhly. Not the least important of the checks on royal prerogative, the more potential from its quiet, constant and unsuspected operation, is found in the Agrarian law of Moses. By this the whole land was originally divided into small proprietorships, the possession of which was inalienable, and the soil was cultivated by actual owners. This placed political power in the hands of the people themselves: for I suppose it will be admitted as a sound maxim, that “Empire follows the balance of property wherever lodged, whether in one, few or many hands.”*

It is time, however, to return from this enticing digression to the fourth chapter of the Hebrew record, which covers the epoch of the great schism. We have seen that the Jewish state was very slowly matured. Four centuries were consumed in its expansion from a single house, and as many more before the cap-stone of monarchy was placed upon the national edifice. Surely we would augur from so protracted an infancy, a long and vigorous manhood, ere the decrepitude of age should supervene: and we are staggered to find, at the close

* Harrington's Prerogative of Pop. Gov., c. 2, as quoted by Mr. Wines, p. 402, of his Commentaries.

of a single century, the empire suddenly dismembered, having reached and passed its culmination during the reign of its first kings. Why then was the schism permitted to take place? It was a dismal event, which led eventually to the overthrow of the entire State. It was not accomplished by external violence, but by the spontaneous action of the people themselves. It was not fortuitous, but came by the immediate appointment of Jehovah. Difficult as it often is to trace the reasons of Divine Providence, the results reached in history upon a large scale afford frequently a clue to its interpretation. Yet this problem is utterly insoluble, without taking into account the relations of Judaism to Christianity. We think God intended by it to counteract tendencies which would have defeated the very purpose for which the theocracy was instituted. There are periods in history when secret forces are preparing, to burst out ere long with irrepressible power; just as the volcano is long brewing in its hidden vaults the lava which it finally belches forth. Such a period were the three first centuries of the Christian Era, when the German barbarians were slowly gathering to pour down from the North of Europe, blotting out the effete Roman Empire and laying the foundations of the present European States: and such an age is that upon which we are now entering. We are no more to deal with nomadic and barbarous hordes with their predatory incursions, such as never can be important factors in the history of the human race; but with well organized governments, whose stupendous achievements fill the records of the past. In this mighty game to be played by the different Asiatic empires, God by this schism disqualifies the Hebrews from participating. He cuts her sinews and humbles her to an insignificant power, that when human society shall be crystallizing into new shapes, she may crystallize upon that single thread he had ordained. Above all, that she may be prepared for her missionary calling, this dismemberment opened the seals of her universal dispersion: the Empire was weakened, that it might be spilled over into all the world.

There were two dangers which Judea, humanly speaking, very narrowly escaped: that of becoming a great

military power, on the one hand ; and a great commercial republic on the other ; either of which would have been fatal to the true ends of her economy. I wish to make this plain.

Never did a people possess historical advantages for establishing a great military kingdom, equal to the Hebrews from the era of the monarchy onwards. Even to as late a period as the schism they had the world before them as a field of conquest, with scarcely an historical competitor. Syria, the earliest of the Eastern powers, was simply in the hands of petty adventurers fleeing from Egypt, who began their Empire by wresting a fragment of Solomon's vast domain. Assyria had not awaked from the long trance of thirteen centuries, which makes such a chasm in history, by at least one hundred and fifty years. Babylon was still a century later, and Media also ; Persia is of course a mere satrapy ; Rome too is not yet founded by nearly three hundred years ; Greece has little more than emerged from her fabulous age, substituting her Archons for Kings, and beginning to plant her colonies on the shores of Asia Minor ; Lycurgus has not yet given laws to Sparta, and Thebes has just proclaimed herself a republic. Troy has fallen : and Carthage is but an insignificant colony, peddling in small traffic on the coast of the Mediterranean. Of all the historic nations, Egypt alone is an adult : and she is nestling herself in the bosom of her Nile-Goddess and fattening upon her bounty. What nation ever had so open a field, or could more easily have trampled upon a conquered world ? Consider the ease with which David extended his sceptre from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, and from the Red Sea to the Mountains of Lebanon, and ask what but the Divine hand restrained him from planting the lion-banner of Judah upon the banks of the Hyphasis and the Indus, thus anticipating the glory of Alexander ? But the advantages of Palestine were not only thus historical ; they were also geographical. Look upon her insulated and central position, upon which I have already dwelt in another connexion. She had only to build herself galleys, and the whole European coast lay at her mercy to the Straits of Hercules. On the East, the whole Syrian Desert lay between her and

a foreign foe; for the wild Arabian tribes crouched at her feet like whipped spaniels in the leash of their master. With a teeming and hardy population upon a compact and fertile territory; with a citizen soldiery, every man of whom was bred to arms, and enrolled in a most perfect military organization; with great social equality among the people, and an entire absence of pauperism and want; with the soil distributed into small proprietorships, and every arable foot under perfect tillage: never was there a land better able to endure the conscriptions of war, or more easily to maintain through long campaigns armies fully equipped. Rich in these internal resources, secure in her own insulation, and convenient in her centrality, no country was ever better situated for aggressive warfare. Had not the military spirit of David been restrained by the Divine jealousy; or had Solomon been inspired with a like heroism and prosecuted the conquests of his father, and his successors been men of martial prowess:—if even this schism had not occurred, blighting all prospects of territorial extension, it is not improbable that Rome would have been outstripped by seven centuries, and Judea sat between her hills the mistress of the world. But what then would have become of Judah's high commission, as the herald of sacred and saving truth? Her glory was not to be that of armies and of battles; her glory is her Priesthood, bearing upon her shoulders the ark of God for the salvation of mankind.

But if the conquests of David had well nigh started the Hebrews upon a career of military renown, the danger of commercial aggrandizement equally threatened the prosperous reign of Solomon. Long before and after the subjugation of Canaan, the Phenicians enjoyed the monopoly of the Mediterranean Sea, which was to ancient commerce what the broad oceans are to modern, and having on its coast many of the most powerful and refined nations of the old world. Alexandria was not yet built, and Carthage was only a dependency of Tyre. The Phenicians, therefore, were left to exchange the products of their manufacturing skill in dyes, tapestry, glass, &c.; to export the wood from their forests in Lebanon, to ship the grain and wool which Palestine

afforded, as well as the linen and superabundant grain of Egypt. Above all, their ports were the chief outlet of the immense caravan trade, bringing the wines of Damascus, as well as the spices and gold of Assyria and distant India. This inland traffic was borne by caravans from Mesopotamia and the regions north of the Persian gulf, and also from the Southern countries washed by the Indus and the waters of the Indian ocean. Parting on the sands of the Syria desert, one branch diverged in a southwestern direction, and was borne by Idumean Arabs on the waters of the Arabian Gulf, or crossing the head of this internal sea, terminated by land carriage in Egypt and the countries westward. The other branch, following the course nearly due west, directly across the desert, passed through the northern portion of Palestine, south of the range of Lebanon, found an outlet, as before stated, through the Phœnician ports. At a later day when these had declined, and under the fostering care of the Seleucidæ, a more northerly direction was given to this stream of inland traffic, which found an outlet through Antioch and by the Orontes, in Asia Minor.*

Such was the posture of ancient commerce when Solomon came to the throne; that "preëminent Hebrew," as he is gorgeously described by Dr. Hamilton of England, in whom "the accumulated qualities of his nation were poured forth, as the aloe in one stately blossom pours forth the collected life of a century."* His vast and enterprising genius sought scope for its activity in civil and peaceful pursuits. Stimulated by the embarrassments of his treasury exhausted in vast architectural designs, as well as by that thirst for knowledge which made him the encyclopedist of his day, he was the first to perceive the commercial advantages which Palestine enjoyed from her geographical position. The victories of David gave him command of that sand-ocean from the borders of Judah to the Euxine Gulf, and from the Jordan to the Euphrates. All the desert races, by whom this traffic was mediated, were subject to his beck. His domestic alliance with the King of Egypt, and his con-

* See Russell's *Connexions of Sacred and Profane History*, book 3, ch. 3.

† *The Royal Preacher*, Lecture 1.

trol of the southern frontier, secured the monopoly of all the exchanges between Egypt and Syria: while his resources enabled him to establish an emporium in the desert, where if his factors did not enjoy a monopoly of the Indian trade in spices, wines and gold, they enjoyed a large revenue from duties levied, and cheerfully paid as an equivalent for the protection of his strong hand against the lawless Bedouins. It is proof of the strong friendship between Palestine and Tyre that the commercial jealousy of the latter was laid aside; and the keels of the two confederates ploughed the waters of the Mediterranean to furthestmost Spain, the eastern arm of the Red Sea, of the Indian Ocean to Java and Malacca, and along the coast of Abyssinia. The commerce of three continents yielded such returns that, translated into the language of our modern currency they seem more like the exaggerations of Eastern fiction than the cold hard figures of the merchant and the banker. But how shall we explain the abstinence of the Hebrews from commercial enterprise till Solomon's day? How came they to tolerate the Philistines as a thorn in their sides during five centuries, when their extermination would have given them a southwestern coast from Joppa to the African line? Still more, how was it that when Amorite, Perizzite and Hittite fell beneath Joshua's battle hand, that the united Hebrew force did not roll like an avalanche upon that strip of land only twelve miles wide covered with the towns and merchandize of Phenicia? Why did they not seize a commerce made ready to their hand, which might still be conducted through the subject ships and seamen of Sidon and of Tyre? Did eighty years of servile bondage crush forever their spirit of enterprise? or did the long residence in Egypt habituate them irrecoverably to husbandry and pasturage? or did the agrarian policy of their own legislator wed them to agriculture as the only basis of prosperity? What are all these influences but agencies by which a high Providence moulded them for a destiny which commerce would have defeated? And when the vast genius of Solomon had opened these vast schemes of commercial aggrandizement, how came they to perish in his tomb? Surely not because the Hebrews were instinctively averse

from mercantile pursuits. They have been a nation of traders for two thousand years; and as early as the days of Antiochus and of Ptolemy, they formed half the population of Alexandria and Antioch. Who is able to measure the influence of this schism, occurring at the coronation of Solomon's successor, in arresting the commercial enterprize of Judea? But one abortive attempt was made in the days of Jehoshaphat to revive the schemes of Solomon. Had not this political convulsion rent the Hebrew State to its base, it may have sunk from its high religious and sacerdotal mission, into a mere commercial republic, and left its name on history as Phenicia or as Carthage.

In the fifth great section of this history we trace the beginning of the end in the Hebrew Dispersions. Two and a half centuries after the schism already described, the House of Israel, as is known to all, was carried into captivity by the Assyrians; and one hundred and thirty years later the same fate befell Judah through the agency of the Babylonians. The two streams which have flowed on so long parallel with each other here divide, never again to mingle in a common current. The destinies of the two are henceforward wholly different. After seventy years of affliction and exile, one branch is restored to its native seat;—the walls of Jerusalem are rebuilt, and the sacred height of Moriah is again crowned with the Temple's golden splendor, while through six centuries the national life lingers. The other branch, transferred to the distant region which now forms the northern part of Persia, is expatriated forever—their very title to their native soil is cancelled by the occupation of rude and foreign colonists—and they are henceforth lost to history, as the river of Africa was fabled to lose its waters in the sands of the desert. This contrast in the fortunes of the two sections challenges explanation. Why should the chastisement be avenging in the one case, and only disciplinary in the other? The answer must be found in the different measures of guilt attached to the two respectively. Judah attempted no organic change of the theocracy. Her fault was simply that she was not fully imbued with the spirit of her own institutions; but yielding sometimes to a corrupt court influence, she vibrated be-

tween the extremes of pure theism and rank idolatry. This facility of disposition needed to be corrected, and greater firmness of religious principle was, we know, acquired in the Babylonian furnace. Israel, on the other hand, effected a radical change in the central institute of the theocracy. Jeroboam clearly saw that if the religious unity of the nation was preserved, and all the tribes repaired to the Temple at the annual festivals, at some favorable juncture the two kingdoms must be consolidated once more under a single government. He, therefore, threw off entirely the theocratic spirit, and surrendered himself to a carnal policy, by erecting local shrines at Bethel and at Dan, and establishing the calves as a substitute for the ark and sanctuary at Jerusalem. It must be conceded, we think, that his object was not to introduce absolute idolatry, or the worship of false Gods, but what the English non-conformists of a later day were accustomed to distinguish as modal idolatry, or the worship of the true God in an irregular and dangerous manner. Doubtless, during his residence in Egypt, whither he had fled a fugitive from Solomon's jealousy, he had become infected with the symbolic notions of that country; and had learned to distinguish, in his own mind, between God and the symbol by which he is represented. Possibly he may have justified himself by the use of the cherubim in the sanctuary at Jerusalem, and felt himself at liberty to decompose those complex figures, and to employ one of them in worship. Whatever were the pleas by which he suborned his own conscience and that of his subjects, he certainly succeeded in devising an intermediate system between Judaism and Paganism; which so firmly rooted itself in the policy and history of the Israelites as never to be abandoned; nor did a single king arise who attempted to reform the religious faith of the people and restore the purity of the ancestral worship. The error of Israel, therefore, in thus recasting the theocracy and essentially modifying the Mosaic Institutes, was more systematic and malignant than the backslidings of Judah; and it was proper that God should discriminate between the two in the punishments inflicted.

This answer, however, is not exhaustive. The promises made to David of the perpetuity of his throne, and the

continuance of this regal type of Christ, rendered the restoration of Judah necessary, and its preservation till the advent of the Messiah. But no such necessity existed in the case of Israel, which was from the beginning a schismatical branch of the kingdom, by no means essential to its integrity. Still we do not obtain entire satisfaction, until regarding Judaism historically as a preparation for Christianity, we discover a reason for the disposition actually made of these two kingdoms. I have already spoken of the world as being in a dormant, un-historic state during the six hundred years in which Judaism is cradled and nursed in Palestine, as the only true Monotheistic faith. It is certainly not without significance that synchronous with the opening of the great historic drama in the eighth century before Christ, God should divide his chosen people into two bands, and assign them in future two distinct geographical theatres of action. He places the ten tribes in the far East, in the very heart of Asia, in the lap of those early empires, Assyria, Babylonia, Media and Persia, where they are left as the exponent of Monotheism, a witness directly confronting the magic and sorcery of Chaldea, the star worship and divination of the entire East; and this too at a period just a little anterior to the appearance of Zoroaster, to revive and to reform the ancient Magian faith. But there are soon to arise mighty empires also in the West. Greece, with all her philosophic culture and mythologic lore, and Rome, with all her martial power and elaborate jurisprudence, are in turn to rule the world: and for the same reason, that the true religion must have a witness in the East through the ten tribes retained there, must there be also a witness in the West through Judah restored again. This gives a clue to the dispensations of Jehovah, touching these captivities. There is the same great theocratic purpose in not restoring the kingdom of Israel, as in replanting that of Judah. Monotheism must have its exponent in the East and in the West; and Judaism must go historically into the wilderness, in these two directions, crying, "prepare ye the way of the Lord."

The sixth and last chapter of this national history, upon which I shall discant, is the withdrawal of the gift of prophecy, and Judaism stiffening into a cold and lifeless

ritualism. After their return from Babylon, a marked change in the whole Hebrew character presents itself to view. Up to this point, they exhibit a most perverse proclivity to idolatry. Every season of prosperity was followed by certain defection from Jehovah; and they yield to every species of evil influence, just as the surface of water curls and ripples before the driving wind. But from this time onwards, we discover all that tenacity of character and inflexible religious zeal, by which they have been distinguished for more than twenty centuries. To whatever causes we choose to refer this change—whether that idolatry became henceforth associated with this national enslavement and degradation, or that a nearer inspection of idolatrous ceremonies produced an invincible repugnance and disgust—or that a special and supernatural influence wrought through and above these—the fact itself cannot be questioned. But alas! it was not Judaism, full of life and sap, but Judaism withered and shrunk—Judaism in cortice hærens, in the letter rather than in the spirit—the bare skeleton of that grand old faith, whose beating pulse the nations had felt through ages past. In token of this, prophecy hushed its voice, and the Hebrew oracle was dumb through silent centuries. This prophecy,—the *nrim* and *thummim* of a long and glorious dispensation,—which had made Judaism the religion of the future, which had given solemn utterances through the patriarchal age, and had, from the time of Samuel, become a permanent order and office: this prophecy was now suspended four hundred years from Malachi, and only resumed in John the Baptist, the last bright gleam of an expiring economy. The deadness of Judaism was evinced likewise in the rise of sects, splitting up between them the venerable faith of their patriarchs and priests. In the early and growing period of the Hebrew church, when the articulate voice of God through the prophets interpreted all the passages of her history, the Jewish doctrines were too sharply defined to admit the rise of party. But when the theocratic control became less direct, and the nation was left to those silent influences which mould the character and destiny of other peoples—when Hebrew piety waxed feeble, and the church began to live in the traditions of

the past, then the spirit of sectrose, and religious discord brought forth its bitter fruit ere long. First, the traditionalists arose, embodying the principle of veneration, "which loves the past in its forms as well as the substance, its ivy as well as its columns." These were the Pharisees, representing the traditional orthodoxy, the dead formalism and legal self-righteousness of Judaism. Affecting to be the Puritans of their day, they sought to reform doctrine and worship after the captivity, taking tradition for their oracle and prescription for their law. Next arose the reactionary party of the Sadducees, who abandoned themselves to Rationalism, the neologists and skeptics of Judea. The complement to these sects was soon furnished in the rise of the Essenes, the mystics and ascetics, who imported the morose and monastic spirit of the East, and divided life between contemplation and labor. Now what does all this betoken, but that whatsoever "decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away?" Judaism stiffens out into an obsolete record, swathed like a mummy in the ceremonies of its own gorgeous ritual: but out of its hollow and lifeless form came forth the immortal church of God to run upon a broader course, whose goal is the foot of the judgment throne. Shall no value be attached to this historical argument for the truth of Christianity? Can that system be false, whose deep foundations are thus laid in the distant past, to which all profane history lifts the voice of a herald, and whose forerunner is this religious race, reaching back almost to the waters of the flood? The whole posture of the heathen and Jewish world, at the advent, proclaimed "the fulness of time" when Messiah must appear. In that Athens, the Acropolis of Paganism, with its countless statues and temples the pantheon of the old mythology, heathenism had written its epitaph on its own altars "to the unknown God," and with a negative voice cried aloud for the instauration of a new and divine faith. Dumb Judaism too, which could no longer speak the language of prophecy and hope, bore positive, though silent, witness for that Gospel which fulfils its types and symbols—and to this day, in the striking language of Dr. Schaff, "impenitent Judaism wanders ghost-like through all these centuries, an incontrovertible witness for Christianity."

H. C. Brinson

THE
SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

An Association of Ministers,

IN

COLUMBIA, S. CAROLINA.

Vol. 9--No. 2.

OCTOBER, 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.

✂ We owe an apology to our readers for the extraordinary delay in the issue of this number of the Review, beyond the regular month of publication. It was occasioned by a lack of paper, which could not be procured in season, the mill whence our supplies are obtained having temporarily suspended operations.

TO OUR PATRONS.

The patronage which the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW has enjoyed during the past eight 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 5000 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.	Rev. Wm. Flinn, Demopolis, Ala.
" S. A. Stanfield, Harmony, N. C.	Mr. J. Whiting, Montgomery, Ala.
" A. A. Morse, Abbeville C. H., S. Carolina.	Rev. R. S. Gladney, Aberdeen, Miss.
Mr. J. Rosser, Camden, S. C.	Nash & Woodhouse, Richmond, Va.
" John Russell, Charleston, S. C.	Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., N. Orleans.
" Wm. E. Mills, Mt. Clio, Sumter, S. Carolina.	Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, 228 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.
" John R. Dow, Augusta, Ga.	Mr. Jas. Armour, Memphis, Tenn.
" W. G. Foote, Savannah, Ga.	Rev. J. M. Becton, Larissa, Cherokee Co., Texas.
Rev. J. P. McMullen, Havanna, Ala.	W. N. White & Brother, Athens, Ga.

H. C. Bronson

THE
SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

An Association of Ministers,

IN

COLUMBIA, S. CAROLINA.

Vol. 9--No. 3.

JANUARY, MDCCCLVI.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
TYPOGRAPHY BY I. C. MORGAN.
1856.

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 eight 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 5000 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. A. W. Miller, Charlotte, N. C.	Rev. Wm. Flinn, Milledgeville, Ga.
“ S. A. Stanfield, Harmony, N. C.	Mr. J. Whiting, Montgomery, Ala.
“ A. A. Morse, Anderson C. H., S. Carolina.	Rev. R. S. Gladney, Aberdeen, Miss.
Mr. J. Rosser, Camden, S. C.	Nash & Woodhouse, Richmond, Va.
“ John Russell, Charleston, S. C.	Rev. W. A. Scott, D.D., San Francisco
“ Wm. E. Mills, Mt. Clio, Sumter, S. Carolina.	Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, 228 Chesnut street, Philadelphia.
“ John R. Dow, John's Island, S. C.	Mr. Jas. Armour, Memphis, Tenn.
“ W. G. Foote, Savannah, Ga.	Rev. J. M. Becton, Larissa, Cherokee Co., Texas.
Rev. J. P. McMullen, Havanna, Ala.	W. N. White & Brother, Athens, Ga.

H C Bronson

THE
SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

In Association of Ministers,

IN

COLUMBIA, S. CAROLINA.

—
Vol. 9--No. 4.

APRIL, MDCCCLVI.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
TYPOGRAPHY BY I. C. MORGAN.
1856.

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 eight 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 5000 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. A. W. Miller, Charlotte, N. C.	Rev. Wm. Flinn, Milledgeville, Ga.
" S. A. Stanfield, Harmony, N. C.	Mr. J. Whiting, Montgomery, Ala.
" A. A. Morse, Anderson C. H., S. Carolina.	Rev. R. S. Gladney, Aberdeen, Miss. Nash & Woodhouse, Richmond, Va.
Mr. J. Rosser, Camden, S. C.	Rev. W. A. Scott, D.D., San Francisco
" John Russell, Charleston, S. C.	Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, 228 Chesnut street, Philadelphia.
" Wm. E. Mills, Mt. Clio, Sumter, S. Carolina.	Mr. Jas. Armour, Memphis, Tenn.
" John R. Dow, John's Island, S. C.	Rev. J. M. Beeton, Larissa, Cherokee Co., Texas.
" W. G. Foote, Savannah, Ga.	W. N. White & Brother, Athens, Ga.
Rev. J. P. McMullen, Havana, Ala.	