



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



32101 063841934

Library of



Princeton University.

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF THE

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

SOUTH.

D. S. DOGGETT, D. D., EDITOR.

VOL. VIII.

RICHMOND, VA.:

PUBLISHED BY STEVENSON AND OWEN, FOR THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH,

No. 123, Main Street.

PRINTED BY COLIN & NOWLAN.

1854.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VIII.

JANUARY.

ART.	PAGE.
I. THE COLERIDGEAN VIEW OF THE ATONEMENT, - - -	1
II. ZECHARIAH, (continued,) - - -	9
III. THE ASCETICAL DEVOTIONS OF PARCAL'S LATE YEARS, -	29
IV. THE EVILS OF INFANT BAPTISM, - - -	32
V. A CRITIQUE ON DR. L. PIERCE'S VIEW OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT,	65
VI. A DISCOURSE ON THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF THE LATE REV. HEZEKIAH G. LEIGH, D. D., - - -	82
VII. ON THE EXISTENCE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ANGELS, -	109
VIII. BRIEF REVIEWS, - - -	130
IX. BIBLICAL, LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC MISCELLANIES, - -	147
X. CONTEMPORARY PERIODICAL LITERATURE, - - -	159

APRIL.

I. JOHN WESLEY, - - -	161
II. POWER OF THE PULPIT, - - -	183
III. ZECHARIAH, (continued,) - - -	194
IV. BUTLER'S ANALOGY, - - -	214
V. CHRIST IN HISTORY, - - -	248
VI. A THEODICY, - - -	265
VII. BRIEF REVIEWS, - - -	298
VIII. BIBLICAL, LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC MISCELLANIES, - -	300

RECAP

172

JULY.

I. ZECHARIAH, (concluded),	-	-	-	-	321
II. PRAYER—AS A MEANS OF GRACE,	-	-	-	-	340
III. EXISTENCE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ANGELS,	-	-	-	-	357
IV. PROTESTANTISM AND CATHOLICISM,	-	-	-	-	369
V. THE BURIAL OF MOSES,	-	-	-	-	394
VI. BLEDSOE'S THEODICY, (continued,)	-	-	-	-	427
VII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	-	-	-	-	450
VIII. INTELLIGENCE; BIBLICAL, LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS,	-	-	-	-	467

OCTOBER.

I. THE THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF THOMAS PAINE,	-	-	-	-	481
II. PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY; Mrs. Somerville reviewed,	-	-	-	-	513
III. THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF ARMINIUS,	-	-	-	-	540
IV. "JUDAISM UNVEILED,"	-	-	-	-	565
V. WESLEYAN METHODISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY,	-	-	-	-	583
VI. RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	-	-	-	-	603
VII. BIBLICAL, LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC MISCELLANIES,	-	-	-	-	624
VIII. CLOSE OF OUR FIRST AND COMMENCEMENT OF OUR SECOND SERIES OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW,	-	-	-	-	639

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW,
OF THE
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
SOUTH.

Vol. VIII.]

JANUARY 1854.

[No. 1.]

ART. I.

THE COLERIDGEAN VIEW OF THE ATONEMENT.

By Rev. John F. Petherbridge, M. D., West River, Md.

The reading public are under many obligations to the Messrs. Harper for their recent edition of the "complete works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, unquestionably one of the deepest thinkers and most suggestive writers of the age. Profound in our admiration of the man, and professing to have had the horizon of our thought greatly extended by the writer, it is with becoming humility we would record our dissent from his statement of a vital doctrine of our holy religion. In all ages of the church's history the doctrine of the atonement has been considered fundamental. In the system of theology we adopt, it is the central truth, around which revolve all the

VOL. VIII.—1

other truths of revelation ; which are indeed important relatively to their connection with this. We repeat, that it is to his *statement* of the doctrine we object. The doctrine itself he embraced and clung to, as the only ground of his acceptance with God on earth, and of his hope of acquittal at the judgment seat. The distinction we have made is an important one, and should ever be borne in mind by all who would understand Coleridge's views upon the subject.

It is in his "Aids to reflection," pp. 307-317, that he has given us the fullest development of these views. The reader, interested in the subject, will turn to the volume itself. We shall only quote so far as may be necessary for an intelligible exposition of his theory :

" Forgiveness of sin, the abolition of guilt through the redemptive power of Christ's love and of his perfect obedience during his voluntary assumption of humanity is expressed, on account of the resemblance of the consequences in both cases, by the payment of a debt for another ; which debt the payer had not himself incurred. Now the impropriation of this metaphor (that is, the taking it literally) by transferring the sameness from the consequents, to the antecedents, or inferring the identity of the causes from a resemblance in the effects ; this is the point on which I am at issue ; and the view or scheme of redemption grounded on this confusion I believe to be altogether unscriptural." " Now the article of redemption may be considered in a twofold relation ; in relation to the antecedent, that is, the Redeemer's act, as the efficient cause and condition of redemption ; and in relation to the consequent, that is, the effects in and for the redeemed. Now it is the latter relation in which the subject is treated of, set forth, expanded and enforced by St. Paul. The mysterious act, the operative cause is transcendent. *Factum est* : and beyond the information contained in the enunciation of the fact, it can be characterized only by the consequences." " Now it would be difficult, if not impossible to select points better suited to this purpose than those are from which the learned apostle has drawn the four principal metaphors by which he illustrates the blessed consequences of Christ's redemption of mankind. These are ; 1. Sin offerings, sacrificial expiation. 2. Reconciliation, atonement, *καταλλαγή*. 3. Ransom from slavery, redemption, the buying back again, or being bought back. 4. Satisfaction of a creditor's claim by a payment of the debt. The very number and variety of the words furnish the strongest presumptive proof that all alike were used metaphorically." " The professional student of theology will perhaps understand the different positions

asserted in the preceding argument more readily, if they are presented synoptically, . . . in the form of answers to four questions comprising the constituent parts of the scriptural doctrine of redemption, as follows :

QUESTIONS.

Who or what is the

{	1. <i>Agens Causator ?</i>
	2. <i>Actus Causativus ?</i>
	3. <i>Effectum Causatum ?</i>
	4. <i>Consequentia, ab effectu ?</i>

ANSWERS.

1. The agent and the personal cause of the redemption of mankind is—the co-eternal word and only begotten Son of the living God.

2. The causative act is—a Spiritual and transcendent mystery *that passeth all understanding.*

3. The effect caused is—the being born anew ; as before in the flesh to the world, so now born in the Spirit to Christ.

4. The consequences from the effects are—sanctification from sin and liberation from the inherent and penal consequences of sin in the world to come, with all the means and processes of sanctification by the word and the Spirit.”

Viewed in the light of revelation, we have at least a two-fold objection to this view of the atonement :—

I. It is a *defective* one ; it is not as full as the Scriptures present it. Availing ourselves of the teachings of inspiration, we are not willing to admit that the causative act is a Spiritual and transcendent mystery “that passeth all understanding.”

Revelation throws its light upon the redemptive act, not only in its relation to man, but upon it also—as it stands related to the Divine character and government. Not only are the consequents, but also the antecedents of the death of Christ brought into view. “God was in Christ *reconciling the world unto himself*, not imputing their trespasses unto them.” The last clause determines who was the subject of this reconciliation. The “not imputing their trespasses unto them” is exegetical of his “reconciling the world unto himself ;” and as it is an act that can be predicated of God alone, we are compelled to understand the passage as affirming that he was subjectively reconciled to man. And precise-

ly the same is the teaching of the apostle in his epistle to the Romans. "When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." That God and not man was the subject of this reconciliation is evident from the fact, than man is said to have been an enemy at the time when the reconciliation took place. According to the teaching of the apostle, the death of Christ operated to the reconciling of God to man. By consequence, the Deity must have been previously unreconciled, or at variance with man. What we are to understand by this reconciliation on the part of God, the apostle informs us in Romans 3 : 25, 26 ; "whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God ; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness : that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." According to this passage, which may be viewed as a summary of the Gospel, Jesus Christ was set forth as a propitiation, and the end in view was, that God "might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Important in the extreme is the last clause *εἰς το εἶναι αὐτον, δικαιον, κ. τ. λ.* ; "That he might be just," &c ; teaching us by the fairest implication, that but for the propitiation he could not "be just," and at the same time, "the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." But the death of Christ reconciled the difficulty, and notwithstanding Coleridge's assertion, that we know nothing about the redemptive act in its relation to God, and his objection to a "theory grounded on a notion of justice ;" yet the apostle does, in this passage, view the death of Christ in its influence upon the divine mind, and affirms that the atonement is a provision "grounded on a notion of justice."

So clearly are these points revealed, that it is impossible for them to be disposed of but by adopting a sophism which underlies this part of his scheme. The sophism consists in applying to the whole what is true in reference to a part only ; or to use his own language against others, he interprets *de omni* what was spoken *de singulo*. For if "ransom from

slavery" and "paying a debt" are metaphorical representations of our redemption, we deny that sacrificial expiation, reconciliation, and atonement are to be interpreted in like manner. Literally, and not metaphorically, are they to be understood. If the apostle's assertion that "when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son," is to be understood metaphorically, so also must the Scripture which affirms, "he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him;" and if God entertains wrath in a metaphorical sense only, by a parity of reasoning, his love for his people must be equally unreal. But the truth is, when God is represented in his word as possessing holiness, justice, truth, love and wrath, we are to understand by these terms essentially the same as when applied to man; the *differentia* being merely the imperfection that attaches to the finite. If, when the apostle says: "now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," we are not to understand him literally, it will be exceedingly difficult to draw the line between that which is literal, and that which is figurative.

We would not, in the most indirect manner, charge Coleridge with being a Unitarian in the latter part of his life. Knowing as we do that, notwithstanding he commenced his public life by preaching that heresy, he soon repudiated it, and unqualifiedly gave his assent to a tri-unity of the Godhead. Yet we have always been struck by the agreement of his views upon this point with those of Channing, the corypheus of modern Unitarianism. The latter, in his discourse at the ordination of the Rev. Jared Sparks, in Baltimore, 1819, says:

"We have no desire to conceal the fact, that a difference of opinion exists among us, in regard to an interesting part of Christ's mediation. I mean, in regard to the precise influence of his death upon our forgiveness. Many suppose that this event contributes to our pardon, as it was a principal means of confirming his religion, and of giving it a power over the mind. In other words, that it procures forgiveness by leading to that repentance and virtue, which is the great and only condition on which forgiveness is bestowed. Many of us are dissatisfied with this explanation, and think that the Scripture ascribes the remission of sins to Christ's death

with an emphasis so peculiar that we ought to consider this event as having a special influence in removing punishment, though the Scriptures may not reveal the way in which it contributes to this end."

If we mistake not, the agreement is perfect; and as the monk of Wittemberg, reformer, and ultraist as he was, in many respects, could not entirely divest his mind of his early faith, we deem it not uncharitable to suppose that the prejudices, the modes of thought peculiar to Coleridge in his early life, ever after, in spite of himself, gave a coloring to his views. His truly gifted daughter in vindicating him against the charge of "heretical and schismatical teaching," says: "His Unitarianism was purely negative; not a satisfaction in the positive formal divinity of the Unitarians, but what remained with him to the last, a revulsion from certain explanations of the atonement commonly received as orthodox."*

As an offset to both Coleridge and Channing, we give an extract from Rev. Richard Watson, a theologian whose views more fully accord with the apostle Paul's on this subject:

"It has been sometimes said by theologians sufficiently sound in their general views of the doctrine of the atonement, that we know not the *vinculum*, or bond of connection between the sufferings of Christ and the pardon of sin, and this, therefore, they place among the mysteries of religion. To me this appears rather to arise from obscure views of the atonement than from the absence of information on this point in the Scriptures themselves. Mysteries of love, and incomprehensible facts are found, it is true, in the incarnation, humiliation and sufferings of our Lord; but the *vinculum*, or the connection of those sufferings, appears to be matter of express revelation, when it is declared that the death of Christ was 'a demonstration of the righteousness of God;' of his righteous character and his just administration; and, therefore, allowed the honorable exercise of mercy without impeachment of justice, or any repeal or relaxation of his laws. If it be meant, in this allegation of mystery, that it is not discernible how the death of Christ is as adequate a display of the justice of God, as though offenders had been personally punished, this also is clearly in opposition to what the apostle has said in the passage which has been so often referred to; 'Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, (*εις, ενδειξις, της, δι, και, οσης, αυτου,*) for a demonstration or manifestation of his righteousness.' This surely is manifestation, not mystery."

* Introduction to *Biographia Literaria*.

II. The scheme under consideration is a *perverted* as well as a defective one. In the third and fourth answer, as above given, there is certainly a misstatement of the effect caused, and the consequences from the effects, if we are to judge the matter by the standard of St. Paul. There is here but little if any notice taken of the sinner's present justification before God. The effect caused is being born anew; and the consequences are sanctification, and liberation from the inherent and penal consequences of sin in the world to come, with all the means and processes of sanctification by the word and the spirit. But for the clause, "liberation from the penal consequences of sin in the world to come," there is no recognition whatever of the *guilt* of sin. By sin, man is diseased and requires a spiritual healing, and the effect of redemption is to cause him to be born anew. That this is one of the glorious effects of the redemption by Jesus Christ, we gladly admit; but we contend that this does not exhaust the redemptive act in reference to man. There is another happy effect resulting from the once offering of the Son of God, and one which precedes his being born again: "We have redemption through his blood, *even the forgiveness of sins.*"

From closing his eyes upon the atonement in its heavenward aspect, and proclaiming it, in this respect, a "transcendent mystery," this great man lost sight of sin as it affects the moral government of God, and confined his view, almost entirely, to its subjective influence on man. But this is not in accordance with the teachings of the Scriptures. They do not exalt one branch of redemption at the expense of the other, but, while they proclaim man to be a polluted being, standing in need of purity, they also, as unequivocally, represent him as being under the condemnatory sentence of the law, and standing in need of pardon. "He that believeth not is condemned already." "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." And the death of Christ is held up as the ground of his justification: "This is my blood of the New Testament shed for many for the remission of sins." The fact is, that the rela-

tion of the death of Christ to our pardon is direct, while its relation to our purity is indirect.

We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith. His blood—his sufferings and death—atoned for our guilt, and God pardons the believing penitent because Christ died for him; whereas his restoration to the divine image; his purity, is effected by the Holy Spirit shed abroad in his heart, after he has been absolved from the guilt of sin. As long as the sinner remained under the condemnatory sentence of the law he was excluded from this specific work of the Holy Ghost. But Christ having redeemed him from the curse of the law, being made a curse for him, the promise of the Spirit, through faith, now comes upon him, whose office it is to create him anew in Christ Jesus.

The atonement then is to be viewed in a twofold light; first, as the means by which God is reconciled to man, and secondly, as the ground of the sinner's restoration to the image of God. Using the phrases now in vogue, redemption is objective as well as subjective. Objectively, it is an expression of God's abhorrence of sin, and of his determination to maintain inviolable his law, and to uphold his moral government, That sin is offensive to God is most emphatically proclaimed by the death of Christ; while the same death solemnly as well as practically asserts that every infraction of God's law will be visited by condign punishment, in order that his moral government may be respected throughout his vast dominions, and may secure the great ends for which it is administered. Subjectively, in reference to man, redemption is the death of sin and the life of God in his heart. By it he is transformed into the image of God, and assimilated into the divine nature; so that he can say: "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God; and we walk in the light as he is in the light, and we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

'This is a glorious state, but we should not lose sight of the fact, that it was the death of Christ that reconciled God to man, and thereby made this state attainable to us. We should be careful not to give so undue a prominence to one of the sides of redemption, as to overlook its other, and equally important one; and this is what, we conceive, has been done by the great and the good Samuel Taylor Coleridge.

ART. II.**Z E C H A R I A H.**

By **Rev. T. V. MOORE, D. D.,** Richmond, Va.

(CONTINUED FROM P. 321.)

We have in previous articles considered the symbolical and didactic division of the prophecy of Zechariah, and we now take up the third or prophetic portion, so called because of the more exclusively future reference of its contents. It is unnecessary to discuss the question of its authorship, which like every possible, if not impossible question, has been raised by German critics. All external evidence is in its favor, and aside from matters of style that are sufficiently explained by the difference of subject, the only argument that is urged, and the only one that is obviously felt is, that it predicts events later than the time of Zechariah, and hence could not have been written by him! If it is admitted that he wrote it, it must be admitted that there is such a thing as divinely inspired writing, and the only escape from this conclusion is to deny that he wrote it, and to support this denial by precisely such arguments as would prove that the author of the *Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful* could not be the author of the *Reflections on the French Revolution*! Such posi-

tions carry with them, to every well ordered mind, their own refutation.

The prophecies of this portion of the book have a very wide range, extending from events shortly after the time of Zechariah to the coming of Messiah, and thence to the yet unknown future. The ninth chapter contains three distinct prophecies. (1.) The conquests of Alexander in Syria and Palestine, v. 1-8; (2.) The lowly King Messiah, v. 9-12; (3.) The Maccabean deliverance, v. 13—end.

The Syrian Conquests of Alexander.

CH. 9 : 1-8.

1. " A burden—the word of Jehovah on the land of Hadrach,
And Damascus shall be its rest,
For to Jehovah is the eye of man,
And all the tribes of Israel.
2. Also Hamath shall border on it,
Tyre and Sidon because it is very wise.
3. And Tyre has built for herself a strong hold,
And has heaped up silver as dust,
And gold as the mire of the streets.
4. Behold the Lord will dispossess her,
And will cast into the sea her bulwark,
And she shall be consumed with fire.
5. Ashkelon shall see it and fear,
Gaza (*shall see it*) and tremble greatly,
And Ekron, for her reliance is disgraced,
And a King shall perish from Gaza,
And Ashkelon shall not be inhabited.
6. An alien shall dwell in Ashdod,
And I will destroy the pride of the Philistines.
7. And I will remove his blood from his mouth,
And his abominations from between his teeth,
And he that remains, even he, shall be for our God,
And he shall be as a prince in Judah,
And Ekron as the Jebusite.
8. And I will encamp around my house because of the army,
Because of the passer by, and because of the returner,
And the exactor shall no more pass through them,
For now I see with mine eyes."

V. 1. This prophecy most obviously predicts the conquests of Alexander the Great in the countries that bordered the Holy Land. Its introduction here is appropriate, because it refers to a state of facts that would affect the Theocracy, and would also at the same time affect the enemies of Israel.

The word "burden" seems to be a sort of title or motto to the prophecy to indicate its minatory character. It is never prefixed to prophecies of any other character, and seems to be an appropriate inscription to such predictions, that hang in the Bible, like dark clouds, surcharged with a burden of wrath. The metaphor is so natural and common, that it is wonderful that any attempt should be made to deny the obvious significance of this word as marking those utterances of prophetic inspiration that contain heavy tidings.

The precise country referred to under the name of Hadrach, is not very clear. It is generally applied to a city and country near Damascus, of which however we know so little that their very existence is denied. Hence it is regarded by others as a symbolical name, (the strong—weak,) and referred to Persia. Which of these interpretations is correct, cannot, perhaps, in the present state of our geographical knowledge, be determined, and on either supposition, the general meaning of the prophecy is the same.

"And Damascus shall be its rest." This is a parallel passage to ch. 6 : 8, where it is said that the anger of the Lord shall rest on the north country. The meaning is that a permanent judgment shall rest on Damascus, implying that this judgment should not be of a wholly destructive character, and hence Damascus remains until the present day.

The next clause assigns the reason for these judgments, and hence begins with the particle "for." The common interpretation of the phrase, "to Jehovah is the eye of man," makes it an expression of the providence of God, but if "eye" retains its ordinary signification, it should be in construction with Jehovah and not with man, to express the fact that the oversight of Jehovah was directed to man. Hence "eye" is here taken in the sense of superintendence. But

still there seems to be a want of naturalness in the phrase, that may be obviated by giving it the sense of *adspetus*, a sense that it has in several passages. (See Num. 11 : 7 ; Ez. 1 : 4 ; Dan. 10 : 6, &c.) The meaning then would be that the relative aspects of the world and the people of Israel had come up before God, he had seen their situation, and hence would bring judgments upon the one whilst he protected the other. The general idea is clear, that these judgments are brought upon the lands in question because the attention of God was directed to them, as well as to the tribes of Israel, and would equalise any apparent anomalies in their relative conditions.

V. 2. Hamath, which lay at the entrance to Palestine from Damascus, should not only border on Damascus in territory, but also in treatment, and should lie in the track of the conquering invader. Pursuing his southern course he should reach Tyre and Sidon, whose conceit of wisdom and godless pride must be punished.

Tyre and Sidon were two of the oldest and richest cities in the world, the one famed for its arts and manufactures, especially in glass and pottery, the other for its commerce. The fine harbor of Tyre had made her the depot for the rich stream of Asiatic trade whose current has always enriched the channels through which it flowed, and her merchant princes were among the rulers of the world. Having almost a monopoly of the carrying trade of the Mediterranean, her wealth became enormous, and her inhabitants lived in a style of luxury that has but few parallels in history. Like Venice in modern times, she became arrogant and contemptuous in her feelings toward other nations, and especially towards the Hebrews, because of their comparative poverty. Hence that offensive pride alluded to in this verse.

V. 3. Old Tyre had been built on the continent, but owing to its greater exposure to invasion, another city was erected on an island about half a mile from the shore. The prophecies of Isaiah and Ezekiel seem to have been directed against Old Tyre, and were fulfilled to the letter by Nebuchadnezzar,

who razed the city to its very foundations and left it a heap of ruins. After the overthrow of Old Tyre, the Tyrians concentrated their strength on the island, surrounded it with a double wall 150 feet high, filled in with 25 feet of earth, which together with the surrounding sea, made the city apparently impregnable. This is the "strong hold" mentioned by the prophet, and her flourishing commerce had at this time made silver and gold to be heaped up in her coffers like the dust of the streets. For the prophet to predict her overthrow, would be like a modern seer to predict the razing of Gibraltar or the sacking of London. Yet it was precisely then that he declared that this proud queen of the waters should be overthrown.

V. 4. It is here predicted that the Lord would dispossess her from her strong seat, cast her girdling bulwark into the sea, and that she should be consumed with fire. Two hundred years passed away, and still Tyre sat in her queenly pride on the throne of the seas, and no power on earth seemed likely to attempt the fulfilment of this prophecy. At length there appeared on the shore an army of Greeks, who demanded the surrender of the city. But they were without a navy, and without any means even of reaching these mighty walls, or arresting for a moment the commerce that thronged her ports, and we cannot wonder that the Tyrians derided the presumption of the young chieftain. But her hour was come. Alexander after various expedients, finally resolved to take the ruins of Old Tyre, and run a mole from the shore to the island, which after incredible labor he did, thus fulfilling another prophecy, that the very dust of Old Tyre should be scraped off, and her stones, timber and dust be laid in the midst of the water! See Ezek. 26 : 4, 12, &c. Having completed this mole, he took the city after a siege of seven months, put to the sword about 10,000, enslaved 30,000, and burnt the city with fire, thus, against the most stupendous improbabilities, fulfilling this remarkable prophecy to the very letter.

V. 5, 6. These verses describe the conquering march of

Alexander along the shore, and depict the terror that the Philistian cities felt when they heard that even Tyre (which is called the reliance of Ekron) had been overthrown. This we know from history to have been the precise track of Alexander, and so completely have these prophecies been fulfilled, that the traveller can hardly discover the sites of some of these once proud and powerful cities. The perishing of a king from Gaza, is the destruction of her form of government and her subjugation; the dwelling of an alien in Ashdod is the banishment of the native population; and the destruction of the pride of the Philistines is the overthrow of those external means of attack and defence in which they placed their pride.

V. 7. The removal of his blood from his mouth, would seem by the parallel phrase to refer to the overthrow of idolatrous practices, one of which was the drinking of sacrificial blood.

In the clause, "and he that remains, even he, shall be for our God," it is intimated that this ruin shall not be total, but that some would remain, who should afterwards be converted to God. This conversion is illustrated by comparing those alluded to among the Philistines to the Jebusites, who were incorporated into the Theocracy, after their subjugation by David. "Ekron as the Jebusite" is there explanatory of the same conversion that is expressed in the parallel clause, "he shall be a prince in Judah." This prediction received its fulfilment in the time of Christ, when a great multitude from Tyre and Sidon came to him, (Luke 6 : 17,) and when churches were planted along these coasts that Paul visited, and from which in the Dioclesian persecution there went up a great cloud of witnesses.

V. 8. The question would naturally arise here to the Jew, will not this temple which we are now building be in danger when such a conqueror is ravaging Palestine? Is he not likely to attack Jerusalem, and undo all this work of our hands? The prophet assures them that the temple is safe, because God will encamp around it because of this invading

army. And it is a remarkable fact, that when Alexander was advancing upon Jerusalem with great fury, he was arrested by a dream, and induced not only to spare it, but also to confer upon it great privileges. Hence in this narrowest sense the prediction has been completely verified.

But as the temple was only a symbol of the Church, the promise must have its widest fulfilment only in the glorious antitype, that church that is kept as the apple of God's eye, and against which the gates of hell shall never prevail.

There is something of very solemn instruction in this prophecy. Never has sin more proudly entrenched herself than in godless, but magnificent Tyre. Never has every element of earthly prosperity seemed more completely under control than in her case. And yet they were all swept like chaff before the whirlwind of the wrath of God, when the time for the fulfilment of his threatenings had come. Hence though nations now trample on law and right, and seem long to flourish in their sin, let not the child of God be impatient. Let him remember that two hundred years passed away after the utterance of these threatenings against Tyre, and she seemed stronger than ever, and yet when the day of doom had dawned, the galleys that left her on their stated voyages, the peerless queen of the seas, when they returned, found her but a bare and blackened rock, a lonely monument of the truth, that our God is a consuming fire. If then God thus executes his threats even on a mighty commonwealth, in spite of his delay, let not the fact that judgment against an evil work is not executed speedily cause the hearts of the sons of men to be fully set in them to do evil. Let men remember that it is a falsehood to violate a threatening as much as to violate a promise, and that God will not make himself a liar to save man in his sins.

The lowly King Messiah.

CH. 9 : 9, 10.

9. " Rejoice greatly, daughter of Zion,
Shout for joy, daughter of Jerusalem,

- Behold! thy King cometh unto thee,
 Just, and endowed with salvation, is he,
 Lowly and riding upon an ass,
 And upon a foal, the son of she-asses.
10. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim,
 And the horse from Jerusalem,
 And the bow of war shall be cut off,
 And he shall speak peace to the nations,
 And his dominion (*be*) from sea to sea,
 And from the river to the ends of the earth."

That this passage applies to Christ is beyond all refutation. It was exactly fulfilled in his history, when he made his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, and is referred to him expressly by the Evangelist. See Matt. 21 : 4, 5. It contains expressions from older Messianic prophecies, the reference of which is generally admitted: it was always so understood in the Jewish church, until Christians used it as an argument in favor of Christ: and, finally, it can be consistently applied to none other. Hence we are justified in taking it as a jubilate, addressed to the church in view of her king, who is described as (1) just, (2) endowed with salvation, (3) lowly, (4) externally poor, "riding on an ass;" and whose kingdom (v. 10) is declared as to its character to be, peaceful, (v. 10,) and as to its extent, universal.

V. 9. The Theocracy, or church, is called to rejoice because of the coming of her king. The kingly office of the Messiah, which was conferred upon him for the accomplishment of the work of redemption, is often alluded to as ground for rejoicing. See Ps. 2, &c. The ground of this rejoicing is expressed in the words succeeding, to be the character of the king and the nature and extent of his kingdom.

(1) He is "just." The righteousness here referred to is not his priestly but his kingly righteousness, that rigorous justice of his reign in virtue of which no good should be unrewarded and no evil unpunished. In the unequal allotments of the present, when the good so often suffer and the bad so often escape, it is surely ground for rejoicing that the king

under whose rule this dispensation is placed is just, and will render to every man according to his work.

(2) He is "endowed with salvation." The word *nosha* is a difficult one here, and has received a great deal of attention from interpreters. Being in the niphal or passive conjugation, it would literally be "saved," "protected" or "delivered." This would give a good sense, but rather a tame one, compared with the other characteristics named in the prophecy. Hence it is usually taken in a secondary sense, as expressing not simply the reception of a salvation, but its possession as a gift that was capable of being bestowed upon others. The same word occurs in this sense elsewhere, as Deut. 33 : 19, Ps. 33 : 16, &c. The meaning then would be that God was with him, in spite of all his lowliness, sustaining him in the mighty work he had undertaken, and that this protection was bestowed upon him not as individual but as a king, a representative of his people, so that he would not only enjoy it himself, but possess the power of bestowing it upon others. Hence while his inflexible justice might make us tremble in our sin, the fact that he was also endowed with a free salvation, and a salvation which he could bestow as a kingly right, would remove these fears and enable us to rejoice in this coming king.

(3) He was to be "lowly." This word *ane* is sometimes rendered meek, because of the Greek word used in the quotation of this passage in Matt. 21 : 5, which has this meaning. But as the word *ane* always refers to lowliness of outward circumstances, and *anav* to lowliness of disposition, Hengstenburg and others allege that the evangelist did not mean to endorse the absolute accuracy of the Septuagint translation of the word, but simply to quote it as a well known version. If the usual sense of the word be given, the church would be summoned to rejoice because of the humiliation of her king. And however incongruous such a ground of rejoicing may seem to be to men generally, the heart that is crushed with penitence or grief will comprehend the reason of this

summons. Had this august king been as sorrowless as he was sinless, had he been a robed seraph or a crowned monarch, the poor and suffering could never have approached him with confidence, for he could not have sympathized with them in their sorrows. But when he comes to us as one who can be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, we welcome him with joy, and understand why we are called to rejoice, because he comes to us as the lowly king. It is marvellous that expositors should have found so much difficulty here, when the reason of this call to rejoice might have been found in the yearnings of their own hearts for the sympathy of one who has himself tasted sorrow. Surely a suffering child of God can understand how blessed a thing it is to have a Saviour king who has known himself what it is to suffer.

(4) He was to be externally in poverty, "riding upon an ass, and upon a foal, the son of she-asses." This is a prediction of poverty, for although in earlier times kings rode on asses, after the time of Solomon, they were never so used, horses having taken their place. The employment of the horse in war also made the use of the ass an indication of peace as well as of poverty. The two members of the sentence are in the form of a climax, the use of an untrained colt being less honorable than that of a full grown animal. The plural "she-asses," is merely the indefinite plural, as in Gen. 21 : 7, where sons is evidently used for the indefinite son, since Sarah had but a single son. The exact fulfilment of this prophecy in the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem was merely a specific illustration of the general prediction, not the entire object of the prediction itself. Its range was much broader than this single event, and indeed would have been substantially fulfilled had this event never occurred. The specific fulfilment however rivets the prophecy more absolutely to Christ.

V. 10 describes the peaceful character of the Messiah's kingdom in metaphorical terms, such as are used elsewhere for the same purpose. The chariot and horse are of course

those used in war, and their removal is equivalent to the cessation of warfare.

The extent of this kingdom is indicated *first* by the fact that he would "speak peace to the nations," (*goyim*, Gentiles,) and hence would rule beyond the limits of Israel; and *secondly*, by the phrase from "sea to sea," &c., which, by comparison with Ps. 72, and other passages, will be found to express absolute universality, being equivalent to the known world. The Euphrates and the Mediterranean were the geographical limits of the earth as known to the Hebrews, and by introducing one into the first member of the parallelism, and the other into the second, the universality of the Messiah's kingdom was emphatically declared.

That the tendencies of Christ's kingdom are to universal peace and universal piety, we need not pause to argue, and that these tendencies shall yet be fully embodied, we believe as well from the voice of history as from the word of prophecy. We have only to patiently labor, and patiently wait, and the white banner of the lowly king shall in due time be unfurled from every mountain top, and over every valley, and men be brother-murderers and brother-haters no more.

This beautiful prediction of the Messiah is a sort of episode, where the longings of prophecy for this mighty future seemed to burst forth, as if irrepressible. These involuntary gushings up of the prophetic hopes are exceedingly touching and beautiful. The prophet then returns to a nearer future in the succeeding verses.

The Maccabean Deliverance.

CH. 9 : 11-17.

11. "Also thou—in the blood of thy covenant
I have sent forth thy prisoners,
From the pit, and there is no water in it.
12. Return to the strong hold, O prisoners of hope!
Even to-day (*am I*) declaring, I will render double to you.
13. For I have bent to me Judah,
The bow have I filled with Ephraim,

- And I have raised up thy sons, O Zion !
 Against thy sons, O Javan !
 And have made thee as the sword of a mighty man.
14. And over them Jehovah will appear,
 And his arrow goes forth like lightning,
 And the Lord Jehovah shall blow the trumpet,
 And he goes forth in the storms of the south.
15. Jehovah of hosts will protect them,
 And they eat, and they trample under foot the sling-stones,
 And they drink, and make a noise as from wine,
 And they are full as the altar-bowls,
 And as the corners of the altar.
16. And Jehovah their God will save them in that day,
 As a flock (*will he save*) his people,
 For as gems of a diadem are they lifted up in his land.
17. For how great is his goodness !
 And how great his beauty !
 Corn makes the young men to grow,
 And new wine the maidens."

The key to this passage lies in v. 13, where a revolt of the chosen people against the sons of Javan, (Ionia or Greece), is predicted. There was no such collision between the Jews and the Greeks, except under the successors of Alexander. Hence the prophecy must refer to the times of the Maccabees. It was natural that, after predicting the conquests of Alexander, some allusion should be made to the important events succeeding.

V. 11. "Also, thou"—. The prophet here turns to the Theocracy to assure them that, in view of the covenant relation, they should be delivered during the troublous times that must precede the coming of the lowly king. "In the blood of thy covenant," means on account of the covenant sealed with blood, referring to the Sinaitic covenant, which guaranteed protection to the chosen people while in the path of duty. The imprisonment in a pit where there was no water, is a metaphor drawn from the deep wells often found in dungeons, into which they lowered prisoners in special cases, and is a figurative representation of the distress that would be occasioned by the successors of Alexander. How great this

distress was may be learned from history. Palestine was the battle-ground of contending rivals for empire, and suffered the usual calamities of such a position. But these sufferings reached their height under the ravages of the cruel Antiochus, who rifled and polluted the temple, murdered and enslaved thousands of the people, and attempted to overturn the religion of Jehovah, and establish the worship of Jupiter. His enormities were so great that the image of the prophet was by no means exaggerated. But these very severities were doubtless the means of preventing a national apostacy. The mild rule of the Ptolemies might soon have seduced the Jews from their allegiance, but the terrible persecutions of Antiochus only made them cling more obstinately to the faith of their fathers.

V. 12. The image of the dungeon in v. 11, suggests that of the strong hold, which is simply a metaphor for divine deliverance. God calls the people to return to him, and he will protect them. The phrase "prisoners of hope," means prisoners who have hope—a hope resting on the covenant. He then assures them that great as was their affliction, their prosperity should be doubly greater.

The next two verses are addressed to the Greeks, and declare, by two images, the deliverance that God would work. When it is remembered that at this time the Greeks were an obscure people, scarcely known beyond their own borders, this prophecy becomes one of the most remarkable in the Scriptures.

V. 13. God appears here as a warrior, taking Judah for his bow, and Ephraim for his arrow, and bending the weapon against the enemies of Zion.

Then addressing Zion and Javan alternately he declares that he will make Zion like the sword of a mighty man, i. e. irresistible and invincible.

V. 14 changes the image to that of a tempest, the arrowy flashes of whose lightning and the trumpet-peals of whose thunder, make it an army of resistless power. Storms

of the south are violent storms, because such was their usual character.

V. 15 turns again to the covenant people, and describes them under the image of a lion, who devours his enemy and then treads him under foot. These enemies are represented under the image of sling-stones, to show their feebleness; for only small stones were suitable for a sling; stones which, when on the ground, were perfectly harmless. This lion was intoxicated with blood as with wine, filled with it like the bowls of the altar, and sprinkled with it, like the corners of the altar. These images of sanguinary conquest are very powerful.

V. 16 contains yet other images of prosperity. God would not only give victory but afterwards peace, and hence the warrior and the lion are now exchanged for the shepherd and the flock, and the spent and worthless stones of the sling scornfully trampled under the feet, are contrasted with the brilliant and costly gems of the diadem that are honorably placed upon the head.

V. 17 is an exulting exclamation in view of the goodness and loveliness of God's character, and the blessings he would then grant to the Theocracy. Corn and wine indicated peace and prosperity that permitted the performance of agricultural labor, whilst the increase of young men and maidens indicated the peaceful increase of population, and showed that children were not cut off, as they commonly are, in a state of war or trouble.

These images of prosperity predict the deliverance that should take place under the Maccabees, which we know to have been one of the most wonderful in history. The tyranny of Antiochus aroused this brave family, whose victories over the repeated armies sent to subdue them, have no parallel but in the rapid conquests of Alexander or Napoleon. Having retaken Jerusalem, the temple was restored and the feast of the Purification instituted, which connects itself with the history of our Lord. The Maccabean rule was one of such prosper-

ity as to fulfil the terms of this prophecy, and designate its era as one of the bright pages in the Hebrew annals.

The spiritual interpretations that are often given of this passage, are not wholly accommodations of its terms. All the facts of the Jewish history are looked at in their relation to the Messianic blessings, and have their value mainly in this connection, and hence as objects seen in the same plane and parallel, their outlines and lights are often blended. We, too, are often in a horrible pit and miry clay. We, too, are prisoners of hope, who are to go forth by the blood of the everlasting covenant; and we, too, have an enemy more terrible by far than the gigantic Epiphanes, and are menaced with a storm of ruin more fearful than that which swept over widowed Judea. Hence the call to turn and flee to the strong hold, is one that may still be sounded to man, and the promised blessings of this passage shall but prefigure those greater blessings that shall be bestowed upon those who are the flock of the good shepherd, and who are among the jewels that glitter in his diadem of many crowns.

Future Blessings to Judah.

CH. 10: 1-5.

1. "Ask of Jehovah rain,
In the time of the latter rain;
Jehovah shall (*then*) cause lightnings,
And shall give abundant rain,
To every man grass in his field.
2. For the teraphim speak nothingness;
And the soothsayers see falsehood;
And the dreams speak vanity;
They comfort falsely;
Wherefore they wander as a flock,
They are troubled because there is no shepherd.
3. Against the shepherds my anger is kindled,
And the he-goats will I punish,
For Jehovah of Hosts visits his flock, the house of Judah,
And makes them like a caparisoned horse in war,
4. From him (*is*) the corner stone, and from him the pin,

From him the bow of battle,
From him comes forth every ruler together.

5. And they shall be as heroes,
Trampling on the mire of the streets in war,
And they fight, for Jehovah is with them,
And the riders on horses are put to shame."

V. 1. We have here indicated the connection between prayer and promise on the one hand, and prayer and the processes of nature on the other. The blessing of rain, which, to an agricultural people, was inclusive of all other temporal blessings, and symbolical of all spiritual ones, was promised; but this promise was dependent on its supplication in prayer. Just as in the great blessing of the descent of the spirit on an individual or a Church, though a free gift, it must be obtained by prayer. It is this fact that makes the spirit of prayer in the Church an index at once of its piety, and of the spiritual blessings it may expect from God. When the Church pours out a fulness of prayer, God will pour out a fulness of his spirit. The inspired writers see no difficulty in the connection between prayer and the processes of nature, such as the mole-eyed philosophy of modern times discovers. They think that the God who has created the elements, may direct them according to his will. "The latter rain" was that which fell in March, to ripen the harvest, whose seed had been watered by the former rain in October. We must not suppose that because God has begun to bless us, we may relax our prayers and efforts. The former rain may be given, but we must also ask for the latter rain. We may have the former rain of conversion, but if we would have the latter rain of ripened sanctification of nature, we must continue to ask of God. So, also, in the revival of religion. The former rain may occur, and souls be converted, but if we would have the ripening of the seed in active Christians, we must ask of God, and he will give growth, greenness and maturity.

V. 2 gives the reason for that suffering of the Jews that made God's interposition necessary. They had forsaken God for other sources of light, and hence soon found themselves

in darkness and emptiness. It is a mournful proof of man's depravity that he will believe any one sooner than God, and seek comfort any where rather than from heaven. But when men resort to their earthly teraphim, they find at last that they have been deceived, and are left in loneliness and sorrow. So it was with the Jews. They wandered like silly sheep, and soon found themselves among the wild mountains and the howling beasts of prey.

V. 3. The people had shepherds, but they were false ones, and they are here threatened. "The he-goats" are the leaders of the people, an image taken from the flock which the he-goats usually head, as they move from place to place. They who are first in crime, will be first in punishment. But God will visit his flock in mercy, and make each one, instead of a timid sheep, to be a war-horse, decked for the battle.

V. 4 predicts that the rulers of the country shall then come forth from the people themselves, and not from foreigners. These are called corner stones and pins, which were used to suspend things upon, because such men were the support of the State, on which everything was sustained or suspended. So, from themselves should come forth military deliverers, symbolised by the "battle-bow." All this was literally fulfilled in the times of the Maccabees, but receives its highest fulfilment in the self-sustaining energy and resources of the kingdom of Messiah.

V. 5 predicts the conquests of the chosen people, that they will trample down their enemies as mire in the streets, and overcome cavalry, so formidable usually to the infantry of the Jews. The cavalry of Antiochus was thus trampled down by the resistless ranks of the Maccabean armies. But, as in previous cases, for reasons already given, these temporal blessings of the Theocracy but symbolise the higher blessings of the Church, whose triumphs are bloodless and tearless, and whose strength is that of the spirit, mighty to the pulling down of strong holds, and the subduing of principalities and powers.

The Restoration of the Jews.

CH. 10 : 6-12.

6. " And I will strengthen the house of Judah,
And I will save the house of Joseph,
And I will again cause them to dwell,
For I have compassion upon them ;
And they shall be as though I had not cast them out,
For I am Jehovah their God, and I will hear them.
7. And Ephraim shall be as a mighty man,
Their heart shall rejoice as (*with*) wine,
And their sons shall see and rejoice,
Their heart shall rejoice in Jehovah.
8. I will hiss to them and collect them,
For I have redeemed them,
And they shall be many as they were before.
9. And I will sow them among the peoples,
And in distant lands they shall remember me,
And with their children they shall live and return.
10. And I will bring them back from the land of Egypt,
And from Assyria will I gather them,
And to the land of Gilead and Lebanon will I bring them,
And there shall not be room to contain them.
11. And he passes through the sea, the affliction,
And he smites in the sea the waves,
And all the deeps of the river are put to shame,
And the pride of Assyria is overthrown,
And the rod of Egypt shall give way.
12. And I will strengthen them in Jehovah,
And in his name shall they walk,
Saith Jehovah."

The prophets do not observe an exact chronological order in their prophecies, but often group together the nearer and more remote. Like a painter who in depicting a landscape will put on the same canvass the hillock at his feet and the mountain that lies leagues away, so they often place the remotest objects in immediate proximity to the nearest in sketching their wondrous pictures. This arises partly from the nature of the prophetic vision that saw future events as if were in the same plane ; partly from the fact that the great-

er future was connected with the lesser present by some bond of relation, causal or otherwise, and hence ought to be considered in connection with it; and partly, from the fact that we naturally rise to the great future, even though but imperfectly connected with the present, when we would draw encouragement to bear existing toils and trials. Thus it is with the minister of the gospel now, who continually breaks away from the narrow present to the more glorious future, either on earth or in Heaven, and thus naturally would it be with the prophets of the Old Testament. Hence we need not be surprised to find a mingling of events in the same prophecy that are very remote in their chronological relations. Such is the case in the present instance, where the restoration of the Jews, an event still future, is connected with the Maccabean deliverance, an event long since past. Like the near planet and the remote fixed star, though widely different and widely apart, they are seen as if side by side in the prophetic firmament.

V. 6 declares the permanent establishment of the two tribes, and the reason of it found in their covenant relation to God, and his compassion on them.

V. 7 extends the same blessing to Ephraim, the most prominent of the ten tribes, most of whom had not yet returned from captivity and hence needed encouragement.

V. 8 begins to widen the view to include the great restoration. "I will hiss to them," is an image taken from the management of bees, where the apiarist hisses or whistles to collect the swam. It is designed to express the ease with which a work, seemingly so difficult, could be accomplished. God has only to hiss and these scattered exiles will be brought back. The word "redeemed" and the context show that this restoration is connected with their conversion to God.

V. 9 shows that the dispersion alluded to was with a special design. They were "sown," and like seed long buried in the dust, they are awaiting the time of germination. It may also indicate the future use of the Jews, when this germ of vitality shall be awakened, in extending the knowledge of the

true God as missionaries. The slight hold that they have on every soil where they now live, the commercial, and hence cosmopolitan character of their pursuits, making a change of residence so easy to them, fit them peculiarly for missionary work. If converted generally they would be a seed of great power in almost every nation of the world. The mention of their children indicates the completeness and permanence of this restoration.

V. 10 proves that this dispersion alluded to here is not the Babylonish captivity, but a later and wider one. Egypt and Assyria are taken as types of all the lands of their dispersion, the one being the first great oppressor of the chosen people and the other among the last, and the one lying on the north whilst the other lay on the south. Hence they are here taken merely as types of the universal dispersion, just as Shinar in ch. 5 : 11. So in the next clause, Gilead beyond Jordan, and Lebanon on the hither side, represent the entire land of promise.

V. 11 keeping up the allusions of v. 10, employs the passage of the Red Sea as an image of the future deliverances of the great restoration. "He" probably refers to God, and "affliction" is in apposition with "sea," showing that it is to be taken metaphorically and not literally. Smiting the waves in the sea, is stilling them, putting down all opposition. "The river" is either the Nile or the Tigris, if the latter, its peculiar importance as a means of defence to Nineveh may be alluded to. "The rod of Egypt shall give way" is of course a metaphorical statement of the fact that the power of all enemies to restrain and oppress the chosen people would be forced to relax. The general meaning of the verse is that all future obstacles would be as powerless to arrest this return as the Red Sea and Jordan were to prevent that of their fathers.

V. 12 predicts their conversion. Here again we find one Jehovah speaking of another, and predicting the fact that in the name they now despise and hate, they shall walk, and shall bear that name with joy. They shall call themselves Christians.

It becomes Christians to pray for the Jews, as they are commanded to ask for rain in the time of the latter rain. It is a remarkable fact recently stated, that the latter rain, that had been withheld since the downfall of Jerusalem, has been given within the last year for the first time. If this be so, it becomes Christians to pray earnestly that the latter rain of the Spirit may now be given, in order that these glorious times may be hastened. The dispersion of the Jews for nearly two thousand years for rejecting Christ, shows that it is a crime of no ordinary magnitude to do so, and furnishes a solemn warning to the unbeliever, for if these things are done in a green tree what shall be done in a dry?

ART. III.

THE ASCETICAL DEVOTIONS OF PASCAL'S LATE YEARS.

A Monograph, by Geo. Frederick Holmes, Esq.

When we reflect upon the vast proportions, the sagacious comprehension, and the wonderful depth of the unrivalled mind of Pascal, and also consider his moral susceptibility and the intimate sympathies which he must have extended to his Port Royal friends, we ought not to be surprised that, in the conflict of his feelings, that great man should have withdrawn himself, in the later years of his life, entirely from secular studies, and from those scientific and literary pursuits by which his fame had been acquired; and should have devoted himself almost exclusively to devotional meditation. We do not think it requires the utmost stretch of philosophy to arrive at the conclusion, not merely that fame is an empty and most unsatisfactory bubble, but that even scientific profundity, literary erudition, and philosophical compass of thought are very

trivial attainments, calculated to produce only a transient self-delusion and to pamper the vanity of human self-conceit, without aiding materially in the discharge of the ordinary duties, or in the gratification of the legitimate pleasures of life; and without removing the philosopher, or the man of science or learning, a single hair's-breadth in any important particular from his less cultivated fellow-mortals.

All the discoveries of science and all the results of philosophy are involved undistinguishably in the inspirations and practical instincts of the boor. Learning and study can only develop them into form and educe order out of the chaos of unshaped thoughts. They may give them precision, an air of novelty, and an appearance of depth, which do not really appertain to them:—but this is all. The impulsive instincts of the unlettered and simple-minded rustic, whose heart is trained to the apprehension of right, to the practice of good, and the performance of duty, arrive spontaneously, and without any delusive, vain-glory at those practical conclusions, which, involved in vapors and technical conclusion, form the proudest triumphs of the inquiring sage. The acquisitions of learning are still more shadowy and deceptive: they are merely accumulations, valueless except in rare and judicious use, and scarcely capable of ministering effectually to any of those wants, which prey continuously upon the yearning aspirations of man's higher nature.

These are conclusions, to which a man of the loftiest order of intellect, like Pascal, must come at an early period of his reflections, and to which he must be the more certainly and expeditiously led, if extrinsic influences operate in the same direction. Is it strange, then, that when he has reached such results, when all his idols are shattered, and the temple of his youthful dreams so completely disenchanting, in the depth of his disgust, despondency and despair, he should throw himself exclusively into exercises of sentimental devotion, and recline in the lap of mystical enthusiasm, until even the native powers of his mind are somewhat unsettled, as was the case with Pascal? He soon discovered that the aliment

which fed the flame of intellectual brilliancy, furnished no wholesome nutriment to his soul. Is it, then surprising, that, with his tender susceptibilities, he should have fed the lamp of reverential feeling so assiduously and exclusively that the blaze of his intellectual fires burnt slow and dimly ?

The very fate of Pascal should, perhaps, teach us that, even in the avoidance of the delusive phantoms which betray the pride of human intellect, there is an extreme into which we are in danger of running ; and that, though we are not to degrade ourselves into the idolaters of science, of learning, or of philosophy, yet the preservation of the healthy equilibrium of our spiritual faculties, requires the regular exercise of the intellect, as well as of all the other powers of man. It may intimate also that the diligent, but not excessive, culture of the mind is a duty just as much as its exclusive development or extravagant admiration is a sin, and a most pernicious illusion. Thus, by the orderly performance of our intellectual as well as of our moral and other duties, a way is pointed out for us, under the wise provision of Providence, for the discovery, dissemination and perpetuation of those general truths of human knowledge, though partial and fragmentary expositions of genuine truth, which may minister to the happiness, the comfort, the service, and the convenience of man :—and, so obtained, also to the greater glory of God, according to Lord Bacon's noble aspiration.

The world would relapse into its former barbarism, or might never have escaped from it, if no inducement, no stimulus were presented for the extension, systematization, and preservation of our knowledge ; but it is only weak minds, or intellects of narrow view, which can be so deceived by the brilliancy of human learning, warped by the temptations of philosophy, or dazzled by the glories of science, as to pride themselves on their own intellectual wealth or capacity, or to suppose that hereby is any way opened for the large satisfaction of the loftier aspirations of the human soul. Let us add, that knowledge pursued under this due sense of its legitimate subordination to higher objects and of the limited range of

the satisfaction which it is competent to afford ; not prosecuted for itself alone, as its own exceeding great reward, nor yet for any material results, whether of profit or of fame, nor even for its direct pleasures, but for the healthy exercise of our faculties, and for the concomitant service of God and man, may supply a wholesome and tranquilizing recreation to the mind, give vigor, purpose, consistency, and direction to our moral and practical aims, and conspire with the other general agencies of heaven in elevating and purifying our own natures, and in working out, to a beneficial result, the great problem of human life, and the greater drama of human history. Otherwise pursued, however, it can only result in moral or intellectual paralysis. Of the latter tendency the latter years of the illustrious Pascal furnish a notable example ; while a still more lamentable confirmation of the former is afforded by the present intellectual anarchy and moral torpidity of the civilized world. Either extreme we should assiduously avoid ; we should endeavor to discharge the whole duty of man, and not merely any select portion to which we may be inclined. But if a choice is to be made between only the two alternatives, we would prefer the fate of Pascal.

ART. IV.

THE EVILS OF INFANT BAPTISM. By Robert Boyte C. Howell, D. D., Pastor of the Second Baptist Church, Richmond, Va. Charleston, S. C. : Southern Baptist Publication Society. 1851.

But for the apprehension that this book, whose very title strikes every pious and candid mind with astonishment, will produce real evil, we would not dignify it with a review, or notice its existence at all. We are most sincere in the opinion, that the treatise before us contains some of the most erroneous views of Infant Baptism, some of the most illogical arguments in support of those views, some of the most glaring

inconsistencies and contradictions in argumentation, some of the most dogmatic and arrogant assumptions of truth, some of the most palpable evidences of ignorance of ecclesiastical history, some of the most painful perversions of the views of paedobaptist authors, some of the most uncharitable reflections upon the piety and learning of the paedobaptist churches, some of the most insidious assaults upon the common cause of Christianity and the unity of the church, and (if its principles be legitimately applied) some of the most powerful arguments against the salvation of infants, we remember ever to have seen from the pen of any writer, Christian or infidel. The author seems to have collected and concentrated in one bold and headlong enterprise against Infant Baptism all that ignorance, enthusiasm, exclusiveness and infatuation could furnish him, and in the expression of his opposition, to have employed the strongest terms his knowledge of language could suggest; unconscious or careless, in the use of such terms, of the suspicions which he inferentially casts upon the sincerity and piety of those he is pleased to call "friends" and "brethren."

In many works written by the Baptists against Infant Baptism, an approximation of error has often been made so near to the truth, that strong plausibility at first sight captivated the mind of the incautious reader, and then was confounded with sound argument, just as opposite colors in a painting, fading slowly and gradually from the highest intensity in either extreme, shade insensibly into each other, till it is impossible for the unskilful eye to designate the nice point or line where they meet and mingle. But a conspicuous feature of the treatise before us is, that the author introduces his arguments with the statement of general principles or truths, universally admitted, and then he boldly strikes out his course from those truths, to which he never once returns, and continues his progress step by step endlessly in the same line of departure, just as a tangent, struck off from the curve, of

which it is no part, to which it can never return, and from which it departs interminably.

The title or proposition of the whole treatise, "the evils of infant baptism," under which the Doctor arranges twenty-one evils, is false in principle. He makes no distinction between the abuse of that which is in itself good and that which is in itself evil, but confounds the one with the other, and this is the ground of all the false conclusions contained in his book. That which is good in itself may be abused, and the abuse only is an evil, while the subject of abuse continues good in itself as though it had not been abused in a single instance, and had been a blessing only and always to mankind. Life is a good in itself, and yet it is abused lamentably and fatally in a thousand ways. Liberty is a good in itself, and yet it is abused; influence is a good in itself, and yet is often abused; knowledge is a good in itself, and yet it is oftener abused than improved; the grace of God is a great good in itself, and yet many receive it in vain; the Bible is a great good in itself, and yet many neglect it, and others "wrest it to their own destruction;" Christianity is a great good, and yet many pervert it to sectarian, political and worldly purposes; the sacraments of Christianity, the Lord's Supper and baptism, are great blessings when properly observed, and yet many desecrate them to the objects of selfishness and hypocrisy; in a word, every thing in the world, good in itself, in one form or other, has been abused by man. And so upon the mode of reasoning applied by Dr. Howell, we must conclude, that life, liberty, knowledge, influence, the grace of God, the Bible, Christianity, the sacraments, and all other things in the world, good in themselves, are evils, because they have been abused, or are liable to abuse. Indeed, God himself is the supreme, necessarily existing, and infinite good, and the source of all good in the universe and in eternity, and yet miserable angels and miserable men exist; so that if we adopt the Doctor's reasoning here, we "demonstrate" that the infinite God is an infinite evil; a conclusion sufficiently absurd to demonstrate

the supreme folly of his reasoning. It would be proper for the Doctor to prove that infant baptism is an evil in itself, and not an evil because of the abuses of which it has been made the occasion by corrupt men: by the latter process he can never prove it to be an evil in itself; the former he has not done. With this remark we introduce the subject of his book.

“Infant baptism is an evil. I hold myself bound to offer in this, and subsequent chapters, such proofs of its truth as shall be irrefutable. At present I shall show that infant baptism is an evil because it is unsupported by the Word of God,” (p. 1.) This is his first argument, and if he has established this his work is done, and well done, he need proceed no farther. But this he has not done, as we shall now see. As an “important preliminary to the argument,” he adverts to “the great Protestant principle: The Word of God is a perfect rule of faith and practice,” (p. 2.) This great principle we most cordially adopt. If infant baptism cannot bear the test of this principle, then we shall be compelled to renounce the doctrine. Here is the Doctor’s method: “If infant baptism is instituted by God, it must be plainly taught in his word. The passages therefore which contain the instructions can be produced. But no such passages have ever yet been found. They never can be found. They do not exist,” (p. 6.) He then concludes: “Then it is certain beyond question, that infant baptism, since it is not enjoined, nor taught, nor authorized in any way, is unsupported by the Word of God,” (p. 7.) But it has been proved, again and again, by paedobaptists, that it is positively enjoined, and authorized, in many ways, in the Word of God; and if it had not been so proved, a positive denial would be equivalent to the Doctor’s affirmation. And as the Doctor says, “here, since this conclusion is irrefutable, we might safely close the argument,” (p. 7,) we reply, as our denial of the truth of the conclusion is a sufficient answer, we might here fairly close the review. But mere affirmations or denials are not arguments, and they always leave the question in discussion unsettled.

In his second argument, he calls attention to "another fact," which he regards as "equally significant" with the preceding, namely: "that no two of the prevailing paedobaptist sects can agree as to their reasons for infant baptism, the class of infants to whom baptism is to be given, or the testimony upon which rests their authority for administering the ordinance to infants, (p. 7.) And what of that? some of them may be right, and others may be wrong, and he has not proved that all are wrong. Others may be right as far as they go, and yet may not go far enough; and he has not proved that these are wrong as far as they go. Others may have contributed something in support of infant baptism, and he has not proved that what these have contributed is exceptionable, either in a rational or scriptural sense. Apply his rule of logic, and he overturns his own Church, for it is divided into a multitude of conflicting sects: apply his rule, and the dogma of "close communion" is proved to be "unsupported by the Word of God," for he and his followers differ from the accomplished Robert Hall and his followers, in "the terms of communion," as may be plainly seen in his own treatise which he has written on this subject. But this is not all. The Doctor, as is usual with men of his school, shamefully misrepresents the paedobaptist authors whom he arrays against each other in support of his argument. "For illustration," says he, "Wall and others of that school, claim that Jewish proselyte baptism is the broad and ample foundation upon which it [infant baptism] rests," (p. 7.) They claim no such thing. Wall says, "Now this [proselyte baptism] gives great light for the better understanding of the meaning of our Saviour, when he bids his apostles 'Go and disciple all nations, and baptize them,'" (Hist. Inf. Bap., vol. 1, p. 21.) Again: "The baptism, indeed, of the nations by the apostles ought to be regulated by the practice of John and of Christ himself, (who by the hands of his disciples baptized many Jews,) rather than by any preceding custom of the Jewish nation, if we had any good ground to believe that they did in the case of infants differ or alter anything from the usual way, (Ibid, p. 27.)

Wall, then, presents the great commission, and the practice of the apostles, as the true ground of infant baptism. Indeed, he positively affirms that the New Testament furnishes authority for infant baptism. In his reply to Gale, he says: "Of his untruths, I would beforehand instance in one flagrant and manifest one, (which, as I shall show, he has affirmed above twenty times over,) his saying, I have in my book yielded and owned, that there is no Scripture proof for infant baptism; though near half his book is spent in refuting (as well as he can) those proofs which I brought from scripture," (Ibid., vol. 4, p. 66.) And he observes, "I did bring many proofs from God's Word, which stand as so many evidences of the falsehood of this foul charge against me. I will refer to the places." And he mentions Mat. 28 : 19; John 3 : 3, 5; Col. 2 : 11, 12; Mark 10 : 13, &c.; 1 Cor. 7 : 14. And he continues: "I had also, long before Mr. Gale wrote, published a little treatise on the question of infant baptism, wherein I insist chiefly and almost only on Scripture proof," (Ibid., vol. 4, pp. 177, 178, 179. It is questionable whether Doctor Howell has ever read Wall's great work, "The History of Infant Baptism," and if he has, it is unquestionable, that he did not do it with candor. In like manner, he misrepresents "Wesley and his disciples." "Wesley and his disciples insist that children are unholy, and must be baptized to cleanse them from their defilements," (p. 7.) And do not Doctor Howell and his brethren believe that children are unholy? So far they agree with "Wesley and his disciples." But Mr. Wesley and his disciples insist that baptism, in the case of children, is typical of cleansing from their defilements, and positively deny that baptism is regeneration, either in the case of infants or adults; and so far the Baptists agree with them. Now, if these opinions of Mr. "Wesley and his disciples" are not "supported by the Word of God," then the opinion of the Baptists, including Doctor Howell himself, are not supported by the Word of God. But this is not all. Mr. Wesley has written an able treatise on baptism, in which he mentions many passages of Scripture in support of

infant baptism. Nor is this all, even granting—which we do not—that Mr. Wesley did believe in infant baptismal regeneration, “his disciples,” as the Doctor is pleased to call the Methodists, do not, in England or America, believe in that baptismal dogma, as the Doctor himself must know, and so is reprehensible for the groundless charge above, or being ignorant of their true opinions of infant baptism, he is guilty of that degree of presumption which ignorance and dogmatism alone can originate and foster. And so he misrepresents other evangelical divines. For instance, says he, “Burder, Dwight, and their class, permit no other infants to be baptized, those of Christian parents,” (p. 7.) Granted; but then they permitted these to be baptized because they believed infant baptism to be scriptural, as their works abundantly show. He continues: “Baxter, Henry, and those of similar faith, baptize infants to bring them into the Covenant and Church of the Redeemer,” (p. 7.) Granted—but then in a sacramental sense; and so the Doctor baptizes adult believers; and both have scriptural ground for this, to say nothing of mode. Besides, the Doctor, on the 27th page of his book, presents Mr. Henry as saying, that Acts 2 : 39, “the promise is unto you and your children,” is “the chief Scripture ground for infant baptism.” What infatuation, then, is it to attempt to prove that infant baptism is “unsupported by the Word of God,” by adducing paedobaptists who argue in support of infant baptism from the Word of God! The issue is between the Doctor and his paedobaptist authors, and hence before he can prove that infant baptism is an evil, he must refute the arguments of his opponents. But he continues: “Many, however, ingenuously confess that they find no express authority for it, but believe the practice in consonance with ‘the general spirit of religion,’ and therefore adopt it. Thus contradictory and suicidal are the reasonings of paedobaptists on this subject,” (p. 8.) Very well, then, some believe the practice to be in consonance with the Bible, and so it is not in opposition to the Bible. But others affirm that there is express authority for the practice in the Bible; and the other

inferentially from the Bible; and so both support it from the Bible. The "reasonings of paedobaptists," therefore, are not contradictory and suicidal on the subject" of infant baptism, any more than positive and circumstantial testimony can be "contradictory and suicidal" on any subject.

But the Doctor has another argument, "if possible, still more conclusive," namely, "very many of the most learned and pious biblical critics, themselves paedobaptists, candidly confess that the practice of infant baptism is not directly enjoined in the Word of God," (p. 9.) And he adduces Luther, Calvin, Burnett, Hahn, Schleirmacher, Lange, Woods, Stuart, "all distinguished divines," as having made the admission. Granted, and what then? Why, these very authors, in a most elaborate and convincing manner, present arguments of an inferential and circumstantial nature, equivalent, indeed, to a positive scriptural injunction; and the Doctor, himself, will not deny, that often an inferential and circumstantial argument is equivalent to a positive demonstration. And when the circumstantial arguments are added to the positive scriptural injunctions, adduced by other paedobaptist authors, the practice of infant baptism is supported and established by the mixed and harmonious evidence beyond all refutation. Indeed, any circumstance or fact of ecclesiastical history, in harmony with the circumstantial and positive arguments drawn from Scripture in favor of infant baptism, must contribute some force to the general evidence. Consequently, the conclusion of the Doctor—"the New Testament is therefore given up," (p. 9)—does not follow, because one class of supporters of infant baptism argue from the New Testament inferentially, and another class positively, and so the New Testament is made the ground of argumentation by both classes of paedobaptists.

His reference to those authors who support infant baptism from the Old Testament is likewise unfortunate. He adduces certain "profound" writers as conceding that infant baptism cannot be supported from the Old Testament, and he mentions Charnock, Starck, Augusti and Jeremy Taylor, and

says, that "a hundred similar" witnesses "could if it were necessary be produced," (p. 10.) Granted; but these very authors, all of them, defend infant baptism upon New Testament ground and from ecclesiastical history, and so the universal conclusion of the Doctor, "the whole Bible is relinquished," does not follow, because a universal conclusion, affirmative or negative, in the nature of things, cannot follow from a particular premise. For instance, the Doctor cannot prove baptism, or immersion, if you choose, from the Old Testament; therefore baptism cannot be proved from the Bible, and so "the whole Bible is relinquished" by the Baptists in defending their opinions of baptism. This is a fair application of the use the Doctor makes of the concessions of certain paedobaptists, and to his mind at least must prove the absurdity of his conclusion against infant baptism. But this is not all. While certain paedobaptists may concede that infant baptism cannot be supported in any manner from the Old Testament, they maintain that it can be supported and established directly and indirectly from the New Testament, and directly from history; and others maintain that it can be supported analogically from the Old Testament, and directly and indirectly from the New Testament, and directly from history; and so both classes maintain the doctrine of infant baptism from the Bible and from history. What, is not the New Testament a part, yea, the chief part of the Bible? And thus a doctrine sustained from the New Testament is as well established as if it were supported likewise by every chapter in the Old Testament. But this is not all. The Doctor, in the first case, attempts to prove from the concessions of one class of paedobaptists that infant baptism is not expressly enjoined in the New Testament, and so concludes that the New Testament is to be abandoned. But in this case he omits the analogical arguments which this class draw from the Old Testament, as well as the positive and inferential arguments which others deduce from the New Testament, in support of infant baptism. And in the second case he attempts to prove, from the concessions of another class of paedobaptists, that infant bap-

tism cannot be supported from the Old Testament, and so concludes that the Old Testament is to be abandoned. But in this case he omits the positive and inferential arguments which this class deduce from the New Testament, as well as the analogical arguments which others draw from the Old Testament. That is, he makes the analogy of the Old Testament invalidate the substance of the New, and the positive and inferential arguments drawn from the New Testament invalidate the analogical arguments drawn from the Old, while it is evident that analogy can never offset a positive truth, and that the positive and inferential arguments of the New Testament, and the analogical arguments from the Old Testament, mutually support and strengthen each other, and so establish the general argument in favor of infant baptism. Analogy, inference, affirmation, all being in harmony, no matter by whom maintained, are enough to establish the truth of any doctrine. The fair and logical method the Doctor should have pursued is this. One class of his opponents abandoning the Old Testament in the argument, but maintaining their views upon inference from the New Testament, he should have thrown the Old Testament out of the discussion with them, and then have fairly met the issue of inference from the New Testament; but while he has done the former, he has not attempted the latter, but placed the negation of the Old Testament, which is nothing, against the inference from the New, which indeed leaves the inference from the New untouched. Again, another class conceding that infant baptism is not expressly enjoined in the New Testament, but maintaining that it is supported by inference from the New Testament; he should have thrown the concession out of the discussion with them, and then have fairly met the argument from inference; but he has perverted the concession to an entire abandonment of the New Testament, which indeed still leaves the argument from inference untouched. Again, one class of his opponents conceding that infant baptism is not expressly enjoined, and another affirming that it is expressly enjoined in the New Testament; he might have fairly placed these two

classes, on the particular issue of positive injunction, against each other, which in the general argument is immaterial; and this he has indeed done, which is immaterial; but he has boldly gone farther, and placed the argument from inference against the argument from positive injunction, when he should have proved that both are false, since if either be true, infant baptism must be cordially admitted, and if both be true, infant baptism is firmly established; and so indeed he leaves both the argument from inference, and from positive injunction, untouched. The Doctor's method is a novel and summary one, perfectly consistent with "the task he has attempted to execute," but it is as illogical as it is novel, and inconclusive as it is summary, and must appear so to any candid and intelligent one of "the million" for whom he "writes."

But the Doctor has another argument, namely, "infant baptism is in truth actually prohibited by the Word of God," (p. 12.) His argument is: "Is not infant baptism directly enjoined in the Word of God? It confessedly is not. Then it is plainly prohibited." And this he attempts to support from Scripture. "It is God who has said: 'What thing soever I command you observe to do it. Thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it.'" Stop my candid reasoner; is this a specific prohibition of infant baptism? This command is from the Old Testament, and referred to the regulation of the Jewish government, moral and ceremonial. But will the Doctor maintain that this command enjoins observance of the old Jewish ceremonial law now? Certainly not; then the supreme Law-giver himself has annulled this injunction so far as it once referred to ceremonial obedience. And it remains for the Doctor to prove that God has not enjoined infant baptism in the New Testament, which, we affirm, he has done. And just here it is worthy of observation, that as God associated infants with the Jewish church, and in the above "command" enjoined that this right be "observed," in circumcision, the formal seal of association with his church, under the Jewish dispensation; and as he has not excluded

infants from his church, the above "command" still enjoins that this right be observed in baptism, the formal seal of association with his church, under the Christian dispensation. And so in fact, the very Scripture the Doctor adduces against infant baptism, is a strong vindication of the doctrine. So much for the first consideration of the Doctor. And he has a second.

"Infant baptism is prohibited by a second consideration, the apostolic commission—'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.' This law is plain and definite. Every positive has its negative. A law to baptize believers necessarily prohibits the baptism of all others than believers. Infants are not believers. Therefore the law prohibits the baptism of infants," (pp. 12, 13.) This argument of the Doctor is fallacious for three reasons. First, it is a particular proposition, referring only to the believer. But infants cannot believe, therefore it does not refer to them, and so cannot prohibit baptism in their case. Secondly, his argument proves too much, and so falls to the ground. Thus "every positive has its negative." Very well. Infants cannot believe, therefore should not be baptized—this is one "negative." Infants cannot believe, therefore should not be saved—this is another "negative." One negative is as legitimate as the other, and to admit the one is to establish the other, and so the Doctor's prohibition involves the damnation of infants! But it may be replied, "infants are saved without faith"—granted, and for that very reason they should be baptized without faith. Thus, the "apostolic commission" refers neither positively nor negatively to infants, and so is not a prohibition of infant baptism. Thirdly, the Doctor gives an improper analysis of the commission. Faith and baptism are made the condition of salvation, not faith the condition of baptism; and thus, as faith, one part of the condition is dispensed with in the case of infants, so baptism, the other part of the condition, is dispensed with, in order to their salvation. Faith alone secures present salvation in the adult, and baptism then

is required of him as expressive of his faith, renunciation of the world, and consecration to God forever. But infants are already in a state of justification, which baptism signifies, implying their consecration to God, and, in due time, their obligation to serve him. Now, unless the Doctor can prove that infants are not in a state of justification, he cannot bring the "commission" against infant baptism.

The Doctor continues: "The baptism of infants is prohibited, thirdly, by the nature and design of baptism itself. In this ordinance you publicly profess your faith in Christ, and devote yourself to him in his visible church. This must be an intelligent and voluntary act on the part of every one who is baptized. To those who cannot so act baptism is prohibited. Infants cannot so act. Therefore the baptism of infants is prohibited," (pp. 13, 14.) The Doctor will not deny that the infant in circumcision was "devoted" to God "in his visible church"—yet he professed no faith in God, and was unable to perform any "intelligent and voluntary act" in the premises. But apply the premises of the Doctor in another respect. Faith is "an intelligent and voluntary act on the part of every one who is" saved. "To those who cannot so act" salvation "is prohibited." Infants cannot so act. Therefore the "salvation" of infants is prohibited. Premises so fatal to the salvation of infants cannot be logical or scriptural when employed against their baptism. But the salvation of infants cannot be forfeited by any blunders of the Doctor's logic, and their right to baptism cannot be disproved by his strongest arguments. It is surprising with what coolness and boldness he exclaims, "it is now proved indubitably that infant baptism is prohibited." And we reply, upon his principles of reasoning, "it is" also "proved indubitably that infant" salvation "is prohibited." And so all his conclusions to the end of the chapter may be retorted upon him. As "infant baptism is in truth no baptism at all," (p. 14)—infant salvation is in truth no salvation at all: "infant baptism is a bold attempt to perfect that which it is vainly imagined God has left deficient," (p. 16)—infant salvation is a bold attempt

to perfect that which it is vainly imagined God has left deficient: "infant baptism is a sin against God," (p. 16)—infant salvation is a sin against God: "thus is infant baptism incontrovertibly proved to be an evil," (p. 16)—thus is infant salvation incontrovertibly proved to be an evil. And so his earnest deprecation of infant baptism—"from my heart I deprecate it in all its bearings"—might just as rationally have been uttered against infant salvation, for his reasons are just as strong against the one as the other, and so it seems at last that the Doctor's logic originated in his heart and not in his head—and thus with a warm heart no doubt the Doctor "writes for the million," for in right good earnest he exhorts, entreats, interrogates, and warns them to the last word in the chapter.

The next general argument of the Doctor is—"Infant baptism is an evil, because its defence leads to the most injurious perversions of the Word of God," (p. 18.) He knows "no better plan" to prove this proposition than by "examples," and "these are so numerous that he knows not where to begin." His first "example" is the perversion of the true meaning of the apostolic commission; but the very ground on which he proves the teaching of paedobaptists a perversion, if admitted, would prove the salvation of infants absolutely impossible. But even admitting (which we do not) that some paedobaptists pervert the meaning of the great commission "to defend infant baptism," it does not follow that infant baptism is an evil, or may not be defended by other Scriptures, or be proved by other paedobaptists, from the great commission itself. Besides, many of "the million" may not regard the Doctor's judgment of the paedobaptist interpretations as sound, and so these interpretations may not turn out, in their minds, to be "perversions." But that interpretation of the commission, which involves the denial of the right of infants to salvation, is, beyond all doubt, a perversion the most repulsive; and such is the Doctor's interpretation: opposition to infant baptism, then, is an evil. But the Doctor adopts a singular way to make out his case of perversions. "When great

and good men, such as these, and the thousands of others who agree with them, thus interpret the commission, can we believe that they are really in earnest? Do they not know better?" (p. 21.) That is, the Doctor supposes that the paedobaptists do not conscientiously believe what they write and avow, and so they knowingly and willingly pervert the Word of God. This is a grave insinuation, and one cannot believe that the Doctor himself is "in earnest" when he makes it, without believing that he has more confidence in his own judgment, than charity in his heart. But the paedobaptists are in good earnest; therefore they do not pervert the Word of God—and so infant baptism is not an evil—the Doctor, himself, being judge.

The second example the Doctor cites, is the "striking instance, 'The promise is to you and to your children.'" The argument of the Doctor is, that Peter referred to the prophecy of Joel, and that Joel referred to "sons and daughters," or, in general terms, "posterity," (p. 24.) If the Doctor can prove that children are not "sons and daughters" or "posterity," then I grant infant baptism cannot be supported from this text. But he perverts both the meaning of Peter and Joel, as any one acquainted with what they say on the subject must know.

Besides, the fearful canon of the Doctor, "every positive has a negative," is here again leveled with fatal precision against the salvation of infants. If infants are not included in "the promise," then they are lost. But they are included in the promise; therefore, they have as good a right to baptism, the sacramental seal of "the promise," under the Christian dispensation, as the adult believing Jews had on the day of Pentecost. The only plausible argument the Doctor uses is, "babes could not fulfil the conditions upon which the promise was made," (p. 26.) But this is the old stereotyped sophism of the Baptists, and its refutation is stamped a thousand times upon the pages of the baptismal controversy, and may be here repeated. If "babes" cannot "fulfil the conditions" of the promise, and for that reason should not be bap-

tized, then they have no right to the blessings of the promise or covenant of salvation, and so all dying in infancy, must be lost. But, if they are included in "the promise" unconditionally, then, they have as good a right to baptism unconditionally, as adults have conditionally. The Doctor denies that "the promise" here means the covenant of salvation, formally made with Abraham, (p. 28,) and we have only to reply, then all children, dying in infancy, are lost—such is his perversion of Peter's meaning. The Doctor's theology is as defective as his logic in another respect. It never has been assumed by paedobaptists, that "the Gospel is a new dispensation of the covenant of circumcision," (p. 28.) The Gospel is not a new dispensation of the covenant of circumcision, but a new dispensation of the same great covenant of salvation, of which circumcision was the sensible, formal seal under the Jewish dispensation. The Doctor does not discriminate between the covenant of salvation, which is one and the same in all ages of time, and the dispensations of the covenant, which are many, and follow in succession at various periods of time. And failing to make this discrimination, it is not surprising that he should not only misrepresent his paedobaptist authorities, but pervert, also the language of prophets and apostles. The same method of misrepresentation and perversion the Doctor pursues to the end of the chapter. And this is the more surprising, as he had said, page 9, that "very many of the most learned and pious biblical critics, themselves paedobaptists, candidly confess that the practice of infant baptism is not directly enjoined in the Word of God;" whereas, in this chapter, he joins issue with many others who claim several scriptures, as "chief scripture ground," and "best supports," of infant baptism. Nor is this all. He has omitted some of the strongest and clearest expositions of the very scriptures examined by him, and these may not be perversions—what then? Nor is this all. He has perverted the meaning of the authors adduced. And so infant baptism cannot be proved to be an evil from the Doctor's perversions, both of his authors and the Scriptures. One can scarcely help smiling at

the Doctor's expression of pious regret. "Thus to expose the errors of our paedobaptist brethren gives me no pleasure—but afflicts me profoundly. The task falls upon me. It shall be faithfully performed," (p. 29.) The great Head of the Church, then, has been late in raising up and qualifying the proper man to perform this important task, especially since so many "pious," and "learned," and "profound biblical critics and scholars," have preceded this champion for the truth, and still surround him, and smile on his presumption, egotism and vanity. We will give the candid reader one example of the Doctor's perversions of his paedobaptist authorities. "You mean that holiness is spiritual, that it is 'ecclesiastical,' and more, you mean that this holiness is produced by hereditary transmission," &c., (pp. 37, 38.) Now we challenge the Doctor to produce any authority in the Protestant or Romish church by whom this charge can be sustained. It never has been assumed, by Protestant or Roman Catholic, that children are born spiritual or holy. So far from it, the Roman Catholic church, and the High Church party in the Church of England, baptize children to make them spiritual or holy, which is absurd in itself, and would be still more absurd, if they baptized children to make them holy, believing at the time that they were already holy. Heretics themselves then deny the charge of the Doctor, and this should cover him with confusion. The Doctor writes for "the million," but what after this can we fairly suppose are his motives, but that he may deceive the ignorant, impose upon the credulous, make proselytes? And surely, ignorance, credulity, and proselytism, are no proofs of the evils of infant baptism, unless, to argue as the Doctor does, infant baptism suggested in him these motives.

The third general argument of the Doctor is, "Infant baptism is an evil because it engrafts Judaism upon the gospel of Christ," (p. 40.) Under this proposition the Doctor displays more ignorance of his authorities, of the Scriptures, of common sense, and of the plainest rules of reasoning, than we have been able to expose in the preceding pages; and "if

the blind be a leader of the blind they will both fall into the ditch." God save "the million." His argument is this: the paedobaptists assume that circumcision and baptism "are substantially the same ordinance," and therefore infant baptism is "the sum and essence of Judaism," (p. 41.) And he says, this is what "our brethren are pleased to call" the argument from "analogy," (p. 40.) It never has been assumed that baptism is "substantially" or circumstantially the same, in all respects, with circumcision, and therefore it cannot be "the sum and essence of Judaism." Baptism has the same spiritual meaning with circumcision, as a sign and seal, and is due to infants, and in these respects only is it substantially the same with circumcision, and of the "same essence with Judaism"—and the Doctor himself will not deny that Judaism vitally, in many respects, was spiritual—unless he deny that God was its author, or that he instituted a system of rites and ceremonies, commands and precepts, that had no spiritual meaning in them. Circumcision had both a secular and spiritual meaning, which distinction the Doctor fails to make, and so unavoidably must impose upon the ignorance of his readers. Thus: "What is Judaism? It is the intermingling, or the amalgamation, of the doctrines, rites, and worship of the Jews, with the doctrines, rites, and worship of Christianity. Infant baptism is amalgamated Judaism and Christianity," (pp. 41, 42.) But has this been done by the evangelical churches, in the case of infant baptism? It has not been done. Has any thing but what was truly evangelical in Judaism been incorporated in the evangelical churches? It has not been done. The Doctor might just as well have accused Christ and his apostles of amalgamating what they separated from Judaism, and abolished, with what they added and enjoined as evangelical under the Christian dispensation. The spiritual meaning of the passover is the same as that of the Lord's Supper. Is it therefore the "sum and essence of Judaism?" or "amalgamated Judaism and Christianity?" The spiritual meaning of the lamb that bled on the Jewish

altar, and of the intercession of the high priest in the holy of holies, is the same as that of the sacrifice of the "Lamb of God," and of the intercession of the Son of God. Is the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, or the intercession of the Son of God, therefore the "sum and essence of Judaism?" In a word, the spiritual meaning of "the doctrines, rites, and worship of the Jews," is the same with that of the doctrines, rites, and worship of Christianity. Are the doctrines, rites, and worship of Christianity the "sum and essence of Judaism?" So the spiritual meaning of circumcision is the same as that of infant baptism. Is infant baptism therefore the "amalgamation of Judaism and Christianity?" The Doctor must assume that circumcision had no spiritual meaning—and then Paul was wrong when he said, "circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law—and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God;" or he must admit that the spiritual meaning of circumcision is the same with that of infant baptism, since the spiritual meaning of circumcision is seen in the "profit" of keeping the law in subsequent life, and felt in the "heart" and "spirit" of the Jew who subsequently believed, according to the light of the Jewish dispensation. The Doctor must admit that "the doctrines, rites, and worship" of Judaism had a spiritual meaning, or the Jews believed and practiced "the doctrines," observed the "rites," and conformed to the "worship" of Judaism in vain, and so were all lost. "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed," Gal. 3 : 8. This destroys the Doctor's whole argument, in the "aggregate," and in its "details."

We shall now examine some of the conclusions of the Doctor, and they will be found as absurd as his premises. The Episcopalian perceives "in the Jewish church three orders of the ministry—there are therefore three orders in the ministry in the Christian church," (pp. 43, 44.) But the Methodists, Presbyterians, and the Baptists themselves reject

the dogma. Besides some Episcopalians maintain that three orders in the ministry are proved from the New Testament. Again, other Episcopalians maintain, and truly, that but two orders in the ministry can be proved from the New Testament, and so the Doctor's conclusion is his own, and does not touch the question of infant baptism.

Again, the Doctor argues that the Roman Catholic deduces the office of "pope" from that of "the great high priest" in the Jewish church; (p. 45.) What of that? We all reject the dogma. Besides, the Roman Catholic maintains that the office of pope is derived by "regular succession from St. Peter," and hence originated in St. Peter, and not in the office of the Jewish high priest, and this also we reject.

In a word, the Doctor employs the most pernicious perversions in certain cases to make out a specific case of perversion in infant baptism, while there is not the remotest connexion or analogy in the cases. The absurdity of this method may be shown by the examination of some of the perversions he adduces. "The Jewish church was a national church, and the Christian church is the same church. Therefore the Christian church must be a national church," (p. 45.) But Christ abolished the nationality of the Jewish church, since the Christian church is to embrace "all nations." And so "the sacrifice of the mass will probably be agreeable. You have it in the Jewish sacrifices," (p. 45.) But Christ consummated the "Jewish sacrifices" in his own sacrifice, and so abolished Jewish sacrifices forever. "You want seventy cardinals? The seventy elders who composed the Jewish council will supply you," (p. 45.) But the ecclesiastical economy of the Jewish church was abolished by the death of Christ, since its work was now accomplished, and the ecclesiastical government of the Christian church is to be framed according to the principles and spirit of the New Testament. And so of all the rest of the Doctor's ridiculous irony. And for once we agree with the Doctor, that such arguments are "really available for papists, and for papists only," (p. 43.) To make out an analogous case, the Doctor must prove that

the paedobaptist churches now practice circumcision. This they do not. The Doctor says, "Essays to engraft Judaism upon the gospel of Christ commenced immediately after the ascension of our Redeemer. The Judaism then preached was precisely such as our paedobaptist brethren claim as legitimate in religion. It did not indeed include infant baptism, but advocated instead literal circumcision," (p. 47.) This was Judaism engrafted upon Christianity. But this was repudiated by the apostles themselves, and has been by the Christian church in all subsequent ages, as the Doctor himself knows, and himself proves on pages 48, 49, 50, 51 and 52, of his own book. In the name of common sense, reason and Scripture, how then can infant baptism be "amalgamated Judaism and Christianity?"

But this is not all. The Doctor himself, unaccountable as it may appear, admits that there is an analogy between the Jewish and Christian church. "There is a beautiful analogy. The Jewish church was a figure, a shadow, a type, of the Christian church," (pp. 53, 54.) And he quotes from the epistle to the Hebrews: "The holy places made with hands were figures of the true holy places"—and adds: "All the parts of the Jewish church and worship were figures of the Christian church and worship. What is true of all the parts is true of the whole. The whole Jewish church therefore was a figure or type of the Christian church," (p. 54.) That is fair for once. This is all we maintain. And so Webster, his authority, gives our view of the analogy we maintain: "an agreement or likeness between things in some circumstances and effects, when the things are otherwise entirely different," (p. 53.) That is, circumcision and infant baptism agree and resemble each other in "some circumstances and effects," while they are "otherwise entirely different." As follows, they both are formal, sensible signs and seals of the same covenant of grace, though practiced under different dispensations. They both have a spiritual meaning, though one had also a secular meaning, which the other has not under the Christian dispensation. They both imposed obligation to

keep the moral and evangelical law of God, in all subsequent life, though the former imposed also obligation to keep the ceremonial law, under the Jewish dispensation, which is abolished under the Christian dispensation. They both formally and sensibly recognize who are entitled to association with the church of God, though the former also recognized those who were the subjects of God in a civil sense, which civil sense is not contained in baptism, since the civil polity of the Jewish church is abolished under the Christian dispensation. They both have a sacramental meaning, though they both are "entirely different things" in essential nature, and form, and mode, and natural effects. So much for Mr. Webster. And so the Doctor's "Hermenentics" are against him. "No external institution or fact in the Old Testament is a type of an external institution or fact in the New Testament. External institutions and facts in the Old Testament are invariable types of internal and spiritual institutions and facts in the New Testament," (p. 55.) Granted, most cordially. Then baptism and the Lord's Supper now set forth "internally and spiritually" what circumcision and the passover set forth "externally" in the Old Testament. But this is not all. The Doctor himself specifies certain analogies between circumcision and baptism. "A correspondence exists in several respects between circumcision and baptism. By circumcision the natural seed were recognized as the children of Abraham, and received as members of the Jewish church; by baptism the spiritual seed are recognized as believers in Christ, and received as members of the Christian church. Circumcision was instituted expressly for literal infants, and it was commanded to be administered to them as soon as they were born; baptism was instituted expressly for spiritual infants—believers in Christ—and it was commanded to be administered to them as soon as they were born again. Circumcision was an essential preliminary to the passover; baptism is an essential preliminary to the Lord's Supper," (p. 59.) This contains in substance, as far as it goes, all we maintain. Circumcision was administered to infants, "literal infants,"

the "natural seed" of Abraham—granted—but it had a spiritual meaning at the same time, recognizing the infant as being already a member of the spiritual church; so that if he in subsequent life committed a sin or "trespass," unless he repented, that is, conformed with the proper spirit to the specific requisitions of the law, he was to be "cut off from the congregation" or church of God, under the Jewish dispensation, which was the mournful case in many individual and collective instances. "Baptism was instituted expressly for spiritual infants:" that is, "believers in Christ"—granted—but then it is more; it is due to those who have a right to spiritual regeneration, and such are all infants, first, those dying in infancy, and secondly, those living and conforming to the specific requisitions of the gospel; as in the case of all infants under the Jewish dispensation, first, all dying in infancy, and secondly, those living and conforming to the specific requisitions of the moral and ceremonial law. The Doctor cannot deny this conclusion, without disproving that circumcision imposed spiritual and moral obligations as well as civil. "Circumcision was an essential preliminary to the passover"—granted—but it was administered to infants; and infants, when they grew up, if they committed sin or trespass, forfeited right to the passover till they repented as above; so infants, unless they repent in the gospel sense, have no right to the Lord's Supper.

Let us return for a moment to the Doctor's "Hermeneutics." We give his own quotation from Turretine, "the distinguished successor of Calvin." "A sacrament is an external thing, and whatever is a type of any internal or spiritual thing has no need of any other type by which it may be represented. Two types may indeed be given similar and corresponding to each other of one and the same truth, and so far the ancient sacraments were antitypes of ours; 'but one type cannot be shadowed forth by another type,' since both are brought forward to represent one truth. So circumcision shadowed forth not baptism, but the grace of regeneration; and the passover represented not the Lord's Supper,

but Christ set forth in the Supper," (p. 55.) Very well; then circumcision and the passover had a spiritual meaning, which is all we maintain; and the analogy between the Jewish and Christian sacraments is established so far as their spiritual meaning is concerned; and so of all the "doctrines, rites and worship" of the Jewish church. And in the language of the Doctor, we observe, "the whole subject of analogy is therefore perfectly plain," (p. 58.)

But this is not all. The Doctor admits "there is a beautiful analogy," but affirms that "the identity assumed is nothing more or less than naked Judaism," (p. 53.) All we maintain is, that the Jewish and Christian churches are spiritual as well as external parts of the same church of God, and therefore in spiritual nature they are identically the same, however they may differ in external form or organization; and this cannot be denied without proving that that which is true of the whole is not true of the parts, and therefore that the whole Jewish church is lost. Such would however be the calamity if we give a logical meaning to the Doctor's propositions. "The figure and the thing signified by it cannot be one. The type and the reality are not identical. The shadow and the substance are never the same thing. The Jewish church and the Christian church are not therefore the same church," (p. 58.) It never has been assumed that they are the same in external nature, but the same in spiritual nature, and all attempts of the Doctor, however desperate and reckless, to involve the paedobaptists in the absurdity of assuming that external Judaism is "amalgamated" with Christianity, are perfectly gratuitous. From the external typical nature of the Jewish church, it is demonstrable that the Jewish church in spirituality is identical with the Christian church, since as the Christian church is a spiritual church, the Jewish church could not have been a type of the Christian church, unless as a type it contained in it a spiritual meaning. And so as the Jewish church had a spiritual meaning in its types, and precepts, and doctrines, and worship, this spiritual meaning was applicable to the Jewish church. But if the

Doctor's conclusion, "the Jewish church and the Christian church are not therefore the same," be true, then the Jews were all lost, which being absurd, it follows that his premises are false.

In farther proof that "infant baptism leads to Judaism," the Doctor asserts that "it is at war irreconcilably with the fundamental principles of the gospel of Christ," (p. 60.) What are these principles? "The gospel of Christ teaches as fundamental, that no one is a child of God by carnal descent"—granted, and infant baptism is not founded upon carnal descent. "That all, whatever may be their aucestry, or their relations, are by nature the children of wrath"—granted, but all infants are by grace the "children of the kingdom of God." "Nor is their disposition, or their character as such, changed in any manner by their baptism in infancy"—granted, for we do not believe in infant baptismal regeneration. "That faith in our Lord Jesus Christ alone can give a title to be regarded on earth, or in heaven, as the children of God"—granted, so far as adults are concerned ; but then if there be no other ground of salvation for infants than this, then they are all lost: there is some other ground for their salvation, and therefore there is some other ground for their baptism. "All true religion is personal"—granted, but infants are not responsible for personal religion. Thus, "the fundamental principles of the gospel of Christ," specified by the Doctor, do not touch the case of infant baptism. There are other "fundamental principles of the gospel," which support the doctrine of infant baptism, and these the Doctor has not mentioned, and so the argument from analogy remains good.

The Doctor says, lastly, "this paedobaptist argument [from analogy] is palpably antisciptural," (p. 61.) And here is his argument. The "paedobaptists declare that the Jewish and the Christian are the same church, and subsist under the same covenant! Never was there a conclusion more palpably antisciptural," (p. 63.) Then the Jews are all lost! But the gospel covenant was preached to the Jews, according to Paul,

as has been already proved; and therefore the paedobaptist argument is strictly scriptural. The types, shadows, symbols and sacrifices of the Jewish dispensation were founded upon the atonement of Christ, to be made in due time, and so were all confirmed and consummated by his vicarious death; and thus the rights of children, sacramentally sealed in circumcision, under the Jewish dispensation, were confirmed by Christ's death, for he "came not to destroy, but to fulfil;" and so the atonement being the foundation of both "the Jewish and the Christian church," they must be parts of the same "spiritual building" or church. We never doubted that circumcision was a part of the Jewish ceremonial law, but then it was more; a seal of the gracious covenant also, "a seal of the righteousness of faith," according to Paul; and according to the Doctor himself, "a type of regeneration by the spirit;" (p. 64,) and thus it does not follow that "the gospel church is in fact built upon the law of Moses"—the Doctor himself being judge.

The next general argument of the Doctor is, "The doctrines upon which infant baptism rests contradict the great fundamental principle of justification by faith," (p. 66.) He says, "justification is the act of God by which he declares a man just and righteous," (p. 67.) Very well; then all infants are in a state of justification, for Christ himself says, "of such is the kingdom of God." Again: "The justified are accepted, and approved, as if they had never sinned," (Ibid.) Very well; then all infants are justified, for they never sinned, and so are unconditionally justified by the vicarious death of Christ. The Doctor continues, "The doctrines of infant baptism on the other hand are not made known in the Bible." That is not the question now. The doctrine of infant justification is the issue; is that found in the Bible? Yes. Very well; being then justified without faith, they have a right to baptism without faith, just as the adult, justified by faith, has a right to baptism because he is justified.

When he says that "infant baptism finds a place there

[in the confessions] sustained by all the doctrines with which popery had surrounded it," this we deny? We have nothing to do with those confessions in which infant baptismal justification and regeneration are maintained. The Doctor knows, or ought to know, that the dogmas of Rome on this subject are utterly rejected by the evangelical churches. The Doctor knows also, or ought to know, that the clergy of the Church of England enjoy a latitude in interpreting the baptismal forms of that church, some being strictly high church, and others as strictly Calvinist, and others still Arminian. The Doctor knows also, or ought to know, that the truly evangelical party in the Protestant Episcopal Church in our country do not agree with the high church party on this subject. The Doctor knows also, or ought to know, that the Methodists, in the interpreting of their Articles and Baptismal Forms, unqualifiedly reject the dogma that the infant "is pardoned, regenerated, adopted, &c., in baptism." His language is, "Methodists affirm that by baptism the new birth, the forgiveness of sins, and adoption, are all to the child, visibly signed and sealed. The child therefore in baptism is pardoned of sin, is regenerated, is adopted, is received into the church, received into the favor of God, and saved in heaven," (p. 76.) This is popery in its worst form, and the Doctor could not have written this language without the profoundest ignorance, or the most unblushing assumption. The Doctor knows, and he avows again and again his knowledge of the fact, that the truly evangelical churches, and the evangelical portions of the Lutheran church, the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, do not maintain this view of infant baptism; and yet in reckless opposition to his own knowledge, and in bold defiance of the truth in the case, he deliberately attempts to deceive "the million." Nor is this all. He gives the particular opinions of some churches, which are heretical, and next of other churches, which are orthodox, and then deduces the general conclusion that all are heretical; which is absurd. For example, some churches adopt affusion as a proper mode of baptism, but one

very respectable church adopts immersion as the only proper mode; therefore all the Christian churches adopt sprinkling and pouring as the only proper modes of baptism—and yet the Doctor knows that but one of the churches practises immersion as the only proper mode of baptism. Again, some of the churches practice open communion, but one very respectable church practices “close communion;” therefore all the churches practice open communion—and yet we all know that but one of the churches practices close communion. Again, some of the churches practice infant baptism; but one very respectable church repudiates the practice; therefore all the churches practice infant baptism—and yet the Doctor knows that one of the churches “abominates” the practice, and that he has written a “little volume” on the “evils” of the practice.

Omitting several particulars, which are immaterial, and several which we have already in substance considered, we give a moment’s consideration to another feature of the Doctor’s treatise. After affirming that “infant baptism entails corruption upon the church,” he assumes, “Baptist churches cannot be corrupted and destroyed. Admitting the claim of the Baptists—which we do not—that infant baptism did not exist in the apostolic churches, nor in the early churches, as the Doctor affirms, “till the middle of the third century,” how did it happen that the church became corrupt at all? But the early churches did become corrupt, and hence corruption originated in the Baptist church; and, therefore, granting that the modern Baptist church is the revival and restoration of apostolic purity, as is assumed by the Baptists, corruption may again originate in the Baptist church, though, in this case, infant baptism cannot be the cause of the corruption. Upon the supposition that the apostolic churches were Baptist churches, whence originated the Ebronites?—the Gnostics?—the Phantastics or Docetæ?—the Marcionites?—the Encratites?—the Carpocratians?—the Patriparsians?—the Valentinians?—the Montanists?—the Manicheans? But this is not all. As Unitarianism was raised in a “Baptist church” in Scotland, so

Universalism originated in this country, and perhaps in the world, in a "Baptist church" in Philadelphia, under the heretical teaching of the celebrated Elnathan Winchester, a Baptist clergyman, who afterwards visited England to disseminate the new heresy there. And Walter Balfour, the great leader of Universalism in New England, was a Baptist, and then became a Universalist, and was one of the most dangerous sophists and heretics of our times. And Alexander Campbell, the Epaminondas of Campbellism, was a Baptist, and is the most dangerous religious sophist of the present age.

The Baptist church may be distinguished into two denominations, the Particular and General Baptists, and these have but little communication with one another. The Particular Baptists are Calvinistic, whose leading article is the doctrine of particular redemption. The General Baptists maintain the doctrine of general redemption, and other doctrines of the Arminian system, while they agree with the Particular Baptists only on the subject of baptism, worship and church discipline. The General Baptists have recently been distinguished into the Old and New connexions. The old General Baptists have been gradually declining, and under the corrupting influence of Socinianism they are likely to become extinct. And then there are the Scottish Baptists, of more recent date still, who differ in various respects from the English Baptists. And then more recently still there has sprung up in Scotland another sect, called the Tabernacle connexion, gathered together by Messrs. James and Haldane, who set out upon the principle of paedobaptism, and formed churches independent of the parent stock, which "evil" has been greatly aggravated by another "evil," namely, that "the Lord's Supper is not peculiarly a church ordinance." And then in the United States there are the "Regular or Associated" Baptists, "moderately Calvinistic in sentiment." And then there are many smaller bodies of Baptists, such as the "Seventh-day" Baptists, mostly Calvinistic—the "Free-Will" Baptists, inclined to Arminianism—the "Christians," who, with few exceptions, deny the Trinity—the "Tunkers or Dunkards,"

found in several parts of our country, and avowed Universalists in sentiment—"Campbellism," that most miserable heresy, or rather combination of most miserable heresies, so prevalent specially in the west, and which has derived most of its victims from the "Baptist churches"—the "Anti-Missionary" Baptists, prominent only for their "ignorance and immorality"—the "Hard-Shell" or "Black-Rock" Baptists, whose title is sufficiently significant without comment—the "Two-Seed" Baptists, a stunted and waning harvest of ancient Manicheism—the sect of "Close-Communion Calvinistic" Baptists, an amalgamation of Baptist worship and Calvinistic doctrine—the "Free Christian" Baptists, whose doctrinal views are in general the same as the Free-Will Baptists—the "Six-Principle" Baptists—and so on, and so on—and how did corruption originate in any of these? or what has broken the Baptist church in fragments in Christendom?

But the sagacious Doctor, confronted on every hand by the truly evangelical character of the paedobaptist churches in our country, with apparent candor inquires, "In our country at least do the corruptions alleged exist, if at all, to the extent indicated?" And he answers: "I am happy to concede that in this favored land, and with some classes of our paedobaptist brethren, its evils are greatly mitigated." Fatal concession—then why so much pompous swelling, ridiculous dogmatism, and pious cant, about imaginary evils, existing only in the excessive vanity of a mind whose judgment is contracted by prejudice and perverted by sophistry? Does not the Doctor know that a thousand corruptions in the church originated in causes entirely independent of infant baptism? That then infant baptism was abused and perverted in common with almost every other evangelical institution? That ambition and bigotry and cupidity were fountains of numberless evils? That false philosophy was the parent of endless heresies and superstitions? That intrigue and worldly policy insidiously engrafted upon the church countless innovations? And that in the incipency and pro-

gress of all these invasions of the simplicity and purity of the church she neglected to conform to the Bible, failed to apply rigidly the proper tests of church membership, and wholly neglected the proper exercise of church discipline? Had she done all these faithfully, corruption would have been impossible.

We will not longer detain the reader with a systematic review of the extraordinary book before us, but close this article with some references to the general character of the book and its author.

The "concluding addresses" are the exhortations of bigotry, the ebullitions of uncharitableness, the jugglery of proselytism, the scheme of schism, and the crowning "evils" of the volume. From beginning to end it is evil, and the only consolation of the pious heart is, that "the million" will detect, on every page in it, the elements of its own conclusive refutation. The author displays a mind, whose character is hatred to infant baptism, and whose ultimate object is its extermination. And yet, in the attempt, the Doctor mingles neither the subtlety of sophistry nor the solidity of reasoning. Instead of obtaining enrolment among the defenders of truth as the reward of courage and victory, he is to be associated with the opposers of Protestantism as the recompense of temerity and defeat, and the price of the calumnies which he has thrown upon illustrious men and evangelical churches. He has written in a spirit inconsistent with the dignity of the Christian ministry, and indulged in a tone of severity unsurpassed by the most malignant champions of infidelity and heresy in any age, and hence his work can contribute nothing to the advancement of "baptistical" dogmas, much less of true piety. He seems to be ignorant of the most obvious truth, that violence only strengthens opposition and confirms prejudices; and is equally incapable of overturning the truth and suppressing error. Of an ardent spirit, without penetration, the Doctor fails to discriminate between true courage and rashness, modesty and boldness, courtesy and rudeness, zeal and vehemence, meekness and dogmatism, charity and

asperity. And of an exclusive bias, he confounds abuses with evils, truth with error, the sanctities of Christianity with the profanations of popery, the institutions of God with the inventions of men, and the purity of the church with the corruptions of the world. His book is a libel on Christendom, ascribing to infant baptism, one of its institutions, every thing horrible, abominable, scandalous, seditious, infectious, treasonable, schismatical, heretical, detestable and destructive ; a libel to which Christian charity can never affix her seal, and Christian forbearance can hardly be extended. It is the sound of the tocsin of religious battle against Christendom, calling "the million" to arms, and the dismal note is given with a peculiar, undefinable joy, which is at once the luxury and reproach of a bigoted and ungenerous spirit, originating in the combined force of the elements of human nature, ill-regulated religious zeal, and misconceptions of the genius and vital doctrines and institutions of Christianity. If we are to believe the Doctor, he has entered, as he states in his preface, upon a great reformation. But he displays neither the abilities nor the qualifications requisite for such a work. There is not in his whole book one argument of the persuasive, sober majesty of truth. In his attack upon what he calls "evils," he displays neither vivacity nor energy, but presumption and dogmatism. His reasonings being little more than pompous flourishes, or ludicrous conceits, are without evidence or solidity. His style is simple, without force, beauty or elegance. He is endued with neither the acuteness, nor the force of genius, nor the learning, nor the piety, nor the candor, to place him among reformers, much less at the head of them. He is neither a theologian, nor logician, nor philosopher, nor scholar ; for he possesses neither the grasp of intellect, nor the extent of attainments, nor the purity of spirit, that constitute those elevated characters. Without liberality, his expositions seem to have originated in considerations of a party nature, and possess nothing of that comprehensiveness of design resembling the amplitude of the sacred Scriptures.

It is true, he indulges in a spirit of free inquiry and independence, but not that which is essential to the character and work of a great reformer, but characteristic of an enthusiast, pursuing a chimera, as if it were the greatest achievement of the age, and the greatest blessing to be transmitted to the future; while his labor is virtually anti-Christian, and, in fact, controversial suicide, since in every step of his argument he betrays a criminal ignorance of that which in infant baptism belongs essentially to our common Christianity, and that which properly belongs to the general mass of the corruptions and profanations of systematic heresy. Had he accurately and with delight surveyed the heavenly land, and the whole field of polemic theology, he never would have returned with such a terrific report; his book would never have appeared. A Reformer! On him can never be fixed the admiring gaze of posterity; to him can never be awarded the wages of laborious piety; and from him can never be transmitted that brilliant and useful light which imparts heat and life to distant ages. But in the presence of the intense and intensely increasing light now in the heavens, his book, not as a splendid orb that gilds the clouds and mountain tops as it rises, but as an inferior star that wanes upon its first appearing, is to be blotted out from the moral firmament. And a reformer, if required, would be a martyr, and by his martyrdom accelerate the march of mind from superstition, and error, and slavery, to the pure worship, and truth, and freedom of primitive Christianity, and so, by his blood, strengthen the cement that unites the church of God indissolubly, and establishes it immovably upon the Rock of Ages; and not, by amassing imagined "evil" upon "evil," attempt to overturn the church, in order to promote the prosperity of interested communities, and aggrandize and immortalize himself. Like men of an inferior spirit, advocating a bad cause, he is warm and vigorous in the first attack, but fainter and weaker to the close of the contest, where his spirits wholly evaporate; like the ancient Gauls, who, in the beginning of battle, were more

than men, but in the end were less than women. Nothing can be more ludicrous than self-sufficiency in men of inferior abilities, and nothing can be fairer than modesty, which, in men of superior abilities, like the flame, trembles as it aspires.

VERITAS.

ART. V.

A CRITIQUE ON DR. L. PIERCE'S VIEW OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

By Rev. R. ABBEY, Miss.

The reverend and venerable Dr. LOVIC PIERCE, of Georgia, has given the church several well written articles, embodying much sober thought and reflection, in several late numbers of the Quarterly. Much wholesome teaching, tending to call off the mind from certain loose popular notions respecting the subject matter in hand, may be gathered from these articles. But with all due deference to the talents, learning and great experience of the venerable author of these articles, it is respectfully, though with much distrust and hesitation, suggested, whether he may not have fallen into error in some of his most fundamental principles. The writer of this article is of this opinion; and as the discovery and exposition of truth can be the only proper object and aim of both, he will proceed immediately to present his objections, and endeavor to sustain them.

Dr. Pierce sets forth his opinion of the fundamental structure of ecclesiastical polity, according to the Divine Word, on the 16th page of the January number of the Review, thus distinctly and briefly. After alluding to some of the chief ele-

VOL. VIII.—5

ments of civil government, and holding up church government in contrast therewith, he remarks :

“But our position is, that the laws of the kingdom of heaven (which kingdom is the church of the Lord Jesus Christ, as instituted by him and his apostles, with its officials, laws, sacraments, services and discipline) are a moral and spiritual monarchy.”

And a little while after he remarks :

“This is our central idea, and shall be our point of departure and return in this essay.”

And on the 35th page of the October number, 1852, he holds the following language :

“In considering the governmental department of the church of God, we have laid it down as a fundamental truth, that the form of its government is monarchical. We must advance a step farther and say it is an absolute monarchy, in so far as what is allowed or disallowed by its executive action is concerned.”

Precisely here issue is joined with the venerable Doctor, and in opposition it is held that no form of government for a Christian church is laid down in the Scriptures, or is necessarily inferrible therefrom. But that, in the language of the Doctor, the Saviour “left the question of church authority and government entirely open,” so far as the forms and mode of procedure are concerned. What do we understand by a form of government? It is this; that, first, the forming and promulgation of rules of conduct, and secondly, the defining and analysis of those rules in their special application, and thirdly, the execution of those rules in cases of violation thereof, are committed to certain persons or officers; or are in fact in the hands of certain officers; in contradistinction to any other kind of officers; or officers exercising less or more enlarged functions. Human government, whether of a church or a state, must necessarily consist of legislative, judicial and executive functions. And the placing of these functions in the hands of this or that class of persons, or their actually being there, in contradistinction to their distribution otherwise, constitutes the essence of forms in government.

There are but two orders of government of which we

have any conception, viz., divine and human. A theocracy is a mixture of both; of which a word will be spoken after awhile. The government of a church is a human government, in the very same sense that the government of a state is such. The various forms of civil government, as it is familiarly called, will perhaps illustrate, as easily as any other way, the idea of the several or various forms of church government. Without in the slightest degree interfering, or attempting to interfere, with sound writers on Political Economy, it may be laid down as an axiom, that in fact, there are, or can be, but two kinds of human or civil government. The one is a despotism or monarchy, in the most strict and absolute sense; and the other, a democracy, perfect and unrestricted. In the one all the functions of government vest directly and immediately in one person; and in the other these functions are equally divided amongst all. It is not likely that either of these forms of government ever existed in a state, large or small, for any great length of time. The former could only be reduced to practice on a very small scale; and the latter could not continue long on account of the jealousies which would be sure to arise between men of years and experience, on the one hand, and women and children on the other. And hence, we find that human governments, in states, are modifications of these two absolute forms, or a mixing together of the absolute elements of each, in greater or lesser degrees of proportion. The present government of Russia, for instance, is called a monarchy, though it is modified by a slight infusion of the democratic principle; for the autocrat requires assistance in the administration, and therefore parcels out the functions of government somewhat amongst other persons. Other governments, that are called monarchical, have still more of the democratic principle; that is, the functions of government are more widely diffused; and still they retain the common name of monarchies. Still greater infusions of the principle of absolute democracy will give a government the name, according to the classifications of political doctors, of aristocracy or mixed government, or

republics. But there are no precise lines of division that can be drawn between these several forms of civil government; for example, the government of England has more of the democratic principle in it, although called a monarchy, than some of the governments south of us, which are called republican.

Now the very pertinent and important question arises; if the government of the Christian church were divinely ordained to be a "monarchy," was it an absolute and perfect monarchy; or if a modified monarchy, which it must certainly have been, how much of the democratic principle was it to receive; were the limits of its modification to be fixed here, or there, or at a still farther point? To say that it was to be a monarchy, does by no means define its form, unless the degrees of the monarchical and the democratic principles, of which it was to be composed, should be specifically defined and adjusted. Was it to be a monarchy of the most free or the most stringent character practicable; or what kind of a monarchy was it to be? Or, inasmuch as it could not be supposed to be a perfect monarchy, how monarchical was it to be? These are questions that ought to be answered, upon the hypothesis, that the venerable author before us was correct in laying it broadly down, that God ordained the government of the church to be monarchical. But they are questions that cannot be answered, and therefore it is concluded the Doctor was in error in laying down this axiom. The terms, "a moral and spiritual monarchy," are not easily comprehended. All human government is necessarily moral, but cannot be spiritual. All divine government is necessarily spiritual, but cannot be said to be moral. The government of God is a spiritual monarchy, but no other government can be.

Let us now spend a few minutes in looking into the Bible, to see what Christ did actually say and teach on the subject of church government; and after finding that he taught nothing, as to any form thereof, as we undoubtedly shall, we will turn, for a brief space, to the analogy of nature and the char-

acter of surrounding circumstances, where we will see, that for him to have done so would have frustrated the design of the gospel, and have produced disruption in the entire scheme of mercy. And first; from the Old Testament Scriptures we can learn nothing, of any advantage to us, on this subject. We can learn here what the character of the government of the Jewish church actually was; and, in this stream of historical facts, we are brought to admire and adore the goodness and wisdom of God; but this is foreign from the immediate purpose in hand, unless we find where it is written, either in precept or in practice, that the government of the New Testament church was to be like that of the Old; or find the precise lines of difference between them. But contrary to all this, we find theocracy written upon the very front of the Jewish polity. There is believed to be much error as to the design and end of the Jewish polity. The character of the government of the Jewish church was a theocracy. A theocracy is a direct, immediate, personal interference of God in the affairs of human government. Consequently it is essentially miraculous. It is a mixture of divine and human government. It is God governing, in worldly, political, civil and ecclesiastical affairs, directly, by a continuous miraculous manifestation of himself or his power, in some way incomprehensible to any except those to whom the manifestation is made. It is a miracle; not a miraculous healing of a wound or raising of the dead, or dividing the waters, but the miraculous governing of a people; a state and a church. The form of the Jewish government, however, remained pretty much as it was before God thus interposed. It was patriarchal; and in process of time became so modified as to be more properly called an aristocracy. Still the theocratic authority prevailed, with, however, considerable modification in the time of Saul, until it became nearly or quite extinct upon the rebuilding of the Temple.

But what has all this to do with the question of the form of government in a Christian church? Nothing. If it was designed as a perpetual model of church government, then

why may it, in much or in little, be departed from? If it was laid aside on the remodeling of the church, then let it be laid aside altogether. "That the mind of God is to be ascertained by us through a careful examination of the divine indications made to the Jews," is very certain, but the question is, what are we to learn respecting the mind of God by these indications? Are we to learn a form of church government for us to copy? Or are we to learn what form of church government was practiced in those days? The latter most assuredly, and not the former. From these indications we learn how God brought up out of the depths of a broad sea of idolatry an embryo church; and how he brought it on through its infancy, teaching it a little at a time; and how he guarded it against the inroads of surrounding dangers, and nursed it, and prepared it to receive another, and still another lesson in religion; and how he led his people by a way they knew not, on and upward, showing them still more of their relation to himself, and teaching them, day by day, more of the principles of their responsibility, until, in the fulness of time, it became practicable and expedient for Christ himself to be introduced to them. The character and the form of their government was one of the many expedients resorted to in the entire scheme of arrangements; it was a proper thing in its proper place, but would be no more applicable now, in this noonday of Christianity, than would the institution of the cities of refuge, the sojournings in Palestine, the worship by sacrifice, or the services of the temple. When we travel in the night, we need a taper, or other incidental helps, that may be safely laid aside on the rising of the sun. When a man has acquired his education, the particular means which were adopted to teach him to read, or to write his name, are no longer useful in prosecuting the duties of life. The theocracy of the Jews was adapted to darkness and twilight, but we live in a sunlight age.

Turning then to the New Testament, what do we find on the subject of church government? Beyond the supposition that the Christian community is to be, in some way and by

some form, efficiently governed, we find extremely little. On the subject of the form of such government we find not one word. The terms "church government," are, perhaps, sometimes used without attaching any very definite idea to them; and, sometimes, possibly, an incorrect idea. The church itself, properly considered, needs no government; is not a subject of government; but the individual persons, who compose the church, should be required to conform to some general rules of external conduct, conformable to the Christianity of the church, for the universal religious benefit of the whole. This is the government of the people in respect to this particular association. It is the government of men, not as citizens of a state, but as members of a voluntary community. But there is no such thing as a divine government of a church, or of persons as members of a church. The divine government applies to men; the race, without any reference to the relation they bear to each other. God makes no rules for these men because they associate as Christians, nor for those because they do not. He requires of all men that they be Christians and submit implicitly to his general law. But still, inasmuch as the fact was in the days of the Saviour, and still is, that some men will not be Christians and join in association with others as such, those who do, knowing this fact, are bound to do, and abstain from doing certain things in respect to such wicked persons. All men are required to withdraw from wicked persons.

But we are to suppose that, in the voluntary association, that is, in the church, there is a person who does things incompatible with Christianity, and so the rule decides, hypothetically, that he is a wicked man. Now what is to be done? Why it is the personal and individual duty of every one to expel him; that is, to withdraw from him. But all are not informed of the delinquency, or if informed, consider the question doubtful. What now is to be done? Here what is called church government begins. There must be some public and authoritative mode instituted by which the question may be determined. The rules by which we proceed,

in determining this question, are what is called the form of church government. These rules are human rules, not divine. The Bible tells us that the thing must be done, but it does not tell us how it must be done. If it were practicable and expedient, one person might determine all these questions for the entire church peremptorily. This would be "an absolute monarchy." Or the church might be divided into several small, independent associations, and at the head of each one of these divisions there might be one person to determine absolutely, and without appeal, such questions. This would be a kind of modified, secondary, limited or provincial monarchy, the particular character of which would be determined by the manner in which these chiefs received their appointment. Or the entire Christian community might be subdivided into still smaller portions, embracing those, or a part of those, in a town or county, and at the head of each of these there might be one exercising absolute rule. If these rulers, such as we commonly call pastors, were entirely independent of each other, their authority might, in a very subordinate sense, be called monarchical; but if they were amenable to each other, in any synodical sense, it would be an aristocracy of a very high and stringent character. But if there existed the right of appeal from such decisions, or if other persons in the association were allowed to sit in council with such rulers, or act before or after them in the matter, then the government would be more properly called an aristocracy of a very mild and tolerant character. And this, after all, is perhaps the form or character of most Christian or church governments. If such rulers or presidents were chosen, at short intervals, by the male adult members of the church, the government would be republican. If the rulers and all the subordinate officers were so chosen, it would, perhaps, be more properly called a democratic government. And if all these officers were chosen by the whole mass of the membership, then it would be a pure democracy. Now which of these several forms of government shall be adopted, or what modifications between any two of them shall be established, are

questions of expediency, not determined in Scripture, but left open for men to decide. And it is the duty of Christian men to decide them according to the circumstances of each particular case. A correct and wise settlement of these points, at one time and place, cannot be pleaded absolutely as a criterion for all other churches.

There is another element, however, of church government, besides that which relates to the cases of wicked persons in the church. The more healthful exercise of the functions of Christianity requires the establishment of various rules of expediency in the progress of ecclesiastical affairs. For example, a ministry may be local or itinerant; there may be missionaries here or there, or in neither place; there may be class meetings or love-feasts, or neither; there may or may not be presbyter or bishop with such or such jurisdiction. All these are, like the former class of questions, matters of expediency, to be determined, for the time, by Christian men, because they are not determined in the Scriptures. Who shall determine these questions, or how shall they be determined, is the same as to ask what form of church government shall we have.

Although there are no directions in the Bible as to any form of government the church must have, yet the historical part of the New Testament gives us considerable intimation as to what kind of government actually existed generally in apostolic times. In early days the government of the church for the most part rather resembled a pretty stringent republicanism, or a rather mild aristocracy. That it was in fact in a very considerable degree popular, seems to be unquestionable. The apostles were rather the servants than the rulers of the churches. The churches, at least sometimes, by the advice of the apostles, elected their own officers; Acts 6 : 1-6. In a case of crime, mentioned in 1 Cor., 5th chapter, the church seems to have judged in the matter. In a case referred to by Dr. Pierce, the instruction is, "Tell it to the church." The epistles of the apostles were addressed either to the churches or to the brethren and ministry conjointly.

Even upon questions of religious belief the church seems to have acted in conjunction with the ministry, as is seen in the 15th chap. of Acts. In apostolic times, nor in fact until about the time of the corruptions of the third and fourth centuries, do we see the slightest trace of monarchical rule in the Christian church.

This however determines nothing beyond those historical facts. What the form of church government was eighteen hundred years ago in Palestine, and what it ought to be, or must be here now. are very different questions. It will not require a very thorough examination into the circumstances and condition of the church under the Roman government, in the days of the apostles, to see that their ecclesiastical rule must have been of a very mild, persuasive, and a somewhat popular character. We are not under the Romans, nor are Paul, Peter and John with us. The question with us is, what kind of church government is best for us? This question will not be examined in this essay however. But this much of a remark may perhaps be ventured, that as a general thing, in our days, we have a little more of government and not quite so much of religion, as seems to have been the original design. A church with about the proper quantum of religion does not need so much government as perhaps might be supposed. And again, there is an idea not entirely without merit, and which runs somewhat on this wise, that "that government is best which is best administered." An English monarchy is better than a French republic or a South American democracy.

We come next to enquire whether a uniform system of government would not be likely to frustrate and defeat the ends of the gospel scheme? The church is an institution of the gospel. It is a thing separate and distinct from the gospel, and not necessary to its existence. But there can be no church without church government; for it is the laws of a church and the means of their execution that constitute its essence. The gospel as a practical system is precisely fitted and adapted to the particular circumstances and conditions of

all men, in all conceivable states and relations ; and the church, as a useful and proper institution of the gospel, designed to accompany it wherever it goes, must also be so adapted, and be in like manner, capable of subsisting in efficiency and strength in all conceivable human conditions. Look at the variety of human conditions and circumstances. Now the design is evidently, that in each of these there shall be a church. Here, for instance, is a most enlightened, intelligent and religious community, where the minister occupies a position of only mediocrity amongst the people. There the people are quite unlearned and ignorant. Here again they are vicious, stupid and sensual, with a very few exceptions ; and there is a missionary station where the people are savages. Would the same form of church government be best suited to the most enlightened portions of Georgia, and the most benighted portions of China? Here is a ship's company, far away on the ocean ; and there are prisoners of war, shut up in an island of the sea. Here is an army, under military discipline ; and there are three hundred congress men. Here are the slaves, on southern plantations ; there the colliers of England, the coolies of China, the sailors of a man-of-war, or a land or sea-exploring expedition. In each one of these places, there ought to be, there is designed to be, a Christian church ; the gospel ought to be ministered and the people ought to live in church and Christian fellowship. Can it be supposed that the same form of church government would be best adapted to the ends of church organization in all these circumstances, whatever form of government might be selected.

But it may be safely supposed that we have seen very little of human condition, and we are therefore very incapable of speaking of its variety. We look back a few years, and we call those days ancient ; a little shorter view, and those years were old times ; the last century comprises the later ages of the world ; and thus we talk of and teach what we call chronology. But, perhaps, chronology has not yet numbered its first incipient datable period. Perhaps the church has not

yet merged into a proper infancy. Who are to see the ruddy buddings of its childhood? What is to be the condition of its youth? What is to be the condition of the church as the world passes gradually on and on through a thousand centuries, and merges into early manhood, and as it rises into riper years and old age? What will twenty, an hundred, or a thousand millions of years bring about? Are a thousand millions of years a long time; too long to talk about? Long, as compared with what? It is a long period compared with a shorter period. It is a long period compared with the life of a man, whose years are threescore and ten; or the life of a fly, whose age is an hour. But that is not the question. Is it a long period compared with the life of a world? No man will say it is absolutely a long period. Its relation to eternity is the same as any other period. What changes are society and the face of the world to pass through? Look at the present condition of civilization and civil polity. Look at Africa and China. Look at Mohamedanism and Popery. How long will missionaries be necessary? Most likely a very short time. We look for great changes to take place in even fifty, a hundred, or a thousand years, in the state of learning, science, infidelity, truth, religion and such things. How long will infidelity exist in the world?

Now all these suggestions, and many others that might be made, indicate that the battles of the gospel will be fought on a thousand different fields, with many different kinds of weapons; in many different ways, and with a variety of results. The armies of the Lord must address themselves to the armies of sin, according to the position and circumstances of the latter. Millennial dawn will burst upon the world some day; and who knows what that will be? Organized, systematic, or outright opposition to religion will then be at an end. But the warfare is still to be prosecuted; no one knows how long; upon other grounds. Who can tell how long separate and distinct ecclesiastical organizations, such as we now call churches, will be kept up, or be useful or necessary? Surely these things are not necessary to Christianity. Sectarian di-

visions, within proper bounds and under suitable regulations, are believed to be useful under the existing circumstances. But who can tell how long they will be useful; how long they will exist? In short, looking even a little way into this unexplored sea of mutation; those more than radical changes and transformations which evidently lie upon the face of the future; who can tell how long church government, of any kind, will be necessary, or even exist? Church government is not an absolutely essential adjunct of the gospel. The essential functions of government and of the ministry are so far from being identical, that they are very opposite in their natures. The one is rule, and the other is service. Nothing vests them, as is usually the case, in the same person, but temporary expediency and custom. But no man can tell how soon it may become obviously necessary or proper that the minister should have nothing whatever to do with the matter of government. No man can tell how soon all human government, at least that of the church, and the state, may be most properly and judiciously vested in the same persons. Nothing requires their separation now but the existing condition of the political world. In fact, the moral features of the world may so change, though this is at present quite unlikely, that family rule itself may give place to a better system of domestic control. There are but three things within our knowledge that we can regard as absolutely stable; God, the Bible, and man's natural constitution. Christianity, religion, are always necessarily the same, because God and his Word will remain as they are. But the external circumstances, or mere habiliments of Christianity, are matters of temporary expediency, and ought to be regulated according to existing and surrounding circumstances. The question, how much of the functions of government shall be exercised by this officer, and how much by that?—whether certain jurisdiction shall extend here, or be restricted there?—whether a minister shall preside in this assembly, or in that?—whether there shall be such an officer as we call presiding elder, and what class of duties shall be assigned to him?—whether there shall

be a class-leader, what shall be his duties, and how he shall receive his appointment?—whether the ministers, and what ministers, shall meet in annual, biennial, or semi-annual conferences, or other kinds of synods?—who shall preside in these assemblies, and what shall be the extent of his authority?—these, and a thousand other questions that pertain essentially to the government of the church, cannot one of them be answered absolutely. To answer them properly we must first take an observation, and enquire into the present state of the world and of the church. And we will find it expedient to give such and such officers, such and such functions of government. Again, a thousand years afterward, or ten thousand, or ten years afterward, under other circumstances, the duties and powers assigned to two or three officers shall be vested in one, or some of them dispensed with altogether.

The more unenlightened and ignorant the church, and the more vicious and stupid the people, the more stringent, centralized and despotic must be the form of church government. This is the character of the proper modifications of human government everywhere; and church government is human government. When an uneducated youth shall not be found; when a higher condition of science and learning than is now found in our best colleges shall be common among all classes; when infidelity shall not be known; when the morals of all classes of society shall present a better appearance than that of our churches now does; must church government be precisely the same, in its form, that it should be now at our missionary stations? Let it be repeated, that the gospel is precisely suited to mankind in all possible circumstances and conditions. But church government, a mere incident or institution of the gospel, is a very different thing. It cannot be thus universally adapted, because its very existence is only incidentally, and not absolutely necessary. Suppose nine tenths of the people in all the most irreligious neighborhoods of the earth were thoroughly sanctified Christians, say ten years? Suppose, in a higher state of intelligence than we can well conceive of, an irreligious, an unsanctified man or

woman could not be found? What then of the "monarchy" of church government? And who knows how soon the world may present that appearance? And who knows that then the gospel has run one half, or one tenth, or one hundredth part of its course? Now take any particular form of church government we may; modify and arrange it as we choose, and endeavor to adapt it to the church in all possible conditions, and see what difficulties and disadvantages will be encountered. The Lord wisely avoided all these disadvantages, by leaving the question of government an "open question," not closed, as are the conditions of salvation.

It ought to be remembered that no intelligent person can be absolutely in favor of or opposed to any particular form of government. The proper government of a family, according to universal acquiescence, is a mixture of monarchy and aristocracy. The government of small, common schools, is mostly, or should be, monarchical; that of larger literary institutions partakes more of the aristocratic form. Military and maritime government is aristocratic. The government of manufacturers and large industrial associations is generally a mixture of monarchy and aristocracy; that of voluntary companies, or associations, is mostly of the elective, monarchical form. Judicial government, in England and the United States, is mostly a very stringent monarchy, or a very high aristocracy. Ecclesiastical government, here and in England, is mostly aristocratic, though oftentimes it has some of the republican principle infused. It is the settled belief, in this country, and is fast becoming the opinion of the world, that under certain and peculiar circumstances a republican form of government is best for a state. Though it is admitted by all, that the present condition of the world, as it respects morals and intelligence, would admit of its adoption only to a very limited extent. For the most part, though with considerable odds oftentimes, in favor of the government, and against the people, civil governments are well adapted to the morality and intelligence of the people. And so it is with the church.

Let the principles of Christianity prevail ; let the people be intelligent and religious, and there is no risk whatever in leaving the question of the form of government "an open question." It will take care of itself. Religious and intelligent men need not to be governed. They only need some mutually binding rules for all to work up to. And who is better calculated to make these rules than wise and religious men, well versed in all the circumstances of the case? We may invest such a man with the functions of the ministry, but that surely does not enable him the better to make wholesome laws. Nor does it, by any means, enable him wisely and judiciously to give explication and application to those laws. Though as a minister, having the church and its interests constantly before his mind, he would be the more likely to be a good and efficient executor of those laws. Still the functions of the ministry and government are quite dissimilar.

Among the different kinds of human government, as it is applied severally to the various associations among men, there is more affinity between that of the state and the church, than is to be found elsewhere. In either case, there is no natural difference between the governors and the governed, as in the family ; nor a difference arising out of the rights of property, as in associations of labour, and the like. The end is mutual advantage. No one has a separate personal interest to subserve, except in a restricted and subordinate sense. Questions of personal right may arise, but every one is interested in their proper adjustment. The advancement of the whole, in the principles of right, in opposition to every thing that is wrong, is, or ought to be, the aim and effort of all, and of each one. Monarchical government, then, would not be likely to be selected as the universal system of polity for the church, because, in its very idea, it supposes an interest in the monarch, which is not common among the members of the community. If monarchical government is allowable, whenever it is allowable, as the government of a state, it is not because it is ab-

stractly, the proper form of civil polity, but because, incidentally, the condition of the people will not allow of a better form. And why may we not so argue of the church?

Where there is a national purity among the people, governing and governed; or where the interests of all are the same, the republican form of government seems to be the natural form. It seems to harmonise most and best with man's constitution and natural rights; and it seems difficult to conceive why this principle will not apply as well to the government of a church as a state. But the question is, when is the state, or when is the church, ready for the introduction of this natural government? That the state can safely receive it at a far earlier period in the advancement of morals and intelligence than the church can, is apparent from the fact, that the latter operates upon a platform of morality and virtue far above the former. In the present condition of things, perhaps, neither could be safely removed from the grounds they respectively occupy. To improve the form of government in the church, we must first improve its morals and its religion, and also administer better the form of government we at present have. Then, in a greatly improved state of morals, intelligence and religion, we will be the better enabled to see what changes will be expedient in her polity.

ART. VI.

A DISCOURSE ON THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF THE LATE
REV. HEZEKIAH G. LEIGH, D. D.

By Rev. William A. Smith, D. D., Pres. E. M. College.

JOHN 1 : 47. "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!"

In respect to the individual of whom the Saviour spoke these words, no remark is required. We select them as peculiarly appropriate, in themselves considered, to the distinguished personage, on the occasion of whose death we are now assembled; distinguished no less for his eminent position and attainments as a minister of the gospel, than for his personal character as a Christian. In preaching the funeral sermon of a private individual, we consider his history as private matter, and are at liberty to be silent. We usually discuss some important doctrine or precept of religion which we suppose will exemplify, in the minds of those competent to make the application, the virtues or the vices by which he was chiefly characterized. But when called to bury those who were illustrious by position, or eminent for their public services, we are allowed to speak to the facts of their history, and if need be, even to discuss their claims to that measure of public attention which they received in virtue of their office or their services. On such occasions, it is proper to employ a portion of Scripture which is supposed to find a striking application of its truth and importance in those virtues and services which are brought to view in the analysis of their character. This is the use we propose to make of the passage: "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" Such we doubt not was our beloved friend, Rev. Dr. Leigh. His experience as a Christian; his sterling integrity; his eminent abilities and great success as a preacher of the gospel,

and the honest devotion with which he consecrated his whole life to the interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom, will strikingly illustrate what it is to be "an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile."

Brother Leigh was born in Perquimans county, N. C., on the 23d day of November 1795. He was converted to God in the 22d year of his age, and at once devoted himself to the ministry of the gospel. He was received, on probation, in the Virginia Conference, in February 1818. On the division of the Conference, in 1836, he attached himself to that part which became the N. C. Conference, of which he remained a prominent and useful member. Of the incidents of his conversion and dedication to the ministry, we are not prepared to speak. His life, his whole life, no less than his peaceful death, illustrates the sound and truly evangelical character of his conversion to God. By reference to the "minutes," it will be seen that he successively filled the following appointments, viz. : Bedford, Raleigh, Gloucester, Norfolk, Petersburg, Meherrin district, James river district, Agency for R. M. College, Petersburg district, Raleigh district, and Henderson circuit. He was a second time agent for R. M. College, and P. E. of Raleigh district, and for five years and nine months, he was without an appointment in consequence of the state of his health. But during this time he was often able to preach, and rendered eminent service to the church at college, and at various other places near his residence. He was appointed to every General Conference of the M. E. Church from 1824 to the time of its division, and attended every session, except that of 1844, from which he was detained by sickness. He was also a member of the Louisville convention in 1845, and of each General Conference of the M. E. Church, South. He was twenty-nine years actively engaged in the regular work of the ministry; twelve of which he devoted to the church, as a single man. In 1830 he was united in wedlock to Miss Mary J. Crump, of Greensville, Va.; who still lives, with four sons and two daughters, to mourn his loss.

Of his character as a husband and father, we do not design to speak. His memory is consecrated in the hearts of those most dear to him whilst he lived. They will continue, without the aid of "monumental stone," or of eulogium from us, to cherish the fondest recollections of those exalted domestic virtues, which now give a hallowed authority to all the precepts by which he sought to govern his family. We turn to those points of his character in which the public have a common interest. We propose to notice his character as a **CHRISTIAN**; as a **PREACHER**; and as a **PATRON OF LEARNING**. Let us, then, consider

I. His character as a **CHRISTIAN**.

We do not introduce this topic to furnish the occasion of a biographical sketch; but rather to call attention to one striking feature in his Christian character; namely, the extent to which the doctrine of "the witness of the Spirit" entered into his theological views, and his personal experience. This doctrine, in the form of words in which the Methodists are accustomed to express it, has, from the beginning, formed a distinguishing feature in Methodist theology. It has always been regarded as the test and measure of Christian experience. That "the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God," is the great peculiarity of Methodism, in the department of experimental religion. The emphasis with which Wesley, and the great and good men of his day, insisted on this as the privilege of every child of God, provoked the charge of fanaticism from the cold and calculating formalism of that age; and although the Scriptural authority for this truth, and the holiness of thousands who professed it have steadily rebuked the error which excepts to the words of the Holy Ghost in defining Christian experience, there are still to be found many who reiterate the charge. But this great Bible truth continues to be the crowning glory of Methodist experience. "The fruit of the Spirit, which is love, joy and peace," enters largely into the character of every truly experimental Christian. And that "love,

joy and peace," should enter into our experience, as the immediate "fruit of the Spirit," is not only a doctrine, "very full of comfort," but one which commends itself to the approbation of our most deliberate judgment. In Methodist philosophy, we can no otherwise account for the existence of these eminent graces, than by tracing them to the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit in the heart as a witnessing spirit. They are "the fruit of the Spirit." They exist in the heart, and, as we conceive, must be produced there by the immediate presence and influence of the Holy Spirit. We cannot otherwise account for their existence, on any known principles of our mental natures, than by considering them as the immediate result of that presentation of Scripture truth to the mind, which He can only make; and of that awakened impulse of our feelings, which He only can produce, enabling us fully to believe; intellectually and devotionally to feel what we believe; or to trust confidently in the truth of that which we believe. In other words, the Holy Spirit alone can enable us to realize that clear, devotional persuasion or belief, that God doth freely accept us through the infinite merit of his Son, and love us as a reconciled Father; and thus to claim confidently, though humbly, the relation of children; "and if of children then of heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ;" which is not only the essential matter of Christian comfort, but is also the necessary and uniform antecedent of that holy emotion of gratitude and delight, denominated the love of God. "We love Him," says John, "because He first loved us." This being true, as a universal conclusion, it is also true of that particular love which we bear to Him as our reconciled Father; so that it is immediately traceable to that cognition of the fact, and fiducial reliance on its truth, called faith, that God doth love us. Without such an antecedent cognition and trust, which must require in our present state of mental imbecility and moral depravity, as the condition of its existence, the immediate presence and influence of the Holy Spirit, we cannot conceive, from any thing now known of our mental natures,

how it could be possible for us to love God, or feel that we are at peace with Him. Undoubtedly, it is not possible for us to realize that emotion of gratitude to God and delight in him, called love, without an antecedent cognition of the fact, that God is not angry with us, but loves us as a reconciled Father. The consciousness that we are the true penitents, in whose favor the act of pardon, according to the Scriptures, always passes the Divine mind, must, we think, be wrought in the heart by the Holy Ghost. To assume so great and important a truth, so as to rely on it with confidence enough to die in peace, would be bold, if not arrogant, were it not warranted by a conviction of its reality, such as the Holy Spirit alone can effect. But with this antecedent influence we can readily perceive how we can so believe. All the conditions necessary to such a faith are fully met by the antecedent presence and influence of the Holy Spirit. And all the conditions plainly necessary to the love of God, by one, who otherwise must look upon him as angry with him, and whose prevailing emotions must therefore be those of fear, of trembling, and ultimately of despair; a class of emotions the most opposite to that of love; are fully met by this antecedent state of devotional belief, that God is not angry with him, but loves him as a reconciled Father. The same faith, fulfilling the condition necessary to remove that sense of guilt which shuts out all peace and joy, enables its possessor to "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." Thus we teach a doctrine, no less in accordance with the philosophy of the human mind, than with the plain teachings of the Holy Scriptures.

The late Dr. J. H. Rice, whose name cannot be mentioned but with the highest respect, because of his piety and learning, once remarked, in a social circle, in the city of Richmond, in which his Methodist brethren were handled with a degree of severity by no means to the taste of one with his large mind and Catholic feelings; "and yet these people die well!" "Yes," he repeated, "notwithstanding what you say may be true, I have often had occasion to notice the re-

markable fact, that these people generally die well!" Ah! truly brethren, it is precisely at this point that Methodism magnifies itself before all the world. Her people die well! Wickedness is rebuked, and doctrinal antagonism itself is made silent, when it is seen how these people die. And when Methodists shall cease to die well, Methodism will cease to be an exponent of Bible truth, and may be laid aside among the things that were. By many the principal cause of the success of Methodism is ascribed to our peculiar system of preaching; and this, no doubt, is one material cause; but, in truth, we must look rather to our doctrines than to our general plan of operations; and of these, the doctrine of a conscious evidence, within one's own heart, of acceptance with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; and the offer of this glorious salvation to all men, without respect of persons, must be regarded as the principal. Yes, we may take it upon us to say, that the great secret of Methodist success is found in the prevalence and authority of these distinguishing doctrines. If Methodists die well, it is because they come to the contest covered with the shield of this great truth; Christ died for me and rose again for my justification; I believe this, and am happy in believing it. God loves me, says the dying saint; I believe this; I feel it; hence I love to trust Him; I rejoice to trust Him; hence I feel the evidence within myself, that I am going to "receive a crown of life which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me in that day." This is a Christian's death; rather, it is the victor's shout of triumph!

But remembering that too many are liable to precipitate a conclusion, it may be proper to remark that we are not at liberty to infer, that all those who are said to reject the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit, are our enemies, because they are our doctrinal opponents. On the contrary, a careful attention to this subject cannot fail to convince us that all true Christians agree in sentiment, though, on many points, they may differ widely in opinion. The true Israel of God are to be found among all those denominations who

agree in the fundamental doctrines of the Bible. We think we have good cause to regret that any should hesitate to adopt the language of the Scripture in defining a genuine Christian experience; namely, "that the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God." But so it is, there are many who attain great eminence in Christian experience, who choose a different form of words in expressing substantially the same thing. If we estimate the experience of Wesley, Benson, Fletcher, and Clarke, and that numerous class of pious Methodists, who follow them in the language by which they define their experience, we shall not find it to differ materially from the experience of Rice, Alexander, Martin, Hallyburton, and the numerous class whom they may be taken to represent, who do not employ, as we are accustomed to think, the same form of sound words in defining the ground of their hopes. But still we repeat, that in our philosophy, no less than our theology, the "witness of the Spirit" is the great point to be gained in a sound Christian experience. Whether we shall express it in the very words of Scripture, or shall adopt a different form of words to express substantially the same idea, is not material as to the essence of the thing itself. No man, we think, can properly be said to be prepared to live the life of a true Christian, without a calm, sober persuasion of mind, that he is pardoned and accepted, through the merits of the Saviour. Much less, can any one be said to be prepared to die, unless he come to the contest with the same devotional persuasion of mind, that he who loved him, and gave himself for him, will sustain him through the conflict and admit him to the rest of heaven.

Our mind has been directed to this topic, by the importance attached to it by our deceased brother. It entered largely into his public exercises, and also into his personal experience. Those acquainted with him well remember with what clearness, with what force of argument, and with what convincing authority from the Scriptures, he enforced in the pulpit this great doctrine of the Bible; the prominence he gave it in the class room, the love feast, and also in private

life, whenever the conversation turned upon Christian experience. With him, it was a settled conviction, that it was both the duty and privilege of every one to live with a clear, devotional persuasion of mind, that Christ loved him and gave himself for him; and to cherish a lively hope that, through him, he would "be faithful unto death, and receive a crown of life." Now, this certainly is the duty of every one, and no man should be satisfied to live short of it. For, if we do not follow our Lord, in the path of humble obedience to his commands, we have no ground even to hope for future salvation; and if we do not love Him, it is utterly impossible to obey Him. For even the most commendable acts, in themselves considered, as prayer, the Lord's Supper, the most bountiful liberality, the utmost integrity and justice in all business transactions, have not a single element of obedience in them, unless they spring from a perception of duty to Christ, and are prompted by the pleasure we take in performing them because they are pleasing to Christ; and this is essentially the love of Christ. Hence, if we do not love Him, we cannot obey Him. But if we do not believe that He loved us and gave Himself for us, and that we are accepted of the Father, on this account, we cannot, according to the known principle of our mental natures, love Him. Because, without this belief, there are only two alternate states of mind, each of which is opposite to the state called love; either the mind must be in a state of indifference about the whole matter; which is a state of darkness and obduracy, and of course, not the state of love, or it must be in an awakened state; awakened to belief in the verity of those truths which address themselves to the condition of a depraved and guilty sinner; which belief, as all experience and sound philosophy show, can only result, so far as its essential tendency is concerned, in fear, and ultimately in despair; which are the opposite of love. Hence without the belief in question, we cannot love Christ. But with this faith, as before shown, the evidence of his compassion for us strongly appeals to our gratitude, and tends directly to awaken within us a holy delight in Him who has done so much for

us; and this is the essential idea of love. But the "carnal mind receiveth not the things of the Spirit;" that is, the carnal mind is morally incapable of clearly perceiving and duly appreciating the pure abstract truths of religion; "they are spiritually discerned," says the Apostle. Hence, if the Holy Spirit be not with us, to "take of the things of God and show them" to the mind of man, or in other words, if the Holy Spirit do not so present the truths of the Bible, and so quicken our perception and feelings that we may be conscious of that true contriteness of heart to which alone the promise of pardon is made, it is impossible that we can so believe as to rest satisfied that the act of pardon has passed the Divine mind. Every one, therefore, who does so believe, does it by the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, leading to the comfortable persuasion of mind, that God, for Christ's sake has forgiven his sins, and hence given him an earnest of future salvation.

To abridge this argument into a series of consecutive propositions, it will stand thus; without that immediate influence of the Holy Spirit in the heart, which we call the witness of the Spirit, no man can believe that God loves him as a reconciled Father; without this belief, he cannot love God, without this love, he cannot obey God; and without this obedience, he cannot cherish a well grounded and comfortable hope of heaven. Therefore, without that influence of the Spirit, in the heart, which we call the witness of the Spirit, no man can cherish a well grounded and comfortable hope of heaven. Hence, further, the possession of this grace is the paramount duty of every man, and if the duty, it is attainable; and if attainable, as from its nature, it is an unspeakable blessing, it is also an incomparable privilege; therefore, the attainment of this grace is the great privilege of every man. These views, we are persuaded, entered largely into the personal experience of our deceased brother. If the tenor of his preaching, and the spirit of his general conversation, be proof of this; the character of his experience, through a long and painful sickness, more fully exemplified the Scripture; the path of the

just shineth more and more unto the perfect day. About ten years since, he was attacked with a rheumatic affection, which soon became chronic, and, for the most part, disqualified him for any very active services as an itinerant preacher. At different intervals, his sufferings were very great. Some eighteen months since, he suffered a partial paralysis of the left side, and in July last, he had a paralysis of the kidneys, which it was expected, at one time, would prove fatal in a few hours. He, however, recovered so far as to encourage the hope that he would be restored to usual health; but, on 9th of September, he was seized with a violent attack of dysentery, which so prostrated the vital energy, that he speedily sunk into a comatose state, from which he never recovered, only as he was aroused, for a few moments, at a time; until, on the eighteenth instant, he slept in death. Our interviews, at different periods of his affliction, were frequent, and the conversation usually turned upon distinctive views of Christian experience. The topics which interested him most, were the faith of assurance, inspired by the Holy Spirit; the rich comfort it afforded him as he drew near the Jordan of death; the bright and glowing light it threw over its otherwise dark valley; the glory that awaited the children of God in the heavenly rest; the curious and interesting inquiries which would be answered in the spiritual state; the difficulties, in both mental and moral nature, which would be solved; and the glorious advance of mind along the illimitable fields of infinite knowledge, developing, at every step of the vast progression, the amazing wonders of Deity, filling the ever increasing capacities of the immortal Spirit with that large measure of heavenly joy which the eternal fountain of light and love could alone supply. At the period when it was supposed that he was within a few hours of his dissolution, I spent some time with him. The conversation turning upon his state and prospects, he dwelt with peculiar interest, on the rich comfort afforded him by the great Bible truth which we have just discussed; and though he felt confident of a safe trust in Christ; a sweet assurance of acceptance, there seem-

ed to open to his view so bright and glowing a prospect of the truths yet to be realized, that he grew eloquent in describing them; and was so lost in a vision of the attainments yet to be made, in the fields of knowledge and comfort provided by the love of Christ, that he narrowed down, by comparison, the attainments already made, to a point so contemptible in his own eyes, as to cause him to loathe himself, and exclaim; "Oh, if there were not a days-man betwixt God and me, how could I stand his searching eye! Thank God, bless God, for such a Saviour." The day before his death, I visited him, and found him fast sinking. Just before leaving, as it was not deemed proper to fatigue him by conversation, I sought only to inquire, "watchman what of the night?" He turned his fading eye upon me, and with a smile of triumph playing on his countenance, he softly said, in reply to my inquiry, if he still felt that his trust was in his Saviour; "Oh yes! What should I do without that? Jesus is with me! My trust is in Him alone." We examine,

II. His character as a PREACHER.

Dr. Leigh had few equals in the pulpit. Sound in theology, bold in conception, often brilliant in fancy, and appealing, in all his efforts, no less to the heart than to the head, he stood a prince among pulpit men. He filled a large space in public attention, and wielded a wide and undisputed influence among his brethren in the ministry. As a presiding elder, (an office which he filled during a large portion of his public life,) no man was more relied on in counsel. He was eminently successful in winning souls to Christ. A great many of the most valuable and influential of our membership in Virginia and North Carolina claim him as their spiritual father, and count it among their brightest sources of joy, that they shall soon join him in their Father's house in heaven. Such were his claims as a pulpit man, that the spirit of a sound criticism can have no tendency to obscure the lustre of his eminent virtues. As a public man, we shall

deal with him. With this view, we invite attention to a few particulars.

We have no satisfactory information as to his early advantages of education; but we cannot be mistaken in assuming that they were good. He preceded me, in 1820, by a few years, on the Gloucester circuit; which was among the first appointments he received. I soon had occasion to know that a bright star had appeared above the horizon, and was destined, ere long, to culminate in the mid-heavens of Methodism. The standard by which I was to be judged, as a pulpit man, a Christian, and a gentleman, had been furnished by my distinguished predecessor. His doctrines, his bold imagery, his remarks in social life, and the specific results of his labors upon the dense masses which attended his pulpit, were all remembered. The old and the young, even children, were fond to quote his sayings. The first time I saw Dr. Leigh was at the Portsmouth Conference, February 1826. His movements in social life; his speeches and bearing in Conference session, and particularly his preaching, engaged my especial attention. I soon determined, in my own mind, that, in many respects, he was by far the most promising member of the body. I have known him well since that period; served with him in important public positions; broken many a lance with him in debate; and have found, to the present time, no reason to change my opinion. But in the midst of a glorious career of usefulness, it pleased God, by a most painful and protracted affliction, to command him to comparative retirement. "The Judge of all the earth will do right." Brother Leigh is no more; but his character is before us for instruction. Indiscriminate praise will not contribute to our edification. We will speak of him with the freedom of a brother beloved. His character as a pulpit man, though distinguished by unusual merit, was not without striking defects. His early advantages of education, though good, were evidently not of that thorough kind which his mind was capable of receiving. The style of his sentences was often inverted. His performance, in many parts, was

often embarrassed by the formalities of a labored preparation. He was endowed by nature with a mind, wide in its compass, active and vigorous in its operations, and he had cultivated it too highly to allow him to appear in public without feeling that he was a master of his subject. His early mental discipline, however, had not been of that thorough kind which enabled him to accomplish his preparation by a course of spontaneous and independent thinking. He, therefore, had recourse to the free use of his pen, and often, we judge, with the strictest formalities of preparation. We are far from censuring this. On the contrary, we deem it the solemn duty of every public man, in such circumstances, to make a free use of the pen. It is folly to bespeak attention when we have nothing to say; to claim to be instructors when we have nothing to impart. If we cannot think through our subject, without the aid of our pens, nor speak through it, without the aid of our manuscripts, then let us use them. But still, it is not to be doubted, that we labor under serious disadvantages. In a public life, of over thirty years, we have met with but one man, in the Methodist pulpit, who could, with any thing like uniform success, declaim his composition with that naturalness and simplicity which gave to it its due and full effect. A failure of memory, or recurrence to the manuscript, or more frequently, a natural inability to fall into and maintain the true spirit of the composition, throughout its delivery, will often dissolve the sympathy between a speaker and his hearers, and cause that only to be admired as beautiful, which should be remembered and felt as true. That degree of mental discipline which will enable a man to think through his whole subject, and to command a view of it from any and all points of observation, and to bring to the aid of his judgment and imagination those rich stores of knowledge which they demand under progressive excitement, is greatly to be desired in all public speakers; and those who have it, possess advantages in awakening the attention and arousing the sympathies of their audience, so as to receive the daguerreotype impression of their views and feelings, which are

not conferred by any other conceivable method of preparation. He who falls below a certain point in mental training, and relies on a laborious and formal preparation, may avail himself, and with propriety, of the most correct information which the age supplies; and in his delivery, may often catch the true inspiration of his theme, and, breaking over all the restraints imposed by the formalities of preparation, may accomplish some of the highest results of eloquence. Dr. Leigh, we think, was a striking example of this. There was also this in the every day discourses of Dr. Leigh; and, perhaps, in as great a degree as those of any man we ever heard; they were full of heart; they were full of Christ. They were, in their essential nature and effects, as far from the mere deductions of a calculating philosophy, as any we ever listened to. He breathed over his audience the pure inspiration of a warm-hearted Christianity. The extent to which the evangelical doctrine we have discussed entered into his own personal experience, very fully accounts for this fact. And on those occasions especially, on which he evidently broke over the bounds of studied preparation, and his will was yielded up to the control of the pure moral sentiments, a direction was given to his perceptivity and imagination which was truly astonishing, in the production of a native, simple, and pure gospel eloquence. In this respect, we may well commend him as a model pulpit man. This preparation was thorough. There was the clear light of truth. It was no borrowed light. It radiated directly from a heart whose fires were kindled by the inspiration of a sound Christian experience. But we proceed to contemplate him,

III. AS A PATRON OF LEARNING.

It is not surprising, that a man of his intellect, and wide views as to the best interests of the church and the country, should be the patron of learning. But Dr. Leigh is to be regarded as one of the pioneers, and perhaps the principal one, in that great movement in behalf of learning, which, for several years, has been going forward in the church in Vir-

ginia and in North Carolina. He began to take rank amongst us at a time when the church literally slept over this great question, embodied in her commission to enlighten the world. In estimating the materials of church history, it cannot escape notice, that learning, and that in the ratio of the demand, was an original and essential element. If only two twelfths of the original number of Christ's ministers were distinguished by the learning of the age, it was because the objects to be accomplished by learned agents required no more at that time. But when, in the sixteenth century, learning was chiefly confined to the Roman priesthood and those who sustained their depraved pretensions, a much greater number of learned men was demanded to carry on the contest. God raised up a Luther, a Melancthon, a Zwingle, an Erasmus, a Calvin, a Beza, and an Arminius. These men achieved a glorious triumph over the learned depravity of the Papal church. The sincere but uninformed leaders of the Anabaptist fanaticism contributed only to impede the progress of the Reformation. And when, in the eighteenth century, the clergy of the National Church of England, and those who sustained them, embodying the learning of the age, had themselves, to a great extent, adopted a system of formalism, which, under the protection of the state, threatened a result to vital Christianity no less disastrous than that from which it had been so recently reformed, God sent forth into his vineyard John and Charles Wesley, Whitfield, Fletcher, Benson, Coke, Clarke and Watson. These were sufficient for the times. The false philosophy of the clergy and their supporters was triumphantly rebuked by the learning of these men. This gave them access to the masses, and particularly enabled them to reach, by their system of lay-preaching, the more obscure portions of society, who had long since ceased to be in contact with the clergy of the establishment. The same system of means was deeply felt to be necessary in this country, when Anglo-American Methodism began to prosper. Coke and Asbury, pressed by the urgency of the demands to oppose the influence of the

settled clergy in the southern country, (the principal theatre of their labors at that time,) by the necessary amount of learned and influential labor, early embarked in the cause of education, and sought the establishment of a college. But the effects of the Revolution had wrought a great change in the demands of the times. It had destroyed the influence of the hitherto established clergy. In fact, it had driven the most of them from the country. It had left the door of access to the great mass of the people wide open. The immediate demand of their labor was the preaching of the simple truths of the gospel, upon the basis of a sound personal experience. This demand was fully supplied by the clear-headed and sound-hearted men who were employed in the itinerant field in that day. But our deceased brother, and those who thought with him, some thirty years ago, were deeply sensible that a different state of things existed at that time. A great change was rapidly coming over the face of society. Those who had been placed in advance of the mass of their hearers, by the simple fact, that they could tell of a sound conversion of heart, and exhort the people to "flee the wrath to come," were no longer in advance of their hearers, by reason of these attainments. The republican principle of our civil institutions was rapidly diffusing the educational element through the mass of society. The yeomanry of the country were rising daily in the scale of intellect and general information. But, from the self-sacrificing nature of our itinerant system, we continued, as heretofore, to receive the supplies, for our fields of labour, from the young men of the land. These young men, as all experience and observation proved, were of necessity much below the current standard of public information. The simple story of conversion was no longer a novelty. Thousands of pulpits, besides our own, taught the same essential truths. These truths, therefore, no longer placed them in advance of the mass of their hearers, and constituted them, in any good sense, as heretofore, the leaders of the people. Withal, other denominations were

raising up an able and learned ministry. These were dividing public attention with us, in all our settled communities. They were pushing their enterprises, side by side, with us in many directions. It was sensibly felt to be the solemn duty of our denomination to hold its way in the great work of "spreading Scripture holiness over these lands." Besides, it was also seen, as it is now beginning to be more deeply felt, that a great struggle with the errors of Papal Rome awaited the church in this country. A struggle which would require, come when it might, a greater array of intellect and knowledge than had ever before been summoned to the conflict. An educational movement was demanded. "It was time," said Dr. Leigh, "high time, our church had moved in this great cause." Again, it was seen that our ministry failed to derive legitimate benefit from the general progress in learning, as well from the fact, that we had no prominent literary institution, as because it was supplied by young men below the current standard of public information. Our youth, if liberally educated at all, were educated at seats of learning under other influences than those of our own church. By reason of this, our educated young men had been weaned, in their feelings of attachment, from the church of their fathers. Accustomed to associate learning and influence with other pulpits, they gradually lost respect for ours. At all events, but few of our educated young men devoted themselves to the ministry amongst us. Dr. Leigh united with others in urging two remedies for these pressing evils. One was a movement in the Conference, with the preachers; and the other was a movement out of the Conference, with the people. In the Conference, a much more extensive course of study for licentiates, with more rigid annual examinations, and more caution in the admission of probationers, was insisted on. It was also recommended to our people to aid in establishing an institution of learning, of high character. This enterprise was carried before the people, and by private conversations and public appeals, an effort was made to arouse the conscience of the church on the subject of education. In

a short time, Dr. Leigh was enabled to present to the Conference a handsome subscription, the fruit of his private labors, in evidence of the readiness of the people to co-operate with the Conference in the establishment of a college. Action on the part of the Conference was now demanded, and at the session, in 1829, a Board of Trustees was appointed to select a suitable location, procure a charter, and complete the enterprise. This Board held a meeting, in the fall of that year, in Petersburg, and one, in the following year, at Zion church, in Mecklenburg, Va. The great solicitude of our friends, in different sections, to secure the location of the institution, in their immediate vicinity, gave rise to conflicting opinions. The land was literally before us. Large inducements were offered, by different communities, to secure the location. After a careful examination of the whole ground, the meeting concurred in selecting the vicinity of Boydton, Mecklenburg, Va., as the location of the college.

Regarding all the circumstances, the prominent position held by Dr. Leigh in originating all the preliminary measures, and his personal activity in advancing them, we have always considered him, in a good sense, the founder of Randolph Macon College. We do his memory no more than justice, when we accord to him the honor to which he is entitled, as a public benefactor. This college will long continue as a noble monument of his far reaching views, and devotion to a great public interest, shedding its light and glory over the church and the land. He also contributed largely, from his private resources, to this object, and lived to see the fruit of his labors in a vast amount of present good, and a cheering prospect for the future. This great work, however, was not accomplished without difficulty. Some saw in the movement a clear evidence of worldly-mindedness; the "entering wedge" of incalculable mischief! Others, whose feelings were dictated by their prejudices, entertained serious fears that we could never succeed! Again, to procure a charter, appoint professors, and use the name of college, were known to be an easy matter; but a mediocre institution, having little

else to recommend it than the empty title, never at all comported with the views of Dr. Leigh and the noble spirits who co-operated with him in the enterprise. A large amount of money was to be raised. True, it was confidently hoped, at first, that the State, in which it might be located, would contribute important aid in its establishment. This consideration had great weight in determining its location to be in Virginia. She had committed herself by an act, in 1821, to appropriate the accruing proceeds of the Literary Fund, after it should reach a certain amount, to the benefit of her chartered institutions of learning. About this time, that fund had reached the maximum, or would do so in a few years. With a view of sharing this appropriation, (other things being equal,) a charter was asked of the State of Virginia, instead of the State of North Carolina. The charter was cheerfully granted, but up to the present time, the Legislature has refused to redeem the pledge of 1821. It was soon discovered, that this pledge was a mere *ruse* of the times, by which a large appropriation to the University of the State was secured, and that the "accruing proceeds," in question, were demanded by a system of demagogueism, without which a large portion of our politicians could not share the distinctions of office. To the appropriations for the University, we did not object; but that the large proceeds of that fund, committed as they are to most useful purposes, should be exhausted on a plan of education called "primary schools," which, as at present conducted, is so entirely unproductive of good, is subject to strong objection, and should, we think, engage the more serious attention of the citizens of this Commonwealth. In these circumstances, it was discovered, at an early period, that if Randolph Macon should ever fulfil her destiny, it would be by the liberality of the church and her friends, aroused through the enterprise of a few presiding minds. From 150 to 200,000 dollars were considered indispensable to accomplish this great work. To raise so large a sum by individual contributions, was a Herculean undertaking. Great difficulties were to be overcome, which at times seemed impassible.

But the work was undertaken, in the name of the Lord ; and his blessing has borne us above all discouragements, and enables us to rejoice in prospect of the permanent establishment of Randolph Macon College.

It is not designed to write the history of this Institution. Suffice it to say, then, that through the co-operation of the Virginia, N. Carolina, S. Carolina, and Georgia Conferences, and the active liberality of the membership and friends of the church within their bounds, the Trustees own large property in lands, buildings, professional apparatus and library ; together with an endowment fund, a portion of which is invested in productive stocks, and the remainder in individual bonds, in a process of collections ; amounting to about 60,000 dollars. In acquiring this, large liabilities had to be assumed. And in so great an undertaking, requiring more personal attention than could be given to it by those most interested in the economy of the expenditures, something, perhaps much, was lost that might have been saved. Until a few years past, the tuition fees frequently did not meet the current expenses of the institution. Hence, debts were accumulated. These debts were long felt as a sore evil. But as the great source of accumulation is cut off, at this time, by the endowment fund, they are now deemed manageable, and fully within the liberality and enterprise of our people. Thirty thousand dollars, would perfect our endowment fund ; pay the debts ; effect repairs, and place the institution beyond the reach of ordinary contingencies ; and what is this among so many !

But the results of this enterprise may be viewed in another direction. In the early period of her history, a large portion of her patronage came from Georgia and South Carolina. For several years past, this source of supply has been cut off. Emory College, Georgia, has received, as it was entitled to do, our Southern patronage. But this deficiency has been fully made up by an increased interest in education among our friends in Virginia and N. Carolina. There has been no material change in our numbers. From one hundred, to one hundred and fifty have generally been in attendance. From

the year 1835, to the present time, there have been one hundred and ninety-two regular graduates. Scarcely a year has passed without a gracious revival of religion. And although we have had a full share of ungodly young men, at all times, yet from data before us, it is doubted if any institution in the land, has greater cause to be thankful for more general good order, studious habits, and a greater relative number of truly pious young men. In free conversation between myself and others, at different times, before his death, brother Leigh discoursed with great interest on this subject. He had resided, he said, in the vicinity of the College from an early period of its history. He had witnessed all its vicissitudes; had been depressed and elevated in his feelings, as Providence seemed to frown or smile upon this cherished object of his prayers, and the toil of the best years of his life; and although he had seen much to regret; much, that he trusted would be corrected by a sounder discipline and the advance of civilization, he felt that he had, with the church, and especially the States of Virginia and N. Carolina; the States most interested; great cause to bless God for what he had lived to see, as the fruits of this institution. So many of the promising youth of the land had been converted to God, or deeply impressed with the saving truths of the Gospel; so many well educated young men had been sent out from this institution to fill the professions of law, medicine and agriculture, with wide views of the wants of the world, and a growing capacity to contribute largely to supply this demand; so many, also, had gone forth as presidents and professors, in Colleges, and as teachers of important schools, and were now exerting a wide and growing influence upon the rising generation; so many also, had entered our Conferences, and were proving themselves able ministers of the New Testament; simple hearted and self sacrificing; they were a standing rebuke to the ignorant conceit, that educated men must be vain and idle. And then, again, he noticed the very large number of poor young men who had been educated here. He doubted if any institution, in the land, could boast so many in the same length of time. No

young man, however needy, if orderly and promising, ever came amongst us, and did not find a hearty welcome. Officers and citizens were always ready to help forward the deserving poor. The revivals of religion, and the educated young men who had entered the ministry, many of whom were eminently useful, engaged his particular attention. Regarding all the circumstances, he declared, though confessing to many misgivings, at times, and many things to regret, there was abundant cause to be thankful and take courage. He felt sure, that the most liberal friend the institution ever had, could not regret a single dollar he had ever contributed to this great work, if he had any thing like a correct idea of the good already accomplished.

On this whole subject, the views of Dr. Leigh were very decided. He was familiar with the popular opinions, as to the part the church should take in the cause of education. He had often discussed them in private, and very deeply regretted that the movements of the church were still slow in that direction; but he entertained no doubts that the onward movements of the age would, ere long, render the victory complete. With him, it was a settled conviction, that learning and religion were inseparable; that "what God had joined together no man should put asunder." The alliance of learning with any thing else but the religious principle, is an unholy wedlock, which can never receive the blessing of God. The church that cares not who teaches her children, in the schools of the land, no less than in the pulpits of the land, has forgotten her mission, and forfeited her Divine charter. It is an idle dream to think that she can prosper, through the mere agency of the pulpit, whilst she yields up her children to be instructed by men of depraved moral habits, or infidel principles, or by Papists, or by Antichrist in some other shape. No! no! It is a great and paramount duty of the church to take care of the pulpit, but it should not be overlooked that, let men of perverted minds prattle as they may, the schools of the country, after all, in a good sense, supply the pulpits of the country. The church must not, she dare

not, be indifferent to this matter. Ministers, true ministers, are men of God's own choosing. This is true beyond all controversy. No others must be countenanced. Many of these are not called until they are prepared for usefulness in the fields of labor, in which it is proper to employ them. This also is true. But then it is equally true, that many are called, and furnish proof, such as has never failed to satisfy the church, in all ages, when, as yet, they are not prepared for successful labor in those fields in which the services of gospel ministers are most urgently demanded. No ecclesiastical council had ever disputed this principle. No writer, of acknowledged authority in the Christian church, had ever asserted a different doctrine in regard to a Divine call to the ministry. Hence, our church never once thought of waiting to find a man called of God to the work of the ministry, who, at the same time, was sufficiently familiar with the Chinese language and customs, to be a profitable preacher to them, before a mission in that country was opened. On the contrary, two men, who were judged to be called of God to the ministry, were deputed, without scruple, to repair to that country, and prepare, by a course of extremely severe study of their difficult language and strange customs, to prosecute a mission among that people. This is only an example of the principle on which the whole Christian church has uniformly acted, in all similar cases, since the period when God fitted men for their work by the miraculous "gift of tongues." Our deceased friend entertained the opinion, in which it is assumed most sober minded men concur, that the instances among ourselves in which men are called *after* they are prepared, are not numerous; but on the contrary, the most of those who are called to the ministry have (except the material fact of a sound conversion) the principal part of the work of preparation to accomplish afterwards. It is exclusively on the basis of this principle, that the law of the church admits none to the regular ministry, without a four years' probation. For, as the proposition, that it belongs alone to God to call men to the work of the ministry, is regarded as a truism,

amongst us; if all whom He calls are prepared for their work, we can have nothing to do but to assign them their labor. Because if it be assumed, that the object of the probation is merely to settle the question of a call, it will then follow, that, on the hypothesis, that He calls none who are not prepared, we could not, with propriety, make their graduation, by ordination, to the office and work of the ministry, to depend upon their passing approved annual examinations upon certain preparatory studies in literature and theology. But on the hypothesis, that though called, they may not be prepared for usefulness, we subject them to a course of preparatory study, and make their ordination to depend upon their giving evidence of preparation, as well as a call. It is also believed with equal confidence, that a great many of the fruits of our pious labors are called to the work of the ministry, but never obey the call. Some refuse by an act of voluntary disobedience. But others refuse under the force of circumstances which greatly palliates their error. They are conscious of a great want of preparation, even for that partial work we propose to assign licentiates in Conference. The public opinion, (whether right or wrong, is not the question,) against the practice of entering the Christian ministry, with as little preparation as they feel they have, is daily finding expression in forms, which have a very discouraging influence on their convictions of duty. The progressive agitation of the subject, in our annual Conferences, tends greatly to increase this discouragement. Its influence reaches beyond the young men in question, and reacts upon them with fearful effect. Presiding elders, and others, who, in former times, would take these young men by the hand and bring them forward to the Conference, for admission on trial, are now discouraged from any such measures; at least, they do it not with that confidence which formerly gave them great success. The result is, that in the present state of public opinion and practice, the labors of a great many young men, who are called to the ministry, are lost to the church. This is truly a serious matter, throughout the whole extent of our work;

and especially in Virginia and North Carolina, at this time. Fields are multiplying on our hands, to an extent far beyond our ability to supply them with profitable labor, or indeed, with labor of any kind. The cause of Christ suffers. And if it be true, that He designates, by a call, a sufficient number to supply the fields which His grace has provided; (and who dare say He does not?) a fearful retribution must await us, if these fields are not supplied by reason of our neglect. God will give them to other shepherds who will care for his sheep. Some remedy should be found, and found speedily, for this evil. The tendency of public opinion is onward. It will hardly be in our power to change its direction, even if it were desirable. In these circumstances, it is clear, to our mind, that it is the solemn duty of all ministers, and others who could, with propriety, approach such young men, to seek them out, and encourage them to obtain an education. They are not the less to be valued because their modest sense of deficiency forbids their coming forward, of themselves. They should be sought out. Their attention should be directed to the facilities they may enjoy at the literary institution of the church. They should be encouraged to secure them.

No man valued the itinerant system more highly than Dr. Leigh. Few men enjoyed better opportunities to appreciate its merits in training young men for the pulpit. In his estimation, it was a school which stood unrivaled by any thing known to the church, as a means of pulpit training. But then a certain degree of mental discipline; a certain degree of knowledge of men and books, and especially of the great principles of the Bible, beyond a mere experience of grace, are obviously necessary to give efficiency to it as a school of training. Like every other great school, it implies a degree of antecedent preparation. A young man, with these antecedent advantages, will find this school of inestimable value in perfecting his knowledge of every thing that belongs to his calling, and of training him to use his knowledge for the benefit of others, with great skill and success. One, without these advantages, will make slow progress in this school. He

would do so under any circumstances. The desultory manner in which he would have to pursue his studies might lumber his head with "much learning," but it could have little tendency to give his mind that discipline which is necessary to use learning to great effect. But with our present plan of operations, requiring so many duties of the young preacher, such as pastoral visiting, co-operation in all the varied and multiplied interests of the church, (which have greatly increased upon us within a few years past,) and not unfrequently the pastoral charge of a circuit or station, it is very obvious, that if his studies are pursued to any material result, these interests, one or all of them, must be neglected. In these circumstances, it is a matter of great moment to enter the itinerant school with the necessary antecedent advantages of mental discipline and information.

The great object of the church, in the educational movement on which the old Virginia Conference entered, in 1829, was to meet the demands of the varied interests we have here discussed. By the co-operation of the N. Carolina Conference, and the great liberality of the lay-membership, this object has been prosecuted to a most valuable result. Something, it is true, remains to be done, to complete the enterprise on the broad scale necessary to meet these high demands. Why may not this work be completed? Oh, where are our men of heart, of means and of mind, who can appreciate, both the breadth of the demand and their duty to meet it? "Oh," said our beloved founder, "why do not our men of head and heart come to the rescue? Why do they not send in their offerings to the Lord, and whilst they live, rejoice in the good their liberality is accomplishing? Dying! why do they not remember this great interest of their beloved church? Has not Randolph Macon another friend, like Jesse Harper, of Orange N. C., in all the bounds of the two Conferences? Oh have we no Wofford amongst us, who would be the benefactor of his race? Let him rear a monument to his memory which shall last as long as religion and learning shall be honored amongst a free and happy people."

Thus, we close the services due, on this occasion, to our beloved founder. We have lost our first our fastest friend. He, whose presiding mind, like the angel spirit whom God placed at the gate of Eden to guard the tree of life, has watched over us in weal and in wo, nourishing us at home, and defending us abroad. He has gone to his reward. But, as he blessed us while living, so the review of his useful life may still administer instruction and comfort. Let us be careful to secure the same sound experience of grace. Let those of us who may be called to occupy a place on the walls of Zion emulate his zeal in consecrating, not a part, but his whole life to the work of the ministry. Remember this; he was a laborious student; a master workman. Let us covet the eminent distinction which he attained in winning souls to Christ. That broad foundation of religion and learning which he so well succeeded in laying, and which promises the noble superstructure of wide usefulness to the church and the country, is now our inheritance; an inheritance bequeathed us by his munificent liberality, and broad views of the public interests. Whilst we honor his memory, let us strive to perfect this great enterprise of his life, and thereby to place Randolph Macon College on a basis from which nothing can ever move her.

ART. VII.

ON THE EXISTENCE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ANGELS.

(From the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, London; October 1852.)

To Biblical students an inquiry into the existence, characteristics, and offices of angels, if properly executed, must be one of deep interest. The frequency of the mention of these celestial beings in the Holy Scriptures, and even in every day conversation, tends to impress upon us that our knowledge of them is considerably greater than upon due examination it will be found to be. Nay, the more accurate the inquiry instituted, the more defective will appear our original conceptions concerning this interesting subject. Erroneous ideas derived from pagan philosophy, from poetic imagery, and from a false Christianity, have so bewildered the study, that many doubtless have thought it safer to allow the consideration of the matter to dwindle down to a mere cursory glance at some of the most prominent features. The *dii minores*, *dæmons*, *genii*, *lares*, and *penates* of the Greeks and Romans had so many ideas connected with them which succeeding ages attached to angels, good and bad, that it requires some attention to separate truth from falsehood. Not only was the popular mind infected with the legends of the former superstitions, but even some of the most learned fathers of the church were led to adopt many of the dogmata of a philosophy which continued to maintain a powerful sway, in a literary point of view, over Christian scholarship. Tertullian believed that angels possessed the human form, and speaks of their hands, ears, feet, and even their complexion—influenced perhaps by Cicero's opinion that the human form appeared evidently the most appropriate for celestial beings. Origen believed that when heavenly beings sinned they were forced into bodies regularly graduated to punish their amount of

transgression—namely, sidereal, æthereal, aerial; after this aqueous, and last of all into human and earthly; and if this course of trial did not amend them, they finally became devils; and he understood the tendency of Jacob's vision to be to prove this singular doctrine, from the fact of the angels regularly ascending and descending. Augustine and Bernard also seem to have believed that angels were not altogether pure spirits: thus showing that all these fathers rather followed the philosophy of Plato than the simple teaching of the Scriptures. The authority of a successful philosophy reigns supreme through every species of literature, for fashion domineers in this as in all other human affairs: thus the early Christian writers, imbued with the reigning hypotheses, and proud of the Platonic or Aristotelian name, moulded the truths of revelation as much as possible after their favorite schools. In treating therefore upon this subject, the first principle to be adhered to is to discard all human authority where not supported by Scripture or the plain deduction of reason.

Existence of Angels.

That angelic beings exist in great numbers is an assertion so established by the most direct relations in Holy Scripture, that to offer any proof for it to the Biblical student would be simply ridiculous. We are obliged, indeed, to grant that it is only from Scripture that we can demonstrate their existence; but although Nature gives no direct intimation of their presence, she bears strong testimony to them in her numerous analogies. To use the language of the authors of the Universal History: 'Had we no such revelation or tradition, it seems very reasonable to suppose there are intermediate beings to fill up the gap which would otherwise be in nature; for as there is a gradation of creatures on earth, some having merely being, as earth, air, and water; some that, besides being, have life, as vegetables; some that, besides life, have sense and perception, as brute animals; and some that, besides life, have reason and cogitation, as men; and as we see our sensitive

part exists in beings beneath us, so it is very probable that our more noble and intellectual part exists in beings as much superior to us as we are to brutes; and that there is a like gradual ascent from the lowest rank of them, which borders upon man, to the highest, which comes as near as a finite creature can to the infinite Deity;’ (vol. i., p. 101.)

The old logicians sometimes gave this argument in a more condensed form:—‘As there are in nature things purely material, and beings partly material and partly spiritual, so it is just to grant that there are beings purely spiritual to complete the circle of creation.’ By such constitution of being they of course approach nearer the perfection of our common Creator, although the infinite distance between the created and the Creator must for ever stamp them as comparatively imperfect. Their knowledge, however extensive, must for ever fall far short of omniscience; and their power, however great, must ever be intuitively felt by themselves as distinctly finite. Their knowledge resembles our own in one respect—that it is progressive, and increases by experience; for Christ informs us that many things are veiled from them; and it is also affirmed that ‘they desire to look into’ the redemption of Christ—the word translated ‘to look into’ denoting an attitude of intense curiosity. In this representation, also, we have presented to us another point in which there is a parallel with our own advance; their acquisition of knowledge requires effort of greater or less amount.

Another passage which proves the sequence of their knowledge is Eph. iii., 10:—‘To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church, the manifold wisdom of God.’ Had not man become a fallen creature, the moral state of angels would have also been exactly parallel to that of the human family, the happiness of both being constituted upon and supported by an accurate attention to the will and laws of their common Creator:—‘Bless the Lord, ye his angels that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word;’ (Ps. ciii., 20.) That they all were crea-

ted by the Omnipotent, will not admit of a doubt by readers of the Scriptures, (Col. i., 16,) but when they came into existence is nowhere intimated; and as Scripture is silent, and reason has no clue to guide her, we might be led to think that every one may entertain what opinion appears most probable; but even here the meddling spirit of Popery must display its bitterness. The Council of Lateran has pronounced as heretical the opinion expressed by several of the early fathers, that the angelic beings were created before the world; and, what is absolutely ridiculous, some Protestant theologians have thought fit to join in the same silly outcry. These worthy critics insist that the creation of angels took place upon the first, second, or third day mentioned in the 1st chapter of Genesis. St. Jerome* distinctly states it as his belief, that countless ages before the creation of this earth, the angels enjoyed their existence in the presence of God; and certainly Job xxxviii., 7, seems to establish this opinion.

Number and Orders.

In Genesis xxxii. we read, 'And Jacob went on his way, and the angels of God met him; and when Jacob saw them, he said this is God's host; and he called the name of that place Mahanaim:' that is, the encampment. The wisdom as well as the mercy of God was strongly displayed in this revelation to the patriarch. His terror of his brother Esau was at that very time greatly increased; for Esau, now established as a powerful chieftain, could easily wreak his ruthless revenge upon his comparatively unwarlike brother, who had been much more accustomed to the management of herds and flocks than to the evolutions of martial squadrons. Nothing could then tranquilise the husband and the father so effectually as the ocular demonstration that the armies of the living God were the sure escort of his way. In early life his heavenly Father taught him a similar lesson in a similar way.

* 'Sex millia necelum orbis nostri implentur anni; et quantas sæculorum origines fuisse arbitrandum est, in quibus Angeli, Throni, Dominationes, ceteræque virtutes servierint Deo, et absque temporum vicibus et absque mensuris Deo jubente substituerint.'—ST. JEROME.

When driven from his home, an adventurer on the wide world, with only a very slender expectation of worldly help, with nothing but his staff in his hand, a journey of five hundred miles before him, and the home from which he had been obliged to tear himself behind him, then his divine Protector showed him that the world abounded with celestial attendants to guard every pilgrim of God, however lowly, on his way. We have a parallel case in 2 Kings vi.:—‘And when the servant of the man of God was risen early and gone forth, behold an host compassed the city both with horses and chariots; and his servant said to him, Alas! my master, how shall we do? And he answered, Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that be with them. And Elisha prayed and said, Lord, I pray thee open his eyes that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man, and he saw; and behold the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha.’ It has been well remarked how suited this vision was to support the confidence of the human mind. No conceivable interference could so instantly restore his fainting courage as the encircling presence of fiery warriors, in comparison to whom all earthly hosts would appear as impotent pigmies.

Whenever angels are mentioned the idea of great number is attached; as when Peter’s zeal urged him to use his sword in defence of his Master, Christ conveyed reproof to him by the assurance that if violence had been necessary for his protection, his Father would instantly have furnished him with more than twelve legions of angels—a number no doubt capable of sweeping to destruction the sum total of earthly warriors. ‘The chariots of God are twenty thousand; even thousands of angels’ (Ps. lxxviii. 17.) ‘And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders, and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands’ (Rev. v. 11.) The general idea attached to these vast multitudes throughout the Scriptures is that of military arrangement.

Thus the angels are usually described as the great hosts or armies of heaven, and the Almighty himself their great Commander. The Lord of Hosts is his name. This representation of itself infers an actual state of warfare, and of course the existence of antagonistic powers whose natures must in many respects coincide with those of the celestial companies.

But the analogy borrowed from human society is still further extended, for the multitude of angels is not only marshalled into hosts, but differences of rank and station are distinctly revealed. The Jews divide them into several grades, ending with archangels, and angels, whom they esteem the lowest of the celestial inhabitants, and the only order which comes down to earth on commissions from the Almighty. An early Christian father, commonly known as Dionysius the Areopagite, headed his division of the heavenly host with cherubim and seraphim. Now cherubim in Scripture never mean actually existing beings; they always are represented as symbolic figures, either artificial or visional. In the tabernacle of Moses and the temple of Solomon they were the product of the same workmen who supplied the other articles; and in the visions of Ezekiel, Daniel, and others, they are symbolical appendages to the majesty of the Most High. But the clearest intimations concerning the difference in the grades of heavenly intelligences are to be found in the writings of St. Paul (Eph. i. 21,) where, speaking of the majesty of Christ the Apostle proceeds; 'Far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.' Again (Col. i. 16:) 'By him were all things created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers.' These two passages establish fully the analogy of the divisions of the celestial hosts according to magisterial arrangement amongst mortals. 'The four different names given to angels in this verse (Eph. 1. 21,)' writes Macknight, 'intimate that there are different orders and degrees of government and subordination among good and bad angels in the invisible world, as

among men in the visible world.' Chandler observes that *ἐπι* the first word, signifies empire of the largest extent, being used by Greek authors to denote the empire of Alexander after he had conquered the East (*Ælian*, Var. Hist. lib. iii. c. 29,) and the empire of the Romans (*Herod.* lib. i. proem.); and that *υποίωτης*, the last word in the verse, signifies the lowest degree of power: so that, as the same author further observes, 'although we do not know precisely what kind or degree of power is marked by these different names, when applied to good and bad angels, yet we perceive the meaning in general to be, that to our Lord in his human nature are subjected the highest, the intermediate, and the lowest orders of beings in the universe, having power, whether among angels or men.' Revelation thus declares to us a certain gradation of rank, but what those ranks are nobody knows. 'If any know them,' says Augustine, 'let them explain them; as for myself, I confess my complete ignorance.'

Distinction between Good and Evil Angels.

Another important truth which revelation furnishes us with, is, that angelic existence is like our own—peccable, except preserved by God himself; and, wonderful to say, a vast multitude have lost their first estate through rebellion, and having destroyed themselves, display an eager determination to destroy all they can. It has been doubted by some whether all the evil spirits mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures were originally, 'angels of light,' or whether these latter beings, with the devil at their head, are not to be altogether allotted to another category of existence. It is admitted by these objectors, that some of the heavenly host rebelled, and are punished for this rebellion; but they argue that their condition is far different from the devils: witness the statement, 2 Pet. ii. 4, 'If God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them unto chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment.' Hence it is argued, that while demons or devils roam at full freedom upon their errands of evil, the fallen angels are kept in the

strictest durance of chains and dungeons, which seems to prove that they cannot be one and the same.

Now to this view we reply that, upon the strictest review of the whole account of evil spirits in the Bible, the generally received opinion seems the best authenticated. *In limine*, however, it must be confessed that we have no regular history of these beings, nor even materials of a connected nature; while the incidental notices, scantily afforded, require inferential reasoning to produce any thing like descriptive narration. From the declaration of St. James, that 'God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any one,' we may assuredly gather that the hosts of evil spirits, with Satan their accredited leader, were originally created upright, and must necessarily now be in their present accursed condition through a voluntary rebellion. The similarity which appears in the intimations given concerning good and evil spirits is striking. They are both spirits as distinguished from matter (Luke viii. 29, xiii. 11; Mark iii. 30, &c. ;) and in Ps. lxxviii. 49, we have the direct name 'evil angels;' and in Rev. xii. 7, 'the dragon and his angels.' Between these spirits or angels, good and bad, there is represented to be continual war; and this very state argues a similarity of original nature. The same division of rank is also kept up. 'For we wrestle not,' says St. Paul (Eph. vi. 12,) 'against flesh and blood'—that is, merely human opponents—'but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness'—rather against 'wicked spirits,' and thus Macknight and other learned men translate the passage.

Of the nature and cause of their rebellion we have no direct intimation whatever, but man's curiosity has frequently ventured to speculate on subjects equally obscure and far less interesting. Pride and envy have been imagined as the two great springs of their original transgression, and it has been insisted on, with implicit confidence, that the creation of man in the image of God, and his obtaining, in consequence, a sway which was supposed eventually to include the angelic race, was the immediate cause of that envy which drove so

many of the host of Heaven from their primeval state. It was also conjectured that some knowledge of the second person of the Godhead intending still further to honour mankind with a more intimate relationship, inflamed to its height the important rage of Satan's accomplices. We need hardly observe how magnificently our great poet Milton has taken advantage of these ingenious suppositions, and interwoven them in his immortal epic. The Jews pretend to know the exact time when such defection took place, namely, upon the second day of creation; because Moses omitted to state that upon that day God pronounced his workmanship good; and therefore, according to Jewish logic, this was the only day upon which evil could have been introduced amongst the celestials. This proof, however, has not met with a favourable reception among Christian commentators, and some have gravely undertaken to overthrow it by quoting the general blessing pronounced by God on all his preceding works on the sixth, which of course takes in the second day.

But if, rejecting mere imagination, we adhere to argument from analogy, upon comparing the characteristics of their existence in common with those of humanity, pride will appear the most likely feeling which urged onward to destruction purely intellectual beings. Consciousness of great power and knowledge, if not restrained by the light-giving grace of God, has a strong tendency towards self-satisfaction and self-sufficiency, inciting the recipient to false views of his position, which is the real foundation of pride whether in man or fiend. This we have from the lips of him who cannot err, who describing Satan by his character, said, 'He abode not in the truth.' And here it may be remarked how suitable was the punishment of the Almighty. These rebels, elated with the feeling of self-dependence, quickly felt the chains of darkness, of the anger of their offended Creator, impress in every feeling their utter impotence when driven from his presence, and their every exertion in future to be entirely dependent upon his felt permission. This utter prostration of independent agency is represented in the language of men by the restraints

of chains, which we cannot for a moment attach literally to disembodied spirits; and this consideration is quite sufficient to invalidate the distinction referred to before, as sought to be instituted between these angels mentioned by Peter and Jude, and the devil and his hosts.

Another analogical deduction is the assimilation sought to be produced by them to their own character. Evil themselves, the Satanic host eagerly endeavour to impress their own character in every direction; and not satisfied with their own advance in iniquity, they ply every effort to swell their ranks with victims from mankind. Nothing can exceed the description of ferocious determination in these spiritual murderers by the pen of revelation, 1 Pet. v. 8, 'be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour.' Now, natural historians inform us that the lion, in his natural state, never walks about roaring except when so under the influence of hunger that it is certain death to whatever animal he meets; hence the innate horror which thrills every inhabitant of the forest when the terrific sound is heard. The untiring energy of Satan thus described leads naturally to an inquiry into the power possessed by him which is thus wielded for destruction.

Mode of communication between spirits.

To beings formed as mortals are, whose corporeal sensations furnish them with the only known ways of intercommunication, the manner in which pure spirits interchange impressions must be altogether unknown. Of the fact that there is universally such interchange no one will entertain a doubt who believes in the existence of angelic beings fallen or un-fallen; and also no one who believes in revelation can doubt that these intelligences are allowed to exert great influences upon human beings; and few subjects can be more interesting than the examination into the amount of evidence yielded by Scripture and reason upon this point. And here we think that it will very generally be granted that the majority of mankind has in all ages been more inclined to believe too

much than too little. There seems, as it were, a natural aptency in the human imagination to people the haunts around us with beings of supernatural existence, and yet approaching sufficiently to humanity in their characteristics to make their supposed presence either an object of dread or of desire. And it is here worthy of remark that the influence of climate upon the imagination displays itself in this subject with remarkable effect. The inhabitants of the northern regions, immured more or less in gloom and darkness, are apt to be terrified with the supposed existence of beings suited to such murky scenes, frightful, ferocious, and destructive; whilst the dwellers in the joyous lands of sun-illuminated skies revel in the imagined company of merry and gladsome beings, who carefully inter within the bowels of the earth all that is terrible and disagreeable. The gay train which crowded the Grecian Olympus formed a strange contrast with the fierce cloud-enveloped followers of Wodin and Thor. The votaries of every set of supernatural intelligences agreed in the belief that these beings influenced their earthly career most materially; but as to how these same beings influenced their minds, their opinions were various and very indistinct.

Let us now, then, with the Word of God as our sole standard of appeal, consider how far we may be enabled to proceed in the inquiry as to the mode of angelic influence on the mind or spirit, whether that influence be for good or evil. The very first chapter of the history of our race furnishes us with an influence of such kind which has affected us most seriously, and will continue to affect every descendant of Adam to the end of time. The assumption of the serpent's form by the Evil Spirit when he tempted Eve, and through her Adam, was, no doubt, that he might the more effectually enforce his wily arguments; and when afterwards he assumed a form to tempt the second Adam, we may argue that this must be his most forcible way of using his influence; for assuredly had he power in a more direct form to guide and warp the mental faculties, he would, on these two especial occasions, have exerted it to insure success. That no beings short

of Deity himself possess such power is evident, for if they did, no such thing as free-agency could be possessed.

We are not, however, left to the mere deductions of reason; here we have surer information. Solomon, in his sublime prayer on the dedication of the Temple, directly affirms that God only knows the hearts of the children of men; (2 Chron. vi., 30; comp. Ps. vii., 9; Ps. cxxxix.; also 1 Cor. ii., 11.) But although neither Satan nor any other spirit save the Creator, fully knows the secrets of the heart, and much less can actuate its faculties and feelings at pleasure, yet that evil beings exert certain influences upon our spirits, and that these influences may be increased to a fearful extent if unresisted, appears plain from intimations of Scripture. The mode of communication between spirits must in our present state remain a mystery to us, and the subtlest attempts of the schoolmen who attempted to dive into all knowledge are merely learned jargon; for when they say, '*Loquuntur vero invicem per directionem conceptuum, in quantum scilicet unus angelus vult cogitationem suam innotescere alteri; hoc ipso enim dat ei jus in suum secretum, sicque fit ut talis cogitatio incipiat relucere in ejus speciebus,*' nothing is explained in reference to the acting of disembodied spirits; because every effort to describe spirit and its operations must of necessity be made in words indicative of sensible effects. The word which appears to us most appropriate in this case is suggestion, which may be a power of impressing ideas upon the mind or of inducing the mind to turn its attention to such ideas.

This power exerted by an evil spirit produces temptation, that by a good spirit the reverse. In the former instance the gradation from the simple suggestion of evil to the fearful scrutiny mentioned by our Lord to Peter (Luke xxii., 31,) is certainly of vast extent, 'Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to sift you as wheat.' But this greatest exertion of the Evil Spirit's power still proves its finiteness. He had exerted his utmost centuries before, in the case of Job. Had the arch-tempter been able to dive into the secrets of the heart, he would not assuredly have exposed himself to be so disgrace-

fully baffled. From the instance of Job and the many cases of possession mentioned in the New Testament, for reasons inscrutable to us, Satan has been allowed, upon innumerable occasions, to exercise an awful influence over the bodies and even the minds of mortals, but seemingly, from the examples furnished in Holy Writ, with this restriction, that he could not affect both at the same time by direct influence. Job and some individuals mentioned in the New Testament, are instances in which extreme bodily suffering left the intellect unimpaired. The patriarch's mind, bewildered by the sufferings of his body, faltered a little because the dealings of God with him seemed to overturn an axiom adopted in the theology of his day, namely, that a truly godly man would be shielded from misfortunes at least of a serious character; and it is curious to observe how the reasonings of Job and his friends are carried on with the full assurance of its truth. In the whole circumstance we have an instance similar to innumerable others, when the sway of a false principle, peculiar to a period, required the direct interference of revelation; while, at other times, the correction arose from the discovery of the error by the advance of true knowledge.

In all other direct influence of Satan mentioned in Scriptural history, the mind of the affected seems to have been his victim; and yet it is here to be observed that this influence appears to have been a bewilderment of the individual's whole faculties, while the evil spirit or spirits assume the functions of the mind; and therefore, in the presence of Christ or any of his disciples empowered to control them, these spirits also spoke in their proper person, and, when expelled, the afflicted mortal became instantly 'of right mind.' A particular species of this possession was that of the Pythoness mentioned in Acts xvi., 16, many instances of which, both real and pretended, are mentioned in profane historians. This form would certainly appear to mortals as the more likely to suit Satan's purposes, because the fortune-telling character of such inspiration is sure at all times to allure the bulk of mankind.

The general features in these instances completely agreed with the former mentioned ; for when the evil spirits were dismissed, the individual became the same as previous to the influence exerted by his persecutor. We do not see how a person under such influence could, for the time being, be accountable, any more than madmen and lunatics. How far their previous accountability superinduced such a state is a different question and not capable of explanation.

In reference to the usual temptations of Satan it must be evident, that if he does not know the secrets of the mind, or direct its faculties, it requires a voluntary reception of his suggestions before they can take effect ; and of course, from the well known law of habit in moral progress, according to the reception of one influence the number of them increases until, from a partial acquaintance, the man becomes wholly the fiend's companion and property. The dalliance with iniquity, and then his acquaintance and advance in it on the part of Judas Iscariot was desperate when it could be said, 'Then entered Satan into Judas Iscariot,' upon which he immediately perpetrated his execrable treason. Yet even in its wildest ruins the mind asserts its native independence ; and however great the sympathy between the infernal malignant and the earthly traitor, still conscience asserted her freedom, and the pangs of remorse refused to obey any laws but those of truth and nature.

Thus the sway of the arch-fiend and his host is conducted with the consummate skill of beings of lofty intellect and equivalent power, whose insidious whisperings find too ready admission into hearts prone to disloyalty, 'walking according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.' The word here used used by the apostle, *ἐνεργῶντος*. 'worketh,' is exceedingly strong, and when used with an accusative denotes complete mastery ; for example, in Eph. i., 11, where it expresses the sovereign sway of God over all things. In the present passage, however, not being

supplied with a direct object, it shows the powerful exertions of Satanic influence, whose melancholy success is but too evidently stamped upon the world's history.

In reference to the important subject of hearing the truth of Christ, the general features of the interference of the great enemy are graphically and accurately portrayed in the parable of the sower. The wayside hearers are that numerous class whose minds are so occupied by worldly thoughts and worldly desires, that the winged and numerous thoughts of Satanic insinuation chase away instantly any impressions of gospel truth whatever. Like vessels filled to the brim, there is no room for the admission of aught else. The stony-ground hearers are those whose excitable feelings seize upon any subject capable of arousing pleasurable sensations, and as long as these sensations last they display ardently their zeal and admiration; but when the novelty wears off, or difficulties intervene, their minds as willingly receive whatever other excitements are supplied to them. The young plants overgrown with thorns represent those whose minds embrace the gospel, but who endeavor to balance their attention equally between it and love of the world; and here the accumulation of worldly cares, and anxieties, and disappointments, and hopes, and varieties of present occurrence, is sure to outweigh the importance of heavenly expectation, which is thus choked amid the weeds of earthly growth. Add to these those represented by the seed cast into good ground, and you have really all classes of mankind.

Of the good Angels.

It will readily be granted, we suppose, that if the operations of evil spirits be so extensive, we may assume that the ministry of good angels is equally extensive; and this supposition is supported by many intimations in the Sacred writings. The heavenly hosts are constantly represented as in a state of anxious benevolence towards this part of God's creation, from the moment in which they raised the hymn of triumph at its birth, through all the ages downward. They crowd, as it

were, in joyous haste, to assist, to defend, and to sympathize with their brethren. If all the scenes of human glory from the beginning could be amalgamated, would they produce a display worthy to be mentioned in comparison with what is described in Luke ii., 8-14; when a mighty angel, accompanied with 'the glory of the Lord,' astonished the gentle shepherds of Judea, and a countless multitude of the heavenly host burst upon their sight with the most glorious hymn that ever poured its harmony into human ears, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men!' But though we are here, and on many similar occasions, made acquainted with the general good offices of these benevolent beings, yet there is a wholesome limit placed to our knowledge. Of no one angel do we know anything essentially different from his compeers. The general term angel is used entirely in reference to office, not at all to character, and is of Greek origin: but a word of the same meaning is used in the Hebrew and kindred tongues, to denote the same order of beings. Enough is revealed to us to animate us on our way, and to raise our admiration of the common Father of all, whose creations in the spiritual world are thus shown to rise in gradation just as in the material. But not a single discovery is given us by which we can be led to an overweening devotion, or even to a sentimental regard for the order of the angelic host. It is true they are ministering spirits commissioned by the Supreme to watch over the 'heirs of salvation:' and we have in Holy Writ numerous instances of their fulfilling such commission; but all the distinct knowledge which we obtain points to them as a class or body, not as individuals; therefore, as far as human knowledge extends, there can be drawn no line of distinction between them. It is true that there is one individual very conspicuous in the times of the patriarchs and early worthies of the Old Testament, frequently styled 'the angel of the Lord,' who forms a striking exception to the above reasoning; but this, we have reason to believe, was no created angel, but the Lord himself from heaven. Jacob wrestled with him a whole night, and felt so con-

vinced of the reality of his Godhead, that he called the place of meeting Peniel, that is, 'the face or presence of God;' for, said he, 'I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.' On his death-bed also he left still farther testimony to the Deity of this great personage; for thus ran his blessing upon the sons of Joseph:—'God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil bless the lads.' In this passage the grammatical rule of apposition shows that the term Angel in the latter clause is equivalent to God in the former clauses.

But in reference to created angels, the obscurity of our knowledge is so dense, that all personality is shrouded from us to obviate any expectation of communication, until, being ushered into the presence of the Great Supreme, we shall thereby avoid any danger of breaking our allegiance to Him by an undue reverence for any created intelligence. As a clear deduction from such reasoning it follows that the notion of guardian angels, meaning by such that each individual Christian is constantly accompanied by a peculiar angel, is a mere figment of human invention. It has been argued in defence of such opinion, that the Jews believed in it; but it is more likely that they adopted this, as they did several other Platonic notions, from the Greeks and Romans, than from opinions held by their forefathers. However this may be, certain it is that no trace of such doctrine can be found in any of their canonical books, nor in those ancient writings known to Protestants by the term Apocrypha. But from whatever source the Jews may have derived their opinion, there is no evidence for it in the Old Testament. Not a single writer gives the slightest intimation that any one of the countless multitudes of the heavenly host stood in any such particular relation to any individual of the human race; nor did any ancient worthy to whom angels appeared discover, by intuition or by revelation, that such a Divine satellite had been allotted him. If at any time such discovery was likely to have been made, doubtless it would have occurred when

Daniel had been thrown into the lions' den, and the Lord delivered him by the mission of an angel; yet the testimony of the prophet is express in answer to the anxious inquiry of the king, 'My God hath sent his angel, and shut the lions' mouths.' Dan. vi. 22. There is a solitary passage in the New Testament which is seized on by the advocates of this notion, namely, that in which our blessed Lord remarks, that however despised the meanest of his followers may be by the haughty ones of this world, yet 'in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.' Matt. xviii. 10. But it is only the appetency for the doctrine in the human mind, so to speak, that could find it in this declaration. As usual, in the Scriptural representations, our Lord speaks of angels in their congregated, not their individual capacities; and Valpy's observations on the verse, are beautifully illustrative of its force. 'Christ,' says he, 'seems here to mean that all Christians, even of the lowest condition, are so dear to God, that he has committed their care to his favoured followers, whose attendance upon God is described by a simile taken from the customs of earthly monarchs, whose presence is accessible to the nobility of the realm and their chosen attendants; and he emphatically draws the conclusion, 'An verò singuli angeli singulis parvulis designentur, nec hic, nec alibi in S. Scriptoribus definitur.' Paul's description forbids the idea by the words employed, Heb. i. 14, 'Are they not all ministering spirits,' λειτουργικά πνεύματα; the former of which words means employment in public, a doing or transacting for the public welfare; it is a kindred word to that from which our word liturgy comes, which every one knows to mean a public service, in opposition to anything private or particular.

We have dwelt the more pointedly on this subject, because, as has been well remarked, it was the belief in this which most probably laid the foundation of the angel and saint worship which virtually turned the truth of Christ into the lie of paganism. Even in the apostles' days, in the ranks of the professors of Christianity were found those whose yearnings

were for the metaphysical searchings of the philosopher and the services of the hero worshipper. 'Let no man beguile you of your reward,' says St. Paul to the Colossians, ch. ii. 18, 'in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.' In this passage we have drawn, by the Spirit of God himself, a picture of the whole mystery of spiritual declension. A false humility, seeking mediators whereupon to rest in seeking interest with God, is here exhibited, and (which proves its utter hollowness) it is entirely based upon the superstitious imagination of its votaries, daringly intruding into what is neither seen nor discoverable by reason, nor revealed by God; and the consequence is forcibly drawn, *καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν*, letting go the head, Christ, they seize on the mere devices of their own fleshly wisdom. Of course as long as the glorious doctrine of justification by faith alone triumphed, so long this carnal doctrine was kept in abeyance: and some centuries even rolled away before it dated to appear in its full deformity. Christians of the four first centuries would have abhorred the charge of worshipping angels, or any other beings whatever but God as revealed in the Gospel. In the writers of the two first centuries, although we have frequent and honourable mention of angels, nay, many supposed visions of such celestial beings, yet so far from any undue reverence being allowed, we have strict injunctions to the contrary. Witness one case from Irenæus: 'Let no one have recourse to the invocation of angels, nor to enchantments; but let every one direct, openly and faithfully, his prayers to the Lord of heaven and earth.' In the third century we have larger materials for distinguishing the various setiments then spreading. Amid its worthies one powerful genius towers above his compeers; and encased in the full panoply of Christian and pagan lore, he planted the standard of the Cross in various parts of the then civilized world, and prostrated to the dust the loftiest foes of

the Cross of Christ. We need hardly say that we mean the erudite Origen. Like all men of high intellect, he was led away with lofty speculations, until he nearly found himself lost in the labyrinths of uncertainty: and amongst other doubtful subjects, he frequently expatiated on the characteristics of the angelic host. Although, however, his ideas of their excellence were exceedingly exalted, he argued at great length against any undue reverence being paid them. 'We know,' says he, 'that angels are spirits whose employment is to watch over those who are heirs of salvation, and that they are continually mounting upwards to heaven, there to present the prayers of men, and descending to bring down God's benefits to his servants. And although we know that the name of angel has been given to them because of their employment; and still further, that because of their Divine nature, they are sometimes styled even Gods in the Holy Scriptures; nevertheless there is not a single word therein obliging us to offer religious service to them, or to adore them in place of that God for whose sake alone they preserve us, and are bearers of his favours to us: because all our supplications, our prayers, our entreaties, and givings of thanks, ought to be addressed to the great God through our sovereign High Priest, who is above all angels, the life-giving Word, who is himself God. But to invoke angels without knowing any more than what man in his present state is capable of knowing, would be to act without reason. But suppose that we had even attained a knowledge, as admirable as recondite, of their natures and employments, yet would not such knowledge authorize our daring to address our prayers to any other but the great God, the Master and absolute Sovereign of all things, through his Son our Saviour, who is the Word, the Wisdom, and the Truth, and to whom all the writers of Scripture bear testimony, both the prophets of God and the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

Towards the end of the fourth century symptoms of angel invocation and worship began to develop themselves, and an unequivocal step in advance appears to us to have been the

dedication of one of the splendid churches in Constantinople by Constantine himself, to the archangel Michael; the alleged visions of whom, together with the miracles said to be performed in the church, formed a very likely commencement to the deluge of superstition which then set in. 'In the long period,' writes Gibbon, 'of twelve hundred years, which elapsed between the reign of Constantine and the reformation of Luther, the worship of saints and relics corrupted the pure and perfect simplicity of the Christian model; and some symptoms of degeneracy may be observed even in the first generations which adopted and cherished these pernicious innovations.' And when the gates were thus opened to angel-worship, and to the adoration of saints and relics, so completely changed was the whole of Christianity, even in appearance, that, 'If' says the same author, 'in the beginning of the fifth century, Tertullian or Lactantius had been suddenly raised from the dead, to assist at the festival of some popular saint or martyr, they would have gazed with astonishment and indignation on the profane spectacle which had succeeded to the pure and spiritual worship of a Christian congregation.' He then particularizes a great number of ridiculous observances accurately retained by the Romish Church, and thus concludes:—'The same uniform original spirit of superstition might suggest in the most distant ages and countries the same methods of deceiving the credulity and of affecting the senses of mankind; but it must ingenuously be confessed, that the ministers of the Catholic Church imitated the profane model which they were impatient to destroy. The most respectable bishops had persuaded themselves that the ignorant rustics would more cheerfully renounce the superstitions of paganism, if they found some resemblance, some compensation, in the bosom of Christianity. The religion of Constantine achieved, in less than a century, the final conquest of the Roman empire; but the victors themselves were insensibly subdued by the arts of their vanquished rivals.'

J. H. C.

ART. VIII.

BRIEF REVIEWS.

We cannot offer to our readers, in addition to the preceding articles and the succeeding summary of intelligence, a more appropriate New Years' salutation than to spread before them a table laden with a choice selection of the richest literary fruits of the season. Persons of intellectual tastes realize a more sensible gratification in scanning even a mere catalogue of new and valuable books, than the professional epicure enjoys in the most luxurious pleasures of the palate. Such we invite to survey, at least for a moment, the sumptuous entertainment which awaits them in the ample and teeming pages of the following publications; which, how unequal soever may be their relative value, will not fail to repay their perusal with both entertainment and profit. It is a source of unalloyed satisfaction to us that, during our short editorial career, we have been able so uniformly to present to the notice of our patrons, a class of works eminently worthy of their approbation. To direct the attention of one enquirer to a useful book, of which he might not otherwise have heard, is to reimburse him with twice his subscription to the Review. This commendation, we trust, may be claimed for the condensed criticisms which we now venture upon some of the recent issues of the American press.

Infidelity; its aspects, causes and agencies: being the prize essay of the British organization of the Evangelical Alliance. By the Rev. Thomas Pearson, Eyemouth, Scotland. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854.

Infidelity, though one in its essence, is Protean in its shapes, ever manifesting the same unalterable hostility to revealed religion. However multifarious in its forms, it is always traceable to the same envenomed radix; "enmity against God." Some of these forms more or less obviously approximate the truth, and by their speciousness, captivate the unsuspecting and inveigle the unwary. Others, again, assume the air of philosophic profundity and scope, and by the splendor and acuteness of their speculations fascinate the more cultivated and aspiring classes of society. To give the history, to trace the development, to define the relations, to demonstrate the fallacy of these bewitching, skeptical phenomena, is a distinct and difficult branch of Christian duty, which, as it recurs at intervals, more or less long, demands unusual abilities in the author. It requires theological soundness, great penetration, subtlety of analysis, a vast fund of historical information, and strong powers of demonstration. In the champions of the Bible, these qualities have been wonderfully united as the exigencies of defence have arisen, and victory has invariably crowned the weapons of

their warfare. A new occasion has thus produced a new and powerful antidote to the ever active poison of formal unbelief, in the able and thoroughly digested volume before us. That it is the "prize essay" of so learned and large a body as the Evangelical Alliance, is much in its favor; but its real merit is in its contents, which, from their copiousness, we cannot hope fully to describe. The plan of the author is remarkably clear and comprehensive, as may be seen by the following outline: "I. *Infidelity in its various aspects*; Atheism, Pantheism, Naturalism, Spiritualism, Indifferentism, Formalism; II. *Infidelity in its various causes*; General Cause, Speculative Philosophy, Social Disaffection, The Corruptions of Christianity, Religious Intolerance, Disunion of the Church; III. *Infidelity in its various agencies*; The Press, The Clubs, The Schools, The Pulpit." It will suffice to say, that these topics are treated with dialectic skill, with unflinching boldness, with congenial ease and freedom, and with a charming perspicuity, laying bare the revolting virus of "that old serpent, the devil," which under color of reason, philosophy, and progress, has smitten with paralysis and death countless victims, and which is still working, with relentless malignity, diffusing its blighting curse in Europe and America, by its ever sleepless agencies. To all who wish to obtain a systematic view of this intellectual antichrist, and especially to ministers of the Gospel, we recommend this instructive book: an octavo of 620 pages, in large and beautiful type.

A Theodicy; or, a vindication of the Divine Glory, as manifested in the constitution and government of the moral world. By Albert Taylor Bledsoe, Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy in the University of Mississippi. New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1853.

The existence of evil, natural and moral, in the government of an infinitely perfect being, is a proposition which, to man's unaided reason, is contradictory in its terms; and its contradiction is readily suggested by the most obvious phenomena. It is, in fact, the great problem of the universe; and the greatest thinkers of every age have been occupied with its solution, with various degrees of success and defeat. Some have regarded its solution utterly impossible, and, committing the universe to chance, have rushed into the vortex of atheism. Others, having postulated and deified the dogma of an ultimate necessity, although admitting the existence of a Supreme Being, have resigned their difficulties to the dominion of a law to which even He is subject. Some, again, locating necessity in the Divine will, have been driven to the alternative of making both natural and moral evil a part of his original plan. Others, adopting the hypothesis of liberty and responsibility, have endeavored to reconcile these apparent contradictions by referring them to the character and purposes of the Divine Governor as revealed in the Holy Scriptures; while, yet others, admitting the two facts to be inscrutable, piously rest in them, without any attempt hypothetically to adjust them. The human mind, however, cannot

remain in a state of blind acquiescence on such a question. Nor should it. The proposition is fundamental to any correct system of nature. To this high problem, Mr. Bledsoe addresses himself with an intense conviction of its vital importance to an enlightened faith. The vindication of the Divine government from, at least, all theoretical impeachment on account of the existence of natural and moral evil, cannot be waived. He adopts the principle of philosophic freedom as the only possible ground upon which the vindication can be predicated, after the most searching investigation into all other theories, especially that of necessity, into the very foundations of which he pours the battery of an irresistible argument, and evinces the entire compatibility of the two terms of the proposition upon the Arminian principle. Mr. Bledsoe's mental capacity and habits, as well as his consciousness of the unsatisfactory state of the discussion, led him into this higher polemical sphere, and he has shown his ability to grapple with its lofty theorems. To our mind, he has not only taken the true position, but has maintained it. And we rejoice to see, from an American author, a scientific inquiry into a theme which few have either been able or willing to approach. Everywhere he gives proof of a higher order of thought, of extensive comparison, and of careful induction. His work is a valuable contribution to American speculative theology, and who ever reads it with attention and with candor will arise from his task with heightened views of the administration of God. It is published by the Methodist Book Concern, New York, in a style of great beauty and finish.

Noah and his Times: embracing the consideration of various inquiries relative to the antediluvian and earlier postdiluvian periods, with discussions of several of the leading questions of the present day. By the Rev. J. Munson Olmstead, M. A. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1853.

Skepticism, of late years, has strenuously endeavored to array science against divine revelation, especially in the departments of ethnology, geology and antiquities. A deadly blow has been aimed at the Mosaic records, with a view to invalidate their statements by recent discoveries, and thus to subvert, from the foundation, the whole system of inspiration. These attempts are reacting with the most beneficial results upon the inspired documents. Each aggression of the pompous vauntings of the skeptical philosophy of the age, has placed the vindication of them a step in advance, and on a higher platform. The discussions, in this book, are an illustration of this fact. Their object is to harmonize the recorded events of the Noahic period with the actual progress of science. This period extends from 1056 to 2006, anno mundi, including the great events of the Deluge, the Death Penalty, and the Shinaric occurrences, which are treated, at length, with the incidental questions which they have raised. The author has brought to bear upon his inquiries the best aids of scholarship and research, and has poured a flood of light upon the remote and venerable age of the Patriarch of two worlds. The very subject is full of fascination; but it is

still more important in its relation to the authenticity of the first of all written documents, and the harmony between the word and the works of God. There can be no real discord between the one and the other, and every assault of our enemies enables us to prove it. The very stones which they hurl at us, furnish materials out of which we construct walls and bastions, which they will never demolish. Thus, will error ever be the servant of truth.

Baptism: its nature, obligation, modes, subjects and benefits. By L. Rosser, A. M., of the Virginia Annual Conference. Richmond, Va. Published by the author. 1853.

No single topic has, in this country, been more fruitful of controversies and books, than baptism, on account of the extreme, ultra importance attached, by immersionists, to the mode of its administration. Labor, learning, sectarianism, have spared no pains to confound the ordinance with the mode, virtually to exalt it into a *sine qua non* of salvation, and to make it the test of church validity. If any modal question has ever been exhausted, on both sides, this would seem to have been. Yet it continues to be agitated with all the vehemence of a first contest, and the necessity of reply, in some form, is perpetually precipitated by the preposterous assumptions of the anabaptists of the present day, as if pædobaptists had never presented an argument worthy of notice. Constant familiarity with these pretensions, through a lapse of sixteen years, induced the author to turn his attention to all the current phases of the controversy, and to frame a treatise in accordance with them. He has devoted all his spare time and energy to its investigation. He has consulted all accessible sources of information, and has composed a book which carries with it evidence of a patient and sifting inquiry. The results of extensive reading, a copious collation of Scripture proofs, able philological criticisms, and new and forcible illustrations enter in the structure of the work. The philological argument is particularly full, both as to cases and authorities. The chapter on the Greek prepositions is, perhaps, the most meritorious part of the book. It has the appearance of more originality in disposing of the force usually attached to this branch of the argument. Not the least valuable part is that on infant baptism, to which we invite special attention. The entire plan of the work is skillfully arranged, and the proofs are marshalled in the order of a well appointed army, and we are persuaded, that it will add to the strength and facility of our defences. We congratulate our brother upon the success of his first attempt at polemical authorship. His work has already met with a flattering acceptance and a ready sale. We trust his highest hopes will be realized in vindicating the gospel from the shackles imposed by contracted notions of its grand peculiarities, and that the arrogance and bigotry of sectaries which converts differences about non-essentials into heresy, may be merged into those broad and expanded views of an all-embracing Christianity, which, while they do not compromise a tittle of all that is vital to it, do honor to the truth of God and to human nature.

Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform. Chiefly from the Edinburgh Review; corrected, vindicated, enlarged, in notes and appendices. By Sir William Hamilton, Bart. With an introductory essay by Robert Turnbull, D. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.

In our last issue, we introduced a notice of the "Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton, arranged and edited by O. W. Wight." It consisted exclusively of the metaphysical views of the author, collected from various sources, and reduced, by the editor, to a system. No complete system of philosophy has ever been prepared by Sir William. His contributions all exist in detached parts, which, nevertheless, embrace all the great questions of the science. The edition of Mr. Wight differs materially from that of the Harpers, not only in its plan, but in its matter. That of the latter, comprises what is properly called his "discussions," on the three great subjects mentioned in the title, with three appendices; philosophical, logical and educational. It contains a part of the matter comprised in the work of Mr. Wight, in addition to the other topics. We have already spoken of the philosophy of Sir William, and need not here repeat our remarks, except that he has laid deep and wide his fundamental principle; that all human knowledge is limited, and that we know nothing, scientifically, of the infinite and the absolute. They are not human cognitions. They come to us from another source, which the philosophy of Sir William reverently admits. On this question, he is impregnable, and, therefore, has demolished the ontological vagaries of the French and German schools. The basis of his whole system is the *data* of consciousness, to which he has arrived by the rigid analysis of man's intellectual and moral constitution. His inquiries into education and logic partake of the same profound character, but bear no proportion to his metaphysical researches. The "discussions" present these in their conflict with other theories, and in the conquest of them. The application of his principle of limitation to the origin of our idea of causation may be well doubted, if he has expressed himself fully on the subject, and appears to contradict what he has affirmed in other places. But we will leave so recondite a question to professional critics, without abating the praise due to his astonishing achievements as a metaphysician.

The Priest and the Huguenot; or, persecution in the age of Louis XV. From the French of L. Bungener. In 2 vols. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

The first of the series of the ingenious and spirited author of these volumes, appeared early last year, under the title of "The Preacher and the King," giving a dramatic account of pulpit eloquence in the reign of Louis XIV.; in which principles and facts were stated under a fictitious representation of distinguished characters, after the manner of an historical romance. The same plan is pursued in the present instance, in delineating

the conflicts of the French Protestants with Romanism, in the age of Louis XV. The actors are personated by Rabaut, the Huguenot, and Bridaine, the priest; the two representatives of the antagonist systems, by which the errors and absurdities of Popery are vividly contrasted with the undiluted truths of the Reformation. If the historical element is sometimes dropped in the discussion, to give place to the dramatic, the author has not merged truth into fiction; while, by concentration, collocation, dialogue and rapidity, he has imparted an amazing vivacity to his subject, and graphically described the causes and the horrors of the Huguenot persecutions. He is, we learn, a minister of the Reformed Church of Geneva, and is occupied with the task of exhibiting in a series, the principal religious aspects of France, from the age of Louis XIV., to the close of the last century. He possesses a wonderful power of combination and description, and enchains the reader until he has dispatched his subject.

Memorials of Early Christianity. By James G. Miall. With illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1853.

The first ages of the Church present its purest type, and next to the Scriptures, we find in them the best representations of Christianity. Under this conviction, Mr. Miall conducts us, by the lights of well attested history, to the localities and characters of the primitive church, to revive and confirm our impression of the imperishable word of God. To revisit the scenes first hallowed by the preaching of the cross and to converse with the first disciples of Christ, is to strengthen our faith and to inflame our zeal. The recital of some of these memorials, as described by the author, will perhaps, better convey an idea of his work; "Jerusalem and the Pentecost; Damascus and Paul; Ephesus and John; Antioch and Ignatius; Justin Martyr and his times; Smyrna and Polycarp; Lyons and Irenæus; Carthage and Tertullian; Hippolytus and the Early Roman Church." Who can pass over these places, in association with these men, without feeling his pulse beat more strongly and his heart glow with a purer and a fresher flame? Many beautiful illustrations of ancient localities and coins embellish the work, and give impressiveness to its descriptions. Were the public taste as pure as it is polluted, the Christian press of the present day would satisfy all the demands for the new and the marvellous, without falsifying truth or history.

The Book of Nature: an elementary introduction to the sciences of Physics, Astronomy, Chemistry, Mineralogy, Geology, Botany, Zoology and Physiology. By Friederick Schoedler, Ph. D. Prof. Nat. Science at Worms. First American, from the second English Edition. Illustrated by 679 engravings, Phila.: Blanchard and Lea. 1853.

One would be greatly mistaken if he were to rank this work with the superficial, empirical productions of the day, on natural science; as he might be tempted to do from the title. On the contrary, it is thoroughly philosophic. It is precisely what it pretends to be; "an elementary intro-

duction to the sciences enumerated. It has gone through repeated editions in England and Germany; a sufficient proof of its merit. No one could have succeeded better in condensing and popularizing the principles of his subjects than the author, as any scientific man may see at once. It is a large octavo, of 691 pages, closely, yet clearly printed, abounding with apt and beautiful diagrams, with a copious glossary and an index. While its range is extensive, its information is accurate and satisfactory. Twenty thousand copies have been printed in Germany in the space of five years. It is endorsed by the most eminent professors of the individual branches of which it treats. Composed by the same distinguished author, all the departments have a uniformity of style and illustration which harmoniously link the entire circle together. The utility of such a connected view of the physical sciences, and on such an approved basis, is beyond price; and places their acquisition within the reach of a vastly increased number of inquirers. Not only to such is it valuable, but to those who wish to have at hand the means of refreshing their memories and enlarging their views upon their favorite studies. Of such a book we speak cordially, and would speak more at length, if space permitted.

Scotia's Bards. Illustrated. Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854.

This is the most magnificent and elegant book of the season, which we have seen. It is the first instance in which the Poets of Scotland have been grouped together in their family relationships, and none are more worthy of the distinction. Scotland, with its rocks and sterility, its thistles and its heathers, is the land of genius and of song. It has long since woven a garland of science and of poetry wherewith to decorate an imperial brow. It is peculiarly rich in lyric poetry. Its bards have made its hills and valleys ring with the strains of war, of love, of nature, and of piety. To collect the most beautiful and touching specimens of these poems into one national group was the pride and the pleasure of the patriotic author; and we praise him for it. It is a grand orchestra, vocal with the varied music of northern harps, touched by fingers taught by nature and perfected by art. The volume, of course, consists of selections; fewer from the well-known, and more from the minor poets, whose occasional effusions are exquisite gems from the crown of the muses. The whole is an embodiment of the sentimental spirit of a people, whose freedom, energy, literature, philosophy, Protestantism and fortunes, have long since assigned them a distinct place in the history of the world. The poems are accompanied with the most tasteful designs of the pencil. The binding and ornaments of the volume are in keeping with its character.

Writings of Professor B. B. Edwards; with a memoir, by Edwards A. Park. In two volumes. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1853.

Learning and piety have, for many years, shed a mild and steady lustre upon the character of Professor Edwards, of Andover, and they embalm his memory in death. His life was no ordinary instance of either of these

acquisitions. He was a noble example of their happy union, in both the private and public stations which he filled. A ripe scholar, a fervent Christian, an able professor, and a fruitful writer, it is proper that a life so fraught with good should be perpetuated by the pen of a competent biographer. The first volume contains the memoir, and seven sermons preached in the Theological Seminary. The second contains his essays, addresses, and lectures on sixteen topics, the whole of them of permanent value: and several of them on the most interesting points of Biblical literature. Though both are replete with instruction, the latter will retain a distinct importance by its literary excellence. The reputation of the distinguished and pious author will commend his remains without any protracted eulogy from us.

Jaqueline Pascal; or, a glimpse of Convent life at Port Royal. From the French of M. Victor Cousin, M. Prosper Faugère, M. Vinet, and other sources. Translated by H. N. With an introduction, by W. R. Williams, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854.

Pascal is an honored name in French literature. The most lofty genius was combined in him with the most unaffected Christian humility and modesty. Though not a Protestant, he was a reformer within the precincts of the church of Rome. He belonged to the school of the Jansenists, who, while they adhered to the Romish church, maintained with zeal the cardinal doctrines of the Scriptures. Their attempts to steer between the tides of the Reformation and Popery finally engulfed them, though they gave birth to many illustrious examples of a piety which, had it shone forth unencumbered by the errors which it retained, would have blazed out with consuming intensity. They fell under the ban of the Pope; their society was persecuted and scattered, and their foundation at Port Royal was destroyed. It is the sister of Blaise Pascal, the philosopher, whose narrative* is here given, the sub-prioress of Port Royal; a lady of kindred genius with her immortal brother, and holding the same religious sentiments. Notwithstanding her Romish predilections, and in despite of them, her life was a perpetual testimony to the power of the gospel, which was beautifully and affectingly displayed in that awful persecution which resulted in the destruction of the body to which she belonged. It is no compromise of Protestantism that we study the lives and writings of those who, though adherents of Popery, were, in the substance of their faith, constant witnesses against its radical corruptions. Miss Pascal's name is worthy of association with that of the philosopher and author of the "Provincial letters," not so much as a relative, as by those qualities which always identify the truly great.

The Young Minister; or, memoirs and remains of Stephen Beekman Bangs, of the New York East Conference. By W. H. N. Magruder, M. A. With a preface, by Erastus O. Haven, M. A. New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1863.

While the youthful ambassador of the cross, however gifted, cannot lay

claim to posthumous honors, in virtue of his literary or ecclesiastical position, he may justly be classed with those whose memory "shall be blessed;" and extraordinary examples of early talent and usefulness cannot fail to impart a salutary impulse to the improvement and consecration of the rising ministry of the church. The star of Mr. Bangs was in the ascendant when it suddenly disappeared. It arose with a calm, steady light, shone with unvoted brilliancy for a season, and then sunk into the heavens. His mind was highly cultivated, his whole soul was fired with the love of Christ, and his youthful energies devoted to the work of the ministry. He was an example worthy of imitation, and we recommend his interesting "memoir" to our younger brethren in the ministry. The larger half of the volume is occupied with his "Remains," comprising specimens of his essays and sermons on a variety of subjects, exhibiting a mind trained to think, and a hand practiced to write. The whole book is a gratifying indication of that spirit of improvement in the ministry which is so rapidly increasing in our Zion.

A Memoir of Richard Williams, Surgeon; Catechist to the Patagonian Missionary Society, in Terra del Fuego. By James Hamilton, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854.

This is a very attractive biography of a Wesleyan catechist, written by a distinguished clergyman of another denomination, and one whose rare powers of composition would invest an ordinary subject with a charm. But the subject here is equal to the manner. Mr. Williams was a professional surgeon, having passed through his regular preparatory course in one of the English Colleges. After his conversion, looking about for an ecclesiastical home, he associated himself with the Methodists, and, in a body whose life is motion, he found a sphere of usefulness in the Patagonian mission, the disasters of which ultimately made more martyrs than disciples. The toils and hardships of the first missionaries border on the marvellous, and though disappointed in their hopes, the missionary annals are perfumed with their heroic sufferings in the cause of Christ. Dr. Hamilton has entered fully into the spirit of his theme, and has given us a picture which will live in the memory of the reader. It is a powerful sketch.

The Religions of the World and their relations to Christianity. By Frederick Denison Maurice, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, and Professor of Divinity in King's College, London. From the third revised London edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

The Boyle Lecture has originated many learned and valuable contributions in vindication of the Christian faith. It was established by the will of the celebrated testator, in 1691, with the direction, that the Christian religion should be proved, by eight sermons a year, "against Atheists, Theists, Pagans, Jews, and Mahometans." In pursuance of this requisition, the author delivered the lectures embodied in this work, and has added

another to the number of unanswerable arguments which have rewarded that well directed bequest. The task assigned him was manifestly difficult, treated as it deserved. It demanded an intimate acquaintance with the very substratum of the various religious systems of mankind, and with their mutual relations to the grand central system of the Bible. Into these deep inquiries Mr. Maurice has laboriously entered, and has deduced conclusions which show the necessity and sufficiency of the gospel for the wants of the human mind, and the essential deficiency and inevitable doom of all antagonist systems. The effort we deem masterly, and, in any event, must prove highly interesting by the comparisons which it institutes with the false and the true. His investigations into the Hindoo and Buddhist mythologies will itself repay the reader's trouble.

The Christian World unmasked. By John Berridge, A. M. With the life of the author, by the Rev. Thomas Guthrie, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

John Berridge was a remarkable character. What Wesley and Whitefield were doing out of the Church of England, he was doing in it, with a zeal and success little, if it all, inferior to theirs. He was, in fact, their coadjutor, though in a different sphere. His preaching was apostolic in its power, and thousands heard to the saving of their souls. He possessed a masculine mind, endowed with sound learning, somewhat given to wit and humor, but never to frivolity. He spent his whole strength and fortune in the cause of Christ. His "Christian World Unmasked," is one of the most original, characteristic books ever written, full of point, pith and peculiarity. He dissects the dead professor with an unsparing hand. He sits down in the character of a physician, prescribing for the sinner ignorant of his malady, determined not to rest until he opens to his view his danger and offers him the only remedy. Many of his expressions are quaint and odd in the extreme, but they flash with light and power. He never tampers, but strikes directly to the root. Full of metaphors and vivacity, the attention never flags, if once gained, until he has delivered his message and confounded, if not converted, his hearer. The perusal of this book will still furnish the quiver of the minister with many a goodly arrow, and teach him with what boldness and fidelity God's honored servants dealt with the sons of men.

The Christian Father's Present to his Children. By J. A. James. From the seventeenth London edition. New York. Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853.

The worth of a book is not in its elegance or erudition, but in its capacity for usefulness; in the salutary influence which it is fitted to exert upon the moral and religious welfare of mankind. This is true of almost all classes of books which aim directly to instil the principles of virtue and religion. But few, however, feel that paternal solicitude, or possess that peculiar aptness which fits them to inculcate piety upon the young. These qualifica-

tions are possessed by Mr. James, in a high degree; and his full appreciation of the seed-time of life engages him to labor to make it available. A Christian father himself, he realizes the duty of parents, and strives to aid them by putting into their hands a manual which will, as far as possible, either promote their exertions or supply their deficiencies. It is written in the didactic form, and divided into chapters. The topics are too numerous to be repeated in this place, but they are well selected and happily applied to the necessities of the youthful mind. As no acquisition of fortune or of fame, no personal charms or abilities, can be compared with right views of religion, no better New Year's gift can be bestowed by a father's fondness than this beautiful and useful volume. Let us be thankful for our facilities, and use them to the glory of God.

A Dictionary of the most important names, objects and terms found in the Holy Scriptures. Intended principally for Sunday Schools and Bible Classes, and as an aid to family instruction. By Howard Malcom, D. D. With numerous illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1853.

Malcom's Dictionary has performed an honored service, in the spheres for which it was intended, for twenty-five years. It arose out of the wants of the times, and has continued to meet them, receiving from the author constant corrections and additions, until it reached the sixth edition, when it was stereotyped, its circulation amounting to 130,000 copies. He still, however, pursued his investigations, and a year ago, it was stereotyped anew, with an enlarged page, completely remodelled, and including, besides a thorough revision, all the best improvements of recent scholars; with many elegant engravings. It may be pronounced the most safe and satisfactory book of its kind. Its size, its new and open type, its accurate definitions and references, the beautiful black letter of the words to be defined; in a word, its entire form and matter make it worthy of a greatly increased patronage in Sunday Schools and families. It may well accompany the pocket Bible of the clergyman.

Louis XVII: his life; his sufferings; his death; the Captivity of the Royal family in the Temple. By A. De Beauchesne. Translated and edited by W. Hazlitt, Esq. Embellished with vignettes, autographs, and plans. 2 volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.

A little work, styled "The Bourbon Prince," by the same publishers, and derived from the larger one now before us, was noticed in a preceding number. While it contains the conclusions, it gives no conception of the elaborate character of its imposing prototype. That two such portly volumes with fac-similes, plans, documents, occupying years in the preparation, and evincing the most arduous labor, should have been written about a child, can only be explained upon the ground that his history is not only a royal tragedy, but a state mystery so complicated and important as to compress within its brief limits, more than the value of an ordinary reign. The fact is, it involves the question of right to the throne of France, and it must

either be explained, or the basest perfidy and cruelty of modern times must stigmatize the annals of the kingdom. Our readers will recall the late curious disclosures of the Rev. Mr. Hanson concerning Rev. Eleazar Williams, as the veritable Dauphin, and the remarkable chain of circumstantial evidence which seemed to identify the former with the lost Prince. M. Beauchesne, on apparently independent grounds, has undertaken to demonstrate that the latter actually died in the Temple. He has executed his task under every appearance of impartiality, and with such an array of documentary testimony as to convince himself and many others, of his triumphant success. His peculiar style, his earnest and confident manner, and the thrilling catastrophe of the Royal Family, all give to the progress of the narrative, the prestige of historical verity. But to us, the demonstration is not made out. It may be true. One link may be wanting, and, perhaps, cannot be supplied. If it should not, history, which is not infallible, will be falsified in the annals of a great kingdom. We yet await the conclusion, and will acquiesce when it comes. By the way, Mr. Hanson has prepared a volume on the opposite issue, which has made its appearance, and which will be noticed below; and Mr. Beauchesne may be put into possession of facts not before found in the Temple or its environs. This, however, cannot disparage the fearful interest which his volumes must excite in every lover either of the true or the marvelous.

History of the captivity of Napoleon at St. Helena; from the letters and journals of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir Hudson Lowe, and official documents not before made public. By William Forsyth, M. A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, in two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.

Sir Hudson Lowe was the governor of St. Helena at the time of Napoleon's exile; the space of five years. From his papers and the dispatches of Earl Bathurst, secretary of state for the Colonies, at the same time, has this history been prepared. Every period of Bonaparte's life, and every spot signalized by his presence has become the property of history. Its most dismal episode was his imprisonment in the rocky isle, and his treatment there has deeply involved the representatives of the British government. Certain it is, that the most grievous complaints have been laid at the door of its functionaries, and if true, must stain its administration with national reproach. To vindicate the memory of those whom he supposes to have been calumniated, Mr. Forsyth has waded through masses of manuscripts and other contemporary authorities, and arrived at the conclusion, that while he cannot repress an unbounded admiration for the genius of the illustrious captive, "he concentrated the energies of his mighty intellect on the ignoble task of insulting the Governor, and manufacturing a case of hardship and oppression for himself." To prove so remarkable an assertion would require the most unquestionable evidence, in the face of counter statements and every human probability. Doubtless retaliation and desperation might pervert the loftiest minds to purposes of revenge, but the world will hardly

credit the allegation of a heart so utterly base and diabolical in its measures as that ascribed to the conqueror of Europe. No doubt, the truth lies between the rumors and their attempted refutation. The British government is not faultless, though Napoleon was to blame.

Life of Benjamin Robert Haydon, historical painter; from his autobiography, and journals. Edited and compiled by Tom Taylor, Esq. of the Inner Temple. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.

The life of an artist is unique. There is something in his constitution, or in his profession, which isolates him from mankind in the very triumph of his art. It is not usually happy or prosperous, though it may be crowned with the applauses of the world. To write it with accuracy is almost an impossibility. Happily Mr. Haydon has done it with his own hand, and done it better than any other could have done. His merit as an historical painter is deservedly high, if not in some instances, unsurpassed by modern skill. His great performances are; Joseph and Mary; the Judgment of Solomon, and Christ entering into Jerusalem. With all his powers and popularity, he became poor, lived miserably, and died by his own hand. These volumes are wholly autobiographical, merely arranged and corrected by the editor. They give a painful picture of the painter himself.

Chambers' Repository of instructive and amusing papers. With illustrations. Vols. III. and IV., each complete in itself. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1853.

This series of popular papers is so similar to the "Miscellany," from the same source, as to require no special description. The subjects are all entertaining and instructive, and frequently highly literary, as well as amusing. The illustrations are very elegantly designed and executed. The tone of the papers is pure and elevated. The contents of volume III. are; Light-houses; The war in Algeria; The Wooden Spoon; Writings of Macaulay; The Retreat of the ten thousand; 'Cute McQuade; Holyrood; and Persian Poetry: of the IV. Vol.; The mines and miners of Cornwall; The old Witchcraft; The artist's love; Henry Arnaud and the Waldenses; History of the moon; Scenes from peasant life in Norway; Elizabeth Stuart and the Palatinate; Spirit of the Lusiad. The volumes are 16mo. tastefully bound, and are issued, one in two months.

The following valuable works, from G. P. Putnam & Co., have been politely handed to us, by A. Morris, Esq., of this city, and are for sale by him, on the most accommodating terms:

The Lost Prince: facts tending to prove the identity of Louis the Seventeenth, of France, and the Rev. Eleazar Williams, missionary among

the Indians of North America. By John H. Hanson. New York: G. P. Putnam & Co. 1854.

We are happy to place in close contiguity, the work of M. Beauchesne, mentioned above, and that of Mr. Hanson, on one of the most deeply interesting questions of modern history. The issue between these authors is one of the most extraordinary ever made. The proofs of the death of the Dauphin, in the Temple, adduced by M. Beauchesne, viewed by themselves, appear convincing, and have been appealed to by the Prince de Joinville, as a sufficient vindication of himself from the charges of Mr. Hanson. On the contrary, the wonderful and varied concatenation of facts presented by the latter, carry to our mind a vastly stronger conviction. Never have we observed such an accumulation of the most natural and authentic circumstantial testimony on any subject. That Rev. Eleazar Williams is Louis XVII., we cannot, at present, doubt, and that the Prince de Joinville made the disclosure of the fact to him, at Green Bay, after the most diligent search, is as certain as he is the son of Louis Phillippe. The Prince, through his secretary, has dishonorably denied what the most indubitable affidavits prove. The reading public will find, in this volume, the most curious investigation of the day, handled in an independent, truth-loving and sagacious manner. It is one of those instances in which truth is more strange and captivating than the most gorgeous fiction.

Outlines of Comparative Philology, with a sketch of the languages of Europe, arranged upon philologic principles; and a brief history of the art of writing. By M. Schele De Vere, of the University of Virginia. New York: G. P. Putnam & Co. 1853.

We have been looking with anxiety for the appearance of this work ever since its announcement. It is on a subject to which scholars must ever attach a profound importance. Each individual language, as the embodiment and vehicle of thought, is a subject of intense study to the philosopher. But when viewed in its outward and internal relations to the great family of languages and their several groups, none can be more absorbing. The science of comparative philology is recent, but has made a rapid progress and educed vastly useful results with regard to the study of language in general, to national affinities, and to the higher question of theology, which, with the science of ethnology, it is hastening to prove on philosophical grounds; the unity of the human race. Although this is not its object, it is a consequence of it. M. Schele is the first to bring this subject, so earnestly pursued in Europe, before an American public. His position as professor of Modern languages, in the University of Virginia, and his accomplishments as a scholar, fit him for this task. His style is polished, his range is extensive, and his observations are marked by maturity and depth. So brief a notice can give no just idea of the erudition of the work. We congratulate our University as the source of this new contribution to American literature.

The Works of Joseph Addison, including the whole contents of Bishop Hurd's edition, with letters and other pieces not found in any previous collection; and Macaulay's essay on his life and works. Edited, with critical and explanatory notes, by George Washington Greene. In five volumes. Volumes I., II., III. New York: G. P. Putnam & Co. 1853.

We could not have been treated with a present more to our taste, than with this elegant edition of the great English classic. No one man has exerted a happier influence upon our language and literature than Addison. His very name is identified with all that is pure and beautiful in its annals. There is more completeness in his literary character and productions than in any author whose labors have enriched our tongue. No essayist has ever combined all the elements of style and all the excellences of composition so thoroughly. His works are a treasure, to possess which no avidity can be exaggerated, and by which the mental habitudes of all our youth ought to be formed. They will be all contained in the five volumes, including his contributions to the "Tattler," "Guardian," and "Spectator;" and will be followed in uniform volumes, with the celebrated papers of Steele, Swift, Pope, Ticknell, &c. The arrangement of these volumes is superior to that of all other editions, and they contain pieces omitted by them. Nothing can be more attractive to the eye than the exquisite manner in which the publishers have executed the work, and offered it to the acceptance of the admirers of polite and elegant learning.

Peruvian Antiquities. By Mariano Edward Rivero, Director of the National Museum, Lima, and corresponding member of various scientific societies in Europe and America; and John James Von Tschudi, Doctor in philosophy, medicine and surgery, &c., &c., &c. Translated into English, from the original Spanish, by Francis L. Hawks, D. D., LL. D. New York: George P. Putnam & Co. 1853.

Long prior to the discovery of this continent by Columbus, powerful tribes occupied many of its localities, flourished and decayed. But they have left the memorials of their barbaric grandeur behind them. Mexico and Central America have richly rewarded the researches of the antiquarian. Not less so the land of the Incas, the boasted children of the Sun, whose fading glory was eclipsed by the rapacity of the Spanish conqueror. "The Conquest of Peru," by Prescott, is, perhaps, familiar to our readers. It is to us, and we never can forget the picture which it draws of the wealth and glory of the Incas, or the perfidy and cruelty of Pizarro. Although it gives much information on the subject of its antiquities, this volume is specially devoted to their investigation by a native Peruvian, of Spanish origin, whose researches extend to 1851, and are consequently the last which we have. It contains a minute description of the architectural remains of the mysterious aborigines whose history fills us with a sentiment of admiration and awe. Dr. Hawks' industry in this department of know-

ledge has laid our countrymen under additional obligations to him by the present translation.

Mr. Rutherford's Children. By the author of "The Wide, Wide World," "Queechy," "Dollars and Cents," &c. New York: G. Putnam & Co. 1853.

A delightful little book for children, by the popular pen of Miss Wetherell, in a series, under the title of "Ellen Montgomery's Bookcase." With its well told incidents, it has a number of embellishments.

Liberia; or Mr. Peyton's experiments. Edited by Mrs. Sarah Hale, author of "Woman's Record." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.

This duodecimo contains an argument for the American Colonization Society, not only valid in itself, but peculiarly forcible to the South. It is based on the contrasted condition of negroes at the North and in Liberia. The leading idea, which is very ingeniously traced, is that of a Virginia gentleman who had freed his servants, and who in his travels made it his business to inquire into their state. He extends his inquiries into the colony, and obtains the most satisfactory account of its prosperity, and the great advantages to the colored race of a settlement there. The book exhibits a very accurate acquaintance with the history of the Colonization Society, and furnishes authentic accounts of its progress. The condition of the colored population at the North is equally a demonstration of abolition fanaticism and of the utility and benevolence of African colonization.

History of the Insurrection in China; with notices of the Christianity, creed and proclamations of the insurgents. By MM. Callery and Yvan. Translated from the French, by John Ocenford. With a fac-simile of a Chinese map of the course of the insurrection, and a portrait of Tien-te, its Chief. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.

The present rebellion in China, the avowed object of which is to overthrow the Tartar dynasty, and to restore that of Ming, is the most momentous movement of the age. It is no other than the spirit of progress, in the providence of God, sent to break down that ill-fated incubus of antiquated system of laws and usages which has nearly exhausted itself in crushing the millions of the Celestial Empire for ages. The leader is one of the most remarkable men living, and seems altogether equal to the tremendous work he has undertaken. His progress has been marked by unshaken firmness and an invincible purpose. In his ideas of reform and of religion, he is far in the advance of his predecessors. They are, indeed, a singular medley, but have the elements of truth. The authors are well informed personally of the principal events, and enliven their narrative by many striking descriptions of the places, scenery, productions, customs and manners of the country. The map is a real curiosity of Chinese topography. A chapter is added to the translation, bringing the history of the revolution

down to its latest period. Should the leader accomplish his object, of which there is every probability, it will be impossible to conjecture the mighty influence which it will exert upon the civil and religious condition of the nation, and the commerce of the world. So full and satisfactory an account of this wonderful event, we have not before seen.

Notes on the State of Virginia, by Thomas Jefferson: illustrated with a map, including the States of Virginia, Maryland, Delaware and Pennsylvania. A new edition, prepared by the author, containing notes and plates never before published. J. W. Randolph, Richmond, Va. 1853.

If these notes, so long before the American public, were not universally known and appreciated, both duty and inclination would induce us to give such an analysis of them as their unquestionable merit deserves. But their excellence, their beauty, their astonishing accuracy and detail, have received the stamp of almost a world-wide approbation, and invested them with the dignity of historical authority. All that is left us to say, respects the present edition. Mr. Jefferson himself made preparations for another, by extensive notes in manuscript, and several plates and maps. But for prudential reasons, it was delayed. Since the last edition became scarce, it was deemed proper, by his executor, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Esq., to accomplish the author's purpose. Accordingly, we have the pleasure of announcing the appearance of the work, in its amended form, in this city, by our enterprising citizen, J. W. Randolph, Esq., who has spared no means to make it acceptable to the public, and a fit representative of its distinguished author. The notes which accompany it are very valuable, displaying his vast resources. Many of them were written in foreign languages, and have been translated, for this edition, by the accomplished professor of Modern languages in the University of Virginia. The map represents the tract of country from Albemarle Sound to Lake Erie, as it was in 1787. "The Topographical Analysis" of the State of Virginia, at the same time, is replete with the most curious information on subjects of interest, especially to every Virginian. It is with peculiar pleasure we remark that the entire work, in every part, including the materials, was executed in our city. The printing by C. H. Wynne, Esq. is ample proof that, in books as well as in periodicals, we are not dependent upon the North. The South is equal to her own responsibilities in publishing, as in other respects, and it is the duty of her people to cherish and sustain the spirit of enterprise now beginning to awake. We hope our friend, J. W. Randolph, Esq., will receive that support which his patriotic exertions deserve.

ART. IX.

BIBLICAL, LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC MISCELLANIES.

An interesting and spirited undertaking has just been commenced by the issuing of the prospectus of a society for exploring the ruins of Assyria and Babylonia, with especial reference to Biblical illustration, under the patronage of his Royal highness, Prince Albert. The light that has been so unexpectedly thrown upon the Bible history of the world by the discovery and interpretations of the Nineveh marbles, and the knowledge that many earlier and more important sculptures remain behind, have awakened an anxious desire among antiquarians and literary men for farther acquisitions. Mr. Layard, who has a firman from the Sultan to go on excavating, is of opinion that he has, so to speak, only scattered the surface of the Assyrian mounds, and that the most ancient ruins of this most ancient people have not yet been reached. It is certain that since the publication of his book, older monuments have been brought to light, and every discovery gives token, after its kind, of newer Biblical light. The government not being disposed to give more money, and the British Museum not having funds for the purpose, it is evident that, to secure these valuable historical records to the pride and glory of England, must be the work of private enterprise. The idea of forming a society among those interested in the matter has been presented to Prince Albert; and his Royal Highness, with a shrewd appreciation of its genuineness and importance, directly sanctioned it with his support. The interest which he so promptly manifested in the undertaking secured at once the co-operation of the most influential noblemen and gentlemen that could be desired, to take part in it; and we question whether it will not be one of the most useful, meritorious, and popular labours with which the honoured name of Prince Albert has been associated. Subscriptions to the amount of £1000., including five of £100 each, have been contributed privately within the last few days. An expedition will at once proceed to Assyria to carry forward the necessary operations. A photographer will accompany the expedition, and will take copies of all objects of interest discovered. In England fac-similes of the drawings and inscriptions will be issued as often as they come to hand, together with explanatory letterpress, the publication of which Mr. Layard has kindly undertaken to superintend. It will be less the object of the expedition to obtain bulky sculptures than to collect materials for completing the history of Assyria and Babylonia, especially as connected with Scripture. These materials consist chiefly of inscribed tablets in stone, and in clay, bronzes, bricks, and sculptured monuments of various kinds, all illustrating the remarkable advancement of that ancient civilization. It is confidently believed that the whole history of Assyria may be restored to a very early

period, and that discoveries of the most important character will be made in connection with the literature and science of the Assyrian people. The present undertaking being regarded as a continuation of the researches already commenced by the British Museum, it is determined that the monuments shall ultimately become the property of the nation.—*Killo, October, 1853.*

From the Church Missionary Intelligencer for September, we extract the following, as the result of a consideration of the various reports and statements respecting the leader of the extraordinary movements in China; That he is probably still alive, and about 40 years of age; that his name is certainly Hung-seu-tseuen; that he is a native of the Hwa district, some 25 miles from Canton; that he took the first, if not the second, literary degree, but found his way to office barred; that he then turned his attention to the doctrines of Christianity, and was for a time in direct connection, more or less intimate, with a Protestant medical missionary at Canton; that he afterwards established in Kwang-se a community of Christians, composed of both Kwang-tung and Kwang-se men; that persecution compelled him and his co-religionists to take arms in self-defence; and that, after this a sense of double injustice, and injury from the government, acting on an ambitious mind, strong feelings, and an enthusiastic temperament, gradually brought him, as the success of his arms increased, to the belief that he was the recipient of a Divine Mission to exterminate the Muntcheos, abolish idolatry, and found a new Christian dynasty.—*Ibid.*

From the 61st (1853) Report of the Baptist Missionary Society, we learn that the revision of the Bengalic New Testament, announced last year as in progress, has been completed. An 8vo. edition has already been published, and the re-print of it in a smaller form, as a pocket Bible for the use of the native Christians, has reached the Acts of the Apostles. The Bengalic version continues at present, and is likely for years, to be the only one in circulation in Bengal. In its revision Mr. Wenger has kept in view, in the numerous alterations he has made, the desirableness of following the original as closely as a due regard to the idiom of the Bengalic language will allow, at the same time retaining the elegance stamped upon it by the late Dr. Yates. In Sanskrit, the second volume of the Old Testament, containing the historical books from Judges to Esther inclusive, has been completed. A revised edition of Genesis, with the first 20 chapters of Exodus, has also been published. The Hindooee Gospels, in the Kaithai character, have been undertaken and carried through the press to John viii, by the joint labors of Mr. Leslie and Mr. Parsons of Monghir; and some little progress has also been made in printing the Hindostanic version in the Roman characters.

From the Report of the Foreign Translation Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, we learn that the works completed during the past year are eight in number:—1. A new and revised edition of the Society's French version of the Bible. 2. A Spanish translation of the

Bible. 3. A Polish version of the New Testament. 4. A new edition of Diodati's Italian translation of the New Testament. 5. A new edition of the Society's French version of the Book of Common Prayer. 6. A new and revised edition of the Spanish version of the Liturgy. 7. A new and more complete edition of the New Zealand Prayer Book. 8. A new edition, revised, and with all former omissions supplied, of the Book of Common Prayer in Dutch and English. The following seven works are at present in progress: 1. The new translation of the Bible into Arabic. 2. The new and completely revised edition of Diodati's Italian Bible. 3. A new revision of the Irish Bible. 4. The printing of the Greek New Testament at Athens. 5. The completion of the Ogibna translation of the New Testament. 6. A translation of the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, of the Acts, and of part of the Book of Genesis, into the Arawak language; and translations of portions of the New Testament and of the English Liturgy into the Loochoon Japanese dialect.

The Arabic translation of the Old Testament is still in progress. Long ago the late Dr. S. Lee formed the design of devoting the last years of his useful and laborious life to a great and most important achievement, never probably attempted before, but for which, by his peculiar talents and remarkable acquirements, he appeared to be eminently qualified, that, namely, of accomplishing a faithful and uniform Arabic translation, from the Hebrew and Greek originals, of the entire volume of Holy Writ. The Foreign Translation Committee gladly accepted his proposals to engage in the work. Faithfully and hopefully did he devote himself to it; and it was his ardent wish, not unfrequently expressed, both in verbal communication and in writing, to be allowed to live to see his task completed. But, in the all-wise dispensations of Providence, his heart's desire was not to be accomplished; and some months before his death he was obliged, in consequence of increasing infirmity, to resign to other hands the superintendance of the work. He had been permitted, however, not only to complete and to witness the publication of the New Testament, but to hear from time to time of the good fruits already produced, under the Divine blessing, by the dissemination of this version in the East; while, under his own care and supervision, the rough draft of the translation of the whole of the Old Testament was accomplished, and the greater part of the Pentateuch, having been carefully revised by the original Hebrew, was set up, corrected, and stereotyped. He had, therefore, the comfort and satisfaction of living to see that, in this last work of his hands, his labor had not been in vain. Others have now entered upon his labors. At his own desire his share of the work was transferred, during the last months of his life, to his pupil and friend, Professor Jarrett, who, since the death of Dr. Lee, has consented, at the request of the Foreign Translation Committee, to undertake the office of principal editor; and upon the same plan, and with the aid of the same able assistants as heretofore, the work is steadily and satisfactorily advancing.

There has been recently formed in London a Society entitled The Anglo-Biblical Institute, for the promotion of Biblical criticism; having more especially in view a superior translation of the Bible into the English language! The Society does not give any pledge for the production of such a work, it only aims at promoting it.

The public meeting to celebrate the labors of Evangelical Christendom for the conversion of the world, was held at Constantinople on the 13th of June last. It took place on account of the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. There were present about two hundred persons, chiefly English and American. Lord Strafford de Radcliffe presided. His lordship warmly commends the zeal and discretion that had characterized the agents employed in spreading the Bible in Turkey, and alluded especially to the labors of the English, American and German missionaries, who had all acted in beautiful harmony in carrying forward the work.

The Jewish Intelligencer for September states that a complete Hebrew Bible printed by the Jews is very seldom to be met with. Every learned Jew is familiar with different editions of the Talmud, which have been printed at a vast expenditure of time and money by members of the Hebrew nation; and editions of parts of the Hebrew Bible, accompanied by the commentaries of Rashi and other Rabbis, have been multiplied to an extraordinary extent; but how many, or rather we may ask how few, have been the editions of the complete Hebrew Bible? The book usually met with among the Jews, and that which the common people seem often to regard as if it were really a complete Bible, contains the Pentateuch, accompanied by the chalaui, Targum, the comment of Rashi, and, as a sort of appendix, the Megilloth, or the books which are read at their great festivals, Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, and the Haphioroth, or lessons from the prophets, which are read in the Synagogues on the different Sabbaths in the year.

The 'United Presbyterian Magazine,' for May, contains an illustration of the slothful hunter, of Proverbs xii. 27, by the Rev. H. M. Waddell, derived from his experience at Old Calabar. He observes that the Hebrew word here is the same as is used in Daniel iii. 27, "Nor was a hair of their head *singed*;" and he thinks that if it were so rendered in Proverbs, "He *singes* not that which he took in hunting;" the sense of the verse would be better brought out than it is by the present translation. In Calabar, and perhaps also in other countries, small animals used for food, sheep, goats, deer, pigs, &c. are not skinned: the hair is burned off and the creature is cut up and dried or dressed in the skin; and almost all fish or flesh meat that comes to market is partially roasted and smoke dried. A diligent man going into the wilds to hunt, if he snares or spears a deer or wild pig, perfectly dries over the fire of his hut, what he does not immediately require for his own use, proceeding on his hunting operations, curing as fast as he takes, till he has obtained as much as he can carry home. Not so the indolent man; as long as his first beast lasts him, he idles his time, eating and sleeping and lounging about his hut, and probably losing half the animal by not quickly or perfectly smoke-drying it. At last he returns, with little to show for the time he has been away; and the little that he has brought, being only half dried is half rotten.

At the Royal Society of Literature (July 20th), Sir John Doratt, V. P. in the chair, Mr. Greenwood's paper, "On certain Epochal Periods of Papal History," was concluded. Mr. Greenwood commenced his paper by a careful revision of the theories of the two principal modern writers on prophecy, Mr. Faber and Mr. Elliot, with regard to that period of 1260 years, 'the reign of the Dragon or Antichrist,' commonly known as the prophe-

tical period of St. John. The first of these writers supposed this period to commence with the edict of the Emperor Phocas, A. D. 606, which he says, conferred on the Bishop of Rome, the title of 'Universal Bishop.' Mr. Elliot, on the other hand, adopts a double commencement for the "reign of the Beast," dating the first from the edict of the Emperor Justinian, A. D. 533, and the second from the edict of Phocas. The object of Mr. Elliot would seem to be to guard against the uncertainty of any single date; while he at the same time, contends that about the year 533, the Roman Papacy commenced the adoption of those principles of domination over the 'ten kingdoms,' which enabled the Pontiffs subsequently to establish their universal rule. Mr. Greenwood objects that the number of ten Gothic Kingdoms cannot be proved upon any sufficiently historical grounds, either within the area or at the time which Mr. Elliot's theory requires, while there is an ambiguity in the use of the word 'Gothic,' inasmuch as the Goths were only one branch of the great Teutonic family. Strictly speaking, there were but two 'Gothic Kingdoms,' in existence when Justinian published his decree, A. D. 533. Mr. Greenwood considered next the question whether the edict of Justinian was really intended to confer exclusive powers on the Roman Papacy, and showed that for all practical purposes these powers had been conferred before, by the decree of Theodosius, A. D. 380, by the exertion of Pope Leo the Great, and by the edict of Valentinian III. even though the actual phrase, 'Universal Bishop' may not have been used. He also remarked that the Eastern Emperors were often in the habit of giving to the Patriarch of Constantinople the complimentary title Œcumenical or Universal Bishop, while they maintained their own autocratic supremacy; while the Western Emperors, on the other hand, fully admitted the spiritual claim, but withheld the specific title, a fact which gives more importance to the decree of Valentinian III. than to those of Justinian and Phocas. This view is still more confirmed by the conduct of Pope Leo at the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, at which his legates obtained the first place of honour, while its decrees were drawn up in his name, that especially against Eutyches being signed by his legate in the name Leo, 'Bishop of the whole church.' The general probability seems to be, that the subsequent decrees, which have been exalted by the interpreters of prophecy into epochal changes, were in fact only the results of a compromise between the Eastern and Western churches, each of whom claimed the like universal powers. In conclusion, Mr. Greenwood stated that, in his opinion, the power of Rome made a greater advance through the agency of Pope Leo the Great, than in any single pontificate previous to the time of Gregory VII., while at no other period was there, on the whole, a more general concurrence of Christendom in the claims put forth by the Roman Pontiff. Mr. Greenwood then noticed several other facts which militate against the theory of the decree of Justinian being the great epochal period, such as the excommunication of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, by Felix III., in A. D. 481, this anathema being issued on the authority of St. Peter and his successor, Felix, 'Bishop of the Universal Church,' and the subsequent acts of Gelasius, Symmachus, and Hormisdas. Again, the character of Justinian as a legislator is against it. Of his own will he drew up a complete code of laws for the Universal Church, entering into all the minutia of doctrine and discipline, &c. Such a ruler may have disregarded, but almost certainly did not intend to promote the power of the Roman Bishop. It is clear that Justinian held that the imperial sanction was necessary to impart the power of law even to ecclesiastical ordinances. Again, a little before the surrender of Rome to Belisarius, the same emperor had aided the recusant bishops of Illyricum Orientale, in their attempt to emancipate themselves from the spiritual jurisdiction of Rome. Again, Justi-

nian applies the title of "Head of all the Holy Churches" to the Patriarch of Constantinople as well as the Pope of Rome, which looks very like a compromise. There are other instances of a similar kind. Mr. Greenwood then showed that so far from the decree of Justinian marking a period of advancement in the Papacy, it really denoted one of decline. With regard to the second point of commencement for the 1260 years; viz., the decree of Phocas in A. D. 606, Mr. Greenwood had some doubts as to its genuineness, as it is only found in Paul Warnefrid's History of the Lombards, written more than a century and a half after the event, but if genuine, the language of it does not impute an exclusive headship to Rome.

Notes on the Ottoman Empire.—The dominant race (observes Mr. Bayle St. John, in a volume of very recent date,) may almost be called an aristocracy in rags. As a rule, there is no medium between successful rapine and semi-beggary. Directly or indirectly, the Christian population is compelled to work, not only for its own support, but for that of a set of idlers, whose ancestors, indeed, were conquerors. The infinitesimal improvements of which statesmen speak exist but in imagination. Every department, judicial and administrative, has increased in venality and corruption. There may be less violence, but there is more fraud. At Constantinople the state of things is bad enough. The evil grows in proportion to the distance from the centre. It would seem as if the Turks believed that the old prophecy is about to be accomplished, which gives the empire four hundred years of life. A principedom is often sold, without much disguise, for about £ 60,000 sterling.

The manners and characters of the Moslems, and especially of the Turks, have been entirely formed on the Koran. No inquiring literature or philosophy has risen up in their minds to take the place of the enthusiasm that was to die away. There has never been among them any thing like public instruction of an elevated character. The elementary schools, whether attached to mosques or fountains, or meeting under trees or hedges, are numerous, it is true; but nothing is taught in them beyond reading and writing. The children sit in circles, and snuffle out passages of the Koran in chorus, or scrawl out sentences on their wooden slates. The science of arithmetic is only learned by a few at a later period. There are no school books. The child of ten years old, like the old man of fifty, derives in Turkey all his ideas of religion, morals, politics, law and geography, from the mystical paragraphs of his sacred volume. It is true, there is a Turkish literature containing some good books; but these are now rarely read. The Turk has settled down into a mere animal state. The Medressis, or Colleges, are principally frequented by persons who do not intend to attempt occupying any public station, and who wish to console and prepare themselves for the future by a life of meditation. There is taught there, however, a kind of body of practical philosophy founded on the Koran, together with Arabic and Persian languages. No scientific instruction is ever attempted.—*Wesleyan Magazine, December 1853.*

A society for protecting the rights of conscience, has been recently formed in Dublin. The first meeting was held in the month of August. The Archbishop of Dublin, who presided, said, "By rights, we understand, not necessarily that every one is right in the religion that he adopts, but that his neighbors have no right to interfere with him. We merely maintain that a man has a right, not necessarily a moral right, nor a right in point of judgment, but a civil right, to worship God according to his own conscience, without suffering any hardships at the hands of his neighbors for so doing. * * * * * When attempts are made to compel men to conform to what they do not conscientiously believe, by the fear of starvation,

by turning them out of employment when they are honest and industrious laborers, by refusing to buy or sell, or hold any intercourse with them, then I think it is, and then only, that a society like this ought to come forward; and that all persons, whatever religion they may be of, or whether they are of any religion at all or not, in a feeling of humanity and justice, ought to look with a favorable eye on such a society as yours, provided it keep itself within its own proper bounds.

The Wesleyan "Mediation Committee" have offered one hundred guineas for the best "Essay on the Pastoral Function in the Christian Church." The competition is open to writers of all evangelical communions. The adjudicators are the Rev. J. Angell James, of Birmingham; the Rev. D. Walton, Sowerby Bridge; and Isaac Taylor, Esq., of Stanford Rivers. The prospectus may be had on application to Edmund Hesley, Esq., Birmingham.

A curious correspondence is given in the "Jewish Chronicle," relating to the alleged discovery, near Naples, of a marble vase, bearing an inscription in Hebrew referring to the trial and sentence of Christ. The statement first appeared in 'Le Moniteur Judicairé' of Lyons, from which it was copied by 'La Presse,' and then the 'Gazette de France,' September 18, 1843; and is to this effect, that when making excavations in the kingdom of Naples in 1808, a brass plate was found on an antique vase of white marble, engraved with an inscription in Hebrew, purporting to have been issued directly from the court of Pontius Pilate. It was discovered by the commissary of Arts attached to the French army during the expedition to Naples under the Empire. It was in the sacristy of the Carthusians, near Naples, in a cedar case, and the vase is still in the chapel of Casente. A translation being made, M. Denon took a copy, which at the sale of his cabinet, was knocked down to Lord Howard for 4800 francs. It is as follows:

'Sentence passed by Pontius Pilate, Regent of Lower Galilee, importing that Jesus of Nazareth shall suffer the punishment of the cross.

'Year 17th of the Empire of Tiberius Cæsar, and the 25th of the month of March, in the Holy City of Jerusalem, Annas and Caiphas being priests and sacrificers of God.

'Pontius Pilate, Governor of Lower Galilee, sitting on the Presidential Proctor's bench, condemns Jesus of Nazareth to die on a cross between two thieves; the great and credible witnesses of the people saying: 1. Jesus is a seducer. 2. Jesus is seditious. 3. He is an enemy to the law. 4. He falsely calls himself Son of God. 5. He falsely calls himself King of Israel. 6. He entered the temple, followed by an armed multitude.

'Orders: That the first centurion, Quirius Cornilius, conduct him to the place of punishment.

'Prohibits all persons, poor or rich, to hinder the death of Jesus.

'The witnesses who have signed the sentence of Jesus are:

'1. Daniel Robane, pharasee. 2. Johannes Zorobahel. 3. Raphael Robane. 4. Gapet, public man.

'Jesus to go out of the city by the Stuepee Gate.'

This sentence was engraved on a brass plate; on the sides were these words: 'A similar plate is sent to each tribe.'

From the Twelfth Annual Report of the Bebek Seminary, (belonging to the American mission,) Constantinople, we learn that Protestant Christianity is spreading in the East. The number of students is fifty. The departments of instruction in the institution are as follows: The principal attends morning prayers at half-past six, after which he hears three classes in English grammar and political economy until eight, when the students have

breakfast and an hour for manual labor. The forenoon (from nine till twelve) is mostly given to Armenian studies and mathematics. In the afternoon the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin hears one class in intellectual philosophy, one in natural philosophy, and one in mathematics, (excepting the two afternoons when the Rev. E. O. Dwight meets the class in theology,) and nearly the whole school in music. The class of Mr. Dwight is composed of eleven Armenian students; and were it not for the language, there would have been six Greeks in addition. None of the class have finished their prescribed course of seminary study. The studies are, Doctrinal Theology, Ecclesiastical History, and interpretation of the Scriptures. The Greek department, comprising fifteen scholars, is conducted mainly by M. Synezius, an accomplished Greek scholar. An interesting part is the manual department, the proceeds of which go a great way to sustain the mission. The stone and tin ware business was first tried, and afterwards an iron and flouring mill was projected to make up the deficiency of employment. Several former pupils have been pursuing various trades in Armenia, in order to meet the increasing demands of the missionary field. One is on his way with extensive and valuable machinery for sawing, turning, sash-blind and door-making, &c. They are also looking forward to adding dentistry, iron foundry, model making, biscuit making, and general machinery, such as printing presses, mill and pump work. One of the former pupils will soon leave for England to learn the art of reducing copper, lead and silver ores. That these enterprises should all be accomplished by poor young men, of a nation but recently brought to the notice of the Christian world, is a signal and interesting proof of the great change in public sentiment in the East towards the missionary cause.

A scheme has just been projected for printing and circulating in China a million copies of the New Testament, to be placed at the disposal of the clergy and missionaries of all denominations now in that part of the world. A Chinese New Testament could be printed and sold for fourpence; 17,000l. is the whole sum required. The Chinese are a reading people, and receive books with avidity; while special favor will be shown to the volume containing an account of that faith which is professed by the leaders of the insurrection. The movement bears much of a religious aspect; and, though mixed with much error, it is evident that many of the revolutionists possess some knowledge of the Bible and Christianity.

It is stated in a foreign paper that a remarkable movement is in progress among the Jews throughout the world, a paper being extensively circulated by an influential Rabbi, in which he proves from Scripture that the time has come when the Jews must prepare for returning to the land of their fathers. The document has been printed in Hebrew and English, and a society has been formed to promote the movement.

Comparative Healthfulness of England, France, Prussia, &c.—The annual rate of mortality in England may be best understood by saying that there are 46 persons living to 1 death; that is, the mortality is 1 in 46. In 1841, the annual mortality per cent. 2207, or 1 in 45. In France, there were 42 living to 1 death; in Prussia 38; in Austria 33; and in Russia 1 person in 28 died annually. In the latter country, the mortality per cent. is 3590; or, in other terms, out of every 100,000 Russians living, 3590 died in one year; while out of every 100,000 British living, only 2207 died in the same period. In several Italian cities, the annual mortality of the inhabitants is from 3 to 4 per cent. In the city of Naples, which has been shown to be one of the unhealthiest in Europe, it appears that 4046 persons died out of every 100,000 of its inhabitants. From these facts, it is evident

that there is a lower rate of mortality among the inhabitants of England than in either of those enumerated; and that, in some instances, the mortality falls little short of one half the same as existing in less favored regions.—*Ellis' Disease in Childhood.*

Thus far, no writer has succeeded in drawing so large pecuniary profits from the exercise of his talents, as Charles Dickens. By this means alone he has raised himself from the position of a newspaper reporter to that of a literary Croesus. He is reported to have realized from Bleak House alone nearly \$ 200,000, and receives an enormous income from Household Words. His dinners are said to be of equal splendor to those of the highest aristocracy, and are furnished with an unsurpassed intellectual banquet of wit and wisdom.—*Norton.*

Rev. Dr. Perkins of Oroomiah, a missionary of the American Board, writes that a translation of the Bible into ancient and modern Syria has been completed and published, at the expense of the American Bible Society.—*Norton.*

Bishop Ives' book, setting forth his reasons for transferring his allegiance from the Protestant Episcopal, to the Roman Catholic Church, is to make its appearance in London this month.—*Norton, November.*

A Baptist Theological seminary has just been opened at Fairmount, near Cincinnati, a new gothic edifice having been erected for it at a cost of 25,000 dollars. It is located on the summit of one of the highest hills in that vicinity, and commands a fine view of Cincinnati, Covington, Newport and the adjacent region. Two professorships have already been filled.

Wesleyan Academy, Wilbraham, is in very prosperous circumstances, exhibiting an aggregate of six hundred scholars during the past year. Rev. Minor Raymond is the principal, with nine assistants in the various departments.

More than eighteen thousand students attended the different universities in Germany and Switzerland, during the past year.

A literary pension of £100 a year has been conferred on Sir Francis Head, the popular author of "Bubbles from the Brunnen" and other popular works.

A university for Australia has been founded and endowed by the local Legislature at Sydney; and the latest tidings from that colony speak of a project being on foot to establish a new college, in connexion with the university there, for educating ministers of the English Church.

Among the papers of Mrs. Gibbon, the aunt of the historian, were found, after her decease, several letters to her from her nephew, Edward Gibbon, the historian, and his friend, Lord Sheffield, from which it would appear, that the religious views of the former had, at least from the year 1788, undergone considerable change. In one of these interesting letters Gibbon says:—Whatever you have been told of my opinions, I can assure you the truth, that I consider religion as the best guide of youth, and the best support of old age; that I firmly believe there is less real happiness in the business and pleasures of the world, than in the life which you have chosen of devotion and retirement.

Alexander Von Humboldt accomplished his eighty-fourth year on the 13th of September last. The illustrious philosopher is in the full enjoyment of health and vigor.

The German poet, Henry Heine, has for many years past been afflicted with complete paralysis. Indeed, it may be said that life only lingers in the brain and tongue; the man is a mere corpse; but the poet still survives, as is strikingly evinced by some of his recent compositions.

A large protestant book store has been established in the city of Constantinople, and transacts a very extensive business.

As a matter of some interest to theological students, we announce a change in the editorship of the *Journal of Sacred Literature*. Circumstances have induced the learned Dr. Kitto, under whose management it has grown to its present well-deserved celebrity, to retire; he has been succeeded by the Rev. H. Burgess, Ph. D., who seems to be eminently qualified to take the place of Dr. Kitto.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND NEW PUBLICATIONS.

FOREIGN.

We learn that Dr. Tregelles hopes very soon to put into the printer's hands a portion of his long-expected edition of the Greek New Testament, and that he will be able to avail himself of the collation of Tischendorf's newly-found ancient MSS. This work does not appear to meet with the encouragement in the number of subscribers, which its importance should warrant.

Preparing for publication, by subscription, *The Repentance of Nineveh*, a metrical oration, by Ephraem Syrus; translated from the original Syriac, with an introduction and notes, by the Rev. Henry Burgess, Ph. D., of Göttingen, Curate of St. Mary's, Blackburn, and translator of select metrical hymns and homilies of Ephraem Syrus. This discourse is perhaps the most remarkable of the numerous works of this celebrated father of the Church. It is written in heptasyllabic metre, and contains nearly two thousand verses. Although apparently composed for the pulpit, it is in reality a fine epic poem, describing with great force of imagination the results of the mission of the prophet Jonah to Nineveh. Apart from its intrinsic excellences, it is well worthy of notice as a specimen of the Syriac metrical literature, hitherto so little recognized, although so extensively employed by the church in the third and fourth centuries. This work will be printed in the same attractive form as the hymns and homilies of Ephraem, recently translated and published by Dr. Burgess.

In the press, *The Genealogies of our Saviour*, as contained in the gospels of St. Matthew and of St. Luke, reconciled with each other, and with the genealogy of the house of David, from Adam to the close of the canon of the Old Testament, and shown to be in harmony with the true chronology of the times. By Lord Arthur Hervey, M. A., Rector of Ickworth. (Macmillan & Co.)

In the press, volume II. of *Egypt's place in Universal History; an Historical Investigation*. By C. C. J. Bunsen, D. C. L., translated from the German, by C. H. Cotterell, M. A.

Longman, Brown & Co., London, announce as preparing for publication, *Hippolytus and His Age: Or Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome*

under Commodus and Alexander Severus; and Ancient and Modern Christianity and Divinity compared. By C. C. J. Bunsen, D. D., D. C. L. A new edition, corrected, remodelled, and extended. 7 vols. 8vo.

1. Hippolytus and His Age; or the Beginnings and Prospects of Christianity. New edition. 2 vols. 8vo.

Separate works connected with *Hippolytus and His Age*, as forming its philosophical and philological key:

2. Sketch of the Philosophy of Language and Religion: or the Beginnings and Prospects of Mankind. 2 vols. 8vo.

3. *Analecta Ante-Nicaena*. 3 vols. 8vo.

I. *Religinae Literariae*;

II. *Religinae Canonicae*;

III. *Religinae Liturgicae*.

Announced as shortly to appear, in royal 8vo., about 150 pp., the *Praktiaprakasa* (or *Sutras*) of Vararuchi, with the Commentary (*Munerama*) of Bhamaha; being a Prakrit Grammar, according to the system of the Hindus. The first complete edition of the original text, with various readings from a collation of six manuscripts in the Bodleian library at Oxford, and the library of the Royal Asiatic Society, and the India House, with notes; to which is added an English translation, with an easy introduction to the knowledge of Prakrit. By Edward B. Cowell, Oxford.

A new edition of Dr. Johnston's Dictionary, is proposed, under the editorship of Dr. Latham, which, it is said, will comprise the text of 1773, with Dr. Todd's and other emendations and additions, forming three volumes 4to.

A new work by the Rev. George Gilfillin, has appeared, entitled the *Grand Discovery*; or the Paternal Character of God, 18mo., Blackader & Co.

In the press: An Introduction to the study of the Gospels, including a new and improved edition of the 'Elements of the Gospel Harmony,' with a *Catena* on inspiration, from the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. By the Rev. B. F. Westcott, of Harrow School. Also, by the same author, an Introduction to the study of the Canonical Epistles, including an attempt to determine their separate purposes and mutual relations. Macmillin & Co.

A translation of Compté's "Positive Philosophy" by Miss Martineau, has just been published in 2 vols. 8vo.

History of the Insurrection in China, with notices of the Christianity, creed, and proclamations of the Insurgents, by MM. Callery and Yvan, translated by John Oxenford. This is said to be a very authentic and timely work. It is thought by a highly reputable London Journal, that, "for a connected account of the revolution from its commencement we are indebted to the labours of the French authors, whose work is now translated by Mr. Oxenford. M. Callery was formerly a Missionary, and afterwards interpreter to the French embassy, to which Dr. Yvan was attached as physician. Some of the statements in their work are corrected by more recent information, but on the whole they have presented a faithful and animated narrative of the insurrection. A perusal of this work is necessary for intelligently following the reports which are likely for some time to be transmitted by each mail from China.

The brightest token of a living scholarship that has lately appeared, says a correspondent of the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, is a 'Theological and

Eccelesiastical Cyclopædia, (Real-Cyclopædie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche: Stuttgart, Scheitlin), recently commenced under the joint operation of the most learned men in Germany, of the moderate and orthodox schools. To any one familiar with German scholarship, the names of Baumgarten, Böhringer, Giesler, Gericke, Hagenback, Hoffman, Jacobi, Leo, Lepsius, Lücke, Müller of Halle, Nitzsch, Pelt, Schenkel, Thilo, Tholuck, Truelsen, Ullman, and Weisler, who are among the contributors, will afford sufficient guarantees of the ability and learning, as well as the conservatism of this great undertaking. We call the undertaking great because the work, instead of being, as are most works of the kind, a compilation of more or less heterogeneous materials made by ordinary hands, will contain a condensed and systematic summary of ascertained results in connection with the vast and diversified province of theology and religion, presenting a complete view of the subject, as revised by the investigations and conclusions of the last half century; drawn up and put together by men most eminent each in his own department, and distinguished in and by the very labors of which he here gives a report in outline. The reader will fall short of a correct conception of the undertaking if he supposes that it is limited to theology in the strict sense of the term. Whatever concerns the Christian religion in its essence, development and history, is here set forth under that aspect in which it appears before the eyes of learned Protestants. In consequence, philosophy, history, jurisprudence, archaeology and philology are all made to bestow their contributions. Excellent in conception, the work is also admirably executed, so far as it has been seen by me. By this I do not mean to signify my assent and consent to all its statements, positions, and opinions; but I everywhere find the spirit of sound scholarship, as well as a reverence not only for the Gospel, but also for its archives, and also a frank recognition of its inestimable worth. For a person desirous of taking a birds-eye view of German theology, I can conceive nothing better. Profound scholars may here find useful summaries and instructive disquisitions; while those who think that it is all barren from Dan to Beersheba in the land of Luther may, if they please, be easily undeceived by the perusal of these learned yet reliable pages.

The following are some of the new announcements of Germany:

Die Christliche Kirche Der Erstern Drei Jahrhunderte Vorlesungen von K. R. Hagenbach, 12mo. Leipsic, 1853.

These Lectures by Dr. Hagenbach on "the Christian Church of the first three centuries," are spoken of as possessing peculiar merits. "The author," it said, "begins even before the Christian era, and proceeds to describe in a very beautiful manner, the advent of the Lord, and the apostolic times. His diction is, as usual, full of grace and beauty (the translation of the Clementine Hymn, p. 222, is a masterpiece of composition, and a gentle and peaceful spirit breathes from the whole, and gives it the same noble power which characterize the other works of the author."

Dormi's Christology, of which the I. vol. in 3 parts has already appeared, and been much admired, will be completed by the publication of vol. II. in 2 parts, the first of which is soon to appear.

Eighteen Historical Lectures delivered in Ludwigsburg and Stuttgart by Chr. Hoffman, inspector of the Evangelical school of Ludwigsburg, are spoken of as deserving general attention. Their subject is the *Regeneration of society by the introduction of Christianity*. The lecturer is said to represent Christianity, which is so often viewed merely as a code of dogmas, or morals, above all as a great historical fact, whose bearing upon the society of our day he leaves to the judgment of his audience. His task is to draw

a clear and correct picture of Christianity in its *first genuine, original* form, as it was at the period of its first appearance, and of its influence on society then. He endeavors therefore to describe the origin, spirit, and developments of the first Christian congregation from the time of Christ, until the completion of the mission of the apostles. The lectures are represented as free from any party spirit for or against certain confessions or dogmatic schools, or from any polemic reflections on modern church, or political doctrines, but as vividly demonstrative of the *force* naturally essential to Christianity as a social principle. These lectures are to appear in book form under the title "Das Christenthum des ersten Jahrhunderts. (The Christianity of the first century.) They will form a moderate sized 8vo. and will not exceed \$ 1 in price.—*Garrigue & Christern's Bulletin.*

That great work, "Gesenius' Thesaurus" has at length been completed. This work, it is said, occupies in Hebrew and Biblical Chaldee the position taken up by the Latin and Greek Thesauri of the two Stephans in these respective languages. It even excels these, since the lesser extent of the field to be explored admitted of a more thorough exhaustion of its subjects. We thus not only find the several forms of words completely registered and grouped, their significations correctly given and ingeniously argued, but also extensive indications of their relations to 'Semitic' languages, and through explanations of all dark passages admitting of various constructions. The work is therefore more than a lexicon; it is profoundly exegetical, throwing light on numerous difficult biblical texts. It is moreover, in many respects, an encyclopaedia of biblical subjects, for it contains a fund of valuable information concerning the topics of the various biblical books, and detailed accounts of proper nouns. Alas! that this description of so important a work, allows of so much abatement by the rationalism of much of its contents.

For late issues of the American press, see *Brief reviews* of this number of our Journal.

CONTEMPORARY PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

The Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature: November, 1853. 1. Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Essex. 2. Early Christian Literature of Syria. 3. Sir Thomas Noon Talfourd. 4. Neo-Platonism, Hypatia. 5. A Gossip about Laureates. 6. George William Curtis. 7. The Occupied Provinces, Mo'davia and Wallachia. 8. John Horne Tooke, and the State trials of 1794. 9. The Life and Poetry of Milton. 10. Mademoiselle Clairon. 11. Benjamin Robert Haydon. 12. Moore's Opinions of his Contemporaries. 13. An Event in the life of Lord Byron. 14. Original Anecdotes. 15. Literary Miscellanies.

Putnam's Monthly. November, 1853. 1. A Moorhead Journal. 2. Odensee. 3. Works of Sir William Hamilton. 4. The Crucifix. 5. The Potiphars in Paris. 6. Casseteralogy; a chapter on Money. 7. Rouen. 8. The Pacific Rail Road and how it is to be built. 9. Reminiscences of an Ex-Jesuit (*Continued.*) 10. Wensley (*continued.*) 11. The American Ideal Woman. 12. Mr. Collier's folio Shakespeare of 1632; its most plausible MS. corrections. 13. The Life of a Dog. 14. Bartleby the Scribe: a story of Wall Street. 15. Inscription for the back of bank note. 16. Characters in Bleak House. 17. Editorial Notes.

Dr. Burgess' Journal of Sacred Literature; October, 1853. 1. The Extent and the Restrictions of Sacred Literature. 2. Robinson's Journey in Palestine. 3. The Ruins of Damascus. 4. The Inspired Character of the four Gospels. 5. On Clerical Education. 6. Syriac Literature. 7. Egyptian Chronology. 8. On the Existence and Characteristics of Angels. 9. On The Study of Hebrew. 10. The fulfilment of Prophecy in the Betrayal of Christ. 11. The Death of Judas. 12. Remarks on Isaiah v., 1-7. 13. On the origin and connection of the Gospels. 14. Was Lucian acquainted with the sacred writings of the Christians. 15. Correspondence.

The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review; October 1853. 1. Outlines of Moral Science, by Archibald Alexander, D. D. 2. Epistle to Diognetus. 3. Modern Millenarianism. 4. China and California. 5. Theology of the Old Testament. 6. The Ventilation of Churches. 7. Short notices.

The Methodist Quarterly Review; October 1853. 1. The Bacon of the Nineteenth Century. (second paper.) 2. The ground of moral obligation. 3. On the second Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy. 4. Davidson's Biblical Criticism. 5. The origin of Evil and the fall. 6. Anselm, of Canterbury. 7. Miscellanies. 8. Short reviews and notices of books. 9. Intelligence.

The Theological and Literary Journal; October 1853. 1. Letters to a Millenarian. 2. False Teachers: their character and doom. 3. Mercantile morals. 4. Commentaries on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews. 5. The Presbyterian Quarterly Review on Millenarianism. 6. The Eclipse of Faith. 7. The revival of the French Emperorship. 8. Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapter xxiv. 9. The Symbols of the Sixth Vial. 10. Literary and critical notices.

Bibliotheca Sacra; October 1853. 1. Phrenology. 2. Professor Edwards' Life and Writings; with selections from his fragmentary thoughts. 3. President Edwards' dissertation on the nature of True Virtue. 4. The Prophet Jonah. 5. The indivisible nature of Revelation. 6. The relation of the Grecian to Christian Ethics. 7. Notices of new publications. 8. Select theological and literary intelligence.

The Southern Ladies Companion; October. Nashville, 1853. Rev. M. M. Henkle, D. D., Editor.

The American and Foreign Christian Union; November. New York, 1853.

The Virginia Historical Register and Literary Companion; Richmond. October 1853.

The Stethoscope and Virginia Medical Gazette; Richmond. November 1853.

The Beauty of Holiness and Sabbath Miscellany; Columbus. November 1853.

The Jewish Chronicle; New York. November 1853.

The Home and Foreign Record of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; Philadelphia. November 1853.

Norton's Literary Gazette. A change is proposed in this valuable Gazette for the ensuing year, by which two numbers will appear monthly, and the price will be increased to two dollars.

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW,
OF THE
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
SOUTH.

Vol. VIII.]

APRIL 1854.

[No. 2.

ART. I.

THE EARLY RELIGIOUS LIFE OF JOHN WESLEY.

BY THE EDITOR.

To enter upon a voyage of circumnavigation or discovery without the skill and apparatus necessary, under the auspices of Divine Providence, to render it successful, would, in the last degree, be preposterous and perilous. Boldness of conception may project the plan, liberality may provide the outfit, intrepidity may nerve the will, but good seamanship must command the expedition. The captain must be a practical sailor as well as a theoretical navigator. An analogous qualification is indispensable in all, however richly endowed, who would undertake to review or explore those historical regions which have been formed and modified by agencies silent, deep and

VOL. VIII.—11

active in the abyss of the mental and spiritual world. All those great movements which leave a permanent impression behind them require, for their solution, an acquaintance, not only with general principles, but with the peculiar laws from which they originate. How well versed soever an observer may be in speculative philosophy, he will be woefully at fault as a demonstrator or an experimentalist, in many particular instances in which his knowledge may be called into requisition. It is this perception of the interior, actual elements of historical periods which places one in the centre of their converging lines, and puts him in possession of the *rationale* of their complicated operation. This is the clew of that labyrinth of facts whose entanglements are inextricable to any other instrument however ingeniously fashioned. The absence of it deranges and distorts the entire scene, from sheer incapacity to appreciate those latent causes which give a real regularity and gracefulness to its forms. In such a case, the effort at explanation is always great, but utterly unavailing. The success is not at all equal to the expenditure of strength which it costs. A sentiment of spontaneous dissatisfaction proves that the experiment is a failure, although the operator may manipulate with all the dexterity of a veteran performer.

This is precisely the defect to which the author of "Wesley and Methodism" is obnoxious, but of which he appears to be totally unconscious. If we have caught the *animus* of his book, self satisfaction in his own judgments quietly pervades all his utterances, as if he were assured that he had reached the *ne plus ultra* of inquiry in that direction. If, never was a man more honest, we hesitate not to aver, never was a man more mistaken in his estimate of the genius of Methodism. If, in his dissection of the *corpus mortuum*, he has discovered the heart and the aorta, and traced with the point of his knife the arterial and venous systems, he has wonderfully overlooked that spirit whose presence gave animation, intelligence, and power to the living mechanism.

No one fact has a more intimate and vital relation to the whole Methodistic movement than the religious experience of

its originator. That was its salient point. That was the "mustard seed" which, in a memorable instance, has so fully realized one of the parables of our Lord. It was the "leaven" which has, with equal certainty and beauty, illustrated another. No adequate view can therefore be taken of the epoch, under consideration, without an analysis of those religious elements which, while they formed an individual character more remarkable than any other which the eighteenth century produced, have impressed themselves with marvellous distinctness upon the largest denomination of Christians that has appeared since that date. Ecclesiastical history affords no instance in which unity of doctrine has been more inviolably preserved, and in none does a greater theological responsibility rest either upon one man or one branch of the Christian church, than upon Wesley and the Methodists. If these elements are Scriptural, the question is forever settled, and admits of no appeal, whatever demurrers or clamors sectaries may make. If unsound, no heresy has been more disastrous since the rise of popery. Consequently no historian could ignore so influential a fact, who would ascribe phenomena to their causes, and give continuity and consistency to their development. But it is just at this point the danger of misconception exists, and the highest qualifications for judging are demanded. He who commits the least blunder here cannot fail, by its inevitable multiplication and diffusion, to entertain a foregone conclusion as to the value of the whole system of results. This is what Mr. Taylor has done, and what Mr. Southey did before him, with this very important difference; Southey was, in no proper sense, a religious man, and, therefore, had no just conception of the solemn theme which he had the temerity to handle; Taylor, on the other hand, possessed that species of faith which, while it satisfies the understanding, enlists also the moral sensibilities, and which inclined him to regard with seriousness and awe whatever had the semblance of Christian truth, and which enabled him to expatiate and to speculate with admirable eloquence upon the general aspects and tendencies of the gospel, but which dis-

qualified him to penetrate into the heart of the gospel itself, or to sit in judgment upon its spiritual manifestations. We regret that we are forced, from his own testimony, to conclude that he is not a competent witness in the case before us, on the principle involved in the words of Christ to Nicodemus on the very subject at issue: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness." With a vastly higher appreciation of experimental religion than Southey, he has nevertheless failed fairly to represent the conversion of John Wesley. We shall adduce proof of these assertions from his own pages.

To preserve the order of the narrative, a few observations, on several preliminary statements, will be pertinent, and will prepare the way for what follows. To evince his estimate of the influence which the personal experience of Wesley exerted upon Methodism, and the infelicity which the one imparted to the other, we select words which do not admit of an equivocal interpretation, and which it requires some effort of ingenuity and charity to reconcile with those flattering notices which bear the appearance of an open hearted sincerity. Speaking of Wesley, he says :

"His conversion, taking place as it did in this manner, by successive *vanquishments*, gave to his own religious opinions, and so afterward to Methodism, a marked character of abruptness and antagonism. . . . Wesleyan Methodism, so far as it was the product of the founder's mind, and the representative of his individual experience, and the symbolical record of his personal religious history, came forth—a cramped Christianity."

Intending to recur to the religious opinions of Wesley hereafter, we recall to the reader's attention the terms, in the preceding quotation, expressive of the author's views of Wesleyan Methodism, so far as it embodied these opinions. According to him, it is characterized by "abruptness and antagonism," and as a "cramped Christianity." We do no violence to language when we suppose that no compliment was intended by these epithets, and that they are compatible with a very meagre approbation of the subject which they qualify ;

that, in reality, whatever distinguished Methodism as such ; those very peculiarities which made it noticeable and efficient, and which afterward took a permanent form, had very little merit, and were deserving of very little respect.

He means that it was wanting, as a system, in theological symmetry and roundness ; that it was a crude embodiment of a few isolated and ill-assorted truths which needed the hand of a philosophical contemplatist to arrange and adjust into a well-ordered and coherent formula ; that, in addition to its immaturity, it was impertinent enough to take a stand of opposition to the prevailing and well established notions of theology and religion ; that, in its youth, it suffered an uncongenial compression from the defectiveness of its founder's knowledge, by which it remained crippled, and from which its manhood was never relieved ; that, in fact, it was a distortion and a deformity. Such are Mr. Taylor's deliberate views of systematic Methodism ; upon which, though couched in a brief paragraph, we feel it our duty to animadvert. First, then, dogmatic Methodism is almost entirely "the product of its founder's mind ;" that is, of his views of the doctrines of the Bible ; and these views were tested in the crucible of "his individual experience," just as the word of the Lord is "tried" by the truly pious ; of which views Methodism is "the symbolical record." There is nothing in Methodistic teaching that did not pass through the alembic of Wesley's mind and receive its sanction from his seal. So that a very large portion, nay, what may be called the totality of Methodism, falls under the denunciatory category of Mr. Taylor. Secondly, those views set forth by Mr. Wesley, and which have been incorporated by his followers, do not rest upon his authority, but upon the broad, imperishable basis of Divine truth, as has been incontestibly shown again and again, and which it is at all times easy to show. These views, therefore, are not human peculiarities generated in the excited imagination of a well-intentioned but deceived man ; they are only a new and powerful manifestation of the long forgotten peculiarities of "the everlasting gospel." They all have their origin, not in

the brain of any man, but in "the unsearchable riches of Christ." Whatever veneration we cherish for Wesley as the instrument of reproducing these "lively oracles," we receive them solely on their inspired credit, and "call no man master." We, therefore, repel the insinuation that Methodism has ever been, to any extent, the mere "product of the founder's mind," and rebuke the fatuity which, without examination, so frequently denounces it as a motley congeries of human absurdities. If every particle of genuine Methodism, from beginning to end, is not found in the only repository of eternal truth, we surrender the point. But, if there, what shall one say of its "abruptness and antagonism," and that it is "a cramped Christianity?" Thirdly, an egregious mistake is made with respect to the mission of Wesley and the character of the system which he originated. That mission was not to elaborate a theological platform. The world had been drugged with scholastic symbols. It was that of a prophet, newly inspired, to arouse the slumbering nation on the platform of the Bible. Activity, motion, progress, conquest, were the elements of his religious character. The study and the chair were not the theatres of his achievement, but the open field of collision with "the powers of darkness." Again, Methodism as a system; as "the product of the founder's mind," we maintain, is complete and harmonious in all its parts and relations. It harmonizes with the word of God in every particular, and with every article of its own creed. If it wants the philosophic element to give it a "broader basis," as our author would have it, it wants that very element which has given interminable confusion and discord to other theological systems, and which with amazing fecundity has been more fruitful of error than of truth. It is this meddling and modelling and tampering in divinity, in order to invest it with scientific attributes, that has spoiled it of its glory and paralyzed its power. While Methodism is a system, and has the true basis of a divine philosophy, and is complete in all its departments, it is denoted by one fact which specially constitutes its grandeur; its practical, didactic simplicity, just as

it is found in the inspired records. The Methodists therefore preach as no other body of ministers preach, not systems which councils and synods have excogitated and endorsed, and churches have adopted as the ground-form of their faith, but the plain, unsophisticated truth drawn immediately from the Scriptures, and which, by the most remarkable concurrence on earth, is inscribed more in the common consciousness of the Methodist people, than in any document which they hold apart from the Bible.

In a sense not designed by Mr. Taylor, and in exact counterpoise of his objections, we feel at liberty to say; Methodism was "abrupt," not by defect of Mr. Wesley's views, not for want of scientific smoothness, but by defect of the times; the stagnant uniformity and formality of the whole church, whose lethean state had emasculated its theology; whose long repose had petrified its articles and homilies into one vast and inert mass of cold, speculative forms. Its attitude was that of a rough, jagged prominence to that death-like acquiescence which gave an uncouth obstrusiveness to any departure from habits and usages which, in the lapse of time, had been incorporated into the very moral frame-work of society. "A marked character of abruptness," an officious rudeness, an unwelcome innovation did thus, to the everlasting credit of Methodism, characterize its sudden appearance on the luxurious theatre of the Anglican church. It possessed "antagonism" also, but it was due, not to an acrid constitution; to an innate ferocity which delights to make war upon all extant institutions, but to the practical and dogmatical errors which held the ascendancy in the public mind, and which opposed, to the death, all energetic measures to evangelize the people; such as a canonized formalism, on the one hand, and an antinomian licentiousness on the other. But the Methodism of Wesley was "a cramped Christianity;" contracted, caricatured by the fetters of an imperious temper and undigested ideas; destitute of that genial expansiveness which adapts itself to the existing condition of things. So our author imagines. It was indeed "cramped" in the estimation of the

world and of a worldly church, not by choleric strictures or any morbid action in itself, but by the stern rigidity with which it maintained the necessity of a sound, clear Christian experience, and a life of spotless holiness. In these senses we appropriate Mr. Taylor's designation, and defy the force of its counter application.

After this digressive pursuit of our author, we approach the principal question discussed in the present section; the "religious feelings" of Wesley; which, he affirms, "went through a twofold transmutation" during his residence at Oxford. We will here supply an omission, which, however it may be regarded by others, is, to us, an important link in the chain of those spiritual influences by which he was so graciously distinguished. At the age of eight years, he was so serious and well informed upon the subject of religion, that he was admitted by his father, who was a very conscientious clergyman, to the Lord's Supper; which does not appear to have been the case with any of his brothers, and which proves that "religious feelings," though, perhaps, not permanent and decisive, long anticipated his college course. It is not improbable that they were never wholly suspended during the interval; that he retained a hopeful religious susceptibility until he took his first degree. He had been a child of a most remarkable providence, on the one hand, and of special maternal solicitude on the other, growing out of that deeply affecting fact. A beautifully illustrative incident we extract from Dr. Whitehead, transcribed by him from the private meditations of Mrs. Wesley:

"Evening, May 17, 1711. Son John.

"What shall I render to the Lord for all his mercies? The little unworthy praise I can offer is so mean and contemptible an offering, that I am ashamed to tender it. But, Lord, accept it for the sake of Christ, and pardon the deficiency of the sacrifice. I would offer thee myself, and all that thou hast given me, and I would resolve, (O give me grace to do it,) that the residue of my life shall be all devoted to thy service. *And I do intend to be more particularly careful of the soul of this child, that thou hast so mercifully provided for, than ever I have been; that I may do my endeavor to instil into his mind the principles of thy true religion and vir-*

roe. Lord give me grace to do it sincerely and prudently, and bless my attempts with good success."

We see in this, if we be not mistaken, the visible foundation of that character which was so eminent for piety and which was guaranteed to his mother's exertions in the promise of Scripture; "train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." Yet we may admit the statement of Mr. Taylor, as to his twofold change at Oxford, if we understand him correctly. It was a change, first, "to a fixed seriousness;" second, to "an open antagonism to the levity, the indifference, and the impiety which, on all sides, surrounded him." These phases did occur at Oxford. But they did not possess that generic difference assigned them, nor did the latter occur as is supposed. We must be allowed to correct what might be set down as minute errors, since it is our duty to eliminate from so grave a point all adventitious or conjectural comment.

It is assumed that this "twofold transmutation" consisted of "two stages," in Wesley's religious course, while they were in reality only the negative and positive sides of the same stage, that of repentance; which evinced itself, at first, in an awakened, and then in active state. In this stage, in which there is every indication of a genuine repentance, it must be confessed that he totally misconceived the method of salvation, or was grossly misled by those celebrated authorities to which he referred for information, and which had so greatly contributed to his conviction for sin. They were Bishop Taylor's "Holy Living and Dying;" Kempis' "Christian Pattern;" and Law's "Serious Call to a devout and holy Life;" of which Mr. Jackson remarks:

"All these works are well adapted to convince the man of the world that his pleasures are both vain and sinful; and to make the formalist feel that his empty religion is not Christianity; but while they forcibly inculcate purity of heart as the essence of Christian godliness, not one of them shows the manner in which that blessing is to be obtained. They preserved a complete silence respecting the faith by which the conscience is purged from dead works, and the very thoughts of the heart are made

pure, and therefore leave the reader engaged in the hopeless attempt to practice Christian holiness while he is under the power of sin."

At that crisis in his penitential state, when a clear exposition of the doctrine of salvation by faith alone would, in all probability, have immediately satisfied his mind; either by the development of the self-righteous element, or the misdirection of his spiritual guides, or by both combined, he fell into a state of legal bondage, in which he strove to please God by works of righteousness only, in every possible form in which they appealed to his conscience. No man ever tried more thoroughly or painfully to work out his salvation by the deeds of the law than he. For ten long, laborious, self-denying years, he lived a pharisee of the strictest sort, full of earnestness, but without any sensible progress, perpetually conscious of his spiritual thralldom. This was the true stage through which he passed, comprising the two aspects to which we have referred.

In the very succinct account of it, in the pages under review, we discover several radical misrepresentations, to which we particularly invite the reader's attention, in order to show how a writer of brilliant parts and of great reputation may be mistaken, and how sadly he may deceive others, upon a plain, practical question. For what he denominates "the second stage" in Mr. Wesley's experience, he affirms that he was mainly indebted to the religious fervor and tenderness of his brother Charles; that the peculiar sensibility of the latter modified and improved the constitutional sternness of the former; melted and mellowed his natural frigidity into the glow and the gratefulness congenial with Christianity. As this is a novel view of this subject, we must repeat the author's language:

"The second stage was not passed through until he, although so much the firmer temper of the two, and although the master mind, had come under a spiritual influence of a deeper sort, namely, that of his brother Charles, and his praying companions. Charles Wesley's soul had more *altitude* (profundity and elevation) than John's, and it is always seen that force and energy give way to and receive their form from depth and inten-

sity of feeling; one might say, in like manner, as the bony structure of the animal frame takes its shape from the softer parts and fluids. Let the Wesleyan hymn book be examined, and the relations between the minds of John and Charles Wesley will become apparent; nor will it seem strange that the maker of the best of those hymns should have governed the robust spirit of the founder of Methodism."

There can be no doubt that the religious state of John became more intense after he returned from his father's curacy to Oxford, and after he associated himself with the little band of seekers which had been formed in his absence; nor that this means conduced to that end. But that the constitutional or religious ardor of Charles's "soul," as the principal cause, communicated itself to or supplied the deficiency of John's, is a species of transfusion or of metempsychosis for which there is no authority in the record; is the merest conjecture imaginable, and does the most flagrant injustice to that profound, sustained and independent process which was gradually progressing in his mind. The constitutional traits of the two brothers were essentially different; that of Charles was sensitive and poetic, frank and generous, while that of John was more grave and reflective, reserved and cautious. They were therefore, in a sort, counterparts of each other, were closely united in affection, and were mutual aids in the first Methodist movement. Especially was Charles subservient to the new impulse by his unequalled lyrics, and, thus, was always allied to his brother. But that he ever came "under the influence" of Charles, or that "his robust spirit was governed by him," so as to impart a higher religious life, is a fiction for which Mr. Taylor, and not history, is responsible.

Passing by the credit which he gives to Jeremy Taylor for consummating the religious character of Wesley, our heaviest allegation lies against the value which he assigns to this "second stage;" a value unsupported by the nature of the case, or the testimony of the Scriptures; a value in which multitudes of professing Christians unhappily concur with him, but against which the whole Methodist community, with one voice, have protested; a position as impregnable as it is

unanimously maintained. It concerns the nature of conversion, which we use, in this article, as a synonyme of regeneration. Contrary to Wesley's most solemn declaration, and what appear to us the most incontrovertible facts, he maintains that this "second stage" was one of regeneration. We will not any farther anticipate his expressed opinions.

"Using, as we must, the liberty to speak of Wesley, as from a broader ground than that of his own views, we must first reject his condemnation of himself, as 'not a regenerate man' at this period, for if not, then many of those whose names adorn church history, during a full thousand years, were not Christians; and moreover, if we compare him as a Christian, at a period later than the date he assigns to his conversion, with some who, since the reformation, have shone as lights in the world, we must think that he, less clearly than many, apprehended the height and depth, the length and breadth, of the Christian scheme."

The standard of evangelical doctrine adopted by our author is, by no means, faintly shadowed in the foregoing paragraph, and is sufficiently confirmatory of the judgment which we have passed upon him as an incompetent reporter of early Methodism. That standard, gathered from undeniable data, recognizes no higher proofs of regeneration than were exhibited by Mr. Wesley during his residence at Oxford. This is certain. If, then, we analyze his religious state during that time, we shall ascertain, in substance, what that standard is; what those proofs are which, in his estimation, contravene Mr. Wesley's own positive assertion that he was not a converted man for many years after; for it is indisputable, if he was converted, he was not only not aware of it, but painfully conscious that he was not. These we find to have been the elements of his state; a deep conviction of sin and of the necessity of a thorough change of heart; the most punctilious observance of every religious duty, private and public; and an exemplary zeal in promoting the welfare of others. Since these were all that were really characteristic of his religious condition, and Mr. Taylor pronounces him, on these grounds, a converted man, it is obvious that he regards conversion to consist in a religiously decided will and in strenu-

ous exertions to please God. We will not argue the accuracy of his position any farther, at present, than to say, that if it be "broader" than Mr. Wesley's, it is essentially different and infinitely more unsafe; that it falls far below that of the Scriptures as held by the Methodists; that if these facts prove conversion, every true penitent is *ipso facto* converted; and that a state of conscious liberty and power is not inseparable from that of the children of God. With so defective an apprehension of "the truth as it is in Jesus," we need not wonder at the construction which he puts upon many of the features of Methodism, and are placed on our guard against deductions which have no better foundation than an accommodating philosophy. It is melancholy to discover in so large a portion of the Christian world, and in writers professedly unfolding the nature and objects of Christianity, ideas so unworthy of its most important requisition.

In singular consistency with these views, he presents us with a most extraordinary specimen of logic, in his method of proving that Mr. Wesley was a converted man during his residence at Oxford. Two arguments are adduced, which, to our mind, have no particle of conclusiveness, and show an utter want of any reliable principles on the subject. His first argument is, that if he were not converted, "many whose names adorn church history, during a full thousand years, were not Christians." He would prove his point, by the absurdity of unchristianizing these ornaments of a thousand years. But what force can there possibly be in such reasoning? He means to say he was as truly Christian as they. If he was not, they were not. If they were, he was. What connection is there between the predicate and the conclusion? None whatever, except what is found in the mere resemblance of their lives, and not in their well ascertained experience. But a resemblance in the lives of persons, at long intervals, may not be so accurate as to justify identity of condition; and resemblance, in this respect, may, to an observer, be perfectly accurate, while their internal states and their actual relations to God may be widely different. Thus, a really regenerated

person will lead an exemplary life, and a true penitent will do the same. Are their religious states consequently the same? So that though all these ornaments of the church, for a thousand years, were beyond doubt regenerated, that fact cannot prove the regeneration of Wesley. Nor can the want of regeneration in Wesley disprove theirs. The denial to one by the denial to the other, is therefore a glaring sophism, used for a species of *ad captandum* effect which we could not have anticipated in Mr. Taylor.

The second argument is still more remarkable and indefinite. It is this, taking him at a time when he *professed* to be converted, and even long after, "and comparing him with many who, since the reformation, have shone as lights in the world," it is evident that he less clearly understood the nature of religion than they. That is, that after he professed conversion, he did not give any better proof of it than he did at Oxford; and not so good as many who professed no higher change than he had experienced at that University. In a word, if he was not converted at Oxford, he never was converted at all, as his subsequent conduct furnished no additional evidence of that fact. An argument so involved and so frivolous scarcely deserves a serious reply; yet we shall honor it with a passing criticism. The comparison which it institutes between him and "those who have shone as lights in the world since the reformation," is not only gratuitous, but decidedly invidious. It contains an unnecessary and an ungenerous reflection upon the piety of one of the holiest men that ever adorned the annals of the church. We challenge the proof that they had any deeper insight into the essence of the gospel than he, or that any man has had since Luther himself. If by "the height and depth, the length and breadth of the Christian scheme," we are to understand the plenitude of its provisions, the degree of its power, or the extent of its application, we protest that no man understood them better or preached them more fully than John Wesley, as his sermons and his labors triumphantly demonstrate. These were the very soul that dilated the entire man, and impressed itself

upon the very constitution of Methodism. If by them he meant a philosophic comprehensiveness, which lays its plans so as to harmonize all views and to merge peculiar doctrines into one grand category of belief; or a system of operation which, instead of confining itself within salutary limitations, diluted its central force by diffusion, Mr. Wesley did not coincide either with the "lights" cited by Mr. Taylor, or with the speculative range of his own erratic theory. Again, it is a matter of fact, that after his professed conversion, that whole type of his character underwent a material alteration; that a new spirit animated his life, and a more elevated tone inspired his teachings; that if, in point of a pure and holy life, no perceptible difference could be detected; in power, freedom, zeal and usefulness, he was immeasurably in advance of his college life. Moreover if these "lights" of Mr. Taylor were superior to him in the knowledge of divine things, it proves nothing to the purpose. It does not prove that either he or they were ever converted; much less that he was converted while at Oxford.

On the subject of Wesley's conversion, so misunderstood and misrepresented by Mr. Taylor, we wish to subjoin a few remarks. His statement totally differs from the account given by Mr. Wesley, who was perfectly qualified to decide for himself; because he had submitted the whole question to the most sifting examination, from a personal desire and an immoveable purpose to arrive at the truth. Scripture, meditation, prayer, reading, conversation, observation, experiment, had all been conscientiously applied for ten anxious years, by a gifted, cultivated and sober mind. Mr. Taylor, we venture to affirm, never sought "the pearl of great price" with equal assiduity. Besides, from the very nature of the case, the best judge of so great a change is the subject of it. No one can testify of it who does not experience it, and no one, with a well-ordered mind, can possess it, who cannot bear record of it. At the close of his long and thrifless struggle with an unreserved nature, he sums up his testimony of himself, a

part of which we select, and which Mr. Taylor from his "broader ground" feels authorized to reject as untrue :

" This then have I learned in the ends of the earth ; that I am fallen short of the glory of God ; that my whole heart is altogether corrupt and abominable ; and, consequently, my whole life ; that alienated as I am, from the life of God, I am a child of wrath, an heir of hell ; that having the sentence of death in my heart, and having nothing, in or of myself, to plead, I have no hope but that of being justified freely through the redemption that is in Jesus."

On what ground one in such a miserable condition can be pronounced regenerate, except upon the inverted hypothesis, that regeneration precedes repentance, it is impossible to conceive ; unless on the opposite theory a protracted repentance be considered identical with regeneration.

We now proceed to inquire into that change which Mr. Wesley regarded as his conversion. We insist upon this point for several reasons. His opinions have been violently assailed ; on this subject they are the opinions of the entire Methodist body, and they are opposed to the sentiments of a large majority of professing Christians. Long prior to the occurrence of this change, he had formed a very exalted idea of the happiness of the converted state. It was his belief that it was the privilege of a child of God both to be conscious of it and to be delivered from the power of sin and the fear of death. He considered these blessings to be involved in the very nature of the new birth, and consequently could not regard any experience short of it as either safe or satisfactory. We will quote two passages explanatory of his views ; one written while residing at Oxford, the other upon his return from Georgia. The former is found in a correspondence with his mother, in reference to the following expression of Bishop Taylor : " Whether God has forgiven us or no, we know not, therefore be sorrowful for ever having sinned." He remarks :

" I take the more notice of this last sentence, because it seems to contradict his words in the next section, where he says, ' that by the Lord's sup-

per all the members are united to one another, and to Christ the head. The Holy Ghost confers on us the graces necessary for, and our souls receive the seeds of an immortal nature.' Now surely these graces are not of so little force as that we cannot perceive whether we have them or not; if we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, which he will not do unless we are regenerate, certainly one must be sensible of it. If we can never have any certainty of our being in a state of salvation, good reason it is, that every moment should be spent, not in joy, but in fear and trembling; and then, undoubtedly, in this life, we are of all men most miserable. God deliver us from such a fearful expectation as this."

While we thus perceive the dismal uncertainty of Bishop Taylor's theology on this question, we enjoy a pleasing surprise, that at so early a period of his religious course, Wesley should have conceived of it so clearly, and argued so forcibly and expressed himself so explicitly upon that very issue which his ministry was to make with the church and the world. Here we see the dawn of that distinctness of perception, on theological subjects, for which he was remarkable, and which imparted such transcendent authority to his preaching. There never was any obscurity or perplexity in his enunciations of vital doctrines; but that solar clearness which is native to essential truth. Nor, whatever he owed to Bishop Taylor, Kempis or Law, was he, in the least, indebted to them for his knowledge of the privilege of believers. With all their talents and piety, they were blind leaders of the blind, with respect to the gate of regeneration. The latter passage, to which we referred, is as follows:

"The faith I want is 'a sure trust and confidence in God, that through the merits of Christ my sins are forgiven, and I reconciled to the favor of God.' I want the faith which St. Paul recommends to all the world, especially in his epistle to the Romans; that faith which enables every one that hath it to cry out, 'I live not; but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.' I want that faith which none can have without knowing that he hath it; for whosoever hath it is freed from sin; the whole body of sin is destroyed in him. He is freed from fear, having peace with God through Christ, and rejoicing in hope of the glory of God. And he is freed from doubt, having 'the love of God shed abroad in his heart through the

Holy Ghost, which is given unto him;’ which ‘Spirit itself beareth witness with his spirit that he is a child of God.’ ”

Although the mark at which he aimed, as here defined, confounds, to some extent, justification with sanctification; an error which he afterwards fully corrected; yet it assigns to justification a high and unequivocal position in his Christian scale; a position which he evidently believed, from the quotations with which he sustains it, to be that of the Bible; a position which must, as its least questionable element, include the assurance of deliverance from the wretchedness of an awakened heart. If he included in the anticipations of that state more than theologically belongs to it, he could not allow himself to expect less than that evidence of his acceptance with God which would counterbalance the sense of condemnation by which he was continually oppressed. He consequently determined, by the grace of God, to reach that desirable point, if it could be gained; and that it could, he firmly believed, unless he had misunderstood the Scriptures. He did reach it, but in a manner which he did not expect. He had, indeed, studied the plan of salvation, and had some general idea of the mode of its application, but had not conceived of the real nature and exclusiveness of its great condition. To use the apt words of Mr. Watson, he did not understand the doctrine of “gratuitous pardon through faith in the merits of Christ’s sacrifice.” He had associated with his notion of faith the efficiency of means; sincerely striving to obtain salvation, at least, in part, through “the righteousness of the law,” and not through “the righteousness of faith” only. By the instrumentality of a learned and pious German divine, with whom he met immediately after his return from Georgia, with whom he frequently conversed, and who “expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly,” to employ his own language, he was “clearly convinced of unbelief, of the want of that faith whereby alone we are saved with full Christian salvation.” Forced out of every retreat which he had taken, and which he had maintained with the most earnest disputation,

by the unanswerable arguments of Peter Böhler, he forthwith surrendered, and although not yet converted, began to preach salvation by faith, until May 24, 1738, when, to his inexpressible joy, he realized the long-sought object of his desires, the occurrence of which is thus described by himself :

“ In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate-street, where one was reading Luther’s preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation ; and an assurance was given to me that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death.”

This was the time and place at which Mr. Wesley reckoned himself converted. These were the circumstances which attended his “ new birth unto righteousness.” Here terminated his legal years. Here commenced that “ liberty of the children of God” for which he had sighed. Here arose a new epoch in his history. From that moment, whatever sanctity had adorned his life, he was a different man ; “ a new creature in Christ Jesus ; old things passed away, and behold, all things became new.” Compare his best Oxford condition with this, and he must be sorely bewildered who cannot recognize all the difference between them that exists between “ the mourner in Zion” and him that hath “ the oil of joy ;” between him that is oppressed with “ the spirit of heaviness,” and him who is clothed with “ the garment of praise.” Sudden as was this glorious event, its influence was as lasting as his life. Says Mr. Watson :

“ His experience, nurtured by habitual prayer, and deepened by unwearyed exertion in the cause of his Saviour, settled into that steadfast faith and solid peace which the grace of God perfected in him to the close of his long and active life.”

Investigating the preceding account of his conversion, it obviously contains the following prominent facts ; that it occurred during an act of calm but earnest attention to the reading of Luther’s preface to the Epistle to the Romans, in which the very subject that occupied his mind was explained ;

that during this act of attention his heart was "strangely warmed;" that he then exercised a realizing trust in Christ; that this trust excluded all other objects; that he then received an assurance of personal pardon. Never was there a clearer, simpler, or more truthful account of any man's conversion; a happy realization, it would seem, of the Scriptural doctrine of justification by faith.

It may be replied, that such undoubtedly was Mr. Wesley's opinion of his conversion; that, nevertheless, "from broader ground than that of his own views," it must be rejected; that he was a regenerate man before this. We hasten, then, to inquire, very briefly, whether that "broader ground" and the Scriptures coincide; and whether, though "broader," it be more solid than that occupied by Mr. Wesley. Let us, by a short and easy method, test the whole question. Justification is conferred alone through faith in the merits of Christ. This is settled by Paul in the Epistle to the Romans. It is that act, on the part of God, by which one becomes evangelically righteous in his sight. From the entire tenor of Mr. Wesley's religious life until immediately preceding his professed conversion, it is as perfectly certain, as any thing of the kind can be, that he had not even clearly conceived of salvation by faith alone; much less had he really "believed with a heart unto righteousness." He could not, therefore, have been in a justified state. If not, he must have been in a state of condemnation, "because he had not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God." If, according to Mr. Taylor, he was, nevertheless, regenerate; he was consequently a child of God, not only in a state of unbelief, but of legal condemnation. Again, the new birth itself is predicated of the exercise of faith. John, the evangelist, says, "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that *believe* on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." As we have seen, Mr. Wesley was destitute of true faith, not only by confession, but, in fact, to the very extent to which such a fact is cognizable.

If he was, nevertheless, regenerate, he was so without the very condition of which it is predicated. Moreover, regeneration which, however distinguished, is inseparable from justification, is, according to the Scriptures, attended with the assurance of its occurrence: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; the Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God; because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father; he that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." Mr. Wesley, during the period in question, was never conscious of any such assurance, nor is there any evidence, apart from his consciousness, that he ever received it. If he was, nevertheless, regenerate, we must allow of a period of ten years' continuance in that state, without the first Scriptural proof of its existence. If, therefore, he was converted, he was so, according to Mr. Taylor's "broader ground," and not according to the Scriptures. Consequently that "ground" and the Scriptures do not coincide, and that occupied by Mr. Wesley is alone tenable.

On this whole subject we repeat our conviction, that while Methodism rests upon the basis of evangelical truth, the personal religious experience of its founder bears a very intimate relation to its entire structure. Evangelical truth, producing that experience, developed itself in the form of Methodism. A correct apprehension of his religious views and feelings is, therefore, necessary to its proper appreciation. The want of such an apprehension has vitiated and pervaded Mr. Taylor's ingenious and eloquent book. It has done more. It has obscured to him, and to many of his readers, the lustre of the brightest jewel in the crown of Methodism; the powerful exhibition which it gives of the true standard of Christian experience; the promised measure of Christian holiness and happiness. It has caused him to represent Mr. Wesley as mistaken in a fundamental point of personal religion, and Methodism as an "immature and a cramped Christianity;" when a more legitimate inspection of inherent qualities would

have extorted from him a commendation similar to that pronounced by a more celebrated man; that it is "Christianity in earnest." We deprecate what we have no better power to remedy than by applying the corrective of historical and Scriptural truth. Our readers cannot fail to see, although we have not fully exposed it, the error which underlies the whole of his work; not insincerity, but imperfect subjective views of Christianity itself. As to his denunciation of Methodism, "so far as it is the product of the founder's mind," we heed it not; it is rendered harmless by the impotence of his theory, though it will impair its usefulness to those who adopt his sentiments. On the other hand, its incomparable merits will sustain its pretensions so long as its friends proclaim its doctrines and exemplify its power. We glory in the unrivalled explicitness and boldness with which it announces Divine truth, the seraphic fervor of its zeal, the aggressive energy of its principles, the almost miraculous success of its preaching, and the wonderful adaptation of its ecclesiastical agencies to the religious advancement of its members and the conversion of the world. We have no apprehension except in the want of that spirituality which imbued the heart of its founder, and of that wise adjustment to the progress of society of which it is so eminently susceptible. Should the one abate or the other be neglected, with all its apparatus of truth and of instrumentality, it will have lost its motive element, and will yield its honored vocation to another form of Christianity more faithful to its trust.

We cannot conclude our bill of exceptions to the document before us without a word of explanation. It was no part of our original plan to detain the reader upon so limited a portion of its text. To those who may suppose that we have expended time and labor disproportionate to the amount and importance of the matter reviewed, we can only say, our convictions have controlled our pen, and that, should we ever trouble them again with our animadversions, it is not probable that we shall indulge a similar propensity either for particularity or diffuseness.

ART. II.

POWER OF THE PULPIT.

By Hon. H. W. HILLIARD, Montgomery, Ala.

The Preacher and the King; or, Bourdaloue in the Court of Louis XIV.; being an account of the Pulpit Eloquence of that distinguished era. Translated from the French of L. Bungener. Paris; 12th edition. With an introduction by the Rev. George Potts, D. D., Pastor of the University Place Presbyterian Church, New York. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1853.

The Preacher and the King is a book of extraordinary interest. It is the best criticism upon the eloquence of the pulpit which we have ever read; for it exhibits the great elements which constitute the power of the preacher, without limiting its range of analysis to mere manner or to intellectual training. It takes into its estimate the moral qualities, and presents to our view the true grandeur of the sacred orator when he stands in the pulpit, exalted above all human fear or wordly ambition; and prepared to vindicate the divine authority of his mission by delivering his message to a crowned king and a splendid court, and an audience made up of the titled and the great, with the sublime emphasis of eternity sounding through all its passages. It does not overlook the importance of style, nor is it indifferent even to manner; but it enables us to comprehend what the evangelist means when he describes the profound impression made upon the people by our Lord's preaching; "for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes."

It was the wise remark of Cicero, that "an orator must be a good man;" for without the high moral qualities in himself, he could not sympathize with them in others, nor could he rise to that commanding height in denouncing vice which gives to eloquence so much of its power and effect. M. Bungener intends, in his book, to teach us, that no grace of man-

ner; no strength of intellect; no advantages of education; no fortunate combination of circumstances, can do what the pulpit requires to be done; and that the grandest and noblest triumphs which the world witnesses in that department of eloquence, are achieved by men who feel that the destinies of the world turn upon the disclosures of the word of God. Not that grace of manner is to be despised, nor strength of intellect undervalued, nor the advantages of education overlooked; quite otherwise; but we are taught that the living and resistless energy of pulpit eloquence is exhibited in its perfection, only by those who possess these great elements in connection with one yet greater than all these; the *unction* which is given by the Holy Spirit. The work is marked with graphic power, and the delineations of BOURDALOUE, of CLAUDE, of BOSSUET, of FENELON, of the grand monarch, Louis XIV., of Madame de Montespan, of Madame de La Vallière, and of others, are as vivid as those which we find in the writings of Macaulay.

The scene is laid at Versailles; that being the residence of the Court in the time of Louis XIV. That magnificent structure, which still stands in the midst of gardens and fountains, is, to-day, unrivalled for its style by any of the palaces of Europe; and, in the time of Louis XIV., it was a scene of regal splendor, unsurpassed in the annals of the world. At that time the avenues of its gardens were thronged by those who were admitted into the Court circle; and Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Flechier, Renadout, Fleury, Langeron and Fenelon, known by the name of "the Philosophers," walked and discoursed of the great topics which the Bible presents, and of the affairs which belonged to the church. That was the Augustan age of France. Louis XIV. was at the pinnacle of worldly glory; his arms were everywhere triumphant; his Court was filled with beautiful women and gallant men; with the great divines whose sermons still sound along our times with a power hardly less than that which they possessed when they were uttered; with the writers whose works we still read with an interest almost as great as that which was

felt in them by the generation to which they were addressed. These all constituted a brilliant and intellectual circle whose light yet streams through the intervening period, now nearly two centuries.

The reign of Louis XV. presents a picture of rapid degeneracy which fills us with sadness as we look upon it. Nothing great or good appears in it to redeem it from the reproach of an inglorious and licentious era. "The Philosophers" of that time were no longer men of true learning and deep religious sentiments, but wild, speculative doubters; men who had faith in nothing; whose task it was to criticise every thing, and to greet every expression of faith or hope in revealed truth with a sneer more malignant than that of the Cynic; or a laugh of derision such as would have been uttered by one of that fallen host cast out of Heaven, if an un-sinful angel had urged him to retrace his steps. The Encyclopedists were as shameless in their writings as the courtiers were in their manners. All veneration for established institutions; all respect for religion; all deference to authority, gave way; and the dykes which shut out the waves having been cut away, the nation was submerged by such a sea as never before swept over any people.

The plan of M. Bungener's book is such as to interest the reader at the very first page; and the mind glows in reading it to the last paragraph. Bourdaloue, in the full possession of his great powers, and in the zenith of his fame, is the Court Preacher. Good-Friday is at hand, and a sermon is to be preached in the presence of the king and of his Court on that day by Bourdaloue. Louis XIV. had for his mistress, at that time, Madame de Montespan. Brilliant, full of tact, comprehending the difficulties which surrounded her, she retained her influence over the king in the face of the most powerful opposition. Yet it seemed that Louis did not love her; at least it was not the sway of passion to which he submitted, but he feared to break with Madame de Montespan long after the ardor of his attachment had declined. The king was religious after a courtly fashion; attended mass regularly; heard

the great preachers with interest in his chapel at Versailles, and confessed and received absolution from time to time. It was the fashion of the times to throng the places of public worship, and it is not easy to conceive a more brilliant spectacle than the chapel in that superb palace presented when Bourdaloue delivered his great discourses.

Notwithstanding the king's connection with Madame de La Vallière, and with Madame de Montespan, it was usual for the Court preachers to address him as if he were in the way to Heaven, and to congratulate him upon his claims to Divine favor. Bourdaloue even had said, in one of his sermons, in the presence of the king, when preaching upon perseverance: "But who will persevere? Who are these faithful and steady souls? Thou alone, oh God, thou alone knowest them. I have reason also, however, to console myself; I know, and the whole universe knows with me, that there is one heart here, formed by thy hand; a heart opposed to all fickleness, consistent in its conduct, steadily attached to the laws which it takes to guide it; who, having formed mighty designs, has performed prodigies of valor in their execution; in order to do this, has sacrificed, not only its repose and pleasures, but even its advantage and interests. How far may not the perfection of thy law carry this firm and fearless heart, oh God! And in this sense, who ever has been fitter than it is for the kingdom of Heaven?" Yet Louis XIV. was, at that time, living in adultery. His "mighty designs" were desolating Europe.

The time had come for Bourdaloue to preach his great annual sermon once more before the king. The day previous the Marquis de Fénelon visits Versailles, and walking in the gardens with his nephew, the Abbe Fénelon, afterwards so celebrated as a writer, overtakes Bossuet, Flechier, and others, who are discussing one of the great passages of Isaiah. The Marquis enters into earnest conversation with Bossuet, and appeals to him as a minister of God to do his duty himself to the king, and to persuade Bourdaloue to turn the terrible artillery of the truth upon Louis in the midst of his Court,

when seated the next day in the chapel. Madame de Montespan is refused absolution by a faithful priest. She is indignant, and the king is offended. He calls Bossuet to him, and lays before him in his cabinet the affront that has been offered to Madame de Montespan.

To comprehend the embarrassment which Bossuet felt on this occasion, we must remember that he was in the presence of Louis XIV. St. Simon says, "I have seen the dauphin and his sons present at the king's dinner, without his even proposing to them to take seats. I have often seen *Monsieur*, the king's brother, present also. He handed the king's napkin, and remained standing. A little after, the king, perceiving that he so remained, asked him if he would not take a seat. He made a reverence, and the king ordered that a seat should be brought him. A tabouret was placed behind him, but he did not sit down. Some moments afterwards, the king said, 'Pray be seated, my brother.' Then he made another reverence and took his seat." Yet Bossuet firmly urged upon Louis that his connection with Madame de Montespan was sinful; ought to be broken off; that the priest who refused her absolution was right, and, at length, brought the king to form something like a purpose to give her up. In a letter addressed by him to the king shortly after this interview, he writes, "Courage, then, Sire, courage! Here is an opportunity for a more glorious victory than any of those for which the world has applauded you; and be assured that on your death-bed you would not give that for all the others."

Bossuet visits Bourdaloue and urges him to perfect the conquest just begun to be achieved over Louis, by making a powerful appeal to his conscience in his sermon which was to be delivered the next day. They are engaged in a conference as to its structure, when a visitor arrives; it is CLAUDE. Claude was the great leader of the Protestants; great in every way; great in the pulpit, and great with his pen. His oratory was powerful, and as he stood in the pulpit it appeared to be a throne of thunders. Other visitors enter, and after a general conversation retire; but Claude remains and enters

into a critical analysis of Bourdaloue's sermon which is to be delivered the next day. Bourdaloue had actually appended to his sermon a peroration full of flattery to the king, which he had once delivered in his presence. Claude exclaims against it warmly, and Bourdaloue overwhelmed with a sense of the utter humiliation to which it would subject him in the eyes of Claude and even of himself, consents to strike it out, and accepts from Claude a splendid but bold passage aimed at the king.

The grandeur of Louis XIVth's character impressed every one who approached him with something like awe. Preaching had ceased at Court to be anything more than a literary performance, except in some few instances. The grand aim of denouncing vice; of arraigning the sinner before the dread tribunal of God; and of turning the terrors of the Almighty upon the whole assembled congregation, including king and nobles, and the humblest subject present, was lost sight of; and the preacher was accustomed to merge the homage due to the unseen Majesty of Heaven in deference to the visible dominion of an earthly monarch. Voltaire wrote of Louis XIV., "he is not one of the greatest men, but certainly one of the greatest kings that ever existed." Leibnitz, in writing to Bossuet, said of him, "He is the most kingly of all kings." M. Bungener says of him, "He was a king in all the extent and force of the appellation; such a king as his father had not been, as his successors were not to be; a king whose like we scarcely find two or three times in all the world's history, where there is, nevertheless, no lack of those men who are called kings." Bourdaloue's agitation may then be comprehended, when it is known that he has consented to appeal directly to the conscience of the king in his sermon to be delivered the next day.

The book abounds with the finest critical discussions of the elements which constitute pulpit eloquence; and the great preachers of the day are brought under the freest examination. It is well remarked, "that man is neither all head nor all heart; and that the Christian orator ought, in consequence,

neither to neglect the heart for the head, nor the head for the heart." Bourdaloue addressed himself too exclusively to the intellect. Fénelon fell into the other extreme; and it is, therefore, that he secretly made a rule that he would never write his sermons. It is true that he lost less by it than any one else would have done. The abundance of his ideas; the astonishing facility of his elocution; the force of his character; all this contributed, with him, to diminish the evils of this method; but it was no reason why he should insist upon advising all to follow a method, good, at the furthest, for himself, and a few other men of remarkable talent.

There is much here well worth our consideration. Some preachers address themselves exclusively to the head; others seek only to move the heart. Bourdaloue's style was somewhat too artistic. Fénelon says of him, "He is quite able to convince, but I scarcely know any preacher who less persuades and touches you." On the contrary, it is said of St. Augustine, "he is touching even when he lays down his points." Yet Bourdaloue, the Thunderer, as he was called, was a great preacher. On one occasion, when he was to preach in Paris, in the evening, Notre Dame was crowded from early in the morning; when he was to preach in the morning, people passed the night in the church. An hour before the sermon you would meet thousands going away without having been able to enter.

Bourdaloue wrote his sermons and memorized them; a habit which we utterly condemn. It throws the whole labor upon the memory, and the mind is engaged in a continued effort to grasp the discourse as it has been written out, without losing a passage; so that the heart has nothing to do with the performance. It is said of Bourdaloue that he experienced inexpressible anguish until he reached the last word of his sermon. He kept his eyes almost always closed; his motions were uneasy; his sentences were too fast or too slow; his gestures often unsuited to the subject; and every thing betrayed a prodigious effort of the memory. He never enjoyed one of his own discourses till he had preached it several

times, and was entirely familiar with it. Yet he was a great preacher. Marmontel's description is a fine one: "The eloquence of Bourdaloue seems to have the impenetrable solidity and the irresistible impetus of a warlike column which advances with slow tread, but whose order and momentum announce that all is going to give way before it." He was accustomed to make the most elaborate preparation for his sermons. Massillon grew up into a rival; young and brilliant, he was greatly admired; and Bourdaloue, in the decline of life, said of him, "he must increase, but I shall decrease." M. Bungeper thinks that posterity has reversed the sentence.

We have said that we condemn the habit of some preachers in writing and memorizing their discourses. We do not wish to be understood as objecting to the amplest preparation for the pulpit; and we incline to think that the best plan is to study the sermon profoundly; to elaborate its meaning; to make full notes; and even to write out the introduction and the peroration, and some of the important passages; but then to leave the notes at home, and trust to the knowledge thus acquired of the subject, to enable the preacher to give his views of it. No one who commits his sermons to memory can be *great*, in the noblest sense of the word; he can never experience what the French call *abandon*; that losing sight of all surrounding things, and being borne away upon the current of thought and emotion. But we cannot, at this time, venture upon an extended criticism of pulpit eloquence. We may, at some future day, when we can command a little leisure, to undertake it. Our wish is now to call attention to M. Bungeper's book. It will interest every one who honors the Bible, or who delights in the great topics discussed in the pulpit, or whose soul is moved by eloquence. We quote the Abbe de Clairvaux' thought, in regard to the relation which the evangelical preacher bears to God. He compared God, in relation with man, to a writer or painter, who guides the hand of a little child, and only asks one thing of it; that it will not move its hand, but will allow it to be guided. And there is a beautiful idea of Monsieur de Saint Cyran: "We should

consider ourselves as the instrument or the pen of God, neither exalting ourselves if we advance, nor growing discouraged if we do not succeed."

The day came for the delivery of Bourdaloue's sermon before Louis XIV. and his splendid Court, in the chapel of Versailles. The king entered after some delay and some hesitation, for he had reason to believe that the sermon would touch his conscience; and he found the chapel thronged. Every body was certain that something unusual was to happen; and it was expected that Bourdaloue would strike a great blow. The anxiety of the king betrayed itself through the usual impassibility of his features. Bourdaloue's manner was more than usually animated and eager. The exordium is uttered; the sermon is on its way; the preacher is impetuous; there is great commotion within him, for he dreads to deliver the peroration which has been given to him by Claude. And yet, how shall he avoid it? He stands in the presence of Claude; of Bossuet; of the injured queen; of God! Dashing on impetuously, and really bewildered, he approaches the close of his sermon; and actually enters upon the first words of his own original exordium, full of praise to the king: "I have, nevertheless, reason to console myself." At this moment he stops, and grows pale, and having averted his head to avoid uttering the praises so ill deserved, before the king's face, he sees the grave, motionless, majestic countenance of Claude. Bourdaloue is annihilated. He slowly bows his head. He clasps his hands. But, oh wonder! he rises again. The fire of his eye breaks forth again; his head is upright and steady; his voice vibrates. It is your turn, Louis le Grand!

No one, save Claude, had perceived the motive of the interruption; no one imagined it to be any thing else but an oratorical *ruse*; but the movement had been too natural, too true, too terrible, not to have a prodigious effect. The orator had perceived, as by a flash of lightning, all the advantage he was going to derive from it. "*I have, nevertheless, reason to console myself.*" It was at these words, that Bourdaloue

had perceived Claude, and that he had risen to fall no more. "To console myself," he repeated slowly, "Ah, my brethren, what was I about to say! Is it, at this hour, when the cross is being erected, that I can have the courage to praise? Does not this blood which is about to flow for all men, cry out to me, that all are sinners? And shall I dare, I, to make one exception! No, Sire, no! I will not set you apart. I would not wish that your diadem should prevent your receiving upon your brow, like the humblest of your subjects, some drops of the blood which purifies and saves!"

Bourdaloue now thoroughly roused, advanced, with majestic head, in his great appeal to the conscience of the king; and poured forth some of the noblest passages which he ever uttered, before he reached the peroration of Claude. He described the illusions under which a king labors, as to the nature and extent of his vices. His advance upon Louis, it is said, became terrible. "There was many an old soldier present, whose heart had never before throbbed so quickly." At length, he entered upon the peroration. Although it was admirably brought in, some contrast to the preceding passages was perceived; and an imperceptible shudder ran through the whole assembly. The king; the great monarch; the august Louis XIV. cast down his eyes, and lowered his head, and Bourdaloue proceeded. Claude looked on; the eyes of the queen, filled with tears, were turned, from time to time, upon the king; then upon the preacher; and sometimes, upon Bossuet. Bossuet's whole soul was fixed upon Bourdaloue. The profoundest silence reigned throughout the crowded chapel; no sound was heard but the grand voice of Bourdaloue, and a stifled sob from the queen. Bourdaloue, more magnificent than ever before, dashed fearlessly through the powerful peroration, keeping his eyes fixed upon the king; and the great victory was won. **THE PREACHER** had triumphed over the **KING**.

What is it that constitutes the power of a preacher? What enabled Bourdaloue to overcome Louis XIV? It was the energy of divine truth which roused the soul of the preacher,

and gave him the victory ; a victory which no genius, no oratory, no human power could have effected. He did not merely prick the conscience of the king. He did not merely blend the terrible denunciation of vice with flatteries to the monarch ; but he turned all his artillery against Louis, and made him feel that God was speaking to him.

This is just what is wanted. All who hear the gospel ought to be made to feel that God speaks. We sometimes step into one of the splendid churches of our cities ; everything is gorgeous ; the decorations are rich ; the music peals with solemn grandeur though the great building ; but the preacher ascends the pulpit, and we listen either to a lame discourse upon some passage of the Scriptures, or to an ingenious exposition of a subject of no practical importance ; and we go away disappointed, having listened only to a Scribe, when we were eager to hear the Son of God. Never did the world more earnestly wish to hear the thunder of the gospel, than now. The pulpit might be made the grandest, the noblest, the sublimest, the most attractive thing on earth.

The curse of our times is the common-place feeling which enters into every department of life, and which surrounds the pulpit like an atmosphere in which nothing great, or vigorous can grow. Every one who enters the pulpit ought to feel that the world is at his feet, and instead of deferring to the sentiment of society, he ought to defy it, and denounce it, and, with the loftiest courage, attack and conquer it, as Bourdaloue is described to have overcome Louis.

Every where, throughout the whole Christian world, it is true, that "to be spiritually minded is life," and "to be carnally minded is death;" but this is especially true in the pulpit. No preacher can be great without spirituality. But he may have this, and yet not be great. Some preach a great way off ; at vice in general, or at the past ages, or to forgotten generations ; and it is not to be wondered at, that people fall asleep, or cease to come to hear. The gospel ought to be delivered as a living message, to living men ; and it ought to be

brought to bear upon passing events. Let the strongholds of society be attacked; and the thunder of the battle and the shoutings of the captain be heard all along the fortified places where sin abounds. As the Abbe de la Broue says, "When I see a preacher exercising his ingenuity in parcelling out some grand and beautiful idea, I fancy I see a man to whom a huge stone has been given to break down a door, and who, instead of throwing it, with all his might, against the obstacle to be vanquished, exhausts himself in breaking up the missile, and in throwing it, piece by piece." This is the manner of some of our learned preachers.

But we forbear. The subject is a great one, and we cannot now venture upon it. We did wish to give our views, at some length, of the power of the pulpit. Now we must decline it. Hereafter we may undertake it.

ART. III.

ZECHARIAH.

By Rev. T. V. MOORE, D. D., Richmond, Va.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 29.)

Chapter 11.

In the utterances of God to his people, the voice of Ebal is always set over against that of Gerizim, and the blessing to faithfulness is enforced by the curse against unfaithfulness. This is necessary, owing to our proneness to sever the blessing from that obedience which is its condition, and expect the one whilst we neglect the other. It is therefore necessary for God to show us that in the same cloud where the rain is treasured there also sleeps the thunderbolt. Hence after pro-

missing (chap. 10 : 1,) the refreshing showers, on the condition of fidelity, the prophet now turns to the stormy rush of evils that would come in their place, if they were unfaithful. These evils are described in a highly dramatic form in ch. 11. It consists of three parts. Part 1, is contained in v. 1-3, and is a general introduction, describing in bold personifications the fierce rush of wrath that would, at a future time, come on the disobedient Jewish people. Part 2, (v. 4-14,) describes symbolically the last great effort made by God to save his chosen people. The prophet, as a type of Christ, is called to take charge of the flock, v. 4-6; speaking in the name of the antitypal shepherd, he takes by solemn covenant this pastoral charge, v. 7, 8; he is rejected and sold for thirty pieces of silver, v. 9-14. Part 3, v. 15-end, describes the curse that follows this rejection by the symbol of an evil shepherd who oppresses the flock, and afterwards is himself punished.

Introduction, v. 1-3.

1. "Open, O Lebanon, thy gates,
And let the fire consume thy cedars.
2. Howl, O cypress, for the cedar falls,
For the lofty are laid waste,
Howl, O ye oaks of Bashan,
For the thick forest falls.
3. A voice of howling of the shepherds!
For their glory is laid waste:
A voice of roaring of the lions!
For the pride of Jordan is laid waste."

This is a highly dramatic passage. The prophet looks to the north, and sees sweeping down a terrific tempest, that bursts through the rocky ramparts of Lebanon, consumes with its lightnings the lordly cedars, lays waste the lofty monarchs of the forest, and spreads terror and ruin along its track. The cypress is called to tremble, because the mightier cedar has been unable to withstand the shock, and the oaks of Bashan to fear because the dense and firmly knit forest has been prostrated by its rush. There mingles then with the crash of the storm a voice of terror and despair from the shepherds who

see their broad pastures laid waste ; and a cry of rage and fear from the lions as their lairs on the banks of the Jordan are torn up by sweep of the hurricane. "The pride of Jordan," is a well known phrase for the beautiful shrubbery that lined its bank, in whose tangled recesses the wild beast found a shelter. The passage is a bold and beautiful description of a tempest that sweeps over the entire length and breadth of the holy land, prostrating everything before it. This metaphor describes the storm of invasion, bloodshed and oppression that should roll over Palestine after the glorious Maccabean era, and before the coming of the Messiah. The designation of Lebanon and Bashan belong to the metaphor, and not to the fulfilment, being designed to set forth by the usual course of such storms the track of this tempest, and hence it is not necessary for us to show that any invasions actually came by the way of Lebanon. The reference is to that desolating storm of civil war that caused the calling in of the Romans, whose legions swept like a whirlwind of steel over the land, and finally prostrated every vestige of independent authority, from the cedar of Lebanon to the lowliest cypress, from the peaceful shepherd to the lion-like spirit that refused to be subdued, and humbled the whole land beneath the mighty power of Rome. It was this state of deep prostration that constituted the dark hour before the dawn, the fulness of time on the arrival of which the great shepherd was to come. God had sent messenger after messenger, some of kindness and some of wrath, but at that time he would make one more effort, and send forth his own son, made of a woman, made under the law, saying, "surely they will reverence my son."

Christ assumes the pastoral care of the Theocracy.

V. 4-14.

4. Thus saith Jehovah my God,
Feed the flock of slaughter.
5. Whose buyers slaughter them,
And do not become guilty :
And whose sellers say,

Blessed be Jehovah, for I am enriched,
And their shepherds spare them not.

6. For I will no longer spare the dwellers in this land,
Saith Jehovah,
And behold! I will give up each man
To the hand of his neighbor,
And to the hand of his king,
And they lay waste the land,
And I will not deliver out of their hand.
7. So I fed the flock of slaughter,
Therefore the humble of the flock,
And I took to myself two staves,
The one I called Favor,
The other I called Union,
And I fed the flock.
8. And I destroyed three shepherds in one month,
And my soul was grieved with them,
And their soul abhorred me.
9. Then I said, I will not feed you,
The dying, let them die,
The cut off, let them be cut off,
The remaining, let them consume each the flesh of the other.
10. And I took my staff Favor and brake it;
To abolish my covenant that I had made with all nations.
11. And it (*the covenant*) was abolished in that day,
And thus they knew (*viz.*)
The humble of the flock who clung to me,
That this is the word of Jehovah.
12. Then I said to them,
If it seem good in your eyes, give me my reward,
And if not, withhold it,
And they weighed my reward, thirty pieces of silver!
13. And Jehovah said to me,
Cast it to the potter,
This magnificent price at which I was valued of them,
And I took the thirty pieces of silver,
And I cast it down in the house of Jehovah,
(*To be given thence*) to the potter.
14. And I broke my second staff Union,
To destroy the brotherhood between Judah and Israel.

The prophet here appears as a type of Christ, and performs a series of symbolic actions that represent the advent of the Messiah "to his own," and his rejection by them, with its

bitter consequences. One last effort will be made to rescue them from the wrath they are so recklessly braving.

V. 4. "Flock of slaughter" is a flock doomed or sentenced to slaughter, in consequence of their insane rejection of the care of the good shepherd.

V. 5 expresses the thought that although once they who oppressed the covenant people would be guilty and so treated by God, now the sins of the people were such that these oppressions were righteous punishments, and their agents therefore not guilty for the execution itself, however they might be for the mode and motives with which they performed it. By the buyers and sellers, are meant the Romans, who used the Jews, as they did all their conquests, as mere merchandise, making from them the greatest possible gain for themselves. "Their shepherds" refer to the civil and ecclesiastical rulers of the Jews, and there is predicted here that extortion and treachery, in which the Pharisee and Sadducee wrung from the unhappy people what the Roman had failed to extort, and both combined thus in spite of their mutual hate in this work of shameless robbery.

V. 6 gives the reason for making this last effort to save them, their wickedness could no longer be borne, but must be arrested either by penitence at the call of Christ, or punishment at the sword of the Roman. The nature of the punishment is described in the latter clauses. Civil war and intestine discord are delineated in each man being given into "the hand of his neighbor," whilst the Roman oppression is indicated by "the hand of the king." Both these were fulfilled in those fearful times when the bloody factions that wasted the land found but a single bond of union, and that in their common hate of their rightful king, and their prophetic cry, "we have no king but Cæsar."

V. 7 represents Christ as taking by covenant the mediatorial work, and gives his reason for so doing. That reason is contained in the phrase, "therefore the humble of the flock." This phrase presents no little grammatical difficulty. The word *lachen* is taken by our translators and others as a pro-

noun with the preposition *lamed* prefixed, and rendered as a dative of advantage, "for you," i. e., "for your sakes, I will feed the flock." This is the sense of the passage, but it requires us to assume a form of the pronoun that never occurs elsewhere. Others translate *lachen* as an adverb, rendering it "because." This would give the exact sense, but this word never has the sense of "because," but always that of "therefore." But there are cases in which it is used to introduce not only the cause but the design of an action. (See Alexander on Isa. 26 : 14.) Taking it in this sense it would furnish the design with which Christ fed the flock, namely, to feed or save "the humble of the flock," the remnant of faithful ones who had never bowed the knee to Baal. We have rendered *aneeyee*, by "humble," because it has that double sense of outward lowliness and inward meekness that *anee* has, especially in this passage. This portion of the flock is referred to in v. 11 more explicitly as the humble of the flock who clung to the Messiah. Hence the fact is set forth, that Christ assumed the work of feeding the Jewish people, in order that he might save that remnant of them who were waiting for the salvation of Israel. Had there not been such a remnant, he would have come as an avenging instead of a suffering messenger from God.

The assumption of this work is symbolically represented by taking two staves of office, or crooks, such as shepherds usually carried. One was called *Favor*, (Eng. version, *Beauty*,) and symbolised the favor with which God caused the Jews to be regarded by other nations, and their rights respected until the work of redemption was completed. How marvelously they were thus preserved, with all their records, usages and institutions, until "the son of David" came, is well known. Alexander, Antiochus and Pompey, were alike held back from destroying them until the mystic staff was broken, after which the power of Titus and the malignity of Julian were alike impotent even to save or restore their temple. The second staff was called *Union*, (Eng. version, *Bands*,) and symbolised that union within themselves, which was se-

cured until the coming of Christ, in order that it could be seen that all the words of prophecy in regard to him were minutely fulfilled.

V. 8. "I destroyed three shepherds in one month." The obscurity of this phrase would have been more easily removed by interpreters, if the threefold nature of Christ's work had been recollected, and its relation to the Jewish polity. He was the great antitype, of which that polity was the complex type. Now he, as our Redeemer, appeared as a Prophet, a Priest and a King, and thus fulfilled all the significance of these three orders in the old dispensation. He was the promised prophet, the one and only priest, and the king in Zion, and hence his appearing brought these respective orders in the theocracy to end, since they were only designed to foreshadow his advent and kingdom. This was done in judicial anger also, they were deposed because of their unfaithfulness in the discharge of their duties. "One month" is mentioned to show that this was done gradually and yet not protractedly. A month is the intermediate measure of time between a day and a year, and expresses thus that gradual transition from the old to the new dispensation, which did in fact occur. The one overlapped and evolved the other.

The other clauses of the verse represent that mutual aversion that existed between Christ and the magnates of the Jewish people. He denounced them with terrible severity, as vipers, hypocrites, &c., whilst they hated him so that they even gloated in fiendish delight over his agony on the cross.

V. 9 sets forth the final abandonment of the Jewish people to their fate, when it became evident that they would not listen to the voice of Jesus. They were left to their fatal choice. A threefold calamity is predicted; pestilence and famine, "the dying;" war, "the cut off;" and intestine discord, "let them consume each the flesh of the other." How terribly these predictions were fulfilled, may be seen from the pages of Josephus, where this threefold calamity is set forth in the most appalling details, in relating the history of the latter days of the Jewish republic.

V. 10 refers to that period when God let loose the angry nations of the earth against his people, and removed that girdle of protection that he had so long kept around them. This is symbolised by breaking the staff *Favor*, which is explained as abolishing the covenant that God had made with all nations. This covenant was of course not a formal engagement between God and all nations in favor of the Jews, but an ordinance of God in reference to all nations, by which they were restrained from destroying the Jews. A similar form of speech will be found in Hos. 2 : 20, when God makes a covenant with the beasts, the birds, and the insects, and in Job 5 : 23, which speaks of a covenant with the stones of the field. This was fulfilled when the Roman eagles gathered in hungry ferocity about the dying commonwealth.

V. 11 states that when this protection was withdrawn "the humble of the flock" who clung to Christ should know that this was the word of Jehovah. This was remarkably fulfilled. When Jerusalem was compassed with armies, the Christians remembered the warning of Christ to flee to the mountains, and accordingly when Titus unaccountably raised the siege for a few days, as if to give them an opportunity of obeying Christ's words, they fled to Pella and escaped the fate of those who remained in the city. Thus they knew that this was the word of Jehovah.

V. 12 contains the record of the final rejection of Christ. The expression, "if it seem good in your eyes," &c., is one of indignant contempt, with an intimation that to retain that reward was a far more costly thing than to bestow it. The reward was that travail of his soul which it was promised he should see and be satisfied, when men would receive him as a Saviour from sin. They, however, not only withheld that obedience and love that were the proper return for the work of Christ among them, but they added insult to injury. "They weighed," (alluding to the ancient mode of computing the value of money,) "my reward, thirty pieces of silver." This was the price of a servant who was gored by an

ox, (see Ex. 21 : 32,) a fact that made the sum a gross insult to him who was the Lord of all. How exactly this was fulfilled, when the traitor sold his master for thirty pieces of silver, all now know. It was fulfilled in its very minutest particulars.

V. 13 shows what was to be done with this price, which is ironically called a "magnificent price." It was to be cast to the potter. This was a proverbial phrase for cast it to an unclean place, like our phrases, "throw it to the dogs," "to the moles and the bats," and others of like character. The origin of this proverb was in the fact that the potter for the temple had his shop in the valley of Hinnom, because it furnished the most suitable clay for his purpose. This valley was a polluted place to the Jews, because of the idolatry once practiced there, and also because of the fact that Josiah defiled it with carrion, bones, &c. See 2 Kings 23 : 10. Hence to cast a thing to the potter, was to cast it to the valley of Hinnom, or to intimate that it was an unclean and unholy thing. That it was to be cast there, was because of a prophecy in Jer., cha. 18th and 19th, where the valley of Hinnom and the shop of the potter are taken as scenes for symbolic actions that apply to this precise period of Jewish history. The prophet Zechariah mentions the potter to connect this prophecy with the older one of Jeremiah, and show that it was only a fuller development of it, or more strictly a second and wider execution of the threatening then contained against unfaithfulness. That this view of the relation of the later to the earlier prophecy is correct, is proved by Matt. 27 : 9, when it is said, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potter's field as the Lord appointed me." The very fact that seems at first sight a difficulty, is the one that proves this connection. It will be seen that the words of Zechariah are referred to Jeremiah, and this is the uniform reading of all

the best MSS. of the gospel. Why then is the prophecy referred to Jeremiah? For the very same reason that a man quoting from the abridgement of a law book, would probably refer to the original author rather than the compiler, even though he quoted the words of the compilation. This is not a solitary instance in the New Testament writers. Mark 1 : 2, 3, quotes the words of Malachi, and refers them to Isaiah, to show the relation between the prophecies. So it is here. The passage is quoted, not verbatim, but with slight explanatory variations, as if to suggest to the reader the fact meant to be indicated by connecting the name of the earlier prophet with the form of the prediction that was given in the words of the later. This was much more obvious to the Jews than it is to us, because the minor prophets were all regarded as constituting but one book, and hence rarely quoted by name, and regarded as supplemental and subsidiary to the major prophets. Hence we see how wonderfully the prediction and the fulfilment have been connected in their very minutest terms, and their very obscurest intimations.

V. 14 predicts by the symbol of breaking the second staff Union, the intestine discord that raged so fearfully after the rejection of Christ by the Jews. The destruction of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel is not to be taken literally, for this bond had been broken long before in the time of Rehoboam, but is used as a metaphor of disunion. The breach of the past, with its mournful results, is used as a type of the future. How terribly this prediction was fulfilled can be seen in the pages of Josephus. The most terrible factions that have ever torn out the vitals of a commonwealth appeared in Judea, and amidst the terrors of invasion without and the horrors of fratricide within, this prophecy was fulfilled. The staff of protection from evil abroad and the staff of continued union at home were both broken, and the double horrors of foreign and domestic war paid the fearful penalty of rejecting the Lord of life, and setting upon him a price which in itself was an insult, and a mockery.

Part 3. The curse of evil rulers after the rejection of Christ.

CH. 11: 15-end.

15. "And Jehovah said to me,
Again, take to thee the implements of a foolish shepherd.
16. For behold! I raise up a shepherd in the land.
The perishing will he not visit,
The straying will he not seek out,
The wounded will he not heal,
The feeble will he not nourish,
And the flesh of the fat ones will he eat
And their hoofs will he break off.
17. Wo to the worthless shepherd, forsaking the flock!
A sword upon his arm!
And upon his right eye!
His arm shall surely be withered,
And his right eye shall surely be blind."

These verses describe a second symbolic action, in which the prophet predicts the curse of evil rulers by taking the implements of a foolish shepherd. What these were, we are not told, but they were doubtless implements calculated to injure and destroy, rather than to benefit the flock. He thus declared that after rejecting their rightful Lord, God would send upon them wicked and cruel rulers, who would waste and scatter them.

V. 15. "Again," seems to be spoken to the prophet and to summon him to the resumption of those symbolical actions that were connected with the predictions, and that now were to express a new state of facts.

V. 16. "The shepherd in the land," is of course not to be taken as an individual, but as representing the ruling power, in whomsoever vested. The characteristics of that power would be neglect, greediness and cruelty. The perishing, straying, wounded and feeble, who needed his aid would be neglected, whilst the fat ones would be devoured, and adding cruelty to greed, their very hoofs would be broken off.

V. 17 declares that these rulers themselves should not escape,

but the arm that oppressed should be palsied, and the eye that coveted should be blinded.

The reference here seems mainly, though not exclusively to be to the Romans. They were the rulers, but not the only rulers of the Jewish people. They were at once rapacious, proud and cruel, and they thronged like vultures to batten on the yet quivering flesh of the dying commonwealth. But they in turn were assailed by others, and it is by overlooking the very exactness of the fulfilment of the terms of the prophecy that the query has been raised about their significance. It is said that there is an incongruity in the change of punishment predicted, the first words declaring that it shall be the sword and the next that it shall be palsy and blindness. But this will vanish the moment we look at the exact facts of the case. Rome like some old lion who had ravaged for many years, when his eye grew dim and his arm grew weak, lay down to die. And it was precisely then that in addition to this internal feebleness there came upon them from the forests of the North, the sword, and thus there was literally fulfilled the terms of this passage. The sword of the barbarian was added to her own blinded and palsied weakness, and thus judgment inflicted in exact accordance with the words of this prophecy. God often uses instruments, which he afterwards throws into the fire.

This chapter is fraught with practical lessons, that have suggested themselves in the exposition, and need not be repeated. It shows that sin is always folly, and the sinner always a fool, for he secures the great evil of punishment in exchange for the small good of gratification, and always therefore makes a fool's bargain. It also shows that wicked rulers are a curse of God for the sins of a wicked nation, and hence that politics and religion can never be separated, however widely and wisely men may separate church and state. It also shows that God will bear with the wicked long, but that there is a point where the silken cords of his long-suffering forbearance will snap, and allow the crushing weight of Almighty wrath to descend in fearful ruin. It also shows that

none can reject Christ with impunity. Even the Jews, who did it "ignorantly in unbelief," paid a terrible penalty for their crime, and "if these things be done in a green tree what shall be done in a dry?"

CHAPTER 12.

Future blessings to Judah. V. 1-9.

1. "A Burden. The word of Jehovah upon Israel,
Saith Jehovah, who stretches the Heavens,
And establishes the earth,
And forms the spirit of man within him.
2. Behold! I make Jerusalem a threshold of shaking
To all nations round about,
And also upon Judah shall it be,
In the siege against Jerusalem.
3. And it shall be in that day,
I will make Jerusalem a stone of burden to all the nations,
All who lift it up shall surely gash themselves,
And there shall be gathered against her all people of the earth.
4. In that day, saith Jehovah,
I will smite every horse with affright,
And his rider with madness,
And upon the house of Judah will I open my eyes,
And every horse of the nations will I smite with blindness.
5. And the princes of Judah say in their hearts,
My strength (*is*) the inhabitants of Jerusalem,
In Jehovah of Hosts, their God.
6. In that day I will make the princes of Judah
As a pan of fire among faggots,
And as a torch of fire in a sheaf,
And they shall consume on the right hand and on the left
All the nations round about,
And Jerusalem shall yet sit in her own place in Jerusalem.
7. And Jehovah shall help the tents of Judah first,
That the glory of the house of David,
And the glory of the inhabitant of Jerusalem,
May not be magnified over Judah.
8. In that day Jehovah will protect the dweller in Jerusalem,
And the feeble among them in that day shall be as David,
And the house of David as God,
As the angel of Jehovah before them.
9. And it shall be in that day
I will seek to destroy all nations
Who come up against Jerusalem."

This chapter ushers in a set of facts over which there hangs some obscurity, both as to the persons to whom they refer and the time of their fulfilment. They are placed subsequent to the rejection of Christ, and yet they seem to refer to a time yet future, and to represent the rejection of Christ as not a hopeless alienation from God. There can be but little doubt that the events here predicted are yet future. The persons referred to are we believe the people of God, the New Testament succession of the theocracy, the church of Jesus Christ, which is the continuation of the kingdom of God as it existed in the Jewish economy. This brings this prophecy in harmony with the rest of the book, which is designed to trace out the historic course of the covenant people down to the time when the unbelieving Jewish element was to be eliminated, and onward to the period when it should be restored in penitence and faith to the one living church of the living God.

V. 1. The word *massah*, (burden,) is usually, if not always, prefixed as a title to threatening prophecies, as if to indicate the weight of wrath that they embosomed in their dark clouds. Although the drift of this prophecy is consoling, yet it is not wholly so, for the greater part of its predictions are threatenings of evil to the enemies of the chosen people. The words "upon Israel" are supposed by Hengstenberg to indicate Israel as the object of the threatening predictions that follow. Israel, or the ten tribes being taken as typical of the enemies of the chosen people: This view is favored by the fact that all the subsequent promises are made to Judah and Jerusalem, and none to Israel. It is however not at all an obvious or usual sense of the words, though the sense thus expressed is the real object of the prophecy, *viz.*, comfort to the people of God by the assurance that their enemies should all be destroyed.

The language describing God's attributes here is peculiar. It is not who *hath* stretched the heavens, &c., but who is *now* stretching them, and by a ceaseless exertion of his power upholding the great ongoings of the universe. The Bible is

ignorant of that philosophy which teaches that God has created the universe and wound up its machinery like a clock, and then left it to run on by its own inherent energies. From moment to moment he is exerting his power in maintaining the movements of visible things. The argument is that God is doing all these mighty works, and hence will be able to do less mighty, and that as he has not excluded himself from his creation, he is able to do all that he has promised. It is therefore a most fitting introduction.

V. 2. The word *saph* is usually translated cup, but the more common, if not the only proper meaning, is "threshold," and as the same figure essentially is used in v. 3, it is most appropriate here. The meaning is that when the nations assail Jerusalem they shall find a crash of ruin falling upon them, just like the man who on entering the house finds the threshold to give way under his feet, bringing down the building in ruins upon his head. The phrase "upon Judah shall it be," &c., is a difficult one, but seems to mean that Judah shall be involved in the evils of the siege against Jerusalem, i. e., that the evil shall be general, so that all, even the most remote shall feel it.

V. 3 declares that the efforts of the enemies of the church to overthrow her shall be futile and injurious only to themselves. It shall be like some huge rock, the efforts to raise which only wound and bruise the hand of him who makes the attempt.

V. 4 drops this metaphor, and as cavalry was in ancient warfare a very important arm of attack, and one which the Jewish people feared, God promises so to confound the horse and his rider as to prevent them from doing any injury to the chosen people, to whom under the phrase, "I will open my eyes," the supervision and protection of God is promised. He had seemed to slumber or to close his eyes upon and forget them, but now he will bestow upon them special attention and protection. A distinction is evidently made between Judah and Jerusalem, or the province and the metropolis, but what is the exact fact alluded to by this distinction, in the

future, we cannot tell. It implies a difference of privilege and of strength among the people of God, corresponding to the difference between a residence within the fortified walls of the city and the hallowed shadow of the temple, and a residence in the less holy and less secure regions of the country.

V. 5 brings out this distinction more emphatically. There are several grammatical difficulties about this verse, but the most natural course seems to be to take *amtsa* as a noun in apposition with *yosh'be yrushalayim*, and *bayehovah* as explanatory of the connection asserted by this apposition. The meaning then would be, that the princes of Judah (who speak for the people) recognise Jerusalem, which is the place of God's special manifestation, as the source from which their strength is to come, and yet as only the medium of transmission, the strength itself residing at last only in Jehovah. The general fact predicted seems to be that cordial union of all portions of the church from the lowest to the highest, that will give the fullest scope for the exertion of God's power in delivering and blessing his people.

V. 6 intimates, that because of the meek acknowledgment of subordination made by the province, they who humbled themselves shall be exalted, and the province should be made the instrument of delivering the metropolis, and should consume the enemies assembled against the church as a pan of coals sets fire to a pile of dry faggots, or a torch consumes a sheaf of straw. Jerusalem sitting "in her own place," describes a settled and secure state of things in the church, which should be brought about by the agency of these feeble and humbler instrumentalities, the princes of Judah.

V. 7 assigns the reason for the preference given to the humbler agencies, it is to prevent all swelling of pride, and show that God and not man is the source of this deliverance, and also to prevent the more favored from looking down contemptuously on the less favored. The "tents of Judah," in their insecurity and lowliness are placed in contrast with the lofty mountains of Jerusalem. As these privileges were likely to

produce pride, God would bestow the honor of this deliverance, as well as the first possession of it, on those who were less favored externally than the inhabitants of the holy city. Such has been his plan in the past, and such it is here declared it will be in the great struggles of the future, the weak things shall confound the mighty, and the things that are not, bring to naught things that are, in order that no flesh may glory in his presence.

V. 8 declares that this favor shall not be restricted to the lowly and less favored, lest it might generate the very evil it was designed to avoid, but that all portions of the church should be visited and blessed. The highest earthly type of might and glory to the Jew was David, and the highest heavenly was the Jehovah angel, the divine messenger who led them through the desert. These are taken as the standards of comparison to describe this future glory. The weakest of the future shall be equal to the strongest of the past, whilst the strong ("the house of David") shall be as God, namely as the angel of Jehovah. There is no reason for taking *elohim* in any other than its usual sense, expressing the abstract notion of Deity, whilst *yehovah*, and especially *malak yehovah*, expresses that concrete and manifested form of divinity, that was most significant to the Jew. The apposition here is another proof that the angel of the covenant is a divine person.

V. 9 declares in general terms the destruction of all the enemies that shall combine against the church, here symbolised by Jerusalem.

As the events predicted here are yet future, it were unwise to dogmatise in regard to their exact nature. The general meaning seems to be, that there shall be hereafter a wide and formidable combination of enemies against the church, that God shall deliver her, not by the instruments to which she has looked, but by others, of the humbler and obscurer part, and that this deliverance should be accompanied by cordial union of affection among all portions of the church and followed by a vast accession of strength to every portion of it,

and by complete overthrow of her enemies. This great struggle yet before the church, is one that seems to have loomed up like the lurid smoke of some distant battle to the eye of all the prophets, from Enoch to the seer of the Apocalypse. Blessed is he who is then found faithful!

There is however another great event that is to accompany this mighty struggle, which is, the conversion and restoration of the Jewish people to the church from which they have been so long separated. This is alluded to and implied in the remaining verses of this chapter and the opening verses of the succeeding.

Future repentance and blessing to Jerusalem.

CH. 12:10—end.

10. " And I pour out upon the house of David,
And upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem,
A spirit of grace and of supplication,
And they look upon me, whom they pierced,
And they lament for him, as the lamenting of an only child,
And they mourn for him, as the mourning of a first-born.
11. And in that day the mourning shall be great in Jerusalem,
As the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the vale of Megiddo.
12. And the land mourns, family by family apart,
The family of the house of David apart and their wives apart,
The family of the house of Nathan apart and their wives apart,
13. The family of the house of Levi apart and their wives apart,
The family of the house of Shimei apart and their wives apart,
14. All the remaining families,
Family by family apart, and their wives apart.

V. 10. There is here predicted a great spiritual blessing from God on the church, but contemplated mainly as now containing the penitent Jews. "A spirit of grace and supplication," is an outpouring of the spirit of God, that awakens gracious affections and leads the heart to prayer. The spirit of prayer is the gauge of the spirit of grace, and the mercury whose rise or fall is an unerring test of the state of the church.

In this mighty revival that shall take place in the future, there will be much prayer and much penitence. This peni-

tence shall pervade the whole church, but especial prominence is given here to the recovered Jews. "They shall look on me whom they have pierced." As God is here the speaker, this passage has always been a stumbling block to the Jews, for how could God be pierced? The only fact that explains it is that which they have not yet admitted, that they have crucified and slain that prince of peace, who was God manifest in the flesh. As soon as they admit this fact they will see the consistency of the passage, and will mourn the guilt of their fathers in crucifying the incarnate son, and their own guilt in so long rejecting him.

John 19 : 37 refers this passage to the piercing of Christ's side, but as this was the act of a Roman soldier and not of the Jewish people, it must be regarded as only a partial fulfilment of the prophecy. It refers to all the sufferings of Christ, and affirms that then the Jews will admit what heretofore they have rejected, a suffering and dying Messiah. There is a change of person from the first to the third, which is not unusual with the prophets, (see Nordheimer's Grammar, § 768, 1, 6,) and which, in view of what was to be said in reference to the speaker, was highly appropriate.

When their eyes were open to see what they had done, they would mourn. The bitterness of this mourning is described by two illustrations, a private and a public. The private is the grief that a parent feels at the loss of a first born and an only child. The bitterness of this agony in any parent is a most vivid image of sorrow, but to a Jew, with his passion for posterity, and his impression of disgrace and curse connected with childlessness, this illustration was one of the most significant that could be used.

V. 11 expresses the public example of sorrow, and it was the most expressive in the history of the Jewish people. The death of the good Josiah was the darkest and saddest event in the history of the monarchy, for it was the quenching of all hope. He was a link of bright memories in the past, and bright hopes in the future, and when he fell, and fell under the displeasure of God, it was as the giving up of the ghost.

It was like the death of Hampden in the English history, or like what the death of Washington in the darkest hour of the revolution would have been in our own, a calamity that would have wrung a wail of agony and despair from a whole people.

V. 12-14 describes the universality of this mourning. It should extend to every family, and every individual, leading each one to retire alone and weep. The selection of names seems designed to express the fact that from the highest to the lowest, this mourning should extend. David and Levi express the kingly and priestly orders, or the civil and ecclesiastical, whilst Nathan, who was not the prophet, but a descendant of David, (see 2 Sam. 5 : 14, Luke 3 : 31,) and Shimei, who was a descendant of Levi, (see Numb. 3 : 18, 21,) carry the lamentation to the remotest members of these two great orders.

The general fact here predicted is a mighty revival of religion, the prominent mourners and penitents in which should be the converted children of those who had slain the Lord of life, though a revival which should pervade the entire church, and penetrate to every house and every heart. The marks of this revival should be a spirit of prayer, and of penitence, and sorrow for the great sin of unbelief in so long and so cruelly rejecting the blessed and crucified Saviour.

ART. IV.

The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature. To which are added Two brief Dissertations: I. On Personal Identity; II. On the Nature of Virtue; by Joseph Butler, D. C. L., late Lord Bishop of Durham: With an Account of the Character and Writings of the Author, by Samuel Halifax, D. D., late Lord Bishop of Gloucester. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 285, Broadway. 8vo.

This is a cheap re-print of the old and familiar edition of Butler's Analogy, and is apparently designed as a stock book for the trade. There is nothing to be said against it; there is nothing to recommend it to especial favor. It does well enough to sell, for it is the genuine article; and it may figure advantageously in day-books and ledgers; but the only good reason for its publication is one of the mysteries revealed solely to those initiated in the worshipful craft of the bibliopoles. Whoever purchases it obtains Butler's Analogy; whoever does not, suffers no deprivation, if he possesses, or can buy or borrow any other copy. It is issued without any date to determine either its age or the suitable duration of its career; but, having no special value now, it is launched into being with the prospect of maintaining its present worth for an indefinite period. It circulates like a foundling through the streets, having neither godfather nor godmother, neither baptism nor registry, being indubitably a live book, but without friends, known relatives, or authentication. Any stick by the road-side, says my Lord Bacon, will make a fagot to burn a fore-doomed martyr; and, on a like principle, even this imprint, which has no particular distinction, and no fixed place in time, may serve our purpose, and afford a loose occasion for a few remarks on the nature of analogical reasoning in general, on its applicability to theological demonstrations, and on its employment by Bishop Butler, in his celebrated work. The very absence of all peculiarities may, perhaps, render this edition more appropriate for our particular design, as it relieves us from any obligation to turn

aside from our direct course to notice specific excellences or defects, and enables us to limit our observations to the general subject which we propose to discuss.

It was our earnest desire, indeed, to have placed at the head of this dissertation the titles of two late editions of considerable but dissimilar merit; the one, comprising both the *Analogy* and *Butler's Sermons*, published in the elegant series of Bohn's standard library; the other, containing the *Aualogy* alone, carefully and skilfully prepared by the late Doctor Emory, and compiled by the Rev. Mr. Crooks. But after many inquiries among the bookstores in Richmond, we were unable to find a copy of either in that city. It would thus appear that if this classic of the scholar, the thinker, and the Christian is estimated there at the same value which it bears everywhere else, it is ordinarily read with entire indifference to those extrinsic aids which are so necessary to facilitate its suitable appreciation.

There are few works, however, whose settled reputation is more disproportionate to the study and attention actually bestowed upon it. Its celebrity gives it currency everywhere, and its currency inclines even its readers to dispense with examination. It is a standard work, an acknowledged authority: it is read as a matter of obligation, sometimes with a vague design of unconsciously undergoing a salutary mental discipline from its perusal, but too rarely with a steady and deliberate effort to master the true scope of the argument, to determine the range and validity of its logic, and to appropriate its valuable results. The book had long since attained to that icy sublimity of fame, from which it towers in unapproached magnificence over the surrounding world, and glitters like hard and impenetrable crystal, in the thin air of its lofty elevation; a spectacle to be admired and lauded, but to the majority of its votaries scarcely a serviceable reality, to be handled, used, and applied. It deserves unquestionably the very high position which it has won; not one word of praise bestowed upon it by others will be contested by us; but it deserves a different treatment from that which it usually receives; for it

merits the intelligent regard and easy communion which bind friend to friend, and the disciple to the teacher, and not the distant homage which is paid to the veiled majesty of oriental despots. The style of Butler, it is true, is awkward, ungainly, and repulsive; his expression is rough and inelegant; his sentences intricate, gnarled, and disjointed; but a clear and equable stream of deep thought flows smoothly on beneath this turbid volume of words, and speaks to the mind of the attentive reader a plainer language than it utters to the ear. The obscurity and difficulty of the *Analogy of Religion* have been often noted, but these defects are only on the surface; they may retard or repel the student of the mere letter, but they do not infect the spirit of the work, or prevent its ready apprehension. Indeed, a very simple rule for the easy intelligence of the book suggests itself to us. It consists in paying less regard to what is said than to what is meant by the author. The style of Bishop Butler was formed and adopted at a time when theology and other recondite sciences had scarcely learnt to speak the language of the vulgar, and before they had condescended to seek popularity by the arts of expression. It neither befitted the earnest simplicity of Butler's own nature, nor the habits of his day, to seek from adventitious aids an interest refused to graver considerations. He had a serious lesson to inculcate, an important truth to develop. To that task he devoted his whole energies, rejecting the meretricious graces which might have secured a more numerous crowd of admirers, but might, at the same time, have hidden the important substance of his argument beneath the unimportant attractions of the form. Still, the ruggedness of his expression has rendered it expedient to assist the sluggish negligence of later students by various contrivances. Sometimes the work is most inappropriately converted into a school-book, and the learner's attention is directed to the successive links in the chain of ratiocination by a series of methodic questions, which break the closely concatenated texture of the whole into a succession of disconnected chunks of doctrine. More frequently an analysis is resorted to, which is an admirable aid and exercise to

a logical mind capable of dispensing with it, but which is harsh, dry, and indigestible to most of our hasty readers. Like a map of a strange country, it exhibits concisely and at a single glance the outlines and relations of the separate parts, but without giving any adequate insight into the internal constitution of the whole, except to those who derive from other studies the knowledge which it may render more orderly and precise. But the chief and inevitable defect of an analysis of Butler's Analogy is, that it can only exhibit the skeleton of the logical sequences and successions of the argument, and must omit the illustration of the most noticeable feature of the work, which is its masterly and sober employment of a very seductive mode of reasoning, without ever being betrayed by any allurements into transcending the narrow range of the legitimate application of analogy. It is this important characteristic which alone we propose to illustrate in our subsequent remarks. But to do so with propriety or effect, it is necessary, in the first instance, to obtain a just comprehension of the nature of analogical reasoning, its merits, its limits, and its defects; and in the next, to determine the degree of its applicability to theological subjects; then, it will be easy to perceive how far Butler was justified in its employment as a criterion of truth in regard to the fundamental problems of religion which he discusses.

Analogy may be applied to deductive reasoning, but it is ordinarily a species of induction, which infers a general law from a special and partial agreement between different particulars. Like the examples recommended and illustrated by the ancient rhetoricians, and repeated in daily conversation without any determination of their exact value in argumentation, it is concerned only with probable conclusions, and can never enter into the composition of a strict demonstration. It proceeds on the assumption that, where things dissimilar are similar in part, there must be a common cause or common law for that partial agreement; and, hence, it either infers the common law from the several accordant instances, or transfers to one of these the operation of the law already recognized as

applicable to the others. The basis of the whole procedure is hypothetical ; the result, therefore, will necessarily be contingent and uncertain ; and, if not contrived with cautious skill, it will be arbitrary also. Analogy, accordingly, can only furnish probable grounds for a reasonable belief, which must derive its assurance from some other source, or else remain merely an opinion ; it can never justify an absolute and settled conviction, independently of other evidence. It thus appertains to that type of reasoning, which has been termed by Aristotle and his followers, dialectical,* in contradistinction to that which is alone demonstrative, and, consequently, alone strictly logical. It authorizes a probable, not a certain conclusion : it may confirm or illustrate a doctrine already entertained ; it may facilitate its reception, explain its import. or strengthen its hold upon the feelings ; but it can never afford any absolute proof of its truth. It is consequently restricted in its legitimate employment to those cases where higher evidence is already accorded, though not of a logical character, or where higher logical evidence is unattainable, or where it is unnecessary.

This limitation of the employment of analogy must be more particularly developed and explained. In all matters connected with faith, where truths are received in obedience to a superior authority, or in consequence of an obligation to believe, and are accepted either from an unshaking confidence in the teacher, or an instinctive appetency for their adoption in the learner, the conviction entertained rests upon sentiments, not upon reasons. The belief is the fruit of feeling, not the product of the intellect. It is supported by the tenacity of the moral, and not of the logical apprehension. It is reached by no logical or demonstrative process, but by higher, more inexplicable, and more indestructible methods of procedure. The subject matter of belief transcends the range and comprehension of the human mind, but not the orbit of the

*Aristot. *Analyt. Pr. lib. I, c. I.* David. *Interp. X. Categ. Schol. Aristot.* p. 25, b. 19-33. Joannes Italus. *cit. Wartz. Ed. Org. vol. I, p. 18 ; and Schol. Cod. Laurent. cit. ibid. p. 17.*

human heart. It invites belief, but does not admit of rigid proof. Hence faith was most philosophically, as well as most religiously, defined by the Apostle to be "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."* In all instances which fall within the natural domain of faith, faith is the highest evidence which the nature of the subject and the constitution of the human mind admit, and affords an assurance far exceeding any which can be reached by the demonstrations of the reason. Thus, in cases of this sort, higher evidence is granted, to wit: revelation addressing itself to faith, than either analogy or any other mode of reasoning can bestow: and analogy becomes applicable merely to enlighten the faith, and clear away the clouds and the fumes of error which reason so often generates to darken the path and mislead the footsteps of the believer. Analogy cannot prove the points in question, but it can exhibit to the reason of man the reasonableness of the belief already entertained in his heart; and it can also disprove objections by showing their futility and absurdity. It can paralyse the arm of an antagonist by rendering it apparent that the weapons, directed against the doctrines of faith, must equally wound the fundamental truths which the adversary himself holds, and is obliged to maintain. The *reductio ad absurdum*, which analogy so frequently and so efficaciously employs, is not a strictly logical refutation; but it is a valid bar to the particular objections urged, by manifesting the untenability of the objector's own position, if he perseveres in his warfare. It opposes an impenetrable shield between the object of attack and the blow of the assailant; and it arrests and withers the arm of the latter, so that his weapon falls powerless from his hand, or flies in vain, like the spear hurled by the decrepit Priam against the youthful Neoptolemus:

—telumque imbelles sine ictu
 Conjecit: raucum quod protinus ære repulsum,
 Et summo clypei nequicquam umbone pependit.

* Heb. xi. 1. Every significant term of this celebrated definition has a profound philosophical meaning.

Analogy, also, furnishes a provisional mode of procedure, and justifies a provisional belief in those cases where the nature of the subject does not altogether exclude higher and more rigid evidence, but where such evidence is not yet accessible. Thus, in the early stages of any branch of science, it may furnish reasonable grounds for the anticipation of a particular doctrine, which cannot be thus definitely established, but may be accepted as probable on this score, until it is either confirmed or refuted by further and stricter testimony. It inaugurates an hypothesis, but it neither determines a law nor authenticates a fact. It is a pioneer, which opens a way through the thicket for new discovery, letting in the light of day into the dense shades of the untrodden forest of possible inquiry. It is in danger of losing its way, but its errors may be corrected by future observation; and more progress is to be achieved by even a wrong step in advance, than by idly waiting until the true path reveals itself to us without an effort of our own. Moreover, analogy, if cautiously followed, will always lead us in a direction not diverging far from the right: Like the second arrow shot by the archer, from the same point, at the same angle, with the same strength, and in the same line as the first, which has been lost, in order to find it, analogy guides us, if not exactly to the spot where that which is sought is to be found, at least into the neighborhood of the place where it is probably concealed, and thus gives a definite scope and a limited range to investigations which would otherwise remain so vague as to be hopeless of any adequate result. It is true, that, in the discharge of this function, analogy only serves to frame an hypothesis. On this ground, those who have adopted from Newton the celebrated axiom, "*hypotheses non fingo*," without understanding either the sense or the limitations under which that great man employed the expression, may reject both the use of hypotheses, and the analogy by which they are suggested. But the careful and judicious employment of hypothetical laws has been recognized as an indispensable aid by the most eminent philosophers and men of science of recent times. By Kant, by

Comte, by Sir John Herschel, and by Prof. Whewell,* among many others, they have been distinctly and explicitly admitted as necessary steps in the procedure of science, and cautions for their legitimate introduction have been laid down. Indeed, Sir Isaac Newton's Fourth Rule of Philosophizing† implies the continued, but not licentious employment of hypothesis, and his practice corresponded with this implication. He himself characterized his explanation of the lunar librations as a theory, and it was termed an hypothesis by Mercator, in a passage approved by Sir Isaac himself.‡ Sir John Herschel points out the ministrations of analogy in framing such hypotheses,§ and, without asserting it in terms, appears perfectly aware that analogy is a form of induction, and the first stage of inductive science. But analogy merely points the way and indicates the probable conclusion, which is only received provisionally, and must be established, if established at all, by further observation, experiment, and induction. It does not prove, it only suggests a thesis. It is induction in its primitive and least perfect form, being a rapid and premature induction from a few isolated instances, while the induction of strict science embraces all known examples of the same kind, which must agree in their significance, and excludes the supposition of any contradictory fact. The extent of the data, their harmony, and the absence of any conflicting instance, authorize ultimately a universal conclusion, which is afterwards confirmed by experiment. But analogy in its simpler form, and in its ordinary signification, only justifies a suspicion or anticipation of a probable truth, without demonstrating it, and is merely a preliminary *tentative*, whose results are to be confirmed or repudiated by further evidence, as soon as other and higher evidence is attainable.

*Kant. Crit. de la Raison Pure. vol. II, p. 246-7. Comte, *passim*. Herschel *Disc. on Nat. Phil.* § 208, p. 147, Am. ed. Whewell *Hist. and Phil. Ind. Sciences*, *passim*.

†Principia, vol. II, p. 4. Ed. Glasgœ, 1833.

‡Principia, lib. III, Prop. II, et. not. Le Seur et Jacquier, vol. II, p. 53.

§Herschel *Disc. Nat. Phil.* §§ 148, 141, 142, pp. 114, 111.

Analogy is, moreover, legitimate and applicable in those subjects or reasonings where only probable presumption is required, and where stronger and more conclusive proof is unnecessary. This occurs in poetry and oratory, and in all reasoning, composition, or conversation, which approximates to the poetical or rhetorical type. When the object is to delight, amuse, or kindle the mind and sentiments by unexpected similitudes, it is sufficiently accomplished by the exposition of the partial agreements which strangely link together things, in their essence or appearance, dissimilar. When persuasion and not conviction is designed, the purpose may be readily and agreeably achieved by a dexterous use of analogy, while the most rigidly coherent logic might fail to attain the same result at all. Nor is analogy necessarily sophistical or deceptive in this employment. It quickens the imagination, it vivifies the feelings, it kindles generous emotions, and while it serves as an amusement and recreation to the mind and expands its horizon into new spheres of thought, it exercises also a felicitous influence on the heart by enlarging and stimulating its sympathies, and deepening the current of its sentiments. It is not enough merely to convince men of the right; they must be allured, persuaded, and induced to practice what they know or believe to be so; and this enticement is happily rendered by different applications of analogy. Usually, indeed, men are guided more by their feelings than their judgment; they obey the dictates of their passions more readily than the instruction of their intellect; and thus, for weal or for woe, so far as action and life are concerned, persuasion wields a more potent and extended authority than logical demonstration. In producing and confirming this persuasion, whether by direct or indirect methods, in poetry, fiction, eloquence, oratory; in preaching, teaching, coaxing, illustrating, explaining, and advising; analogy finds a legitimate and wide field for its operation, and is habitually employed, even when its use is least suspected.

It is sufficiently apparent, from what has been said, that analogy, in all its forms and applications, is incompetent to

substantiate the truth of any doctrine of itself. It is often an available substitute for demonstration, rendering services which demonstration cannot render; but it never is entitled to be regarded as a demonstrative process. It may win assent, but it cannot necessitate a conclusion. It is a mode of reasoning which dispenses with proof, and asks only credence. The cogency which it may possess is not derived from the forms or laws of human thought, but from the probabilities of the subject-matter. It is consequently not a logical, but an extra-logical process; if we give to logic the narrow range only to which it has been limited by the principal logicians since Persius published, in 1575, at Padua, his thesis on the subject of logic. At any rate, to use the language of Aristotle, analogical reasoning is not syllogistic, but dialectical.

The positions laid down are capable of full confirmation and abundant illustration from the very highest authorities; if any such confirmation were required in support of doctrines so clear and obvious as to be almost axiomatic. Kant* exhibits the limited character of the evidence which analogy supplies, and illustrates the extreme caution which must accompany its use, in order that that use may be valid. In the opening remarks of the Introduction to his great work,† Bishop Butler distinctly expresses his recognition of the imperfect and fallible nature of analogy, and indicates his full acquaintance with the fact that analogies of equal legitimacy may lead to contradictory conclusions, one of which must necessarily be false. The first words which he utters, in approaching his important thesis, show that he was misled by no vain hope of demonstrating the indemonstrable, but sought only for such assistance towards the discovery or apprehension of truth, as might be properly expected from the employment of analogical reasoning. "Probable evidence," says he, "is essentially distinguished from demonstrative by this, that it admits of degrees; and of all variety of them, from the highest moral certainty, to the very lowest presumption. We cannot, in-

* Kant. Crit. du Jugement, § lxxxix, vol. II, p. 193-6, Trad. Bami.

† Butler's Analogy, Introd. p. xlvi, xlix.

deed, say a thing is probably true upon one very slight presumption for it ; because, as there may be probabilities on both sides of a question, there may be some against it ; and, though there be not, yet a slight presumption does not beget that degree of conviction, which is implied in saying a thing is probably true. But that the slightest possible presumption is of the nature of a probability, appears from hence ; that such low presumption, often repeated, will amount even to moral certainty." * * * "That which chiefly constitutes probability is expressed in the word likely, i. e., like some truth, or true event ; like it, in itself, in its evidence, in some more or fewer of its circumstances." * * * "Probable evidence, in its very nature, affords but an imperfect kind of information ; and is to be considered as relative only to beings of limited capacities." * * * "From these things it follows, that in questions of difficulty, or such as are thought so, where more satisfactory evidence cannot be had, or is not seen ; if the result of examination be, that there appears upon the whole, any the lowest presumption on one side, and none on the other, or a greater presumption on one side, though in the lowest degree greater ; this determines the question, even in matters of speculation ; and in matters of practice, will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation, in point of prudence and of interest, though it be so low as to leave the mind in very great doubt which is the truth."*

There is here no attempt to magnify the functions or importance of analogy ; it is discreetly estimated at its just worth, and throughout the whole of Bishop Butler's argument the imperfections of the instrument are kept steadily in view, and at the same time made, with singular skill, the strongest of all the reasons adduced for the final acceptance of the doctrine which he seeks to enforce.

From these remarks, especially if just, as we believe them to be, it might appear that the credit usually ascribed to Butler's analogy, of being an able and valid assertion of the truth

*Butler's Analogy, Introd. p. xlviij, xlix, xlix-l. Many other similar passages occur in the course of the work.

of natural and revealed religion, was undeserved ; and that analogical reasoning was an inappropriate and inadequate method of establishing the reasonableness of either. It is unquestionably true, that neither does analogy furnish that rigid and logical evidence in favour of religion, which it is habitually, but too hastily, presumed to do ; nor does Butler's Analogy afford, or profess to afford, that demonstrative proof, which it is often commended for rendering. But this failure, which constitutes apparently such a signal defect, is, in reality, the highest excellence both of that work, and of the mode of reasoning adopted therein. To illustrate the accuracy of this paradoxical proposition, we proceed to consider the applicability of analogy to the purposes of theological disputation.

It is universally admitted by the clearest thinkers and most profound reasoners on the difficult problems of theology, that religion can be efficaciously received only through the operation of faith, and not by the conclusions of the reason alone. St. Thomas Aquinas maintains that inductive reasoning, (to use his own expression for the logic of demonstrative science,) diminishes or destroys the merit of faith, when it is employed for its determination in the first instance, but not when simply used for its illumination and confirmation.* Cardinal Caietan, the most illustrious of the later schoolmen, observes, that 'our intellect reposes not in the evidence of the sensible truth, but in the incomprehensible sublimity of the hidden truth, since, as St. Gregory notes, he, who believes of the Divinity only so much as he can measure with his own understanding, has an inadequate apprehension of God.† This passage is quoted and approved by Leibnitz, and accompanied with the remark, that Caietan is an author equal to the importance of the sub-

* Cit. Rémusat. Abélard. lib. III., ch. II., vol. II., p. 204, note.

† Quiescit intellectus noster non evidentia veritatis inspectæ, sed altitudine inaccessiblei veritatis occultæ, quoniam, ut ait S. Gregorius, minus de Deo sentit, qui hoc tantum de divinitate credit, quod suo ingenio metiri potest. Comm. in I Part, Summæ. Qu. 22. Art. 4.

ject.* Grotius says that the extrinsic proof of Christianity given to us was less than it might have been, that the Gospel might be a test, like the Lydian stone, to discover those natures which admitted of cure.† This striking observation is quoted with approval by Butler himself, who elsewhere remarks, that it is certain no revelation would have been given, had the light of nature been sufficient in such a sense as to render one not wanting and useless.‡

But there is no necessity to recur to authorities, however cogent or distinguished, for the settlement of this fundamental question. It is a palpable truth, equally manifest to the experience of the illiterate, and to the philosophy of the reflecting, that religion must operate on the heart and conscience in a higher mode and larger sense than it can or ought to affect the intellect. It is equally obvious that the subject matter of religion places it beyond the reach of science, or the full apprehension of rationalistic speculation; and rather addresses itself to faith than supports itself by demonstrative evidence. It must be candidly admitted by every intelligent person, that the knowledge of God and of the supernatural mysteries of revelation cannot be attained by human reason alone, but requires the lively exercise of a confiding belief, inasmuch as it transcends the sphere of the human mind.

The position of Roger Bacon is irrefragable: it is impossible that man should recognize the ultimate truth of the relations of the creature to the Creator, unless especially illuminated by God:§ and this tenet is equally incontrovertible in a

* Hæc Cajetanus, cujus sententia tanto dignior est observatu, quod hic esset Autor argumento inspiciendo par. De Conform. Fid. cum Rat. § 48. Leibnitzii Opera. Ed. Dutens, tom. I, p. 95.

† * * ut ita sermo Evangelii tanquam lapis esset Lydius, ad quem ingenia sanabilia explorarentur. De Ver. Rel. Christ. lib. II, cit. Butler's Analogy. Pt. II, ch. VI, p. 238.

‡ Analogy. Pt. II, ch. I, p. 165.

§ Impossibile enim est quod homo sciret veritatem creaturæ ultimam secundum quam accipitur in scriptura, nisi fuerit specialiter a Deo illustratus. Opus Majus. lib. II, c. viii, p. 22.

modified sense, when applied to the proximate truths of this relation. It is impossible that man should obtain a knowledge of God and of his duties to God, without a revelation, and without an exercise of other faculties than those which are applied to the discovery of the truths of observation and deduction. These are points which are axioms, in the estimation of those whose minds have not been bewildered and betrayed by the intricacies and perplexities of too refined, and therefore sophistical reasoning. Nevertheless, we hold it to be undoubted, that we may derive some aid from reason in the recognition of even the truths of revealed religion. We have cited Roger Bacon's testimony to the necessity of revelation; we assent equally to the declaration made by him in the same connection, that speculative philosophy leads to the knowledge of the creator through his creatures, and is competent to give proofs of the truth of Christianity.* Only we make a wide distinction, as he and the other great names previously referred to have done, between that proof which is illustrative, and confirmatory of a truth otherwise received and established, and that proof which is original, conclusive, demonstrative, and sufficient of itself to implant and compel belief. All religious evidences, in our opinion, belong to the former class; and would entirely defeat the purposes of religion if they belonged to the latter. For, how could religion be either a test or an ordeal; how could it discipline the feelings and purify the heart; how could it try the reins and the hearts, even to give every man according to his ways and according to the fruit of his doings; how could it do all this, which is its especial function, if the commandments of God were merely logical conclusions, rigidly demonstrable and demonstrated, and necessitating the same implicit acceptance by the intellect as the processes of science, or the theorems of geometry? The evidences of religion must necessarily appear imperfect in com-

* *Philosophia enim speculativa decurrit usque ad cognitionem creatoris per creaturas. Opus Majus. lib. II, c. vii, p. 22. * * Ergo philosophia habet dare probationes fidei Christianæ. Opus Majus. lib. II, c. viii, p. 31. Ed. Venet.*

parison with scientific demonstrations, in order to leave to men the option and the responsibility of its acceptance or rejection, and in order to allow the heart free play in arriving at its determinations. We may thus unite with Kant in regarding the impenetrable wisdom of God, with equal veneration for that which it has accorded, and that which it has denied to us: * but we must cease to look for demonstrations in the evidences of either natural religion or Christianity, and must be careful not to vitiate the whole scheme by expecting that which its very essence precludes.

If these views of the relation of human knowledge and the human mind to the suprasensible mysteries of the divine system be correct, it will be obvious that the argument in favor of religion must be limited to a purely negative exposition, to the elucidation of obscurities and the removal of objections merely, and cannot pretend to a direct and positive demonstration, which must always be beyond our reach. This aspect of the subject was instinctively recognised by the earlier Christian fathers, who gave to their treatises, written in defence of Christianity, the name of Apologies, not simply in consequence of the attitude which the Christians of that day occupied with respect to the political and social predominance of heathenism, but more peculiarly in obedience to the undeveloped conviction profoundly entertained, that the real proof of religious truth lay in the authoritative revelation of God, and that human philosophy and speculation were limited to the refutation of objections, the removal of the obstacles to belief, and the illustration only of the higher evidence supplied by divine inspiration. A similar sentiment undoubtedly dictated the course of reasoning pursued by Bishop Butler in his Analogy, as is evident both from his own expressions and from the character of his procedure. Perhaps it may be in great measure due to the absence of such wise restraint, and to the arrogance of ignorance which would hope to render the rational proof co-equal with the divine revelation, that the

* Kant Crit. de la Raison Prat. p. 370, Trad. Barni.

modern evidences of Christianity have been so often impotent to satisfy or confute the sceptic and the infidel.

The character of the evidences employed in the establishment or defence of the great principles of religious doctrine, necessarily varies with the different ages and the shifting opinions of the world;† for the proof offered being in its nature negative, must change its ground and its front with the successive modifications of the objections brought against religion. Hence the Apologies of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Lactantius and Augustine, will necessarily differ materially from those of an Anselm or a Peter Lombard; and each of these be dissimilar from the argument followed by a Pascal, a Leibnitz, a Clarke, or a Paley. Each great change in the intellectual characteristics of the world requires a corresponding change in the line of defence selected for the maintenance of Christianity. In our day, to resume the old line of defence, is to fight anew a battle already won. We have new adversaries to encounter, new stratagems to resist, and a change of tactics is thus necessary for success. But, above all things, it is imperatively required of the advocates of Christianity that they should not injure their cause, and expose it to the deadly blows of the enemy by professing or pretending to adduce such proof as the subject will not admit, and thus involving themselves in fallacies which may be easily employed for their discomfiture.

Butler has carefully avoided any such aberration. He attempts no more than he can legitimately hope to accomplish, and while he addressed himself particularly to the difficulties and objections current in his own time, his moderation enabled him to produce a book of permanent value and of great logical interest. He rests his argument not on the strength of the position of Christianity so much as on the inherent weakness of the opposition brought against it. He proposes no demonstration, and therefore lays himself open to no new attack; but he turns the weapons of the enemy against them-

† Vide Westminster Review, Oct. 1851, Art. III., p. 36, Am. Ed.

selves, and shows that their conduct and argument are alike unreasonable, even on those very principles which they accept as fatal to religion. He renounces for the time the authority of revelation, and meets them in their own mode of warfare ; defending Christianity by the logical application of those very maxims which are applied in the daily action and conversation of the unbelievers, and which are sophistically abused when converted into arguments against religion. This course is obviously a *reductio ad absurdum*, and therefore only a negative proof ; but it is only necessary to read Butler's work with care in order to discover how dexterously and ingeniously he has managed his weapons, and how effective they become in his hands for the maintenance of truth.

All attacks on Christianity proceed upon the allegation of the inconsistencies or improbabilities of the sacred Scriptures, or of the events recorded therein ; or of the absurdity and needlessness of a revelation, and the impossibility of the miracles by which it is said to be confirmed ; or of the supposed immorality of the doctrine, or its want of harmony with human reason. These objections can be brought only in part against what has been called natural religion ; but this branch of the subject we overlook at present, both because few persons in our day are disposed to reject it, and also because it is handled by Bishop Butler mainly as an inducement and preliminary to the second part of his thesis.

If these objections be attentively regarded, it must become apparent at once that they do not admit of direct refutation ; that is to say, it must be promptly admitted that no positive and logical demonstration of the converse of each can be given. The objections alleged lie not in the form of the reasoning, but solely in the mind and belief of their propounder. You may strengthen by reasoning and reflection your own conviction that there is neither inconsistency nor improbability in the statements of the Bible ; you cannot, however, by any demonstration alter the settled conviction of another who believes the very opposite. You cannot satisfy Strauss of its consistency, or Tom Paine of its probability. The diver-

gence of opinions is not attributable to a difference of conclusions so much as to a primitive and inherent discrepance of sentiments. In such a case demonstration is of no use, there are no common premises to reason from, no agreement in the manner in which the same propositions are accepted. The same observations are equally appropriate to the other objections enumerated. They are not to be reached by arguments addressed to the reason alone. The subjects transcend the mere intellect, and are beyond the forms of thought. The particular views entertained are suggested and modified by the sentiments, and the heart must be in some degree influenced before the reason can be reached. It would be absolutely impossible to prove to David Hume the reality of any particular miracle, or to make the author of the *Vestiges of Civilization* acknowledge that there was nothing absurd in the idea of revelation. These are feats beyond the capacity of logic or demonstration to perform. All that can be expected, or should be desired in such cases, is to show that the arguments which sustain these objections, and harden the erroneous sentiments from which they spring, are themselves unreasonable and inconclusive. This is all that can be done or ought to be attempted in the first instance. This is sufficient to render ridiculous and repel the attacks made upon our creed; it relieves wavering and weak-minded believers from the uncertainties by which they might have been alarmed or overcome; and it defends religion from the aspersions thrown upon it by its assailants. If, however, this task is to be accomplished effectually, and with the hope of ultimately changing the opinions of the objectors themselves, it must be done by accepting their principles, their postulates, and their logic, by employing them more rigidly and cautiously, and extending their legitimate conclusions, beyond the circle to which they were originally confined, into those spheres which embrace those topics, which we seek not to prove but to render probable.

Analogy is not the sole, but the simplest, the most intelligible, and the most efficacious method of accomplishing this

design. It is necessary, however, to bear in mind that it can demonstrate no tenet, but can only render it reasonable and probable, and thus clear away the obstacles which impede the free growth and exercise of faith. Accepting the principles and the procedure of the opponents of Christianity, it employs these for the exhibition of the unreasonableness of their opposition, by showing that these same positions carried out to their natural results render belief more reasonable than unbelief. It eventuates in a balancing of contradictory probabilities; but as probability is assumed as the ground of rejection, it is sufficient to claim and justify the acceptance of religion, if a stronger probability of the same kind can be arrayed in its favor. Butler distinctly perceives that this is the true line of argument, and the only one which his plan, his method, and the nature of the subject will admit. He never dreams of accomplishing more than this, but by limiting his efforts rigidly to a moderate and legitimate aim, he achieves infinitely more than could have been attained by a more dogmatic and demonstrative attempt.

Analogy proceeds from that which is admitted and supposed to be certainly known, to that which is denied as being doubtful or unrecognised. Its sole principle is that a similarity of result is a certain indication of a similarity, if not of an identity of cause. This is of course an hypothesis; but the supposition is justified by the general current of events and by the daily observation of men. Analogy, however, proceeds a step further, and, if the cause of one series of events, its law, or its reason, is regarded as known, it infers that the particular cause, law, or reason of a corresponding series must be the same, or, at least, of the like character, and may therefore be concluded to be known also. This is a second stage of hypothesis: in the first instance the similarity of the law was supposed; in the second, this similarity is restricted to a known and particular law. The reasoning is legitimate only in those cases where a stricter procedure is inapplicable; and only then, if employed with the most sedate caution, restricted to indubitable analogies, and never

pressed beyond the establishment of a presumptive probability. So used, it is a valid and potent instrument for the defence and confirmation of religious truth; but otherwise, by pretending to accomplish too much, it fails to reach the object which is attainable, and betrays its cause into the hands of its adversaries. Bishop Butler maintains the difficult position of entire sobriety and moderation with singular dexterity; while most other writers who have employed the same method have grossly mistaken its limits and overlooked its imperfections. This is especially evident in the various writers who have dilated into ponderous volumes the narrow thesis of natural theology.

The whole argument of natural theology is derived from a very simple analogy. A single indubitable instance of a valid analogy proves its sole point; so far as this method is capable of affording any proof. The multiplication of doubtful or imperfect instances, in default of one which is indisputable, may increase the probabilities of the inference, or may overwhelm the mind by the multitudinous array of apparently independent testimonies, but cannot equal the evidence afforded by a solitary example of a strict analogy. Thus Butler's work is alone a stronger argument for religion than can be compressed out of all the other numerous treatises on natural theology. For natural theology, as ordinarily conceived and usually exhibited, attempts too much and overshoots its mark. It appears, or is presumed, to offer an adequate substitute for revelation; human reason being thus rendered co-ordinate with a divinely inspired faith, and revelation itself being consequently rendered unnecessary. So understood and so received, it tends to produce results, which justify the remark of an acute infidel, that natural theology is the beginning of atheism. Before him, indeed, the profound Kant had declared it impossible for natural theology to furnish any original proof, or any argument, other than corroborative, of the being of God, the doctrine of immortality, or the freedom of the will. And yet his own philosophy did dispense with the proof of these things from revelation, endeavouring to resolve them

into postulates *a priori* of the practical reason, whereas the Critique of that reason could legitimately establish merely the accordance of the revealed truths, on these topics, with the constitution of the human mind. Thus he himself, with all his acuteness, and perhaps in consequence of his acuteness, was partially and unconsciously betrayed into an error closely analogous to that which he exposed. There can, however, be no room for doubt, that if the conclusions of natural theology are accepted as any thing more than illustrations and confirmations of revelation, they are fatal to the recognition of the latter, by introducing a concurrent jurisdiction in a case, wherein, if reason suffice, revelation must be unnecessary; and if unnecessary, then false, as being employed without the urgency of any *dignus vindice nodus*.

It is remarkable, too, that natural theology was habitually employed by the ancient philosophers; and besides the tenets which they, in common with the moderns, supposed it to sustain, there were others, such as auguries and divinations, which it was equally considered by them to support. This is, of course, no objection if we consider the evidence which it affords to be merely presumptive and not demonstrative; but it is a fatal excess, if we adhere to the latter opinion. There is hardly anything added, in either form or cogency, by recent writers to the arguments of natural theology, as exhibited by Lucilius Balbus, the Stoic, in the Second Book of Cicero, *De natura Deorum*. In fact, we think, that in point of form, the ancients infinitely surpassed the modern speculators. The argument in favor of the existence of God, drawn from the constitution of nature, is laid down, according to the stoic philosophy, as beautifully and effectively as by any later authors. But that the argument does not of itself supply any conclusive proof of the existence of such a being, as we understand by God, is evinced by the fact that the stoic disputant proceeds to demonstrate from the same premises the divinity of the universe, the existence of an *anima mundi*, its wisdom, and its happiness.* Notwithstanding this

* Cic. De Nat. Deor. lib. II., c. V.-XV.

defect, which may be found in principle in the logic of the moderns, as well as in effect in that of the ancients, Lord Brougham was so much struck with the general superiority of the earlier manner of handling the subject, that he remarks: "Certainly we must allow that those old writers upon natural theology, in the place which they assigned to intellectual phenomena, pursued a more sound and consistent method of philosophising than the moderns have done when speculating upon the same subject."† Lord Brougham himself, however, falls into the common error of the majority of both ancients and moderns, when he asserts natural theology to be "strictly a branch of inductive philosophy."‡ He has neglected the distinction which Bacon draws between that loose induction from casual and isolated instances, which corresponds with analogy, and that multiplied induction from numerous and successive series of interdependent data, which constitutes the rigid process of science.

We have previously remarked, that the whole argument of natural theology springs from a simple analogy. That analogy is, by a happy instinct, made the corner-stone of Paley's popular work, stated in that syllogistic form, which most readily lends itself to apprehension and discussion, it assumes this shape :

Every design indicates a designer,
 Many of the phenomena of nature indicate design,
 Therefore, the phenomena of nature prove the existence of God.

Whoever is even slightly acquainted with logic, must perceive that this reasoning is fallacious, even if the conclusion be true ; which it is only in a partial and limited sense. It is not necessary to recur to the subtle speculations of Kant,§ in order to discover the invalidity of the procedure. This is apparent at first blush. The argument is in every respect defective. More than three terms must be introduced into the

† Disc. on Nat. Theology, p. 167.

‡ Disc. on Nat. Theol., Pt. I., sec. I., p. 22, and p. 27.

§ Crit. de la Raison Pure, No. II, ch. III, § VI—vol. II, p. 325-30.

scheme of proof in order to arrive at the conclusion. It concludes something not contemplated in the premises. The major premise is merely the equipoise of correlative or tautological terms; it contains neither *nota rei* nor *nota notæ* in it. It is merely the expansion of a verbal definition. The words, design and designer are, moreover, not merely correlative, but they are even co-ordinate terms: they signify the same thing, only under different aspects. Taking the act as the point of view, we speak of a design with an implied reference to a designer: taking the agent as the point of view, we speak of a designer with reference to a design: It is merely a logical evolution which is expressed by the first premise; a change of front; a logical see-saw—it is not a significant proposition, nor even a complete verbal definition.

But, reducing the argument to its legitimate three terms, it cannot be put into such a form that it will constitute a valid syllogism, without a limitation of its pretended range; nor can it be so expressed as to justify such a conclusion as that which is usually supposed to be attainable. Making the requisite alterations, it would assume this shape;

The adaptation of means to ends indicates an intelligent agent,
 The phenomena of nature indicate the adaptation of means to ends,
 Therefore, the phenomena of nature indicate an intelligent agent.

The major premise is still obnoxious to censure; but this is the largest conclusion that can be established, viz; that the world cannot be otherwise conceived, with a due regard to evidence, than as the production of an intelligent cause. The whole of natural theology is condensed into these few propositions; and the whole of its legitimate scope is embraced in this indefinite conclusion. And, observe, that indications only, and not assurances, constitute the essence of what is predicated; and that no particular cause is or can be specified by this argument. The determination of this most important point must be obtained by recurrence to other evidence than the visible wonders of creation. Man himself would be an intelligent cause, and as such, might be represented as the agent intimated.

But, as he is obviously incompetent to such a task, in the estimation of all civilized races, it may be properly concluded, that man is not the author of creation. As man, however, is the only intelligent agent of which we have material or sensuous experience, we may conclude that the phenomena around us must be attributed to some being of higher power and intelligence than man. Not one single step further can we logically proceed. If we attempt it, we stumble upon a fallacy, as is habitually done. We may accept the true doctrine as the result; but, if we do, we arrive at it, not *ex vi argumenti*, but, independently of the argument, in accordance with a belief previously present in the mind, derived from a different source. The soul of the world, the spirit of the universe, the plastic force of nature and other fictions of heathen philosophy, are intelligences transcending human reason, and have been accepted as the creative agencies, in obedience to the same logical fallacy, which tempts us to believe that the phenomena of nature alone demonstrate the being and the attributes of God. Indeed, the ancients exhibited the argument in a much neater and more measured form than most of the moderns. The indication of a superintending Providence; (we take occasion to remark, that this term Providence is not a Christian phrase, but peculiarly the invention of the Stoic philosophy;) the indication of such a Providence by the mysteries of nature, was exhibited hypothetically, contingently, and, therefore, only presumptively by them. If the works of nature are more perfect than those of art; and human art can effect nothing without intelligence; their nature cannot be held to be devoid of intelligence;* and again; is it possible that those things should be effected by nature without mind and reason, which not only require reason for their contrivance, but the highest stretch of human reason for their comprehension.† This is the modern argument of natural theology, only exhibited in a less exceptionable form. Yet, from these positions the Stoics concluded, not the existence of God, but

* Cic. De Nat. Deor. lib. II, c. xxxiv, § 87.

† Cic. De Nat. Deor. lib. II, c. xlv, § 115.

the existence of an intelligent *anima mundi*. This deduction was erroneous, but not more illogical than the customary inferences of the moderns. In fact, natural theology only leads the religious inquirer to that point where the necessity of belief begins to be urgently felt, and prepares him to receive from revelation that faith and gift of illumination which his own unaided efforts cannot attain. After the belief, however, is thus acquired, it again lends its aid to the inquiring mind, by guiding it through the miracles of creation, and pointing out to it the multitudinous and unexpected manifestations of the divine action and attributes, which are unperceived and unintelligible until science suffers herself to be led by the hand of divine faith. If we arrogate more than this to natural theology, in the first instance, we cannot hope to convince or to persuade the unbelieving, for they will see the fallacy of our arguments, which escapes our eyes because we confound the independent truth of our tenets with the logical sufficiency of our conclusion. If we claim for it a higher function, in the second instance, we impair or destroy the authority of revelation and the operation of faith by finding in the human reason a substitute for both.

As natural theology relies principally upon analogy for its arguments, what is said of the one is usually applicable to the other also, and the limitations of natural theology indicate the necessary restrictions of analogical reasoning in this branch of speculation.

We have urged this point in regard to the inability of analogy to furnish any other result than strong probable presumptions, and have handled it under many different aspects, and at various returns, because it is too often overlooked in the popular favor indiscriminately bestowed upon Bridgewater Treatises, new editions of Paley, and other works of that type; and, furthermore, because it is absolutely essential that it should be fully recognized and appreciated before Butler's great work can be properly comprehended, its peculiar excellence felt, or the true advantages to be derived from it adequately experienced. No apology is requisite for the prolix-

ity and apparent repetition which has attended this exposition ; but one may be needed to excuse the difficulties and obscurities which may have been left behind in our statement. The subject, however, is one which scarcely admits of popular discussion, and certainly tolerates no development capable of dispensing with the close attention and careful reflections of the reader. It is concerned with some of the nicest questions of logic and evidence ; and, at a time when the former is almost completely out of fashion and forgotten, and its terms discarded from general use so that we have been obliged to forego their assistance, it is not easy to adopt such a phraseology as shall be readily intelligible, without sacrificing matters of more essential consideration to the attainment of an easy perspicuity. Moreover, we are perfectly conscious that a large majority of well-meaning but weak-minded people ; pious, but not reflecting ; imagine that every objection to the reasoning by which any truth is supposed to be supported, is an objection to the truth itself. They cannot distinguish between the doctrine, and its alleged evidences ; and they hastily presume this to be an impossibility to every one else. We are no strangers to these risks ; but we encounter them without fear and without hesitation ; knowing that we are in the right so far, and that religion has much to gain from renouncing the fallacies and recognizing the flaws which may have crept unobserved into the logical processes of the popular theology ; and knowing that we render good service to humanity by calling public attention to them.

We shall conclude this dissertation by a few brief remarks upon the manner in which Bishop Butler has employed analogical reasoning in his work. We have frequently touched upon this point in the course of our previous observations, and have noted, on several occasions, the peculiar caution and dexterity of his procedure. Indeed, everything which we have said, besides being designed as an illustration of the general subject, bore a direct and intimate relation to Bishop Butler's treatise, and is calculated, we hope, to render its peculiar merits more perceptible. But we desire, in addition to this labor,

to inquire how far Bishop Butler's practice accords with the principles which have been propounded, both in order to form a definite estimate of the legitimacy of its reasoning, and also to confirm our position by any agreement therewith which we may be able to discover.

“The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature,” belongs of course to the category of natural theology; and, if our observations on the latter topic be just, they must be applicable to Bishop Butler's book. It is equally obvious from the context and the title of the treatise that the logical instrument principally relied upon by him is analogy, and consequently that our conclusions in regard to the character of this form of reasoning and its applicability to religious speculation may be used as a test in the examination of the work, and also receive illustration from it. Before we proceed further, however, we would note a singular, but uncensured fallacy, which is contained in the title and plan of the book. It is divided into two parts, in accordance with the objects indicated on the title-page, by its designation; the former of which is devoted to the discussion of the Analogy of Natural Religion to the Constitution and Course of Nature. But natural religion is that religion which is suggested and rendered probable to our minds by the observation of the constitution and course of nature. If, then, we substitute this definition in the title in place of the thing defined, the fallacy of the contemplated argument, so far, becomes at once apparent; for the subject proposed thus appears to be, the analogy of the religion suggested and rendered probable by the constitution and course of nature to the constitution and course of nature; that is to say, the agreement of the conclusion with that whereby it is concluded. Now, although there is no impropriety nor fallacy in testing the accuracy of the conclusion by an examination of the validity of the reasoning, this is simply a critical analysis, and is a very different thing from what was designed and attempted by Bishop Butler. It was his purpose to show the reasonableness of natural religion by showing its agreement with the indications of

nature ; to furnish thus a further and extrinsic evidence of its probable truth, not simply to estimate the sufficiency of the steps by which it had been originally settled. He is thus guilty of a gross *petitio principii*, for he endeavors to prove the truth of that which is already assumed, by the same line of argument which authorized its previous assumption. This, in our opinion, is the sole flaw in Butler's Analogy ; it is one, however, which renders his reasoning obscure and confused, so far as the main purpose is concerned, however luminous it may be in the exposition of details.

It is true that this fallacy does not prove to be as serious a defect as it might reasonably be expected to be, and the reason of this is plain. The error lies more in the form of the statement, and the outward scheme of the argument, than in the substance of the thought. If we renounce his particular mode of expression, and the slight obliquities of conception which it has inevitably occasioned, we shall discover that all that really is attempted ; (and that is achieved ;) is to prove the agreement or conformity of that body of religious doctrine, which is supposed to exist independently of revelation, and has been loosely termed natural religion, without any distinct reference to the source whence it was derived, with the general indications of a superintending Providence, and the rules of Providential action afforded by the constitution and course of nature.* The equivocation in the announcement, and partially in the development of the thesis, is a serious defect in the logical construction of the argument, and exposes a vulnerable side to the sophistry which it tempts and suggests. At the same time it renders the procedure less firm and more wavering, and the cogency of the reasoning less perceptible. Moreover as the great merit of the work, both as a philosophical production and as an apology for religion, whether spontaneous or revealed, consists in its logical sobriety and accuracy, and in its ordinarily careful restriction of

* See Butler's Analogy, *Introd.*, p. lv.-vi.

analogy within the narrow and definitely marked domain, to which it is legitimately appropriate, a mistake of this sort at the commencement, must detract from its merit, and infect, in some degree, its future developments. Still, if we can divest ourselves of the particular aspects of the case which are forced upon us by the author's expression, and confine our view to that which, although vaguely apprehended, constituted the nucleus of his thought, and ought to have been solely and explicitly his object, the fallacy indicated will be found to be only accidental and superficial, and to affect Butler's utterance much more than it does the natural development of the argument.

From this exposure of the solitary blemish which, in our estimation, disfigures the remarkable excellence of Bishop Butler's Analogy, we pass to the consideration of the manner in which analogical reasoning is employed by him. In the first place, he avoids the impudent tendency of most modern natural theologians, to expatiate exclusively or principally on the phenomena of physical nature, and recurs to the more correct practice of the ancients, approved by Lord Brougham, which devoted the chief attention to the analogies afforded by the moral and intellectual constitution of man. The analogies of external nature, especially when pursued into the minute and intricate details of scientific speculation, are striking, attractive, curious, but they are uncertain; and the more subtle and multiplied they be, the more obnoxious do they become to cavil or the prospect of refutation. At best they pass before the mind like a miraculous phantasmagoria, gratifying the intellect, stimulating the imagination to licentious and arbitrary anticipations, dissipating the attention, and enervating the thought. They rarely penetrate to the belief and feeling. The broad analogies, on the other hand, afforded by the constitution of man, commonplace as they appear to be, exercise a direct and immediate influence on his most profound convictions. As facts they are perfectly familiar; and this familiarity renders them both intelligible without effort, and undeniable without conscious violence to our own self-

consciousness. They thus operate at once and potently on the heart. Their simplicity and their axiomatic truth, moreover, prevent the attention from being withdrawn by any novelty from their obvious logical significance; the imagination is not unduly excited; but the calm reason and the sincere feeling are left to the undisturbed recognition and appreciation of their logical efficacy in suggesting and necessitating assent to the doctrines of religion. In the prosecution of this method, the conduct of Butler's reasoning is entitled to all praise, and is unrivalled by any other example. There is no impatience, no affected subtlety, no coercion of conclusions, no stretching of inferences beyond their due range; but from the common sentiments, and admitted axioms of men, and from the recognised laws or habitudes of natural procedure, he shows that all the probabilities of truth are on the side of religion, and adverse to infidelity. He shows, that, if the principles which we habitually observe in our ordinary judgments and daily actions are true; and so far as human reason is concerned they must be accepted as true, for they are universally adopted, and cannot be conceived otherwise than as true; he shows that if these principles are admitted to be true, then every presumption is in favour of religion and revelation. If even it were possible to deny the truth of these fundamental principles, it would avail nothing to the sceptics; because, on those principles they rely for the supposed validity of their objections to religion; and to deny them is to repudiate their own premises, and to leave themselves without any foothold for their opposition.

Neither in this case, nor in any other part of his work, does Bishop Butler assert that analogy furnishes any demonstration of religion, or that he demonstrates the truth of either religion in general or Christianity in particular. He is far from committing this fallacy, which is not as scrupulously avoided by his editor, the Bishop of Gloucester, or by the ordinary estimate of the work. The utmost that he ever pretends to have accomplished is, that analogy "in some few instances, perhaps, may amount to a real practical proof; in

others not so." The practical proof is the full extent of his largest aims; but practical proof is the reverse of logical demonstration; it is that proof which is sufficient for practice and justifies action, not such proof as establishes the conclusions of scientific speculation. It requires the assistance of faith, confidence, reliance, to generate belief; it does not compel belief as an intellectual necessity. This Bishop Butler fully perceives, for he adds to the remark quoted, the further observation, "yet in these it is a confirmation of what is proved otherwise."

The single point, which in its various phases and applications Butler intends to illustrate, is, that the objections which are brought against religion, natural or revealed, lie equally against every other tenet or belief of the human mind. If they are valid in the former case, they must be so in the latter, and consequently all argument, as all conviction or intelligent action must be, at once declared to be absurd or impossible. If, however, they are invalid in the latter case, they must be equally or more invalid in the former, because the arguments, principles and premises are analogous in both, and the analogies are more numerous and cogent in regard to every particular doctrine of religion, than with respect to any separate tenet of worldly prudence or scientific speculation. He endeavors to show, and succeeds in showing, that the harmony of the intelligible and natural universe is broken by the rejection of religion; and, consequently, that a gross practical and even logical fallacy is committed thereby. For the essential character of human reason requires, what the unity of truth appears also to demand, that the principles of speculation and belief should be of universal and not of partial application; that they should not be held as sometimes true and sometimes invalid, but either universally true or universally unreliable. The opponent of Christianity or natural religion is placed in a dilemma, from which the only escape offered is the complete renunciation of his opposition as

* Butler's Analogy, Introd., p. lv., compare conclusion, p. 287.

a thing ridiculous and untenable. For the analogies adduced, and the multitude which may be adduced, compel him either to admit that religion is probably and presumptively true, or that his own principles of reasoning are unstable and invalid. In either event he must perceive his own resistance to be unreasonable.

Much more is accomplished for the cause of religion and truth by confining the argument to the determination of this negative result, than could be achieved by any positive demonstration of theological doctrines, even if it were possible. For, by this procedure, the sceptic is left with the disposition and under the necessity of admitting reason and religion, if he is to believe or to reason at all; and at any rate, his polemics are shown to be impotent and inconsistent. But, supposing a demonstration of the tenets of faith practicable, it would defeat its own aim by accomplishing too much. For it would display revelation in the light of a superfluous assistance, unnecessarily granted; and would reduce religion to a mere intellectual scheme. In the former event, revelation could be accepted only by the superstitious, for its sole extrinsic probability lies in its urgent requirement: in the latter, religion would be lost in science, and furnish no ordeal for the sentiments, and the commandments of God, would be received, not in the spirit of obedience to divine authority, but as speculative truths discoverable by man for himself. Thence, in either case, the idea of divinity would be habitually excluded from our thoughts, and would soon be sublimated into a vain phantasm of the imagination. But, by the analogical procedure, and its due limitation to a merely probable or presumptive proof, these fatal consequences are avoided, the absurdities of unbelief exposed, and the minds of the indifferent, the doubting, or the denying, prepared for the admission of faith.

These results are obtained by Bishop Butler, in consequence of his steady observance of the moderation and restricted procedure which we have illustrated. His work, thus, is a most beautiful example of correctness, ingenuity, and perspicuity, in an exceedingly difficult and seductive mode of argumentation,

at the same time, that it affords a valid and unanswerable defence for Christianity against all ordinary objections, and especially against those particular attacks which were prevalent in the latter part of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century. Its great value consists in its being an irrefragable apology for religion, and a splendid exemplar of accurate, consistent, and valid analogical reasoning: it is not to be sought, as the editor of the American school edition has supposed, in any "comprehensive, logical, and scientific summary of the first truths of natural and revealed religion, and the evidences on which they are predicated." The work is by no means comprehensive, either in details or in mode of illustration; its force is due to its special character, and to the compact convergence of its positions towards a few points. It is not strictly logical, but dialectical, as has been previously intimated. It is the reverse of scientific; for it is practical, and aims at probable not demonstrative conclusions. It neither predicates the truth of religion, nor professes to supply logical evidences: it only proposes to refute objections by counter-probabilities of analogous kind, and to afford confirmations and illustrations of the tenets of faith.

That we have neither misrepresented Butler's design, nor the legitimate use of analogy, may be sufficiently indicated by a reference to his own language. Of analogy, he says, it is "a proof easily cavilled at, easily shown not to be demonstrative, for it is not offered as such; but impossible, I think, to be evaded or answered." He is guiltless of misapprehension on these important topics; but his readers and admirers are not all equally free from erroneous appreciation. In regard to the object and efficacy of the work, he remarks; "Hence, therefore, may be observed distinctly, what is the force of this treatise. It will be, to such as are convinced of religion, upon the proof arising out of the two last mentioned principles, (liberty and moral fitness,) an additional proof and a confirmation of it; to such as do not admit those principles, an original proof and a confirmation of that proof. Those who believe, will here find the scheme of Christianity cleared of objections,

and the evidence of it in a peculiar manner strengthened: those who do not believe, will at least be shown the absurdity of all attempts to prove Christianity false, the plain undoubted credibility of it, and, I hope, a good deal more.* And again, he sums up the general conclusion thus; "The whole then of religion is throughout credible;"† not demonstrated, or demonstratively certain; but worthy of belief. Its absolute truth, and the obligation to positive belief, rest upon other and paramount authority.

In these observations of Bishop Butler, there is only one expression which is ambiguous and requires explanation. He speaks of "an original proof," constituted by the course of his analogical reasoning. But in the context, as throughout the whole tenor of the treatise, he employs the word proof, unless where otherwise expressly indicated, in the sense of presumptive or probable proof; *id quod probatum est*, or *id per quod probatum est*, that which is approved or rendered probable, or that by which probability is attained.

It only remains for us to renew our caution, and deprecate the misapprehension of our criticism which would result from the common error of confounding objections to a particular line of argument with a doubt of the doctrine supposed to be established by that argument. And to render our position less open to question, suspicion, or cavil, we take advantage of the explicit declaration of Butler, who himself deemed it necessary to call attention to the fact, that "objections against a proof, and objections against what is said to be proved, * * * are different things."‡

That Butler's Analogy may continue to be studied with daily increasing assiduity and admiration is our sincere wish. But we hope it will be regarded in its true light, and not as a proof of things which it explicitly renounces all intention to prove. It is not a school book, nor a child's book, nor a book adapted for hasty reading and unreflecting popularity. As an

* Butler's Analogy, Part II, c. viii, p. 285-6.

† Butler's Analogy, Conclusion, p. 293.

‡ Butler's Analogy, Introd. p. lv.

exercise to the mind in one of the highest and most difficult branches of dialectics, it is invaluable; as a model of that analogical reasoning, which usually runs into absurdity, extravagance, and sophistry, it is unapproached by any other work; and as an apology for religion and for Christianity, it is worth much more, in our humble opinion, than every thing else which has been written in our language on the subject.

ART. V.

CHRIST IN HISTORY, *or the central power among men.* By Robert Turnbull, D. D., Boston; Philips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

By Rev. JOHN E. EDWARDS, Lynchburg, Va.

Dr. Turnbull is a Baptist minister, and enjoys a good reputation as an author and a preacher. He is an independent thinker, and what he writes is entitled to a respectful consideration. In the work before us, he has addressed himself to the discussion of a theme every way worthy of his abilities; and while he does not reach the full measure of result that we conceive to be attainable in this department of literature and research, we nevertheless regard the production as one of the best, if not the best that has appeared on the interesting subject which he discusses.

God in history, and Christ in history, have been glanced at by a long succession of writers. Not a few, eminent for their abilities and learning, have felt the need of some central point in history; something to reduce the chaotic mass of apparently unrelated details to a system. But the idea of history, as a unit or system, did not find embodiment in any work of reputation until the seventeenth century. Bossuet, in his *Universal History*, was the first to elucidate and apply this great thought. His work, however, is not regarded as thorough,

but rather as "a grand historical sketch intended for popular impression." His scope is too contracted. His papal standpoint did not allow him to take that comprehensive survey of the whole domain of human affairs, which was necessary to exhibit his subject in a coherent and philosophical form. "Still his work possesses the great merit of recognizing God in the affairs of men, and describing the succession of events with a grave eloquence."

It is a remarkable fact that a class of metaphysicians, who have been suspected, and not without cause, of a strong tendency to pantheistic infidelity, have recognized the divine element in history. John Baptist Vico, "who," as our author remarks, "united the brevity and obscurity of Heraclitus to the depth and force of Plato, maintains that the divine element underlies humanity, in all its phases, and may be recognized even in the superstitions of the heathen *cultus*." Fichte, Schelling, and Cousin, have all given distinct expression of a recognition of this element in history. To these we may add the names of Herder, F. W. Schlegel, and Bunsen, all of whom, from different points of survey, and with widely different purposes, give intimation of their full belief in the constant tendency of historical events to a fuller, and clearer manifestation of the perfections of God; and the last mentioned "distinctly recognizes the great truth of God in manifested form, and especially in Jesus Christ, as lying at the foundation of all religion and historical development." Jonathan Edwards' valuable work, bating its Calvinism, entitled "History of Redemption," is a partial view of the subject which our author elaborates in the volume under notice. Edwards restricts himself to the Bible, and to Bible history, and Christ is every where found in promise, type, symbol, and prophecy; but he does not apply his leading thought to the general course of human affairs, and historical events, so as to exhibit the hand of God everywhere pointing to Christ on the cross, and Christ on the throne of intercession.

It is a grand and beautiful conception to recognize the finger of God in the midst of the complicated, ever-varying, and

conflicting scenes of time, steadily pointing to Calvary. Starting with the sublime, creative fiat, that caused a universe to tremble into existence; walking among the stars that shine from afar; treading the new-made earth in its pre-Adamic state; gazing upon its immense forests, and curiously constructed animals; standing amid the fragrant flowers, and blushing beauties of Eden; or mournfully recounting its moments of innocency, as the footfall of its retiring occupants vibrates on the ear; or, gliding down the stream of time, and viewing the relics of empires; the broken fragments of proud monumental piles; the ruins of cities; the remains of altars and thrones, and the footprints of patriarchs, prophets, philosophers, and seers that mark the ever winding shore, and everywhere to trace the inscriptions, "look to the future;" "look to Calvary;" "look to the throne of intercession;" "look to the great white throne of the final judgment;" this is to see and acknowledge Christ in history. In the rise and downfall of nations; in the rush of armed legions, and the dying groans of slaughtered millions; in the elevation of rulers, and overthrow and extermination of mighty dynasties; in the stupendous overgrowth of colossal kingly power; in the dark shadowy form of idolatry; in the tormenting fears of a gross superstition; in the Proteus-like character of ancient philosophy; in the arts and sciences, and in all the various phases of human society, to recognize a central power, around which all revolve and take a symmetrical form, is to acknowledge Christ in history.

The author tells us that he has endeavored to conduct his investigations in the freest and most liberal manner, holding himself aloof, as much as possible, from unproved preconceptions, and that he has been less anxious "to favor or deny orthodoxy, heterodoxy, or, what Luther calls cacodoxy, than to establish simple truth." The implied pledges made to the reader, have been faithfully kept by the writer. He has studiously avoided any doctrinal views that would be likely to prove offensive to a person holding Protestantism in any of its commonly received creeds. The work comprehends a vast

range of matter ; and from a tangled skein of threads of diverse colors, he weaves a coronet of dazzling beauty, with which he decks the radiant brow of the crucified Son of God.

The plan of the work, in part, at least, is admirable. The first eight chapters are logically arranged, and constantly tends to a stronger and more striking development of the theme, "Christ in history." But there is a great deal of superfluous matter ; matter that does not immediately pertain to the subject in hand ; and it is not a little surprising that Dr. Turnbull, with his literary taste, logical skill, and polished style in the main, should have committed the blunder of introducing so much that is irrelevant to the prime object of the work. The work, with all its excellencies, is defective in several important regards, and the field is still open for something better in this department of theological literature. It is, however, a good book ; the style elevated and strong, and generally well sustained. It is also a highly suggestive work, which is always a most valuable quality in a written production. It is imbued with the spirit of our holy Christianity, and is truly evangelical. It is levelled with great force, in some parts, against the infidelity of Strauss, whose philosophical views embodied in his *Life of Jesus*, have been generally adopted by the sceptics of Europe, and by Theodore Parker and his adherents in this country. The views presented are liberal and broad, and the book amply repays perusal, which cannot be said of all the works that receive the commendation of the press in the present day ; but after all, we do not hesitate to say that it is not the work, on Christ in history that the times demand. It may prove to be the forerunner of such a work, for which it prepares the way.

The Dr. starts with the idea that "all things have their centres of life and motion, and that they belong to a single system." He discourses on this wise :

"Acting and interacting, moving, now this way, now that, all at last tend one way. The stars revolve around their suns, the suns themselves, with attendant planets, revolve around a

central orb. Unity and variety, as in a circle, with its star-like radii, the unity ever passing into variety, and the variety into unity, pervade the visible creation. Nothing is insulated, nothing irregular. One mysterious law comprehends and governs the whole. All proceed from, and gravitate to, one centre."

The views so felicitously expressed in the above quoted paragraph are as happily sustained by a striking induction of facts, patent on every hand, in the varied works of nature, and everywhere developed in the onward march of science and civilization. The largest masses of matter, and the smallest atoms, fibres, and crystals, as well as the endless variety of plants and animals, are all found organized around their centres. The rose unfolds itself with its delicately painted petals and leaves, from a vital root. The dew drop that reflects the cope of Heaven, is globed by the force of gravitation. "The bubble which floats in the sunbeam, the joy of childhood, obeys the same law; it is sphered like a star, and carries on its bosom all the splendors of the rainbow." The smallest grain of sand, is found, on examination to be formed on the strictest mathematical principles. The microscope reveals its crystalline character, with its lines, sides and angles. The same instrument applied to the tiny wing of an insect, shows us the delicate down arranged in perfect order, and growing like a grove of palms.

The author maintains that it is no less true in society than in nature, that there is a central power which constitutes its life. He says,

"Men may seem to be insulated as individuals, but they grow together; and not only so, but they intergrow. They are many, yet they are one, like the myriad globules of water that form the rushing stream. No two are alike, yet all are alike. They move apparently in different orbits, and yet they move together in a common orbit. One spiritual, all-pervading force, or aggregate of forces impels them in the same direction."

This force is religion; this centre of life and motion is God.

Around this point society revolves ; to this point society gravitates ; "at once centripetal and centrifugal." Our author remarks that, this characteristic of man, like the cerulean color of the ocean or atmosphere may not indeed be visible in detached fragments, but is always obvious in the whole. God and man are bound together by mysterious ties. Our origin and end are in God. Severed from him man floats adrift upon a dark and shoreless ocean, without a star or beacon fire to guide his course along the deep, and he only finds repose when he returns to this great centre of rest.

Great minds, in all ages of the world, have ever been wont "to feel after God." Thales, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Cicero, and Plutarch of the years before Christ, "stretched themselves towards the divine, like confined flowers, instinctively seeking the sun." And what we find to have been true of individuals is equally true of whole communities and nations. When St. Paul stood on Mar's Hill, and preached "Jesus, and the Resurrection," he found among the temples which sheltered the shrines of the thirty thousand deities of Athens, at least one altar 'to the unknown God.' This one altar, after all, was the central point of all the religion of Athens. But religion, in some of its forms, has ever been the central force of society, the keystone of States and empires. "It is the law which, a community carries, not in its government archives, but in its heart. * * * Its domain is invisible and all-comprehending, like the magnetic forces which pervade universal nature." So fully convinced of this fact, is our author that he says ;

"A true history of the world, especially of its civilization, its progress, or decay, would be a history of religion in its relations to society. This everywhere is the pervading and abiding power. This marks the degree of elevation and depression in all. As this rises, so rises society in prosperity and strength. As this falls, so falls society in barbarism and decay."

On this ground he maintains that God, in some manifested form, or organized belief, and especially in Jesus Christ, and

Christianity, to which Judaism was an introduction, is the centre of all history, past, present, and to come. So that those who would know Christ must know history, and those who would know history must know Christ. And this view, it will be remembered, has strong scriptural confirmation in one of St. Paul's epistles, where he says, "By him [that is Christ] *all things consist*;" (*συνεστηκεν*) literally, *stand together*; that is, *in Christ*, and *around him*, *all facts converge*.

The second and third chapters of this work the author devotes to the consideration of "Christ in ancient religion." He displays a good deal of information in this department of his subject, but he has failed to invest it with that charm and fascination which he throws around some of the other topics which he introduces. He rather supplies the reader with a "comprehensive sketch" of the history and general character of religion during the long dark night of idolatry and superstition that preceded the ushering in the Gospel day, than furnishes him with a view of Christ as a central principle in the idolatrous worship of the heathen nations. He shows, however, most clearly, that man must have a religion, and in the absence of the true religion, he invents "lords many, and gods many." The various nations that peopled the world before Christ came, are made to pass in review before us. The spectacle is full of melancholy interest. Some of the forms of idolatry and heathenish worship are solemn and imposing, but for the most part their religious rites and ceremonies are abhorrent and revolting. None of them have a particle of the true Christian element in them.

The master-minds, the world's great thinkers, who, in the darkness of heathenism,

"Saw the far off mountain tops of distant thoughts,
That men of common stature never saw,"

were often disgusted with the impurities and horrid rites of their religion, and longed and wished for something better; but they were not able to find a substitute that would answer as well. They therefore submitted to and even sustained their

systems, under the conviction that, bad as they were, they were better than none. The failure of idolatry or false religion to meet the desires and wishes of the immortal mind, prepared the way for the Redeemer. The experiment was made upon a large scale, and the result amounted to a demonstration that a religion without a Redeemer was defective and unsatisfying.

"Often," says our author, "the night was dark and portentous; but anon the everlasting stars were visible in the Heavens. * * * The sun had not yet risen, but lights were gleaming at distant intervals, relieving the terrible gloom of the long polar night, or heralding the dawn of the approaching day."

The subject of the fourth chapter is, "the central idea, or Christ in ancient philosophy." The author shows himself pretty well acquainted with the prevalent philosophical theories of the ancient world. But all the speculations of uninspired men only served to show that "the world by wisdom, knew not God." Philosophy gave no rest to the weary conscience of man, and left a cloud of impenetrable darkness hanging over the path of life. It, however, "nourished a few great characters, and produced a dim, and often passionate longing for a higher light." Some good men have gone so far as to speak of Socrates, Plato and Plutarch as a sort of Christians by anticipation. Erasmus was so charmed with the character of Socrates, that we find him on one occasion, exclaiming, *Sancte Socrates, ora pro nobis!* While it must be admitted that this was carrying the matter too far, as our author remarks, it must nevertheless be allowed, "that many of the Grecian sages, considering their circumstances, made some remarkable approximations to the central truths of the divine unity and supremacy, and the possibility, on the part of man, of union and fellowship with God." But after all, the most that ancient philosophy did accomplish was, to prepare the way for Christ.

Emerging from the intricacies and labyrinthian mazes of oriental philosophy, in which our author finds occasional

“flashes of light, and glimpses of beauty, radiant and eternal,” significantly pointing to Christ as their author and source of emanation, he turns to a more interesting view of his subject, namely, “the central race, or Christ among the Hebrews,” on which he discourses, through two whole chapters, with marked originality, beauty and force. It is really delightful to follow him as he unfolds his subject with increasing interest on every page.

He premises, as follows ;

“As in society at large we find a central power, in religion a central principle, and in philosophy a central idea, it may be presumed that, in the succession of human affairs, we shall find among the nations, in a more or less perfect form, a central or chosen people, whether named church, theocracy or kingdom of God.”

This chosen nation he finds in the Hebrew people. We find central communities in the matters of science, literature, refinement, and art, legislation and arms. Greece was the central nation of philosophy and art ; Rome of political power and civil law. From Plato sprang the speculative spirit ; from Homer that of poetry and song. As it is, then, according to the divine procedure, in the cases just enumerated, to convey temporal blessings from central points, may we not reasonably look for a similar procedure in relation to things spiritual ? This analogy we find in the selection of central families ; central individuals ; great lights in the world ; whose ministry and mission have been a blessing to all.

The Hebrew people were the centre of a pure religion for all ages. Every other nation had lost the knowledge of the true God. Their religion was corrupt and impure, and their worship in many instances demoralizing. The Jews had the knowledge of the true God, which was measurably lost to others ; they had committed to them the sacred oracles, and they preserved, from age to age, the great principles of religion. They were God’s chosen depositaries of the knowledge of himself, and by them this knowledge was to be perpetuated, and transmitted to others.

A Redeemer was promised to man at the time of Adam's expulsion from the Garden of Eden. God, at first, made individuals recipients of his truth and teachers of mankind, and thus transmitted through pious Seth, and Enoch, and Noah, the promise of a Saviour, till the period when the beautiful bow of hope, fringed the dark skirts of the retiring clouds, and spanned the turbid waters of the deluge. From Noah the truth was transmitted through individuals until Abraham commenced a new era in the history of mankind. God graciously condescended to enter into covenant engagements and relations with man. "The unity of God, the hope of a Messiah, the spirituality of the human soul, and the beauty of virtue are involved in this arrangement. Idolatry is checked. The dawn of a brighter day rises on the world." To Abraham it was promised that through him, the one eternal Jehovah should manifest himself to mankind, and bring them into a new and peculiar relation with himself. The promise was renewed to Isaac, and afterwards to Jacob, from whom, more directly, sprang the Hebrew nation. Of this nation our author observes ;

"First nurtured and disciplined in Canaan as a patriarchal family ; then in Egypt as a peculiar people ; then in the wilderness, for many years, as a wandering tribe ; then again in Canaan as a settled nation ; and finally, in all lands, as a sacred race ; and all for the purpose of maintaining and transmitting to mankind the knowledge of the true God ; one Almighty Redeemer ; one eternal life."

The Jews must ever be the wonder of the whole earth ! Among this peculiar people ; this central race, God raised up, at longer and shorter intervals, prophets, who stood on high moral elevations, and with inspired vision looked down the long lapse of ages till the end of time. These holy men of God, as they gave utterance to the sublime and awful visions that were spread before their prophetic gaze, spoke ever and anon of the "Shiloh," the "Redeemer," "the Wonderful Counselor," "the Mighty God," "the Prince of Peace," the "An-

cient of Days," the "Messiah," who was to make his appearance in the fulness of time, and bringing in an everlasting righteousness. The prophet Malachi, who stood nearer to the advent than any who had preceded him, and who saw the light breaking over the mountains, kindling upon the loftier summits, burnishing the departing clouds, and shooting far up the heavens, announced the coming Messiah as the "Sun of Righteousness."

God planted this people, at last, permanently in a geographical position favorable to the accomplishment of the end proposed in making them the depositaries of his truth. Says our author, "They were planted in a goodly land, in a singularly protected but fertile heritage among the mountains, with Asia on the one side, and Europe on the other, quite near to Egypt and Ethiopia, and not far from Greece and Rome; with rivers, roads, and seas around them, sufficient when the time came, to link them with the commercial, political and religious destiny of the world." This position was assigned to the Hebrews with especial reference to Christ. Everything in their history was looking towards Calvary. Amid all their corruptions and dispersions, the hope of the Messiah was the polar star of their history; their cloud by day, and their pillar of fire by night. "Among the hills of Canaan; on the banks of the sacred Nile; in the beautiful Damascus; by the ancient Euphrates, where they hung their harps on the willows; in Antioch and Jerusalem; in Babylon and Alexandria; in Corinth, and in Rome; wherever, indeed, they were scattered in later years, this was 'the consolation of Israel.'" They never lost the idea of the coming Messiah, who should set up an everlasting kingdom of righteousness and peace, which was to have dominion from sea to sea, and stretch out "from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof."

In the fulness of time the long expected Messiah came; but there was such a disparity between the lofty notes of the prophet's harp, that announced his coming, and his humble appearance when he came, that he was rejected by his own

people, and in the world which he made with his own arm of power, he had not a place to lay his head. As the Jews looked back through the long periods of their eventful history, and recalled their ancient rites and sacrifices, all of which were typical of Christ, and recurred to the solemn and sublime prophecies that foretold his advent and the glory that should follow; and passed in review the long cherished hopes of the nation as to his commanding person and kingly power, and then looked on the obscure, humble, portionless Nazarene that set up the claim to be their Messiah, and king of the Jews, they rejected his pretensions, and stigmatized him as an impostor.

The world had been gradually preparing during a period of four thousand years for the appearance of Jesus Christ. The history of nations and empires, in all their fortunes, was tending to this point. God used the Assyrians, the Persians, the Grecians, and the Romans, all, to prepare the way for the advent of Christ. By these nations, God strangely preserved the Jews in Palestine, with their inspired books, sacred places, and Messianic hopes, but by the same agencies he scattered them in Rome, Greece, Egypt, Arabia, Syria, Babylon, and even Judea, into which places, as says our author, "they carried their peculiar principles and expectations, so that great numbers of the heathen became their proselytes, and cherished in form, more or less perfect, their peculiar hopes."

The old dynasties were subdued, and Rome was every where dominant. The Grecian language, from a variety of causes, had become almost cosmopolitan. Thus the nations were brought together. Thus the streams of history were converging to some central issue. The splendid visions of Grecian polytheism had long been tarnished. Olympus was deserted. Magnificent temples, beautiful poetry, exquisite statuary remained, but all earnest worship was lost, and the world was anxiously looking for some great change. The time had come, and suddenly, "as the protrusion of a hand from the dark, or a flash of lightning at midnight," Christ was born into the world; born in an obscure place; in the

silence of night ; among strangers who cared nothing for the event ; in a condition of extreme poverty and lowliness. But while men were indifferent, the heavenly hosts gathered over the plains of Bethlehem, and shook the midnight air with their songs of triumph ; "Glory to God in the highest ; peace on earth, good will to man."

Our author after he reaches the advent of Christ, seems strangely enough to have forgotten his subject, "Christ in history ;" and through nearly two hundred pages, he throws together, without any striking logical connection, a large amount of matter, which might be dismissed from his book without materially impairing its value. He discourses, at a weary length, on the "discipline," and early training of Christ ; "the inauguration, or John the Baptist ;" on the "mythic theory ;" the "teachings of Christ ;" and "the miracles of Christ." In our estimation, these topics have comparatively little to do with his subject. The *Life of Christ*, by Neander, with all its faults and objectionable features, furnishes us with a more thoroughly digested and instructive discussion of most of these topics than we find in the work before us. One of the chapters, in this part of his book, the author published during the past year in the *Christian Review*, and had it remained there, the present work would have suffered nothing from its absence. But the Doctor seemed determined to swell out the dimensions of his book ; and departing from his original plan, he throws together a great deal of extraneous matter, which had better been used alone in his weekly lectures, or at most found their place in a *Quarterly Review*. Really, it is provoking to a reader, who is pursuing a subject, well arranged and ably discussed, to be interrupted by a break that occupies hundreds of pages. But it cannot be disguised, that the author loses his grasp upon his subject, and never fully gets hold of it again. The work is disjointed. One chapter of thirty pages might have comprised all that was essentially necessary to form the connection between the advent, and "Christ in the primitive church." It is however due to the author to say, that the latter part of his book is better than the middle.

The beginning is first rate; the middle is inferior, the latter part is better than the middle. It reminds one of a barrel of flour, or a hogshead of tobacco prepared for market with reference to an inspection at one end or the other, with the design of getting the whole off on the quality of that which first meets the eye. The faults on which we have dared to animadvert are inexcusable in an author of Dr. Turnbull's acknowledged ability. He is capable of vigorously prosecuting a subject in a close, connected and methodical manner, and is not the man whom the reading public will permit to write in a loose, fragmentary, and disconnected style, without complaint.

The sixteenth chapter takes up the subject with some vigor, and increase of interest. Here we have "Christ in the middle ages." Amid the darkness, ignorance, and corruptions of mediæval times, our author finds "cloisters of holy confessors, and faithful Christians, bound to God, and to one another by holy ties." Christ was not without witnesses in the most corrupt stages of the history of the Church. "The night," says the author, "so far as our common Christianity was concerned, seemed dark and portentous, but ever and anon the stars appeared in the peaceful Heavens. The love of God revealed in Christ as a sweet power, brooded over the troubled elements. Angels of mercy visited the earth, in the persons of self-denying men, and of devout and disinterested women. The river of life was hidden amid gloomy woods and precipices, but it kept its silent course, and in due time reappeared in the smiling landscape. There were Reformers before the Reformation, martyrs for the truth and freedom in the darkest days of bigotry and lust." We are presented with a long list of names of persons of extraordinary piety and devotion, who lived before the Reformation. They shine out most beautifully amid the gloom that surrounded them. From all the facts which are brought to light, the author concludes, that Christ was in the Church of the middle ages, as a regenerative power, and that from this source sprang the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

We next have "Christ in the Reformation." Luther was the principal agent in this work, but it was not Luther's reformation. Its latent or ultimate cause was Christ among men. The influences had been operating for a long time, which brought about the wonderful results that followed Luther's labors, in the sixteenth century. These influences had worked silently, and under the surface of things, but God was conducting all to the accomplishment of a certain result. Martin Luther was formed by God for the great work of the reformation. He preached Christ, and Christ was the element of power that accomplished such stupendous results. What a spectacle was that, when an obscure Dominican monk was seen rising up beneath the superincumbent mass, which had been gradually accumulating for more than a thousand years; and by the time he attracts the attention of the spectators to his robust form, he is seen laying hold on the ancient pillars of the Romish hierarchy, and bending himself to the effort, he calls upon his God for strength, and instantly the whole superstructure begins to heave and topple as if convulsed with the throes of a mighty earthquake; the Vatican nods to its fall, while the gray spires, and moss-covered towers and battlements of old cathedrals rock like reeds before the storm. The inmates of monasteries, and of Papal palaces tremble as if the day of doom were come, and fly as if their habitations had been smitten by an invisible hand. But amid the darkness and consternation a day dawns upon the world, which is never to be succeeded by a total night. Christ arose upon the world in the Reformation with increased power.

"If Christ was not in the Reformation," says our author, "Christ never was in the garden, or on the cross." "Christ was in it," he continues, "as a power of hope and transformation to many souls and many lands. It was as if the frosts of a long winter had dissolved, and quickening spring was breathing through the forests of Germany, and the mountains of Switzerland, and far off amid the plains of England, and the hills of Scotland. The waters of life, long pent up among frozen rocks, let loose by the breath of God, were rolling and

flashing under the deepening radiance. The wilderness and the solitary place were made glad, and the desert rejoiced and blossomed as the rose."

The work under review, closes with a chapter on "Christ in modern society." We have not the space to present the author's views at length; but he shows how Christianity is pressing all modern improvements and discoveries into its service, in furthering the cause of Christ in the world. He holds this language;

"All improvements in mechanics and the means of locomotion through the world aid the progress of Christianity. She goes forth over all seas and lands on tours of exploration, takes possession of favorable positions all along the lines of business and travel, plants her colonies and schools here, there, everywhere, and thus prepares herself, one of these days, to occupy the whole."

Christianity has become so closely and permanently identified with the two most powerful commercial nations upon the earth that she already commands an approach to all quarters of the globe. Civilization is everywhere on the advance, and wherever civilization advances, Christianity must advance. Speaking of the great influence and power of Great Britain and the United States, Dr. Turnbull says: "Everywhere they diffuse themselves and plant extensive colonies. Two thirds of all the roads and railways; and nearly the whole of the oceanic steam navigation of the world, at this moment, are in their hands. Their language, their influence, their usages, their ideas are becoming all but cosmopolitan. With the single exception of France, and even in her case to a very limited extent, Papal nations are planting no colonies, and exerting little influence beyond their own sphere, while all the Protestant nations, especially England and the United States, are taking possession, we trust for Christ, of some of the most interesting and influential portions of the globe." These are most striking and suggestive facts.

Commerce, especially, in the present day, is promising the happiest results to Christianity. It is overleaping all its an-

cient barriers, spreading over all seas and lands, and bringing all the nations of the whole earth into commercial brotherhood. The spread of the Saxon tongue, and Saxon literature is also tending to the same result. Wherever it goes it carries with it all the elements of social life which we hold dear, and all the precious truths of Protestant Christianity. The commerce of Great Britain and the United States, and the spread of the Saxon tongue, are to contribute immensely to the ultimate triumphs of the cross of Christ. Christ is in modern society. He is in all the great national movements of the day. He is preparing his way on the continent of Europe, and in distant China. Christ is everywhere. His footsteps are in Burmah, and the Polynesian isles as well as in Germany, England, and the United States. His benign presence is felt far away in Africa, in the plains of Australia, upon the bleak shores of Greenland, and amid the golden fields of the Pacific slopes, and the mountain wilds of South America. "Distant and dissimilar nations are calling to each other; China to Europe, and Europe to China; Burmah to America, and America to Burmah, in the common speech of Christianity."

Christ is in all past history, in all present history, and he will be in all future history. His cause is connected with all the movements of the age, and is more or less affected by them. His work goes on amid all the convulsions and changes that rock ancient and long established kingdoms to their deeply imbedded foundations. His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and of his dominion there shall be no end. When the nations of this earth, with their splendid cities and monumental piles, shall have faded away, Christ shall still reign "King of kings and Lord of lords." Millions of ages hence, when the earth shall only be remembered as the pedestal of the cross, Christ shall be had in everlasting remembrance.

ART. VI.

A THEODICY: or vindication of the divine glory, as manifested in the constitution and government of the moral world. By Albert Taylor Bledsoe, Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy in the University of Mississippi.*

By Rev. J. S. R. CLARKE, Hampton, Va.

This heading of the following review constitutes the title page of a book bearing the imprint of Carlton and Phillips, the present publishers for the Methodist Book Concern, New York, 200 Mulberry street. 1853. If this book be a fair specimen of what these publishers do, they are certainly a credit to the concern and to the city in which it is located.

The inside of a book is not the only part of it which may or may not be a manifestation of good sense and good taste. The outside of a publication, as well as its contents, may then well come in for a share of praise or blame when the reviewer addresses himself to his task. We have nothing but what is commendatory to say of the publishers' performance in this instance. This is in every respect a highly creditable piece of work. The book is bound on the back and corners with the best Turkey morocco, on the sides with strong and handsome muslin, and within with enameled and variegated paper. The printing is done with type of beautiful size, and on fine substantial paper, leaving sufficient space between the lines, and giving ample margin, which affords the thinking reader verge enough for any reasonable amount of marginal notes. In a word, we have no present recollection of seeing a job from any book establishment in this country which was in so many respects so much in accordance with our taste.

*The present article will be estimated by its own merits. Great fundamental inquiries deserve a rigid investigation. The reader will recall our commendatory notice of the "Theodicy" in our last issue.—EDITOR.

After this brief notice of the publishers and their work, we proceed to pay our respects to the author and his work, which for the present is our chief concern. The title page, it is evident at once, is redolent with promise, and kindles the imagination with the pleasing expectation of a satisfactory fulfillment. The same remark is equally true of his elaborate introduction. In this he discusses most extensively the possibility of a theodicy. We agree with him in regard to its possibility, and think he has said some very good things upon the subject, but dispensing with this for the present, we set down to direct communion with the body of the work.

Our author divides his work into two parts. The first discusses the proposition, "The existence of moral evil or sin consistent with the holiness of God;" and the second, "The existence of natural evil or suffering consistent with the goodness of God." We confess we feel our expectation somewhat damped, and the wing of our imagination droops. Goodness or holiness (the former, in our opinion, includes the latter) is not the only divine attribute which must be vindicated in a proper theodicy. We think it necessary, in such a work, that God's power and wisdom, and even his very existence and freedom, should also receive a due share of attention. But it would not be difficult here to show, that instead of vindicating the divine power, he appears to assail it by making many things too hard for it. The reader will see this further on in our review. He has much to say in vindication of human freedom or the free will of man, and not a word in vindication of the divine freedom or free will of the divine Being, and all this in a theodicy, as it is called. The reader will see, too, that he entertains views on free will, which would make it a delicate matter for him to discourse much about the free will of the divine Being, in whose "image" we are made. Moreover these propositions, embracing as they do all that the author intends to lay before his reader, promise nothing with regard to the divine existence and the divine wisdom, which certainly need vindication against the atheist and deist. The page of contents, then,

badly accords with the title page. However, let us not despond so soon. Let us open the book and commence with the first chapter of part the first.

Our author begins the task, which he has assigned himself, with the following statements: "The doctrine of necessity has been, in all ages of the world, the stronghold of the atheist," and "is the mighty instrument with which the unbeliever seeks to strip man of all accountability, and to destroy our faith and confidence in God by tracing up the existence of all moral evil to his agency." This is seemingly somewhat contradictory. The doctrine of necessity, in its widest atheistic sense, does indeed seek to strip man of all accountability, by teaching us to have no faith in God, that is, in his existence, but it does not seek to destroy our confidence in God by tracing up the existence of all moral evil to his agency, who according to it, has no existence. The author unwittingly here anticipates a distinction in point of title among the different schemes of necessity, which he afterward makes, and fixes the eye of his mind upon the one which, not the atheist, but a certain class of divines, have projected and advocated. "It will not be denied," he further states, "that this opinion;" the necessity of the divines still; "*seems at first view* to be inconsistent with the free agency and accountability of man, and that *it appears* to impair our idea of God by staining it with impurity. *Hence* it has been *used* by the profligate and profane to excuse men for their crimes. It is against *this use* of the doctrine that we intend to direct the force of our argument." Let any candid reader look over these quotations and carefully consider the italicized portions, and he will perceive that they indicate very considerable affiliation with those divines who advocate the opinion of necessity. Indeed so strong is this indication, that if he had said nothing more than is contained in these quotations, we should have been inclined to the opinion that he would, were he to develop his views more fully, make an effort at doing away what he regards a seeming opposition between

the doctrine of necessity and the free agency and accountability of man.

By no means would we dream, that he would think of taking position by the side of Butler, from whom he quotes. However, let us hear him: "Can we refute the argument against the accountability of man, without attacking the doctrine in which it is founded?" How reluctantly he seems to approach an issue, which he would, if he could well avoid. Nevertheless, we shall, after awhile, find him eager enough in the fray. "If we can meet this argument at all, it must be either by showing that no such consequence flows from the scheme of necessity, or by showing that the scheme itself is false." Yes, one or the other of these issues is unavoidable. Without doing one of these things, there is no chance for the free agency and accountability of man, or even we would add, for the free agency of the Divine Being! Without showing one or the other of these positions, we cannot see that there is any propriety at all, in talking about the origin of evil. It must have been without origin from all eternity, and consequently neither God nor man is to blame for it. But we must not forget, that our author is still anticipating a distinction, which he makes hereafter, and unconsciously betrays a pre-determination to do a very partial work by directing much more attention to man than God, even while naming his work a theodicy. "After long and patient meditation on the subject, we have been forced to the conclusion, that the only way to repel the argument of the sceptic, and cause the intrinsic lustre of man's free agency to appear, is to unravel and refute the doctrine of necessity." Excusing this conceit, we agree with him that it is absolutely necessary to "unravel and refute the doctrine of necessity," in order to a true theodicy. But let not the reader be mistaken by these bold words. He does not intend to make as thorough work of it as he seems to indicate. He intends to "unravel and refute the doctrine of necessity," only so far as the Calvinistic divines hold it; only so far as to make man culpable in the origin of evil, and not far enough to give us a complete vindication of God and his government.

This will become evident to the reader by the following quotations. After having distinguished the schemes of the necessitarians, and divided them into three, he says: "Widely as these schemes may differ in other respects," (and widely enough do they differ in other respects,) "they have one feature in common," (which is even trivial compared with other features,) "they all seem to bear with equal stringency on the human will, and deprive it of that freedom, which is now conceded to be indispensable to render men accountable for their actions." We have now, by quotations and remarks, laid before the reader the design of our author and the plan by which he hoped to effect it. His design, in the title page, is to vindicate God and his entire moral government, which, in the beginning of the first chapter, he reduces to the design of showing the freedom of the human will, and consequent chargeableness of the origin of evil in this world upon man, without seeming to be aware that proving man's guilt, does not by any means disprove the possibility of God's being a *particeps criminis*, or exculpate the Divine Being in regard to moral evil as it elsewhere exists.

In view of the above statement, which we deem to be just, we bring the following charges against the first part of this book, which part only, we now undertake to review. It fails even in design to give us a theodicy proper, that is, a comprehensive and thorough vindication of the existence and character of God, as the Creator, Revealer and Governor of the moral and material universe, as it comes under man's observation, against all schemes of necessity, atheism, deism, and pantheism. Even after its design is reduced to demonstrating the freedom of the human will and the consequent inculpation of man in the origin of moral evil among men, it is encumbered, in its execution, with a supererogatory effort, and much irrelevant matter. Instead of giving us even a partial theodicy, it shrinks to the very small dimensions of an ineffectual attempt to extol what has been variously called Finneyism, New Divinity, &c. It unnecessarily attempts and signally fails to explode the atheistic argument of Bayle and

others. It has not, as it should have done, even in accomplishing its limited design, assailed and overthrown the theory of causation upon which all schemes of necessity are based, thus setting aside even the semblance of a necessity for an effort at improving the categories of Cousin.

The first of these charges scarcely needs anything in the way of remark to sustain it. It is only necessary to read the first three or four pages, to satisfy any one of its truth. If anything more is needed, let our reader turn to the first section of the first chapter, headed; "The attempts of Calvin and Luther to reconcile the scheme of necessity with the responsibility of man." This heading is a misnomer; for, according to the author's own confession, Calvin attempted to make out no such reconciliation and made light of the attempts of those who did. This remark, however, is rather aside from the object of this paragraph. In the section thus headed the author divides the schemes of necessity into three, and then remarks; "The first we shall call materialistic fatalism; the second stoical fatalism; and the third we shall designate by the term necessity." He passes by the first two without the slightest discussion, except as they are very slightly, to the extent of the freedom of the human will, involved in the third. The necessity of the divines, then, and of the divines only, receives his attention through the rest of his work. Beside looking in the grim faces of ancient materialistic and stoical fatalism, he has nothing to say about modern atheism, like that of Hume, or modern deism, like that of Herbert, or modern pantheism, like that of Spinoza. Thus to shirk the difficulties presented in these systems, standing opposed as they are to God and his government, is to make theodicy a comparatively easy work.

The second charge is, that the execution of his design is encumbered with an unnecessary effort, and much irrelevant matter. It was not at all necessary for our author to attempt to show that the advocates of the third scheme of necessity vainly endeavored to reconcile it with the responsibility of man. This effort is evidently superfluous. No-

thing more was necessary than that he should assail this scheme of necessity, in his own way, and whether its advocates had successfully or unsuccessfully endeavored to reconcile these unreconcilable matters, should have been to him matter of no consequence. If he should prove successful in overturning their scheme, they and their success or failure in reconciling it with man's responsibility, could in no way affect his result. The most he could have been justifiable in doing in any notice of these necessitarians would have been to give a brief statement of the principle upon which they all unite in making out their reconciliation, and of the reason why he considered it unsatisfactory. Instead of this, he has enlarged the first part of his book by one third of its present size with irrelevant matter in endeavoring to make good a very unnecessary position. Moreover, he has even brought in Hume and Comte to show how they reconcile these two things, when, in fact, their atheistic position makes them deny man's responsibility altogether, and upon quite other grounds than that of necessity; upon the ground there is no God, no moral governor of the universe, before whose bar he can be accountable. We might bring up other instances of irrelevancy from other portions of this work, but this we regard as quite sufficient.

The third charge is, that our author allows the partial theodicy, which he ultimately contemplated, to degenerate, in fact, into a vindication of New Divinity. This will incidentally become manifest in the examination we purpose to give to our fourth charge. There is no doubt that he himself occasionally has misgivings that he deals more with theology than theodicy.

We have given but brief space to the charges above discussed; barely enough to suggest what we conceive to be the defects of the book under review in these regards; and in view of the necessarily limited extent of an article of this kind, and the more elaborate treatment we design to give those which remain, we could not do more. In discussing the fourth charge it will be our endeavor to pursue a method which may

enable us to effect several incidental purposes, besides the main one, such as slight intimations with regard to some characteristics of our author as a writer, as a metaphysician, as a logician and as a divine.

We would direct the attention of the reader to part 1st, chap. VI. and section 5th of the book before us, which section the author rather rashly heads; "The sophism of the Atheist exploded." He here replies to the argument of Bayle and other atheists, which as forcibly stated by Cudworth, reads thus: "The supposed Deity and Maker of the world was either willing to abolish all evils, but not able; or he was able and not willing; or else lastly, he was both able and willing. This latter is the only thing that answers fully to the notion of a God. Now that the supposed Creator of all things was not thus both able and willing to abolish all evils, is plain, because then there would have been no evil at all left. Wherefore, since there is such a deluge of evils overflowing all, it must needs be that either he was willing, and not able to remove them, and then he was impotent; or else he was able and not willing, and then he was envious; or lastly, he was neither able nor willing, and then he was both impotent and envious." Now Leibnitz laid his finger upon and pointed out the fallacy of this argument. He did so by showing clearly, that the atheist leaves out of his account the divine wisdom, and assumes that there is no other attribute of the divine nature concerned in this matter than His power or goodness.

In order to make the argument of the atheist good, he should have successfully impeached the infinite wisdom of God as displayed in the entire order of existing things. But this is a task too much for any finite intelligence. Leibnitz's showing of this fallacy ruined the atheistic argument and rendered it quite unnecessary for our author to trouble himself about it. He read the reply of Leibnitz, did appreciate its force, considered it unsatisfactory and straightway went and hung himself upon one of the horns of the atheistic dilemma.

What a melancholy suicide and for what small cause! Nevertheless, it is even a fact as, we think, will presently appear.

Our author begins his reply to the atheist with this sentence: "Supposing God to possess perfect holiness, he would certainly prevent all moral evil, says the atheist, unless his power were limited." This manner of re-stating the atheistic position amounts to a selection of that horn of the dilemma in the atheistic argument, which involves God's omnipotence. The author then virtually pledges himself, in this selection, to show that the prevention of moral evil, in the universe, was a task too much for omnipotence itself. That which he here implies, he, in the next sentence, obviously declares, which amounts to the same thing as saying, God did not prevent all moral evil, because he could not. Further on, he tells us, that the omnipotence of God could not prevent moral evil because it is not an object of power, which is the same thing as to say, he could not because he could not. Of course that which we cannot do, is not an object of our power, and it is equally a matter of course, that that which God cannot do, is not an object of His power; but the very fact that anything is not an object of our power, convinces us of the limited action of our power, and, therefore, we should as readily conclude, that if anything is not the object of the Divine power, it proves the limitation of the Divine power. This seems very much like admitting, aye, even proving, rather than refuting, the atheistic argument. Our author felt that this position had this appearance, and, therefore, attempts to show that it is more of a paradox than an absurdity. He does this by attempting to show the truth of another either paradoxical or absurd position, namely, that some things are impossible of performance, is no limitation of omnipotence. "This inference is drawn from a false premise, namely, that if God is omnipotent, he could easily prevent moral evil, and cause virtue to exist without any mixture of vice." If there is any force at all in the word "easily," as our author here employs

it, we infer he must think there are some things which God can easily do, some things which he can do with difficulty, and some things which he cannot do at all. Now, this looks with somewhat of an air of patronage, or at least toleration, upon some form, of fatalism. We do not accuse our author of being aware of this, but such, it seems to us, is the fact. Some of the ancient fatalists thought there were some things in the material world too hard for the Divine power, and our author thinks there are some things in the immaterial world too hard for it. Now, if the doctrine of the former can be, with any justice, called materialistic fatalism, why may not that of our author be, with equal justice, called immaterialistic fatalism? Beside this, we further complain of this sentence, that it very illogically calls that an "inference from a false premise," which is in fact no inference at all, but is an assumption, and, we might add, a justifiable assumption, in the major premise of the atheistic argument. To show what we say to be true, we will give this argument a syllogistic statement. If God be both omnipotent and holy, He can and will prevent all moral evil; but he does not prevent all moral evil; therefore, either He cannot prevent all moral evil, and for that reason, is not omnipotent; or will not prevent it, and for that reason is not holy. In this syllogism it is evident that the word *can* in the major premise assumes that omnipotence is sufficient to prevent all moral evil. Our author accepts the first alternate in the conclusion of this syllogism and rejects the second, and, therefore, quarrels with the first, and concedes the second assumption, in its major premise. This is, we think, what he does. It is simply a logical blunder in our author to call this assumption of this major premise, namely, that there is nothing impossible to omnipotence, an inference from a false premise. This, however, is a matter of but little importance, since we clearly understand his position; namely, there are some things which omnipotence cannot do. "This assumption has been incautiously conceded to the atheist, by his opponent, and hence his argument has not been clearly and fully refuted. Our author is right here, in calling it

an assumption, instead of an inference from a false premise, (as before he called it;) which latter phrase is a logical impropriety, as it implies that an inference or conclusion may be drawn from a single premise. This assumption, then, is, that God can, by his omnipotence, prevent all moral evil. Now, we cannot agree with our author in saying that Leibnitz, for instance, has incautiously conceded this assumption, but, we think, as there was wisdom in Leibnitz's not assailing it, there is weakness manifested in our author's indiscreetly calling it in question. But admitting, for the present, that our author has planted his dart in the heel of this argument, its really vulnerable part, the negation of this assumption and a clear showing that such negation could be nothing derogatory from the Divine omnipotence, would have been all that, in any logical propriety, could have been demanded. This would have been to send the argument back to the atheist to be either mended, by proving his assumption, or acknowledged as refuted by the exposure of its fallacy. He is too chivalrous or too rash for such merely defensive policy. He is not content with denying this assumption and justifying himself in this negation. He must undertake to show, to use his own phraseology, that omnipotence itself cannot "cause virtue to exist without any mixture of vice;" or, as he afterward expresses himself, "cause virtue to exist in the breast of a moral agent." If this negation be an indiscretion, this attempt at proving his antagonistic position, must be madness. Like a certain knight of a celebrated fiction, he is unwilling to stay at home and defend himself against imaginary assaults of imaginary foes, but in a spirit of eagerness for chivalrous renown, becomes errant, and goes abroad seeking adventures; while his imagination leads him not only to assail that for a fallacy, which is, in fact no fallacy at all, but to build a castle with airy materials, on an airy foundation. He lays down the plan of his procedure thus: "To refute this argument with perfect clearness, it is necessary to show two things: first that it is no limitation of the Divine omnipotence to say that it cannot work contradictions; and secondly, that if God should

cause virtue to exist in the heart of a moral agent, he would work a contradiction." This statement of the author's process in refutation of the atheistic argument, seems to us imperfect and obscure, which, in fact, may be said of all that precedes and succeeds it. We think he would have made his purpose and plan of procedure more evident, had he expressed himself as follows; To refute this argument, it is necessary to disprove its assumption; namely, that omnipotence can prevent all moral evil; and to disprove this assumption it is necessary to prove it contradictory, namely, that omnipotence cannot prevent all moral evil. In proving this negation, "it is necessary to show two things: first that it is no limitation of the Divine omnipotence that it cannot work contradictions; and secondly, that if God should cause virtue to exist in the heart of a moral agent, he would work a contradiction."

He begins his next paragraph thus: "In the first place, then, it is not a limitation of the Divine omnipotence to say that it cannot work contradictions." We would move two amendments to this resolution; to the first of which, we are sure, the author can have no objection when it is suggested, as it will relieve his proposition from being a very decidedly apparent triviality. We propose that it read; it is no limitation of Divine omnipotence, that it cannot work contradictions. The reader, and the author too, must at once see that this is a very different proposition, and much more worthy of serious attention. Certainly nothing we can "say" can limit Divine omnipotence. Our second amendment is, that the whole proposition be changed thus; it is no impeachment of God's omnipotence, that in the exercise of his infinite wisdom he will not work contradictions. Our author will not accept this amendment, or rather substitute. This would be to abandon the whole ground of his reply, as he has stated it, and to take position with Leibnitz in his reply, which he has already pronounced unsatisfactory. We will not, therefore, further urge it, at present. "There will be little difficulty in establishing this point. Indeed it will be readily conceded; and if we offer a few remarks upon it, it is only that we may

leave nothing dark and obscure behind us, even to those whose minds are not accustomed to such speculations." Little difficulty! Readily conceded! If this be true, why should our author trouble himself with trying to prove it? Had he not better pass on to his second proposition? Now by attempting to "show" a thing so "readily conceded," as he imagines this will be, he brings himself under the same condemnation, which he heaped, in his fourth chapter, upon Descartes, Edwards and others. "Ask a child, did you make yourself? and the child will answer, No. Propound the same question to the roving savage, or the man of mere common sense, and he will answer, No. Appeal to the universal reason of man, and the emphatic No, will come up from its profoundest depths. But your redoubtable logicians are not satisfied to rely on such testimony alone: they dare not build on such a foundation, unless it be first secured and rendered firm by the syllogistic process. I know 'I did not make myself,' says Descartes, 'for if I had made myself, I should have given myself every perfection!'" Now this argument in true syllogistic form, stands thus: If I had made myself, I should have endowed myself with every perfection; I am not endowed with every perfection; therefore I did not make myself. Surely, after so clear a process of reasoning, no one can possibly doubt the proposition that Descartes did not make himself! In the same way we might show that he did not make his own logic: for if he had made his own logic, he would have endowed it with every possible perfection; but it is not endowed with every possible perfection; and therefore he did not make it." Now notwithstanding the turbid quality of his eloquence, in this quotation, the author is, with no little show of justice, quite keenly, and even facetiously sarcastic. In a grave logical treatise, or what should be such, upon a very grave and great subject, there can be no propriety in introducing such a strain of reflection. However sprightly it may seem, it is after all inappropriate. The author cannot complain, then, if we remind him of this literary peccadillo by turning the edge of his sarcasm against himself. He him-

self becomes, in turn, one of the "redoubtable logicians," of whom he speaks, when he undertakes to show the truth of a proposition, which he considers so very evident as to be "readily conceded." Again he says: "Surely, if any thing can equal the fatuity of the hypothesis that nonentity can bring forth, or that a thing can produce itself, it is a serious attempt to refute it. How often while poring over the works of necessitarians are we lost in amazement at the logical mania which seems to have seized them, and which in its impetuous efforts to settle and determine every thing by reasoning, leaves reason itself neither time nor opportunity to contemplate the nature of things themselves, or listen to its own most authoritative and irreversible mandates." Good: But does not some of this same "logical mania" seem to seize our author in his attempt to show what he says will be "readily conceded?" We do not see that, in this respect, he is any better than those whom he so severely censures. With all the simplicity and earnestness imaginable, he attempts to justify his "logical mania." He says, "if we offer a few remarks upon it;" his "readily conceded proposition;" it is only that we may leave nothing dark and obscure behind us, even to those whose minds are not accustomed to such speculations." Now, in the first place, he should not admit, as he does in this justification, that what he had declared will be "readily conceded" could be at all "dark and obscure," even to ordinary discernment. He should remember his appeal to the child, the savage, and the man of common sense against Descartes. In the next place, we think, the same justification will do equally well for Descartes, Edwards and others, whom he condemns for doing precisely the same thing, according to his own admission, which he himself here promises to do. Lastly, when one undertakes to write a great treatise upon so elevated and difficult a theme as a theodicy, it is manifestly a great literary impropriety to discuss it, as if for those "whose minds are not accustomed to such speculations." When he selected his theme, from the inevitable nature of the case, he, at the same time, selected the "fit audience though few,"

and should have carefully kept that audience alone perpetually before the eye of his mind. It takes a very great man indeed ; one of the " aloë blossoms of humanity," as they have been very beautifully called ; one in whom great metaphysical and logical qualities are harmoniously blended with common sense in the rarest degree, to know well, and at all times, what he is doing in the ethereal regions of thought ; and even such an one will make some blunders, which must be charitably regarded.

" As contradictions are impossible in themselves, so to say that God could perform them would not be to magnify his power, but to expose our own absurdity." Contradictions impossible in themselves ! The same may be said of every thing outside of the universe of mind. It is mind and mind only that is capable of any thing in itself. The human mind is capable of contradictions, and sometimes performs them, which arises from a misdirection of its power through its deficiency in wisdom. Certainly to say that God cannot perform contradictions, is not to magnify his power, but to exhibit our rashness in making an assertion, the force of which we do not understand. To say that he will not perform contradictions, is to magnify his wisdom without impeaching, or seeming to impeach his omnipotence. But our author will not adopt this view. This would be to give up his plan of assault upon the atheist. This would no longer be to make it a question of mere power, which he so much insists upon doing. We prefer to make it a question of wisdom as well as of power, as did Leibnitz, and say that God cannot perform contradictions consistently with his wisdom. This would be, not to limit his power, but its performances or displays. " When we affirm that omnipotence cannot cause a thing to be and not to be at one and the same time, or cannot make two and two equal to five, we do not set limits to it, we simply declare that such things are not the objects of power." A very unwise declaration certainly ! You not only say they are not, but if you still make it a question of power merely, you say the arm of His power is too short to reach them. They are not objects of power,

we allow, not because they cannot be, for finite intelligence is not competent to decide what infinite power cannot do, but because infinite wisdom has decided they shall not be. In saying they are not, because they cannot be objects of infinite power, you certainly do set limits to omnipotence, and thereby teach a sort of immaterialistic fatalism, which seems to us to abridge the divine freedom. But when we say they are not, because infinite wisdom has decided once and forever they shall not be objects of power, we do not limit omnipotence, but its voluntary displays. This, however, is to make it a question of wisdom, as well as of power, which does not suit the purpose of our author. He rather impeaches the divine power, and then strives to persuade himself that he does not, and all this, that he may make valid his objection to the atheistic argument. There is wanting in his treatise a clear notion of either power or wisdom or the relation of the one to the other in the divine character. Further that God has unchangeably determined that these things shall not be, and in keeping with this unalterable determination has so constituted the human mind that it cannot conceive of them as possible, are perhaps, as much as any finite intelligence should dare to assert upon such a subject. It seems to us to be most vain and presumptuous, in such a dweller in dust as man, to think or assert any thing more upon subjects so infinitely beyond the grasp of his feeble intellect.

Our author lacks, we think, the reverence and modesty of a profound and devout philosopher. "A circle cannot be made to possess the properties of a square, nor a square the properties of a circle. Infinite power cannot confer the properties of the one of these figures upon the other, not because it is less than infinite power, but because it is not within the nature or province or dominion of power to perform such things, to embody such inherent and immutable absurdities in an actual existence." What an air of competency to judge and decide where an archangel might tremble to be pryingly curious! It is true that the human mind cannot conceive of these things

being done, but does it *follow* from this that infinite power cannot do them, if infinite wisdom should determine upon such things? Or does it follow that the small light of human intelligence is sufficient to illumine a subject so vast, and enable man to set "metes and bounds" about omnipotence? Our author seems very unaware with what a short line he is determining the dimensions of immensity. He very coolly talks about impossibilities to infinite power and determines what omnipotence can and what it cannot do, as if it were a steam engine, whose force he had thoroughly calculated and fully understood. However, admitting, for the moment, that these things as he affirms, (and he ought to know certainly,) cannot be done by the power of God, it will not follow as he further declares, that they do not limit it. They prove the contrary, for a power that is all powerful, which is the meaning of omnipotence, must have all things for its objects. That power outside of whose possible range of operation there lies any class of objects whatever, cannot be omnipotent. The moment any degree of power, even though it be regarded as absolute or infinite, meets with an impossibility of any kind, it seems to us, in that impossibility it meets with a limitation and finds itself to be less than absolute or infinite. Let not our author suppose that because God does not and will not do such things, that his omnipotence finds impossibilities in them, and, therefore cannot do them.

"In regard to the doing of such things, or rather of such absurd and inconceivable nothings, omnipotence itself possesses no advantage over weakness." How he talks about omnipotence, as if he understood all about it, and comprehended the whole range of its possibilities! How astonishing the assertion, that omnipotence is in any respect whatever on a level with weakness, having "no advantage over it!" If we were a weeping philosopher, we should undoubtedly shed tears here; and if we were a laughing philosopher, this sentence, with the two preceding it, would afford us sufficient mirth. "Power from its very nature and essence is confined to the accomplishment of such things as are possible, or im-

ply no contradiction." We are inclined to the opinion that our author's ideas of the "nature," or "essence" of power, or possibility, are not very distinct, or he would not thus write. It seems to us that power is the exact measure of possibility. If the power be finite, things are possible to it which come within its degree of operation, and there may be much lying outside which to it is impossible. If it be infinite, it exceeds all degrees, takes in all objects real or imaginary, and finds nothing but what is possible to it. But it does not follow that it must do whatever is possible to it, as our author seems to imply. Impossibility and contradiction seem with him to be commensurate terms. Does he not know that men not unfrequently perpetrate contradictions? A contradiction, therefore, is not necessarily an impossibility. The contradictions of men spring from their deficiency in wisdom, by which their power becomes misguided. Infinite power being always guided by infinite wisdom will not, not that it cannot perform contradictions. Our author cannot see that this is a question of wisdom as well as of power. Power, that is, finite power, must be "confined," that is limited by something; but how does the word "confined" comport with infinite power, which from its limitless extent, to say nothing about its "nature" and "essence," is beyond all bounds? Man's power, that is, finite power, must meet with innumerable impossibilities, which are not even contradictions, such as building or destroying worlds, but that infinite power can meet with an impossibility even in a contradiction, is not for man's finite capacity of thought to decide or assert. We can conceive how it would be unwise, as we have before said, (but not how it could be impossible,) for infinite power to perform a contradiction. In like manner we can conceive how it would be inconsistent with infinite goodness for infinite power to do any thing wrong or cruel, but not how it would be impossible for omnipotence, *per se*, to do any thing, however absurd or wrong or cruel. Infinite power can do any thing, but will not do every thing, while it sustains the relations it does in the divine character. This view of om-

nipotence does not limit it, it only limits its displays or manifestations. It is certainly very bold and rash in our author so unqualifiedly and repeatedly to assert that omnipotence cannot do this or that, it matters not what it may be. When and where did he learn so fully to comprehend omnipotence as to make such confident assertions? His assertions do not merely declare the displays of omnipotence to be limited, but they, in fact, amount to its utter negation. Were such limitations, as his words of necessity imply, really true, God could not be a God all-powerful.

It may, however, be proper to say, that it would be unwise or wicked to do this or that, or that infinite power cannot do certain things consistently with infinite power or goodness. This would not, as we have before declared, suit the purpose of our author. It would not harmonize with his plan of attack upon the atheistic argument. "Hence it is beyond the reach of almighty power itself to break up and confound the immutable foundations of reason and truth." If what we have already said in reply to previous assertions be true, there can be no logical force in this "hence." This sentence is but another objectionable assertion like those we have examined before it. Because of God's infinite wisdom by which his infinite power is guided in its displays, and not limited in its extent, he will not break up the foundations of reason and truth, which he has immutably established. "God possesses no such miserable power, no such horribly distorted attribute, no such inconceivably monstrous imperfection and deformity of nature, as will enable him to embody absurdities and contradictions in actual existence." What a specimen of bathos we have here! How eagerly would Dean Swift or Pope have clutched it and given it a place in their art of sinking! What a prodigious effort it must have cost our author to produce it! Now all this comes of his not discerning any difference between what infinite power does do, and can do, and will do. We hope he will allow us to assure him, that though these things are not too much, or too hard for infinite power, *per se*, yet as long as it is associated with

infinite wisdom and goodness in all its movements, there can be no danger that it will "embody absurdities and contradictions in actual existence." However, we suppose this assurance will not be very acceptable to our author, as he seems so very averse to recognise this matter in any degree a question of wisdom. "It is one of the chief excellencies and glories of the divine nature that its infinite power works within a sphere of light and love, without the least tendency to break over the sacred bounds of eternal truth into the outer darkness of chaotic night." In this sentence our author seems to have some gleam of the real fallacy of the atheistic argument and of the validity of Leibnitz's reply. For what does the term "light," which he here employs, signify, if it be not a figurative term for wisdom. Does he not then make it a question of wisdom as well as of power, and does he not thereby surrender the position with which he begins, the intention of fortifying and defending? Is it possible that he was wholly unconscious that in this sentence he has actually given up what he has been contending for throughout this paragraph? Whether he was or was not thus conscious, he has certainly confessed to the indefensibility of his position.

We have now passed through this paragraph, in which our author endeavors to show his first position. We have met with nothing like proof in it. We have found a great variety of phraseology variously, though uniformly, repeating the same dogmatism, namely, that there are certain things, which infinite power cannot do, and which, nevertheless, are not limitations to it; all the presented illustrative instances of which, are, in fact, merely what infinite power does not do, and, as long as it is combined with infinite wisdom in the divine character, will not do. But the reader, upon a little reflection, must see that because infinite power does not and will not do certain things, it must not, therefore, follow it cannot do them. This is a manifest *non sequitur*. There are two points in this position which he attempts to show; namely, first, that there are certain things which omnipotence cannot do, and se-

condly, that the fact that it cannot do these things, does not render it any the less powerful, neither of which has he shown or can he show to be true, and both of which, we think, we have shown to be false. Not only has he failed in his proofs, but he has unconsciously, though not for that reason the less certainly, given up the whole position in asserting that infinite power "works in a sphere of light and love without the slightest tendency to break over the sacred bounds of eternal truth into the outer darkness of chaotic night;" which chaotic night, we suppose, must be a region of impossibilities and contradictions. What is this but another and figurative way of saying, that infinite power cannot consistently with infinite wisdom and goodness do certain things? His first position thus falling into ruins, his second, which was dependent upon it, most inevitably shares the same fate. This whole reply to the atheistic argument is, then, nothing more than a ruinous failure.

So far as the mere refutation of our author's reply to this argument is concerned, we have already said enough. Other and incidental purposes, however, which we indicated in the beginning, as part of our method of criticism, make it necessary for us to follow our author through the showing of his second position. He says; "This conducts to our second position; namely, that if God should cause virtue to exist in the breast of a moral agent, He would work a contradiction." This proposition would be more precise and clear were it to read; The constitution of a virtuous moral agent in, or subsequent to, the act of his creation, is a contradiction, just as a square circle is a contradiction. This statement is truly and substantially our author's second position, and, we think, a clearer and more forcible expression of it. What does our author here mean by the terms "virtue" and "moral agent?" Would it not have been more philosophic in him to give us analyses of these things into their elements that we might be able to see what he considers their characteristics? How else can we know whether he is true or false in his assertion, that a combination of these two things in an act of creation, or

their union in an act subsequent to the creation of the moral agent, is really a contradiction? Without these steps, how else, than obscurely, can we expect him to treat this position? However, without, at present, investigating his notions of moral agency and virtue, we may assert that his position implies that there is such incompatibility between moral agency and virtue, that there is no more congruity between them than there is between the properties of the square and the circle, and consequently, that the union of the two first by an act of God would be as much of a contradiction as the union of the last two. And, yet, our author thinks that though God has not enough power to combine these incongruous things, and so perform a contradiction, the moral agent himself can, by an act, or series of acts, effect this contradiction. Is not this marvelously strange! Again, we have seen, in the anxiety with which he has sought to establish the freedom of the will, that he must regard it as a characteristic, aye, the chief characteristic, if not the only characteristic of a moral agent. That the freedom of the will, is an indispensable element of moral agency, we, with all cheerfulness, concede. Now in order that the combination of virtue with this chief characteristic of moral agency, in the act of creation, should be a contradiction, it is necessary that virtue should be something, whatever that something may be, which is, in its very nature, incompatible with free will. If, then, the original combination of these things, in an act of creation, is a contradiction on the score of their incompatibility, (and there is no other ground for such contradiction that we can see,) then the moral agent who may, after his creation and by his own voluntary efforts, attain virtue, must, in that attainment, effectually extinguish his free will, the chief and indispensable element of moral agency, and thereby destroy his moral agency, or himself as a moral agent. The moment he becomes virtuous, he is no longer a moral agent, because from the incompatibility of virtue with free will he must either lose his free will, or become a living contradiction or impossibility. A virtuous moral agent must be a contradiction or im-

possibility, then, whether he become such by extraneous power in creation, or by intrinsic power in attainment. Again, if there be such incompatibility between free will and virtue that they cannot meet, in creation or attainment, without constituting such a contradiction or impossibility as is a square circle, we cannot see that they could, by any possibility, co-exist in the divine character from all eternity. For, in this case, they would constitute a contradiction or impossibility whose existence would be from everlasting to everlasting. We are forced, then, if our author's second position be true, to take one or the other of the following alternatives; either the divine will is not free and fatalism is true, or the divine character is not holy, and then the atheistic argument is true.

We see not how our author is to avoid these inevitable instances of *reductio ad absurdum*, no matter what explanation he may give of his views of moral agency and virtue. Again, if moral agency and virtue be not, in their natures, so incompatible that their combination in a virtuous moral agent, must necessarily constitute a contradiction, then a moral agent may attain to virtue without extinguishing the freedom of his will, and, therefore, because virtue and free will are not incompatible, a virtuous moral agent by attainment is a possibility and no contradiction. But if the absence of incompatibility between virtue and free will be the ground on which a virtuous moral agent by attainment, is a possibility and no contradiction, on the same ground, a virtuous moral agent by creation, is a possibility and no contradiction. Again, if virtue be something subjective with regard to the nature of a virtuous moral agent, as our author seems to indicate by the words "cause virtue to exist in the breast of a moral agent," and virtue and free will be not in themselves incompatible, we see not why God should not "cause virtue to exist in the breast of a moral agent," at any time subsequent to his creation, provided it be not done contrary to, and in violation of, the freedom of his will. If he did it in disregard and violation of his free will, which a God of infinite wisdom as well as power never will do, he would indeed either destroy the

will of the moral agent or else work a contradiction. But this is not the only alternative. For, in the case of a fallen and vicious moral agent, God may, by the influence of truth on his understanding and of his spirit on the conscience, awaken him to a sense of the necessity of virtue or holiness to his happiness, without disturbing the freedom of his will in the least; for he will be still free to yield or withhold his consent to God's endowing him with a moral quality so indispensable to his well-being. If in this case, the vicious moral agent in the unfettered exercise of his free will, rejects the proffered blessing, God does but leave him to a gloomy moral progression in working out his utter ruin. If, on the contrary, seeing in the light of divine truth, and feeling under the influence of God's good spirit, its necessity to his happiness, he freely yields the consent of his will to be blessed of the Spirit he goes on in a happy progression through successive attainments in virtue or holiness precisely correspondent with the successive consenting acts of his free will. As in this moral progress of the moral agent, from vice to virtue, there is nothing done on the part of God in violation of his free will, therefore, there is no contradiction or impossibility in God's thus causing "virtue to exist in the breast of a moral agent." Thus by five arguments, the first three indirect, and the last two direct in their process, we think, we have clearly disproved our author's second position.

But we invite the attention of the reader to a still further consideration of this proposition. As to the natures of the two things, moral agency and virtue, so far as our author's subsequent remarks betray, we think, he must be a decided new divinity divine. If we are true in this judgment of him here we meet with that idol of the theatre, the light of whose glory, the creation of his own too vivid imagination, has, like a will-with-the-wisp, led him such a dance through the misty mazes of his second position. He takes for granted the truth of a whole system of divinity, whose peculiar tenets are disputable and controverted, and bases the showing of his second position upon certain ones of them, any proof

of which he does not offer. These assumed and disputed points, should be firmly and indisputably settled before his reply to the atheist can be entitled to the least confidence. One of his assumptions, we think, may be thus stated: A moral agent is a being whose nature is such by creation and by endowment with free will, that he is, as he comes from the hand of his maker, neither virtuous nor vicious, neither holy nor unholy, but quite capable, in the exercise of his free will, of electing to be and becoming either. He is, therefore, from his very nature, at first, characterless. He may, by his own energy, rise to virtue by electing to obey and actually obeying the moral law under which he is placed; or fall into vice by electing to disobey and actually disobeying such law, (in regard to which he possesses, in the beginning, no moral affinity or aversion which would incline him or disincline him to its obedience,) and thus attain to the possession of a character either good or evil. It follows, then, that a moral agent *per se*, is a kind of *tertium quid* between a virtuous and a vicious moral agent. In the first place, if this hypothesis be true, it must be a fact of consciousness clearly sustainable by a sound psychology. But no moral agent among men, at least, can be found, who will be so bold as to assert that it is clearly within his recollection, and therefore, an indubitable fact of his consciousness, that he has known a period in his history when he was neither virtuous nor vicious, when he felt no desire to obey or disobey, and did not obey or disobey any of the requirements of moral law in his feelings and their indulgences, much less will all men, capable of investigating the phenomena of consciousness, unite in such a declaration. This hypothesis, then, being no fact of consciousness, and not fairly inferable from any well known facts of consciousness, is but a wild speculation, into which our author has been betrayed, by an overweening desire to sustain a favorite system of divinity. We further object to it on the ground of its inherent difficulties. We cannot see why this hypothesis should be resorted to, unless our author thought, that if the moral agent

were created virtuous or vicious, his virtuous or vicious moral disposition must, of necessity, exert such an influence over the will, as forever to continue him virtuous or vicious, so that being virtuous he could not fall, and being vicious he could not rise. If he were created virtuous, his virtue must necessitate his will, and thereby prevent his endowment with free will; and, therefore, our author thinks that God could not in the creation of such a being, "cause virtue to exist in his breast." In the first place, if the nature of virtue be such that being imparted in the act and moment of creation, it must necessitate the will and destroy its freedom, can its nature and tendency be different in the moment and act of its attainment by the voluntary effort of the moral agent? If it be different in the tendency of its nature in these two different circumstances of its origin within the moral agent, upon what ground of common sense, (which is now allowed to be authority in philosophy,) can any one affirm, that in the two circumstances it is really the same thing, and, therefore, entitled to the same appellation? If in both instances it be the same thing, and in the first instance, necessitates the will and destroys its freedom, must it not be followed by the same consequences in the second instance? How, then, can there be such a thing as a virtuous moral agent, by voluntary attainment, any more than by creation? The moment the moral agent, by voluntary effort, becomes virtuous, must not his virtue, from its very nature and inevitable influence, necessitate his will and extinguish its freedom? Again, we presume that this hypothesis, can be no more justifiable in implying the necessitating tendency of virtue than of vice, and, therefore, if the former necessitates in one direction, the latter must necessitate in the opposite direction. The moment, then, that a moral agent by his voluntary election becomes vicious, his vicious condition must necessitate his will and destroy its freedom. If this be not the tendency and result of a vicious condition of the nature of a moral agent, then, while a virtuous moral agent must be necessitated, a vicious moral agent may be free, which is a hitherto undreamed of advantage of a vicious over a vir-

tuous moral agent. Again, if both virtue and vice be necessitating in their influence upon the will, as this hypothesis seems to imply, then, there is such an impassable gulf between them, that a moral agent once becoming virtuous can never afterward become vicious, or once becoming vicious can never afterward become virtuous. For in the moment he passes from this characterless, this *tertium quid* condition, and thereby becomes either virtuous or vicious, the freedom of the will is at once extinguished, and he can never afterward elect to become other than what he may be. Again, if, as we think, this hypothesis necessarily implies, both virtue and vice be necessitating in their influence upon the will, and consequently destructive of its freedom, a moral agent can be free only while he is a moral agent *per se*, and nothing more. There can be but a moment, as it were, through whose brief duration he can be free. As soon as he takes a step and makes any moral progress, either in an upward or downward career, either in virtue or vice, the freedom of his will is gone, and in that instant he becomes as mere a machine as any scheme of necessity can make him. Is this difference between the necessitarians and our author, worth contending for? How transient and trivial a thing, according to this hypothesis, is the free will of a moral agent! However, if our author had only proved this hypothesis, we would not have said a word against it. This he neither does nor attempts to do. He assumes its truth through all his reply to the atheist. Moreover, this hypothesis involves a heterodox tenet or two in theology. It implies a denial of the doctrine of original sin, as orthodox writers have chosen to denominate it. For, if we are born depraved or vicious, this depraved or vicious condition which we bring into the world with us, must have its necessitating influence upon our wills. Therefore, when we are born, we are without free will, and then are beings of necessity, mere machines as the schemes of necessity teach, or we are born without depravity, an inherent vicious condition of the soul, and then we are not tainted with original sin, as orthodoxy teaches. But our author's hypothesis implies that we are made, in the beginning of our

being, moral agents, and therefore free, and as there is no other alternative, he must take the heterodox position, and deny original sin. Is not this the position of the new divinity divines? As a necessary consequence, do they not still further deny the renewing influence of the Holy Ghost upon the moral nature of man to be anything more than merely *suasive* in restoring him from the fall.

What is virtue or holiness according to our author, who uses these terms interchangeably? He does not any where tell us with satisfactory distinctness. We are left to infer it from the general tenor or incidental indications of his remarks which seem, with no little dubiousness, to look sometimes in one direction and sometimes in another. We shall not here so infer it as to give it that clearness of statement, which our author has so carefully, perhaps we may say, so adroitly avoided. We shall endeavor to treat this point, by a series of suppositions and remarks such as may insure an answer to his views, whatever they may be, even at the risk of involving ourselves, as we fear we have already done, to some extent, in some repetition. Is virtue, in the opinion of our author, something innately subjective, or subjectively attainable, or wholly an objective possibility realized in outward acts, with regard to a moral agent? It cannot be the first. This would be wholly inconsistent with his second position, as he himself has stated it, and with the hypothesis of moral agency which we have now noticed as implied, as we think, in the statement of that position. This hypothesis framed for the purpose of avoiding the necessitating influence of virtue upon the will, and of securing its freedom, and consequently the moral agent's accountability, supposes virtue to be anything but innate, or contemporaneous with the moral agent's origin. Innate virtue, or virtue contemporaneous with the very framing of the moral agent's constitution, must then be denied as something unfriendly to the freedom of his will. It may be and perhaps is the second. If it be the second, in what department of man's nature, when voluntarily attained, does it locate itself? Does it become a condition of the sensibilities? We presume it

can be nothing else. If so, are the sensibilities *per se* active or passive, or do they become active in the attainment of virtue? The latter is more consonant with our author's hypothesis of moral agency. The attainment of virtue then (virtue being an active principle which imparts its own activity to the moral agent attaining it, which is an absurdity,) must be the acquisition of a second and independent principle of activity, or causative force, within the virtuous moral agent, which must be inconsistent with, and unfriendly to, free will, that sovereignty in man and all moral agents, so that the moment the moral agent becomes virtuous his free will or sovereignty is destroyed by another causative force or sovereignty exerting itself, as it were, within the same territory, even the nature of the moral agent. Therefore, it becomes necessary to deny virtue altogether to the moral agent in order to save his free will. If, however, the sensibilities, *per se*, that is whether in a virtuous or vicious condition, or neither, possess this principle of activity or causative force, the sensibilities, *per se*, must be as inconsistent with, and as unfriendly to free will, as any virtuous or vicious condition of them can be; and, therefore, to make the will of the moral agent truly free it must be equally necessary to divest him of this entire endowment of his nature. Moreover, if the sensibilities be invested with this principle of activity or causative force, we see not why we may not regard the intellect as in like manner invested, which will drive us to a similar and even worse conclusion in order to save the free will of the moral agent; namely, that there must be two principles of activity or causative force independent of each other and of the will, and antagonistic to each other and to the will, that true sovereignty of a moral agent. Who is prepared to accept such a psychology as this? Would it not drive us to the absurd conceit, that a moral agent, to whom free will is indispensable, cannot, in fact be a moral agent while encumbered with either intellect or sensibilities; that to be truly a moral agent he must be a mere free will, and, therefore, man is and is not a moral agent

at one and the same time, which is a contradiction not very unlike a circular square.

But suppose we conclude that the sensibilities are not active, but passive, (and this is the reason why they have been so long called passions,) that they do not act, but are merely acted upon, and that the activity or power of the will so permeates and acts upon them as to suppress or excite, or modify, or regulate them, (and who is not conscious of this?) then there can be no psychological ground to fear that any condition of the sensibilities whether virtuous, or vicious, or *per se*, can necessarily interfere with or destroy free will. Therefore, whether virtue be a production of the divine power within the moral agent, in the act of creation, or by the same power subsequently, and with his free consent, in an act of sanctification, or a voluntary attainment of the moral agent, it can never be inconsistent with, or opposed to, free will, and consequently our author's hypothetical moral agency and his whole metaphysical and theological system are quite unnecessary to secure the freedom of the will. Can virtue, according to our author, be an objective possibility, realized only in the acts of the moral agent? The preceding supposition, whose consideration we have just finished, seems to us more sustained by the general tenor of our author's remarks, in this reply to the atheist. Nevertheless, these remarks are not without some show of favor toward the last mentioned supposition, especially in the following sentence: "This," that is virtue, "consists, not in the possession of moral powers, but in the proper and obedient exercise of those powers." We have no further remark to make upon this quotation, at present, than that it makes virtue nothing more than obedience without reference to any precedent moral condition even suggestively or suavisely, influencing him to an act or course of obedience, and therefore, with regard to him must be a thing wholly objective. Now, although we have said that the preceding supposition, is more favored by the tenor of our author's remarks, this, we think, comes very near to a distinct enunciation in this quotation ;

and beside, if we mistake not, is more consonant with the system of New Divinity, of which we consider our author an advocate. Upon the whole, then, appearances are very nearly balanced against each other as to which of these views of virtue he really entertains. If, in his estimation, it be this outward objective something we call obedience, we cannot see but there would be as much difficulty in causing it "to exist in the breast of a moral agent" by intrinsic agency, that is, the voluntary power of the moral agent, as by extraneous agency, that is, the power of God. The difficulty in the one case, would be the same and as much involve a contradiction, as in the other. Indeed, if this be his notion of virtue or holiness, all that he says upon the subject amounts to an obscure way of saying what, when cleared of its obscurity and reduced to some simplicity and directness of expression, may, perhaps, be thus stated; Virtue is objective with regard to the moral agent and consists, not in any internal moral condition disposing to obedience, but in an external act or course of acts conforming to moral law, that is, it is obedience itself. Now why adopt this view of virtue unless our author be operated upon by a dread, which we have before intimated he must feel, that if virtue be subjective it will endanger and even destroy the freedom of the will. This view of it harmonizes with the view of moral agency which we have ascribed to him, as well as with the whole system of New Divinity. Now if, we are not mistaken, we have shown that there is no necessity for resorting to this objective view of virtue, and therefore, on this ground, we are opposed to it. Again, it not only makes virtue to consist in obedience merely or conformity to moral law in external acts, but it denies all predisposing moral condition of the moral agent, whether the effect of extraneous or intrinsic power, in inclining him to this virtue or obedience, and thereby denies all moral character to the moral agent giving rise to reputation, on which his fellows may rely in estimating his moral worth and in governing their conduct towards him. Again, this view of virtue or holiness implies that character is, in fact, nothing more than reputation, in

like manner as Brown considered that cause or power was nothing more than immediate, invariable antecedence, and that the instinctive belief of all men in something back of man's acts, and consisting in a more or less endowed, developed, trained and established condition of the sensibilities and intellect, which may truly be denominated character, is an unreal, deceptive and unphilosophic reliance upon a fiction of men's imaginations, not unlike the common reliance upon what Brown regarded as the subtle fiction, the generally received notion of cause, a mere chimera of the imagination. This sweeping implication denying all true character to men is as reasonable, not at all less so, as the denial of moral character, or what may be truly considered such, so decidedly implied in this hypothetic virtue we have under consideration. For, if there be no certain moral condition of the sensibilities inducing, though not compelling, the moral agent to certain acts of compliance with the requirements of moral law, (which moral condition of the sensibilities is in fact the moral character of the moral agent, and which acts of compliance constantly occurring are the manifestations of his character, upon which men, whether they rightly or wrongly comprehend them, instinctively rely as evidence of his moral character); then, no acts or want of acts of men, however constantly manifest, whether in the production of what is useful, just, beautiful, good or true, can be manifestations of character, whether intellectual or moral; that is, of certain well established conditions of endowment, development and discipline of the intellect and sensibilities of the agent. The difficulty which induces this conclusion with regard to the moral sensibilities and their adjustment into any degree or kind of permanent condition by endowment or education so as to constitute subjective character, which may lead to anything like consistent and continued manifestations of itself in the acts of outward life, is as great with regard to the other sensibilities of the agent and even his intellectual susceptibilities; namely, the conceit that their influence upon the will must of necessity be compulsory. But as no condition of these passive departments of the nature of a moral agent,

constituting character in its broadest sense, can exert such a compulsory influence upon the will, so no condition of the moral sensibilities, constituting virtue or holiness or moral character, can be any difficulty in the way of free will in moral agency. Finally, if our author had, in the first place, disproved the subjectivity of virtue, and in the second, clearly shown that it is the objectivity, obedience, instead of assuming, as he seems to do, the falsehood of the first and the truth of the last, even then we should not be prepared to concede or approve of his assertion, that God could not make that which is objective, subjective. We think it would better comport with finite intelligence and our imperfect comprehension of omnipotence to say, that having in his infinite wisdom, made it objective, God will not capriciously and inconsistently, as it would seem to us, make it subjective, any more than having determined the respective properties of the square and circle, He will transfer the one to the other. This, however, as we have repeatedly reminded the reader, would be far from sustaining our author's first position, so very necessary to the validity of his reply to the atheist.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

ART. VII.

BRIEF REVIEWS.

We open our quarterly report of the recent additions to American literature with the announcement of, at least, imposing titles. As these titles are designed to herald the works which bear them, they indicate the pretensions of their authors; either what they propose to accomplish, or what they imagine they have accomplished. It is natural that those who have excogitated themes with which they have been in travail for months, should invest them with an importance equal to their pangs, and baptize them with names expressive of their hopes. Nor need we be surprised that parental fondness should not always meet, from public opinion, with unqualified praise; since those who solicit approbation and those whose prerogative it is to bestow it, contemplate the objects from very different positions. Freedom of judgment, exercised with a due regard to the claims of truth and humanity, is not only a right but a necessity of our social relations; and is incumbent upon all men, but especially upon such as are charged with the responsibility of inaugurating the productions of the press. Yet partiality or haste may betray a very conscientious editor. He must therefore challenge, for the accuracy of his decisions, the application of that test which every freeman possesses, "Judge for yourself." We invoke this text in the cases now to be submitted.

The Conflict of Ages; or the great debate on the moral relations of God and man. By Edward Beecher, D. D. Fifth edition. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1854.

The tendency of the age is at war with the mere dogmas of belief. It is laboring to make its escape from technicalities and forms into the sphere of ultimate principles, so as to attain, if possible, a higher position whence to survey, to combine and to harmonize apparent incongruities. In every age, minds of a peculiar mould have been striving after the same consummation, but the present is remarkable for the number and the boldness of such speculations in all departments of human knowledge. Theology is undergoing the same ordeal, and attempts are made to clear it of its objections and to reconcile it with the philosophy of the human mind, on the

ground that no one system of truth can really clash with another. All well directed efforts in this behalf are in the highest degree laudable as well as useful; but it is melancholy to see men of ability and reputation betrayed by their anxiety or their generosity into measures which are not only untenable, but which make, in the end, an unwarrantable concession to the opponents of Divine revelation; and the more so, when it is apparent that the difficulties which they propose to meet are raised, to a great extent, by the fallacies of their peculiar religious tenets, involving the credit of the Scriptures in allegations which grow out of speculative theology. This we humbly conceive to have been the case with Dr. Beecher, who in the reconciliation of conflicting extremes, has run into one farther from truth and sobriety than either of those he has endeavored to remove. Seeking to account for the comparative inefficiency of Christianity, as it is generally taught, he arrives at the conclusion that this inefficiency is due, to a defective adjustment of its fundamental parts, on the part of the church, that this disharmony of theoretical opinions results in disastrous practical differences, sectarian collisions, dissipation of strength, and a wasteful expenditure of means; that this has been the case for fifteen hundred years; that it consists in the irreconcilable hostility in any or all of the views entertained on the question of the introduction of moral evil; that only one solution remains which can harmonize the fact of universal depravity with all our intuitive ideas of the rectitude and benevolence of the Divine character; and that solution is, that man did not federally fall in Adam, according to our present orthodoxy, but that every human being past, present and to come, existed in some indefinite period before his birth, and in that state sinned and fell, and that the responsibility of his present moral condition, which would be otherwise chargeable upon God, is transferred to that pre-existent state in which, before he became depraved and was subjected to his present disadvantages, he had his proper probation. This is the Conflict of Ages, and this is its solution! As this is not the department for extended review, we shall indulge in only a few animadversions upon this extraordinary book. It is written with great earnestness, and the subject had been revolving in the author's mind for twenty years. It is fenced with authorities, is impregnated with the savour of much apparent Christian benevolence, but is very diffuse and repetitious in its style. We set down several objections to its doctrines. We object, first, that though a conflict really exists, and has existed for ages, in the creed and the practice of Christendom, its character, extent and disasters are unduly magnified, so as materially to obscure the actual efficiency and achievements of Christianity. Secondly, that the principal impediment to the progress of Christianity is not in the dogmatism of church symbols upon the speculative points assumed, but in that want of the Spirit of Christ which is independent of such dogmatism. Thirdly, that in the truly Arminian view of the question, the supposed source of the conflict does not inhere as it does in every possible modification of the Calvinian theory. In

the legitimate operations of this theory a fearful conflict must exist between all our ideas of justice and those of the Divine character. Fourthly, that to assign those convictions which we call intuitive; those interpretations which we give to the data of human consciousness, the office of an infallible test by which to settle and explain positively revealed and undeniable truths, the whole bearing of which, in the present state, we cannot comprehend, is to exalt human reason, not into a judge of the evidence but into a critic of the truth itself. Fifthly, that though there is much that is mysterious, there is nothing that is contradictory to reason, in the federal relation of all human souls as well as all human bodies to the soul and body of Adam. Sixthly, that allowing that Adam was the representative and visible fountain of the human race, there is nothing contradictory in the involvement of his entire posterity in the consequences of his defection, provided, that a counterpoise to those consequences be found in the instantaneous provisions of the redemptive system, including the unconditional salvation of all dying in infancy, and the universal offer of salvation with that preventient grace which empowers the will to embrace them. If every man comes into the world with a bias to sin, as he does with a bias to disease, that condition is relieved by the representative character of the first man, who, in the exercise of his proper freedom, fell, and by the institution of an universally remedial agency concomitant with his defection. For it is manifest that the provision of it was designed conditionally to indemnify the posterity of Adam. Posterity without it would have been inconceivable as an act of justice. But the provision of it, under the circumstances named, clears the question of every element of injustice, by allowing human beings, with every disadvantage of the fall, to come into the world under an economy which is so transcendent as to counterpoise these disadvantages, and even to educe from them that disciplinary process which may eternally enhance their happiness. If multitudes of the human race be eternally damned, that result is not the necessary predicate of the fall, considered in itself, but of probation, as such, abused. Damnation is not chargeable upon this condition of things, but upon totally different issues, as seen in the case of the fallen angels, whose doom was not affected by any disadvantages subsequent to their fall, but grew immediately out of their defection from what Jude calls "their first estate," which they did not keep. Seventhly, that admitting the orthodox view to be irreconcilable with our intuitive ideas of what our author calls "honor and right," it is totally inadmissible to adopt a mere hypothesis to reconcile them, unless that hypothesis can afterward be demonstrated by irresistible proofs. This is the only philosophical mode of adopting hypotheses upon important subjects. Every true hypothesis will not only explain all its phenomena, but will, after its adoption, be proven. Sir Isaac Newton adopted the hypothesis of the law of gravitation, but he demonstrated it by overwhelming proofs afterward. Dr. Beecher does not pretend to any proofs beyond what appears to him to be the necessity of his induction, which is no proof at all, and es-

pecially so to any one except himself. It is necessarily beyond the sphere of proof that any human soul existed in a state prior to its birth. It is not even, though ancient, a creditable speculation, except from its motives to disembarass the government of God. Eighthly, does the hypothesis, in any way, answer its purpose? Does it so explain the present phase of humanity as to exempt the government of God from all blame from everlasting to everlasting? It appears to us not only to make the question one of mere chronology, by putting it farther back in duration, but to preclude the very possibility of an adjustment of it. To put each or any individual soul upon its naked probation, at any given period, especially with the advantages supposed to appertain to it, and then to suppose that soul by first sinning to become depraved, is to place it in the exact condition of "the angels who kept not their first estate;" and that condition is such, in the light of all our convictions, as to place them beyond the possibility of recovery. The self-induced fall of untempted beings, unrelated to each other, except by the mere order of their existence, evinces a moral incapacity for redemption, in the sense in which it has been employed in the behalf of man, from the pure spirituality of their natures, their independent activity, and their unaffiliated relation to, one common generic type. Had there not been some such incapacity in their natures, superinduced by the full and fair exercise of their probation, every idea of justice and benevolence would revolt at the arbitrary caprice which consigned them to chains of everlasting darkness, and the partiality which overlooked them to display itself upon man. This hypothesis consequently precludes the reappearance of these pre-existing souls in human forms, as certainly as the fallen angels are reserved "unto the judgment of the great day." Ninthly, but could the fact of a fall in a pre-existent state lessen the difficulties which encumber the orthodox view? According to that, they would be guilty of their own depravity and responsible for the disadvantages of their new mode of existence; a mode of existence perfectly new to their own consciousness. If new to their consciousness, as it obviously must be in every case, it would be impossible for them to conceive of the pre-existing cause of their misfortunes, and if so, by their very ideas of "honor and right," they would complain of their condition precisely as men do now. For of what a man is not conscious, what he does not know by any of the methods of information, is to him as though it had no existence, and consequently, the ground of objection would not be changed, but remain where it has always stood. Nay, more, could such a pre-existent state be a matter of consciousness or of any species of knowledge, it would enhance the objection. For to all the evils of the present state it superadds those incurred by a previous fall. Tenthly, the hypothesis is not only unnecessary and unwarrantable, but is positively mischievous. It admits the utter incongruity of the indubitable facts of revelation with reason, since no mere hypothesis will be adopted by minds which demand proof, and it surrenders the question to the skeptic who will laugh at so frivolous an attempt to con-

mend a contradictory system to his approbation. We object, finally, that the whole theory is opposed to the explicit account of the fall of man in the book of Genesis, the object of which was to set forth the very fact in debate, the introduction of sin into our world. No unsophisticated mind can read that account without recognizing the very first instance in which sin invaded the human soul.

We say no more, now, of a book which is making a noise in the world, and which receives praise even from those who dissent from its positions. We utterly repudiate its central idea as the offspring of an ardent and an active mind, but one which has not ascertained the logical limits of its own capacity, nor the necessary conditions of all human cognitions. It is infinitely better to admit our theological difficulties than to attempt to adjust them by methods which recoil upon the admission; and, especially, is it better definitely to decide whether the exact matter assumed, as a difficulty, be the undoubted teaching of the Scriptures, or the traditional or the hypothetical interpretation which misguided systematizers have put upon them.

The Apocalypse Unveiled. The day of judgment, the resurrection, and the millennium, presented in a new light; the repossession of Palestine by the Jews, and their conversion to Christ as their Messiah. 2 vols. New York: E. French. 1853.

The world will be indebted to that man who shall fulfil these initiatory words. But alas! who has been equal to the task, or who will be? That the Apocalypse possesses perfect unity in its plan and an absolute intelligibility in its import, are data which all who believe in its inspiration are obliged to admit. Yet who is the interpreter, and where is the key? Eighteen centuries have beheld its hieroglyphs. Profound inquirers have studied its symbols. The universal church has felt the solemn conscientiousness that it contains a definite, coherent message to mankind, but no mortal man has yet hit the solution which has carried with it the demonstration of its truth. Hypotheses the most plausible and commanding have been adopted, and some of the wards appear to have been passed, but that one mysterious key which equally unlocks them all, remains yet to be found; obviously, in our opinion, because the great historic periods embraced in its prophetic outline have not yet transpired so definitely as to give precision to their correlation. Conjecture, more or less probable, may approximate the evolution, but that alone will unfold its plot and unveil its mysteries. In the mean time, we cannot speak of the unappropriated work before us, (for its authorship is concealed,) without a sentiment of profound admiration. Its conception is essentially different from any that precedes it. It is original, bold, venturesome, yet modest, subdued, reverent, full of unity and novelty. The illustration of the symbols is, beyond doubt, ingenious and impressive, though entirely destitute of contrivance. All is natural and unconstrained, fluent, fertile and frequently eloquent.

The author ignores all the ordinary methods of criticism, and bases his exposition upon his own convictions of symbolic language and of historical events, and many a new and wonderful phase is presented to the eye of the reader. He is orthodox in doctrine, and deeply versed in ecclesiastical history, and writes with an impulse imparted by the grandeur of his subject and the certainty of his success. Many curious specimens of interpretation might be adduced, but this is not the place for them. If the work does not satisfy, it will deeply interest the reader.

Homiletics; or, the theory of preaching. By A. Vinet, D. D. Translated and edited by Thomas H. Skinner, D. D., professor of sacred rhetoric and pastoral theology in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. New York: Ivison & Plinney, 178 Fulton street. 1854.

It has been but a short time since the public were favored with a most valuable work on Pastoral Theology by M. Vinet, in a translation by Dr. Skinner. The present volume was then promised. We waited for it with anxiety, and it has not disappointed our expectations. It has transcended them. We are at a loss to express, in a few words, our estimate of its value. It is a profoundly philosophical investigation into the science of the most sacred and sublime of all vocations. Preaching is a branch of oratory; a form of public address for religious purposes. It has therefore its laws; its fundamental principles; its "theory." It is in the highest sense an art, and the highest of all arts; an art which consists in a wise, intelligent adjustment of all the materials of the ministry to the subjective condition of men as an assembly of hearers. It cannot be any other, unless we suppose preachers to be endowed with plenary inspiration. They are not so endowed, and must therefore address their auditory in accordance with the laws of their mental economy as they have been ascertained by careful induction. These laws are both general and special; such as appertain to every kind of public address, and such as grow out of the peculiar character of the sacred office. These latter, based upon the former, make preaching a distinct species of oratory, denominated "Homiletics." An acquaintance with them is of the highest importance to effectual preaching, viewed from a human stand-point, and in subservience to that divine sanction with which, as unalterable conditions, they must necessarily harmonize. M. Vinet's treatise is the most original and complete that is extant. There is no part of the noble theme that is not handled by a genius as penetrating as it is devout, and which has succeeded in giving it a distinctness and shedding over it a lustre and enriching it with a plenitude which excite our astonishment. Ministers of the gospel must feel indebted to him for an aid which they all need, and cannot withhold their gratitude. While nothing seems wanting in matter, the style of the book is remarkable for vivacity, aphoristic sententiousness, rapidity, brilliancy and force. Sudden turns of expression, the evident result of a most prolific mental activity, impart to some of his sentences a

momentary obscurity. But the whole performance is a masterpiece of homiletic information. Dr. Skinner says, "We venture to say, that among all the productions of his powerful pen, it is destined to be regarded universally as in the first rank of scholarship; learning, intellectual affluence and power, grace and beauty, order and perfection of execution." We add no more in its praise.

Christ in History; or the central power among men. By Robert Turnbull, D. D. Boston; Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

The admirable article in review of this work, in our present number, renders it unnecessary for us to give it a special notice in this place. The subject is one of profound interest. It presents the course of events in a new light. It imparts to history its true philosophy. It consecrates it to religion. We refer the reader to the article mentioned, for an accurate account of the manner in which it is treated by Dr. Turnbull.

The Life of William Pinkney. By his nephew, the Rev. William Pinkney, D. D. New York; D. Appleton & Company. 1853.

The jewels of a country are its great men, and their memories ought to be preserved and cherished with patriotic jealousy, not only for the reputation which they confer, or the good which they have accomplished, but for the influence which their genius and their character are calculated to exert upon their successors. No fact is more certain than that noble examples are powerful, especially upon the young. These examples are recorded from both the literature and the life of communities, and ought to be made familiar to all. We can affirm this with confidence and even pride of the life of William Pinkney, whose memorial ought, long ago, to have been placed by the side of those whom, from our childhood, we learn to venerate. A filial hand has paid the fond tribute, and rescued from oblivion materials which must soon have perished. Few men amongst us have filled more exalted stations at home or abroad, have been endowed with more splendid abilities, or have possessed a purer character, than Mr. Pinkney. Whether as a lawyer, a foreign minister, senator, or attorney general of the United States, he was one of the most illustrious ornaments which this country has ever produced. His eloquence was surpassingly grand. He stood in the front ranks of those remarkable men who have given to American eloquence a power and a grandeur unrivalled by that of the tribune or the parliament in their palmiest days. It is unfortunate that we are dependent, as in the case of Patrick Henry, upon tradition for our knowledge of Mr. Pinkney's transcendent power as a speaker, since no perfect specimen of his oratory has been preserved. His speech on the Missouri compromise, which was the climax of his success in the senate, was very imperfectly reported. We nevertheless find in this work a portrait which fills us with admiration and excites our emulation.

The United States Grinnell Expedition in Search of Sir John Franklin.

A personal narrative. By Elisha Kent Kane, M. D., U. S. N. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1854.

The sympathy excited by the fate of the English navigator is the most remarkable on record. The expedition under his command in search of the North West passage was regarded with universal interest as the common enterprize of civilization and of science, and its justly apprehended disaster has awakened a response as extensive as its hopes. No energy or expense have been spared to recover the loss. Polar seas have been searched and the rigors of high northern latitudes have been braved by English and American ships, but all in vain, and the British Admiralty, by this time, have formally announced the sad catastrophe. The American expedition, whose narrative is here given, is an honor to humanity, more by the generosity of its principal originator and patron than by the action of the government. A wealthy citizen of New York, impatient at the delays of the government, fitted out two ships at his own expense, and offered them to the authorities, upon the condition that they should be put under the command of officers of the navy. The offer was accepted and the expedition entered upon its voyage, and though it failed in its principal object, it has enriched the country with valuable results. Our northern seas have been explored, currents have been defined, courses have been established and a vast number of phenomena, useful to science, have been noted. Besides these, the incidents of a long, dreary and perilous polar voyage give to the narrative that species of romance which appeals to the imaginations and hearts of all men. We wish that our space would allow us to refer, more in detail, to the stirring descriptions of Dr. Kane, whose eye nothing seems to have escaped, from the archipelagoes of icebergs to the Kayak of the Esquimaux. The book is beautifully enriched with numerous engravings of the principal scenes which everywhere arrested the attention of the voyagers, and is one of the most thrilling accounts of maritime adventure we have ever read.

The Mission of the Comforter. By Archdeacon Hare. Gould & Lincoln. Boston. 1854.

This is one of those rare works of which we can neither think nor speak lightly, both on account of the solemn subject of which it treats, and the high merit of the performance. The position and offices of the Holy Spirit in the work of redemption is a theme of vital importance to the church of Christ. Nor has it received that full and accurate examination which the welfare of Christianity demands, and especially at this time, when human reason and human pride have endeavored to deprive the gospel of that feature without which it sinks into the category of mere speculation. Archdeacon Hare's timely work unfolds this sublime subject in a most masterly manner, founded upon that passage in the 16th chapter of John which so

distinctly portrays "the Mission of the Comforter." A large body of notes of great value is appended to the work displaying equal labor and research. We trust that a book of such value will find its way into the hands of every intelligent Christian.

The Philosophy of Faith: A treatise on the nature, traits, and relations of Faith. In three parts. By the Rev. James E. Cobb, of the Ark. Conf., M. E. Church, South. Louisville, Ky. 1853.

We rejoice to see works of this class emanating from the bosom of Methodism. It is time she had performed her part in investigating the higher and deeper elements of the Christian system, and evincing those grounds upon which they rest, and the relations which they bear. Our author has selected a most important subject with a view of giving it a thorough analysis and thus of overturning the several forms of human opinion antagonistic of it. This is certainly striking at the root; for to establish faith upon its essential basis is to dissolve at a blow all their pretensions. Undoubtedly nothing is more rational than faith. There is a deep unassailable philosophy in it, as our author shews. His enquiries on this subject manifest a philosophic spirit, a wide, comprehensive conception and diligent study, in connection with a sober judgment and a proper recognition of inspired authority. His manner of treatment is logical and his style combines accuracy with freedom. We regard his work with decided approbation and doubt not that it has opened a fruitful field to the contemplation of the sincere enquirer. His labor will not be lost. The book may be obtained of E. Stevenson, Louisville, Ky.; or D. J. Allen, Memphis, Tenn.

An attempt to exhibit the true theory of Christianity as a consistent and practical system. By William S. Grayson, New York. D. Appleton & Company. 1853.

Mr. Grayson has undertaken a great task in this treatise. It is kindred in its object to the preceding volume, but covers more extensive ground, and discusses more difficult theological questions. There are many positions in it worthy of grave consideration, and others which we would admit with caution. We wish Mr. Grayson had expressed himself more concisely, and had pruned his style of some of its redundances. Notwithstanding these defects, the reader will perceive an active mind, and find instructive views of his grand theme.

The Cruise of the Steam Yacht North Star; a narrative of the excursion of Mr. Vanderbilt's party to England, Russia, Denmark, France, Spain, Italy, Malta, Turkey, Madeira, &c. By the Rev. John Overton Choules, D. D., Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

Rarely, if ever, has a single individual performed such a feat as fitting up a magnificent steamship for the purpose of a pleasure trip with a select party to the principal seaports of Europe. It is a most astonishing instance of individual chivalry and luxury. It was entirely successful, and every

where met with unqualified praise. Mr. Choules was the chaplain of the party, and has favored us with a graphic account of this novel excursion. But his book must not be put down as a common place diary, but as a record of striking facts, and wise observations on every variety of object worthy of note. He is an able and an elegant tourist, and makes a real contribution to the information of American readers. The enterprize of Mr. Vanderbilt excited great attention, and its record, by so polished a pen, will be read with satisfaction.

A discourse concerning the Divine Providence. By William Sherlock, D. D. Third American edition. Richmond, Va., and Louisville, Ky.: John Early. 1854.

We should rejoice to see more of the old English divines introduced into our theology. Their sterling, solid sense, thorough investigations, their profound learning, and their sober piety, would have given stamina to our systems, and aliment to our thoughts. We have here an auspicious omen. We sincerely hope the plan will be prosecuted, and constant and well selected additions will be made to our catalogue. This is an old book, but of imperishable value. Nothing has yet superseded or equalled it in the particular field which it occupies. All our people should read it for its clear, Scriptural exposition of a subject so deeply and perpetually connected with human happiness. It is prefaced by a brief historical preface by Dr. Sammers. It is very tastefully bound, and of a size accessible to all our readers.

Outlines of Scripture Geography and History: Illustrating the Historical Portions of the Old and New Testaments. Designed for the use of schools and private reading. Based upon Coleman's Historical Geography of the Bible. By Edward Hughes, F. R. A. S., F. R. G. S. Philadelphia: Blanchard and Lea. 1854.

An accurate knowledge of geography, is confessedly important to the historical student. Localities are so essentially connected with the events of history, that ignorance of the former is incompatible with a just estimate or proper understanding of the latter. And as a large portion of the Bible is historical in its character, it is manifest that a knowledge of the localities with which the events of Scripture are so intimately associated, is necessary to an intelligent appreciation of those important portions of the Sacred Volume. Besides, many of the prophecies of the Bible refer to places, cities and countries, in order to the understanding of which, a knowledge of those localities is necessary. This fact should prompt in the Christian public a grateful reception of any aid which may be offered to so valuable an attainment. The work now under notice we regard as an estimable contribution to our sources of information with regard to the geography of the Bible. The method adopted by the author, in pursuing a regular and connected chain of history through the Old and New Testament, and illustrating the localities

as they arise in connection with the events as they are recorded by the Sacred Penman, constitutes its peculiar and most valuable feature. The book is accompanied with twelve well executed and beautifully colored maps. And we sincerely recommend it to the pastor, the parent, the teacher and the pupil, with the assurance that it will be found a useful companion in enabling them to "search the Scriptures."

Hand-books of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy. Dyonisius Lardner, D. C. L. Third Course. Meteorology — Astronomy. With thirty-seven Plates, and upward of 200 illustrations on Wood. Philadelphia: Blanchard & Lea. 1854.

We have had the pleasure of notifying the public of the admirable scientific works in a course of publication, by the meritorious firm above named. The two sciences are treated copiously, and illustrated elegantly. We have never seen more beautiful specimens of art. To speak of the intrinsic character of the work, would be wholly superfluous. Dr. Lardner's reputation as a natural philosopher, needs no endorsement.

The Czar and the Sultan; or Nicholas and Abdul Medjid, their private lives and public actions. By Adrian Gilson. To which is added, *The Turks in Europe: their rise and decadence.* By Francis Bonnet, New York: Harper and Brothers. 1853.

The second great event of the times is the war between Russia and Turkey; an event which associates with it the character of the two potentates who respectively rule them. The biographies of them must excite particular attention in the present aspect of affairs. They are written by a gentleman who resided in the Danubian principalities, the object of contest between the conflicting powers. The reliable information which it affords of countries so remote and on the issue of their present strife is not only seasonable, but valuable, and will be read with interest. The insight into the spirit and policy of the two governments is minute, that of Turkey in Europe especially, in the behalf of which American sympathies are so cordially enlisted in the pending struggle.

The American Statesman; or illustrations of the life and character of Daniel Webster. Designed for American youth. By Rev. Joseph Banvard. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1853.

Webster is, in many respects, a model for American youth. In many he is not. A blind admiration may betray an author into dangerous error, unless he uses great discrimination. On this principle, the present author professes to act; selecting the commendable traits of the great statesman for imitation. In this he has done wisely. To identify great qualities with great men is to give them substance and shape, and to impress them with more certainty upon the aspiring minds of youth. America has produced no prototype more worthy of imitation, in statesmanship, than Dan-

iel Webster. The instances are taken from sources already before the public.

The Mud Cabin ; or the character and tendency of British institutions, as illustrated in their effect upon human character and destiny. By Warren Isham, New York : D. Appleton and Company. 1853.

The rural population of Great Britain is undoubtedly in a very abject condition, and this is no doubt the result of its institutions, social and domestic. The true exponent of national life is its peasantry. The great outside is deceptive. Mr. Isham spent eighteen months in investigating the obscure interior of English society, and gives a truly appalling picture of its ignorance and degradation. Who ever wishes to enter into this melancholy subject need only follow the author through his faithful pages. Some allowance ought, however, to be always made for those prejudices which an American is so apt to carry with him into another country. The book will enhance our appreciation of our inestimable privileges, and awaken a sympathy for the hopeless poor of monarchical governments.

We are obliged to reserve the notice of a number of useful books for another occasion, as our space is full. Several of the foregoing books have received a limited attention from want of room.

ART. VIII.

BIBLICAL, LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC MISCELLANIES.

China.—While those parts of Europe which are subject to the church of Rome, are for the present in great measure closed against the Bible, and agents for the circulation of God's word are either expelled from the scene of their labors, or compelled to advance with caution, and amidst much apprehension, the East presents prospects of a widely different character. The political and religious changes which are taking place in China, are of such a description, that it seems impossible to avoid recognizing the hand of Divine providence in them, removing the barriers which had so long intercepted the light of Christianity, and facilitating the entrance and circulation of the Scriptures. Idolatry is breaking up in this vast empire, and a spirit of inquiry is abroad, which promises the most favorable results. The Rev. J. Hobson, chaplain at Shanghai, in a communication to the society for promoting Christian knowledge, dated June 2, 1853, observes that, "whether this rebellion succeed or not, it is evident the days of Chinese exclusiveness and apathy are numbered. The demand for Christian books, and especially for works treating of Western nations, is greatly increased. I have had nearly fifty applications at the chaplaincy within a few days."

We invite attention to the following interesting account of the tract or series of tracts, which it is said, gave the first impetus to the revolutionary movement in China. The work is entitled "Good words to admonish the age."

"Good words to admonish the age" was a tract well known to missionaries some ten or twelve years ago, but it has lately been out of print. I had the old blocks sought out, however during the present week, and have had a few copies struck off. No one can look into it without seeing at once that its phraseology and modes of presenting the truth are repeated in the publications obtained at Nankin. It is rather a misnomer to call it a tract. It is a compilation of tracts, or short sermons on passages of Scripture, and the general principles of religion, in four pretty large Chinese volumes. The different volumes, however, used to be distributed separately, each with the general title, and, perhaps, Sew-tseun only received one of them, and not the entire set. So then, as the oak is in the acorn, the present great movement lay in one or more of the volumes of this compilation; "Good words to Admonish the Age." The writer is still alive, a Chinese, named Leang A-fah, who was baptized at Malacca, in 1816,

by Dr. Milne, and still continues abundant in labors, in connection with Dr. Hobson's operations in Canton. And now for the fact of the distribution of this tract at the literary examinations in Canton. This I shall give in the words of A-fah, in a letter written in the end of 1834: "For three or four years I have been in the habit of circulating the Scripture lessons (another name for "Good words to Admonish the Age,") which have been joyfully received by many. This year the triennial examination of literary candidates was held in Canton, and I desired to distribute works among the candidates. On the 20th of August, therefore, accompanied by Woo A-chan, Chow A-san, and Leang A-san, we distributed 5000, which were gladly received without the least disturbance. The next day we distributed about 5000 more." My space will not allow me to quote more of A-fah's letter. His good endeavor soon brought the attention of the Mandarins upon him, and the end was the severe punishment of one of his friends, the death of a second, and the flight of himself to Singapore. The detail which I have given, shows you the detail by which, the individual by whom, and the manner in which the head of this formidable rebellion was first brought into contact with Scriptural truth. The connection between him and A-fah will greatly interest those who wisely like, in their study of providence, to put this and that together. A-fah was the first convert made by Protestant Missions, and by him is communicated an influence to the mind of this remarkable individual, which has already extended to tens of thousands, and may by and by, spread over the whole of this vast and thickly-peopled territory.

The following hymn, extracted from the "Book of Religious Precepts of the Thæ-ping dynasty," proves very clearly that Christian doctrine has in its leading features been received by the insurgents:

'How different are the true doctrines, from the doctrines of the world!
 They save the souls of men, and lead to the enjoyment of endless bliss:
 The wise receive them with exultation, as the source of their happiness:
 The foolish when awakened, understand thereby the way to heaven.
 Our heavenly Father, of his great mercy, and unbounded goodness,
 Spared not his first-born Son, but sent him down into the world,
 To give his life, for the redemption of all our transgressions,
 The knowledge of which, coupled with repentance, saves the souls of men.'

In the contemplation of such marked tendencies towards Christianity, and of the measures actively taken by the insurgents for the suppression of the existing idolatries, it is gratifying to learn that the proposal to print a million of copies of the New Testament in Chinese, is obtaining extensive sympathy and support. Subscriptions have been already received towards 130,000 copies. The Testaments are to be printed in China, at the cost of 4d. each, by the British and Foreign Bible Society. It appears that the printing establishments of the London Missionary Society at Hong-Kong and Shanghai, are abundantly supplied with Chinese type for printing the whole Bible, and will doubtless be of eminent service at this important crisis. Some of the missionaries of the society referred to, were,

by the last advices, engaged in revising the Chinese translation of the Scriptures by Morrison and Milne.—*Journal of Sacred Literature.*

An edition of the Gospel of St. Luke, in Mussulman-Bengali, has been completed by the Rev. J. Patterson, and has been ordered to be printed at the Baptist mission press. A version of the Acts of the Apostles, in the Nepalee language, by the Rev. W. Start, in continuation of a version of St. Luke's Gospel by the same gentleman, has also been sent to press. The Rev. W. Lewis, of Cherraponjee, has translated the four Gospels, and Acts into the Khassia language. The first volume of the Hindi Bible was completed last year. The Rev. Mr. Owen, the principal reviser of the work, states that the second volume is in progress, the Book of Job being in the press. The Rev. Mr. Scheider, of the Church Mission at Agra, had been engaged in this work as one of the revisers of the translation. An edition of the Psalms in the Panjabi language is about to appear. A new edition of the Malayalim Bible having been called for, a revision has taken place, which has already extended to the Book of Genesis, and the Gospel of St. Matthew, Mark, and Luke; and the New Testament is being printed. A revision of the Canarese version has also taken place, and a large edition of the Gospels, as far as to the end of Luke has been prepared. The Telugu Old Testament, slightly revised as to the more prominent names and to orthography, has also been printed for the use of missionaries. Revisions and new editions of the Bible in the Marathi, and the New Testament in the Guzerathi language, are also in progress. These various works, which are at present in the course of completion, or which have been recently brought to a close, indicate the extent of the agencies now in operation for the evangelization of Hindoostan.—*J. S. Lit.*

The following items of interest we extract from the same valuable journal.

Polynesia.—A version of the scriptures in the Samoan language, employed by the natives of the Navigator's Islands, is being now made under the direction of the missionaries. The whole Pentateuch and the Psalms are now in print, and other portions are in various stages of progress.

South Seas.—A version of the Bible in the Javanese has been completed, under the direction of the Netherlands Bible Society. Another translation into the Dajadi language is being made in Borneo, by M. Hardeland.

Syria.—The following illustration of Oriental habits, referred to in the New Testament, is given by Habeeb R. A. Effendi, in his recent work, "The Thistle and Cedar of Lebanon," p. 71. It is a description of a marriage in a native Christian family at Aleppo.

"On arriving at the residence of the bridegroom, we were ushered into a long room, in which guests were seated from the door to the upper part, according to their rank in life, the chief guests being seated at the head of the divan, on either side of the master of the house; others were ranged

lower and lower; the poorest guests were close to the doorway, and one or two so poor that they did not even aspire to a place in the divan, but squatted themselves cross-legged on the ground. On the arrival of a fresh guest, the master of the house would rise and come forward to receive him; and if, as happened on some occasions, the guest, from mock humility, would seat himself in a position lower than what his usual rank of precedence entitled him to, an absurd scuffle would ensue, in which the master of the house would endeavor to drag the other higher up into the room; and the guest, with many "stafer Allabs," (God forbid,) and many false protestations, would pretend reluctantly to yield to the distinction proffered him, and so gain honor in the sight of the assembled multitude. Such scenes brought vividly to my mind our Lord's parable about the meek being exalted; and rendered it clearly evident that this etiquette, so strictly adhered to by the nations of all Syria to this present hour, existed in the time of the Redeemer."

Palestine.—An interesting paper was read at the Syro-Egyptian Society, Nov. 8th, "on the appearance of the so-called tombs of the Patriarchs at Hebron in the middle ages," by T. Wright, Esq., F. S. A., &c. Mr. Wright referred, in the first instance, to the *Itinerarium a Burgdigala Hierusalem usqué*, (A. D. 333,) which describes the tomb of Joseph as being near Neapolis, (Nabúz,) and those of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Sarah, Rebecca, and Leah, at Hebron. The next referred to was Bishop Arculf, (A. D. 760,) who represents the tombs of the Patriarchs, and of Adam, as being in a double cave, looking towards Mamrè, (Hebron.) The cave was enclosed in a low wall, which Mr. Wright identified with the monument in form of a Square, mentioned by the earlier writer. Soewulf, who traveled in 1102, describes the monuments of the Patriarchs and Adam "of ancient workmanship," as being surrounded by a strong castle, each monument being like a church, with two sarcophagi within: one for the man, and another for the woman. The bones of Joseph were buried more humbly than the rest, at the extremity of the castle. This "castle" was supposed, by Mr. Wright, to be the "square wall," before mentioned, or one built on its site. It is evident that alterations had taken place, probably in the time of the Crusades. Sixty-one years after this, Benjamin of Tudela, speaks of six sepulchres erected by the Gentiles, and it is plain, from his language, that he considered the tombs then shown as modern inventions. Borchard, a monk who travelled A. D. 1283, describes the Saracens as having built a fortification over against the double cave which was contained in the Cathedral Church. Maunderville, forty years after, observed that Christians were not allowed to enter these caves, and this prohibition has continued till the present day. Mr. Wright remarked on Sandy's mistaken statement that the building over the tombs was a Christian Church erected by the empress Helena, but now converted into a mosque. Mangle's description of an outer wall of great antiquity, was referred to the square hall of the early travelers.

The tomb of Ezekiel.—Mr. T. K. Lynch, in some notes recently made public, describes a visit made by him, in May, 1848, to Kiffel, a place where the prophet Ezekiel is said to be buried. He visited the tomb of the prophet, traversing first a spacious court, and on entering a large hall supported on two rows of pilastered columns, was shown in a recess at the far end, a precious manuscript of the Pentateuch, written on a single scroll. Leading out of this hall, on the south side, was a little dark chamber, which contained the tomb itself, enclosed in a wooden case. Above the tomb rose a spiral dome, gilt and enamelled internally.

Africa.—It is stated in the *Pennsylvania Freeman*, that Dr. Phillips, a missionary in South Africa, has been informed by a German traveler, that he had discovered a race of negroes near the kingdom of Bambam, who are Jews in their religious rites and observances. Nearly every family, he says, has the law of Moses written on parchments. This statement furnishes a subject of interesting inquiry, but is probably much exaggerated.

Genealogy of our Lord.—An interesting extract from a journal of Rev. F. C. Ewald, in reference to the above important subject, appears in the "Jewish Intelligencer, for December." It is as follows:

"In the opening of the New Testament, the genealogy of our Lord, as given by Matthew and Luke, perplexed them. In Matthew, Joseph is called the son of Jacob; in Luke, he is called the son of Eli; and both evangelists apparently give only the genealogy of Joseph; which I explained in the following manner:—According to the laws given to the Israelites, we find that if a father of a family had no sons, but daughters, the inheritance was given to the daughter; this law was established in the wilderness on the occasion when the daughters of Zelophehad came to Moses and said, "Our father died in the wilderness, and he was not in the company of them that gathered themselves against the Lord in the company of Korah; but died in his own sin, and had no sons. Why should the name of our father be done away from among his family, because he hath no son? Give unto us, therefore, a possession among the brethren of our father." Moses brought the case before the Lord, and the Lord said, "If a man die and have no son, then ye shall cause his inheritance to pass unto his daughter." (Numbers, xxvii.) However, as soon as this law was promulgated, there arose a difficulty. The promised land was to be divided by lot to the children of Israel; each tribe was to have a certain portion, and each family in that tribe again their portion; if, therefore, a daughter became the heiress and married into another tribe, the one tribe would lose a portion, whilst the other would gain it. Therefore another law was given, namely, that such heiresses could not marry into another tribe, but their future husbands must be of their own tribe. (Numbers xxxvi.) The chief object of these laws was that the name of the man who died sonless should not be lost. (Numbers xxvii, 4.) On that account, he who married such an heiress was called after the name of his father-in-law and also of his own father, and had

thus two family names. For instance, we read in 1 Chron. ii, 21-23, that Hezron married the daughter of Machir, the father of Gilead, and she bare him Segub. "And Segub begat Jair, who had three-and-twenty cities in the land of Gilead. And he took Geshur and Aram, with the towns of Jair, from them, with Kenath, and the towns thereof, even threescore cities. All these belonged to the sons of Machir, the father of Gilead. But they were the sons of Hezron, and the grand-sons of Machir. The same is also clear from Nehemiah vii, 63. Jacob was the father of Joseph, Eli the father of Mary and the father-in-law of Joseph. Mary was an heiress, whose property was in Bethlehem, on which account she went to that place to be taxed. Mary being of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of David, she married Joseph, who was of the same tribe and family; he therefore is called, according to established law and custom among the Jews, the son of Jacob and the son of Eli, though the latter was his father-in-law, and therefore Jesus was called, by the Jews, the "son of David."

The Archbishop of Paris lately addressed a pastoral letter to the clergy and people of his diocese, instituting a new fête, to be called the *Fête des Ecoles*, which is designed to celebrate the renewed alliance in France of science and religion. The ceremony took place in the church of St. Geneviève, formerly the Pantheon, on November 27th, and was attended by the minister of public instruction, and a number of persons of distinction, connected with the learned and professional bodies. The service was conducted with universal pomp and splendor, and an oration was delivered by the Archbishop, which extended to two hours in length.

The King of Bavaria has lately created a special order of knighthood, to reward eminent literary and scientific merit. The order is to be named after the King-Maximilian order; and its decoration consists of a blue ribbon edged with white.

The recent meeting of the *Kirchentag*, in which the confession of Augsburg was recognized as the standard of doctrine amongst German Protestants, was succeeded by a meeting on the subject of the Home Mission, founded by Dr. Wichern of Hamburg, who is also the founder of the *Rothens Hans* there, an institution analogous to the ragged schools of England. The special subjects considered at this meeting were the observance of Sunday, spiritual provision for criminals, and for laborers on canals and railways, and prisoners discharged from houses of correction; also young men's associations, temperance societies, &c. It was resolved to urge on the authorities to establish a numerical proportion between the clergy and the population in large towns, and to take steps to put down houses of prostitution.

Modern Greek Language.—In an inaugural lecture, distinguished for its vigor and novelty, delivered at the opening of the session of the Greek classes in the University of Edinburgh, Professor Blackie said that some of

the most striking peculiarities of modern Greek can be pointed out as characterising the dialects of the New Testament, so that the readiest way to become familiar with the language of the Christian Scriptures, is to hear lectures in theology and church history, in the modern Christian University of Athens. On this I desire to speak with peculiar emphasis, as, among other benefits which I have received from the study of the living language of Greece, the more intimate and familiar knowledge of the philology of the New Testament is not the least. Nothing, indeed, can be more hurtful to the highest interests of sacred literature, than that nice circumscription within the limits of a few select authors, called classical, to which verbal scholars of a certain meagre culture, not uncommon in England, are apt to confine their attention.

The English *Publishers Circular* estimates that the issues of new publications and new editions average 4,380 volumes per annum, showing an increase of nearly one-fourth over that of ten years back. This estimate does not include pamphlets.

The Massachusetts Mechanics' Charitable Association, propose to erect, in the city of Boston, a bronze statue of Benjamin Franklin. A meeting in reference to it, was held on the 148th anniversary of Franklin's birthday, at which addresses were made by Hon. R. C. Winthrop, Jared Sparks, Abbott Lawrence, Josiah Quincy, and other eminent citizens. In the hands of such men the enterprize will surely go forward.—*Norton*.

The library of the late Dr. Philo, for many years Professor of church history at Halle, is now for sale. It consists of about 4,000 volumes, relating to church history, and is especially rich in the works of the Greek and Latin fathers. It will be sold for 2,000 dollars. It is said that a New England college is taking measures to secure it. Applications may be addressed to H. Linnekogel, bookseller at Halle.—*Norton*.

Three separate versions have appeared in England of the Priest and the Huguenot, by L. Bungener, with as many different titles. The only one sanctioned by the author is that published by Constable.

British Museum Manuscripts.—The manuscript collections have been pronounced by competent judges to be the most numerous, and probably, the finest in the world. Considerable difficulty arises in the attempt to form a correct estimate of their extent. If we consider each single letter and paper to be a manuscript, as it undoubtedly is, the gross amount will be enormous. But in many cases, some hundreds of such letters are bound together into one volume; it is evident, therefore, that where the volumes only are counted, the actual amount of the manuscripts will be very far from being ascertained. As the latter method, however, appears to be that usually employed in large libraries, we have adopted it on the present occasion. So far, then, as we have been enabled to collect from the cata-

logues, the number of volumes at this time amounts to about 34,434.—*Sims' Handbook.*

The Russian Priest and the Comet.—The comet lately visible has served a priest near Warsaw with materials for a very curious sermon. After having summoned his congregation together, although it was neither Sunday nor festival, and shown them the comet, he informed them that that was the same star that had appeared to the magi at the birth of the Saviour, and that it was only visible now in the Russian empire. Its appearance on this occasion was to intimate to the Russian eagle, that the time was now come for it to spread out its wings and embrace all mankind in one orthodox and soul-sanctifying church! He showed them that the star was now standing over Constantinople, and explained that the dull light of the nucleus indicated its sorrow at the delays of the Russian army in proceeding to its destination!

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND NEW PUBLICATIONS.

FOREIGN.—ENGLISH.

The works announced by Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh, in the New Series of their Foreign Theological Library, are the following:

Hengstenberg's *Christology* in four volumes translated from the edition of the original work.

Baumgarten's *Apostolic History*; or *The Progress of the Development of the Church from Jerusalem to Rome.* Translated by the Rev. A. J. W. Morrison, A. M.

Stier on the words of the Lord Jesus.

Ullman's *Reformers before the Reformation*; translated by the Rev. Robert Menzies, of Stoddam.

Two or more volumes of selections from the *Studien und Kritiken.* Translated by the Rev. Dr. W. L. Alexander.

Keil's *Commentary on Kings.* Translated by the Rev. Dr. Murphy of Belfast.

Keil's *Commentary on Joshua.*

Dorner on *The Person of Christ.*

This New Series promises to be one of great interest and value to the theologian.

Mr. Blackader has published the second part of the English Bible. This is a valuable edition of the Holy Scriptures.

Repentance of Nineveh; a Metrical Homily on the Mission of Jonah. B. Ephraim Syrus. Translated by the Rev. H. Burgess. (Blackader.)

A Memoir of W. Jay, by the Rev. S. S. Wilson, a member of his congregation, with portrait, and an appendix containing remarkable passages from Mr. Jay's Discourses. (Binns and Goodwin.)

Of Bohn's Classical Library, the following works have recently appeared: Athenæus. The Deipnosophists or the Banquet of the Learned. Translated by C. D. Yonge, with an appendix of Poetical Fragments rendered into English verse by various authors, and general Index. Complete in three volumes. Vol. 1, pp. 482.

Vol. 6 of Plato, completing the work, and containing the doubtful Works; namely, Epinomis, Axivehus, on Virtue, on Justice, Sisyphus, Demodoces, and Definitions; The Treatise of Timæus Loems on the soul of the world and nature. To which are added, the lives of Plato by Diogenes Laertius, Hyachius, and Olympiodorus; and the introductions to his doctrines by Alcinous and Albinous; Apuleius on the Doctrines of Plato, and remarks on Plato's writings by the Poet Gray. Edited with notes by George Burgess, M. A. With general Index.

GERMANY.

Among the religious works which have come under my notice, says a correspondent of the Journal of Sacred Literature, for Jan. 1854, I may briefly characterize the following:—An appropriate New Year's present may be made in the second edition of a very celebrated and permanently useful work, which bears the name of *Thoma-a-Kempis*, (De Imitatione Christi,) translated and published in the beautiful little volume of which the title runs, "Thomas von Kempen vier Bücher von der Nachfolge Christi Verschen, &c. Von D. A. L. G. Krehl, mit illustrationen, &c. Leipzig, Kesselring." This work is regarded, in Germany, as a master-piece of what is there called Christian mysticism. The term has not, as in this country, an offensive character. Mysticism there means pretty much what we intend by piety. Mysticism considered systematically, may be termed "the religion of feeling," or that devotion of the religious nature of man which has its source and its outflow in and from the heart. The subject has once more excited attention in Germany, chiefly as a part of the prevalent reaction against rationalism. The views thereof of a learned and moderate divine whose name is honorably known in England, (Dr. A. Tholuck,) may be found, as in a nut-shell, in "*Die Mystik, Vortrag*, 2nd edition, 1853. Those of your readers who may wish to study the subject systematically and historically, will do well to possess themselves of the excellent treatise, "*Die Christliche Mystik*, (Mysticism in the Christian

Church,) considered in its historical developments in the middle ages and in modern days, by Dr. L. Noack; one vol. 8vo., 1853, in which full and accurate sketches of the doctrine and its influences are given, as exemplified, among others, in Thomas Münzer, John Arndt, Jacob denberg, Novalis, as well as the older representatives of the system, Bernhard Clairvaux, Tauler, Thomas-a-Kempis, Staupitz, &c. The learned author has also very recently published a valuable work, entitled, "Die Biblische Theologie," (The Theology of the Bible,) an introduction to the Old and New Testament, with an exhibition of the doctrinal contents of the Scriptures; one vol. 8vo., 1853. Holding that the predominance of any one of our human faculties necessarily leads to error, so that the heart begets mysticism, and the head rationalism, both wrong in their negations, while on their positive side they, as all mere systems must do, run to excess, Dr. J. Scheinert has endeavored to expound and uphold in its fulness, as well as its purity, in his work, "Die Christliche Religion," (the Christian Religion,) one vol. 8vo., 1853, the simplicity of whose title is an image of the simplicity of the Gospel, as it there appears scripturally expounded and reviewed, and set forth under the conjoint influence of reason and sentiment. How fiercely the war rages between Romanism and Protestantism, on the Continent, is made manifest—as by many painful signs and incidents—so by a systematic and reliable development of the workings and aims of the extreme and non-predominant (though beginning already to decline) party in the Papal Church, in the carefully compiled work, "Die Propaganda," (The Roman Propaganda,) the field and the laws of its operations, by Dr. O. Meier, 2 vols. 8vo.

Dr. Karl Zimmermann announces the appearance of an edition of Dr. Martin Luther's works, twelve volumes octavo. It is to be issued in four divisions; viz. I. Reformatory and Polemical writings; II. Exegetic and Dogmatic writings; III. Sermons and Catechetical writings; IV. Letters, Circular Letters and Discourses. Two volumes to be issued every year.

The first volume of a German translation of Rev. Theodore Parker's writings has just been issued, containing the critical and miscellaneous essays. A second edition of a previous translation of his *ten sermons on religious subjects*, is about to be printed.

Handbuch of Methodismus, enth. die Geschichte, Lehre, das Kirchenregiment und cegenthüml. Gebräuche desselben. Nach authent. Quellen bearb. von L. S. Jacoby. (With a portrait of J. Wesley.) 8vo. (Handbook of Methodism, containing the History, Doctrine, the Church Government, and peculiar usages of the same.)

AMERICAN.

The announcements of the American press are more than ordinarily important.

The Messrs. Appleton are engaged in bringing out the standard English authors in a handsome form, under the title of Appleton's Library Series of the British Classics. They will follow the Spectator by the works of Johnson, Pope, Goldsmith, Fielding, and Smollet, making together nearly thirty octavo volumes.

Harper and Brothers announce as in press, Wilson's Life of the Rev. William Jay; Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson's popular account of the ancient Egyptians; Lardner's Museum of Science and Art; Rome, Regal and Republican, by Miss Strickland.

Scribner has in press the valuable work on "The Life and Epistles of St. Paul," by Rev. W. J. Coneybeare and Rev. J. S. Howson. The English edition of this book, in two quarto volumes, has long been too cumbersome and too costly for the general reader and students. Mr. Scribner also announces as in preparation, a Cyclopaedia of American Literature, from the earliest period to the present day; a Cyclopaedia of Missions, by Rev. Henry Newcombe, besides other valuable works.

Carter and Brothers have nearly ready, The Eternal Day, by Rev. H. Bonar; Brown on the Discourses and Sayings of Christ, in 2 vols. 8vo. The English edition of this work is in three vols. It is a valuable work, which deserves a place in every minister's library. Daniel, a model for young men; a series of Lectures, Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D.; and a new edition of Jay's morning and evening exercises, in 4 vols. 8vo.

Mr. Redfield announces, a reply to Beecher's Conflict of Ages, by Rev. Moses Ballou; The Catacombs of Rome; or the Church above, and below ground, by Rev. W. Ingram Kip.

Little, Brown & Co., are issuing some splendid library editions of standard English Authors; besides the Life of Sir James Macintosh, and the History of England, by Hume, already published, they have nearly ready, Hume's Philosophical Works, in 4 vols. 8vo.; Goldsmith's Miscellaneous Works, collected and edited by James Prior, in 4 vols. 8vo.; Plutarch's Lives, carefully revised and corrected, in 5 vols. 8vo.; Lord Bacon's Works, by Basil Montague, in 12 vols. 8vo.

Gould & Lincoln have in press, the Plurality of Worlds: a work on Natural Religion, adapted to the Scientific man, the Theologian, and the general reader.

J. C. Ricker, will publish "The Life and Labors of St. Augustine," by Philip Schaff, D. D. Translated by Professor T. C. Porter.

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW,
OF THE
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
SOUTH.

Vol. VIII.]

JULY 1854.

[No. 3.

ART. I.
ZECHARIAH.

By Rev. T. V. MOORE, D. D., Richmond, Va.

[CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 213.]

Fruits of penitence.

CH. 13: 1-6.

1. "In that day there shall be a fountain opened,
To the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem,
For sin, and for uncleanness.
2. And it shall be in that day, saith Jehovah of Hosts,
I will cut off the names of the idols from the land,
And they shall not be remembered any more;
And also the prophets, and the spirit of uncleanness
Will I remove from the land.
3. And it happens, if a man still prophesy,
His father and his mother who begat him say unto him,

- ‘Thou shalt not live,
 Because thou hast spoken falsehood in the name of Jehovah,’
 And his father and his mother who begat him,
 Pierce him through in his prophesying.
4. And it happens in that day, the prophets are ashamed
 From their vision in their prophesying,
 And they shall no longer put on the mantle of hair to deceive.
5. And he says, ‘I am not a prophet, I am a husbandman,
 For a man has sold me from the time of my youth.’
6. And he (*the former*) says unto him,
 ‘What then are these wounds between thy hands?’
 And he replies: ‘(*they are the wounds*)
 Which I received in the house of my lovers.’”

V. 1. We have shown before that the preceding chapter refers to a great revival of religion in the church, which is yet future, and to this revival especially as it should include the Jews, who would at that time be restored to the church from which they had been so long separated by unbelief. The depth of their penitence is described very vividly in ch. 12 : 8-14. Connected with this penitence, however, would then be, what their previous mourning had never attained, a felt possession of pardon. This is represented by the metaphor of a fountain, that bestows the double blessing of refreshment to the thirsty, and purification to the unclean. This fountain is not then opened for the first time, for it has long been flowing from the riven rock. But it is opened then for the first time to the house of David, after their long and weary wanderings. Like Hagar they had wandered in the wilderness until they were ready to perish, ignorant of the refreshment that was near them, until the Lord opened their eyes to see the fountain. Prominence is here given to its purifying power, because of the guilt that had so long rested on the covenant people.

V. 2, describes the consequences of this pardon. A free forgiveness does not lead to indolence, but to a more vigorous discharge of duty, and extirpation of sin. The two great sins of the Jewish people before the captivity, were idolatry and false prophecy, and these are taken as the types of all

ungodliness of whatever specific form. All actual, outward idolatry and false prophecy have ceased among the Jews, and hence these sins are only the types of sin in general. It is, however, worthy of remark, that the only sin of heart that is called emphatically idolatry, is a sin that is supposed to be peculiarly that which besets the Jew, the worship of mammon, and who can tell but that the wealth of the world is gathering into the hands of Jews, in anticipation of that mighty Exodus that is yet to be made by the sons of Jacob. Certain it is that a general conversion of the Jews would throw an amount of wealth into the treasury of the Lord, of which we now can have no conception, and give a blow to the rule of gold, such as no other event we can now specify would be likely to do. "The Spirit of uncleanness" is here put in contrast with the Spirit of God, who inspired the true prophets, and refers doubtless to more than a mere impersonal depravity of human souls, but to spiritual influences of demoniac form, such as are so often referred to in the Bible in connection with sin.

V. 3, describes in dramatic form the effect of this removal of sin. There is not only a passive abandonment of sin, but also an action antagonistic to it that is strong enough to overcome the most powerful principles of our nature. The one selected is parental affection, whose strength is such as usually to survive the greatest unworthiness in its object. The prodigal boy may be despised and hated by all the world, and yet the heart of the father will yearn kindly toward the hapless outcast, and the arms of the mother will be ever ready to fold him in forgiving love. Now the love of duty that can surpass an affection like this, must be of a most controlling character. The precise incidents here conceived, seem to have been suggested by Deut. 13 : 6-10, 18 : 20, where the nearest relation of the false prophet was required to put him to death, a heroic sense of duty that had been embodied thus in Hebrew law, long before Brutus made it famous by a similar act in Roman history. The general truth is that the re-

ligious emotions shall swallow up, like Aaron's rod, all others in the nature.

V. 4, declares that so general will be the power of this religious reformation, that even sin itself shall hide its head in shame. The false prophets shall be ashamed to utter their pretended visions. The prophets usually wore a hairy garment, such as was worn by mourners, because of the solemn and often mournful purport of their messages. Hence deceivers adopted the same garb, but this symbol of deception shall then be laid aside in dread of the fiery storm of zeal for God that then should sweep the land.

V. 5, and 6, describe in dialogue form the detection of one of these prophets. He is seized by some zealous vindicator of the law, and in his fright he exclaims that he is not a false prophet, but a field servant, who was purchased for that purpose in his youth, and hence could not have exercised the prophetic function, being under the absolute control of a master. The interrogator, however, detects falsehood in the statements of the prophet, and forces him to confess his character. He sees scars in his hands. The phrase "between thy hands," means this, as appears from Prov. 26 : 13, where *ben* has the same signification. He demands an explanation of these scars, and the guilty man confesses with shame that they were received in the service of idols. This verse is often applied to Christ, in the grossest misapprehension of its meaning. It applies solely to the detected false prophet. Some have taken the passage as a continuance of his defence, asserting that these were scars received from his master, but besides destroying the fine dramatic finale that the real sense gives us, it is inconsistent with the terms used. *Maakhabeim* is the word usually employed to represent the objects of idolatrous love and service, and must so be taken here, and 1 Kings 18 : 28, and other passages show that cutting the flesh was a part often of idolatrous worship. It is, therefore, the trembling confession of a confused culprit, who is detected, and in shame and terror, acknowledges his crime in hope of mercy. We have thus

a highly picturesque description of the zeal for God, the hatred of evil, and the shrinking fear and concealment of sin that will be found in the great Revival of the future.

The sword awake against the shepherd.

CH. 13 : 7-9.

7. "O sword! awake against my shepherd,
Against a man, my nearest kin,
Saith Jehovah of Hosts,
Smite the shepherd,
And the sheep shall be scattered,
And I will bring back my hand upon the little ones.
8. And it shall be in all the land, saith Jehovah,
Two portions shall be cut off and die,
And the third portion shall remain in it.
9. And I bring the third part into the fire
And purify them as silver is purified,
And try them as gold is tried.
They shall call upon my name,
And I will hear them,
I will say they are my people,
And they shall say, Jehovah is my God."

It is not unusual with the prophets to give at the opening or the close of a prophecy, a summary of its contents. An instance of the first, we have in ch. 11, 1-5, and an instance of the second we have in the passage before us. It sums up the preceding prophecy, which had declared the assumption of the pastoral charge of the flock by the Messiah, his rejection by the people, their rejection by God, their dispersion and subsequent restoration. This summary is in this case the more necessary, because the reason for cutting off the Messiah was not stated. Only the human agency was brought out, because the deeper significance of this awful fact was not pertinent to the scope of that portion of the prophecy. It seemed a mysterious thing that one whose coming was to be such a blessing should be cut off before he had bestowed that blessing. It seemed a final triumph of wickedness, and a defeat of the merciful purposes of God, by the insane folly of man.

It was therefore necessary before ending the prophecy to bring to view that deeper mystery that underlaid this fact and show that God's great purposes were in it all, and that what seemed man's final ruin, was really man's appointed salvation.

The meaning of this passage is clearly fixed by Christ, when in Matt. 26 : 31, 32, he applies it expressly to himself, at that dread hour when he was about to finish the mystery of redemption. There is in the whole compass of human knowledge, nothing more awfully sublime, than this seeming schism in the Godhead. It is as if sin was so dreadful an evil, that the assumption of its guilt by a sinless Mediator, must for a time make a division, even in the absolute unity of the Godhead itself. It is the most awful illustration of the repulsive and separating power of sin, that the history of the universe affords.

V. 7. The sword is the symbol of judicial power. The taking away of life being the highest function of government, the sword, which is the instrument of violent death, was selected as the symbol of these functions. The magistrate was called one who beareth the sword, see Rom. 13 : 4, because he wielded judicial power. Hence the great doctrine here set forth is, that the death of Christ was a judicial act, in which he endured the penalty of that law, whose penal power was symbolised by this sword of divine wrath. The sheep had deserved the blow but the shepherd bares his own bosom to the sword, and is wounded for the sins of his people, and bears those sins in his own body on the tree. The vicarious nature of the atonement is therefore distinctly involved in this passage.

But who was this shepherd? "A man, my nearest kin." He was a man, with all human sympathies and emotions, but he was more than a man, the nearest kin of Jehovah. The word *ameith* is only found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, where it is used for the nearest kin, and sometimes as synonymous with brother. See Lev. 5 : 17, etc. It is never used to indicate similarity of office, as Socinians assert on this passage, but always nearness of relation, or kindred. Hence it here must

refer to a human nature that beyond this humanity has a nature in the nearest possible relation to Jehovah, which of course must be a divine nature. Hence we have here clearly a twofold nature in the suffering Messiah, human and divine.

The scattering of the sheep must not be limited exclusively to the dispersion of the disciples on the night of Christ's arrest, but refers to that general dispersion that should follow the death of Messiah. The extent of the dispersion is explained in the next verses. To "bring back the hand" is to interpose in reference to any one, whatever be the animus of the interposition, and to do so upon the little ones, is that interposition in favour of the humble and faithful that is alluded to elsewhere, see ch. 11:7, 11. It was partly fulfilled in the gathering of Jewish disciples into the Christian church.

V. 7, predicts the destruction of a majority of the theocratic people, after the death of Messiah. The phrase, "a mouth of two," (probably a mouth-portion of two, a double portion of eatables,) is taken from Deut. 21:7, and here means a large portion. This was fulfilled in the immense destruction of the Jewish people that took place after the death of Christ.

V. 9, declares that the smaller portion that would be saved, must be brought through great trials. This portion includes not only the Jews who were converted to Christianity, and who passed through the fires of persecution, but also that portion that survived the dispersion, and still remain in unbelief. They are still in the furnace, but the time comes when they shall be purified and return to God in covenant love, and be received by him again into favor. These verses therefore give us an epitomised history of redemption, and show that there are yet purposes of mercy in reserve for the ancient covenant people.

CHAPTER 14.

Future glories of the Church.

1. Behold a day comes to Jehovah.
And thy spoil is divided in the midst of thee.

2. And I collect all the nations against Jerusalem to battle,
And the city is taken, and the houses plundered,
And the women dishonored,
And half the city go forth into captivity,
And the remnant of the city shall not be cut off from the city.
3. And Jehovah goes forth and fights against those heathen,
As in the day of his conflict, in the day of battle.
4. And his feet shall stand in that day on the mount of Olives,
Which is before Jerusalem, on the east,
And the mount of Olives is split in the midst
From east to west, a great valley
And half the mountain recedes to the north, and half to the south.
5. And ye flee into my mountain valley,
For the mountain valley will extend to Azal,
And ye shall flee, as ye fled before the earthquake,
In the days of Uzziab, king of Judah,
And there comes Jehovah my God, all holy ones with thee.
6. And it shall be in that day,
It shall not be light, precious things are obscured.
7. And it shall be one day, it shall be known to Jehovah,
Not day, and not night,
And it shall be that in the evening time it shall be light.
8. And it shall be in that day,
Living waters shall go out from Jerusalem,
Their half to the eastern sea,
And their half to the western sea,
In summer and winter it shall be.
9. And Jehovah shall be king over the whole land,
In that day Jehovah shall be one, and his name one.
10. All the land shall be changed,
As the plain from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem,
And she shall be exalted and sit in her place,
From the gate of Benjamin to the place of the first gate,
To the gate of the corner,
And from the tower of Hananeel to the king's wine presses.
11. And they dwell in her,
And there shall be no more curse,
And Jerusalem sits in security.
12. And this shall be the plague, with which Jehovah shall plague
All nations which warred against Jerusalem,
His flesh shall rot, and he standing on his feet,
And his eyes shall rot in their sockets,
And their tongue shall rot in their mouth.
13. And it shall be in that day,
There shall be among them a great confusion from Jehovah,

And they shall seize each man the hand of his neighbour,
And his hand shall rise against the hand of his neighbour.

14. And Judah also shall fight in Jerusalem,
And the wealth of all the nations round about shall be gathered ;
Gold, and silver, and garments in great abundance.
15. And so shall be the plague of the horse, the mule, the camel, and the
ass,
Which shall be in these camps, as this plague.
16. And it shall be that the remnant of all the nations,
Who came up against Jerusalem,
Shall go up from year to year, (*to Jerusalem,*)
To worship the king, Jehovah of Hosts,
And to keep the feast of tabernacles.
17. And it shall be that whoever of the tribes of the earth,
Will not go up to Jerusalem to worship the king, Jehovah of Hosts,
Upon them there shall be no rain.
18. And if the family of Egypt will not go forth, and come up,
And there shall not be upon them (*therefore any rain,*)
There shall be the plague with which Jehovah shall plague the nations
That do not come up to keep the feast of tabernacles.
19. And this will be the sin of Egypt and the sin of all nations,
That come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles.
20. In that day there shall be upon the bells of the horses
"SACRED TO JEHOVAH."
And the vessels in the house of Jehovah shall be,
As the sacrificial bowls upon the altar.
21. And every vessel in Jerusalem and Judah shall be,
SACRED TO JEHOVAH OF HOSTS.
And all the sacrificers shall come, and take from them and offer in them,
And there shall be no more a Canaanite
In the house of Jehovah of Hosts, in that day."

This chapter is one of those portions of Scripture which, like sealed orders to a vessel, which are not to be opened until a certain latitude is reached, can only be read in perfect comprehension after the church has reached a point in her history yet future. Until the seal is removed at the appointed time, we can only conjecture the full meaning of the predictions, and await the clearer light of the future. The chapter seems to refer to facts distinct from those predicted in the last chapter, probably the last great events of the present dispensation, that are described in other prophecies in terms of such fearful grandeur. It seems to point to that last great struggle of the

powers of evil with the church, which is to be ended by the coming of Christ in great power, and the complete establishment of his kingdom of glory. It is therefore parallel with the prediction of Enoch, concerning the coming of the Lord with ten thousand of his holy ones; with that of Ezek. 39, about the battle of Gog and Magog, and the corresponding passage in Rev. 20, referring to the same great events. The general facts predicted are, a wide combination against the church, a time of trouble ensuing, in the midst of which the Lord appears in terrible power, destroys the enemies of his people, establishes the church in permanent glory, inflicts enduring punishment on the finally wicked, and brings about a state of holiness that shall be the last and perfected state of the church.

V. 1. The phrase "a day comes to Jehovah," means more than that the day of Jehovah comes. It conveys the thought that this time is to be one of special glory to Jehovah, in which his government shall be vindicated and his name glorified. The second member of the verse is addressed to the church, and shows that she also shall share in the glory of this day. The promise, "thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee," is a promise of victory and security. Victory is indicated by "spoil," and security by the manner in which the spoil was to be divided; not secretly in places of concealment, for fear of a return of the enemy, but openly in the midst of the city; showing that the enemy is completely vanquished. Hence this verse is the caption of the prophecy, showing that it predicts glory to God and triumph to his church.

V. 2, explains how this spoil comes to be in the hands of the church. It is the spoil of those who have come up to destroy her. In consequence of her coldness and defections, a combination of enemies is allowed against her. This is represented under the image of a siege, with obvious allusion to the capture of Jerusalem by Babylon. There is first the investiture of the city by the besiegers, then the breach, and then the pillage, brutality and cruelty that accompanied the

sack of a city. But this capture should not be like the first one, so vividly in their memory then, for "the remnant of the city shall not be cut off from the city." There shall be a faithful few who shall be left like wheat when the chaff has been winnowed by the tempest, and who shall not be cut off from the city.

V. 3. When the scene is darkest, and the enemies of the church seem to be completely victorious, God himself appears in a form of terrible majesty, and takes part against the invading nations. What shall be the exact mode of this interposition, the event only can fully declare. "The day of conflict," alluded to in the second member of the verse, is probably the Egyptian deliverance, which is called a battle in Ex. 14 : 14, 15 : 3, and which always was regarded as *the* deliverance of the nation, by way of eminence.

V. 4, describes the first great act of interposition, viz. an earthquake, which divides the Mount of Olives in half and opens out a valley toward the Jordan, which would be a prolongation eastward of the valley of Jehoshaphat. The Mount of Olives is chosen as the spot that commanded the finest view of Jerusalem, and hence the one most suitable for God to occupy as a position of observation.

V. 5, explains the reason for opening out this valley. The Mount of Olives would be an obstacle in the way of a sudden flight from the city. When, therefore, the earthquake was sent in judgment on the enemies of the church, it was necessary that the few faithful should be enabled to escape like Lot from Sodom; and to enable them to do so in the speediest manner, the same mighty convulsion that was sent to swallow up the enemy opened up a way of escape for them. "My mountain-valley," (lit. valley of my mountains,) would seem to be the valley of Jehoshaphat, which lay along Zion and Moriah, which may be called God's mountains, from their peculiar sacredness. This is said to extend, in consequence of the disruption of the Mount of Olives, to Azal. The word *Azal* means, probably, standing still, or ceasing, and may be used to express the fact that the

valley of deliverance should extend to the point where all danger would cease. If it designates any actually existing place, it must have been some small city east of Jerusalem. . . . The earthquake in the days of Uzziah is not mentioned in the historical books of the Old Testament, but is alluded to in Amos 1 : 1, as a very memorable event in the history of Judah. . . . It is impossible for us to take this whole passage literally, for God cannot literally place his feet on the Mount of Olives, but how far it must be taken as figurative, we cannot now tell. It is clear, however, that it predicts scenes of confusion and terror, in the midst of which God shall interpose by some amazing acts, which shall at the same time destroy his enemies and deliver his people. How far the mighty agencies of the material world shall be actually employed, it is impossible for us now to say with certainty.

The last member of the verse seems like a sudden exclamation. After looking at the earthquake, and the rending mountain, and the flying crowds rushing to a place of safety, the prophet looks up and sees a sight that causes him suddenly to cry out with joyful surprise, "there comes Jehovah my God! all holy ones with thee!" The surprise is indicated not only by the abrupt transition, but also by the change of persons from the third to the second. The "holy ones" are the inhabitants of heaven, whether angels or redeemed souls, and the same with the saints, &c., that are so frequently mentioned in connection with the coming of the Lord. This coming of Jehovah is distinct from the interposition predicted in v. 3, 4, and seems to be that last great coming to judgment, elsewhere so vividly depicted. This exclamation is thrown in parenthetically, like that in 13 : 7, "awake, O sword," &c., as if the prophet had lifted his eyes from the dim and troubled scenes he was contemplating to a more distant but more radiant future, the light of which enabled him to look more steadily on the scenes more immediately before him. Having gazed for an instant of exulting rapture on that glorious procession that he saw approaching, he then returns in the next verse to describe more in detail the events

he had been just before describing. This sudden transition from a nearer to a remoter future, that has some connection with it, we have already noticed frequently in this prophecy, and need not pause to explain or defend it, for it is the natural action of the mind in looking at a series of future events.

V. 6, returns to the events that are to attend this interposition of God for his church. The words *y'karoth*, *y'kiphaen*, are obscure, and have received a variety of interpretations. The usual meaning of *yakar* is a precious thing, and *kapha* means to contract or lessen, and if applied to bright or precious things, would imply a lessening of their brightness or value. Hengstenberg refers the phrase to the heavenly bodies, as implying their obscuration. But there seems to be no necessity for limiting the word to any definite class of objects. When the light disappears, all precious things, heavenly and earthly, must be obscured, and the general fact predicted seems to be, that in the time of trouble here declared, all that is most prized among men, all the guiding lights of human ambition, and all the precious things of human affection, shall lose their former value, and darken under a gloomy eclipse.

V. 7, declares that this state of darkness shall not be long in duration, nor shall it be total in its obscurity. It shall be only "one day, known to Jehovah," but a short time, and this time limited by the purposes of God. The words, "not day, not night," indicate that it shall not be a total obscurity, but only a twilight dimness, in which the darkness of the past shall be yielding to the light of the future. And then when it seems to the fainting hope of God's people that this darkness is thickening into the deeper gloom of night, it suddenly breaks away, like the outburst of the setting sun, after a day of clouds, and at "evening time it shall be light." The meaning is as obvious as the image is beautiful, and in the experience of many a Christian has it been true, as it will be in the great sunset of the world, that when the gloom that has thickened through the waning noon, seems to be deepening into the blackness of night, then is the sudden sunburst

of a bright revealing of the face of God, so that in the evening time there is light.

V. 8, predicts the coming of blessings on the earth, by means of the church. These blessings are set forth under the symbol of living (i. e. running) waters, a symbol which is frequently used in Scripture to express not only divine blessings, but these very blessings that are yet in store for the church. See Isa. 44 : 3, &c. ; Ezekiel's vision of the river flowing forth from the temple, ch. 47 ; Joel 4 : 18, and Rev. 22 : 1. To an Oriental in his burning clime, the image of a gushing stream, whose grassy margin was overhung by waving trees, was one of the most significant that could be used to express a divine blessing. Their going out from Jerusalem, implied that the church should be the medium of these blessings ; their flowing to the Eastern and Western seas, i. e. the Dead and Mediterranean, implied their universality, as these were the limits of the holy land ; whilst their perennial endurance is declared by the fact that they would be unaffected by either the summer's drought or the winter's cold.

V. 9, explains this blessing in more distinct terms. It shall consist in the acknowledgment of God's rightful authority. Hitherto men have revolted from the one God, and served divers lusts and vanities, and made to themselves gods many and lords many. But then, they shall acknowledge God as their rightful ruler, and all acknowledge the same God, know God by the same name, and worship him with the same views. This seems to be the meaning of the words, "Jehovah shall be one and his name one." The diversities of the present shall give place to a living and glorious unity. This is as if in designed denunciation of the type that infidelity is now assuming, that all existing forms of religion are good, and that it is bigotry to assert any one, only true system of religious belief and practice.

V. 10, describes symbolically the future exaltation and restoration of the church. This is described first by the prediction that all the mountainous region round about Jerusalem, should be levelled into a plain, like the plain or valley of the

Jordan. "From Geba to Rimmon," expresses the fact that this would be general, as Geba was the northern limit of Judah (2 Kings 23 : 8), and Rimmon (not the rock Rimmon, but Rimmon of Simeon, Josh. 15 : 32,) was the southern. The fact predicted is, not that the church should be exalted so much as that the world should be humbled; the cold and stony pride that has hitherto surrounded the church should be abased, and that church left in her lofty pre-eminence as the dwelling place of God among men. The future restoration of the church to her former condition is described by the terms, "From the gate of Benjamin to the place of the first gate, &c." This refers to the capture and sack described in v. 2, and declares that all trace of this destruction shall be effaced. The places named here are the boundaries of the city as they were known in the time of Zechariah, the gate of Benjamin being on the north, the first gate on the east, the tower of Hananeel on the south east, the wine vats on the south west, and the corner gate on the extreme west. The general fact predicted is that all traces of this time of trouble should be effaced and the church restored to all her former glory.

V. 11, declares that there should be no return of these seasons of trial. Being kept pure, she needed not again to pass through the furnace, the days of her mourning being ended.

V. 12, introduces the declaration of the punishment that God would inflict on his enemies. This passage is parallel to Isa. 66 : 24, and seems to allude to the same general facts. It is a figurative description of the punishment of sin. The first element of the punishment is *corruption*, which is set forth by the terrible image of a living death, a fearful, anomalous state in which the mouldy rottenness of death is combined in horrible union with the vivid, conscious sensibility of life. The soul of the sinner in its future consciousness of sin, shall feel its loathsome corruption as vividly as now it would feel the slow putrefaction of the body that rotted piecemeal to the grave.

The second element of the punishment is given in v. 13, viz. *mutual hate and contention*. The image is that of a panic-struck army, in which each man clutches and strikes in frantic fury his nearest neighbour. Hell shall be hate, in its fiercest and hatefulest forms. Sin is now the cause of all the quarrels on earth, it shall be cause of endless quarrels in hell. Oh the thought of an everlasting scene of rage, hate and conflict is intolerable, and yet this is but sin left to itself.

The third element of this punishment is given in v. 14, viz. *loss of the blessings previously enjoyed*. This is represented by the image of spoil. The wealth of the nations that besieged Jerusalem shall be taken by Judah and Jerusalem, which are here combined in the triumph, as they were combined in the struggle described in ch. 12. This is parallel to the fact alluded to in the parable where the one talent is taken from the unfaithful servant and given to him who has ten talents. The blessings that sinners now have, and abuse in having, will then be taken from them and given to others.

A fourth element is described in v. 15, viz. *the infectious nature of sin*. Sin defiles all that it touches. It has defiled the earth and all it contains so that it must be burned up; and it will hereafter transform the dwelling place of its possessors into a hell, and their companions into fiends, and make it necessary that the very instruments of enjoyment they have possessed in life should be taken from them and destroyed.

These denunciations of punishment may refer to events preceding the last judgment, but they will not probably have their complete fulfilment until afterwards, when sin shall have developed itself perfectly into sorrow and everlasting woe.

V. 16, turns to the church, and asserts her supremacy over all her enemies, and her extension over all the earth. This is done by the statement, that all that survive of the nations of the earth, shall come up to the observance of the feast of tabernacles. This is of course not to be taken literally, as it would be impossible as a literal fact, without a miracle, and in contradiction to the obvious teachings of Paul in regard to the temporary character of these ordinances. The feast of

tabernacles was selected as the ground of this figurative prediction, because it was a feast of peculiar joy. It was instituted as a memorial of the wanderings in the wilderness, and as an acknowledgment of the ingathering of the harvest. It therefore clustered around it, the memories of the past and the blessings of the present. The selection of it as a basis of the representation of future blessings to the church implies that in that period predicted, her wanderings in the wilderness shall have ended, her seed-time of tears shall have issued in a reaping time of joy, and along the hills of light that stretch away in the Canaan above, there shall roll the everlasting song of her harvest home.

V. 17, threatens that upon those who refuse thus to go up, there shall be no rain. It is not meant to be implied, that at the time predicted, there shall be such disobedient persons, for in v. 16, it is clearly implied that there shall be none of such. It is rather a figurative assertion of the fact that in this future condition, the present mingled state of reward and punishment shall end. Now God sends rain on the just and the unjust, then he will separate the good and the evil, and render unto every man according to his works.

V. 18, amplifies this thought. It might be thought that to some this threatening would convey nothing that they would fear, just as the threatening of no rain would not be feared by Egypt, which in fact rarely had any rain, but depended for water on the Nile. Thus to threaten a hardened sinner with the withholding of the gentle showers of divine grace, would seem to him to be no punishment, for he never had enjoyed these showers from heaven, but found his enjoyment in the turbid waters of the earthly. It is then declared that even for such, there shall be a suitable punishment, and one that they shall feel. God's magazine of wrath has an instrument for every shade of guilt. They who fear not the drought, shall tremble before the pestilence. The somewhat obscure words *v'lo alehem*, we have taken as expressing the result of the supposed disobedience, as threatened in v. 17. If Egypt

refuses to obey, and as a consequence of this refusal there falls no rain upon her people, then although this would be no punishment to be dreaded by them, there shall be a punishment which they must dread, namely the plague.

V. 19, explains what is the real nature of the sin of the impenitent world, namely, a refusal to attach themselves to the people of God. It is therefore only a figurative declaration of the fact that unbelief and being ashamed of Christ are the damning sins of the world.

V. 20, 21, close up this picture of the future with a fitting finale, developing the great fact that this future state of the church would be happy because it would be holy, and that this holiness would extend to every thing connected with her. The distinction between sacred and profane was introduced by sin, and would cease with its termination on the earth. The Mosaic dispensations drew the line with much sharpness and narrowness; the Christian dispensation widened the limits, and made all the saints to be priests, but there comes a time when this consecration shall be wider still, and extend to the minutest things pertaining to life. The "bells of the horses," were those bells that were fastened to them partly for ornament and partly to make them easily found if they strayed away at night. They were not necessary parts of the harness, and trifling in value. When therefore it is said that even they should have the inscription that was engraved on the breastplate of the high priest, this declares the fact that even the most trifling things in this future state of the church should be consecrated to God, equally with the highest and holiest.

It is further stated that the vessels in the temple used for boiling, receiving ashes, &c. shall be as holy as the golden bowls that were used to catch the blood of the sacrificial victim. This is to affirm that all outward distinctions in the church, official and otherwise, should be swallowed up in the great brotherhood of the children of God.

To show the extent of this holiness, it is added that the very cooking utensils of Jerusalem, should be holy to the

Lord, or that the smallest acts of the daily life should be consecrated, and holiness diffuse itself in living power through the whole man, in all the departments of his activity, leading him whatsoever he does to do all to the glory of God. The idea is, absolute, and universal consecration to the Lord.

The words "all the sacrificers shall come &c.," imply that this condition shall be one of active obedience, and not of mere passive enjoyment; whilst the prediction that there should be no more a Canaanite in the house of the Lord, affirms that no profane or unclean person shall there be found in the redeemed church. The mingled condition of the present shall give place to a state in the future, in which all shall be holy, and nothing unclean be found in the new Jerusalem. The whole passage is then parallel with the sublime close of the Apocalypse, in which the holiness of the heavenly state is depicted in such magnificent terms. All shall be happy because all shall be holy. Sorrow shall cease because sin shall cease. The groaning earth shall be mantled with joy because the trail of the serpent shall be gone, and the Eden of the future make us cease to look back with longing at the Eden of the past. If then a man would have the beginnings of Heaven, it must be by this absolute consecration of every thing to God on earth, for precisely as "holiness to the Lord" is upon the "bells of the horses," shall their melody have the ring of the golden harps. Let a man's life be a liturgy, a holy service of acted worship, and his death shall be a sweeter melody than the fabled song of the dying swan, and his eternity the song of Moses and the lamb.

ART. II.

PRAYER—AS A MEANS OF GRACE.

[We publish the following article on the *rationale* of prayer, although, on very sufficient grounds, we totally dissent from what seems to be the main conclusion of the author; as, we apprehend, does also the great body of the Christian Church. It is the production of an intelligent layman, who has thought deeply and anxiously on the subject, and who appears to be very sincerely desirous of ascertaining the exact import of the Scriptures concerning it; for he is manifestly in doubt. It is written with clearness and with force, but without dogmatism. It raises the question, well known to theologians, of the direct motive influence of prayer upon the Deity, representing it as principally, if not wholly, subjective with respect to the petitioner, while its indispensable obligation is unequivocally admitted. We solicit from any of our able contributors such a response as the question really admits of, that the actual, objective prevalence of prayer, both as a revealed fact and as consistent with the Divine government, may be fully set before our readers. No subject could be more profitable, wisely discussed.—EDITOR.]

Παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον πάντων ποιῆσαι δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας τιάς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων.—I Tim. chap. 2, v. 1.

There are not wanting those simple, honest, devout persons in our communion, perhaps in others, may be in all, who receive the teachings of our creed, and scarcely less the expositions of Scripture, in the ordinary pulpit labours of our ministry, as the truth; the very truth; from which there may be no dissent but at the risk, to the caviller, of being charged with infidelity to the church. In the excess of their zeal, or of their credulity, they seem willing to admit without question; to accept without reserve; to adopt without investigation, just what the pious preacher may say; or what the pious writer may have written; without being able to give any satisfactory reason why, or wherefore. They believe what the preacher believes, and *because* the preacher believes;

and it is barely possible that the preacher, himself, may believe a given tenet because other preachers believed for him, and before him. Such persons are most likely to regard any attempt to apply the tests of reason to any commonly received, though it may be erroneous, belief; any effort at calm analysis and philosophical investigation, intended to separate the dross from the pure metal, as little less than sacrilege; or at least, as evincing a suspicious degree of sceptical obliquity, ominous of entire apostacy from the true faith. There are others who are not disposed to give themselves over-much trouble on the score of doctrinal difficulties; who are content to leave knots and niceties to the critical; who care not to look beyond literal precept and common belief; who, having perceived, as they understand, plain duty, think it enough to obey; and who seem to apprehend danger in the region of the speculative, and fear that much learning might make them mad. In this habitude of thought and feeling there may be much to commend, and with it we make no quarrel.

There are others, again, who, quite as loyal to the church, its doctrines, its ministry, its economy, as any of all the fraternity, are yet earnest lovers of truth; who are willing to search for it as for hid treasure, either in or out of the "articles;" whether it be found to harmonize, or to conflict, with what may be proclaimed from the pulpit; because, they conceive, there is no harm in truth; that truth is everlastingly consistent with itself; consistent with the highest interests of created beings, and consistent with God. Upon a clear and adequate conception of the true in religion; of the ultimately true and the absolutely reasonable, in our faith, must depend, in a good degree, the fullness of our peace and joy in believing, and the due meed of praise to God, our Saviour.

With these preliminary hints, we propose to state and discuss a proposition on the subject of prayer, without being able to satisfy our own mind, so as to remove all reasonable doubt of the truth of either the affirmative or negative of that proposition. But since both cannot be true, one or the other

must be erroneous ; and our principal object in writing is that some of our able, learned and experienced spiritual leaders may be induced to give us light, and thus lead us to the truth. The proposition may be thus stated in the form of an interrogatory ; Can prayer move God to the performance of aught that is merciful which he otherwise would not perform ? The point of difficulty arises in the inquiry, whether the act and exercise of prayer moves God to the soul, or moves the soul to God ? But, *cui bono* ? Why pursue an inquiry which is so immaterial to the honest worshipper ? If the soul is brought into holy union with its maker, by means of prayer, why consume time in a fruitless search to determine whether the prayer draw the Saviour to the sinner's side, or lift the sinner up to his Saviour ? Why, so far as the individual petitioner is concerned, the inquiry might be forever dropped as an useless one. We admit, in *his* case, prayer is the indispensable means of his salvation ; nor would we gratify a mere curiosity to reason farther. But it must be obvious to all that very important and practical deductions are to be made, so far as the praying *for others* is concerned, as that same inquiry is determined the one way or the other. If prayer move God to the soul, then our prayers may move Him to the souls of others ; but if prayer can only move the soul to God, by the preparing influences of penitence, earnest desire and humble faith, then it follows necessarily that our prayers, considered as distinct and separate means, can have nothing directly to do with the salvation of others. If prayer is only productive of preparation ; if it only bring the spiritual man into position ; if it only place the soul where it may be reached and affected by the boundless and ever-abounding grace of God ; if it has, in fact, nothing to do by way of *causing* the communication of that grace ; the active exertion of that unspeakable, incomprehensible goodness ; then it is, to our understanding, unquestionably true that such prayer can have no possible influence, for good or evil, upon the souls of others, distant and separated from the petitioner. It might be that the praying *with* others publicly could exert, in any

event, a sympathetic influence for good. But this cannot at all affect the result of our investigation.

In the foregoing view of the case we are able to conceive an interest, and to discover an importance in discussing the main proposition; and of seeking earnestly for a correct solution. We are brought again to inquire, Can prayer move God to the performance of aught that is merciful, which, in the absence of such prayer, He would not perform? (1.) It may be affirmatively argued that such seems to have been the conviction of good and holy men of all ages of the world; the conviction of the church, at any past time and at the present. So *seem* to have believed Job and Abraham, Moses and David, prophets and apostles, and those of the modern church, most learned and experienced in the deep things of God. If it were not true, should we find the saints of all times, inspired as well as uninspired, believing, teaching, living, a doctrine that affirms the power of prayer with God? Is there not a sense in which the concurrent testimony of "the holy Catholic Church" becomes to us the voice of God? "Whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven," is a solemn declaration which means something. (2.) The truth of the affirmative may be further inferred, because such a view of the case comports more strictly and harmoniously with the laws of the moral nature of man, as developed, more particularly, in the dominion of the affections. Man's nature, physical, intellectual and moral, is the perfect workmanship of the infinitely Wise, and no less infinitely True. Considered, of course, as uncorrupted by sin; it is indeed "very good," and could not be otherwise. Freed from the disturbing forces of sin, the heart of man is true; his nature is essentially noble and correct. Hence, when that nature, swayed by holy influences; when the heart, prompted by pure and lofty impulse, inclines us, with a powerful and overwhelming motive, to *pray for others*, it is some evidence that it is right to do so; that it is important to do so. Is it a sufficient answer to this, to af-

firm that such devotional exercises are designed to improve the moral nature, and fix the religious habits of the worshipper himself, and thus exercise an important influence for good, although such prayer can effect nothing in behalf of others? Does it satisfy our reason or our faith to affirm, that we can be thus led by holy influence, to pray for *that, quoad hoc*, so far as others are to be affected, we may as well call upon Baal as upon Jehovah? (3.) The truth of the affirmative may be further inferred, because such a view of the case is in accordance with, and promotive of the duties of active Christian benevolence. The praying for another is the most likely, of any other act, to induce the petitioner to perform other acts of kindness for the object of his benevolence. He who *prays* most for the success of missions is most likely to contribute liberally to promote that success. But, on the contrary, if the petitioner honestly believe that his prayer could have, in fact, no object beyond himself, (which he ought to believe, if really true,) he must soon cease to pray for others, however benevolent he may feel. Now, a belief which tends in practice to fasten and strengthen the conviction, that, in this holy exercise, I am *not* "my brother's keeper;" and hence tends to diminish my interest in, and my efforts for, his salvation, may well be regarded with distrust, and needs to be sustained by reason and by authority. (4.) It may be affirmed, upon proof furnished in the experience of every truly pious soul, that the Holy Spirit, as they understand it, *moves* the renewed heart to pray for others. If, really, such prayer could have, in the nature of the case, no other objective result than to elevate the religious tone of the worshipper himself, why should he be thus led, or misled, to approach God by indirection? Is it entirely consistent with the revealed character of our Maker that honest zeal should be thus conducted to the attainment of truth by the path of actual error; of absolute delusion? Are not absolute, ultimate, abstract Truth, and God, and Religion, *One*? (5.) It may be further argued, affirmatively, that, among the multitudinous Scripture lessons recorded on the subject of prayer, no single

passage is found in which the contrary doctrine is explicitly taught. If the truth lay in the negative of the proposition, could our apprehension of the truth have been left wholly dependent upon processes of ratiocination, unassisted and undirected by the light of Revelation? The Scriptures were given by inspiration, and are available "for instruction in righteousness." (6.) The affirmative of the proposition may be further maintained from the fact, that the Scripture record furnishes very many texts that seem to teach, by their apparently plain and obvious import, the duty and consequent results of intercession for others; for particular classes, and for all men.

Before any enumeration is made of such texts, it may be well to remark that it might be, at least, hazardous, to resolve all such plain teachings into figure and metaphor, and by thus explaining away the commonly received truth, deduce or infer a doctrine the opposite and contrary of that which the church in all ages has received as the very truth of God. But while it may be well to carry with us, into all our investigations in the field of revealed truth, this important and necessary caution; yet we frankly admit that such a *ca-veat* is not argument, nor is it offered as such.

On the other hand, it may be remarked, with great force and propriety, that he who seeks to comprehend clearly and adequately a system of sound theology, will find himself perpetually embarrassed, and entangled in mazes of irreconcilable theories if he attempt to build upon a basis of scattered and isolated texts. The whole record, or rather, the record as a whole, must be consistently interpreted. The whole subject must be grasped. The truth may not be exhibited by fragments. The Oracles of God must be made to utter no doubtful or uncertain response. In the one case, the investigator may construct a system of *textology*, but scarcely a trust-worthy system of revealed truth. While, then, it is proper to follow with reverence the plain import, the teaching, the spirit of the selected Scriptures, it is also exceedingly unwise and unsafe to insist upon the deduction of a theolog-

ical truth, of universal authority, affecting the whole subject of man's duty and accountability, because a particular text, separately construed, seems to favor or to warrant such a deduction. There is no plainer and easier exegetical theorem, than that a special or particular inference must give way before a general and more enlarged deduction, when the two are in real conflict. But we only meant to indicate, and not to discuss, this proposition.

If, indeed, contrary to common belief, the truth lies yet deeper, it must needs be dug up and exhibited; for all the superincumbent mass may be nought but dross and rubbish. To the record. The Book, properly interpreted, is the law of the case, because it is the truth and the absolute fitness and reasonableness of the case.

We shall enumerate the texts in order, and reserve our comment for the sequel. Job 42 ; 8. "Take you now seven bullocks, go to my servant Job; offer up for yourselves a burnt offering; *my servant Job shall pray for you; for him will I accept*, lest I deal with you after your folly." Gen. 18 ; 25, etc. Wilt thou "slay the righteous with the wicked? Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? O let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak yet but this once: peradventure ten shall be found there? and he said I will not destroy it for ten's sake." Exodus 32 ; 9, etc. "And the Lord said unto Moses . . . *let me alone* that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them, and I will make of thee a great nation. And Moses *besought* the Lord, his God, and said . . . turn from this fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people. And the Lord *repented* of the evil which He thought to do unto His people." Deut. 9 : 14, etc. "The Lord said unto me . . . *Let me alone* that I may destroy them . . . and I fell down before the Lord as at the first. . . The Lord *hearkened unto me* at that time also." 1 Samuel 12 ; 23. "God forbid that I should sin against the Lord *in ceasing to pray for you*; but I will teach you the good and the right way." Joel 2 ; 17, 18. "Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord

weep between the porch and the altar; and let them say, spare thy people, O Lord! Then will the Lord be jealous for his land, and pity his people." Ezek. 22; 30. "I sought for a man among them that should make up the hedge, and stand in the gap before me for the land, that I should not destroy it." Matt. 8; 5—13. "There came unto Jesus a Centurion *beseeking him*, saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home, sick of the palsy, grievously tormented . . . speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed. . . . And Jesus said unto the Centurion, go thy way, and *as thou hast believed*, so be it done unto thee; and his servant was healed in the self-same hour." Matt. 18; 19. "Again I say unto you if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything *they shall ask*, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in Heaven." 1 Tim. 2; 1, etc. "I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made *for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life*, in all godliness and honesty." Jas. 5; 14, etc. "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them *pray over him* and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him. The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man *avaieth much*. Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are," &c.

We now offer a brief word of comment upon the texts we have selected out of a very extended list which seem to throw light on the main inquiry. We have neither time nor space for a critical exposition, nor have we an inclination to bring to this discussion anything in aid of either side, of a forced or doubtful authority. And first, the passage from the book of Job, properly understood, may not strengthen the affirmation. Let us see. Job was a priest, and a holy man of exalted character, and remarkable piety. • While suffering severe affliction, and yet trusting the hand that chastened him, his erring and ignorant friends were constantly referring his affliction to other

than the true causes ; and did not magnify the character, the goodness and justice of God, as did the suffering Job. They had sinned, therefore, and needed an atonement. The true meaning of the text *may be* expressed in language like this : “ Ye friends of Job have not glorified my name in your counsels. Ye have spoken foolishly and wickedly before me. Now take your seven bullocks and *offer for yourselves* a burnt offering, through my servant Job, who is a priest accepted of the Lord ; and ye shall thus make an atonement for your sins. My servant Job shall officiate for you, and I will accept the sacrifice thus made by this priest of the Lord.” If this be the true meaning, then, so far as the argument is concerned, the text is disposed of, and we proceed to others.

The next is the case of Abraham pleading for the cities of the plain. It is often said, and allowed even by learned commentators, that the angel of the covenant could not proceed to the destruction of Sodom while Abraham continued to plead for the devoted cities. Such, it is inferred, is the power of prayer to move God. But is there anything in the record to warrant such a deduction? Is there anything to prove that the Lord would have destroyed the cities, with or without Abraham's prayer, involving in that ruin fifty, or forty, thirty, twenty, or ten-righteous men? Abraham prayed to save the cities while “ten” were there ; but the all-merciful God would not destroy them while “one” was there! And did not the Lord know there was but one? And what, after all, is proved, but that Abraham, appealing to the mercy of God through His attribute of Justice, begged that the innocent should not suffer with the guilty? “ That be far from Thee—the Judge of all the earth will do right.” Aye, and He will do right, and show abundantly more mercy to sinning man than even the Father of the faithful had faith to ask! Thus far, we think these Scriptures do not settle the point. We proceed to others. The next is the case of Moses interceding for the sinning hosts of Israel. In this instance one fact is established : Moses *thought* his prayers prevailed with God to save the children of Israel from immediate destruction. For such con-

viction on his part is clearly shown by his own declarations in reciting the facts to the congregation : Deut. 9 : 9, etc. But what is gained for the argument, (assuming he *did* thus believe) more than that a good man believed, as many other good men believe, in the affirmative of our proposition ? We think no deduction of a more authoritative character can be made. But did the supplication move the awful presence on Sinai to forbear a threatened vengeance ? Are not all, both of threatenings and promises, announced, so far as man is affected by either, on conditions ? “ Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown,” was proclaimed by order and by authority of God. This sentence of destruction was pronounced upon that grievously wicked Nineveh, which remaining the same, would have been smitten by the bolt of death : but not against repentant Nineveh, prostrate in sack-cloth and ashes. And this may be substantially affirmed of every curse ; of every threatened judgment recorded in the Bible, so far as man’s probationary state can be, as it is intended to be affected thereby. Now if the idolatrous hosts of Israel had continued to worship a golden calf under the leadership of Aaron, would they not have been destroyed, notwithstanding the pleadings of Moses ? But would the congregation, humbled and suppliant, have been destroyed, in the absence of those pleadings ? And were they not ultimately cut off, in some form, every man, woman and child that came out of Egypt, save two, (after Moses) because they, in after years, continued to sin ? And unless regarded as conditionally announced, as above hinted, how could the unchangeable God change a plan, or repent of an intention, or countermand an order, or alter a design ? How will such a supposition comport with the character of the All-good, the All-wise, the All-powerful One ? And if the intimation of God to Moses of a purpose to “ destroy them ” were announced *conditionally*, what were the conditions ? To repent, as did the inhabitants of Nineveh ? If this be granted, was not His forbearance referable to the moral act of the offending multitude ; to a change in their relations, and hence a change of the conditions, and not a change in

the mind of Deity." If this be true, was the prayer of Moses, for the people, the motive, or cause of God's forbearance? If not, then nothing is gained to establish the affirmative from this record. From the text in 1 Sam. 12; 23, it seems nothing more can be inferred than that the seer thought it a duty to pray for his people, and dared not omit a duty on the score of responsibility. To that from Joel 2; 17, 18, we know not what to say differently from the reasoning applied in the case of Moses and the camp of Israel. And we think the same solution is true as applied to the text from Ezek. 22; 30, with this note of explanation; If one had been found to perform for the people of the land, what Moses did for the camp of emigrants, viz. induce them *to repent*, then the same results would follow in both cases, and for the same reasons; viz. a change in the moral relation of the people, and a consequent change in the announced administration of God.

The next in order of our scripture authorities are those from Mat. 8: 5-13, and 18: 19. It will be difficult; exceedingly difficult; to reconcile the facts and teachings of these scriptures with any other hypothesis than that prayer may move God to perform acts of mercy which He otherwise would not perform. The centurion's servant was at home, sick of palsy and grievously tormented. He could not ask, in person, the cure he needed. There is nothing in the record to warrant even the presumption that he prayed at all for that relief. His master sought the interposition of the blessed Christ on his servant's behalf. He prayed in faith, beseechingly: "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." The word was spoken; as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. Now, would the miracle have been wrought; would Jesus have spoken that word, but in answer to the prayer of faith? Is there anything to warrant that supposition? But for whom, it may justly be inquired; for whom was the miracle wrought? To whom was the favor shown? In whose favor was almighty power exerted? Was not the blessing sought by, obtained for, and granted to, the centurion

himself, and not the servant? "As thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee," is the answer of the Messiah. But this was a miracle. The age of miracles, as understood theologically, is past; because they are no longer necessary attestations of the Messiahship of the meek and lowly Man of Galilee, nor any longer necessary as proofs of our holy religion. A miracle is that which is done, or accomplished by a power above and beyond the ordinary and known laws of Nature; and, (may we not correctly add?) variant from the ordinary dealings of God with man. Can we then infer from miracles proper, a law or laws, operating in, and applicable to, the ordinary, the universal government of God, affecting the moral relations of man? Could we properly pray for the instantaneous healing of a withered arm; for the immediate cure of total blindness; in either case, irrespective of any physical remedy; or for the raising up of the dead? Surely not. But all these as miracles, were wrought in answer to prayer. Is there, then, in the case of the centurion, authority enough to determine our proposition affirmatively? It seems to us that, while it bears strongly in that direction, if it stood alone, there might be ground for doubt.

"But again; "if any two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." And what do we apprehend from this very remarkable declaration and precious promise? These words are plain words. No oracle need be consulted here. The record speaks directly to the heart. Can it be made to teach a doctrine the opposite of its plain import? Why should the joint supplication of two persons be marked with special emphasis, and encouraged with a specific promise? We cannot tell. Let, then, the parents of some absent prodigal jointly agree, touching the reformation of "him that was lost." They comply in faith with the condition. They "put to proof the high supremacy" of the Incarnate Word. They demand of God, upon the sealed conditions of His covenant, to comply with His promise; to perform His own undertaking! Will not the answer to each suppliant be; "As

thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee?" Such, we apprehend, is the faith of the church. But the question is by no means free from difficulty and embarrassment. If the parents do not thus petition, will the prodigal be therefore lost? And could divine grace do more to save him, in any case, than divine grace has already done? But more of this hereafter. Next in order, is the text selected as our caption: 1 Tim. 2; 1, &c.; "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions," &c. "be made for all men," &c. May this be regarded as an injunction upon all pious persons, a disregard of which would be a criminal omission of duty? Was this exhortation inspired of God? Or was it merely the advice of a holy and zealous apostle? Would not all the proposed ends; the leading peaceable and quiet lives in godliness and honesty, be accomplished, if the prayers and supplications had no other effect than to bring the petitioners nearer to God, thus preparing them for the exercise of patience, endurance, forbearance, hope and love? But if the prayers are to be answered in this unconscious mode, why were the Christians addressed, taught to pray for kings and rulers, for the officers of the civil government? We cannot understand the propriety, the meaning, the rational intent, of this scripture in any other sense than in harmony with the affirmative of our main inquiry. The last text in our list is that from the epistle of James; "Is any sick among you?" &c. Now, it occurs to us, the directions and the promised results in this instance could only be applicable to; could only be affirmed of, a case of miracle, in the age of miracles. Understood in such sense, it becomes conceivably true. How otherwise? There is a time, to all who are mortal, of sickness and of death; of irremediable sickness, and of inevitable dissolution. "And if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." But remission of sins is absolutely dependent on certain conditions, among which are conviction, penitence, desire and faith, experienced in the heart of him who needs pardon. He may be impenitently wicked, and refuse to believe; refuse to sue for pardon; or be, from physical causes, utterly incapable of

doing either. It would impair the force of revealed truth, in the understandings of men, to insist upon any ordinary and literal application of this scripture. The case of Elijah praying to withhold, and to send rain, is referred to by the apostle as a precedent, which case was clearly and eminently miraculous. Nothing pertinent to our inquiry, we think, is definitely settled by this authority.

The affirmative may be argued, (7.) from the example of our Saviour. The man, Christ Jesus, prayed for his disciples, for all believers, and for the world of men. What effect for good could this have produced upon his own immaculate soul? If none, then it must have had the good of others for an object. If the motive to his prayers was the good of others, it could only be exerted, so far as we can conceive, in one of two forms; either, first, by the results of a direct answer, granting the blessing asked; or, secondly, by setting up and leaving to all believers in after time an example for imitation and conscientious practice. If the first supposition be true, then we have an illustrious instance of the affirmative truth enacted by our great Exemplar. If the second hypothesis involve the correct inference, then we have the most emphatic and sublime expression of duty and benevolence, with their consequent results of blessing to man; a duty, the performance of which, it may be reasonably assumed, is not less imperative than the exercise of love to God and to our brother. This conclusion, it seems to us, is logically reached by argumentation which is fair and just. But is it either safe or proper, in general, to attempt to deduce a rule, a law, a truth, applicable to our sinning race in its moral relations, from the personal acts of the Son of Man? We cannot fast forty days; nor acquire knowledge without learning; nor converse with Angels; nor ask of God; nor suffer, after the example of the second Adam. His relations were peculiar and impossible to all other created beings. The relations being wholly different, the analogies must cease. From such

considerations we might doubt both the propriety and the force of the last argument.

We have now gone through with the more prominent considerations which seem to favor the affirmative of our proposition. We have interspersed a few hints bearing negatively where we deemed it proper. It now remains to make a brief statement of the negative argument. In doing this we assure our readers that no fancy for the metaphysical ; no vain curiosity, has led us into this region of deep waters and unsolved mysteries. Assuming, then, for convenience, that the affirmative may be true, let us reason, for the time, upon that assumption. How does prayer move God to do anything? Is the thing sought according to his will? Then was not that will pre-existing, independently of the prayer? If so, did the prayer cause God to will that thing? If not, how, then, has prayer moved him? If the thing sought be contrary to His will, can the supplications of a creature induce Him to change his moral government and violate His own will? This, of course, no one supposes. The petition, then, to be answered, must ask for something which God wills to do, to give, or to allow. But by the very terms of his nature and attributes, God did always and from everlasting will to do, to give, or to permit, the very thing prayed for. Why, then, it may be asked, does not God bless the suppliant soul before and without any prayer? To which it may be replied ; man is a moral agent, with absolute freedom of volition ; whose rational conduct is entirely his own ; and of whose moral relations, he is himself, in this sense, the absolute arbiter and controller. Hence his unavoidable moral responsibility. It is necessary, therefore, in all our approaches to God ; in all realizations of his grace, that the free will of man shall unite and agree with the will of God. There never was and never can be any change in the will of God ; the will of man alone, in this connection, is the subject of change. Man, therefore, cannot receive spiritual blessings without willing, seeking, praying for them ; being thus pre-

pared, in the economy of grace, for the reception and enjoyment of an unlimited and illimitable supply of good, of light, of love, which had pre-existed eternally.

Dropping the assumption of the affirmative, let us inquire, if prayer moves God to the conversion of another, how is that conversion effected? against the will and without the effort of the party converted? If not, then is it by the desire, effort, faith and proper use of the means of grace on the part of the pardoned? If so, would not the use of such means result in his conversion without our prayer? If it is affirmed that our prayer caused the proper use of such means, we ask how? Could our prayer, in itself, have any effect upon the unconscious heart of another? If not, then prayer could only cause it by moving God to the bestowment of special grace, or, to the ordering of more gracious providences, in favor of the pardoned soul. But can Almighty Goodness ordered by omniscient wisdom, do more for the salvation of man, under any possible circumstances, than it has already done; than it will forever do? Can prayer amplify the goodness and grace of our Redeemer? Can it arouse new compassion? Can it make incomprehensible goodness better? Can it add a motive to Divine love? Can it enlarge the sphere and multiply the offices of the grace of God? "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." "Neither is it the will of your heavenly Father that one of these little ones should perish." No responsible moral agent, as man, can ever be brought into union with God; into subjection to His will, but by the consent and exercise of the will of such agent. That will is never forced; that will cannot be forced. Infinite goodness cannot compel men to repent and be saved, consistently with the Divine government. But outside of, and in harmony with, that absolute, irreversible freedom of man's volition, the goodness, the grace, the power, the mercy, the love, that will save him, are immeasurable, eternal, infinite, out-gushing, overflowing, all-embracing, unspeakable, irresistible, inconceivable!

“ Mine is an unchanging Love !
Higher than the heights above ;
Deeper than the depths beneath ;
Free and faithful, strong as death ! ”

In what sense, we earnestly ask, can our prayer make such goodness more, or cause it to be more mercifully exerted ? Can it move God to the performance of aught that is merciful which He otherwise would not perform ? Prayer is the suppliant act of the soul submitting itself to the will of the Supreme Ruler. Prayer is the effort of the soul to accept of the boundless, offered grace. There is no merit in prayer ; it can earn nothing ; purchase nothing ; and, in relation to God, it can cause nothing. Its effect is upon him alone who prays ; being a preparatory process, and hence, a necessary condition, of receiving and enjoying a goodness, which is neither increased nor diminished by the accident of such enjoyment. This view does not abate aught of the importance of prayer, which is, to every responsible soul, the necessary condition of salvation. But does it not magnify, in our conceptions, the greatness and goodness of Him, who is above all and blessed forevermore ? Nor does this view of the case affect our responsibility for a failure to institute and to apply all proper agencies for the good of man. Example, precept, education, preaching of the word ; these are in the line of plain duty ; these affect ourselves ; these, by the blessing of God, are productive of much good. We may not, upon our peril, omit to do what we may for the weal of our brother. And may not the language of Scripture, as to the effect of prayer, be simply an accommodation of sublime truth to the humblest capacity of man ? May it not be used, in analogy, as many other truths are expressed, by a vocabulary finite and human ? Just as our Maker is sometimes described, as possessing eyes, ears, mouth, hands, arms, feet ? As being angry, grieved, repenting, laughing, seeking to find out, proving men to determine their fidelity, awaking out of sleep ? etc. etc.

We have now discussed, as well as we might, both sides of our proposition. Most candidly we doubt whether the affir-

mative or negative be true. If we are more inclined to adopt the one or the other; if we have stronger convictions of the truth of either, they are in favor of the negative; and those convictions are becoming gradually strengthened and settled. We seek only for the true, in the spirit of the truth; and as the orthodoxy of a layman can be of no very great consequence to the church, we have risked nothing in speaking out. If the question is regarded as of sufficient practical or theoretical importance, to demand competent investigation, it is hoped that those who are equal to the task will settle it to the satisfaction of all inquirers.

ART. III.

“EXISTENCE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ANGELS.”

By Rev. S. PATTON, D. D.

The Southern Methodist Quarterly Review, for January 1854, contains an article “On the Existence and Characteristics of Angels,” copied “from the Journal of Sacred Literature, London, October 1853.” To the objects of that article, or to the general tenor of its discussions, we have nothing to object, except the implied assumption, running through it, that angels are superior in their intellectual nature to man. The writer quotes from “The Authors of the Universal History,” as follows:

“Had we no such Revelation or tradition, it seems very reasonable to suppose there are intermediate beings to fill up the gap which would otherwise be in nature; for as there is a gradation of creatures on earth, some having merely being, as earth, air, and water; some that, besides being, have life, as vegetables; some that, besides life, have sense and perception, as brute animals; and some that, besides life, have reason and cogitation, as men; and as we see our sensitive part exists in beings beneath us, so it is very probable that our more noble and intellectual part exists in beings

as much superior to us as we are to brutes; and that there is a like gradual ascent from the lowest ranks of them, which borders upon man, to the highest, which comes as near as a creature can to the infinite Deity." (Vol. 1, p. 101.)

As to the fact of the *existence* of angels, no sober and intelligent believer in the Bible will call it in question; whatever difference of opinion there may be, as to the dignity of their nature, or the position they occupy in the scale of being,—whether there are grades in angelic natures, or whether they are relatively superior or inferior, when the nature of human beings is the standard. These and like questions do not affect our faith, either in the fact of their existence, or the agency in which they are employed, in the dispensations of Divine Providence and grace towards the children of men. But we can readily conceive of an effect, injurious to the sublime act of pure Christian worship, resulting from an overestimate of angelic natures; especially when it is associated with a rational and scriptural belief that those unseen beings continue to take the same interest in the recovery of our race from sin and death, that they did in Old Testament times, and which was so clearly manifested at the birth of our Saviour.

A leading and controlling idea that runs through and modifies every part of our theory on any subject pertaining to the administration of moral government—(speculative, though our theory may be,) must exert an influence on the moral feelings and affections of the heart. If, for instance, we contemplate the gradations in the scale of being, from a particle of inert matter to a lofty intelligence, scarcely less than *midway* between ourselves and God, and with a firm persuasion that the intelligence which constitutes the crowning glory of infinite wisdom and creative energy, is our *boon companion*, though unseen, caring for us, guarding us, and ministering to us, may we not imperceptibly and almost unavoidably, transfer to such being, a part of that homage which is due to God alone?

That the worship of angels, as an act of religious devotion

is as positively forbidden as the worship of idols, will not be denied by any Christian theist; hence there is a very obvious reason why the Scriptures should afford no evidence that angels belong to, or constitute an order of beings with a nobler or loftier nature than ourselves. We do not now speak of those imperfections of our nature which are continually exhibiting themselves in its fallen state. That state itself, is only a condition, or circumstance, of our nature, and is no part of it; neither is it a necessary condition of it, but a painful and humiliating appendage, which has resulted from the despoiling of its glory, without lessening its intrinsic value as a specimen of the workmanship of God, or lowering it in the scale of being originally designed by its Creator. That, in the present lapsed and fallen condition of our nature, it is inferior to that of angels, may be, nay, must be admitted, if it be compared with unfallen natures; but we contend that it is only an inferiority of condition, and not of nature, and that in all that constitutes the dignity and nobility of intellectual natures, there is no proof in the word of God that He ever formed, or created, an order of beings superior to man. Moreover, if he ever did, to hide it from man was a wise and benevolent measure, while there are some strong reasons furnished by the Scriptures, for believing that man himself is the master piece of the creative skill and workmanship of his Maker.

There are various respects in which inferiority does not affect the question of a comparative dignity of nature, and in some cases, a conceded superiority is proof of an inferior nature. We will instance but a few; a mountain is larger than a horse; one is purely material; the other is actuated by a spirit, little as we may know about that spirit. An elephant is stronger than a man, and yet the fact of his being an elephant is at once proof of his inferiority to man. The eagle soars aloft in the heavens, and at a glance surveys mountain, vale and river, and in this respect is superior to man. We mention these things merely to remind the reader, that superiority of position, circumstance, or condition, does not fur-

nish, in most cases, any decisive proof of a superiority of nature. True, there are cases in which they do, but they are for the most part, cases in which the position, circumstance, or condition, is not necessary to the point in question. A man fills an office of state, and a horse labors in harness, but neither of these circumstances is necessary to prove the superiority of the one or the inferiority of the other.

We reason from little things, and things well known, to great things, and things less known; and in the absence of positive information on any subject, we must be guided by the best lights we have; but, in all such cases, we should guard against a theory, doctrine, or thesis, which in its practical effects upon us tends to lower our estimate of the dignity of our own nature, or leads, however remotely, to the worship of any creature. Whatever doctrine or proposition commands our hearty assent, exerts an influence upon us in exact proportion to its importance in the system or theory to which it belongs; and if we are taught to believe that the angels are as far superior to us in the dignity of their intellectual nature, as they are in the strength which is ascribed to them, and withal so intensely interested in the salvation of the world as the scriptures testify of them, we see not but there is a continual temptation before us, to divide, (however unconsciously,) our homage between them, and Him to whom it is alone due, To believe that angels are "mighty;" that "they excel in strength;" that they exist in great numbers, and that they feel a lively interest in the welfare of Christ's kingdom in the world, is only to believe the plain declarations of the Bible; but to believe that they are superior in their intellectual nature, or that they form a higher order in the scale of being, otherwise than an order of condition, is to believe a doctrine which we do not believe is taught in the Bible.

There are strong arguments in support of the theory which supposes angels to have existed millions of years anterior to the creation of our world. When the science of numbers, so far as comprehensible by man in his present restrained condition, has tried its strength in the enumeration of imaginable

periods before the creation of the solar system, we can readily suppose there were angels at the remotest point, to celebrate the praises of the Most High ; but all this affords no proof that they possess an intellectual nature, or moral capabilities, superior to those with which man is endowed. When human nature, fallen and degraded as it is, shall have been fully recovered from its degradation, and restored to the likeness of its adorable Redeemer, we think there is nothing in the Bible going to show that any creature in existence, angel or archangel, whether found in "principalities," or "powers," will exhibit a loftier, a more illustrious, or a more dignified nature than this self-same creature, man. Some, at least, of the reasons for this opinion, we shall now proceed to show.

Man was created in the "image of God." Christian writers say that this means His natural image, as well as His moral image. Whether they understand themselves when they speak of the *natural image* of God, we know not ; but be that as it may, one thing is certain, man was formed with intellectual faculties ; constituted an intelligent being, capable of understanding, reasoning and judging, according to the nature, character, relations and fitness of things, as they had been determined by the Most High ; besides, *intellectuality*, (to use an obsolete phrase, but one that expresses our idea,) is essential to the idea of a moral being ; a capable subject of moral government. Now in this respect, what more could be said of angel or archangel ? According to the received doctrine of the Divine incarnation, even the adorable Word, the Second Person in the Trinity, tabernacled in a human body, and therefore no argument in favor of man's inferiority to angels, can be drawn from his connection with flesh and blood.

So far as we are informed, man is the sole object of the redeeming scheme, although he is not the only being that has been guilty of defection from God. We have heard it said, that fallen angels, being purely spiritual, and not having in their nature, *blood* which could be shed for sin, therefore, God could not redeem angels ; but this method of accounting for the non-redemption of fallen angels, is exceedingly unsatis-

factory, and proves nothing with regard to the relative dignity of human and angelic natures ; and while we claim not the teachings of Scripture to show that man, in respect to dignity of nature, is superior to angels, we cannot admit that the non-redemption of fallen angels is to be ascribed to any want of ability in infinite wisdom, to devise a plan for their recovery, or to any want of power to accomplish that object, had it been conformable to the benevolent purposes of Him who cannot err. To assume the superiority of the angelic nature to that of men, and then to account for the absence of all remedial measures in relation to the former, by supposing some want of ability in God to employ measures suited to the end, is to limit His wisdom, and restrain His power. Let the reason for the non-redemption of fallen angels remain among the things *not revealed*, but let not the Divine glory be tarnished by an assumption which has no foundation in the Bible, and one which is suggested by a theory equally destitute of any direct support in that unerring source of all our knowledge. That God had an infinite reason for leaving rebel angels beyond the range of the redeeming plan, cannot be doubted, but it is not our province to scan his hidden counsels or to assign reasons for His conduct, which would tarnish the glory of His character and contradict the whole tenor of His revelation to man ; a revelation that admits of no impossibility with God, but that which would involve some defect in His wisdom or His power, or some departure from His essential righteousness and unchanging benevolence.

That the object contemplated in the redemption of man is worthy of God himself, will not admit of doubt ; and although that remedial measure may furnish no proof that human nature is the highest grade of created intellectual being, it goes far to prove that *that* nature has no superior in intrinsic value. Man is intellectual, moral, and capable of the enjoyment of the Supreme Good in endless fruition. A redeemed soul has "fellowship with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ ;" will be like its Lord ; enter into the joy

of its Lord ; sit down with Christ on his throne ; a child, an heir of God, who is his everlasting portion : considerations which go far to prove, that whatever may be the temporary degradation of human nature, it is not inferior, in the scale of intellectual and moral being, to any order of which the Bible gives us any information. We know not what has been done in reference to other beings and other orders of being, not mentioned in the Scriptures, and we have no right to assume where we know nothing, or by a "voluntary humility," to degrade ourselves in our own estimation.

The vast array of costly means, and the concentrated attention of the universe to the redeeming scheme, especially, to the tragic scenes of Calvary and the events which almost immediately followed, stamp the impress of Heaven's own seal upon the value, dignity, and nobility of human nature. Infinite wisdom cannot err in its estimate of the relative value of things, or in its judgment concerning the grade of intellectual beings. But we find the gift of "God's dear Son," not deemed too much for the recovery of human nature from the snare of the devil. No reason could ever be conceived of in the legislation of created intelligences, or in their civil jurisprudence, that would justify the infliction of punishment on an innocent *third person*, in the room and stead of the guilty ; but we see, in the light which Revelation sheds upon our vision, that the infinite perfections of the Great God, all acquiesced and harmonized in the astounding operations of His love, which gave His only begotten Son to die for the world. But God never acts without a reason, or without a reason worthy of Himself, and one that will command the admiration of an intelligent universe ; and although they may gaze and adore and wonder at the exhibition of the Divine resources which was made in the gift of Christ for the redemption of the world, yet they must have an abiding conviction that the object was worthy of the means employed to accomplish it. In other words, that the intrinsic excellence and dignity of human nature were such as to justify the outlay, and direct the attention of all creation to the special object of

such amazing love. Wealth and prodigality might expend immense sums for the rescue of a pet monkey, from a perilous situation, but the judgment of wisdom would condemn the expenditure, because of the disproportion between the outlay and the object to be gained by it. Such disproportions are common in the operations of men, but never, in the unerring economy of God; and it is impossible to conceive of a created being so intrinsically valuable in its nature as to require or justify more for its redemption than has been done for the redemption of man. It may be said, this is common-place. Be it common-place, if the reader please; it stamps the broad seal of Heaven upon the illustrious dignity of man's intellectual and moral nature, and removes him beyond the just suspicion of inferiority in nature, to any created being, whether in heaven above or in the earth beneath.

There are other and collateral reasons for the sentiment which constitutes the leading feature in the doctrines of this article. Some of these have been glanced at, as corroborative of the positions we have taken, but we wish to invite special attention to them; and, (1.) the glorious destination for which man was designed in his creation. Thought labors, imagination ranges, and reason stands confounded before the effulgence of that glory with which the redeemed shall be crowned, when they "shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father;" when they shall sit with Christ "on his throne," "far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named; not only in this world, but also in that which is to come;" and where "the Lord God and the Lamb are the light" of the city. Now, taking the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion for our guide, there can be no higher, no more exalted, or transcendently glorious state or position, assigned to any creature, than that which is designed for man, by his Creator, who knows better than all others, the vastness of his powers and the capaciousness of his nature, when freed from the restraints which now hold it in "durance vile." (2.) In conformity with this view of the subject, the whole intelligent

creation, so far as we are informed, are more or less engaged, either in promoting or retarding this wondrous destiny designed for man. Soon after the flood, the ministry of angels was employed among men, and on every occasion they are represented as performing their mission with an interest not less intense than that which men should have felt for themselves. This ministry was kept up through the patriarchal and prophetic dispensations; by it the advent of the Saviour was announced; angels watched the progress of the rising Church; and at the date of St. Peter's first epistle, they "desired to look into" and comprehend the mystery of "the grace to sinners showed." There is nothing in Scripture or reason, to justify a doubt that angels will continue their ministrations in the church militant till the last returning son or daughter of Adam shall have finished the warfare of the Christian life, and gone to swell the ranks of the redeemed in heaven.

"Angels our servants are,
And keep in all our ways;
And in their hands they bear
The sacred souls of grace."

(3.) It would be but a dictate of reason to suppose, that after the economy of redemption was ordained, and ambassadors were to be sent to negotiate a peace with rebellious sinners, those selected for such an honorable and responsible office would be taken from an order of beings, the dignity of whose nature would accord with the lofty principles of the message to be proclaimed. But among all the intelligent natures in the range of created being, none were deemed so appropriate to this delicate work as that of man himself. No greater mission was ever ordained; no more glorious message was ever borne; nor, among created beings, was ever nobler nature employed, than that by which the "gospel of the grace of God" is proclaimed to men.

To the views we have taken, it may be objected, 1st, that they are not taught in the Scriptures; and 2nd, that they are flattering, and tend to foster pride, the "*besetting sin*" of our

nature. To the first, we reply ; the contrary is not taught in the Scriptures, and they furnish many arguments in favor of the views given above. To the second, the experience of mankind shows that when any one fixes a low estimate upon himself, with reference either to his intellectual or moral nature, it is injurious, if not fatal to his success ; in the one case, in his investigations ; and in the other, in his religious progress. Self-abandonment to a low position, either in the society of our fellow men, or in the scale of intellectual and moral being, is an *incubus* that will enervate the faculties, prey upon the spirits, and disarm the energies of the soul, both natural and moral, more than any other operation of the mind to which it can be subjected. Flatter human nature and foster pride ! We deny it. It is ignorance of our illustrious origin, the nobility of our nature, and our glorious destiny, that disarms us of our courage and leaves us grovelling in pursuits and practices, debasing to our nature and unbecoming the dignity of our position. Persuade a man that he has no soul and he will live as if he had none. Impress him with the idea that he fills a low grade in the ascending scale of intellectual being, and if he look up at all, he is apt to limit his vision by some creature, real or imaginary, less than God. On this principle, we may readily account for the degradation of the masses in Roman Catholic countries, and the readiness with which they kneel before a wafer god and pay homage to canonized saints. But we will not pursue this subject. It finds a thousand illustrations in the every-day walks of life, and the views here suggested, a thousand corroborative facts in the experience of observing minds.

There is one other view of the destiny of man, which we will present to the reader before we close this article. There are extremes of happiness and misery ; and though we may slight the one and despise the other, the fact of their existence will hardly be denied. These extremes are realized by intelligent beings, and the height of the one, or the depth of the other, is fairly admitted to be beyond the range of our present limited vision. But what class or classes of beings shall real-

ize these extremes? Angels stand in the presence of God, or fly like lightning at his command; but there is a peculiar manifestation of the Divine glory which they never knew; "the glory of God shining in the face of Jesus Christ." Yet redeemed man attains to the knowledge of it. We do not mean to say, that, in this peculiarity, a premium is given to sin; but such is the intrinsic excellence of our nature, that its fall is turned into an occasion for the exhibition of this peculiarity in his behalf; therefore, no created being will ever reach a loftier height in happiness and glory than that prepared for man, "obedient to the faith." "Devils fear and tremble," and are "reserved in chains to the judgment of the great day." They are, therefore, in a state of hopeless degradation and unutterable ruin; but the keenest pang of misery which can ever pierce the heart of an intelligent and sentient being, is reserved for him who turns away his eyes and ears from an offered Saviour. In this inquiry into a subject of such sublime and awful import, we tread the ground with reverence and sacred awe; nor would we, with unhallowed thought or presumptuous gaze, intrude into those things which have not been seen; but we humbly conceive that the leading postulate of this article; that man is not inferior, in nature, to angelic beings, is fairly deducible from the principles, facts, and doctrines laid down in the Bible.

Love; innate, unchanging, and eternal love, prompted the creation of man, for the diffusion of its own cheering and blissful nature; prompted the creation of our world as the temporary abode of probationers under law; and when man had fallen, prompted a remedial measure which astonished the universe and attracted the admiring gaze of the whole intelligent creation. Is it wild, is it visionary, is it contrary to the scriptural doctrine of man's nature and responsibilities, to suppose, that repenting, believing, redeemed man, will share the richest inheritance Heaven has in store? Or, that rebellious, intractable, and incorrigible sinners, who "laugh at offered grace," reject the Saviour, and trample on his precious blood,

will, with an unmeasured capacity of endurance, realize a deeper degradation, traverse a gloomier region, and feel a keener pang of sorrow, than any other being ever formed? Rather, do not such conclusions legitimately result from the truths revealed concerning the mixed administration of threat and promise, judgment and mercy, terror and love, under which we are placed?

We will close this article with the following theses; (1.) man occupies a rank in the scale of being, inferior to none other in the intelligent universe. (2.) By his fall, he is debased, degraded; a melancholy picture of grandeur in ruins. (3.) A peculiar and astounding exhibition of Divine Love is made in his behalf, by the gift of "God's dear Son," for his redemption. (4.) By the "obedience of faith," he may regain his lost position, and realize a peculiar felicity and glory; shining upon him in a phase of it, and through a medium peculiarly prepared for him. (5.) By unbelief and disobedience, he plunges himself into the deepest ruin, and subjects himself to the sorest pang of misery known to intellectual and sentient beings. (6.) The race of Adam will furnish an exhibition of the loftiest heights of glory attainable by created natures, and the deepest and most unalleviated misery which it is possible for sensitive beings to endure. (7.) The history of man, and his final destiny, will be an instructive moral lesson to an unmeasured universe of moral beings forever and ever.

ART. IV.

PROTESTANTISM AND CATHOLICISM.

By W. S. GRAYSON, Mississippi.

Whoever undertakes to inquire into the leading distinction between Protestantism and Catholicism, will find it to be the right of protest, upon the part of unauthorized persons, against the errors of the fallible officers of the Christian church. Whenever the regular officers of the Christian church modify or alter its constitutional framework, or its creed of doctrines, by regular church action, such alteration, or modification, is not Protestantism. If the regular officers of the Roman church, in the year 1517, for instance, at which time Luther flourished, and wrote his celebrated ninety-five propositions against the sale of indulgences, had, by formal action or constitutional procedure, modified the organic law of that church and her teachings, and had even adopted the structure and the teachings of the present Anglican church, such regular action would have been no *protest*. The first true instance of the exercise of this right of *protest*, now under consideration, occurred in the 16th century under the leadership of the Roman Catholic priest whose name we have just mentioned, and whose fame, in all probability, will be coeval with time. It was afterwards exercised by the Romish bishops who organized the present Anglican church, and by John Calvin, the second great reformer of the 16th century, and by John Wesley, the most distinguished of them all.

The authority of the Christian ministry and the authority of the Scriptures of Christ, are two different and distinct authorities. The failure to observe the great and momentous distinction between them, has been the fruitful source of many frightful heresies. The authority of the officers of the Christian

church is a fallible authority, whereas that of the Scriptures is infallible. Whenever we come to inquire into Protestantism, or into the right of protest, in connection with the great doctrine upon which Protestantism reposes; that the Scriptures are the test and standard of the propriety of all human conduct, there at once arises to our view, clearly and distinctly, the difference between the right of protest and the proper exercise of that right. It is plainly and undeniably true, that even if unauthorized persons have a right of protest against the errors of the officers of the Christian church, their action can never be right, unless sustained and sanctioned by the Scriptures, the infallible test and standard of what is right and wrong. Because we suppose that unauthorized persons have a right of protest against the errors of the regular officers of the Christian church, we are not to be charged with the dangerous doctrine, that these unauthorized persons have any right of protest against church officers when church officers are not in error.

Protestantism means, that unauthorized persons have a right to obey the Scriptures, when the Christian ministry refuse to obey them. Hence it follows, since the Scriptures are the infallible test and standard of right and wrong, that, even if unauthorized persons have a right of protest in those particular cases, and those particular cases alone, in which the officers of the Christian church are in error, these unauthorized persons have no right in their action of protest to depart from the laws of the Scriptures. We illustrate these principles in this way: Although it is not to be denied, we think, that the Romish bishops of the Catholic church, (even after excommunication, by which sentence they ceased to be church officers,) had the right of protest against the *errors* of the remaining or unseceding regular officers of the Catholic church, they had no right to protest except by such organized action of protest as had the warrant and sanction of the Scriptures. They had no right to organize a wrong or an unscriptural church. If those excommunicated bishops who, anterior to deposition from office, had

been regular church officers, but afterwards unauthorized persons, had a right of protest, and had, in the exercise of that right, organized the Anglican church after the model of the Mormon society, teaching the Mormon doctrines, such action upon their part would have been wrong, because it would not have had the sanction of the Scriptures. Hence we say, if the Anglican church is an unscriptural church in any particular, these reforming members of the Catholic church by which she was organized had no right so to organize her, and their action in such respects was unauthorized. They had no authority for such unscriptural conduct. Hence we infer, that in the event, (by no means improbable, since all men are liable to err,) that these excommunicated persons, (who had been once officers of an existing church, but who were officers no longer,) had a right to organize the new church called the Anglican church, and had, in the exercise of that right, organized her in any respect, either with regard to the organic laws which constitute her framework, or in regard to the principles which constitute her gospel teachings, in opposition to, or at variance with, the laws of the Christian church and the laws of the Gospel as they are written in the infallible Scriptures, there would at once accrue to all other persons the right to protest against their disregard of the Scripture. This is the right that John Wesley exercised. He corrected, in the Methodist church by his protestant action, the errors that had been committed by the excommunicated persons of the Anglican church by whom she had been organized unscripturally. They should have conformed to the infallible test and standard.

A protest conveys two ideas—1. It conveys the idea of a mere verbal protest—and 2. it conveys the idea of action under that protest. We do not imagine that any man will contend that a private person has any right to a verbal protest, even against the Christian church, or against the officers of the Christian church, when *he* is in the wrong and the ministry or the church is in the right. A right to protest conveys the idea that the Protestant party is right. What makes him

right? Why the Scriptures of Jesus Christ. Let us illustrate this important principle by a supposed case. We will suppose what has actually occurred in the Christian church. We will suppose that Thomas Cranmer, an officer of the Anglican church, and who had much influence upon her organization, is presiding over the martyrdom, by burning, of Joan Bocher, for supposed errors of religious opinion, and directs A, B, and C. to kindle the fires that are to consume her body. We will suppose that A, B, and C. protest. What kind of protest have they a right to make against the authority of this Christian church officer? Most persons will allow that they would have a right to a practical protest; that is to say; that if they were to carry their verbal protest into action, their conduct could be defended upon the principles of the Christian Scriptures. But then there is a large class of very intelligent writers who would maintain that private or unauthorized persons have a right verbally to protest against the errors of the officers of the Christian church, but that they have no right, under the laws of Christ, to carry that verbal protest into practical operation. The case given is a case in point. The right to burn persons for defective religious knowledge, was, at that day, the teaching of the regular officers of the church, called the Anglican church. Now the question at issue is, have unauthorized persons the right, practically, to protest against the authority of the officers of the Christian church in such doctrines taught by them as have not the warrant of the Scriptures. If the fact were not before our eyes, as clear as the sun at noontide, we should have supposed that no fair minded philosopher, much less a Christian, would deny the right of action in conformity with right or Scriptural principles.

We have no difficulty with this subject so far as respects the precepts of the Scriptures. Our only difficulty is in respect to the laws that should constitute the framework of the Christian church. Few men are now to be found, even in the Catholic church, who would fail to say that private persons have a right of practical resistance against the authority of the officers of the church, should the church inculcate the erroneous

doctrine of the lawfulness of highway robbery or the innocence of private theft. All that we wish to establish in this argument, is the abstract right of private practical resistance in instances of departures from the written divine law upon the part of the officers of the Christian church. Let us once establish this principle and then we get rid of the transmitted authority of the officers of the Christian church as divine.

We admit an authority to exist in the officers of the Christian church, and admit that this authority is also divine in a certain contingency. For example, we admit ministerial authority to be divine when it rightfully enforces a Scriptural, or a Divine law. Its authority, in such a case, is divine, not because of any authority personal to the minister, that is divine, but divine because Jesus Christ is the author of the law or of the authority which is sought to be enforced. We do not sanction any right of resistance to a divine authority. Whenever, therefore, you admit that private or unauthorized persons have a right of *practical* resistance against wrongful encroachments of ministerial authority, you establish the principle of Protestantism for which we are now contending. We do not even wish our reader to go so far as to say that the officers of the Christian church during the 16th century were in the wrong when they vended indulgences under the sanction and protection of the Christian church. That is no part of the design of our argument. The precise point that we wish to raise and discuss, is, as to the right of private or unauthorized practical resistance, where it is admitted that church officers are in the wrong and private members in the right. If you allow the possibility of such an occurrence, as for church officers to be in the wrong and private persons to be in the right, in any contest with respect to Scriptural laws, either organic or doctrinal, then we desire to convince you, in this argument, that those private persons have a right practically to disregard the authority of those erring church officers in respect to their errors.

We desire nothing more to make a man a Protestant than the admission of this principle. It is fatal to the doctrine of

the apostolical succession, as we shall show. What good would it do the members of the Methodist church to prove that the Church of England, at the day of John Wesley, was an unscriptural church in organic law or in moral teaching, if the other question were left unsettled? Before we proceed to inquire which of these two opposing parties were wrong, and which right, it is evidently a preliminary necessity of the first importance, to determine the other question, authoritatively; whether Mr. Wesley had a right, upon the supposition that he was without ministerial authority to organize a distinct church from the one that gave him his ministerial authority, and to disregard the authority of this church's ministry, in the event that he was right and the ministry wrong.

If it were only necessary to prove that ministerial authority were, in any given instance, in the wrong, in order to justify private practical resistance, we would not have one word to say farther in this argument. The task would be easy. If you allow Luther's right of practical protest in the event that we can prove that the Romish church was in error, the final chapter of our argument is forever closed. For no man can make this general admission without abandoning the doctrine of the apostolical succession, or Romanism, and becoming a Protestant. When we come to inquire whether the Catholic church, during the 16th century, was in error, or to inquire whether the Anglican church was in error, in those points of conflict between it and John Wesley, we are thrown at once upon a particular line of inquiry. The inquiry leads us at once to the Scriptures.

Do you allow that this question can be determined by the authority of the Scriptures, then you are fully committed to the other doctrine, equally fatal to the divine authority of the officers of the Christian church, that these Scriptures are the test and standard of the Christian church. There cannot logically or rationally be two tests and standards of the Christian church, of distinct and different character. If you say ministerial authority is the test and standard of the Christian church, as to whether it be a true church or not, you assume

that the Scriptures of Jesus Christ are not the test and standard; and *vice versa*. Certainly if A has a right of protest against the officers of the church, then A, to be right or to have right, must have the authority of the Scriptures to sustain him, and in that case the officers of the church cannot possibly have any divine authority to sustain them, unless there be another divine authority directly in opposition to the authority of Jesus Christ as found in the Scriptures.

In this world, it is customary to call the Scriptures the voice of Jesus Christ. If this written voice says one thing and the ministers of the church say another, and a very different thing, and yet say that they speak with divine authority coming from Christ, they make Christ the author of a contradiction.

Every action taken or performed by a human being that goes to the making, or contributes to the organization of a Christian church is human action. Since the death of the first infallible officers of the Christian church, all the subsequent officers have been fallible men. If this be a true proposition, and it also be true that the Scriptures are the infallible voice of a Divine personage, and all the actions that go towards the organization of Christian people into a Christian church, be fallible, human conduct, then we very seriously inquire, how can that fallible conduct have the divine sanction, or the divine authority, or divine ministerial authority, *if it be wrong* in the eye of the infallible written law. Thus are we brought again to perceive that there is a marked and most momentous distinction between right human conduct, and the authority of the persons who performed this right human conduct. We illustrate this principle, or this distinction, in this way. It is wrong in church officers to disobey the express organic law of the Christian church, that received them into its bosom, and that conferred their ministerial office upon them. Now suppose the Romish church was, at the day when the Anglican church received its separate existence at the hands of Protestant Romish bishops, an unscriptural organization, teaching unscriptural doctrines, and these Protes-

tant bishops had organized the Anglican church scripturally and separated her from the Roman church, such human conduct would furnish an example of right human conduct by persons who violated the express organic law of the church that received them into her bosom and imparted their ministerial authority to them. Suppose A lives in a community where the law of the land only authorizes a certain public officer, called an executioner, to execute the penalty of death in cases of violation of the law. Suppose A is the involuntary spectator of the attempt of a murderer to take the life of his child, and as the only possible preventive under the circumstances, A inflicts the death penalty upon the assailant. Here is an action that discovers to us the distinction between a *right action* and the *authority* of the person who performed it.

This principle is especially discoverable in instances of revolutions in civil governments. Every christian is under a moral obligation to submit quietly to the constituted authorities. The present government of the United States is now the civil authority to which by scriptural laws every Christian owes submission and allegiance. If a revolution were to occur, and the present civil government were to be displaced by another and a different civil government, and were to become the constituted authority, every Christian would then be discharged from any divine obligation to submit to the authority of the displaced government, and would owe submission to the constituted revolutionary government, although it is the product of wrong human conduct. This case has actually occurred in this country. Now in 1854 every Christian residing in the United States owes submission to the United States government, although in 1700 the constituted authority of this country was the monarchy of Great Britain. The Christians of this country recognize the government of the United States as a right government, although it was brought into practical existence by the revolting subjects of the monarchy of Great Britain.

So the reader will observe, that a *right* thing may be done

by persons who, in one aspect of the question may have violated the authority of a Scriptural law, as was plainly the case with the revolting subjects of the monarchy of Great Britain, who refused to submit to the constituted authority of that monarchy as enjoined in the Scripture. The reader will observe the design and scope of this reasoning. Even if the Catholic bishops violated the law of the Scriptures, (which requires submission from all members of the church to the organic law of the church,) in organizing a reformed Protestant church, (as we allow for the sake of argument the Anglican church to be,) in opposition to the organic law of the Catholic church, it does not therefore follow, that the Anglican church is not a true Christian church, as is contended by the writers of the Catholic church. And we say it does not so follow, does not therefore follow, because we hold that a right thing may be done by persons without authority. As a general rule, no persons who are members of a Christian church, have a right to disregard the authority of the church, which the Catholic bishops, who organized the Anglican church did, and which Luther and Wesley did, but then all general rules (but one) have exceptions. We venture to assert, that we can mention three score and ten scriptural laws whose violations may be properly justified upon the ground of *necessity*, or the force of peculiar circumstances. We propose to mention a few, in order that the reader may see that we do not speak without our host. It is unscriptural to kill, yet we may rightfully kill upon the ground of necessity, in cases of self-defence. It is unscriptural to gather corn on the Sabbath day, yet it may be rightfully gathered in stress of circumstances. It is unscriptural to eschew matrimony, yet celibacy may be right under certain circumstances. It is unscriptural to be angry, yet the force of circumstances may excuse it. It is unscriptural to pray standing in the market places and corners of the streets, *to be seen of men*, and yet circumstances may justify it. It is Scriptural to pay government taxes, and yet circumstances may justify a refusal. It is unscriptural to be intemperate, and yet circumstances may justify

drunkenness, as for example, when a sick man is made drunk by his physician to save his life. Nothing is more common in this probationary life than for man to be hedged in by the force of circumstances between two opposite commands, where his action is called a choice of evils. A good man may be married to a woman of vicious character, whose association is destructive of his spiritual health. He is called upon by the force of circumstances either to abandon his religious efforts or to abandon his matrimonial ties. St. Paul has taken notice of this distinction in his writings. "As much as lieth in you brethren, live peaceably with all men."

From this reasoning we are led to conclude, that even if those who hold the Methodist church to be a true and a valid Christian church, invested with the undiminished attributes that scripturally belong to the church of Christ upon earth, were to admit that John Wesley in the ordination of Dr. Coke, acted without any ministerial authority at all, acted in plain and unquestionable opposition to plain and unquestionable scriptural laws, such admission would have no bearing upon the other question of the validity of the church of Christ, called the Methodist church. We have given instances and may give more almost without number in which force of circumstances may justify a violation of a Scriptural command. Even if Mr. Wesley did violate a Scriptural command, it *does not therefore* follow as an *unavoidable consequence* that his conduct itself in this very violation, cannot be justified by the force of the very extraordinary circumstances in which he was placed.

Let us examine these positions more carefully. Even if Methodists were to allow every position urged by High Churchmen with respect to John Wesley, personally, viz: that Jesus Christ in the Scriptures had declared that no church officer, below a bishop, should ordain another church officer to the office of bishop, and that Mr. Wesley, being but a presbyter, in violation of this Scriptural command, had ordained Dr. Coke to the office of bishop in the Methodist church, it would be no fair or logical conclusion for these High Churchmen to

draw, that Mr. Wesley was not perfectly justified even in this individual conduct, unless they were able also to show that the extraordinary circumstances in which he was placed by the providence of God did not fully justify him.

But will any High Churchman ever undertake to make this inquiry? Never, never. And why? Because it would be a virtual abandonment of succession. Were any High Churchman to agree to go into this inquiry, it would be a virtual admission, upon his part, that circumstances might justify a disregard of the apostolical succession. This would be a surrender of the question. Many distinguished writers of the Anglican church have made this concession, and it has always been regarded by friend and foe as a confession of defeat. Among these conceders stands conspicuous the distinguished Hooker.

And we say also, yet further, that even if it were to be admitted that Mr. Wesley violated a plain scriptural command, under circumstances which did not justify him, it would not even therefore inevitably follow that the church of Christ, called the Methodist church, which was the product of Mr. Wesley's unscriptural and unjustifiable conduct, was no true and valid Christian church, unless it were also shown from the standard by which a true or false Christian church is to be infallibly tried, that she was a false church. And this would have to be done by comparing her organic laws and her teachings with the organic laws and the teachings which Jesus Christ has infallibly written for the government and organization of *his* church. But will any High Churchman dare enter upon such an investigation? Certainly he dare not. If he were to enter upon the inquiry whether the Methodist church were a true or a false Christian church, by comparing her organic laws and her doctrinal teaching with the organic laws and doctrinal teachings of Christ, as he finds them in the Scriptures, it would be a virtual surrender of a divine, personal, ministerial authority; an ingredient, deemed essential to the very validity of a church of Christ in his creed.

“Unus utrique
Error; sed variis illudit partibus.”—HOR.

We desire the reader to be particularly careful to bear in mind the distinction that should attend justifiable violations of scriptural laws. If Mr. Wesley violated a scriptural command in ordaining Dr. Coke to the office of bishop in the Christian church, when he himself was but a presbyter, supposing a presbyter to have regularly no such scriptural right, it would not have been proper to continue this unscriptural procedure in the Methodist church which he organized. If the Scripture teaches that to the office of bishop in the Christian church, attaches the exclusive duty of ordination, then Mr. Wesley, in the organic law of the Methodist church, should have adopted this regulation as the permanent law of the church. Hence the reader will observe that we do not advocate any such doctrine as a regular, or as a permanent violation of Scripture. We only claim to justify it as a choice of evils and of course as occasional and incidental,

If the Catholic bishops, or rather if the *quondam*, or *quasi* bishops of the Catholic church, who organized the Anglican church, organized her, the Anglican church, defectively, or in opposition to the laws of the Scripture, either in matters of organism, or of teachings, their conduct would be condemnable even if they had possessed all the ministerial authority that indisputably belonged to Titus and Timothy, the fallible successors of the Apostles. Let us admit, for the argument sake, that the duty of ordination attaches regularly to the office of bishop in the church of Christ. Then upon this admission, we argue, that if these *quasi* bishops had organized the Anglican church upon the congregational form of church government, by assigning the same duties to all presbyters, not allowing any distinction between them, such conduct would have been culpable, because upon the hypothesis, it would have been a permanent violation of the Scriptures. If the reader will turn his attention to those classes of cases of which we have given a few, where it is justifiable to violate a scriptural command, he will readily discover that it would

be unphilosophical as well as unscriptural to contend that these evasions of Scripture could be defended as permanent regulations. For example, although we contend that A, B, & C. may destroy human life in opposition to Scripture in cases of self-defence, or in defence of the right to live, which A, B, & C. received from God, yet we do not, therefore, by any means, contend that private killing as a permanent permission, or as a general rule, is justifiable. We hold to the precisely opposite.

Proceed to our supposititious instance again, that the Scripture declares that the duty of ordination attaches to the office of bishops in the Christian church. Now upon this admission we argue, that although according to our theory we might be able to justify Mr. Wesley in an occasional disregard of this law, yet we confess we would be unable to defend him upon scriptural grounds had he incorporated in the organic law of the Methodist church a provision of permanent standing, that in this church presbyters might ordain. It is proper to remark, that although we condemn the conduct of those gentlemen of the Romish church who organized the Anglican church in the very teeth of the authority of the church of which they were members, as being an example, if made the permanent law of the church, utterly ruinous to the peace and destructive of the authority of the church of Christ; yet if they can show that this was but an occasional act, we would be prepared to justify them, if the circumstances in which they were placed justified them. But we would be utterly unprepared to defend their conduct, had they incorporated in the organic law of the Anglican church a permanent provision that church officers of the Christian church may disregard her authority, frustrate her plans, and question her plain rights, by conduct the most contumacious, whenever they saw proper.

It is proper to remark yet farther, in this connection, that although we may believe that these gentlemen of the Romish communion, who set the example of acting in the very teeth of the authority of the church, of which they were offi-

cers, upon the ground of the force of circumstances, were justified by these circumstances, in proceeding to organize the Anglican church, in accordance with the Scripture, upon the plea that the Roman church had departed from it, yet we are certainly forbidden to approve of the scriptural errors and misapprehensions into which they were betrayed; and even although we may believe that they intended, as it is not to be questioned, to follow the words of Jesus Christ in the business of church protestation, and in some respects mistook the meaning, or misunderstood the precise import of those words, such intentions may shield them from the charge of wilful transgression of God's holy law, but does not suffice to blot out the *fact* of such misunderstandings and scriptural errors. It was their misfortune if they did not understand the Scriptures more perfectly, or less perfectly than men of a later date, and of more accurate and more enlarged acquaintance with the Scriptures. That John Wesley was a wiser man than those Romish gentlemen, may not be attributed to any superior discernment upon his part, in any greater degree than to the superior advantages of the age and time in which he flourished. The error into which Cranmer fell, as to the scriptural right of the officers of the Christian church to burn a human being to death by the agonizing torture of a slow fire, would at this day, out of all Catholic countries, dishonor the intelligence of the Hottentots among us. Is it to be wondered at, that men, who could so grossly mistake and outrage the mild and loving doctrines of Jesus Christ, could wander yet farther with respect to the yet more complex written law of church organization?

In order to test the limit and extent of ministerial authority in the Christian church, we will suppose the Catholic church, during the year 1529, was a scriptural organization and taught the gospel in its purity, as it is found written in the Scriptures. Now let the reader bear this supposition in his mind for a moment, while we cursorily mention the doctrine against which we are contending. The adherents of the Anglican church contend, that this church is a true Chris-

tian church, not because her organic laws and pulpit teachings are conformed to the Scriptures. They contend that the Anglican church is a true Christian church, because the bishops by whom she was organized had episcopal ordination; had that kind of ministerial authority regularly transmitted, which, in their theory, is essential to the validity of every organization of men claiming to be a Christian church, and without which no organization can be a Christian church, whatever may be its organization. They admit that there are two distinct elements of a Christian church, proper organizers and proper laws of organization; but then they do not contend that the latter is all that is essential to the validity of a Christian church. They do not and cannot contend that proper or scriptural laws are essential to the validity of the Christian church, because that would destroy the validity of the Catholic church, from whom the Anglican church derived her validity. They are compelled, according to their theory, to uphold the validity of the Catholic church at the period of the reformation, at the same time that they admit that the Catholic church then had unscriptural laws of organization and taught false doctrines.

Another yet more cogent reason why these adherents of the Anglican church are compelled to contend that scriptural laws of organization are not essential to the validity of the Christian church, is, that if they were so to contend, these two consequences would follow, equally fatal to the necessity of ministerial authority regularly transmitted: 1. It would make the Scriptures the test and standard of the Christian church; and 2. It would destroy the validity of the Catholic church at the time of the English reformation, from whose officers she derived *her* validity. Were they to admit that the Scriptures were the test and standard of the Christian church, then that church would be surely an unscriptural or false church, that was not conformed to the Scriptures, by whomsoever organized, or by the very best description of ministerial authority. The reader will observe that we ask nothing unusual, or nothing which these Anglican church-

men cannot readily allow, for the sake of the argument, when we ask them to *suppose* that the Catholic church, at the day of the English reformation, was a true and valid Christian church, because the ministerial authority that makes the Anglican church a true and valid church then existed in the bishops of the Catholic church, who afterwards became bishops of the Anglican church.

It will not do to suppose, for example, that Cranmer had any more, or any greater ministerial authority regularly descended from the apostles, after he became a bishop in the reformed organization of the Anglican church, than he possessed while an officer of the Romish church. And what is true of Cranmer is true of the other Catholic officers who assisted Cranmer. These adherents of the Anglican church do not claim that the reforming Romish bishops were infallible men; were not liable to error, because the other Romish bishops who did not agree with them in the necessity or propriety of a new Protestant organization, had the very same ministerial authority that was possessed by Cranmer and his revolutionists. They went astray in the opinion of these English reformers or seceders.

In view then of these considerations, we will suppose, for the sake of the argument, that the Catholic church, at the date of the English Reformation, was a true scriptural organization; taught the doctrines of Jesus Christ in their purity, and was a true and valid Christian church. Now, will these adherents of the Anglican church have the hardihood to maintain that the ministerial authority in the possession of the reforming Anglican bishops was a sufficient divine authority to justify them in organizing a schism; in organizing a false church; false both in organic law and in Gospel teachings; that ministerial authority has a divine authority to disregard the plain written divine authority of Jesus Christ? Who will answer? It would be evident to the commonest comprehension that if the Catholic church were a Scriptural church, the Anglican church must be an unscriptural church. This line of argument places these adherents of the Anglican church in

circumstances of the utmost embarrassment. If they proceed to argue that the Catholic church was a false church, because she was an unscriptural church in organic law, and in pulpit teachings, and that therefore these reforming seceders, had a right to organize a new and a wholly different organization, it becomes as plain as the sun at noon, that they thereby make the Scriptures the test and standard of the Christian church, and not that of ministerial authority, regularly transmitted; and in that contingency they would be compelled to admit that the Anglican church was an untrue or a false church, if they failed to follow the Scriptures in the organic laws they adopted, and in their written creed.

We are unable to perceive a flaw in this reasoning. The ministerial authority in the possession of those Catholic bishops of the date of the English Reformation, who did not secede from the then existing church, was just as good, just as valid, just as regularly descended, and just precisely as divine, as that which was upon the heads of the English reformers. Now is it not just as good an argument to urge in behalf of the Romish church, that she being in the possession of a true, valid, regularly transmitted, divine ministerial authority, is therefore a true and valid Christian church, as to urge for the very same reason that the Anglican church is a true and valid Christian church. We leave it to any fair minded man, in pursuit of truth, to say whether this does not dispense with the obligatory force of the Scriptures as a moral law? Certainly it cannot be denied, that if the Scriptures be indeed of obligatory force, as a moral law, then it follows that the true, valid, regularly transmitted, divine ministerial authority, in either one or the other of these two hostile and contrariant churches, could, by no possibility, have had any divine authority to organize a Christian church in opposition to the obligatory force of the Scriptures. We may now, therefore, recognize it as certainly and undeniably true, that one of these assumed true, valid, regularly transmitted, divine ministerial authorities had no authority, that could be regarded as divine,

to organize an unscriptural church. It is not our province, or our wish, nor is it necessary to our argument, to undertake to determine which of the two of these contrariant, divine, transmitted ministerial authorities was in the wrong. It is sufficient for our purpose that it is plainly and undeniably true that *one* of these authorities, differing as they did, must be in the wrong. And why? Because it had in the organization of the Christian church departed from the Scriptures. That is all we ask in this argument. Grant us the fact that an assumed regularly transmitted ministerial authority does wrong when it organizes a church that is unscriptural, then we will show you that any kind of ministerial authority does right when it organizes the church Scripturally. Do you admit that the ministerial authority in the possession of the non-seceding bishops of the Catholic church, did a false thing, or a wrong thing, when they organized the Catholic church unscripturally, and when they taught unscriptural doctrines? If so, then what right have you to say that Mr. Wesley did a wrong thing because he did not have the same kind of ministerial authority that you acknowledge went wrong or did a wrong thing? Why not judge Mr. Wesley or the Methodist church, by the same standard by which you try the conduct of the officers of the Catholic church? Why not inquire whether the organic laws of the Methodist church and her pulpit teachings are wrong, by the same standard that in this other case you allow to be a standard of right and wrong?

If you make the Scriptures the test of right and wrong in respect to organic law, as tolerated, or as introduced into the church by ministerial authority, and the Scriptures be allowed to decide this question, then you are undoubtedly estopped from holding that the Methodist church is an untrue church upon any such ground as want of ministerial authority. If you desired to show such a thing you would have to show it from the Scriptures. Why not be consistent? The Roman church had the ministerial authority of which you approve. She had, in your opinion, a regularly transmitted divine ministerial authority at the day of the Reformation. Now you under-

take to show from the Scriptures that this Roman church was at that day an untrue or false church. The reason you assign for this conclusion is, that this Roman church had organic laws and taught doctrines which were not sanctioned by the Scriptures. But we ask you to do the same thing by the Methodist church. And you refuse. And why do you refuse? Do you not refuse because you have two tests of the Christian church, and two different tests? Is not this a plain contradiction and absurdity? Suppose you try and find out any analogous instance in the whole range of philosophy and religion? You will signally fail.

You apply the test of ministerial authority to the Roman church and you find that she possessed it. Now what is the only logical conclusion? That she was and is a true church, if the test be true. If the test be false, why not abandon it with respect to the Methodist church? You apply the test of the Scriptures to the Roman church, and you reply with all the confidence in the world as if this test were a true test. Then why not apply it to the Methodist church? You apply the test of the Scriptures to the Anglican church, and you reply that she is a true church with every confidence in the certainty of this test. Then why not agree to try it with the Methodist church? All we desire is to agree to try it. You must very well know, that when you agree to try it, as a test of the true or false Christian church, you at once get rid of your crude notions about the necessity of some other different test, such as is regularly transmitted divine ministerial authority.

The reader will please suppose that we are now arguing this question with a High Churchman who pins his faith to a divine ministerial authority. We desire to ask him this question: Suppose the English people were to depute an agent to visit the United States for the purpose of examining the institutions of Virginia and Kentucky for the benefit of the English people, and this agent the English people agree to compensate. Now suppose this agent arrives in the United States and begins his agency in Virginia. He proceeds to inquire into the

institutions of Virginia. We ask under what authority does he act? Certainly under English authority. But suppose he discontinues to inquire into the institutions of Virginia and turns his attention to and occupies his time in horse racing or in highway robbery. Under what authority is he then acting? Will you please answer this question? Is he still acting under English authority, and will his conduct receive the approval of the English people? You cannot fail to see the force of this example. Do you not know that Christian ministers are church agents, acting under written scriptural instructions and compensated by the church. Suppose Christian ministers take to horse racing or highway robbery, have they the authority of the church for such a departure from the written law of their agency? You will of course readily agree that if they have no church authority to depart from the law of their agency in respect to one law therein contained, they have no right to depart from any other law therein contained.

Then we may continue the argument upon the supposition, that whenever ministers depart from the law of the agency, imposed upon them by the church, they do not have the church's authority for such departure. It is generally admitted that the Scriptures are the law which the church requests ministers to obey. It is generally admitted that the Scriptures are the law of ministerial agency, and that they have neither church nor divine authority to depart from this law. The great commission given to ministers by Christ himself plainly makes this law the law of ministerial agency. He directed them "to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature;" directing every creature to do what? Why to observe his commands; to observe whatsoever he had commanded, neither more nor less. All the commands of which we have any knowledge that emanated from Christ, and that have the divine authority, are contained in the Scriptures. This reasoning, and these facts, establish the great principle that ministers are church agents, and the law of their agency are the Scriptures of Christ.

Now suppose a minister departs from the law of his agency, under what authority does he act? Let us put a case before you answer it. Do you not know that the Roman Catholic bishops, who stand between the present Anglican bishops and the apostles, ordained wicked men, and boys, and some think, wicked women, knowing them to be wicked, to the episcopal office in the Christian church? Now you need not be told that such an act is in express contravention of the written law of their agency. We ask under what authority did they act in doing these actions in opposition to the Scriptures? You cannot say they acted under any divine church authority, for it is plain the church cannot give a divine authority to a minister to disobey Jesus Christ. You cannot say they acted under divine written authority, for the actions are in plain opposition to the only divine written authority of which we have any knowledge. You are, then, compelled to admit that they acted from human authority, or from unauthorized church authority. Now these wicked men and boys who were ordained to office in the Christian church, were ordained by mere human authority. One human being has as much authority as another, considered merely as a human being. Thus, you perceive, there stands between the present ministry of the Anglican church, which you say is a true and valid Christian church, certain church officers in the way who received church ordination, and hence ministerial authority, from mere human beings, or a mere human authority. Does not this make a break in the regularity of your divine transmitted ministerial authority? You are now under a necessity to contend that the church has authority to grant to ministers the authority to disobey Jesus Christ; or to say, that ministers have a divine authority to disobey the Scriptures, or that the Scriptures teach that it is proper to ordain wicked men and boys, knowing them to be such, to the highest offices and most responsible stations in the church of Jesus Christ. Are you willing to admit that the Christian church has a divine authority to ordain a wicked boy of ten years of age, when she knows that he is a wicked boy, to the most

responsible stations of the church? If you say no, then you must say that the Romish church had no divine authority to ordain bad boys, knowing them to be such, to office in the church. You must perceive the plain consequence of admitting that the church had no divine authority for an act the church performs. If it be undeniable, if she had no divine authority for the action, then the action sprung from human authority necessarily. There is no other possible alternative.

Are you willing to admit that the Scriptures of Jesus Christ give any authority to the officers of the Christian church to depart from the express and unequivocal declarations of Christ? If you say no, as you cannot logically or consistently say, then you decide that the Catholic bishops, who ordained wicked boys, knowing them to be wicked, or wicked men, knowing them to be such, or women of licentious habits, knowing them to be of such habits, acted from human authority in such ordinations. You do not certainly require us to repeat the consequences, so utterly destructive of the doctrine of the apostolical succession, or the doctrine of duly transmitted, divine ministerial authority, testing the Christian church, as to its validity, when this divine transmitted authority comes from the hands of those wicked men and boys whose ordinations were precisely in opposition to the plain and express declarations of the only Divine Person connected with the whole business of human salvation, and who were, therefore, only invested with human authority. In this discussion, it is necessary, although it is a self-evident truth, to affirm that there can be but two descriptions of authority connected with the Christian ministry; the divine and human authority.

The precise point of difference between the Methodist church and High Churchmen is, that the Methodist church holds to a divine transmitted authority, and High Churchmen to a divine *personal* transmitted authority in addition. High Churchmen hold to two different and distinct divine authorities, viz: the Scriptures and the divine personal transmitted ministerial authority. Hence you will observe, that the

Methodist church is never guilty of the glaring inconsistency of holding that Christian ministers have a divine personal authority to perform actions in opposition to the divine authority of the Scriptures. If High Churchmen were to avoid this palpable inconsistency, they would necessarily have to abandon their doctrine of ministerial authority testing the Christian church. It is to be supposed that no man acquainted with the character or the teachings of Jesus Christ would hesitate to say, that it would be in plain opposition to both for church officers to ordain wicked men and boys, knowing them to be such, to distinguished official stations in the church. That this was done by the bishops of the Catholic church is not to be denied. Now High Churchmen are under a necessity, from which there is evidently no escape, of maintaining that these Catholic bishops had a divine personal transmitted ministerial authority to ordain these wicked men and boys, when they knew them to be such, and when it was in opposition to the Scriptures. Suppose they were to admit, for one moment, that these bishops had a personal transmitted ministerial authority to ordain them, nobody would dispute their declaration. But that, by removing the *divine* authority, makes it to be done by human authority, and that destroys the doctrine. Hence it is, that we affirm, so confidently, that High Churchmen are under a necessity, from which there is evidently no escape, of insisting that ministers have a divine personal authority to disobey the express divine authority of the Scriptures of Jesus Christ, and what is the infinite absurdity, they put upon Christ the paternity of the two glaring contradictions.

Allow me to point out some of the evil consequences of the doctrine of the apostolical succession. Since you hold that church ministers in regular descent from the apostles have a divine personal authority, and that this authority is not identical with that inherent authority that attaches to the Scriptures of Christ, and since you hold that even ministers who have this regularly transmitted personal authority are fallible men and liable to err, you are obliged to hold, then, in cases

of such erring or such departures from the Scriptures, that there are in this world two divine authorities for certain human actions, when those two divine authorities are in precise opposition to each other. Since you hold that that regularly transmitted ministerial authority, belonging undoubtedly to church officers, is personal and divine, you take away from Luther, from the reforming bishops of the Anglican church, and from John Wesley, the right of protest, or protestantism, unless you admit that it can be right to oppose the divine authority. A third evil consequence of the doctrine is that you bewilder the human mind with a problem which it has not intelligence enough to solve; the problem of deciding between two divine authorities in plain opposition to each other: the divine personal authority of ministers duly transmitted, and the divine authority that is found written by the finger of divine inspiration in the Holy Scriptures. The consequences of opposing the divine authority we are taught in the Scriptures, is the loss of the soul. Your theory nullifies this doctrine, and thereby shakes the foundation pillars of revelation. The evident tendency of the doctrine is to blank infidelity. As for example; if the penalty of disobeying the divine authority be the everlasting damnation of the disobedient party, and this human party beholds the church teaching the existence of two divine authorities in direct opposition to each other, one of which he is necessitated to disobey, he will be irresistibly led to discard revelation as a dream or a fable. The Anglican church bishops get their divine, personal, regularly transmitted ministerial authority from a church, that during the dark ages, had departed from the written Scriptures thus establishing the existence at that day of two divine authorities in opposition to each other.

Suppose we allow that the very identical, divine, personal, duly and regularly transmitted ministerial authority now in the persons of the bishops of the Anglican church was, at the day of the English Reformation in the persons of the bishops of the Catholic church, then the English Reformation is the standing proof that the authority that was personal to these

Catholic bishops was in opposition to the authority of the Scriptures. In what situation did this embarrassment place the residue of mankind. Was its tendency not plainly to make infidels of them? What, two contradictory divine authorities to receive the assent of rational men! If any one should presume to answer this argument, it will be necessary for him to maintain the divinity of a personal ministerial authority distinct from and utterly dissimilar to that which inheres in the divine declarations and institutions of our blessed Saviour.

The Methodist church will engage, under all and every contingency, to submit to every law and to every declaration, clearly made by the finger of divine inspiration in the Holy Scriptures. But she will perish from the face of the earth before she will ever believe in the divine authority of church officers, however carefully the church may have transmitted their authority when they manifestly depart from the Scriptures. She bows with humble and deferential awe to the written authority of Jesus Christ, but she will not credit the existence of a divine personal authority in the persons of frail and fallible men as distinct and different from that divine authority which she recognizes to exist in the Scriptures of Jesus Christ.

"Aviendo pregonado vino, venden vinagre."

After having tasted of the true vine, it goes against the stomach to return to the spurious vinegar.

ART. V.

THE BURIAL OF MOSES ;

WITH REMARKS ON MAL. IV. 5, 6, AND ON THE REAPPEARANCE OF
ENOCH AND ELIJAH AS THE APOCALYPTIC WITNESSES.

From "Journal of Sacred Literature." London : April, 1854.

If we look at the New Testameht evidence upon the subject of the Redeemer's second Advent, with especial reference to the Church, it will appear that, when He comes in his kingdom, the dead in Christ are to be raised with incorruptible bodies, and that the then living and believing expectants of His return in glory are to be changed into the likeness of their Lord. We are thus assisted in understanding the connection between the facts of the Transfiguration and the prophetic declaration of Christ which had recently preceded them. A few days before this typical manifestation of his future glory, the Lord said to his disciples, 'There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, until they see *the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.*' It is then added, that, 'after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John up into a high mountain apart.' There while he prayed (and surely we may well believe, from that which immediately followed, that a part at least of his prayer had special referuce to the fulfilment by the Father of the promise recently made to the disciples), the fashion of his countenance was altered, and he was transfigured before them ; his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light.' While he was thus transfigured, Moses and Elijah appeared in glory (*i. e.* glorious also themselves), and talked with Him. As the three disciples saw the persons of the two illustrious Israelites who thus talked with the Lord, all was doubtless real, and no mere vision. And thus was exhibited to the three favoured disciples, and in the Evangelist's narrative has been set forth to the Church, a typical

representation of the future coming of the Son of Man in his kingdom. The Lord Jesus is himself glorified in the body, and Moses and Elijah are personally present with him in glory. The former of these two illustrious Israelites may be regarded as the representative of the risen saints; and the latter of those who, not having tasted death before the Lord's coming in his kingdom, are then changed and glorified.

Now, it is scarcely possible for any one at all familiar with the Old Testament, while reading the Evangelist's account of the Transfiguration on the mount, where Moses and Elijah appear (beyond reasonable doubt) to have been really present, to refrain from calling to mind not only the translation of the Prophet, but also the *secret burial* of the great Lawgiver. The following is the scriptural narrative of this remarkable burial: 'Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor, *but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.*' From this brief record, we learn that God selected of his own will a grave in which, without human interposition, and probably through the ministry of Angels, He placed the corpse of his faithful servant, with the express intention that the site of the sepulchre should never be known to the children of Israel.

It appears to the writer that the facts of the Transfiguration furnish a key to the mystery of the secret burial of Moses; and also, in part at least, to the divine purpose in the translation of Elijah.

Let us, then, suppose the temporary glory of the Transfiguration to have just ceased, and, for our better guidance, let us follow and observe the blessed Jesus. We see him now divested of the unearthly brightness in which he had so recently been clothed by the Father, and he again appears in his ordinary human condition, *exactly as He had been previous to the Transfiguration.* He returns with the three disciples, and resumes his every-day work of teaching, miracles, and mercy. Are we liable to the charge of presumptuously seeking to pry into that which seems to have been concealed from our knowl-

edge, if we conceive that we may, neither unreasonably nor improbably, hence infer that which befell Moses also after the glory on the mount had passed away? Neither he nor Elijah was any longer visible to Peter and his companions, for 'Jesus stood alone before them.' And what other inference can be fairly drawn in the present case than this, *that Moses also returned to the same condition in which he had been before he thus stood with the Lord upon the 'holy mount?'* And, accordingly, it is here supposed that the body of this venerable servant of God, deprived of the glory which had been bestowed upon it in the Transfiguration, and of that physical life which had been restored to it, in order that it might assist in glorifying the Lord Jesus, by sharing subordinately in that celestial but temporary splendour, was borne back, perhaps again through the ministry of angels, to the same secret grave from which it had been taken. The immortal spirit would return from the bright scene of homage and testimony to the Incarnate Word, to the happy abode where the disembodied spirits of Jehovah's faithful servants, Abel, Noah, Abraham and others, expect in blessedness the morning of the resurrection.

There is an ancient tradition on the subject of the death of Moses, which is thus noticed in Scott's valuable Commentary: 'Nothing can be considered more directly opposite to Scripture than the tradition sanctioned by several ancient Christian writers, and apparently favoured by some moderns, that Moses did not die, but went to heaven alive, as Enoch and Elijah did.' It is, however, worthy of notice that the existence of a tradition so plainly contradictory to the express words of Holy Writ, would seem to show that its supporters felt the very great difficulty of the supposition that the body of Moses, after its mysterious interment, gradually mouldered into dust, and was afterwards *raised from its dust*, to meet the Lord Jesus and Elijah upon the Mount of Transfiguration.

Is it, then, necessary to believe that the body of Moses *was raised from its dust* to meet the Lord on the mount? When the great leader of the twelve tribes, after viewing the prom-

ined land, had ceased to live, the God of Israel had (we may reverently say) the choice of two methods of procedure. He could leave the body to return to corruption and dust, according to what is called the great law of nature, and, at the appointed time, restore and raise it into life to appear with Elijah at the Transfiguration. This method (to speak after the manner of our conceptions) involves two great miracles, although the whole would, in reality, be one easy result of the Divine will. For the body would have to be formed and fashioned anew (in a manner somewhat analogous to the original formation of the body of Adam in Eden from the dust of the ground), and then to be again endued with physical life. Or, on the other hand (and this is surely the more scriptural and reasonable view), the Omnipotent God could as easily will the preservation of the dead body of his servant from decay and corruption, during the nearly fourteen centuries which were to intervene before the divinely decreed time of the Transfiguration. Thus, at the proper season, the Most High would only have to will the reanimation of the yet undecayed and uninjured corpse, and place the living Moses before the Incarnate Word on the holy mount. Do not the facts of the miraculous interment of the body, and its subsequent miraculous reappearance on the mount, almost constrain us to believe that it was also divinely and miraculously preserved, during the long interval, from decay? Indeed, the longer the mind dwells upon the question, the more does this latter course seem to commend itself to the judgment of the Christian reader of the inspired Scriptures, as far the more probable; and the case before us may be regarded as one of those instances of the Divine procedure in which we may reverently argue as to scriptural and reasonable probability, even though we may not for a moment venture to decide.

It may, perhaps, be objected to this view, that as Moses died at the advanced age of 120 years, there must have been required in his case something more than the mere reanimation of the lifeless body, that he might stand with Elijah erect and vigorous on the mount. Would not something like organic

change have been needed to accomplish this, in order that there might be no appearance of feebleness and decrepitude, and that the scene of the Transfiguration might be, in all points, harmonious and consistent with its great purpose? We can at once state, in reply to this objection, that the Bible gives no countenance to the idea that any such necessity existed. So far was Moses from having died, bent down with years and worn with age, that he had not outlived the power of leading and governing the twelve tribes, and earnestly prayed to be permitted to accompany the chosen people into the promised land. Indeed the testimony of Scripture is remarkably strong against the supposition of any need of such a comparatively organic change in the body of Moses as that of which we are now speaking. Isaac was permitted to live beyond the period of strength and vigour; and it is said of him before his death, that 'he was old, and that his eyes were dim, that he could not see.' And we read of Jacob, in similar language, 'that the eyes of Jacob were dim, that he could not see.' Had it been the Divine will to raise either of these illustrious patriarchs to meet the Lord Jesus, something like organic change would seem to have been requisite in their case, in order that every thing might be in agreement with the character of the kingdom and kingly glory manifested there. They must, for such a purpose, have been raised from their graves, as if they had died some years earlier than the actual date of their decease, and as if they had never reached the dim and almost sightless feebleness of very advanced age. Not so, however, the great leader and lawgiver of Israel. For it is expressly written of him that, at the time of his death, '*his eye was not dim, neither his natural force abated.*' Accordingly, when about to die, he ascends, at the Divine command, a high mountain; a task to which the two patriarchs would have been utterly unequal shortly before their death. From its summit, he enjoys, *with eyes that years have not yet dimmed*, a clear view of the promised land; the prospect would have been a blank to the dull and failing vision of the dying Isaac or Jacob. He then straightway dies, not through the feebleness and exhaustion of age,

but according to the special announcement of God, and for his former transgression at Meribah-Kadesh.

What was the lot of the reanimated body after the Transfiguration? We have already stated that, as the Lord returned from the mount to his previous condition and circumstances, it may be probably inferred that the body of Moses was again deprived of physical life, and borne back to its grave at Beth-peor, in order to abide there until the appointed resurrection of the just. It may here be added that the contrary opinion would seem to militate directly against the glorious truth, that the Lord Jesus was, in His resurrection, '*the first-fruits of them that slept, the first-born from the dead.*' Nor is it easy to believe, in the face of this assertion of the Redeemer's absolute precedence and priority in the glory of the resurrection to immortality (he is the source and fountain-head of resurrection-life), that it could be said, *before the death and resurrection of Jesus*, even of Moses after the Transfiguration,—'Having died once, he dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.' Is it not both reasonable and scriptural to suppose that the glory of the Transfiguration was, in all respects (though a pledge and foretaste of the future), only temporary to Moses as well as to his Lord.

Some minds will perhaps shrink from the idea that the body of Moses should undergo the humiliation of death (and also of its appointed natural consequences, decay, and conversion into dust,) *after* having been raised to participate in the glory of the Transfiguration. May it not be easily explained that there is no insuperable difficulty here? Of the three persons seen by the disciples upon the mount, the Lord Jesus in was expressibly the greatest and most illustrious: indeed, the attending legislator and prophet received their subordinate share in the glory for His sake. So far, however, was the privilege of temporary participation in this unearthly glory from constituting a *necessary exemption from the after-lot of death and the grave*, to those upon whom it had been bestowed, that the blessed Jesus himself, who was the King and Lord in this glory, afterwards underwent, in that very body which

had been thus marvelously glorified, excruciating sufferings amidst all the scorn and ignominy which human hatred, stimulated by diabolical malignity, could devise and inflict. Did not scornful men scourge, spit upon, buffet, and crown with thorns, that sacred body and that hallowed head which the Father had invested with such celestial radiance on the mount? Nay, was not He, who was there transfigured, '*his face shining as the sun, and his raiment becoming white as light*'—was not He afterwards nailed to the cross between two malefactors on the hill of Calvary; and, being then and there 'made a curse for us,' did he not openly die a death of the deepest pain and shame? When, therefore, we reflect that all these things happened, *after the Transfiguration*, to Him for whom all that glory was called into temporary existence as a pledge and anticipation of the glorious future, can we hesitate to admit the scriptural probability that the body of Moses, when the appointed purpose of its reappearance had been fulfilled, was conveyed back to 'the valley over against Bethpeor,' whence it had been taken (an act involving not the shadow of special personal humiliation to the individual;) and that, having undergone a second separation from the immortal spirit—a *separation of the most gentle, peaceful, and painless character*—it then (if no longer required by God for any other future purpose) gradually passed through corruption and decay into dust. And thus, in the case of Moses also, the great law would finally, though tardily, be fulfilled, 'Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.'

Nor, on the view here advocated, need our sympathies be arrayed on the side of this venerable servant of the Most High, as if something like injury and wrong would thus be inflicted upon him. Is it conceivable that the great Legislator could have entertained, at such a time and on such an occasion, one passing thought of dissatisfaction at the lot which is here supposed to have probably befallen him, or have breathed one prayer that his flesh might no more enter the grave? For what was the special subject of conversation between him, Elijah, and the great Redeemer on the mount?

They spake of the decease which Jesus should accomplish at Jerusalem. The character and results of that divinely appointed death, with reference both to his own resurrection and the salvation of his Church, were already well known to the Lord Jesus, and would, doubtless, be so to Moses and Elijah, at least before the close of the Transfiguration. It seems, therefore, quite impossible that Moses, thus fully aware of the death of shame and suffering which his Lord was soon to undergo, should feel one moment's reluctance that his own body should again die a peaceful and painless death, and be once more deposited in its grave. Can we suppose that Moses, who must doubtless have learned, before leaving the mount, the divinely-decreed resurrection of his Lord, as 'the first fruits of them that slept,' should desire to precede in his own person the resurrection and immortality of the great King Messiah, in whose presence he was at that moment privileged to stand? Truly he might be well content to receive, through the knowledge of the approaching death and resurrection of his Redeemer and Lord, a brighter assurance of the certainty of the final resurrection of the just, and of his own certain participation in that glorious triumph over death. In such circumstances, he could not but cheerfully and gratefully adore and acquiesce in the will of his God, should that holy will have been to replace his body once more in its grave at Bethpeor, for the purpose of awaiting there the morning of the resurrection of God's redeemed servants, and to convey back the immortal spirit to rejoin, after its brief and happy absence, the other disembodied spirits of the just, whose joy it might be privileged to increase by imparting to them the glad tidings of all that had just passed on the Mount of Transfiguration.

We must not pass over without notice an apparently probable reason which has been alleged why it pleased the Most High to place the lifeless body of his servant in a grave purposely concealed from the children of Israel. This was done, it is said, lest the Hebrews should afterwards pay a supersti-

tious reverence to the memory and sepulchre of their great lawgiver and leader. Yet with regard to this supposed danger of the introduction of idolatrous error, may it not be fairly asked ; Was not the sepulchre of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, at Hebron, as likely, to say the least, to be thus ignorantly and sinfully honoured ? And surely, the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh might have been expected, on the same view, to have gradually instituted sinful and superstitious ceremonies at the tomb of Joseph, their great ancestor, whose bones were conveyed from Egypt to the promised land ; and also at that of Joshua, the illustrious ornament of the tribe of Ephraim. This apparently probable reason might have been more readily admitted as the most satisfactory cause of the concealment of the lawgiver's grave, if we had never read in the sacred volume of the reappearance of Moses in his living body upon the Mount of Transfiguration. But, as the case stands, it would perhaps seem to be scripturally reasonable and probable, that the mysterious manner of his interment had (chiefly and especially) reference to his destined brief reappearance on the 'holy mount ;' and also, that the body was preserved by the Divine will from corruption, at least until the close of that great transaction. Thus the records of the mysterious burial in the Old, and of the glorious Transfiguration in the New Testament, appear to illustrate each other ; the former having been designed and executed chiefly with a view to, and for the sake of, the latter. Had the place of interment been known, the Hebrews might afterwards, without any superstitious intention at the time, have sought to convey the mortal remains of their lawgiver to the western side of the Jordan. A part of the Divine secret would thus have been discovered ; although they could not have approached to any probable conjecture why they had found their buried lawgiver fresh and undecayed, as at the moment of death ; a slumbering body, rather than a decaying corpse, or fleshless skeleton.

And what became of Elijah after the Transfiguration ? If Christ is to have priority and precedence not only in the Re-

surrection, but also in the *immortality* of the body, does it not seem necessary to admit that the body of Elijah, instead of returning to its heavenly abode, was separated from the spirit, and placed by the power of God in a grave in some part of the Holy Land? I should be inclined to reply in the affirmative to this question, but for certain extraordinary circumstances recorded and predicted in the Scriptures concerning this illustrious prophet. In 2 Chron. xxi. 12, mention is made of a letter or 'writing' from Elijah to Jehoram, King of Judah, the wicked son of Jehoshaphat. It is plain from the contents of this writing, that it was not sent at the beginning of this king's reign. And that it must have been received *after Elijah's translation*, appears to be certain from 2 Kings iii. 11-15, where Jehoshaphat (the father of this wicked Jehoram, to whom the letter was addressed,) and Jehoram, King of Israel, the son of Ahab, through fear of the Moabites, apply to Elisha, 'who had poured water on the hands of Elijah,' as the most eminent of the prophets of the time. It is thought by some, that the letter in question must have been written by Elijah *before his translation*—a view which is plainly not inconsistent with humble and devout reverence for the Scriptures, as it admits the letter to have been a divinely inspired prophetic denunciation of judgment. But surely there is no need to have recourse to any such hypothesis to remove a difficulty which is rather imaginary than real. Why may we not suppose that Elijah, by Divine command, dictated the prophetic message to an angel, who could direct some pious Israelite to commit it to writing and convey it to the King of Judah? At all events, whatever difficulty to our conceptions there may be in the wonderful transaction, it is better to leave it with the wisdom and omnipotence of the LORD.

In this simple scriptural narrative we have the striking and remarkable fact—that Elijah, after leaving the earth, and from his abode in the heavenly regions, exercised on one occasion his prophetic office in rebuking sin and denouncing judicial punishment. It is also to be noticed, that although he was specially a prophet to the ten tribes and to the kings of Sa-

maria while on earth, he was directed, after his translation, to rebuke with prophetic authority the King of Judah, whose throne was at Jerusalem.

This single transaction, if we accept the scriptural record in its plain and *literal* meaning, teaches us that the exercise of Elijah's prophetic office towards the children of Israel living upon that earth from which he had himself been miraculously removed, did not finally cease at his translation. And this single instance should forbid us to assert positively (at least so long as the children of Abraham shall continue in their marvellous and predicted separation from the nations of the earth) *that God will never again call upon him to resume the exercise of his prophetic office.*

It cannot be denied that when we read the account of Elijah's letter to Jehoram, and do not look beyond the narrative, we are utterly at a loss to understand the motives of the divine procedure, and are perplexed and astonished because God did not commit to the illustrious living prophet Elisha the task of rebuking the King of Judah. But further inquiry may possibly diminish our perplexity and astonishment, and teach us that the LORD had wise and good reasons for making it manifest to his church that Elijah's exercise of his prophetic office did not finally cease at his translation, and that, when resumed on the occasion in question, it was enlarged and extended to comprehend Judah and Jerusalem.

We are, then, carefully to bear in mind that the single transaction of which we have been speaking, suffices to instruct us that Elijah's translation into the heavenly regions was not the final termination of his official and prophetic connection with the land and people of God. And if it be asked why other instances of writings from Elijah to the kings of Judah did not occur, we may reply that probably the Divine purpose did not require more than the one which is recorded. And should it again be reverently asked—What conceivable purpose the LORD had in view in this single and solitary transaction? the inquirer may be referred to the verses which form the conclusion of the canon of Old Testa-

ment prophecy, where we find Jehovah thus speaking by his servant Malachi: 'Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and terrible day of the LORD: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth (land?) with a curse.' Mal. iv, 5, 6. Now, there are certain points connected with this prophecy concerning Elijah which at once arrest our attention. 1. The prevailing ungodliness of the Jewish people at the time in question, implied in the words—'Lest I come and smite the earth (land?) with a curse.' 2. The purpose and character of the predicted ministry. It was not only to precede, but be *preparatory and introductory to*, and therefore *intimately connected* with, a glorious Divine dispensation, and to exercise a strong moral influence upon the national mind. Now, both these points are *unquestionably applicable to the times and ministry of John the Baptist*. 3. But what shall be said of the third point? viz., of the *time* of the predicted return and ministry of Elijah? This return is to take place before (and doubtless *not long before*) 'the great and dreadful day of the LORD.' But is this a vague and obscure expression? Or are any of the peculiar features of this 'great day' pointed out in the immediately preceding context? The prophet appears to teach us, though undoubtedly in highly figurative language, that the day or time in question will be marked by a terrible and *decisive* overthrow of the enemies of God, and also by the *visible*, triumphant, and final deliverance of his people. The day shortly before which the Elijah of Malachi is to return will be one of fiery vengeance, in which 'all the proud, and all that do wickedly shall be as stubble—it shall leave them neither root nor branch, saith the Lord.' And what is to be the lot of the servants of the Most High at the same awful period? 'But unto you that fear my name, shall the Sun of Righteousness arise, with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be as ashes under the soles of your feet, in the day that I shall do this, saith

the Lord of Hosts.' Now, whatever be the real and full meaning of this latter clause, it must mean something more than the possession of the spiritual blessings of justification and sanctification in a world in which believers are persecuted, or at best tolerated. Malachi seems to assure us that, at the time in question, believers are *visibly exalted by God*, and the unbelievers visibly, extensively, and utterly cast down. Can, then, the first coming of our Lord be considered as fulfilling that which is predicted of this great day? And if not, neither can the Baptist's ministry be received as the entire fulfillment of Malachi's prediction. Let us take into account, as belonging to the First Advent, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the slaughter and dispersion of the Jewish nation. Yet so far as that which is earthly and visible was concerned, this was the triumph of fierce and ungodly Gentiles over the more wicked and guilty Jews. That the cause of God was materially served, and the people of God greatly assisted, is not denied. Yet where was the *visible* triumph of the Church, which the words of Malachi would lead us to expect? The Jewish Christians preserved their lives and liberties by previously escaping from the devoted city. Scarcely ten years afterwards, Domitian, a monster of depravity, became Emperor of Rome; and the Christians (numbers of whom would of course be converted Jews) were persecuted during a part of his reign, as they were subsequently under Trajan and others. We are taught in the Old Testament of a yet future unparalleled tribulation of Israel; and also of the shame and final destruction of their enemies by a glorious Divine interposition. And as the First Advent of the meek and lowly Jesus was announced by a specially appointed herald, we need not be surprised if God has determined that the true Elijah is to return as a witness and herald, from his heavenly abode, shortly before the great day of Messiah's triumphant return in power and glory.

The majority of commentators consider that the words of Malachi received their complete fulfilment in the ministry of John the Baptist, concerning whom an angel had testified that

he should go before him *in the spirit and power of Elias* to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children; thus evidently connecting John's ministry with Malachi's prediction. Yet how did John himself afterwards act when questioned on the subject? He was asked, '*Art thou Elias?*' Surely this question is not to be understood as referring merely to *personal identity*. It must also imply, 'Does thy mission fulfil what is foretold of Elijah? And is Malachi's prediction thy warrant and commission *for authoritatively calling upon Israel to be baptized?*' John, although he must have learned from his parents the angel's prophetic announcement, that he was to minister in the spirit and power of Elias, yet answers distinctly in the negative. And it may be fairly urged that his words were not merely a denial of personal identity with the Tishbite, but also an explicit denial that his ministry was the absolute and only fulfilment which Malachi's prediction was intended to receive.

The writer is inclined to think that Elijah's single exercise of his prophetic office, after his translation, in the letter to Jehoram King of Judah was designed and recorded by God to enable his church afterwards more readily to receive the literal interpretation of Malachi's prophecy. And this view enables us to discern clearly a wise and important divine purpose in a transaction which would otherwise seem to us perplexing and unintelligible. Surely the language of Malachi's prediction concerning the actual return to the earth (and to a second earthly ministry) of the Hebrew prophet Elijah (who had been, without previously dying, translated into heaven) seems to be in itself so clear and distinct, was so certainly understood in its literal sense by the Jewish church unto and at the time of our Lord's ministry; so unambiguously points out that return as *preparatory and introductory to and intimately connected with the coming of the dread and terrible day of the LORD*; that to set aside the idea of the yet future return of the true Elijah to a second prophetic ministry upon the earth, we are well-nigh justified, under all the circumstances of the case, in expecting that Christ should not only

have said, '*John is Elias who was to come,*' but that he should also have added, '*and there is no other Elias to come after John.*'

And here it may be asked, if the true Elijah is really to return from heaven, and exercise again his prophetic office within the limits of the promised land, is there any special period, are there any special circumstances revealed in the Old Testament, with which we may suppose the return of the translated Prophet to synchronise? When does Malachi tell us that Elijah is to descend and resume his ministry? Shortly before (*and for the purpose of introducing*) '*that great and terrible day of the LORD.*' And how does Zechariah introduce the extraordinary events foretold in his fourteenth chapter, the final and dreadful desolation of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, and the final and glorious restoration of this city, when '*living waters shall go out from Jerusalem, and the LORD shall be king over all the earth; when there shall be no more utter destruction, but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited?*' With this solemn clause—'*Behold the day of the LORD cometh.*' It would appear, then, that previous to the coming of the day of the LORD, the Jews will have returned in large numbers to Palestine, apparently by their own resources and arrangements, yet, in reality, under a permissive and controlling Providence, secretly superintending all their efforts and measures, and watching over the due fulfilment of the prophetic Scriptures. It must be supposed that they will still, when in Palestine, reject the claims of Jesus of Nazareth to be their Messiah. For, should they then accept Him with all their hearts, and turn to the Father through him, it seems to be utterly against all Scriptural precedent and analogy to suppose that the LORD would, under these circumstances, permit such a horrible overthrow and sack of Jerusalem as that here described by Zechariah. The continued and contumacious rejection of the Lord Jesus, may be deemed a sufficient provocation of the Divine Majesty, to call down upon the guilty city so awful a visitation. Yet there is another *possible* addition to their guilt which ought not to be overlooked. If we are to interpret

literally the prediction of Malachi concerning the return of Elijah as a religious teacher and reformer before (and introductory to) '*the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord,*' then, since Zechariah, as seen above, introduces his fourteenth chapter with the solemn clause, '*Behold the day of the Lord cometh,*' may we not scripturally suppose that *Elijah will return and minister to the Jews, shortly before this last siege and sack of Jerusalem?* Admitting this, we may also think that Elijah's testimony, though received by some, will be rejected by the majority, who will thus become guilty of a sin, second only to that of their forefathers in the rejection of the Messiah.

Now the two Apocalyptic witnesses prophesy, clothed in sackcloth (*yet invincible, invulnerable, and armed almost with Divine power*), during the forty and two months that the holy city is trodden under foot by the Gentiles. It appears highly probable to the writer, that this is the period during which Zechariah's Gentile conqueror retains possession of the captured holy city, and that Enoch returns from heaven to unite with Elijah in joint testimony, as the two witnesses against God's triumphant enemies, as soon as the Tishbite's ministry, as a religious teacher and reformer, shall have ended.

The limits of this essay do not permit me to enter at length into the proofs of this view. I will, however, call the attention of the reader to the oath of the mighty angel, as recorded in Rev. x. 5-7: '*And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and the earth, lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever and ever, that there should be delay (χρόνος) no longer. But in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets.*' It appears to the writer that the angel here uses the words, '*no more delay,*' in a very gracious sense, as furnishing the consoling assurance that there would really be but a short interval from the utterance of the oath to the voice of the seventh trumpet. He does not indeed say that not another month or year is to intervene, and that no other pain-

ful and important events are previously to take place ; but he may be understood as assuring the Apostle that the really short interval will not deserve the name of delay ; *and that all the events which will yet have to occur, will wear the character of an onward and rapid advance to the destined termination.*

And we might expect, reasoning from the analogy of Scripture, that the leading character of the events subsequent to the angelic oath (should any be deemed necessary in the Divine wisdom to intervene between the oath and the seventh trumpet) would be twofold, comprehending a triumphant oppression (almost unprecedented) of the truth and people of God, by His enemies, and also such a testimony, in their sight, of His own Divine power, as should leave them utterly without excuse, and justify Him, not only in finally rewarding His servants, but also in finally casting down the unbelieving and scornful oppressors.

There is also every appearance that the 1260 days of testimony coincide with the forty-two months of the degradation of the holy city. And thus the triumphant possession of the holy city by the Gentiles, and the (apparently) miraculous ministry of the two witnesses are not only to be viewed as contemporaneous, but as also having a certain relation to each other ; for while the one is the act of unbelieving and scornful men against God, the other is the testimony of God through his servants, against this scorn and unbelief.

And on the supposition that the 1260 days of testimony of the two witnesses occur in the interval between the angelic oath, and the sounding of the seventh trumpet, it would seem to be impossible to consider the 1260 days to represent so many years ; for nothing can be conceived more contradictory to the angel's words--*'there shall be delay no longer.'* And, on the other hand, to interpret literally the 1260 days, is not only in accordance with, but, apparently, positively required by the terms of the angelic oath. And if the 1260 days are literal days, it becomes not only possible, but also not improbable, that the two witnesses are not two churches, but two individual servants of God. Indeed, if we consider the tes-

timony of the two witnesses, and the treading down of the holy city by the Gentiles, to be subsequent to the angel's assurance that 'there should be delay no longer,' it is quite in harmony with that assurance to mark the duration of these two events by such short divisions of time as those of days and months.

Let this subject be considered in another and important point of view. It is questioned whether these two witnesses are individuals or churches, or even the Books of the Old and New Testament. Their ministry is to continue during twelve hundred and sixty (real or prophetic) days. Now, if we are to consider that days are here put for years, it will be, of course, impossible to regard the witnesses as two individual servants of God. And, on this view, it must also be supposed that the whole of the long period in question, or, at least, a considerable portion of it, has already elapsed. Yet neither of these two suppositions seem to be at all consistent with what may be called the *essential character* of the Apostle's prophetic narrative, which sets before us two witnesses or prophets, clothed indeed in sackcloth—(sackcloth of humiliation, but not of weakness)—but armed with a power which has never yet been granted to any of God's witnesses who have from time to time been sent forth by Him. Elijah, *on certain special occasions*, was endued with a power from heaven bearing some resemblance to that which is given to these witnesses; yet, when Jezebel, enraged at the slaughter of the prophets of Baal, threatened his life, he sought safety *in flight* from her vindictive cruelty, and said, 'O Lord, take away my life, for I am not better than my fathers.' Moses and Aaron also, as witnesses for God against the pride and contumacy of Pharaoh, wrought the most awful judicial miracles in Egypt, exercising over the waters and the earth a power not unlike that ascribed to the two witnesses. But the sons of Amram *received minute and special directions from the LORD every time that wonders were to be performed and judgments inflicted through their instrumentality*. The time and the manner, the *when*, and the *how*, were reserved

in God's hands. But it is not so with the two Apocalyptic witnesses. Of these it is said, 'if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies.' Can this striking clause fairly mean any thing short of this, that these two witnesses are invulnerable and invincible against all human power during the whole course of their ministry, until the close of the 1260 days, and never need seek, as Elijah, to escape by flight from their enemies and persecutors. Again, instead of receiving (as did Moses and Aaron,) minute and special directions from God on certain special occasions, the two Apocalyptic witnesses appear to be entrusted with a commission of far higher character, and exercise their awful judicial powers over the waters, and over the earth (*ὡσάντις τὰν θελήσωσι*), 'as often as they will.' And surely every interpretation of St. John's prophetic notice of the ministry of the two witnesses, which does not give due weight to this striking and important clause—'as often as they will,' would seem to be so far defective and erroneous. Indeed this short and emphatic clause (especially when considered in connection with the terms of the angel's oath, that there should be delay no longer) appears to be quite inconsistent with any other view than that which regards the witnesses as two individuals, and the 1260 days as literal days.

It may here be fairly asked, 'Are we to think that the exercise of such awful power is to be left to the arbitrary will of two frail and fallible men? No. If the two witnesses are two individual servants of God, they will be men of humility, faith, and prayer towards God; as humble, dutiful, obedient, dependent, and prayerful towards God, as they are stern, uncompromising and undaunted towards their wicked enemies. Aware that it is God's special will, the special divine purpose for which they are raised up as witnesses, that they are to remain personally unharmed, and openly to confound their ungodly enemies during the appointed 1260 days of their prophetic ministry, they will know it to be their duty to cast down their assailants when their own preservation shall demand such a measure, and to exercise judicial power

over the land and waters whenever flagrant impiety shall render it necessary to do so.

Surely, then, the more closely we study the prophetic narrative in the Apocalypse, the more clearly shall we see that (whatever particular events and special divine judgments may occur from time to time,) a certain definite and unvarying character appertains to the whole period during which the witnesses exercised their ministry. Two prominent features belong equally to every one of the 1260 days, viz: the sack-cloth attire, (signifying the depressed state of the church at the time,) and the possession by those who are thus attired, of a superhuman power from God, which they are to use to the certain destruction of every ungodly enemy who shall attack them with a view to injure them or slay them.

But more remains to be said upon this vitally important subject.

Let us suppose that the apostle's prediction applies to two witnessing churches, and that the testimony is to be maintained during 1260 *years*. We must therefore believe, that a very considerable portion of this period has already elapsed, and that certain particular churches, such as those of the Paulicians, Valleuses, and Albigenses, were intended in the prophecy. Yet, although these were highly honoured witnesses for the truth in seasons of surrounding darkness, how imperfectly, at best, does their history correspond with the inspired description of the ministry of the two witnesses! Instead of openly testifying for the truth, *in the midst of their enemies*, abashing, overawing, and terrifying them, how frequently were they chased by their foes, and driven to take refuge in rocks and caves! How often were they reduced to conceal themselves with anxious care, and to dwell apart from the world as isolated communities, happy to find a precarious security in the sequestered mountain valley, and in retreats either unknown or inaccessible to their cruel and malignant persecutors! The impious and superstitious had to seek the servants of God with diligence and effort, and to penetrate, often with much difficulty, into their remote abodes. These

churches were sometimes almost crushed and overwhelmed, and their witnessing members, when discovered, *were slain without mercy by their enemies*. Surely then *the feeblest interpretation* that we can venture to put upon the apostle's description of the ministry of the two witnesses will still present a testimony for God of a character very much more aggressive and victorious (so far as the dauntless bearing and personal safety of the witnesses are concerned) than belongs to any series of consecutive events recorded in the history of these churches. In what considerable period of that history shall we find it to be (not the exception but) the invariable rule of the Divine procedure that believers, when threatened or attacked, confound with the words of their mouth, and drive back in shame or dismay, their fierce assailants, and *preserve themselves unharmed from all attacks*. For surely something like this is required for any witnessing ministry to correspond at all, even with the *spirit* (to say nothing of the *letter*) of the apostle's description. Nay, what we read of the proto-martyr Stephen, would not adequately meet the requirements of that description. He, 'being full of faith and power,' performed many miracles and wonders, but not of a judicial and destructive character. His enemies encounter him in argument, but 'cannot resist the wisdom and the spirit in which he speaks.' They have recourse to forcible measures and bring him before the council. He stands in the presence of his judges with something celestial and angelic in his countenance. His keen and burning rebukes cut them to the heart, and they 'gnash on him with their teeth.' Here, doubtless, we have a witnessing servant of Christ, of whom it might be figuratively said that fire proceeded out of his mouth to confound and awe (but not to destroy) his accusers and judges. Yet, if they are confounded by his burning rebukes, they are also exasperated; and, instead of being overawed and terrified into forbearance, they cast him out of the city and stone him as a blasphemer. And as he was not commissioned during his ministry to perform judicial and destructive miracles (as are the two witnesses), so, in accordance

with the spirit of his mission, and after the example of his Master, he prayed to that risen and exalted Master, 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.'

There is another not unimportant objection to the supposition that the two witnesses are two churches. We find, indeed, instances of the exercise of judicial power in inflicting punishment on offenders in the Acts of the Apostles. Thus, at the word of Peter, Ananias and Sapphira fell to the ground and died, and blindness came upon Elymas the sorcerer, at the rebuke of the apostle Paul. But these were special judgments for special offences; the one on delinquent professors of the Gospel, the other on a subtle and malignant opposer of Christian truth, who was seeking to turn away a listening Gentile from the faith. But undoubtedly it is among the fundamental principles of the New Testament that the Church of Christ is to manifest the spirit of her Divine founder, who was the Father's faithful and true witness, who 'before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession,' 'who when he was reviled reviled not again, and when he suffered threatened not;' who on the cross prayed for his murderers, and whose charge to his disciples was, 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you.' Thus we appear to be taught that Peter, John, and Paul, *and not Moses and Aaron*; that Stephen the Martyr, *and not Elijah the Prophet*, are the human examples which the churches of the Lord Jesus are to follow, as the apostle and martyr followed him. How striking are the words of our Lord to James and John, when, indignant at the ignorant bigotry of the Samaritans, and under the impulse of sinful impatience and anger, they said, 'Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, as Elias did? Jesus turned and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.' Now the supposition that the two apocalyptic witnesses are churches, and that their awful ministry is exercised during many centuries, seems

very contrary to the essential feature of the Church of Christ just alluded to: for it makes the supposed churches to maintain their testimony for God, as *fire-breathing* and *smiting*, rather than as *suffering* witnessing churches. And if we are to interpret the days of their testimony as years, then will the apparently offensive anomaly of *fire-breathing* and *smiting*, instead of *suffering* testimony, continue during the long period of 1260 years. Hence it would seem that the mission entrusted to the two witnesses is of a *special and exceptional character*, one that would far more suitably be given 1260 days than 1260 years, before the close of the present dispensation, when final judicial vengeance on the ungodly and impenitent will immediately precede and usher in the final triumph of God and his Christ—a mission that we should rather expect to see entrusted to Enoch and Elijah, than to gospel churches or gospel ministers of Christ.

It has been already observed that the mission of Moses and Aaron, as well as that of Elijah, was far inferior to that of the two apocalyptic witnesses. These, during the 1260 days of their ministry, are entrusted with powers far greater than were the illustrious brothers in the days of Pharaoh, and are commissioned to exercise them according to their own judgment and discretion, and so to speak, ὡς αὐτοὶ ἴαν θελήσωσι, '*as often as they will.*'

Let us, for a moment, reflect upon this marvelous delegated authority—power 'to turn the waters to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues as often as they will.' To hold such power during 1260 days, would it not be enough to endanger the fidelity even of the apostle Paul? to corrupt the principles of the most eminent saint, and turn him into a self-willed and self-worshipping antichrist? It may, indeed, be truly said that when God gives the power, he can give the grace to exercise aright what he has given. This cannot be denied. Yet we seem to find in the Scriptures that, when God calls any of his servants to an arduous and exalted sphere of duty, he generally prepares them for it by a course of special and suitable training and discipline. Earth, however,

seems to offer no preparatory school to train and fit 'men of like infirmity with ourselves' for the righteous exercise of such awful and, as it were, divine power. The only adequate discipline and training would appear to be that which Enoch and Elijah have long been and still are undergoing—a sojourn in the heavenly regions. During the last eighteen centuries of that sojourn they have doubtless been eye-witnesses of the exaltation of Jesus at the right hand of God. Surely we must feel that earth has no bribe that can tempt, no terror that can affright, witnesses who shall have thus been disciplined and trained, and are armed with such superhuman power. Actually eye-witnesses during eighteen centuries of the heavenly glory given to Christ by the Father, and having received from God the assurance of the speedy return of his Son to the earth in glory, the annunciation of which may perhaps form the most offensive portion of their testimony, they will well deserve the name applied to them in the Apocalypse, '*My two witnesses.*' They know, and Satan knows, even to a single day, how long they are to be a piercing thorn in the side of antichristian impiety and blasphemy, which, in the midst of its triumph, is utterly unable to silence two unarmed witnesses clad in sackcloth. They are to torment the enemies of God 1260 days. At the close of that period, 'the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them and kill them.' Their dead bodies lie three days and a half 'in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, and *where also our Lord was crucified.*' Certain persons or delegates from the various kindreds and nations shall see their dead bodies, three days and a half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put into graves.' This shameful spectacle is to terminate in their resurrection and return to heaven. On the fourth day, perhaps at the moment when the sun has reached the zenith, at the hour of noon, when many will probably be still looking on with fierce exultation, 'the spirit of life from God shall enter into them, and they shall stand upon their

feet, and great fear shall fall on them who shall see them.' Then, too, a great voice from heaven shall say unto them, 'Come up hither; and they shall ascend into heaven in the cloud, and their enemies shall behold them.' It is added that 'at the same hour there was a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell, and in the earthquake were slain (of the names of men) seven thousand; and the remnant were affrighted and gave glory to God.' This last clause may seem to imply that the affrighted remnant now acknowledged the two witnesses and their testimony to have been from God.—They who think that the length of the time in which the two witnesses prophesy, must be understood in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the angelic oath—'there shall be delay no longer'—will feel it almost impossible to consider the 1260 days and the 42 months to be other than literal days and months. They will think from the 14th verse of the xi. Rev.—'The second woe is past; behold, the third woe cometh *quickly*,'—that the witnesses prophesy at the very close of the period of the second woe. Again, the 13th verse of xi. Rev., in saying that '*the remnant were affrighted and gave glory to the God of heaven*,' would seem to speak of a certain number of actual survivors from a real disastrous visitation; and, therefore, to teach that the locality is definite, the earthquake real and not figurative, and that the seven thousand men (whatever be the apparent difficulty as to the number, and the form of expression '*names of men*')—really perish by the earthquake. If so, the city, of which the tenth part falls, is not a kingdom but a literal city.

The idea that Enoch and Elijah are to re-appear upon the earth as the two Apocalyptic witnesses is no novel theory. Tertullian and other ancient fathers are said to have held this to be the true interpretation of St. John's remarkable prediction. This is, of course, no necessary proof of the correctness of their view. Perhaps, during the first four or five centuries of our era, it was scarcely possible not to suppose that the prediction in question was to be fulfilled by the joint ministry of two individuals, and Enoch and Elijah would natu-

rally present themselves to the mind of the Scriptural student as the persons most probably intended in the apostle's vision. During those early centuries also, Christians would not generally suppose that twelve centuries and a half were to elapse before the Millenium, and would therefore be inclined to regard the 42 months and 1260 days as literal months and days.

Enoch was the son of Jared, and, at the age of sixty-five years, became the father of Methuselah. During the three hundred years which intervened between this event and his translation 'he walked with God,' living a life of faith and of intimate spiritual communion with his gracious God. When he was three hundred and sixty-five years of age we find it recorded in the concise language of Holy Writ, '*that he was not, for God took him.*' The inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews settles the meaning of these words when he tells us, '*By faith Enoch was translated, that he should not see death, and was not found because God had translated him.*'

We have also, in the Epistle of St. Jude, important additional information on the subject of Enoch's history. The inspired writer, having described certain ungodly persons who had insinuated themselves into the Church, proceeds to say of them, '*And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.*' This prediction, delivered by the antediluvian patriarch, and which is here quoted by Jude, cannot, when taken in connection with the immediate context, be confined to that awful day of the Lord in which God '*brought the flood upon the world of the ungodly.*' We surely have here nothing less than an explicit prediction of the yet future coming of the Lord in glory and majesty to execute judgment. We cannot help feeling astonished that the illustrious

antediluvian prophet should so distinctly announce the coming 'of the great and terrible day of the Lord.' But our wonder would in some measure cease, and we should at once recognize both the Divine wisdom and prescience, could we feel assured that it was with some great special church purpose that God inspired and strengthened his servant to proclaim this prophetic testimony. What marvelous fitness and harmony should we discover in the whole transaction could we believe that God withdrew his faithful servant into heaven from his apparently unfinished work of bearing testimony to the second advent—(I say from his *apparently unfinished work*, as, strictly speaking, death is the only proper termination to earthly duties, and Elijah's prophetic office did not terminate at his translation)—in order to send him to the earth again, shortly before Christ's glorious coming, to resume and complete his glorious testimony.

It is not, however, to be denied that the language of the apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, concerning the translation of this eminent servant of God—'by faith Enoch was translated *that he should not see death*'—may afford some plausible ground for supposing that he was never to taste of death. Yet, though the words will bear this meaning, such is by no means their *necessary* signification. A more literal version of the original would be, 'By (through) faith Enoch was removed, or withdrawn, from seeing death.' Now we may safely assert that Enoch, without a special Divine interposition, would certainly have died before the deluge, either in the ordinary course of nature or through the hatred of ungodly men. These, provoked and exasperated by his faithful reproofs, awful warnings, and holy example, may have even sought to lay violent hands upon the zealous servant of the Most High. But he was divinely preserved from either form of death through translation into heaven. And such glorious preservation would seem fully to satisfy the apostle's language, even if the translated saint is reserved during a long appointed period in heaven, that he may return to the earth

shortly before the Lord Messiah's glorious advent, to resume his antediluvian testimony and seal it with his blood.

The majority of devout and sincere Christians probably find it difficult, not to say impossible, to admit the idea that Enoch was removed from an *unfinished* work of testimony into heaven, whence he is to return to our earth in order to *resume and complete that testimony*, witnessing even unto death. In not a few minds the difficulty in question arises from a Romish notion that it was not only through faith, but also, in some degree, on account of a *meritorious* course of holiness during more than three hundred years, that Enoch *earned* his present exalted position, and cannot therefore be *justly* degraded from it. Yet that a long career of holy spiritual communion with God during three hundred years is no indispensable qualification for the honor of translation into heaven without previously tasting death, is clearly proved from the fact that Elijah also was thus translated.

Again, the very singularity and rarity of the honor conferred on Enoch and Elijah tend to foster erroneous notions on this subject. As only two individuals have been thus favored by God, the mind is naturally prone to imagine that there must have been in these two illustrious persons some peculiar worth and excellency, raising them far above all other servants of the Lord. We do not duly reflect that the cause of their translation (an honor, be it remembered, for which the most eminent believer would not dare to pray) may far better be referred to the *peculiar and distinct character of certain great purposes of God*—(not revealed to the Church at the time, and kept secret until God's *last* prophetic communication to the beloved disciple in the isle of Patmos)—purposes which the Most High designed, and yet designs, to accomplish *through the agency of these translated saints*. And, so far as any Romish notions of human merit are unconsciously entertained, it may be asked, were Enoch and Elijah really more holy and faithful than Elisha and Daniel, than John the Baptist, Stephen, or the apostle Paul?

It is, perhaps, not difficult to meet the seeming objection

drawn from the apparent degradation involved in the supposition of the return of these translated saints to earth, and earthly conflicts and death, after a sojourn in the heavenly regions of more than 4000 years in the case of Enoch, and of almost 3000 in that of Elijah. Whence is it that, according to the will of God, dignity and glory arise in the world to come? Whence, but from faithful and enlightened, zealous and devoted obedience to and testimony for God, in this our world, which 'lieth in the evil one?' Let it then be supposed that Enoch and Elijah are to fulfil what St. John has predicted concerning the two witnesses. After having faithfully used their miraculous powers, and testified for God and his Christ during 1260 days of a period in which Satan will be permitted to exercise extraordinary influence and power, they close their testimony by suffering a violent death, 'the beast of the abyss making war against them, and overcoming them.' Will they not thus be prepared, in the judgment of men and angels, to occupy a far higher place in the glorious kingdom of Christ than before? Is their former honour of translation to be for a moment compared to this latter glory of resurrection (anticipating that of the Church) and of re-ascension into heaven after such renewed, arduous, and unspeakably glorious conflict? Did apostles formerly rejoice that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Jesus? And shall not Enoch and Elijah—who have been privileged during eighteen centuries to behold in their heavenly abode their glorified Saviour bearing in his hands and feet the marks of far greater shame and suffering—be permitted to share in such sentiments, and anticipate with holy joy the 1260 days of renewed conflict and testimony upon earth, and the three and half days of the ignominious exposure of their unburied corpses 'in the (broad) street of the great city?' Thus, instead of being wronged and degraded by their return from their long sojourn in heaven to such a high and arduous career of duty as that of the last and greatest of God's champions on earth against the prince of darkness, and of the faithful herald witnesses of the Lord King Messiah's speedy advent, they will rather be more nearly assimilated to

the likeness of their Saviour to come, and receive no slight increase of glory in the world to come.

It has been observed above, that some minds probably feel as if Enoch could not be *justly* degraded from his present exalted position by being sent back to earthly conflicts and suffering. This objection also will perhaps not bear examination. Even if it were conceivable that no additional honour in Messiah's glorious kingdom shall accrue to the two translated saints from their return to arduous conflict and martyrdom on earth, surely we may not dare to think that God will be *unjust* in sending down his faithful witnesses to the performance of such a task. He had an unquestionable right to *add* to the actual period of their abode on earth, when they were formerly living among men, 1260 days of arduous spiritual conflict and testimony, and then to permit their enemies to put them to a cruel death, and deny to their exposed corpses the rites of sepulture. Where, then, would be even the *semblance of injustice* in God's *deferring*, so to speak, the final termination of the prophetic career of these saints until his wise and holy purposes require their *joint* agency? and in reserving them, during the long intervals, closely united in the bonds of holy fellowship and friendship, in a state of unearthly blessedness?—a blessedness surely not inferior to that of the spirits of those who have died in the faith, a blessedness which, we may fearlessly say, would be increased rather than diminished by the prospect of resuming in holy and intimate fellowship their testimony upon earth as the herald-witnesses, amidst a deluge of ungodliness, of the fast approaching advent of their Lord and king.

While we thus endeavour to discover, from Scriptural arguments and analogies, some special and suitable church purpose in the translations of Enoch and Elijah, let it not be hastily said that one instance of translation is a more awful and powerful rebuke to unbelief than the courageous deaths of a thousand martyrs. The records of the translations of Enoch and Elijah will be received by the sceptic with contempt, and are impressive only to him who already believes, and they glorify God only to him. Who saw the translation of Enoch and

Elisha, and perhaps 'the fifty sons of the prophets who stood afar off,' were the only spectators of that of Elijah. The reality of their translation into heaven would be doubted by many who were not unbelievers in the ordinary sense of the term. Nay, we find that in the case of Elijah, the sons of the prophets (apparently the very persons who had said to Elisha, just before the translation, 'knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day?') urge him to send 'fifty strong men' to search for Elijah's body, adding as their reason for giving this advice, 'lest, peradventure, the spirit of the Lord hath taken him up and cast him upon some mountain, or into some valley.' They believed that Elijah had been miraculously taken up from the earth by the Lord, and yet could not feel certain that he had been translated into heaven. They pressed Elisha with such importunity that they shamed him into consenting that 'fifty men should be sent forth, who' (and this shows the reality of their apprehensions) 'searched three days for Elijah and found him not.' And in so far as the mere translation of these two saints into heaven without seeing death is concerned, they do not seem to be set forth as an example; for there does not appear to be the shadow of a Scriptural warrant for any individual believer to dare to entertain the hope or even the desire of such a special distinction, though it will be vouchsafed to such of the church as are living at their Lord's second coming.

The limits of this essay scarcely permit me to do more than allude to one or two additional points; yet I must not altogether pass without notice a popular and apparently strong objection to the return of Enoch and Elijah to the earth as the two Apocalyptic witnesses. It has been said 'that Enoch was doubtless changed or *transformed* before he was translated, as will be the case with those believers who, "being alive" at "the coming of the Lord," shall first be *changed* (1 Cor. xv. 51), and then "shall be caught up in the clouds."' If this be true of Enoch, it must be so of Elijah too, and thus we could not reasonably suppose that either of these saints is ever to see death. It must be confessed that it certainly seems both a

natural and *spiritual* (so to speak) impossibility that two human beings should be taken up into the *holy heavenly regions*, and reside during three or four thousand years without previously undergoing that organic change and transformation in which 'the corruptible puts on incorruption, and the mortal puts on immortality.' Yet, on the other hand, the Scriptures would seem to teach us that no such glorious and triumphant organic change can have taken place in any of Adam's descendants before the resurrection in immortality of the Lord of life and glory.

Yet may it not be allowed to meet this popular objection in the words of the Saviour?—'The things that are impossible with men are possible with God.' How many natural impossibilities have been overcome by God in behalf of his servants without their bodies undergoing any organic change? The life of Jonah was preserved while he was in the belly of the fish, and in the depths of the sea. Peter walked on the water, and the spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, and he was found at Azotus. Again, as marvelous as the case of Jonah was the preservation of the three Jewish witnesses 'in the burning fiery furnace, over whose bodies the fire had no power.' Moses, as well as Elijah and our Lord Jesus, was forty days without food, and yet enjoyed amidst that miraculous abstinence full bodily and mental vigour. Let us read (and this is perhaps nearer to our present purpose) what is written of Moses: '*And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days; and the seventh day he called unto Moses out of the midst of the cloud. And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like a devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel. And Moses went into the midst of the cloud, and gat him up into the mount; and Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights*' (Exod. xxiv. 16-18). Surely this part of the history of Moses resembles a species of translation from earth to heaven, and does not seem altogether unworthy to be compared with that of Enoch or Elijah. The Lord descends in bright and burning glory upon the Mount Sinai, and *his hea-*

venly throne is, as it were, established on the summit of the mount. Moses, without previously tasting death, passes into the midst of the cloud, and continues in the immediate vicinity of the glory of the LORD during forty days. Are Enoch and Elijah nearer to the Divine glory (are they as near) as was Moses during those forty days? And the humblest reader of the Scriptural narrative feels conscious that the return of Moses at the end of that time was not the result of any necessity arising from human infirmity and exhaustion, but that, had the Divine purpose required it, the Lord could have prolonged the abode of his servant amidst the glory on the Mount forty times forty days. All these wonders may indeed appear, if hastily glanced at, incomparably below the marvel of the translations of Enoch and Elijah into heavenly abodes without previous death or *transformation*; yet, if patiently weighed, they may gradually and powerfully assist in removing prejudices and objections against the return to testimony and martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah as the two predicted witnesses, and teach us to bow yet more reverently to the words of the LORD which have already been cited, 'The things that are impossible with men are possible with God.'

The writer has a faint recollection of having read in some commentary a remark to this effect—that if there had been more examples of similar devotedness and zeal, there would perhaps have been more instances on record of the translation of God's faithful servants into heaven. It is, however, probable that very few thoughtful readers of the Bible will consider such a sentiment to be either reasonable or Scriptural. On the contrary, the more attentively the subject is weighed in all its bearings, the more agreeable will it seem both to Scripture and to reason to suppose that *three such marvelous and extraordinary transactions* as the secret burial of Moses and the successive translations of Enoch and Elijah, were designed for certain special and important purposes—*purposes in harmony with the transactions themselves*; that these purposes were such as to require *neither a second secret burial nor a third translation into heaven.* The re-appearance of

Moses upon the Mount of Transfiguration would seem to furnish a probable Scriptural key to the mysterious circumstances of his interment. The same glorious event of the Transfiguration might have readily been accepted as an adequate cause for the translation of Elijah, had not Malachi predicted his return as a religious reformer, or had Elijah alone been translated. Yet why should there be adequate reasons for the special honors conferred on Moses and Elijah, and no similar assignable cause for the translation of Enoch? There does, however, seem to be a very adequate cause for this translation, and a very suitable place in the Word of God *for the re-appearance of Enoch upon the earth*, if we suppose that he and Elijah are destined to fulfil all that has been predicted of the two prophetic witnesses in the Apocalypse. And if this view of the subject be allowed, then it will follow that as *two* witnesses are in the Scriptures considered sufficient to establish a testimony, it was altogether unnecessary, so to speak, *to translate and reserve a third.*

G.

 ART. VI.

BLEDSOE'S THEODICY.

(CONTINUED.)

We have discussed our author's second position in what he is pleased to call "the atheistic sophism exploded;" and shown, as we think, that in this no more than in his first position, can such an explosion as he imagines take place. It is all a mistake, a floating mote in the sunlight evidence of the common-place truth, that "to err is human." He has allowed himself to be deceived by an imagination excited under the too potent, disturbing influence of a novel hypothesis. We shall presently proceed to examine and explode his own dis-

cussion of his second position, when the truth of what we said in April, will be made more manifest in July. Before we begin this task, however, we propose formally to show the New Divinity involved in this imaginary explosion; or rather that the explosive and exploding material is New Divinity itself.

If for the moment we allow the truth of our author's second position, that God cannot cause virtue or holiness to exist in the breast of a moral agent, will it not follow, that when He makes a moral agent, He makes him a *tertium quid*, a moral agent *per se*, neither virtuous nor vicious, neither holy nor unholy? Whether in itself it be absurd or reasonable, does not this consequence with inevitable logical certainty flow out of his position? Who can doubt it? Let us, then, see how this agrees with Finneyism. Take the following quotation from Mr. Finney.

“Here are two systems; the one maintains that *infants have no moral character at all, until they have committed actual transgression*, that their first moral actions are universally sinful, *but that previous to moral action they are neither sinful nor holy*, that, as they have no moral character, they deserve neither praise nor blame, neither life nor death at the hand of God; God might annihilate them without injustice, or he may bestow upon them eternal life as a free and unearned gift.”

Again:

“When Adam was first created, and awoke into being, before he had obeyed or disobeyed his Maker, he could have had no moral character at all; he had exercised no affections, no desires, nor put forth any actions. In this state he was a complete moral agent, and in this respect in the image of his Maker, but as yet could have had no moral character; for moral character cannot be a subject of creation, but attaches to voluntary action.”

Let the reader examine the italicised portions of these two quotations, and test ever so severely the logical consequence we have drawn from our author's second position, and then avoid the conclusion, if he can, that here there is coincidence between Mr. Finney and our author; that both teach that Adam was, and every infant is, made without moral character, “neither sinful nor holy.”

We have said in the portion of this review which appeared in April last, that it is, owing to our author's deficiency both in perspicuity and precision, somewhat doubtful whether his views of virtue or holiness, and, consequently, of vice or depravity, are in relation to the moral agent subjective or objective. The mist of thought which obscures some of his paragraphs, is such as to leave us in some doubt whether or not, in his opinion, it may be possible, that holiness may be caused to exist in the breast through intrinsic agency; though it may be impossible through extraneous agency. Now upon the supposition that this may possibly be his view of the matter, he in part coincides with, and in part differs from, Mr. Finney and his school of New Divines. He coincides with them as to the subjective origin of holiness, and differs from them as to its subjective nature; the subjectivity in each instance being understood in relation to the moral agent. Where these parties coincide, they differ from the views of both Arminians and Calvinists, and agree with Pelagians; and we shall, therefore, take the liberty of considering them heterodox. For both Calvinists and Arminians concur in teaching that the holiness of a moral agent is originated by the extraneous agency of God. When, under the supposition we have just above stated, our author and these New Divines differ, namely, with regard to its subjective nature in relation to the moral agent, our author has the decided advantage in point of psychology, inasmuch as his view admits the truth of the universal and intuitive conviction of subjective character, upon which men rely in making their calculations in regard to the conduct of one another. After all, it is but barely possible that our author may entertain this view of holiness, while it is highly probable, if not quite certain, that he considers it objective. This would seem almost plainly declared in the following quotation in which he is speaking of the moral agent: "If it could not sin, there would be no merit, no virtue, in its obedience." Here our author locates virtue or holiness in obedience, or rather makes obedience itself virtue or holiness, and, of course, makes it objective. Does not this entirely coincide with what

we have before quoted from Mr. Finney, the very corypheus of the New Divinity school, especially with these expressions: "When Adam was first created, and awoke into being, before he had obeyed or disobeyed his Maker, he could have had no moral character at all." . . . "Moral character cannot be a subject of creation, but attaches to voluntary action." If holiness or virtue be any part of moral character, and moral character attaches to voluntary action, and this voluntary action takes place when the moral agent obeys, as these quotations evidently teach, then holiness must be objective. It follows that another point of coincidence between our author and these New Divines, is here seen. Query: According to this objective view of holiness, is it not altogether wrong to speak of a holy moral agent or a holy God, seeing holiness cannot be affirmed of any being, but only of his actions? Query the second; Can holiness with any propriety be affirmed of either God or his actions, seeing that it consists only in obedient actions?

Our author in declaring that God cannot cause holiness to exist in the breast of a moral agent, must ignore orthodox views of the regenerative operation of the Holy Ghost in the renewal of our fallen nature. For, if the Holy Ghost be God, and God cannot cause holiness to exist in the breast of a moral agent, the Holy Ghost cannot any more than any other extraneous agent renew us in the image of God. We must, therefore, renew ourselves by the power of our own wills. Let us see what Mr. Finney says upon this point in his sermon entitled, "Sinners bound to change their own hearts." "All holiness in God, angels or men, must be voluntary, or it is not holiness." The very title of the sermon from which we take this quotation, is sufficient to satisfy the mind of our reader as to what are the views of Mr. Finney and his coadjutors on the point we are considering. Of course, if they think that sinners can and ought to change their own hearts, they will reject all notion of the Holy Ghost performing such a work of supererogation as to change their hearts for them. And why will they reject the Holy Ghost in producing this change?

Because they assert it must be voluntary on the part of the moral agent in whose experience it occurs, voluntary not in submitting to, but in producing the change. This, of necessity, excludes the efficient agency of the Holy Ghost from the work of man's regeneration, and coincides with our author's declaration, that God, the Holy Ghost, cannot cause holiness to exist in the breast of a moral agent.

If, as we have seen in a quotation from our author, he makes holiness to consist in obedience, must not unholiness or depravity consist in disobedience, and must not this necessarily deny the orthodox tenet of innate infant depravity? For the infant being incapable of either obeying or disobeying for some time after its birth, can, at the time of its birth, be neither holy nor depraved, if, indeed, it be at all possible for him ever after to become either. Let us hear Mr. Finney on this point. "By total depravity is not meant that any being is or can be sinful before he has exercised the powers of moral agency." Now no infant in the hour of his formation or birth can "exercise the powers of moral agency." This is a proposition no man in his senses can question, and, therefore, according to Mr. Finney, no infant can be born depraved. Again: "By total depravity, I do not mean that there is any sin in human beings, or in any other beings, separate from actual transgression." No human being is, before he is born, or at the time he is born, capable of actual transgression, and therefore, no infant can be born depraved. Again: "The sinner's hatred of God is not caused by any hereditary or transmitted disposition to hate him." We could not have asked Mr. Finney to express himself more plainly than he does in this last quotation. The deduction from our author's position is scarcely less satisfactory. Here, then, we discover another point of harmony between our author and Mr. Finney, who is a leader among the new school divines.

Writers of the same school both in theology and metaphysics, as well as other departments of knowledge, do for the most part show their affiliation in their terms as well as their views, and in the sense in which they employ those terms.

This is very natural, and is, of course, very naturally to be expected. In this respect, we discover a strong affinity, if not positive identity, in the views of our author and of the Finneyites or New Divines. For, there is a striking coincidence between them in their employment of the terms virtue and holiness, which is far from being unworthy of our consideration. We have heretofore cited the attention of the reader to the fact that our author employs these terms synonymously, and we now cite him to the additional fact that Mr. Finney does the same. In a quotation from him which we have before made use of, he says; "Holiness is virtue." Now it strikes us that this is a decided literary peculiarity of these New Divines, which grows out of the hypothetic views of moral agency they advocate. For, if no moral quality according to these views can be affirmed of a moral agent, and every moral quality must be affirmed of his actions, there can be no alternative; there can be no difference between holiness and virtue; these terms must mean the same objective something. As we know no other class of writers either in the theological or classical literature of our language, who entertains these views of moral agency, so we know no other who, from fixed purpose and habit, do thus confound the differing acceptations of these terms, and persist in employing them as synonymous. The best writers of our language employ these terms in widely different senses; the first, to signify a moral quality of a moral agent, and the second, to signify a moral quality of his conduct. But this reputable usage of these terms, would not by any means teach that which is in accordance with New Divinity, and hence the New Divines have a usage of their own, better harmonizing with their peculiar theology. The usage of our author with regard to these terms, we have seen, is the same. Now why has he in this respect forsaken the classical writers of our language as well as its orthodox divines, and associated himself with these New Divines, if he does not affiliate with them in doctrine?

That we are not mistaken with regard to the New Divinity views of our author, we have further evidence in the history

of his doctrinal revolution as given us in the introduction to the work under review. We refer the reader to page 26, where he says :

“ Whether at the outset of his inquiries, he was the more of an Arminian or of a Calvinist, he is unable to say ; but if his crude and imperfectly developed sentiments had then been made known, it is probable he would have been ranked with the Arminians. Be this as it may, it is certain he was never so much of an Arminian, or of anything else, as to imagine that Calvinism admitted of nothing great and good. On the contrary, he has ever believed that the Calvinists were at least equal to any other body of men in piety, which is certainly the highest and noblest of all qualities. And besides, it was a constant delight to him to read the great master-pieces of reasoning which Calvinism had furnished for the instruction and admiration of mankind. By this he came to believe that the scheme of the Arminians could not be maintained, and his faith in it was gradually undermined.”

From this extract we learn, that when our author was yet young, and his theological views were in but a crude and forming state, he thinks it probable, not by any means certain, he was an Arminian ; but as he grew older and approximated the maturity of his mental development, his familiarity with the master-pieces of Calvinism, dissipated all such doctrinal illusion, convinced him that Arminianism “ could not be maintained,” and, of course, induced him to reject it as false. Now the question is, has he ever returned to his first love, if Arminianism ever was truly such ? Has he now become convinced, that these “ Calvinistic master-pieces ” so sophisticated Arminianism, and perverted his mental vision, as to make him see her in a light not truly her own ? Does he now see her as “ the fairest among ten thousand and altogether lovely ? ” Nothing of the sort is declared in, or may be clearly inferred from, anything he has written in the book before us. The reader will in vain search it, however diligent may be his search, to find anything more than a faint semblance of a return to Arminianism, which consists merely in dissatisfaction with old school Calvinism and the enunciation of the freedom of the will merely. Up to the hour, then, in which this book

went to the press, he still remained under the conviction for which he was indebted to the "master-pieces of Calvinism," namely, that Arminianism "could not be maintained."

We will look at one more extract just here.

"But although he thus submitted his mind to the dominion of Calvinism, as advocated by Edwards, and earnestly espoused it with some exceptions; he never felt that profound, internal satisfaction of the truth of the system, after which his rational nature continually longed, and which it struggled to realize. He certainly expected to find this satisfaction in Calvinism, if any where. Long, therefore, did he pass over every portion of Calvinism, in order to discover, if possible, how its foundations might be rendered more clear and convincing, and all its parts harmonized among themselves as well as with the great undeniable facts of man's nature and destiny. While engaged in these inquiries, he has been more than once led to see what appeared to be a flaw in Calvinism itself; but without at first perceiving all its consequences. By reflection on these apparent defects; nay, by protracted and earnest meditation on them, his suspicions have been confirmed and his opinions changed. If what now so clearly appears to be the truth, is so or not, it is certain that it has not been embraced out of a spirit of opposition to Calvinism, or to any other system of religious faith whatever. Its light whether real or imaginary, has dawned upon his mind while seeking after truth amid the foundations of Calvinism itself; and this light has been augmented more by reading the works of Calvinists themselves, than those of their opponents."

Let the reader examine this quotation, remembering that its author has set aside Arminianism as incapable of being maintained, and that he here speaks exclusively of Calvinism. He goes to work to see if all the parts of Calvinism cannot be made to harmonize "among themselves as well as with the great undeniable facts of man's nature and destiny." He seemed to think at first that this harmony could be effected. But in examining the foundations of the system, he discovers flaws in Calvinism itself, upon which the more he meditates, the more he discovers the impracticability of his purpose. He, therefore, changes his opinion, and concludes that Calvinism cannot be so harmonized. While engaged in this work amid the foundations of Calvinism, and with none but Calvinistic lights around him, the morning of "what now so clearly appears to be the truth," dawns upon him for the first time. What was that, the truth of Arminianism? No, in-

deed; he had seen that before, and rejected it. Moreover, no Calvinistic writer has ever been known to augment the light of Arminianism, however they may awaken suspicions as to the truth of Calvinism. What is it that so clearly appears to be the truth now? Why it is, that if Calvinism "as advocated by Edwards," cannot be made to harmonize in itself and with "the great undeniable facts of man's nature and destiny," it may be mended into such harmony. What class of Calvinistic writers were those who augmented for our author the light of this discovery? Why, they were new school Calvinists, to be sure. They had been at work before him down among the dark foundations of Calvinism, and before him they had made the same discovery. He finds among them congenial company and occupation. They patch up the flaws of Calvinism with pieces torn from the cloth of Pelagianism, and scraps of recent psychology, badly understood and applied, whereby the rent is made worse. There is too much in common between him and them to allow any one, who will give the matter a proper investigation, to think we are doing him any injustice in assigning him a place among these New Divines.

Our author flatters himself, and would persuade others, that he is an eclectic in theology.

"We have sought the truth, and how far we have found it no one should proceed to determine without having first read and examined. We have sought, not in Calvinism alone, nor in Arminianism alone, nor in any other creed or system of man's devising. In every direction have we sought it, as our feeble abilities would permit; and yet, we hope it will be found that the body of truth which we now have to offer is not a mere hasty patch-work of superficial eclecticism, but a living and organic whole. By this test we could wish to be tried; for as Bacon hath well said, 'It is the harmony of any philosophy in itself that giveth it light and credence.'"

Now we are of the opinion, though our author does not exactly say so, that he thinks that he has made up this eclecticism of his by modifying and blending the systems of Calvin and Arminius, when in fact he has made a compromise between Calvin and Pelagius, favoring the latter with very

decided advantage in too many vital points. And this, too, is what we think the New Divines have done. Calvinism teaches the depravity of man's nature and its irresistible regeneration by the Holy Ghost, as if man had no will to oppose the work; Arminianism teaches the depravity of man's nature and its regeneration by the Holy Ghost upon gaining the consent of man's will; while Pelagius, the New Divines and our author harmonize in teaching, that man's nature is not depraved, and therefore is not, and cannot be, changed by the Holy Ghost. They affirm that depravity attaches to voluntary actions with regard to which man's own agency is abundantly sufficient to change him. It is evident, then, that where Arminianism and Calvinism are agreed, namely, that man is depraved and must be regenerated of the Holy Ghost, our author, coinciding with Pelagius and the New Divines, denies this orthodox view of depravity and asserts the competency of man to produce whatever moral change his condition may require. Can the reader accept such eclecticism? Could any Pelagian object to it? Is it not all New Divinity could ask it to be? The reader will pardon us, if we here turn aside for a moment from the purpose of this paragraph, to notice our author's confidence in the internal harmony of his system. He thinks this harmony of its parts is sufficient evidence of its truth. "By this test," he desires "to be tried." He is of opinion, that my Lord Bacon has laid down this as a sufficient criterion of philosophic certitude. Our author is an astronomer, and we, therefore, appeal to him, if the nebular theory of Laplace is not regarded as beautifully harmonious in itself, and if, nevertheless, it has not been rejected as wanting in harmony with the facts of nature, and, therefore, incapable of standing the test of Bacon's inductive method. Is not the ideal pantheism of Spinoza conceded to be pre-eminently marked by internal harmony? is it not regarded as remarkable for logical consistency or harmony of parts as any system that has appeared in the history of speculative philosophy; and yet is it not rejected as not sufficiently harmonizing with "the facts of man's nature and

destiny?" As it does not follow that a system must be necessarily false, because it is deficient in internal harmony, neither does it follow that it must be true, because it is distinguished by ever so great a degree of it. For as a system may be altogether consistent with itself and yet deplorably deficient as to harmony with the universe of facts within and around us; so it may be greatly deficient in symmetry, and at the same time harmonious with external facts. We cannot, therefore, trust our author's test, even should it be found to be true that his system is as harmonious as he imagines it. Moreover, my Lord Bacon, in the sentence quoted from him, had reference, it seems to us, to the acceptableness and attraction with which such harmony invests any system for the human mind, naturally constituted to take delight in whatever is harmonious. He could not have intended to lay down a test for truth, which would at once and forever supersede the inductive method, which has rendered his name so immortally famous in the history of philosophy.

In conclusion of the evidence, as to our author's theological position, let us turn to the chapter in which he anticipates and answers objections. We shall find here, as we think, satisfactory proof of his New Divinity affiliations. He heads the first section of this chapter; "It may be objected that the foregoing scheme is 'New Theology.'" We lay before the reader all of any importance in his reply to this objection.

"If nothing more were intended by such an objection, than to put the reader on his guard against the prejudice in favour of novelty, we could not complain of it. For surely every new opinion which comes into collision with received doctrines, should be held suspected, until it is made to undergo the scrutiny to which its importance and appearance of truth may entitle it. No reasonable man should complain of such a precaution. Certainly, the present writer should not complain of such treatment, for it is precisely the treatment which he has received from himself. He well remembers, that when the great truths, as he now conceives them to be, first dawned upon his own mind, how sadly they disturbed and perplexed his blind veneration for the past. As he was himself, then, so ready to shrink from his own views as 'new theology,' he surely cannot censure any one else for so doing, provided he will but give them a fair and

impartial hearing before he proceeds to scout them from his presence. It is true, after the writer had once fairly made the discovery that 'old theology' is not necessarily true theology, he could proceed with the greater freedom in his inquiries. He did not very particularly inquire whether this or that was old or new, but whether it was true. He felt assured, that if he could only be so fortunate as to find the truth, the defect of novelty would be cured by lapse of time, and he need give himself no very great concern about it."

By "new theology," in this quotation, he means what we have been calling New Divinity. This is sufficiently evident from the fact that he frequently in his book quotes from and replies to a work entitled "Old and New Theology," published by The Presbyterian Board of Publication, and written with reference to the New Divinity controversy, which has divided the Presbyterian church in this country into old and new school Presbyterians. He does not deny that this objection is founded in truth, that these New Divinity views are properly attributed to him. He denies only the validity of the objection on the score of the truth of this new theology. It is no objection to his system that it is New Divinity, because New Divinity in his judgment is true. He concedes, then, all that we have here contended for.

We now proceed to examine the merits of our author's own discussion of his second position. We shall do this in the same detailed manner that we did in the case of his first position.

"In other words," that is, in another and broader and more ornate way of stating his second position, "the production of virtue by any extraneous agency, is one of those impossible conceits, those inherent absurdities, which lie quite beyond the sphere of light in which the divine omnipotence moves, and has no existence except in the outer darkness of a lawless imagination, or in the dim regions of error, in which the true nature of moral goodness, has never been seen."

This sentence was not, of course, intended to prove anything. Our author is sometimes a little Spanish in his taste, and he here takes a fancy to give his second position a slight touch of grandiloquence. He informs us here that virtue or holiness cannot be caused to exist in the breast of a moral

agent "by any extraneous agency" whatever. Well, we would very naturally and without being informed upon the subject, have supposed that if God could not do it, no one else could. We are surprised that he should have troubled himself to state a thing of such obvious inference. Again: He informs us that contradictions or absurdities are "beyond the sphere of light," or wisdom, "in which the divine omnipotence moves;" which is equivalent to asserting that God's omnipotence is governed in its manifestations by his infinite wisdom. What is this but saying that omnipotence will not perform contradictions, because they would be inconsistent with infinite wisdom, and not because they are impossible to itself. This is the ground we took in replying to his first position, and it is an evident surrender of it. Finally, what a platitude he perpetrates when he so grandly informs us that "moral goodness has never been seen in the dim regions of error." "It is absurd, we say, to suppose that moral agents can be governed and controlled in any other way than by moral means." What does our author mean by placing such a sentence in such a connexion? Is he not speaking of the impossibility of producing holiness in the breast of a moral agent? Why, then, does he, in the same connexion, allude to governing a moral agent? Does he wish us to understand that these two are one and the same? That there is no difference between producing virtue or holiness in the breast of a moral agent and governing him? We suppose so, because he thinks that holiness, in his breast, must necessitate his will and compel his whole course of action. Can he prove this? Will he prove it? He neither will nor can; for if he could, he would; but he does not, as we shall see. "All physical power is here out of the question." There is no such thing as physical power, as we expect to show when we come to discuss the subject of causation. He means, however, to give us to understand that there are two kinds of power, the one physical and the other moral. As an illustration of this distinction; if God by an act of his will regenerates a man, he is regenerated by physical power; but if the

man, influenced by inducements presented by God, puts forth his own will and regenerates himself, he is regenerated by moral power. Now it is very certain there can be nothing causative in these inducements. If there were, man would be as much a being of necessity as if the will of God operated directly upon his will and compelled to certain actions. The difference between these two cases, then, may be thus stated : in the first, man is regenerated by the will of God, and in the second, he is regenerated by his own will. If this statement be true, where can be the propriety of our author's distinction between physical and moral power, ascribing the first to the divine will and the second to the human will ? Is God a physical being ? Is he possessed of physical attributes ? If not, can his will be a physical power ? " By physical power, in connexion with wisdom and goodness, a moral agent may be created, and endowed with the noblest attributes." If there be such a thing as physical power, it should, it seems to us, be the attribute of some physical or material being, but it is manifest that, in this sentence, by physical power, is meant the divine omnipotence. This being the case, it is equally manifest that if the divine omnipotence is physical power, either God must be a physical being, or else being immaterial, his immateriality is strangely indued with a physical attribute. Either horn of this dilemma is monstrous enough, and our author is welcome to swing upon whichever pleases him most.

But why does our author talk thus, if he does not wish us to believe that the power of God, operating upon a moral agent so as to cause holiness to exist in him, would produce a physical rather than a moral effect ? He never thought of anything more absurd than an immaterial being possessing a physical attribute, or an immaterial being operating on an immaterial being a physical effect, or holiness in a moral agent being a physical effect.

" By physical power, a moral agent may be caused to glow with a feeling of love, and armed with an uncommon energy of will ; but such ef-

fects, though produced by the power of God, are not the virtue of the moral agent in whom they are produced."

If there be such a thing as physical power we presume it will produce only physical effects. Are we, then, to class the feeling of love and energy of will among physical effects? If they are physical we know not where to find anything moral. What is energy of will but power of will? Now by holiness in a moral agent we understand that power of will whereby the moral agent is rendered able to love God with all his heart, soul and mind, and his neighbor as himself; which Paul tells us "is the fulfilling of the law," and our author here admits that "by physical power," which with him is the same as divine omnipotence, this can be caused in a moral agent. This is admitting all that we could ask of him, especially as he does not at all intimate that divine omnipotence in doing this, would work a contradiction. But he says this virtue or holiness would not be that of the moral agent. We should like to know why not? It seems to us as much his as anything else God has given him; as much so as his own existence, this being the production of the divine omnipotence also. We cannot, as does our author, assume that this assertion must be granted. "This," that is, virtue or holiness, "consists, not in the possession of moral powers, but in the proper and obedient exercise of those powers." Did our author ever meet with one who advanced the notion that virtue or holiness consists "in the possession of moral powers?" Did he ever meet with this notion advanced in any book? We think not. Why then does he speak of such an absurdity, such a chimera of his own imagination, which, to employ his own fine language, "has no existence except in the outer darkness of a lawless imagination, or in the dim regions of error, in which the true nature of moral goodness has never been seen." And yet he seems to think, that holiness must be either "the possession of moral powers," or "the proper and obedient exercise" of them; as if there could, by no possibility, be any other alternative. We deny that it is either. It could not be "the possession of moral powers," because, in this case, every

human being possessing the same moral powers both in number and kind, all human beings, without distinction, whether good or bad, would be equally holy, and could not be otherwise while they retained all the essential attributes of humanity. It could not be the mere "proper and obedient exercise" of these moral powers, because, in this case, holiness would be no property of being but of action, and, therefore, it would be highly improper to speak of a holy man, and only proper to speak of holy actions or exercises. But it seems to us, that holiness must consist in a certain healthful spiritual condition of these moral powers, which may be increased, diminished, lost, or restored, according as the moral agent is faithful or unfaithful to God, who at first gave and, when lost, restores it, according to his infinite wisdom, goodness and power. In this case, when a man's moral powers are in a right moral condition, it can be affirmed of him, he is holy; and when they are in an opposite moral condition, it may be affirmed of him, he is unholy. This much, however, we will concede to our author; if he can prove that holiness "consists" "in the proper and obedient exercise" of moral powers, he can prove that God will not cause holiness to exist in the breast of a moral agent, and thereby work a contradiction. He cannot prove this. For we presume if he could, he would have done it.

"If infinite wisdom, and goodness, and power, should muster all the means and appliances in the universe, and cause them to bear with united energy on a single mind, the effect produced, however grand and beautiful, would not be the virtue of the agent in whom it is produced."

•This is tremendous! Why, if "all the means and appliances in the universe," were, according to the possibility which our author here supposes, brought by omnipotence "to bear with united energy on a single mind," it would be annihilated. All this effort would be quite unnecessary, and by far too much, for the production of holiness in the breast of a moral agent. A single volition of the divine will, would be amply sufficient to put all his moral powers in proper moral

condition, provided the moral agent consented to be so operated upon.

Being thus renewed, we cannot see why the holiness thus conferred upon him, should not be his, as much as his power to think, which was also conferred upon him, is his. "Nothing can be his virtue which is produced by an extraneous agency. This is a dictate of the universal reason and consciousness." These sentences might do very well if our author's definition of holiness or virtue were true. For if holiness or virtue were something objective, or lying without the moral agent, our consciousness would not enable us to see it as something subjective or lying within the moral agent, whether as produced there by extraneous or intrinsic agency. But he has not shown us that his definition is true, and, we think, we have shown it to be false, and, therefore, these sentences seem to us as idle as the words of one who murmurs in his slumber. "It needs no metaphysical refinement for its support and no scholastic jargon for its illustration." No, it really does not. These would not at all help it. But it does need a little clear convincing logic most wofully.

"On this broad principle, then, which is so clearly deduced, not from the confined darkness of the schools, but the open light of nature, we intend to take our stand in opposition to the embattled ranks of atheism."

The vanity of our author must have been in a most glorious state of titillation when he penned this sentence. What a hero he must have seemed to himself, if not to his page. He tramples with lofty disdain all the schools of philosophy under foot, in the carnage and ruin of this awful conflict with the atheists. A single knight in battle array against all their "embattled ranks," he must have fancied himself doing knightly deeds in days of chivalry. No, sir, it is all a waking dream. You have drawn no "broad principle" either "from the confined darkness of the schools," or "the open light of nature."

"The argument of the atheist assumes, as we have seen, that a Being of infinite power could easily prevent sin, and

cause holiness to exist." Our author thus begins another paragraph. When we remember the proposition he is discussing, it is evident he means that the atheist assumes that infinite power could prevent sin by causing holiness to exist in the breast of a moral agent. We do not think that the atheist assumes any such thing, and would like to see some show of evidence that he does. This assumption here ascribed to the atheist, itself assumes that holiness in the breast of a moral agent must of necessity forever prevent him from sinning. This further assumes that the atheist entertains the same views of holiness that our author does, which cannot be shown any more than the truth of these views can be. What the atheist really assumes is, that a God of infinite wisdom, power and goodness, ought, some how or other, but how he does not undertake to prescribe, prevent all sin; which is ridiculously absurd, because it still further assumes the sufficiency of his own limited, short-sighted wisdom to comprehend and determine what infinite wisdom ought to do. Unless there be such a thing as a New Divinity atheist, of which we have never yet heard, this is all that can be fairly charged upon the atheist. "It" (the atheistic argument) "assumes that it is possible, that it implies no contradiction, to create an intelligent moral agent, and place it beyond all liability of sinning." This sentence assumes several things; first, that holiness in the breasts of moral agents, would destroy their capability of sinning; second, that there is no difference between a capability, and a liability of sinning; and third, that the atheist is of the same opinion on both of these points with our author; all three of which assumptions, we presume, he might find some difficulty in proving. In regard to this second assumption, we would say, that a moral agent, whose moral powers are in a proper moral condition, or, in other words, whose nature is holy, must, in any conceivable circumstances, however favorable for his continuance in this state, be forever capable of sinning, and, of course, there must ever be a possibility of his sinning, however infinitesimal it may become by reason of the progressive intensity of his holiness;

and if he be placed in a world of temptation and wickedness like ours, he must be liable to sin, slight as this liability may be, when we consider his progress in holiness to be considerable; but, if he be placed, as all good Christians hope ultimately to be, in a heavenly state, free from all temptation to sin, we cannot conceive otherwise than that he will be cut off from all liability to sin. If we are right, it must be conceded that our author is here not a little misty and confused. "If it could not sin, there would be no merit, no virtue in its obedience. That is to say, it would not be a moral agent at all, but a mere machine."

Notwithstanding we have admitted that it seems to us that a moral agent, however holy, must be capable of sinning, it does not follow that if he be not capable of sinning, he must be a mere machine. For it might be possible, for aught we can see to the contrary, that his knowledge and discernment, as to all good and evil, should become so extensive and acute as to prevent him from falling into the folly of sin. Is God capable of sinning? Why is he not? Because his perfection in knowledge and holiness enables him to understand it thoroughly and abhor it perfectly. Our author's position would seem to us to drive him to this dilemma: either God is capable of sinning or He is a mere machine. "The power to do wrong, as well as to do right, is included in the very idea of a moral and accountable agent, and no such agent can possibly exist without being invested with such power." We have no objection to this sentence, but we do not see how it can serve any purpose of the author in this reply to the atheist, inasmuch as we do not see, as he assumes, that holiness in the breast of a moral agent must destroy his power to do wrong. We can very well see how it would, especially if united with a high degree of knowledge in the moral agent, greatly lessen, if not destroy the probability and liability, though not the possibility and power of doing wrong. Why does not our author come to the point at once, and show us that holiness in the breast of a moral agent is really and irreconcilably opposed to the freedom of his will, and that, there-

fore, it would be a contradiction for these two things to exist together in the nature of a moral agent? He assumes that such holiness must necessitate the will, which he ought to prove, and then boldly draws his conclusion. He must give us better logic than this, or we will not allow that he can "explode" the atheist.

"To suppose such an agent to be created, and placed beyond all liability to sin, is to suppose it to be what it is, and not what it is, at one and the same time; it is to suppose a creature to be endowed with a power to do wrong, and yet destitute of such a power, which is a plain contradiction."

Saying nothing as to his confounding "liability to sin" and "power to do wrong," our author has not shown, and cannot show, that holiness in the breast of a moral agent must destroy either his "liability to sin" or his "power to do wrong," and, therefore, it does not follow, as he asserts, that "such an agent" "supposes a creature to be endowed with a power to do wrong, and yet destitute of such a power;" which, were it true, we allow, would be "a plain contradiction." The reader must see that he is all the time assuming and dogmatizing, instead of proving, which is certainly, to say the very least, very illogical. "Hence Omnipotence cannot create such a being, and deny to it a power to do evil, or secure it against the possibility of sinning." What does he here mean by denying to the moral agent "the power to do evil" or securing him "against the possibility of sinning?" Why, nothing more than creating him with holiness in his breast; this, in his judgment, being necessarily to necessitate his will. Now, when we remember that our author nowhere shows, what certainly devolves on him to show, and what without showing, nothing he can say will avail him in his endeavor to establish his second position, namely, that holiness in the breast must necessitate the will and thereby utterly destroy all power to sin, can we do otherwise than consider this about the most extraordinary "hence" that was ever presented to a reader for a logical conclusion?

The next paragraph of our author carries with it even less semblance of reasoning than the two we have already exam-

ined. In it he seems to proceed upon the assumption that the belief that holiness can be caused by God to exist in the breast of a moral agent, is peculiar to the atheist. Assuming further that such holiness is utterly inconsistent with any will at all in the moral agent, (will and the common pleonasm free will meaning the same,) he attempts to frighten the atheist with some rather impotent sarcasm. We will, however, pay the paragraph, as far as, in the nature of things, it can be done, the deference due to an argument which ought to be refuted.

“ We may, with the atheist, conceive of a universe of such beings, if we please, and we may suppose them to be at all times prevented from sinning by the omnipotent and irresistible energy of the Divine Being; and having imagined all this, we may be infinitely better pleased with this ideal creation of our own than with that which God has called into actual existence around us.”

Is not this rather a superfluity of imagination? If holiness in the breast be sufficient to necessitate the will and to destroy “ the power to sin,” as our author assumes, why is he so prodigal as to tax his imagination with the additional and unnecessary supposition that omnipotent and irresistible energy should be at all times employed to prevent sin; which, according to his assumption, could not possibly take place. We think this is giving “ omnipotent and irresistible energy ” very idle and ridiculous employment. Our author cannot show this holiness to be necessitating to the will, nor that the atheist believed it to be, nor that the atheist desired “ omnipotent and irresistible energy ” to be at all times employed in preventing sin, and, therefore, this sentence looks something like a sarcastic failure. What prevents the Divine Being from doing what would be a sin if done by a moral agent? We suppose His infinite wisdom and goodness. What else could? Does the fact that they do prevent Him from sinning, at all necessitate His will? Who will be fatalist enough to assert this? Is an infinity of wisdom and goodness necessary to prevent any being from sinning, without impairing the freedom of the will? Can any one prove the affirmative to

this question? If not, can any one show it to be impossible for God to bestow upon a moral agent a sufficiency of wisdom and goodness to prevent him from sinning, and yet not necessitate his will? We should like to see this demonstrated to be an impossibility. We have no objection, at any rate, to be prevented from sinning by having conferred upon us any amount of wisdom and goodness, which may be requisite, or even more than would be requisite, if infinite wisdom and goodness should see proper to bestow it. We have no objection to be bound to be good and to do good, as far as the Good Being himself may be so bound.

Moreover, we would much prefer a universe of moral agents so bound, to such a universe of spiritual nondescripts as our author takes a fancy to, namely, a universe of moral agents without either holiness or unholiness in their breasts, and, who are incapable of either receiving or acquiring such holiness or unholiness. The reader may regard this as a difference in taste or a difference in philosophy between the author and the reviewer; nevertheless, we are in earnest in our designated preference; because we cannot conceive otherwise than that a moral agent as infallible in his knowledge and discernment for his finite sphere, as God is for His which is infinite, and at the same time as holy as God is holy, would as certainly be prevented by his knowledge, discernment and holiness from doing evil in his sphere of activity, as God is in his; and, so far as the choosing and doing of right or wrong is concerned, would be as free as God is free?

“But then we should only prefer the absurd and contradictory model of a universe engendered in our own weak brains, to that which infinite wisdom, and power, and goodness have actually projected into being.”

If by “the absurd and contradictory model of a universe,” our author means one of moral agents with such holiness in their breasts as to necessitate them to do nothing but what is right, and yet requiring the constant employment of “omnipotent and irresistible energy” to prevent sin from occurring in it; such as in the extravagance of his wild imagination he supposes, we must concede such a “model of a universe”

could be "engendered" only "in weak brains." We can most heartily unite with him in decrying it as supremely ridiculous. But then we cannot allow him to pass this off for the nonsense of the atheist. If he means that a universe of moral agents with holiness in their breasts, must be a universe of agents whose freedom of will is destroyed and rendered thereby incapable of doing evil, we must demand of him proof that this must be so, and that the atheist had any dream of such a universe. Moreover, he assumes in this sentence, that the universe of moral agents "actually projected into being," is a universe of moral agents without either holiness or unholiness in their breasts: which assumption he cannot prove to be true; and not being able to prove this, neither can he prove his second position.

"Such a universe, if freed from contradictions, might be also free from evil, nay, from the very possibility of evil; but only on condition that it should at the same time be free from the very possibility of good."

Such a universe? To which of the first two models mentioned in our remarks on the sentence which precedes the one we are now considering, does the author refer? To the first? It is too obviously absurd to occupy further attention. To the second? The author cannot show that holiness in the breast of moral agents must necessitate the will, and, therefore, it is a mere chimera of his own imagination which he supposes to be chargeable upon the atheist. A universe of moral agents with holiness in their breasts is also a universe of free wills, and needs no freeing from his imaginary "contradictions" in order to render both good and evil possible to it.

ART. VII.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A New and Complete Gazetteer of the United States; giving a full and comprehensive review of the present condition, industry and resources of the American confederacy: embracing, also, important topographical, statistical, and historical information, from recent and original sources; together with the results of the census of 1850, and population and statistics in many cases to 1853. By Thomas Baldwin and J. Thomas, M. D. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1854.

A gazetteer is necessarily a book of facts for reference; and its entire merit depends upon its accuracy, its completeness and its arrangement. Combining these requisitions, it is an indispensable companion of every well informed man, in every avocation of life. Especially must it be so in a country so vast, varied, and progressive as ours, with whose topography, statistics, growth and resources, no one, without such a manual, can be familiar. The present work is devoted exclusively to a knowledge of the United States. It is an ample, double-columned octavo, of more than 1300 pages, with a sufficiently detailed description of all the prominent localities in the country, and a copious notation of all its minor places, which may be found with great facility, including "all the most interesting points in the statistics furnished by the census of 1850." The compilers have laboriously sought the latest and most authentic information both from books and men, and although minute errors exist in their work, we are pleased to say, that they deserve the gratitude and patronage of the American public for their fidelity and success. The arrangement is strictly alphabetical; and where the same name frequently occurs, it will be found in the order of the states, as geographically given. The origin and pronunciation of many names are added to the articles. A new and beautiful map of the United States, with the routes of internal communication, and valuable tabular appendices greatly enhance the book as a means of ready and satisfactory reference.

Annual of Scientific Discovery; or, year-book of facts in science and art, for 1854. Edited by David A. Wells, A. M. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

These annuals fill a most important place in current literature. They collect and condense for the general reader the principal events in the whole circle of the arts and sciences, during the preceding twelve-month; and not even the scholar, who has not sifted the journals, has any conception of

their rapid and wonderful accumulation ; of the amazing activity of the human mind, and the additions and improvements perpetually made to the stock of our ideas and our implements. The preliminary chapter, by the editor ; a *resumé* for 1853 ; is exceedingly interesting. The facts, in the present volume, are arranged under the departments of "mechanics and the useful arts ; natural philosophy ; chemical science ; geology ; botany ; zoology ; astronomy and meteorology ; geography and antiquities. Here we have an account of every real achievement made in these departments, during the past year. Money is never thrown away in the purchase of a book of this kind. We could easily give examples from the volume, were this the place for them.

Oriental and Sacred Scenes, from notes of travel in Greece, Turkey, and Palestine. By Fisher Howe. New York : M. W. Dodd. 1854.

There is a too flippant mode of disposing of works of travel by editors, as perhaps, of all others ; and we must admit the existence of a very provoking cause in this instance ; the utter inanity of the great majority of these itinerary effusions. We must not, however, hastily place all in this expurgatory catalogue. While some are worth the time and cost to the reader, by their originality and freshness, others possess the quality of utility in a high degree. They improve the heart as well as the mind, by delineating the hand of Providence and illustrating the words of Scripture. Every such book is meritorious, whether it be more or less recondite in its investigations. There is very little in this that is properly elaborate or antiquarian, yet its page is eloquent for truth, as well as for instruction. The most notable sites in the above mentioned countries were visited, and are spiritedly described by the author ; with those reflections which give the Christian reader peculiar satisfaction. He is especially attractive in his notes upon the consecrated localities of Palestine ; points of interest always inspiring to the lovers of the Bible. We assure the reader that Fisher Howe is no mean writer, whether he reasons or describes. Teachers of Bible classes and of Sunday schools will find him an able assistant in their useful labors.

Classic and Historic Portraits. By James Bruce. Redfield. New York 1854.

The author of these sketches assumes the natural curiosity of mankind to know the personal appearance, the peculiar traits and manners of distinguished individuals, male and female, who have, in some way, affected the destiny of the world. And there is a deep philosophy in this wish, since these personalities have, in reality, a relation to this result. Who does not desire to learn something of the features and habits of such persons as Cæsar and Napoleon ; of Helen and Cleopatra ; of Plato and Charlemagne ; of Lucrezia Borgia and Catherine of Russia ? This desire the author undertakes to gratify in his "portraits." They are not biographies,

but picture pencilings of celebrated characters in order to produce an ideal identity of them in the mind. His catalogue extends from Sappho to Madame de Stael, with upwards of fifty intervening examples, from the records of the past. He descants, at some length, on the element of beauty in the cases of illustrious females, and writes like a connoisseur in such matters. Some of his designs are well drawn; others of them are meagre and unsatisfactory; and we candidly confess that all of them appear to more advantage in the history of their lives than in the artificial arrangements of a gallery.

Theological Essays. By Frederick Denison Maurice, M. A., chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. From the second London edition. With a new preface and other additions. Redfield. New York. 1854.

Mr. Maurice, was, not long since, expelled from King's College, as theological professor, for teaching his class doctrines, which were alleged to be heretical. He has since published his lectures and sermons, in the form of essays, to adapt them to popular reading, or rather, to divest them of the formalities of direct address. As they thus appear, they indicate boldness, independence, and earnestness. No one can accuse him of levity, or acerbity of temper. On the contrary, he is serious and genial, in a very high degree. The charges, to which he was held obnoxious by the authorities of the college, respect the cardinal orthodox views of "atonement," "the resurrection of Christ," "the final judgment," and the import of the word "eternal." On these articles, he undoubtedly entertains opinions widely different, both from those of the Church of England and of evangelical dissenters, while he avows every one of them to be Scripturally true. His error lies, therefore, not in the formal rejection of them, but in his mode of explaining them. Having, to some extent examined Mr. Maurice's essays, we submit one or two reflections upon them. The first, somewhat mitigates, though it does not exculpate, his position. He deprecates the baneful influence of mere technical theology, as at war with the spirit of the gospel; as narrowing, in human phraseology, the teachings of Christ, to scientific formulas, and then putting all who reject them, as such, under the ban of reprobation; cutting off from the hope of salvation, those who do not subscribe to them, although they professedly receive the word of God as it is. He admits the necessity of creeds, but opposes the damnatory tenets which they contain, as inconsistent with rational liberty, and that spirit of universal charity, which pervades the gospel. Without arguing these points, we are free to say, that the tendency of ecclesiastical symbolism, under the demarcation of sectarian exclusiveness, is prejudicial to Christianity upon the public mind, and promotive of a multifarious infidelity. The great landmarks of Divine truth, as held by the churches of Christendom, must be defined, so as to be distinguished from obvious heresy, yet the danger is, of mixing with them merely human elements, and giving them the awful sanctions of inspiration, and making them the coa-

ditions of life and death. As to Mr. Maurice's interpretation of the articles, in question, we hold very different sentiments. While he labors to rid the existing orthodoxy of its too Procrustean models, he runs into the opposite extreme of an ultra evangelism, under the plausible pretext of an all-embracing, and even an indiscriminate application of it to humanity. In order to insure this, he not only nullifies the stern requisitions of current creeds, but, in fact, emasculates the very gospel of those grand, distinctive truths, which demand *the obedience of faith*, as the unalterable condition of its saving benefits to those who hear it, and which designate it, not only as the offer of ineffable love, but the authoritative command of a righteous Judge. It is thus, that, on the alleged grounds, his views are latitudinarian, and virtually skeptical, and blend with the wild speculations of the day, which make our intuitions the standard and the test, as well as the interpretation of whatever claims to be divine.

On Civil Liberty and Self-Government. By Francis Lieber, LL. D., C. M. French Institute, &c. &c. In two volumes. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo and Co.

The author is professor of history and political philosophy and economy in the State college of South Carolina. These volumes, though dated in 1853, have but recently reached our table, and, therefore, require from us the courtesies of the craft. We do not express ourselves, however, out of mere civility, but with a high estimate of the eloquence, talent, and general principles, which they evince. They are dedicated to his former pupils, both as a tribute of regard, and as counsel for the times. The generalizations of political science are full of grandeur, as well as of utility, and require great discrimination to state them accurately. On their proper appreciation and exact equilibrium, depend the stability of government, and the happiness and prosperity of the citizen. Mr. Lieber is perfectly familiar with the history of civil liberty, and has entered with deep penetration into its elements, guards, and development. Glowing with enthusiasm for American institutions, yet guided by a sage maturity of judgment, he reprobates all those movements which disturb the sacred relations inherent in society, and guaranteed by the conservative operation of well-appointed and wisely administered constitutional law. In the restless commotion of the age, he views with anxiety the vicissitudes of states, and the dangers which threaten our institutions. We recommend his work, as an enlightened and expanded treatise upon a subject, always fraught with interest to freemen, and always turning up some new phase in the ever-recurring struggles of our vast and widening arena.

The Lectures, complete, of Father Gavazzi, as delivered in New York, and revised and corrected by Gavazzi himself. To which is prefixed his life. M. W. Dodd, New York. 1854.

The excitement produced by the speeches of the celebrated exile, at the

time of their delivery, has passed away, but is well remembered by the whole American public. It was electrical, and has made its impression, notwithstanding the persecutions which the Roman Catholic community raised against him. He is a man of extraordinary genius and oratory, and had the rare faculty; though a foreigner, of diffusing his fervid spirit through the enormous audiences who crowded the Tabernacle to hear him. Exasperated by the wrongs of Italian despotism and jealousy, he spared no terms in denouncing them, and invoking the dawn of European liberty. Yet his position was somewhat equivocal. He never avowed himself as a Protestant, if, indeed, he was one, but contented himself with assailing the political and ecclesiastical corruptions of Rome. Like the most of the escaped victims of continental tyranny, struggling for the rights of humanity, his notions of republicanism were crude and unsettled. Yet the lofty disdain of his spirit, and the vehement castigation of his enemies, awaken that sympathy so natural to this country; and the fearless manner in which he exposes the rottenness of Romish institutions, arouses the indignation of every Protestant. We are borne, by an irresistible impulse, along the tide of his withering and fertile declamation. We learn from one thoroughly initiated into "the mystery of iniquity," its horrid impurities, and its direful incubus upon the countries infested with its curse. Our readers will find here an additional insight into the seductive policy of "the mother harlots and abominations of the earth."

The Works of Joseph Addison, including the whole contents of Bp. Hurd's edition, with letters and pieces not found in any previous collection; and Macaulay's essay on his life and works. Edited, with critical and explanatory notes, by George Washington Greene. In five volumes. Vol. V. New York: G. P. Putnam & Co. 1854.

We have already noticed and recommended this elegant library edition of the great English classic. Nothing is more to our taste, than the mechanical execution, and the whole style of the edition. This volume closes the series, and is occupied with that most finished and charming production of the first English essayist; the *Spectator*. Let our young men return from the flashy, frothy stuff of our modern scribblers, to the pure, unalloyed beauties of the best periods of English literature, and chasten their imaginations and form their tastes and whet their wits by means which delighted and improved the best circles of British society.

History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth, from the execution of Charles I. to the death of Cromwell. By M. Guizot. Translated by Andrew R. Scoble. In two volumes. Philadelphia: Blanchard and Lea. 1854.

These themes, though hackneyed, are such vital parts of modern history, and so intimately interwoven with the present state of the civilized world, that they are invested with a permanent interest to the student of political

philosophy. The epoch and the actor, referred to, are links in the chain of political sequences extending to our times, which every great mind, in any country, feels inclined to trace. M. Guizot, by national and professional habits, is one of those authors who could not fail to impart to any question, the strength and vivacity of his great intellect. The peculiar rapidity and fire of the French style, and, above all, the philosophical and statesman-like views of so distinguished a writer, give fresh coloring to the most eventful period of British history, while his position, affinities, and researches, add other particulars to the chronicle of the times, and present, from a foreign standpoint, a different aspect of the wonderful drama which he elucidates with extraordinary power.

The Trials of a Mind in its Progress to Catholicism: a letter to his old friends, by L. Silliman Ives, LL. D., late Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in North Carolina. Boston: Patrick Donahoe. 1854.

The progress down so frightful a declivity could not be unattended with violent emotions, in a mind not yet wholly abandoned to delusion. *Facilis descensus Averni*, beautifully describes the gentle movement of a body along a graceful slope, but not the passage of an intelligent being from the commanding eminence of Protestant truth, over intervening crags, to the foul abyss of Romish error. And if the mental spasms cease, the repose is explained by the stupor of the terrible recoil. The *modus* of the transition, in the case of Bishop Ives, admits of several explanations; an early bias to Rome; the absence of all experimental religion while in the Episcopal church; a morbid condition of his mind; or the legitimate influence of the succession dogma. He has certainly betrayed the operation of all these causes; but which of them is entitled to the prominence, is matter of conjecture. From our knowledge of his career in the diocese of North Carolina, we were not surprised at the catastrophe. But since it is but one of the numerous instances of recent retreat to Rome amongst the High Church party of the Episcopal church, it may be regarded as an exponent of that graceless assumption, which, as it is inaccessible by argument, is destined to find its rebuke in its inevitable consequences. We have never read so weak a book from one whose pretensions justified, at least, the semblance of an argument. The total renunciation of the Bible as the sole arbiter of faith, the complete surrender of private judgment to the merest fictions of superstition, the adoption of tradition as co-ordinate with Scripture, and the acceptance of the worst puerilities of the fathers, in lieu of the sober interpretations of learned reformers, as here confessed, fills one with pity at the wretchedness and amazement at the presumption of a Protestant bishop, if not with disgust at the impotent attempt to explain and to justify those feverish stages which resulted in his formal adhesion to "the man of sin," within the very precincts of the Vatican. The feebleness of his apology will be the antidote to its poison, unless it be received by some whose disordered minds, like his own, find relief in the congeniality of error.

***Glad Tidings*; or The Gospel of Peace.** A series of daily meditations for Christian disciples. By the Rev. W. K. Tweedie, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59 Washington street. 1854.

The author of this work says in the preface that "religion may be contemplated under various aspects: *First*, It may be viewed as it existed in man's soul when he was first created. *Secondly*, Religion may be viewed as it is revealed and recorded in the book of inspiration. *Thirdly*, It may be viewed doctrinally as a system to be examined and believed upon sufficient evidence. Or *finally*, Religion may be viewed as taught to an individual soul by the Holy Spirit, according to the inspired Book. In this form, the highest manifestation in religion, it appears as devotion, or communion with God, according to his word." The meditations contained in this book are designed to foster godliness of the last mentioned type. The book is divided into three sections, having reference to the three stages in which personal religion may be studied: First, as *presented*; "Good Tidings;" secondly, as *attracting* the soul by its "Wonders;" and thirdly, as *realized*, when man is under the gracious guardianship of "the Shepherd of Israel." These brief daily meditations belong to a class of books which are highly adapted to promote the piety of "Christian Disciples." They are plain, practical and scriptural in their character; and not unfrequently richly suggestive of more extended reflections on the passages of Scripture, on which they are founded.

The Bible in many Tongues. Revised by D. P. Kidder. New York: Carlton & Phillips, 200 Mulberry street.

This is a revised edition of one of the London "Religious Tract Society's" publications. It is anonymous, but the author assuredly had no reason to be ashamed of his production. No man but an eminent Christian scholar could have written such a book. It is emphatically much in a little space. It is exceedingly rare to meet with a book at once so small, and yet so rich in valuable information on so interesting a subject. It is not only an excellent contribution to Sunday school literature, but also to the general religious literature of our country. There are a few adults and even ministers who will not find themselves richly repaid for the careful perusal of this well-filled little volume.

The Greek and Eastern Churches: Their History, Faith and Worship. Revised by D. P. Kidder. New York: Carlton & Phillips.

This is another deeply interesting volume from the press of the Methodist Book Concern, in New York, which will be hailed with delight and gratitude. It contains an excellent history of the origin, progress to the present time, tenets, ceremonies, worthies, heretics and sectaries of the Greek church, together with the relations of Protestantism to that church. This book admirably supplies a want of the times. Much is now said and written about Russia and the East. But how little is accurately known in this coun-

try, of the history and characteristics of that Church which embraces in its pale and moulds the religious character of the teeming population of the vast empire of the Czar. We hail this book as one that has an important mission to accomplish, in disseminating intelligence of very great interest among the youth, and Christian families of our land.

The Checkered Scene ; or Memorials of Samuel Oliver. By Rev. Gervase Smith. Revised by D. P. Kidder. New York : Carlton and Phillips.

These well written memorials trace the life and fortunes of their subject from his early youth to his triumphant Christian departure to another and a better world. Here we see the evils of parental neglect, in the follies and vices of wayward youth, the perils of the soldier, endured in foreign lands, the miseries of paganism as manifested in those lands, the wonders of Divine Providence as seen in the protection vouchsafed to Mr. Oliver amid his various perils by land and by sea, the workings of Divine grace in awakening the conscience of the sinner, leading him to the Saviour, and in creating him anew unto good works, and giving him victory in the last conflict. And he who follows the author over this variegated path, will gather flowers of wisdom, and pearls of instruction with which he may adorn and enrich his own life and character.

Alona. By Marion Harland. Richmond : Published by A. Morris. 1854.

The fair author of this tale is a resident of the city in which it is published. It has met with extraordinary success, considering the very short period which has elapsed since its appearance, and the unheralded, unobtrusive character of the writer. It is thrown forth into the literary gulf to sink or survive by its own qualities. It avouches to be "a simple tale of life, and of truthfulness to nature." We take it to be such, notwithstanding the well-known peccadilloes of this species of author-craft, and give it the merit of substantial reality, with the allowable substitution of fictitious for real names, and the less veracious introduction of fancy-coloring to embellish the picture. It is, in our judgment, far above the level of that class of books to which it categorically belongs. It displays decided genius, unusual fertility of invention, a sparkling vivacity of expression, a natural aptness of interlocution, a ready delineation of character, and a picturesque descriptiveness of scenes. Many passages exhibit a masculine power of conception combined with feminine sentimentality. The *morale* of the book, we regard, as good, and many of its religious sketches as extremely truthful and touching. At the same time, we are compelled to say, that some of its conversational sallies are too strongly marked by passion and hyperbole, and that the chapter on the Rocky Mount meeting, appears to contain a sarcastic fling at revivals of religion. As a specimen of native female talent, it is undoubtedly creditable, and will be read with a lively appreciation of the intellectual activity which pervades it, and the piety

which it inculcates, maugre the satire on the preachers and proceedings at Rocky Mount. It has reached its third edition.

Russia as it is. By Count A. De Gurowski. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1854.

The existing status of any nation is the aggregate result of very remote and complicated social elements, passing through great modifying epochs, yet retaining their original tendency. To explain the phenomena of national organizations, it is necessary to trace to their ultimate sources, and through all their changing aspects, these subtle influences. This is the philosophy of history; and this, De Gurowski applies to that colossal centralization of political power which develops itself in the Russian autocracy. The Count, once a subject of the Czar, and now an adopted American citizen, formerly embraced the theory of Central Panlavism as the true idea of uniting and regenerating those aboriginal tribes which constitute the vast family of nations of which the Russian empire consists. His subsequent investigations have conducted him to the opposite conclusion; that the hopes of the Slavi are in the people themselves, and that, with all their submission to and admiration of absolutism, they actually possess and exhibit symptoms of a higher civilization, and will not, in the end, be far in the rear, if at all, of other European nations in reaching it, although they have manifested less of those convulsive efforts which have agitated southern Europe. His inquiries into this subject, shew that he has read extensively, observed carefully, and thought profoundly upon the nature and progress of society. His eminent abilities and his scholarly erudition lay open to us many a page into one of the most marvellous and stupendous of all modern governments.

The Working-Man's Way in the World; being the autobiography of a journeyman printer. Redfield. New York. 1854.

The different trades have their own history, and it can be fully told only by those initiated into their mysteries. And if the pen of the artizan himself be not wielded with the gracefulness of the practised writer, its truthfulness compensates for the want of literary elegance. No craft amongst us is really so little known or appreciated as that of the practical printer, though his labors give information on all other subjects. The tuition and the hazards through which he passes in the struggles of life are replete with incidents peculiar to his calling, and of novelty to that great outside world that knows so little of the inner life of the laboring classes of society. A journeyman printer writes here his own experiences while working his doubtful and eventful way in the world; and the reader may here see what is actually passing in one of those large, active, useful operative associations of the community, unseen by the public, except in those wonderful mechanical exploits of their art with which all are familiar. He asks

to 'e heard, and need not deprecate the ordeal of criticism, for there is a voice in his narrative which will find a response in the soul of humanity.

Sacred Poems and Hymns, for public and private devotion. By James Montgomery. With the author's latest corrections, and an introduction by John Holland. New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1854.

We feel a reverence for the memory of this man. It is associated with all that is beautiful and hallowed. Adorned with a long life of the purest Christian philanthropy, he consecrated his genius to the noble employment of moulding the gospel into poetry and song. Following in the wake of Watts and of Charles Wesley, he has refuted the maxim of Johnson, that the truths of the Bible, from their very nature, could not take the form of poetry. He has strung a thread of evangelic pearls which glitter in all the essential beauties of the art divine. Inspired with the broadest catholic spirit, he has versified for all Christian churches, and for all time, the doctrines and the sentiments common to them all. If his poetic faculty was not of the first order, it was of that type which made it of the first utility, and imparted to it that universality which the highest gifts seem destined never to reach. The present volume gives the original hymns of the Sheffield bard, with the last touches of his pen; a present which all the admirers of a life so charming, and of talents so useful, will accept with gratitude, and which the churches of Christ will employ in the solemn services of the great congregation. The sweet lyrist has closed his beautiful career, to join the celestial choir, but has transmitted to posterity a harp whose sanctified chords will vibrate with heavenly music to the end of time.

Experimental Religion: embracing Justification, Regeneration, Sanctification, and the Witness of the Spirit. Rules for holy living are also added. Designed principally for young Christians. By L. Rosser, A. M., of the Virginia Annual Conference. Richmond, Va. 1854.

The present age, and the condition of the church, call for plain and practical treatises of the kind before us; especially such as explain those grand points of personal religion maintained by the Methodist denomination. Our preaching and exhortations are full of them, but our press has not yet met the demand which is felt in the intervals of business, and in the quiet of retirement, where doubts and difficulties muster their greatest strength, and where a judicious book supplies the absence of the minister. We highly approve of the design and the execution of this little manual, so convenient in size, and so cheap in price. Young Christians need the timely information and counsel which it contains, while all will be refreshed with its spirit and advice.

Uncle Robin in his Cabin in Virginia, and *Tom without one in Boston*. By J. W. Page. J. W. Randolph, Richmond, Va. 1853.

Real life among the slaves of the South, is as little known by our North-

ern censors, as that of Japan. Extreme cases, colored by a fanatical imagination, have furnished the text and the commentary of their fiery harangues, while their own visionary philanthropy has superinduced, to a great extent, the horrors which they so untruthfully depict. Mr. Page proves the fallacy of their investives, and contrasts the happy condition of the slave in the South with the wretchedness of those who have fled to the cold embrace of their heartless seducers. Robin in Virginia is a prince to Tom in Boston, and the magnanimous owner, an angel to the real abolition fiend, whose only object is to gratify a morbid sensibility, and not to impart a personal benefit.

The Complete Works of William Cowper. With Life, and critical notice of his writings. Eight engravings on steel. Boston: Gould and Lincoln.

There is nothing remarkable in this edition of Cowper, except the convenience of its size, the instructive sketch of the poet's tragical life, and the beauty of the engravings. They are very fine. The type, by condensing the whole of the poetry into one duodecimo volume, is too small and crowded for the eyes of any except the young.

Lectures on the Doctrine of Election. By Alexander C. Rutherford, Minister of the Gospel, Greenock. Philadelphia: Higgins & Peckinpine, 40 North Fourth street. 1854.

From recent indications, it would seem that the celebrated controversy between Calvinism and Arminianism is to be revived. There has recently appeared from Calvinistic divines of this country, a disposition to force upon public notice the doctrines of election, predestination, and reprobation, in their most objectionable forms, while at the same time, there is a most uncandid representation of Arminian views and principles. The latter are charged with being shallow, unintellectual, and the source of all kinds of heresies and evil consequences. For many years of successful Christian operation and enterprize for the extension of Christ's kingdom, this controversy has been allowed a comparative repose. What has disturbed that repose? What has aroused these Calvinistic champions to arm themselves afresh for this well-fought field of Arminian triumph? We think it is attributable, chiefly, to the fact, that the current religious literature of the master minds of this age, in America, Great Britain, and on the Continent, is proclaiming, as the result of its critical and searching investigations, doctrines by no means flattering to the Calvinian theory. Look at Beecher's "Conflict of Ages," that misshapen birth from the struggles of a soul, between the dictates of its religious consciousness and practical reason, on the one side, and the indigestible dogmas of Calvinism on the other. The Theodicy of Bledsoe, once a Calvinist, in which, in the cloud-land of metaphysics, he meets the *horribile decretum* with its own weapons, and gives it a blow, from the stunning effects of which it is not likely soon to recover. McCosh, who, in Scotland, the adopted and long-cherished abode of high-

tomed Calvinism, has, at least, labored to unbind the human will, and vindicate the individual responsibility of man. Contemplate these facts, and such as these, which might be easily multiplied, and one may readily perceive why it is that these divines are beginning to draw again into open day-light, doctrines, which, for the most part, they considered it prudent to allow quietly to slumber in their symbols and bodies of divinity. The lectures contained in this volume, were delivered first at Greenock, and by special requisition of Christian brethren, they were repeated in the city of Glasgow. The author was himself at first a Calvinist. But, convinced of his errors, he recanted, and adopted Arminian principles. And this volume, in our judgment, contains a thorough, scriptural refutation of his former faith, and vindication of his present belief. The book is worthy of a wide circulation at the present time.

The Race for Riches, and some of the Pits into which the Runners fall: Six Lectures, applying the Word of God to the Traffic of Men. By William Arnot, Minister of Free St. Peters, Glasgow. American Edition. With Preface and Notes. By Stephen Calwell. Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1853.

This is a reprint of a work, as well adapted to the circumstances of this country, as to those of the land of its birth. Here, as there, many are running the race for riches. And recent developments clearly demonstrate, that the fearful pits which abound along the course are not without their victims. Thus verifying the word of God, which says that "they who will be rich fall into divers snares and lusts, which drown men's souls in perdition." The author of this book wields a vigorous pen, and with practical and profound views of the devices for money-getting, tears off the tinsel and exposes the bald realities, and, with the voice of a trumpet, warns the eager racers of their danger, and of their duty. The preface and notes of the American editor greatly enhance the value of the book. Such lessons are needed to check the secular current of this age, and give to human efforts and aims, higher objects than those which perish with the using.

The Christian Sacraments. By Orseneth Fisher. New Orleans: Published by John Ball.

This book professes to give, in the form of question and answer, "a scriptural exhibition of the nature, design, mode, and subjects of Christian Baptism, together with the nature, design, proper use, perpetuity, and proper subjects of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." It will be found to be a useful manual on these important subjects, adapted more especially to the masses and to the young, for whom it was chiefly designed. We are personally acquainted with the author. He is a veteran and an eloquent itinerant Methodist minister in the great Southwest, where he is laboring with a voice and a pen which will exert their full share in moulding its

growing and teeming population. His definitions are clear, discriminating and scriptural.

The Virginia Springs. By John J. Moorman, M. D., for many years Resident Physician at the White Sulphur Springs. Second Edition, greatly enlarged, with Maps and Plates; and the Routes and Distances to the various Springs. Also an Appendix, containing an account of the Natural Curiosities of Virginia. J. W. Randolph, Richmond, Va. 1854.

From the same publisher. *Guide to the Hot Springs, Bath co., Va.* By Thomas Goode, M. D.

These volumes are not only useful as a guide to those contemplating a visit to the watering places of Virginia, but interesting to readers generally on account of the valuable information which they furnish of the chemical properties and medicinal applications and virtues of the different classes of waters which are found in the numerous springs indicated. These books contain, also, especially the larger one, a skillful comparison of the virtues of these waters with those of Germany, and judicious counsel as to the mode of using them to the best advantage, together with remarks on diet, &c. For the want of this kind of information, invalids have often failed to realize the advantages, which otherwise they might have realized. And hence the value of such guides from sources so experienced and competent.

The Chemistry of Common Life. By James F. W. Johnston, M. A., F. R. S., F. G. S., etc. etc.

Alcohol and the Constitution of Man. Being a popular scientific account of the chemical history and properties of Alcohol, and its leading effects upon the healthy human constitution. Illustrated by a beautifully colored chemical chart. By Edward L. Youmans.

These are too excellent treatises, by men of distinguished scientific attainments, which we have received from the publishing house of the Appletons, N. Y. Worthily do they commend themselves to the reading of the million. The circulation of such popularized science, having so practical a bearing upon the weal of men, cannot fail to produce the happiest results, both in enlarging the scope of mental vision, and leading to a more intelligent appreciation of, and conformity to the laws of organic nature. A vast amount of the most useful knowledge is comprised within the limits of these little volumes.

Clinton: a book for boys. By William Simonds. With illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

We cheerfully accord to this juvenile book the accomplishment of that which the author claims to be its object, in his preface: He says, "The story of Clinton is designed mainly to illustrate by example the importance of early habits of obedience and industry; the danger of mingling with

unprincipled and vicious companions; and the necessity of being able to say no, when tempted to do wrong. It is also designed to awaken in boys a stronger taste for the quiet and innocent pursuits and pleasures of home life; a taste which can hardly be over estimated, as one of the heaven-appointed safeguards of youthful virtue."

Remarkable Examples of Moral Recovery; showing the power of religion in extreme cases. Edited by Abel Stevens. New York. Carlton & Phillips.

These examples are well selected and happily presented. The moral and Christian reflections to which the examples give rise evince the talent of the accomplished editor, and must produce salutary impressions on the reader. Teaching by example has the highest authority for its use. So Christ taught. And it is adapted at once to rivet the attention, affect the heart, and improve the life.

Sketches of Western Methodism: biographical, historical, and miscellaneous; illustrative of pioneer life. By Rev. James B. Finley. Edited by W. P. Strickland, D. D. Cincinnati: printed at the Methodist Book Concern. 1854.

Methodism in the West is connected with its settlement and civilization by white men. In Revolutionary times, its first preachers trod its soil, and made its silence vocal with the glad tidings of salvation. Their perils, adventures, and toils are full of the romance of that period, when the ravages of the British invasion in the East, and the horrors of savage cruelty in the West, filled the country with consternation. Soon after the conclusion of the Revolution, emigrants poured into the Western wilds, yet tenanted by aboriginal tribes, whose barbarian blood boiled with vengeance against the settler; and by beasts of prey, whose depredations vied with the tragedies of Indian ferocity. Along with the stream of the early population went the Methodist preachers, local and itinerant, displaying a heroism of apostolic sublimity, and laying the foundation of that vast fabric of Methodism which extends from the Lakes to the Gulf, and from the Alleghanies to the shores of the Pacific. The terrible emergencies of those times required and developed a class of preachers, who, to the monotony and effeminacy of our age, appear to be well nigh fabulous; and, if their exploits were not recorded by credible historians, would soon be regarded as the fictions of a mythic period. Mr. Finley, in giving these sketches, is writing, at the same time, a history of Western civilization and of Western Methodism, equally authentic. He has taken in hand a task, in itself, full of merit as it is of the marvellous. Its principal attraction, however, is the portraits which it contains, of the most remarkable men of modern times; the apostles of Methodism in the West, in whom were exhibited the loftiest qualities of the missionary character. "Full of faith and of the Holy Ghost," making every sacrifice, meeting every danger, they kin-

dled the fire and unfurled the banner of the Cross in vallies and forests where, here and there, the backwoodsman's hut then skirted the unbroken wilderness ; where now magnificent cities rise, and golden harvests wave. While we acknowledge our obligations to Mr. Finley for the historical data of Methodism which he has rescued from oblivion, we will not withhold our approbation of the manner in which his work is executed. We will refer to only two of the sketches ; those of Burke and of Bascom. That of the former is an autobiography, written in a style of beautiful simplicity, but condensing an astonishing amount of information respecting the settlement and evangelization of the West. It is the first sketch given. We recommend its perusal, as a faithful chronicle of the times. We invite the attention of the Church, South, to the melancholy strain with which the venerable pioneer closes his narrative. Is he in want ? Will Southern Methodism allow it ? His words, on page 92, are these ; "I am superannuate in the Southern division, and know not how I shall make out to live. . . . None seem to care for my circumstances now." Will not these plaintive words find a response ? The sketch of Bascom is from the pen of the author. It is a just and an elegant tribute. We have nowhere seen, within the same limits, one more appreciative, descriptive, or reliable. It accords with the grandeur of the theme, and is full of affectionate admiration of the man.

We have already noticed several of the Sunday school publications of the Methodist Book Concern, N. Y., brought out under the revising hand of the able and industrious editor, Rev. D. P. Kidder. These books are a credit to both the editor and the press from which they are issued. The following are equally worthy of the place they occupy in the same valuable catalogue of Sunday school literature, viz :

Remarkable Escapes from Peril.

This book furnishes many striking illustrations of the providence of God, and encouragements to faith and piety.

Successful Men of Modern Times.

In this volume we have both rules and examples of success in various departments of secular business, scientific investigations, and literary pursuits. The success here advocated and illustrated is based upon sound principles, with a distinct recognition of the obligation resting upon all men to "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness."

The Life of Alexander the Great.

This is a well written and instructive history, condensed into a small space, of the life and exploits of the great hero and conqueror of the ancient world. Alexander is here contemplated in the light of a higher philosophy than that of this world.

Switzerland, Historical and Descriptive.

In the historical portion of this book we are presented with some of the most stirring scenes and events of Continental agitations, revolutions and reformations. Its descriptive part presents us with graphic views of the enchanting scenery of the land of mountains and lakes.

Australia: Its Scenery, Natural History and Resources. With a Glance at its Gold Fields.

The title of this book sufficiently indicates the materials of which it is composed. As a gold region, a detailed account of Australia will of course be interesting to most readers. An object so glittering cannot fail to be attractive.

Old Edinburgh: A Historical Sketch of the Ancient Metropolis of Scotland.

This vivid sketch of the old home of kings and queens, of philosophers, divines and reformers, cannot fail to furnish both entertainment and instruction to the youthful reader.

The Youth's Monitor. Vol. III.

True to its title. If our voice could reach them, we would advise the young to ponder its contents, as a means of growing wiser and better.

The Life and Experience of a Converted Infidel. By John Scarlet, of the New Jersey Conference. New York: Carlton & Phillips.

Such books as this are well calculated for usefulness. First, as a beacon light to warn the unsophisticated youth against the paths of vice and the wiles of infidelity. Secondly, as a guide and encouragement to the vicious and unbelieving in their return to virtue, truth and God. This tale is admirably told, and deserves a wide circulation.

Advanced Latin Exercises, with selections for reading. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1854.*A Manual of the French verbs.* By T. Simonnè. D. Appleton & Co. New York. 1854.*The Adventures de Télémaque.* Par Fénélon. Deux Tom. en un. New York: Appleton & Co. 1854.

These aids to the knowledge of the Latin and French languages we candidly commend to teachers and students. While both of these languages are increasing in their demands upon American youth, we take pleasure in advertizing them of the rare facilities afforded by such publications.

Though they deserve a better fate, we cannot do more than give the titles
VOL. VIII.—30

of the following volumes, sent us so politely by the publishers, in as much as we have occupied our space with so extended a list of notices.

Rob of the Bowl. A legend of St. Inigoe's. By J. P. Kennedy. Revised edition. G. P. Putnam. New York. 1854.

Mellichampe. A legend of the Santee. By W. Gilmore Sims, Esq. New and revised edition. Redfield. New York. 1854.

The Partisan. A Romance of the revolution. By W. Gilmore Simms, Esq. New and revised edition. Redfield. New York. 1854.

Merrimack; or Life at the Loom. By Day Kellogg Lee. Redfield. New York. 1854.

The Master's House. A tale of Southern Life. By Logan. New York : T. L. McElrath & Co. 1854.

An Attic Philosopher in Paris. From the French of Emile Souvestre. New York : Appleton & Co. 1854.

ART. VIII.

BIBLICAL, LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC MISCELLANIES.

China.—The only portion of the Scripture which has been hitherto known to be in the possession of the Tae-Ping party, is the first part of the book of Genesis. The public journals, however, now announce the arrival of a ship, which has brought further portions of the Pentateuch, and the Gospel of St. Matthew, printed by authority of the Tae-Ping-Wang. This circumstance will afford additional encouragement to the efforts now making to provide a million of copies of the Word of God for the use of the Chinese; and we observe that subscriptions towards that truly Christian object are rapidly flowing in.

The extraordinary movement now progressing in China, we regard as of so much importance in its bearings upon the interests of the Kingdom of Christ, as to justify our laying before the readers of this journal, such information upon the subject of Chinese affairs, as we may be able to gather from the most reliable sources. And we are happy to acknowledge our obligations in this respect, to the very able and valuable "Journal of Sacred Literature," edited by Dr. Burgess, London.

In a letter to the editor of a missionary publication, dated November 10th, 1853, Dr. Legge, writes as follows:—

"I should not have been writing to you by this mail, but that I received, two days ago, from Dr. Medhurst, the copy of the 'North China Herald,' which will be delivered to you, I hope, along with this. He asks me to send it on to you, as you would like to read the portion of the Bishop's charge, which is given in it. The reading of it filled me with astonishment; it is so much more decided and thorough-going than any thing which could have been expected.

"His views of the religion of China are precisely those which I have maintained and illustrated in my 'Notions,' &c.; and his giving up, first, his former idea of using TEEN-SHIN for God, and then his proposal to adopt the Roman Catholic term, TEEN-CHOO, and coming out, without reservation, with SHANG-TZ for God, and SHIN for Spirit, are very creditable to his ingenuousness, and highly encouraging to us.

"I am informed that after the delivery of the charge, the Church Missionaries at Shanghai and Ningpo, all met and agreed to adopt the Bish-

op's terms. Only one man demurred; and he, finally, gave in. So now, English missionaries are very nearly of *one mind*, on this vexed question, and entirely of *one practice*.

"Two or three months ago," writes Dr. Legge, on the 16th of November, 1853, "a shoemaker here, (Hong-Kong) showed me a letter from a relative, who is in the ranks of the rebel army at Nan-King. It was obviously the production of an unlettered man, but an enthusiast. 'I have joined,' writes he, 'this army, because God has raised up our true Lord to drive out the Tartars, and *deliver China from idolatry*. Our army is a holy army, and we are sure of success. Every morning, and every evening, and at our meals, we pray to God. Formerly I was an idolator, and worthy of death, as you are now. Worship God! Go to some of the foreigners at Canton, and get a copy of God's Holy Book. That will teach you what to believe and what to do.'

"Surely," observes Dr. Legge, "a movement in which such letters are going about through all China, must be regarded by us with intense solicitude."

Dr. Medhurst, in a communication to the North China Herald of December 17, observes:—

"As every thing regarding the insurgents possesses a degree of interest at the present moment, I beg leave to send you the following account:

"Having obtained admission into the City of Shanghae, this afternoon, I proceeded to one of the chapels belonging to the London Missionary Society, where I commenced preaching to a large congregation, which had almost immediately gathered within the walls. I was descanting on the folly of idolatry, and urging the necessity of worshipping the one true God, on the ground that he alone could protect his servants, while idols were things of nought, destined soon to perish out of the land; when suddenly a man stood up in the midst of the congregation and exclaimed, that is true; that is true; the idols must perish, and shall perish. I am a Kwang-tse man, a follower of Tae-Ping-Wang; we all of us worship one God (Shangti), and believe in Jesus, while we do our utmost to put down idolatry, every where demolishing the temples and destroying the idols, and exhorting the people to forsake these superstitions. When we commenced, two years ago, we were only 1000 in number, and we have marched from one end of the empire to the other, putting to flight whole armies of the Mandarin troops that were sent against us. If it had not been that God was on our side we would not have thus prevailed against such overwhelming numbers; but now our troops have arrived at Tee-tsin, and we expect soon to be victorious over the whole empire. He then proceeded to exhort the people, in a most lively and earnest strain, to abandon idolatry, which was only worship of devils, and the perseverance in which would involve them in the misery of hell; while by giving it up, and believing in

Jesus, they would obtain the salvation of their souls. As for us, he said, we feel quite happy, in the profession of our religion, and look on the day of our death as the happiest period of our existence. When any of our number die, we never weep, but congratulate each other on the joyful occasion, because a brother is gone to glory, to enjoy all the magnificence and splendor of the heavenly world. While continuing here we make it our business to keep the commandments, to worship God, and to exhort each other to do good, for which end we have frequent meetings for preaching and prayer. What is the use, then, he asked, of your Chinese going on to burn incense and candles and gilt paper? which if your idols really required it, would only show their covetous dispositions; just like the Mandarina, who seize men by the throat, and if they will not give them money, squeeze them seriously, but if they will, they only squeeze them gently. He went on to inveigh against the prevailing vices of his countrymen, particularly opium-smoking. But you must be quick, he adds, for Tae-Ping-Wang is coming, and he will not allow the least infringement of his rules; no opium, no tobacco, no snuff, no wine, and no vicious indulgence of any kind. All offences against the commandments of God are punished by him with the severest rigor, while the incorrigible are beheaded; therefore repent in time.

"I could perceive from the style of his expressions, and from his frequently quoting the books of the Tae-Ping dynasty, that he was familiar with those records, and had been thoroughly trained in that school. No Chinaman, who had not been following the camp of the insurgents for a considerable time, could have spoken as he did.

"He touched also on the expense of opium-smoking, which drained their pockets and kept them poor in the midst of wealth; whilst we, he said, who never touch the drug, are not put to such expense; our master provides us with food and clothing, which is all we want, so that we are rich without money.

"I could not help being struck, also, with the appearance of the man, as he went on in his earnest strain, bold and fearless as he stood, openly denouncing the vices of the people, his countenance beaming with intelligence, his upright and manly form the very picture of health, while his voice thrilled through the crowd. They seemed petrified with amazement, their natural conscience assured them that his testimony was true, while the conviction seemed to be strong amongst them, that the two great objects of his denunciation, opium and idolatry, were both bad things and must be given up."

The Rev. Dr. Medhurst has translated "The Book of religious precepts of the Tae-Ping Dynasty," from which the following is extracted:

"The great God says, Thou shalt have no other spirits (gods) besides me. Therefore all besides the great God are corrupt spirits (gods), deceiving

and destroying mankind; they must on no account be worshiped; whoever worships the whole class of corrupt spirits (gods) offends against the commands of heaven.

“The hymn says;

‘Corrupt devils very easily delude the souls of men:
If you perversely believe in them, you will at last go down to hell.
We exhort you all, brave people, to awake from your lethargy,
And early make your peace with your exalted heavenly Father.’

“The third command. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

“The name of the great God is Jehovah, which men must not take in vain. Whoever takes God’s name in vain, and rails against heaven, offends against this command.

“The hymn says;

‘Our exalted heavenly Father is infinitely honorable;
Those who disobey and profane his name, seldom come to a good end.
If unacquainted with the true doctrine, you should be on your guard,
For those who wantonly blaspheme, involve themselves in endless crimes.’

“The fourth command. On the seventh day, the day of worship, you should praise the great God for his goodness.

“In the beginning the great God made heaven and earth, land and sea, men and things, in six days, and having finished his works on the seventh day, he called it the day of rest (or Sabbath): therefore all the men of the world, who enjoy the blessing of the great God, should on every seventh day especially reverence and worship the great God, and praise him for his goodness.

“The hymn says;

‘All the happiness enjoyed in the world comes from Heaven.
It is therefore reasonable that men should give thanks and sing;
At the daily morning and evening meal there should be thanksgiving,
But on the seventh day, the worship should be more intense.’

“The fifth command. Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be prolonged. Whoever disobeys his parents breaks this command.

“The hymn says;

‘History records that Shem honored his parents to the end of his days,
Causing them to experience the intensest pleasure and delight:
August heaven will abundantly reward all who act thus,
And do not disappoint the expectations of the authors of their being.’

“The sixth command. Thou shalt not kill or injure men.

“He who kills another kills himself, and he who injures another injures himself.

“The hymn says :

‘The whole world is one family, and all men are brethren.
How can they be permitted to kill and destroy one another?
The outward form and the inward principle are both conferred by heaven,
Allow every one, then, to enjoy the ease and comfort which he desires.’

“The seventh command. Thou shalt not commit adultery, or anything unclean.

“All the men in the world are brethren, and all the women in the world are sisters. Among the sons and daughters of the celestial hall, the males are on one side and the females on the other, and are not allowed to intermix. Should either man or woman practice lewdness, they are considered outcasts, as having offended against one of the chief commands of heaven. The casting of amorous glances, the harboring of lustful imaginations, the *smoking of foreign tobacco (opium)*, or the singing of libidinous songs, must all be considered as breaches of this command.

“The hymn says :

‘Lust and lewdness constitute the chief transgression :
Those who practice it become outcasts, and are the objects of pity.
If you wish to enjoy the substantial happiness of heaven,
It is necessary to deny yourselves and earnestly cultivate virtue.’”

Hindustan.—The Missionary Magazine for February, 1854, contains an interesting narrative of a tour made through the Zillahs of Rajshaye, Begra, and Rungpore, east of the Ganges, by the Rev. A. F. Lacroix, and three companions, for the purpose of circulating the Scriptures and promoting the spread of Christianity. Few schools were found in these districts, but numbers of persons were able to read, it being a practice of shop keepers and others, during their leisure hours, to teach two or three of their neighbors’ sons with their own. The majority of the inhabitants are Mahometans, and of these many have of late years become Ferajees, a sect like the Wahabites of Arabia, who reject all traditions, holding the Koran only as the word of God. So great was the eagerness of these people to possess the Scriptures, that in the course of a few days, at least two thousand copies were put in circulation. On one occasion, when the people were addressed on the vanity and sinfulness of idolatry, they listened with much apparent attention ; but a priest, who was near, seeing his craft in danger, poured forth a torrent of abuse and invective, which he continued even after the missionaries had turned away. In this he was supported by the wealthier part of the people, while the poorer villagers were willing to hear the gospel. This scene reminded the Christians who witnessed it, of Luke vii : 29, 30, “All the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God. . . . But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God,” &c.

The monthly extracts from the correspondence of the British and Foreign Bible Society contain the following interesting communication from Calcutta, July 15, 1853 :

"You have probably seen already some accounts of the baptism, last cold season, of the young Maharah Ah Dhuleep Sing, the son of Runjeet Sing, the famous 'Lion of the Punjaub,' whose kingdom was conquered by Lord Hardinge and our present Governor-General, after so many fearful engagements with his long trained and formidable army. This young son had never forgotten the awful scenes of his youth. As a child, after his father's death, he had witnessed, in the open Durbar, the murder of one after another, in that long period of bloody anarchy that preceded the Seik invasion of our territories. When, at last, he was dethroned, Lord Dalhousie placed him under the care of an able and excellent man, Dr. Login. In 1851, when Dr. Login had occasion to come to Calcutta, Dhuleep Sing was left at Futyghur; and, as his companion, an educated youth, from the American mission school there, was chosen. They read the Bible together, and very soon Dhuleep wrote down to his guardian, and said that he wished to become a Christian, and to break his caste at once. Dr. Login urged him to pause, and to do nothing that he would not deliberately adhere to. But months passed, and the desire grew; and at length, with the cordial consent of Dr. Login, and, I believe, of the Governor-General and Arch-deacon Pratt, who happened to be up there, and to have had opportunities of seeing him, this young chieftain of the Seikhs was baptized. It was an important as well as a most interesting event.

"Then, again, I heard lately from Mr. Kay, the principal of Bishop's College, of a fine and intelligent young Mussulman whom he had baptized, and whose history was remarkable. He was born in Persia. Being of a restless and enterprising character, he commenced travelling at an early age, and after a time came to Afghanistan. There, at Candahar, he obtained a Bible or Testament, I forget which. But how came the Scriptures in that dark abode of Mohammedism? The explanation is curious. In our ill-fated Afghan war there were some pious officers, (I believe Dr. Login was one of them,) who desired and attempted to introduce the Scriptures into the country. Those sent from this society were introduced into that country in chests, with the mess-stores, wines and beer for the officers. It probably was one of the Scriptures thus carried into Afghanistan that this young man acquired. He was struck with the contents, and came to the American missionaries at Lodianah, but did not give them satisfaction. Still he came on from place to place, as an inquirer, till happily he met with Mr. Kay, who appears to have dealt with him very wisely. He appeared so truly humble, and manifested so much that was hopeful to the missionaries at Lodianah, that he was baptized. Since then he has given fair promise of being a burning and a shining light to his countrymen and the Mussulmen of this land."

Smyrna.—A very improved state of feeling on religious subjects is prevailing amongst the people of Asia Minor. The Scriptures are being circulated successfully by the American missionaries and the agents of the London Missionary Society.

The following extract from letters in the *Jewish Herald* illustrates the fulfilment of prophecy in regard to Tyre.

“ At the distance of four or five miles from Tyre there is a romantic dell traversed by the river Kasimiyeh. Crossing the bridge, and taking an oblique course across the plain, I found myself on the probable site of the original Tyre, though not a stone remains to assure the traveller of the fact, so literal has been the fulfilment of the inspired prophecy, ‘ I will also scrape the dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock’ (i. e. for barrenness); and again, ‘ *Thou shalt be no more. Though thou be sought for, yet thou shalt never be found again.*’ And yet again, ‘ *They shall lay thy stones, and thy timbers, and thy dust, in the midst of the waters.*’ There is every reason to suppose that the materials of the ancient city, which had been razed to the ground by Nebuchadnezzar, were used by Alexander in the construction of his famous mole, or causeway, by which he connected the new city of *insular* Tyre with the main land. When that monarch took the city at the end of the seven months’ siege, he set it on fire, as it is written, ‘ *He will cast her out, and He will smite her power in the sea, and she shall be devoured with fire.*’

“ The most remarkable remains at Tyre are the large stones and pillars scattered about on the south side of the peninsula, and the port wall on the north; a portion of the present wall, on the north-east side, is actually ~~in~~ *in* the water, another indication of the encroachments of the sea. This, too, is a distinct literal fulfilment of the prophecy, ‘ *Thus saith the Lord God, when I shall make thee a desolate city, like the cities that are not inhabited, when I shall bring up the deep upon thee, and great waters shall cover thee, when I shall bring thee down with them that descend into the pit.*’ The population of the modern town is said to be 5000, composed, half of Christians, and half of Metaweeleh, the heterodox Moslems, who are found in such numbers in the southern parts of Lebanon. There are two or three Evangelical Christians, who may prove a wholesome leaven amidst the mass of corruption and death around.”

Assyria.—In the following extract from his letter to the London Athenæum, Col. Rawlinson says: “ Mr. J. Taylor, who has been employed during the winter in conducting the British Museum excavations in Southern Chaldæa, under my superintendence, has lately discovered a number of clay cylinders, in the ruins of Um-Qeer, (the ancient Ur of the Chaldees, and near the modern Arab capital of Sook-ess-Shookh, on the Euphrates.) Two of these cylinders have already reached me, and I have found them to contain a memorial of the works executed by Nebonidus, (the last king of Babylon,) in Southern Chaldæa. They describe, among other things, the restoration of temples, originally built by the Chaldæan monarchs, at least 1600 years previously, and further notice the reopening of canals, dug by Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar. The most important fact, however,

which they disclose, is, that the eldest son of Nabonidus was named Belshar-*ezar*, and that he was admitted by his father to a share in the government. This name is, undoubtedly, the Belshazzar of Daniel, and thus furnishes us with a key to the explanation of that great historical problem, which has hitherto defied solution. We can now understand how Belshazzar, as joint king with his father, may have been governor of Babylon, when the city was attacked by the combined forces of the Medes and Persians, and may have perished in the assault which followed; while Nabonidus, leading a force to the relief of the place, was defeated, and obliged to take refuge in the neighboring town of Borsippa, (or Birs-i-Nimrud,) capitulating, after a short resistance, and being subsequently assigned, according to Berossus, an honorable retirement in Carmania. By the discovery, indeed, of the name of Belshar-*ezar*, as appertaining to the son of Nabonidus, we are, for the first time, enabled to reconcile authentic history, (such as it is related by Herodotus and Berossus, and not as we find it in the romance of Xenophon or the fables of Ctesias,) with the inspired record of Daniel, which forms one of the bulwarks of our religion."

The following interesting details relating to the Exodus, are comprised in a letter from the Rev. D. J. Heath, to the editor of the *London Atheneum*, February 11.

"Any new facts which throw light, either on the date or the circumstances of the Exodus, will be so interesting to a large class of your readers, that I hope I need not apologize for troubling you with the following. I have taken them out of the *Select Papyri*, published in fac-simile, ten years ago, by the British Museum; but towards the translation of which, comparatively little has hitherto been effected.

"Some of the new facts I have discovered in the almost virgin soil of these Papyri, are as follows. They speak for themselves:

"1st. In the third year of this very Manepthah, one *Jannes* was president of the temple and governor of the prison at Heliopolis, the very spot where Joseph had married, and the Jews had settled.

"2d. At a mutilated date, apparently the thirteenth year, the same *Jannes* was engaged, with one *Maien Taku*, or lover of the *Taku*, in bringing three obelisks from Pelusium to Heliopolis. *Jannes* is here again named, as of the seed of the sun, i. e. a priest of Heliopolis, while *Maien Taku* is merely the chief of the *Marjain*.

"3d. These *Marjain* were fed at the expense of the king.

"4th. They spoke a different language from the Egyptians, and *Maien Taku* translated books of truth from the language of *Kam*, or Egypt, to that of the *Taku*.

"5th. Upon the refusal of the *Taku* to perform their accustomed services, a young scribe, *Amenthoesa*, was sent to them, to expatiate upon the

liberality of the king in the matter of their daily food. He did so, and was unsuccessful. The parley took place at a place where straw was brought.

"6th. The Taku or Marjain made request that they might celebrate their tribe rites, and take sacrificial cattle with them. The request was granted.

"7th. On a night between the 10th and 20th of Epiphi, (Abib?) Amethoses was ordered to accompany the Taku beyond Tesek, . . . (Tasakarta,) on the road to Migdol.

"8th. There was a great passage of these people by water, with a lamentation on the part of the king for an unsuccessful expedition.

"9th. These Marjain were bondsmen, or, at least, were registered.

"10th. Another name, Shuna, connected with them, is described as the name of brick-burners.

"Lastly. It is possible to read the name of a fellow-officer of Jannes as the bull Jammr! Jammr would be Jambes, as Emrys is Welsh for Ambrosius."

Madagascar.—A revised edition of the whole Bible, in the native tongue of Madagascar, is now in progress, under the directions of the B. and F. Bible Society. Very earnest applications for it have been made by the Christians of Madagascar.

The late Mr. Richard Burney, M. A., of Christ's College, having signified his intention of founding an annual prize, not exceeding £105, for the best English essay "on some moral or metaphysical subject, on the existence, nature, and attributes of God, or on the truth and evidence of the Christian religion, the Vice-Chancellor gives notice, that the subject for the present year is, "Faith in natural and revealed religion is necessary for the purification and perfectibility of man." The essays are to be sent to the Vice-Chancellor on or before the 13th of November, 1854.

At the Royal Society of Literature, February 8, Mr. Davies read a paper "On the Rhythm or Metre to be found in the Books of the Old Testament, especially the Psalms; on *Selah*, its signification and uses." Mr. Davies' object was, to show that the Psalms of David, at all events, if not other parts of the sacred writings, were rhythmical, if not metrical; that the word "*Selah*," which occurs so frequently in the Psalms, is always conformable to the rhythm established, and sometimes that it is necessary to the rhythm; and that it may in all cases be translated with the sense of "forever." After noticing the various systems which have been propounded by Bishops Lowth and Jebb, and Mr. Graves, Mr. Davies argued from the occurrence of rhythm, if not of metre, in many other ancient laws, in some Egyptian Papyri, and in some Chinese writings, that the same fact might be discovered in the case of the Hebrew Scriptures; it not being likely that the Jews should have formed a case isolated from all nations.

preceding and following them. Mr. Davies then showed that the Psalms, and many other writings, were of the lyrical class, by careful examination of the text of the first Psalm, the Song of Miriam, the Tenth Commandment, and the first chapter of Lamentations, which, he contended, bore some resemblance to the rhythm of the choruses at the end of the Greek Tragedies. Mr. Davies then showed that, in many cases, the parallelism of sense given in the English translation is at variance with the original; while the word "Selah," agreeably with many of the old commentators, he considered might mean "forever," believing that it should be so translated as to fill up the fulness of the sense.

It is said, that in France, the good understanding which has existed between the government and the Roman Catholic party, is likely to be interrupted, by the efforts of the State to obtain for the Academies throughout the empire, in connection with the University, such an organization as shall place them in a position less dependent on the Bishops than they are at present. In consequence, Cardinal Gousset has declined to take his seat in the council of Public Instruction. The *Ame de la Religion* asserted that "the liberty of instruction had never been more strongly attacked;" for which expression it was subjected to a "warning" by the Minister of Public Instruction.

The public library at Vienne, in France, has been totally destroyed by fire; 8000 volumes, and some very valuable old MSS. were burnt to cinders, and a painting of Claude Lorraine, representing "the Daughters of Lot," was a good deal damaged.

The library of the Ohio Wesleyan University, located at Delaware, Ohio, will be largely increased during the ensuing year. The donation of ten thousand dollars by William Sturges, of the firm of Sturges and Ellis, N. Y., will be expended by the president mainly in Europe. A large edifice, to cost over 15,000 dollars, is now in process of erection, and will be finished for the reception of the library next year.

The Literary Fund of the state of Virginia amounts to \$ 1,606,802, the revenue from which, in 1853, was \$ 108,627. Of this income \$ 75,000 is appropriated to the support of Free schools, \$ 15,000 to the University, and \$ 1,500 to the Military institute. The number of indigent children in the state is reported at 55,271, of which 32,072 are in the public schools.

A bill has passed the senate of Massachusetts providing that whenever, within a year after the passage of the act, the corporation of Harvard College shall cause to be raised, by subscriptions and donations, a fund of two hundred thousand dollars, to be forever applied to the establishment of at least one hundred free scholarships, each yielding one hundred dollars a year, to which the youth of Massachusetts shall be from time to time admitted, the connection now existing on the part of the state with Harvard shall be dissolved.

The Petersburg (Va.) Library Association has now been in operation one year, and is already in possession of 3,600 well selected volumes. Of these, 3,260 were purchased at an average cost of \$ 1 10 per volume, the remainder being donations. An alphabetical catalogue has been prepared, and will soon be published. Thos. S. Pleasants, librarian.

A letter has been received from Geo. Peabody, Esq., of London, authorizing his agent to purchase 3,000 vols. of standard books, for the new Peabody Institute of Danvers.

The Rev. Benjamin M. Smith, D. D., secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, has been elected by the Board of Directors of the Union Theological Seminary of Virginia, to the Professorship of Oriental Literature, made vacant by the death of the late Dr. Sampson.

On the 15th ult. the annual competition came off for the gold medal, valued at \$ 100, by the members of the senior class of Yale College. The competitors were Starr H. Nichols, Yung Wing, (Chinaman,) Carroll Cutler, Wm. A. Fenn, James E. Raine, Wm. C. Flagg, and Jas. C. Rice. The judges assigned to the compositions of Cutler, Nichols, and Wing a rank not inferior to the compositions of Fenn and Raine; but looking as the terms of the De Forrest prize require, to writing and speaking conjointly, they came to the conclusion that the prize lay between the two latter; and between these two they decided by a major vote in favour of Wm. H. Fenn, of Charleston, S. C.

Dr. Brunnow has accepted the appointment of Director of the Observatory and Professor of Astronomy in the University of Michigan, and was expected on about the first of July, when the instruments will be ready for the Observatory. The telescope, made by Mr. Henry Fitz, will have an object glass of thirteen inches diameter. The transit-instrument is just completed in Berlin, by Piston and Martins, under the superintendence of Professor Encke and his assistant, Dr. Brunnow; and is pronounced by them the best hitherto made.

The Senate of the state of Connecticut has made an appropriation of \$10,000 to the Wesleyan University, conditional upon the raising of \$ 90,000 by the friends of the institution.

The amount of money already collected for the monument to be erected to the memory of Professor Wilson of Edinburgh, is £477.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ENGLISH.

The Cyclopædia Bibliographica, which has been in progress for some months, is now completed in large octavo volume. It comprises nearly all authors of note, ancient and modern, in Theology, Ecclesiastical History, Moral Philosophy, &c., including a selection in most branches of Literature, with short biographical, bibliographical, and analytical notices. A catalogue of each author's works is given. This Cyclopædia has been founded on the Metropolitan Library of London, which comprises about 30,000 volumes.

A History of the Papacy to the period of the Reformation, by Rev. J. E. Riddle.

Lectures on English History, English Literature, and Ecclesiastical History, delivered by Professor Maurice, to the students of King's College.

Evenings with the Romanists, by the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour.

The Early Prophecies of a Redeemer, from the first Promise to the Prophecy of Moses, by Wm. De Burgh, B. D.

Sacred Studies, or Aids to the Developement of Truth, by the Rev. R. Ferguson, LL. D., M. R. S. A.

Evenings with the Prophets, a Series of Memoirs and Meditations, by the Rev. A. Morton Browne, LL. D.

The volumes recently issued by the Calvin Translation Society for 1853, contain Daniel, vol. II., Harmony of Pentateuch, vol. II., Isaiah, vol. IV., and Hebrews complete.

The Letters of John Calvin, compiled from the Original Latin and French MSS., with an Introduction and Notes, by Dr. Jules Bonnet. The arrangement of the letters will be chronological.

A new and enlarged edition of *Meditationes Hebraicae*, an Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by the Rev. W. Tait of Rugby.

Christ as made known to the ancient church; an Exposition of the Divine Revelation of Grace as contained in the Old Testament Scriptures, by the late Robert Gordon, D. D., F. R. S. E.

GERMAN.

Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte.
T. C. Baur.

Part 15 of the "Kurtzgefasstes Exeg. Handbuch zum A. T." contains Bertheaus on the Books of Chronicles.

Vol. VII. of Olshausen's Commentary contains Ebrard's Exposition of the Apocalypse, and Vol. VI. part I. Wiesinger's Commentary on the Epistle of James. A fourth edition of Vol. I. has also been published, revived by Ebrard.

Part I. Vol. II. of Hoffman's "Schriftbeweis" has made its appearance.

Sec. 1, of the second part of the new edition of Dorner's "History of the development of the doctrine of the person of Christ," has after some delay appeared.

A small work entitled "Sin, a contribution to the theology of the Old Testament," by Umbreit, has been published.

Vol. I. of a "History of Protestant Dogmatics in its connection with Theology in general," is just out, edited by Dr. W. Gass.

Vol. I. of "The Central Doctrines of Protestantism, as developed within the Reformed Church," by Dr. A. Schevezier, embracing the 16th century.

"The Life of Jesus," by Hase. 4th edition.

"History of the Old Testament," by Kurtz. Vol. 1, 2d edition.

"History of the people of Israel to the time of Christ," by Ewald. 2d edition, Vol III. (History of David and of the Kings of Israel.)

The Polyglott Bible, edited by Dr. R. Stier and Dr. H. G. W. Theile. Old Text. Vol. III. part 1. Part 2d is in press and will complete the work. This work is particularly valuable to those who love to study the sacred oracles closely and critically.

AMERICAN.

Guido and Julius. The Doctrine of Sin and the Propitiator, by Frederick Augustus O. Tholuck, D. D. Translated by Jonathan Edwards Ryland. Introduction by J. Pye Smith, D. D. 16 mo. Gould and Lincoln, Boston.

Historical Survey of Speculative Philosophy from Kant to Hegel; designed as an Introduction to the Opinions of the Recent Schools. By Heinrich Moritz Chalybaus, professor of philosophy in the University of Kiel. Translated from the fourth edition of the German by Alfred Tulk. Andover: W. F. Draper. 12 mo. p. 397.

An Historical Text-Book and Atlas of Biblical Geography. By Lyman Coleman. Philadelphia: Grambro & Co.

We notice the following announcements from the American press.

History of Philip the Second, by Wm. H. Prescott.

An Encyclopædia of Music, compiled by Mr. John W. Moore, aided by distinguished Musicians.

A translation into the German language of Benton's "Thirty years in the United States Senate.

Inspiration of Holy Scripture or, Canon of the Old and New Testaments, in Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge, by Christopher Wordsworth, D. D.

Practical Sermons, in one 12 mo., volume, by Rt. Rev. George Burgess.

Compte's Positive Philosophy, freely translated and condensed by Harriet Martineau.

Specimens of the Greek and Roman classic poets, in a chronological series from Homer to Tryphiodorus, translated into English verse, and illustrated with biographical and critical notices, by Charles A. Elton. In 3 vols. crown octavo with portraits.

Lord Brougham's Sketches of Statesmen of the Time of Geo. III.

Lamartine's Memorirs of Celebrated European characters.

Sunny Memories of Foreign Lands by Mrs. Stowe. This book is advertised in London with 60 Illustrations, by the Author.

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW,
OF THE
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
SOUTH.

Vol. VIII.]

OCTOBER 1854.

[No. 4.]

ART. I.

THE THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF THOMAS PAINE. BOSTON. 1853.

By Rev. T. O. SUMMERS, D. D., Charleston, S. C.

The recent republication of Thomas Paine's Theological Works, with the zealous efforts put forth in their circulation, suggests the inquiry whether the replies to the "Age of Reason" fairly met and answered the objections to the Bible contained in that work; and, if so, whether the replications of Mr. Paine contain any new matter which deserves regard.

In respect to the former point in this inquiry, it may be observed that the first part of the Age of Reason does not appear to have given much concern either to friends or foes. No one after reading it will be astonished at this. It contains scarcely anything but ribald and ignorant blasphemies mingled with laudations of nature and science as the only true religion.

The unhappy author of this work was born at Thetford, England, January 29th, 1737. His father belonged to the society of Quakers, of whom Mr. P. says, p. 146, "they are rather deists than Christians: they do not believe much about Jesus Christ, and they call the Scriptures a dead letter." He tells us that when he was only seven or eight years old his mind revolted at the doctrine of redemption by Christ. The aversion to the religion of the Bible, thus early conceived, was nourished and strengthened throughout the whole course of his life. After taking an interest in promoting the American Revolution, his love of liberty engaged him in kindred services for France. Having become a citizen of the Republic, under the reign of Terror, he came near sharing the fate of others who were conspicuous in the French Revolution. In 1793 he was excluded from the Convention and afterwards imprisoned in the Luxembourg, where he was seized with a fever, which he thinks saved his life, as it prevented the execution of a decree of accusation against him, which was subsequently found among the papers of Robespierre. Just six hours before his imprisonment he finished his hastily-written essay, the first part of the *Age of Reason*, which he committed to Joel Barlow for publication in the United States.

His object in this treatise is to decry the religion of the Bible, which he says is made up of lying and stupid Mysteries, Miracles, and Prophecies, by contrasting it with the religion of nature and science, which involve none of those elements. He does not seem to know that nature has mysteries as numerous and as inexplicable as revelation; and that if there be any religion in nature no one knows so much about it as the believer in the Bible. He lauds the book of Job and the nineteenth Psalm as sublime deistical productions, borrowed by the Jews from the Persian Magi. But as he had no Bible by him at the time, and as he could not quote the Psalm, he gives us the paraphrase of Mr. Addison, which only extends to the sixth verse--the remainder of the Psalm being a sublime eulogy of the Mosaic Scriptures, ending with a prayer for deliverance from sin and for acceptance with the Most

High, whom the psalmist styles, "My Strength and my Redeemer!" Mr. P., it must be observed, considers prayer a grand impertinence—the *deistical* psalmist it appears was of a different mind.

He tells us that he never studied the languages, a knowledge of which he does not consider of any importance. He seems to boast of his ignorance of Hebrew, and yet dogmatizes concerning Hebrew literature as if he were as learned as a Jewish Rabbi. A fine critic of the Old Testament truly, when he supposed that the Greek astronomical names, Pleiades, Orion, and Arcturus were borrowed by the Jews, who knew nothing about astronomy, and having no translation of those names in Hebrew, adopted them as they found them in the Gentile poem! We need not say the names used in the Hebrew by Job are all different—*Ash, Kesil, and Kimah.*

His ignorance of Hebrew literature crops out in the sage notion that the distinction between "the greater and the lesser prophets" refers to degrees of prophesying: a Sunday school child could tell him that it refers to the quantity and not to the quality of their predictions—We suppose that is not as absurd as "the greater and the lesser God!"

He charges "the Christian mythologists" with absurdity in their accounts of the death of Christ, as if they affirmed the abstract necessity that it should be brought about by the instrumentalities by which it was effected—which is nowhere intimated. He charges them with quibbling in regard to the effect of the death of Christ, inasmuch as men die now as they did before that event. But where is the quibble? Who told him that the death of man would not have been an eternal death if Christ had not undertaken to die for him? And what quibble is there in affirming that the death of the Son of God, the second Adam, though he rose from the dead, was a substitute for the death of the first Adam, though he must needs die a temporal death? The death of Christ was not a mere "natural death," nor is the death of the believer in Jesus an eternal death; yet without "quibble, subterfuge and pun," we may call both the one and the other *death.*

He asserts that the doctrine of redemption by the blood of Christ is founded on a pecuniary idea, fabricated as a basis for the selling of pardons, indulgences, *etc.*; and that it is inapplicable to the case of criminals, where moral and not pecuniary justice is in demand. Such language betrays utter ignorance of the system. The New Testament speaks of redemption as a great governmental expedient by means of which God can be just and yet justify repenting sinners—it necessarily rises above all earthly analogies, and only admits of partial and imperfect illustration by reference to the affairs of men—such as paying debts, redeeming inheritances, ransoming captives, discharging criminals. It is not a mere pecuniary idea, but “moral justice,” that is the basis of redemption—not however apart from wisdom and benevolence. It does not follow that because earthly governments cannot punish the innocent for the guilty, therefore the voluntary sufferings of the Son of God, cannot be regarded as a meritorious consideration in view of which God might, without injuriously affecting the stability of his government and the interests of the universe, extend pardon to his rebellious but repenting subjects. This is the grand essential fact of redemption—something very different from Mr. Paine’s “ideas of pecuniary and moral justice.”

It is very evident that when Mr. Paine did not identify Christianity with popery, priestcraft, and the like, he confounded it with the “horrible decree” of John Calvin. Thus he speaks of “Moloch and modern Predestinarianism,” and of preachers who “tell their congregations that God predestinated and selected from all eternity a certain number to be saved and a certain number to be damned eternally. If this were true,” he continues, “the day of judgment is past: their preaching is in vain, and they had better work at some useful calling for their livelihood. This doctrine hath a direct tendency to demoralize mankind. Can a bad man be reformed by telling him that if he is one of those who was decreed to be damned before he was born, his reformation will do him no good; and if he was decreed to be saved, he will be saved

whether he believes it or not; for this is the result of the doctrine. Such preaching and such preachers do injury to the moral world. They had better be at the plow." It is very obvious that if this doctrine be identified with Christianity, Christianity cannot stand in an *age of reason*.

Mr. Paine's aversion to Calvinists was strengthened by the persecutions which they waged against all who were under their power, particularly the Quakers, in whose society he was brought up. Thus in his Letter to Mr. Erskine he says, "Catholics, when they had the ascendancy burnt Protestants, who in turn led Catholics to the stake, and both united in exterminating Dissenters. The Dissenters when they had the power pursued the same course. The diabolical act of Calvin in the burning of Dr. Servetus is an awful instance of this fact. The Dissenters, who escaped from England, had scarcely seated themselves in the wilds of America, before they began to exterminate from the territory they seized upon, all those who did not profess what they called the orthodox faith. Priests, Quakers, and Adamites were prohibited from entering the territory on pain of death." But before rejecting Christianity because of the erroneous doctrines and persecuting practices of some that bear the Christian name, he ought to have candidly studied the system, and he would have found that it is not responsible for the one or the other, but as much opposed to both as Mr. P. himself. There is no more Calvinism in the Bible than there is popery—if there were, we should not appear in its defence, though we should not imitate the author of the *Age of Reason*, in his vulgar denunciations of it. We are aware that thousands have been made infidels by supposing that popery is Christianity, or that Calvinism is contained in the Bible; but surely the Bible is not responsible for their mistakes or for the blunders or bad faith of its professed expounders.

There is nothing in the first part of the *Age of Reason*, besides what we have noticed, that is worthy of regard; and there is nothing in the second part of any consequence unnoticed by Bishop Watson.

When George the third was informed that the bishop of Llandaff had written an Apology for the Bible, the king replied, he did not know the Bible needed any *apology*. Whether he intended this for a *pun* on the word, or did not know its classical meaning, is of no consequence, Thomas Paine knew; and it was small wit in him to use the word as if it meant the making of an excuse. He *felt* that Bishop Watson's defence of the Bible was no excuse for errors and imperfections. The masterly manner in which the learned prelate demonstrated the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred books—wiped off the foul aspersions which Mr. Paine had cast upon the inspired writers—and defended the God of the Bible from the blasphemous allegations of the Age of Reason, was what might have been expected from one so well fitted for the task.

Bishop Watson possessed an acute and vigorous mind, richly endowed and strengthened by a close application to study through the whole course of his life. On the death of Dr. Rutherford, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, Dr. Watson was appointed to fill his place. He tells us how he qualified himself for this important post: "I reduced the study of divinity into as narrow a compass as possible, for I determined to study nothing but my Bible, being much unconcerned about the opinions of councils, fathers, churches, bishops, and other men, as little inspired as myself. This mode of proceeding, being opposite to the general one, and especially to that of the master of Peterhouse, who was a great reader, he used to call me the self-taught divine. My mind was wholly unbiassed; I had no prejudice against, no predilection for, the Church of England; but a sincere regard for the Church of Christ, and an insuperable objection to every degree of dogmatical intolerance. Holding the New Testament in my hand, I used to say, *En sacrum codicem!* There is the fountain of truth, why do you follow the streams derived from it by the sophistry, or polluted by the passions of man? If you can bring proofs against anything delivered in this book, I shall think it my duty to reply to you; articles of

churches are not of divine authority ; have done with them ; for they may be true, they may be false ; and appeal to the book itself."

Learned, laborious, and liberal, he was the very man to cope with the adversaries of the Bible, whether they made their attacks in the covert, sinister, and insinuating manner of the serpentine and slimy author of the *Decline and Fall*, or in the scurrilous and abusive style of the wolfish author of the *Age of Reason*. Some have thought he carried his courtesy to an extreme. "It is well known," says one, "that the liberal and gentlemanly manner in which Dr. Watson, in his *Apology for Christianity*, treated the infidel historians, displeased some of the doughty polemics of the time. Mr. Gibbon himself acknowledged the copy of that work, sent to him by the author, in a strain of great politeness." But the cause of truth never loses anything by the courteous manner in which it is defended. The meekness and gentleness of Christ are well-adapted to disarm opposition to the Bible and secure a candid attention to the arguments adduced in proof of its divine original. And it is worthy of remark that Mr. Paine, in his *Reply*, writes in a subdued tone, and speaks of the bishop almost in terms of respect.

In that *Reply* he starts out with an attempt to show that the book of *Genesis* is not the first, or most ancient book of the *Old Testament*, but the most recent. He says: "If *Genesis* be, as the bishop asserts, the oldest book in the world, and consequently the oldest and first written book of the *Bible*, and if the extraordinary things related in it, such as the creation of the world in six days, the tree of life and of good and evil, the story of *Eve* and of the talking serpent, the fall of man and his being turned out of *Paradise*, were facts, or even believed by the *Jews* to be facts, they would be referred to as fundamental matters, and that very frequently, in the books of the *Bible* that were written by various authors afterwards ; whereas there is not a book, a chapter, or verse of the *Bible*, including a space of more than a thousand years, in which there is any mention made of these things, or any of them,

nor are they so much as alluded to. How will the bishop solve this difficulty, which stands as a circumstantial contradiction to his assertion? There are but two ways of solving it: First, that the book of Genesis is not an ancient book; that it has been written by some (now) unknown person after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, about a thousand years after the time that Moses is said to have lived, and put as a preface or introduction to the other books, when they were formed into a canon in the time of the second temple, and therefore not having existed before that time, none of these things mentioned in it could be referred to in those books. Secondly, that admitting Genesis to have been written by Moses, the Jews did not believe the things stated in it to be true, and, therefore, as they could not refer to them as facts, they would not refer to them as fables. The first of these solutions goes against the antiquity of the book, and the second against its authenticity, and the bishop may take which he pleases."

We suppose "the bishop" would take neither the one nor the other; he would be very foolish to do so.

No references to the book of Genesis in the other books of the Old Testament! What a bold, unscrupulous assertion! The truth is, the events recorded in Genesis are frequently referred to in the succeeding books of the Bible.

Exodus begins with a continuation of the history of the patriarchs, with which Genesis closed. It frequently mentions "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers"—refers to the grant of Canaan made to them, Gen. xv. xvii., and to the account of the creation and the Sabbath, Gen. i. ii.

Leviticus makes a similar reference to the grant of Canaan, recorded in Genesis. Lev. xiv. 34, xx. 24.

Numbers makes special mention of the sons of Jacob, as the patriarchs of the twelve tribes. Gen. xlvi. Num. i—iii, xxvi.; and of their descent into Egypt, Num. xx. 15—it represents Balaam speaking of *Jacob* as the cognomen of the

children of Israel, in reference to their origin recorded in Genesis.

Deuteronomy refers to the oath by which Canaan was secured to the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and to the grants spoken of, Gen. xiv. xv. xvii. Deu. i. ii. vi. ix. xix. xxxi. xxxiv.—to Moab and Ammon, sons of Lot, and their inheritance, Gen. xix. Deu. ii.—to the descent into Egypt, Deu. x. xi. xxvi. xxvii.—to the Canaanitish nations specified, Gen. xv. Deu. xx.—to the overthrow of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, Gen. xix. Deu. xxix.—to the division of the earth, Gen. xi. Deu. xxxii.—to the history of Joseph and his brethren, Deu. xxxiii.

Joshua takes up the history where the Pentateuch left it—alluding to “the book of the law of Moses,” Josh. i. viii. xxiii.—and to the events recorded therein, including references to the Canaanitish nations and the signal fulfilment of the prediction in Gen. xv.—to circumcision, as practiced before the Exodus, agreeably to Gen. xvii.—to the fathers of the twelve tribes—to the call and exodus of Abraham from the birth-place of himself, Nahor, and their father Terah, in Mesopotamia, recorded Gen. xi. xii.—and even the burial of Joseph’s bones in the parcel of ground which Jacob bought of the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem for a hundred pieces of silver, and it became the inheritance of the children of Joseph. Gen. xxxiii. 1.

Judges continues the history, referring to the oath by which God promised Canaan to the forefathers of Israel, and to persons and places mentioned in Genesis. Gen. xvii. Jud. ii.

Ruth alludes to Gen. xxix. xxx. xxxviii., specifying “Rachel and Leah, which two did build the house of Israel,” and to “the house of Pharez which Tamar bare unto Judah.” Ruth iv.

1 *Samuel* (x.) alludes to Rachel’s sepulchre, spoken of Gen. xxxv.—speaks of the Israelites as Hebrews, according to Gen. xiv. 13—and makes frequent reference to localities first men-

tioned in Genesis.—Compare Gen. xxi. 21, xxv. 18, with 1 Sam. xxvi. xxvii. 8.

2 *Samuel* alludes frequently to places mentioned in Genesis: *e. g.*—Hebron, Mahanaim, and “the king’s vale.”—Compare Gen. xiii. xiv. xxxii. with 2 Sam. ii. xviii. 18.

1 *Kings* frequently refers to places mentioned in Genesis, as Dan, Beersheba, Bethel, and (xviii. 31,) makes a particular reference to Gen. xxxii. 28, in these words, “Elijah took twelve stones, according to the number of the tribes of the sons of Jacob, unto whom the word of the Lord came, saying, Israel shall be thy name.”

2 *Kings* continues the history in the same vein, and (xiii. 23,) particularly specifies the covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Gen. xvii.

1 *Chronicles* leads off with chronological tables and historical notices, derived from Genesis and the other books of the Pentateuch, and so presented as to make it simply ridiculous to say that the pentateuchal history was written after the *Chronicles*—it also alludes (xxvii. 23,) to the promise made to Abram, Gen. xv. 5, “because the Lord had said he would increase Israel like to the stars of the heavens”—it represents David invoking the Most High as the “Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, our fathers,” whose history is given at large in Genesis and nowhere else but there.

2 *Chronicles* (xx. 2,) alludes to Hazazon-tamar, first mentioned Gen. xiv. 7—represents Jehoshaphat saying, “Art not thou our God who didst drive out the inhabitants of this land before thy people Israel, and gavest it to the seed of Abraham thy friend forever?”—a passage utterly void of meaning unless Genesis was then a recognized history—speaks of “the law in the book of Moses,” and of the “Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel.” (xxv. 4; xxx. 6, 16; xxxiv. 14.)

Ezra uses the common formula, “as it is written in the law of Moses, the man of God,” (iii. 2,) and particularly specifies (ix.) the nations mentioned, Gen. xv.

Nehemiah (viii. xiii.) mentions “the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel”—and re-

fers to the call of Abram, the change of his name, his faith, the covenant grant of Canaan to him and his seed, as recorded in Genesis, and to other facts recorded in succeeding historical books;—and Nehemiah does not appear to have been an idiot, which he must have been if Genesis be not a genuine book.

Esther treats of subjects which would scarcely suggest any reference to the Mosaic writings, nevertheless, the idioms of Genesis are found in *Esther*, showing a familiar acquaintance with it. Compare Gen. xxxvii. 14; xxxiv. 19; xxvii. 34; xxxv. 5; x. 5, with Esth. ii. 11, 14; iv. 1; viii. 17; x. 1.

Job alludes to the land of Uz, mentioned Gen. x. 23—to Teman, who appears to have been the son of one Eliphaz and the father of another, giving his name to a part of Idumea which his posterity inhabited: Compare Gen. xxxvi. 9–12; Job ii. 11; Jer. xlix. 7—to Teman, Gen. xxv. 15; Job vi. 19—the allusions to the rending of clothes and mourning seven days and nights, (i. ii.,) the ten times, (xix. 3.) Gen. xxxi. 7, the references to the work of creation, (xxvi. xxxviii. *etc.*), the breath and Spirit of God in the nostrils, (xxv. 3; xxxiii. 4,) Gen. ii. 7, and numerous other incidental passages of a kindred character, show that the book of Genesis was not unknown to the author of the book of Job, if indeed Moses was not the author of both.

Psalms abounds in allusions to the Pentateuchal history, including many pregnant references to Genesis: *e. g.*—the dominion of man over the lower animals, (viii.) Gen. i. ix.—creation, (xxxiii.) Gen. i. ii.—the covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the history of Joseph, the descent into Egypt, the plagues, Exodus, *etc.* are set forth in Ps. cv., and the creation, miracles in Egypt, *etc.* in Ps. cxxxvi., in language taken from Genesis. (Compare also Gen. xix. 24, Ps. xi. 6.) This is just what might have been expected. The pious Hebrew would naturally interweave the wonders of sacred history in his songs of praise.

Proverbs alludes to the tree of life, (iii. 18,) spoken of Gen. ii. iii.—and to the creation, (viii.,) Gen. i.

Ecclesiastes refers (i. 13) to the curse pronounced on the earth, Gen. iii. 19,—and (vii. 29) to the creation and fall, Gen. i. iii.

Solomon's Song abounds in the idioms of the book of Genesis and refers to places and things therein mentioned, as Damascus, Gilead, and Mahanaim, the last place being suggested as a simile by the *two hosts* of angels that met Jacob on his return from Padam-Aram. Compare Gen. xxxii. 2, with Song vi. 13. "The mandrakes" (vii. 13) were perhaps suggested by Gen. xxx. 14–16.

Isaiah (i. 9, 10; xiii. 19,) refers to the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, Gen. xix.—alludes to Abraham, (xxix. 22; xli. 8; li. 2:) "Thou Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham, my friend:" "Look unto Abraham, your father, and unto Sarah that bare you, for I called him alone and blessed him, and increased him"—it alludes also to the general deluge: (liv. 9:) "I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth"—also to Midian, Moab, Edom, Nebaioth, Kedar, and other places and things, in terms utterly incomprehensible without reference to the record in Genesis: compare Gen. x. xxv. Is. lx. lxvi.—and to Gen. iii. 14, in lxv. 25: "dust shall be the serpent's meat."

Jeremiah refers to Gen. i. in iv. 23: "I beheld the earth and lo! it was without form and void; and the heavens, and they had no light"—to Gen. viii. 22, in v. 24: "He reserveth unto us the appointed weeks of the harvest;" and xxxii. 20: "my covenant of the day and my covenant of the night"—to the "overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the neighbor cities thereof," Gen. xix., in c. l. 40—to Gen. xxxvii. 35, in viii. 22. xlvi. 11: "balm in Gilead"—to Gen. xlix. 10, in xxx. 21: "Their nobles shall be of themselves and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them"—to the creation of sun, moon, and stars, xxxi. 35—and the names of nations, localities, *etc.* postulate an acquaintance with the history in Genesis.

Lamentations (ii. iv.) speaks of Jacob and Judah as the

well known progenitors of the Jewish nation, of the punishment of the sin of Sodom, and of "Edom in the land of Uz," of which subjects the book of Genesis contains the original record.

Ezekiel (xiv.) refers to the righteousness of Noah, by which he was delivered from the flood, Gen. vii.—to the sin of Sodom, (xvi.) Gen. xix.—to Dedan, Kedron, Sheba, Haran, (xxvii.) and Gomer, Magog, Meshech, Tubal, and Tarshish, (xxxviii.) mentioned Gen. x. xi. xxv.—to "the trees of Eden in the garden of God, (xxxi. xxxvii.,) Gen. ii. iii.—to Joseph, Ephraim, Judah, and the twelve tribes in general, (xxxvii. xlvi.,) Gen. xlvi. xlix.—to the oath by which the grant of Canaan was confirmed to the "fathers" of the Hebrew nation, (xlvii.,) Gen. xv. xvii.

The prophecies of Daniel and the lesser prophets, in consequence of their brevity, did not allow of more than an occasional reference to the facts recorded in the Pentateuch and the succeeding historical books; but we have gone through every book in order down to *Ezekiel*, who wrote during the captivity, and find references to Genesis in every one, and in several of the *earlier* books many and copious quotations; and yet Mr. Paine says, "there is not a book, chapter, or verse of the Bible, from the time Moses is said to have written the book of Genesis to the book of Malachi, including a space of more than a thousand years, in which there is any mention of these things, [the creation, tree of life, *etc.*,] or any of them, nor are they so much as alluded to!"

He says the Jews stole their cosmogony from the Persians, and, to conceal the theft, the Rabbins of the second temple published Genesis as a book of Moses. He even has the hardihood to say that the name of Moses is not found in the Jewish Scriptures, and says that "this is strange if the Jews knew or believed anything about him or the books he is said to have written."—Of course then there never was such a man as Moses, or Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, or Joseph—there never were any Hebrew kings, or prophets, or priests—never any Jewish wars, victories or captivities—Josephus, Philo, the

Targumists, and other ancient Jewish writers were fools when they spoke of the laws of Moses—so were Julian the apostate, Porphyry the bitter enemy of Christianity, Numenius the Pythagorean, Longinus the celebrated critic, Juvenal the satirist, Tacitus the historian, Justin the abbeviator of Trogius, Strabo and Diodorus Siculus the great geographers, Artapanus, Eupolemus, Manetho, and other Heathen writers of antiquity, who all agree in assigning the Pentateuch to Moses—Ptolemy was imposed upon when he had the *Palaca Diatheka* translated and placed in the Alexandrian library—the Samaritans were hoaxed when they made their copy of the Pentateuch, which is substantially the same as the Hebrew now in our possession. The four later books of the Pentateuch fully endorse the first book and continue the history which that begins; and all together form the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of an ancient nation, which forsooth knew nothing about the books or their author! The whole affair was concocted by “those priestly reformers, impostors, I should call them,” says Mr. Paine, “Hilkiah, Ezra, and Nehemiah, who began to produce books under the name of the books of Moses. They trumped up a story of the creation being made in six days, and of the Creator resting on the seventh, to suit with the lunar and chronological period of seven days; and they manufactured a commandment to agree with both. Impostors always work in this manner. They put fables for originals and causes for effects.”

This passage is a fine specimen of Mr. Paine’s taste, logic, and literature. He will not credit the testimony of all ancient historians, sacred and profane, in regard to the antiquity of the Pentateuch—the proofs derived from the numerous monuments which attest that antiquity, additions to which are made from time to time by the discoveries in Palestine, Egypt, Nineveh, and other places—the multifarious institutions of the Hebrew church and nation, which postulate that antiquity with greater certainty than the institutions of this country and Great Britain corroborate the ages assigned to Rymer’s *Federa*, *Doomsday Book*, *Blackstone’s Commentary*, the *De-*

claration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States. And yet "those priestly impostors" manufactured the Constitution of the Hebrew nation, and all the historic details connected therewith, and palmed their forgery on the Jews, after they had been governed by it for more than a thousand years, and could produce ten thousand monuments and institutions, and a library of authentic records—Hebrew, Samaritan, Egyptian, Chaldee, and Persian—in evidence of its antiquity!

"We now hear of thousands of Abrahams, Isaacs, and Jacobs among the Jews," says Mr. Paine, "but the Bible does not contain one from the time that Abraham is said to have lived to the time of the Babylonish captivity—this can be accounted for but one way, which is, that before the Babylonish captivity the Jews had no such books as Genesis, nor knew anything of the names and persons it mentions, nor of the things it relates, and that the stories in it have been manufactured since that time." He puts Exodus, with the names of Moses and Aaron, in the same category—all modern priestly inventions! The argument is this: 'The Pentateuch is a fabrication of Hilkiah & Co., because the Jews did not give their children the names of Moses, Abraham, and other patriarchs, until after the captivity: the negative is proved by reference to books, which, as we have seen, are full of allusions to the law of Moses and constantly refer to the names of persons and places, facts and occurrences which make up the Pentateuchal record!

Again: "We do not hear—I speak for myself"—says Mr. Paine, "of any Jew of the present day of the name of Adam, Abel, Seth, Enoch, Methuselah, Noah, Shem, Ham, Japhet—the most extraordinary of all the names that make up the catalogue of the Jewish chronology. The names the Jews now adopt are those that are mentioned in Genesis after the tenth chapter, for the reason, the Jews consider the former not real, but fictitious or allegorical persons." It will not do to say in this case, *Credat Judæus Apella*, for there is not a real Jew upon the earth that would not laugh at such stupidity. Does

not the eleventh chapter of Genesis continue the history without any pause or mark of distinction—repeating the genealogy of Shem and bringing it down to Abram, Sarai, and Lot? And do not the genealogical names of the tenth chapter reappear in various parts of the succeeding books of the Bible, as the names of veritable persons the progenitors of powerful nations, some of which are still in existence, and the founders of cities, the ruins of which corroborate their Biblical history? If the first ten chapters be fable, so is the eleventh; and Abraham is as mythical a personage as Adam, and there ought not to be an Abraham among Mr. Paine's modern Jews, or an *Ibrahim* among his Arabs and Turks.

The practice of giving names to children expressive of some circumstance connected with their birth obtained very extensively during the Biblical periods of Jewish history, which accounts for the great variety of names found in their records. This practice, for the most part, ceased in later times, and it became fashionable to name children after the famous men of their nation; and as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses, were the first and most conspicuous among them, their names would naturally become the most popular. The names of antediluvian patriarchs would not so generally be used, because they were the ancestors of the Jews only as they were the ancestors of all the world beside; and yet *Noah* is a name that obtains among modern Jews—it means *comfort*, and this, apart from the historical association it suggests, may account for its being in vogue. Adam and Enos mean *man*—Abel means *vanity*—Shem means *name*—meanings which would not recommend them to popular use, especially as they do *not* belong to “the catalogue of the Jewish chronology.” It is a bright suggestion, that Adam, Noah, and Ham were Jews! But Mr. Paine makes them Jews, or there is no pertinency in his argument. An American historian may draw up a chronology of English heroes, but that would not be an American chronology; nor would the occurrence of such names as Ethelwolf, Edgar, Arthur, Stuart, Sidney, Pitt, and Wellington, lead us to suppose that Americans

would bring them into use as often as those of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Jackson, Webster, Clay, or Calhoun.

Mr. Paine wrote a book on Common Sense—had he so styled his Reply to Bishop Watson, the misnomer would have been a richer joke than any found in all his “Theological Works,” which, strange enough, are remarkable for their jocularity.

It requires the credulity of no ordinary type of infidelity—infidels being the most credulous creatures in the universe—to believe that Hilkiab, Ezra, and Nehemiah “constructed the fable of *the fall of man*”—an expression, by the way, not found in the Bible—out of an idea borrowed from the Persian Zendavesta, which refers to the *fall of the year*—that the *evil* thereby superinduced was the “evil of winter”—the *serpent* was the constellation so called—the apple (for Mr. P. will have it, it was an apple)—alludes to the fall of the year, the time when that fruit gets ripe—and “the midst of the garden,” in which the tree was planted, is nothing but “the mid-season between summer and winter”—the “coats” provided for Adam and Eve were a prudent provision for “the evil of winter, which made warm clothing necessary.” What a pity that Mr. Paine did not publish a work which he promised the world in which he would “speak fully of these things!” He ought to have been associated with the “priestly impostors” in the manufacture of this “cunningly-devised fable”—Genesis would then have come to us in a vastly improved form.

The book of Job is generally admitted to be one of the most obscure and difficult in the Bible; yet Mr. Paine says, “it is sublime, beautiful, and scientific—full of sentiment, and abounding in grand metaphorical description.” Marvelous! What could induce such a testimony? Why, “it is a book of the Gentiles.” Reason enough! Mr. Paine chuckles amazingly over this discovery. He says it is the work of the Persian Magi, translated by the Jews of the captivity and put

into their sacred books. The proof of all this is the sublimity of the book and its astronomical allusions! as if the Old Testament did not abound in such matter.—But Job dwelt in Uz, and “if Uz is the same as Ur, it was in Chaldea, the country of the Gentiles.” But if it was not, and every tyro in sacred geography knows it was not, what then?—Besides, how does he know that Ur was in Chaldea? He could learn this only from the book of Genesis, which he says is a fable—the names therein contained being fictitious.—The truth is, and everybody knows it, Job was not a Jew—he was an Idumean, Uz being in the country of Edom, which belonged to the descendants of Esau. It was called the land of Uz, doubtless, after Uz, the son of Dishan, one of the sons of Seir, a Horite, one of the original proprietors of that part of the country, which was called after him, Mount Seir. Esau took possession thereof. His first son was named Eliphaz, whose first son was named Teman—and these names identify the land of Uz with this portion of Idumea, and furnish strong proofs that the history in Genesis was well known to the author of the book of Job—who might have been a Gentile or a Hebrew for anything that appears to the contrary. Compare Gen. xiv. 6, xxxvi.—The patronymic of Dishan’s son, Uz, appears to have been Uz, grandson of Shem. Gen. x. 22, 23. 1 Chron. i. 17, 42. Jeremiah fixes the locality, “Rejoice and be glad, O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz.” Lam. iv. 21. And again: “Concerning Edom, thus saith the Lord of hosts, Is wisdom no more in Teman? Flee, O inhabitants of Dedan, for I will bring the calamity of Esau upon him—Bozrah shall become a desolation—Edom shall be a desolation: as in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah and the neighbor cities thereof. Hear the counsel of the Lord against Edom, and his purposes against the inhabitants of Teman.” Jer. xlix. 7–22. So Ezek. xxv. 13: “I will stretch out mine hand upon Edom, and I will make it desolate from Teman, and they of Dedan shall fall by the sword.” Amos i. 11, 12, in like manner identifies Edom, Teman, and Bozrah. Obadiah also speaks of Teman

as the mount of Esau, or a portion thereof. Joshua, moreover, places *Naamah* on the border of Edom—xv. 21, 41. Jeremiah xxv. 20–24 also associates Dedan, *Teman*, and *Buz*—Edom, Moab, and other countries, circumjacent to Palestine. Moses tells us that *Shuah* was the son, and Dedan, the grandson, of Abraham, by Keturah. Gen. xxv. Their descendants spread abroad in the region east of Canaan.

The Chaldeans and Sabeans, in their predatory excursions, would be as likely to visit Idumea as Palestine or any other region. They are represented as foreigners, invading the land of Uz, which was therefore not Ur of the Chaldees, as Mr. Paine, with his usual sagacity, supposes.

We have been thus precise in speaking of Job the Uzzite, Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shubite, Zophar the Naamathite, and Elihu the Buzite, not so much to correct the geography of Mr. Paine, as to show how the genuineness and authenticity of Pentateuchal and Prophetical Scriptures, collated with the book of Job, speak out in those numerous and incidental references to persons and places, many of which in themselves considered are of no importance.

Who Job was we cannot say with certainty. A scholium in the Greek, Arabic, and old Latin Vulgate versions of this book, there said to be taken from the Syriac, identifies Job with Jobab—it says he married an Arabian—that he was the son of Zerah, of the posterity of Esau, a native of Bozrah—so that he was the fifth from Abraham. This is the oldest account we have of the matter, and it was credited by Aristeus, Philo, Polyhistor, and the Greek and Latin fathers. This would make Job contemporary with Moses—both being descended from Abraham and Isaac. Thus Jacob and Esau were the sons of Isaac—their sons, respectively, Levi and Reuel—their sons, respectively, Amram and Zerah—and theirs, Moses and Jobab. Compare Gen. xxxvi. 17, 33. 1 Chron. i. 35–44. Ex. ii. And there is no possibility of disproving the very ancient opinion, that Moses wrote the history of his cousin. He had an opportunity to do so, either when he sojourned in Midian or when conducting Israel through the wilder-

ness. But if it was written by Job himself, or by one of his countrymen, and afterward, like the prophecies of Balaam, revised and by divine direction placed in the Jewish canon, as some suppose, its value is not thereby increased or diminished. The Jews recognized the reality of the character, and the canonicity of the book, of Job, as appears from Ezek. xiv. 14, 20—a passage, by the way, which shows they did not extract it from Persian fables, during the captivity. Josephus and Philo bear testimony to it, as belonging to the Hebrew canon, while Christians, of course, are satisfied with apostolic authority in the premises. Compare Job v. 13, 17. 1 Cor. iii. 19. Heb. xii. 5. James v. 10, 11.

The foregoing observations render it unnecessary to say much in reply to Mr. Paine's assertion that "the book of Job belongs either to the Persians, the Chaldeans, or the Egyptians, because the structure of it is consistent with the dogma that they held, that of a good and evil spirit, called in Job, God and Satan, existing as distinct and separate beings, and it is not consistent with any dogma of the Jews."—Suppose it was a Chaldean dogma, could not the Jews have derived it from the Chaldeans, Abraham himself having emigrated thence. Suppose it was Egyptian—could not the Hebrews have learned it during their long sojourn in Egypt, or afterward, in their frequent correspondences with that country? Were they absolute fools, until after they came in contact with the Persian Magi?—The truth is, all these nations acquired their information on this subject from one and the same original source, *viz*: the tradition of the temptation in Eden. Who or what was the *Nachash*, but the devil? Christ and the apostles never dreamed that he was anything else, nor have we any reason to suppose that Moses and the prophets entertained a different opinion. And the serpent worship which obtained in all countries from remote antiquity shows, that the heathen knew the serpent was the devil, and they symbolized him accordingly. The term Satan is a Hebrew word, meaning *adversary*, and is so used in 1 Sam. xxix. 4, 1 Kings xi. 14, 23, 24. v. 4. It could not have been first applied to the devil by the

author of the book of Job, because he speaks of Satan, as a well-known personage—although if we admit that Job was written before Psalms, then that book is the first place in which the title is so appropriated in the Bible. David uses the word in Ps. cix. and Zech. in c. iii.—but whether they mean by it a human or an angelic adversary is hard to say.

The agency of evil spirits in tempting men to sin, and in tormenting them, is distinctly recognized in 1 Sam. xvi. 14–23. xviii. 10—and as clearly distinguished from that of the Most High. “The Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him.” Compare 1 Kings xxii. 21–23. What were these evil spirits and lying spirits, but Satan, or fallen angels under his sway? Was there ever a Jew stupid enough to suppose that these evil spirits were one and the same being as the Lord God of Israel? And yet Mr. Paine says, “The belief of a good and an evil spirit, existing as distinct and separate beings, is not a dogma to be found in any of the books of the Bible.” It is not necessary for us to characterize that assertion. He has told us that he knew nothing about the Hebrew language: he might have spared himself the confession. Nobody that knows anything about Hebrew idioms wants to be told that the Hebrew writers frequently speak of a person’s doing a thing, or appointing a thing, which he only permits or does not prevent. Calvinists themselves, however inconsistently, are obliged to make this admission. Thus God’s hardening Pharaoh’s heart—selling Joseph into Egypt—sending an evil spirit to Saul and a lying spirit into Ahab’s prophets—simply means that he permitted the parties concerned to do the things affirmed of them, when he might have prevented them. Sometimes the passages which contain those idiomatic forms of expression are explained by others—as where Pharaoh is said to harden his own heart—where *Satan* is said to tempt David to number the people. Compare 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, 1 Chron. xxi. 1. At other times, it seems to be taken for granted that nobody will receive a wrong impression from the idioms employed; and as we believe that a man must be unusually stupid, or mali-

ciously captious, to bring this forward as an objection against the Bible, we will not waste any more ink upon it.

Mr. Paine says, "It was the Jews who dishonored God: it was the Gentiles who glorified him." How did the Jews dishonor him? Do not their sacred books constitute one continued protest against idolatry and polytheism? The Jews did dishonor God; but it was only when they imported the idolatries of the heathen around about them. From whom did they learn the worship of the host of heaven, but from Mr. Paine's famous astronomers, the Chaldeans? From whom did they learn brute and fetish worship, but from his scientific Egyptians? To what nations did Ashtoreth, Dagon, Moloch, the rabble of Baalim and the queen of heaven belong? Were not Chaldeans, Egyptians, Philistines, Ammonites, Zidonians—nay, all other nations but the Jews—most miserable idolaters? And were not all the Hebrew institutions purposely framed and adapted to keep the Jews from imitating the polytheistic practices of other people? And for what reason were they ultimately sent into captivity? Was it not for breaking through all restraints and falling into idolatry? And during the captivity did not the prophets perpetually and earnestly warn them from doing after the manner of the heathen, *viz*: the Chaldeans and Persians? who, according to Mr. Paine, were exemplary monotheists, but according to themselves, their monuments and histories being in evidence of the fact, were base idolaters, and withal some of the most abominable wretches that ever cursed the earth. These were "the Gentiles who glorified God!" Even so said Julian, the apostate, when in like manner he contrasted the pagans of his time with the followers of Christ—only Julian had not the hardihood to say that the Greeks and Romans did not worship more than one God.

Mr. Paine never loses an opportunity to vent his spleen against the practice of prayer. Of course his ancient monotheistic friends, the pious Persians, never prayed; and as the book of Job is a portion of the Persian liturgy, "in Job," says he, "we find adoration, and submission, but not prayer. Even

the ten commandments enjoin not prayer." It is a wonder then that Mr. Paine did not recognize their *Persian* origin and excellence, and practically regard them—whereas he pronounced them a base forgery, and violated the letter of some of them and the spirit of them all. But why did not the decalogue enjoin prayer? We answer this question by propounding another: Why did not the decalogue enjoin adoration? It forbids us to worship images, but does not command us to worship Jehovah? A slight examination of the decalogue will furnish the reason in both cases.

But is there no mention of prayer in the book of Job? Let us see. Passing over the third chapter, which Mr. Paine would have considered praying with a vengeance, had it been in a Jewish and not a *Persian* book—what means the advice of Eliphaz: "I would seek unto God, and unto God would I commit my cause"—that would be a recommendation of prayer in Isaiah or Matthew? This, too, sounds like prayer—almost like "discontented solicitation," as Mr. Paine elegantly words it—"O that I might have my request—that God would grant me the thing that I long for: even that it would please God to destroy me—that he would let loose his hand and cut me off." "Why dost thou not pardon my transgression, and take away mine iniquity?" Hear Bildad: "If thou wouldst seek unto God betimes and make thy supplication to the Almighty—he would awake for thee." That is not prayer, we suppose! Hear Job again: "I will say unto God, Do not condemn me; show me wherefore thou contendest with me." Is that not prayer? So Zophar: "If thou prepare thy heart and stretch out thy hands toward him—thou shalt forget thy misery." Is that not prayer? Eliphaz, in one place, supposes that Job had *restrained* "prayer before God," and assigns this as one reason for his calamities. But he was greatly mistaken, if this book represents the common practice of Job, for it is full of prayer. Indeed, Job thinks that they who do not pray are abominable wretches, who "say unto God, Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways. What is the Almighty, that we

should serve him? and what profit should we have if we pray unto him?" Let Thomas Paine answer these questions. He would not give an answer like that of Eliphaz: "Thou shalt make thy prayer unto him, and he shall hear thee, and thou shalt pay thy vows—the light shall shine upon thy ways." Elihu thought there is some profit in prayer: "Surely it is meet to be said unto God, I have borne chastisement, I will not offend any more. That which I know not, teach thou me." And, not to quote numerous other passages of like import, hear what God says in the epilogue of the drama: "Therefore take unto you now seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering; and my servant Job shall pray for you; for him will I accept: lest I deal with you after your folly, in that ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, like my servant Job. So Eliphaz the Temanite, and Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite, went and did according as the Lord commanded them: the Lord also accepted Job."

Yet Mr. Paine says, "In Job we find adoration and submission, but not prayer"—a fair specimen of his searching and honest criticisms.

In his "disconnected part" of the Reply to Bishop Watson, speaking of the Sabbath or Sunday, Mr. Paine says, "Had the bishop been acquainted with the history of astronomy he would have known that the period of seven days was originally a numerical division of time, and nothing more. Like any other of the artificial divisions of the year, it is only a fractional part thereof, contrived for the sake of counters." Now, we suppose Bishop Watson knew as much about astronomy as Thomas Paine; but no science or history can prove that the week was not originally a sacred division of time. We assert that it was. We have proved the antiquity of the Pentateuch, and that speaks of the Sabbath as set apart for religious purposes from the creation, Gen. ii.—it recognizes the cycle of seven days in Gen. vii. 4, 10; viii. 10 12—called a week, Gen. xxx. 27, 28. Compare Judges xiv.

17.—Est. i. marks it with deep religious emphasis in the falling of the manna, Ex. xvi.—incorporates it in the fourth commandment, Ex. xx.—repeats it, Ex. xxiii. and Deu. v.—and makes it the basis of the septennial and jubilee festivals of the Hebrew church and nation. Mr. Paine says the Pentateuch was written after the captivity, by priestly impostors, to give an historical prestige to their theocratical system—how comes it, then, that they did not state more explicitly the observance of the Sabbath by the antediluvian patriarchs? Why is it that the references to it are so few and indirect? And after the entrance into Canaan, how comes it that we hear nothing distinctly about its observance until the time of David, 1 Chron. xxiii. 31? We can furnish a ready answer. There was but little more occasion to speak of the Sabbath than there was of circumcision, of which no mention is made after the entrance into Canaan down to the time of Christ; and yet nobody will have the boldness to say that the posterity of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were not circumcised in their generations, during this period of fifteen hundred years. When, in consequence of the laxity of morals and the prevalence of idolatry, the Sabbath was neglected by the Jews, the prophets denounced them for their neglect, Isa. lvi. lviii.; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21; Neh. ix. 14, x. 28–33, xiii. 15–22; Eze. xx. 12–24; Hos. ii. 11. All this is just what we would expect to find in a genuine, truthful record—subjects occurring in a natural way, without any apparent anxiety in regard to the credibility of the statements recorded. Truth, having nothing to fear, is artless and unsuspecting.

The fact, triumphantly adduced by Mr. Paine, that heathen nations, in remote antiquity, recognized the septenary division of time, does not prove that it is a natural division. He cannot specify any nation that ever found out the weekly cycle by the quarters of the moon, as there is nothing remarkable in the appearance of that luminary at her first and third quarters. But as all men sprang from the same source—Adam the first, and Noah the second, father of the race—it is not to be wondered at that the principal nations of an-

tiquity had some knowledge of the Sabbath, of sacrifices, of the future state, and other great constituents of patriarchal faith and worship. By reference to these interesting facts, we establish not merely the Hebrew, but the ante-Mosaic origin of this great catholic institution, which Mr. Paine so cordially hates as a production of "ignorance, imposition, and priestcraft."

But any man who will assert that the law of Moses had no existence until the priests pretended to find a copy of it in the temple, in the reign of Josiah; and in the same breath assert that Hilkiyah, Ezra, and Nehemiah began to produce books under the names of the books of Moses; and that the Sabbaths spoken of seventy years before Josiah by Hosea, though particularly distinguished from the new moons, were lunar Sabbaths—not "Mosaic," but "Sabbaths of the idolatry," that is, heathen institutions:—any man that can bring together so many contradictions and absurdities, puts himself beyond the pale of reason.

Were Josiah and his subjects such fools as not to *know* that the Mosaic law was the constitution of their church and nation—although during the half century of Manasseh's preceding idolatrous and persecuting reign, the priests of the false gods having turned the temple into a pantheon and destroyed all the copies of the law they could find, we can readily conceive that the pious young king would be ignorant of a great many things contained therein. This was just the case. When the book of the law was found, the priests and the king were not as much surprised as Luther was when he found a Latin Bible in his monastery—though they were not less joyful than he at the discovery—and when the law was read Josiah did not, by its light, discern more evils to be corrected in the Jewish church than did the Augustinian monk in the Christian. In both cases, existing institutions verified the genuineness of the documents—of which there were, doubtless, numerous copies in the hands of private persons who had concealed them because of the inquisitorial proceedings of their persecutors—and in both cases, the documents,

thus brought to light, discovered and denounced the abuses that had been grafted on the respective systems of religion, and superinduced the most effectual means of reformation.

Mr. Paine's insinuation that the Heathen possessed the knowledge of a future state and that the Jews did not, and that the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body is a miserable conceit, does not deserve any notice. Traditions of patriarchal religion and outbeamings of the Hebrew faith gave the ancient Heathen some notions of a future state; but how they became distorted in their hands so as to be worse than useless, everybody knows that is acquainted with Egyptian, Oriental, Greek, and Roman mythology—of which Mr. Paine seems to have been profoundly ignorant.

Mr. Paine cannot conceive what is meant by Christ's coming in "the fulness of time." Of course, he cannot, if he denies the authenticity of the Bible and entertains "a well-founded suspicion that Christ did not exist even as a man—that he is merely an imaginary or allegorical character, as Apollo, Hercules, Jupiter, and all the deities of antiquity were: there is," he adds, "no history written at the time Jesus Christ is said to have lived that speaks of the existence of such a person even as a man." If he never came at all, it is useless to cavil about his coming in "the fulness of time;" and it shows great poverty of invention to make that expression the text for ignorant and vulgar diatribe.

The same remark applies to his reference to what he elegantly calls the "very stupid story of the apostles' having the gift of tongues." We shall not, of course, say anything in reply to his abortive attempts at wit and his successful efforts at blasphemy, in alluding to this well-attested and significant miracle. When, however, he says, "It was infinitely more important that man should be taught the art of printing than that Adam should be taught to make a pair of leather breeches or his wife a petticoat"—we may ask, why man was not taught that art, or why did he not discover it, until several thousands of years had elapsed? Will it be said, the fulness of time had not arrived before?—the world was not prepared

for it? But why was it not prepared? Why not say outright, God has never had anything to do with the affairs of men—there is no moral governor of the world—and then what becomes of Mr. Paine's boasted theism? Is it not as much as to say there is no God, as to say he does not govern the world?

Mr. Paine's fling at miracles is as silly as it is trite. It is an old trick to identify the miracles of the Bible with the lying wonders of paganism and popery; and Hume himself acknowledged the sophistry of the argument which opposes universal experience to particular testimony in regard to the credibility of miracles. So far as we know, however, Mr. Paine may claim the sole proprietorship of the argument that Jesus Christ had no divine mission, because he was "ignorant of the art of printing!" But why is the knowledge of printing, and, we will add, of the steam car and electric telegraph, so important in revealed religion, when natural religion, according to Mr. Paine, did very well without it? If he is disposed to catechise us with regard to the omissions and mysteries of the Bible, we can ask him questions enough of this sort in respect to his boasted Persian and Parisian systems of mythology and "theophilanthropy." They contain not one jot or tittle of good that was not taken from the revelations found in the Bible—while they ignore or deny a thousand important things therein contained.

The editor of Mr. Paine's Works says a portion of his Answer to Bishop Watson was incorporated in his Letter to Erskine on the Prosecution of Thomas Williams for publishing the Age of Reason.

We have read this famous Letter with some care, and consider it a silly production. It cites at length the first and second chapters of Genesis, and tries to show a discrepancy between these two accounts of the creation—alluding to what *learned* men have more distinctly marked and characterized, as the *Elohistic*, *Jehovistic*, and *Jehovah-Elohistic* style in speaking of the Supreme Being—a curiosity of literature which does not affect the authenticity or genuineness of the

record. He says that Gen. i. 27 and Gen. ii. 7, 21, 22 are at variance. This is not so: the former passage speaks in general terms of the creation of the human species, male and female—the latter details the process, the male being formed immediately out of the earth and the female out of the male—where is the contradiction?

He says one and the same person could not say, as in Gen. i. 29, that God gave our first parents every tree, and, as in Gen. ii. that the Lord God planted a tree and forbade man to eat of it!—A bright conception, truly!—as if there could not be a grant made in general terms and then a special exception or limitation inserted in the grant or appended to it.

Here is another bright thought: “One and the same person could not say, ‘Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them, and on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made,’ and shortly after set the Creator to work again, to plant a garden, to make a man and a woman, *etc.*, as is done in the second chapter.”—Does the second account state that any thing said in the former account to have been created in the six days was created after the rest of the seventh day? It does not. Why then might not both accounts be true, and both proceed from one source.

Mr. Paine insinuates that the care of the garden was inconsistent with dominion over all the earth. We should like to know why. He intimates that the events recorded in the second story are fabulous, because they are not contained in the first story. But then he says, both are fabulous: we say both are true; and the “second story” was inserted for the very reason that it contains things not contained in the first, yet perfectly consistent therewith.

He objects to the general deluge because it was “so tremendously severe and merciless.” But that does not prove it never happened. Must infidels be pointed for the ten thousandth time to the tremendously severe and merciless instances of providential interposition in the destruction of millions upon millions by floods, and fires, and earthquakes, and fa-

mines, and plagues, which are constantly recurring in the Divine administration. Mr. Paine as a theist, will not put these calamities beyond the providence of God, although without the Bible he cannot assign the reasons for them, or justify the ways of God to men in such severe visitations.

He tries to disprove the account of the deluge by charging it with an anachronism in the mention of the clean and unclean animals—a distinction which, he says, never obtained before the giving of the law of Moses. But he says in another place that God never gave the Israelites that law, but that it was forged by Hilkiah in the days of Josiah, and by Ezra and others after the captivity—the Jews being pagans until that time. What then is the use of referring to the Mosaic distinction of clean and unclean animals, if no such distinction obtained until the times of Hilkiah and Nehemiah—who by the way, were not contemporaries by one hundred and seventy-eight years?—But to the point: We have proved that the Pentateuch is true; and where does it say that the distinction between clean and unclean animals originated with Moses? Who can prove it did not obtain in the times of Adam and Abel, who offered a *lamb*, a clean animal, in sacrifice? Abraham lived before Moses, and offered sacrifices too, and all the animals that he offered were those that are prescribed in Leviticus. Compare Gen. xv. The distinction did not refer exclusively or primarily to *the table*, but to *the altar*; and like circumcision and the Sabbath, it was very naturally and pertinently incorporated into the Levitical law. Where is the anachronism?

With all his opposition to miracles and severe providences, Mr. Paine can admit of both, on occasion—that is to say, when Jews are to be the victims. It seems they were pure pagans for a thousand years—“they then established a law, which they called the law of the Lord given by Moses, and were destroyed; and it is very remarkable,” says he, “that no sooner had they established it than they were a destroyed people, as if they were punished for acting an imposition and

affixing the name of the Lord to it, and massacring their former priests under the pretence of religion"!—It seems then, miracles are not impossible: they do occur sometimes: here is one about which there can be no mistake; for, says Mr. Paine, "This is not opinion but historical evidence." We agree with him so far, that there was a special interposition of Providence, "tremendously severe," as well in their Babylonish as in their Roman captivity; but we affirm that this took place because of their violation of the law of Moses, which threatened them with all the evils they suffered in consequence of disobedience.—Of this we have abundant historical proofs furnished by records and monuments whose genuineness is invincible to all the attacks of infidelity.

Mr. Paine says the Bible "has been read more and examined less than any [other] book that ever existed." Had he said it has been examined more than all other books that ever existed, he would perhaps have come nearer the truth. However, this must be said, that if Biblical critics *examined* it in a manner so superficial as that of Mr. Paine, we say nothing now about the spirit in which he has turned over its pages—they might as well spare their pains.

Having been graveled by Bishop Watson so completely, in regard to the contradictions charged upon the Bible in the second part of the Age of Reason, he has to make a fling at the Bishop about the obscure parts of the Bible, which require learning and labor to make them plain:—"It is because the Bible needs such an undertaking, that is one of the first causes to suspect it is not the word of God. What! does not the Creator of the universe, the Fountain of all wisdom, the Origin of all science, the Author of all knowledge, the God of order and of harmony, know how to write? The writings of Thomas Paine, even of Thomas Paine, need no commentator to explain, expound, arrange, and rearrange their several parts, to render them intelligible—he can relate a fact, or write an essay, without forgetting in one page what he has written in another.—For my own part, my belief in the perfection of the

Deity will not permit me to believe that a book so manifestly obscure, disorderly and contradictory can be his word. I can write a better book myself."

A modest passage that! Now, without stopping to compare the Bible with the Age of Reason, let us compare it with the book of Nature, which Mr. Paine calls his Bible. Are there no mysteries in that volume? Mr. Paine's pagan friends have studied it closely for thousands of years, and what is the knowledge they have derived from it? Some of them have learned from it that two principles govern the world—one good and the other evil—and nothing but the Bible can prove the opinion false. Others have learned from it that there are thirty thousand, or as his Chinese friends, of whom he is so proud, would say, as many millions of deities that rule the universe—all candidates for man's homage and obedience. Others, like his compatriots in France, have gathered from it that there is no God at all. Why this obscurity, contradiction, mystery? We fear that the stars which Mr. Paine loves so much to read—"the stars are poor books"—as Hubert says—they fail to give us the first principles of religion and morals. How many ages was it before man found out what the heavenly bodies are—their size—their distances, their motions, the forces by which they move! The same ignorance, connected with the grossest errors, prevailed in regard to every other department of nature and science. And even now, how many millions of mysteries are there in creation and providence—and apparent contradictions too—which baffle and nonplus the mind of the philosopher. So multiplied are they, that we are bold to affirm there can be no such thing as the religion of nature—unless doubts, and fears, and bold assumptions, and bald superstitions can constitute religion. Divine revelation alone can so far clear up the mysteries of nature and providence as to allow of the exercise and development of faith, hope, and charity, the grand elements of a rational and practical, or, to speak properly, a scriptural piety. The Bible no where affirms that much learning is necessary to make a man a Christian. The

inspired volume has shallows in which a lamb might wade—as Mr. Paine could have proved had he made the experiment: it has also depths in which an elephant might swim, and in which whole armies of proud, caviling infidels have been drowned—albeit the case of Mr. Paine shows that that might be effected in some of its most shallow places.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

ART. II.

PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY. By MARY SOMERVILLE, Author of the "Connection of the Physical Sciences," "Mechanism of the Heavens," &c., &c. Second American, from the new and revised London edition. With Additions and a Glossary prepared for this edition. Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1850. 12mo.

The most attractive story in M^{de}. De Genlis' 'Tales of a Castle—a work almost forgotten now with the excluded Orleans dynasty, for the instruction of whose young princes it was originally composed, but which, some fifty years ago, was the delight of children, and not without a lively interest for their elders—was devoted to the narrative of a long imaginary tour through various regions, and to a graphic delineation of the curiosities, wonders, peculiarities, and unfamiliar phenomena, which the several parts of the world afforded. All that was then known most marvellous in the productions and operations of nature, and in the usages of men, was diligently collected together, and skilfully exhibited in this supposed circumnavigation of the globe, so as to throw the charm of romance over realities, and to clothe instruction with the seductive graces of a fairy tale. But this museum of prodigies, amazing as it once appeared to us, dwindles into very insignificant proportions, when contrasted with the exuberant variety of surpri-

sing facts, discovered or rendered familiar in more recent years by the untiring and diversified labors of naturalists, the acute and persevering researches of men of science, and the arduous explorations of accomplished travellers. Schleiden reveals more wonders in the internal economy of a single plant than Mdme. De Genlis could cull in her whole ideal perambulation of the earth. The world, and all that therein is, could not supply to the *dilettanti* of her day miracles, as numerous or as startling, as Hugh Miller discerns in a single extinct fish, Schacht in the growth of a tree, or Eifrenberg in a cubic inch of Tripoli. Each of the separate sciences, devoted to a special province of nature, has extended its range into singular obscurities, and augmented the wealth of our curious information. Each has pressed its investigations into the most remote corners of the earth, and into the most recondite mysteries of the economy of creation; and, from its varied search, each has brought back a rich harvest of acquisitions, like the honey-bee returning to its hive from its devious wanderings, in which it has hovered over every flower, and extracted for future use the nectar it contained. When the results, thus separately obtained by laborious investigations in the different departments of scientific speculation, are brought together, collated, harmonized and arranged, so as to reflect mutual light upon each other, and to furnish the connected materials for the inauguration of a new science, the sum of the discoveries, thus combined into a single aggregate, bears a similar relation, in order and abundance, to Mdme. De Genlis' cabinet of wonders, that is borne by the subterranean treasure-chambers of Oriental fiction to the trinket-box of a modern lady of fashion.

Such, too, is the character of the analogy between the modern science of Physical Geography—if it is not premature to term it a science as yet—and the tale in the *Veilles de Château*, to which we have alluded. In its popular aspects, which are those principally presented by Mrs. Somerville, Physical Geography may be regarded as the conglomeration and systematization of all the curious information connected

with the action of the general laws of nature and with the remarkable phenomena of the globe we inhabit, as these are modified by diverse influences in its several regions and climates. It arranges under specific heads and methodizes the various knowledge already gained with respect to the different provinces of nature, as exhibited in their spontaneous development on our planet:—treating of the relation of the earth to the planetary system; of the figure of the globe, of its constituents, their order, and their disposition;—of the direction and conformation of continents, and the forces which have concurred in the production of such direction and conformation;—of mountains, valleys, plains, table lands, and deserts, and of the infinite variety which these introduce into the operations of nature, as well as into the aspect of the landscape; of the locality of precious stones, metals and minerals, their relative abundance and value in different places, and the conditions which attend their deposition;—of the distribution of sea and land, and the consequences of this distribution; of springs, river-systems, cataracts, and lakes, and of that bounteous economy of nature which provides so simply and effectually for the maintainance of all her productions, and for their ever changing beauty, by the abundant, but neither regular nor universal, diffusion of the waters which replenish the earth. Physical Geography further examines into the diversities of climates, their causes, conditions, and effects; it tracks around the globe the undulating lines of temperature, isothermal, isotheral, isochimical; it considers the fitful cycle of meteorological change, and the daily recurring variations of those atmospheric influences, which are essential to animate and inanimate existence, as well as to human health and enjoyment. The vapors, the dews, the fogs, the clouds, the rains, the frosts, the snows, the winds, the lightning, the thunder, and the tempest, with the only half revealed mysteries of light, heat, magnetism, and electricity, all contribute their secrets to swell the tale of wonder which this new and attractive science undertakes to narrate. From the study of the inorganic world, this pursuit

conducts us to the contemplation of the more complicated phenomena of life, vegetable and animal, which are so absolutely dependent for their being and characteristics upon the constitution of the globe whereon they are placed, and upon the unintelligent, but not unguided, forces, which have operated, and are operating around them. From the investigation of the mysterious agencies which are the ministers of life, though claiming also for themselves an extensive field of independent action, we pass to the phenomena of vegetation, and the modifications experienced by it in different latitudes, continents, and circumstances. The multiform phases of vegetable production are exhibited in their due order and in their reciprocal relations, so far as their varieties of aspect are distinctly attributable or connected with geographical position, or other cognizable mundane influences. The gradual progression of vegetable development, from the mosses and lichens of the frozen barrens which surround the poles, to the useful and pleasing variety of the temperate zones, and the brilliant luxuriance of the tropics, receives ample illustration from the researches of Physical Geography. The examination of the Flora of the different regions of the earth exemplifies also the variety of action which the general laws of nature admit, within a certain limited range; and explains the characteristic differences of aspect which appertain to the several continents and their dependent islands. Even the depths of the ocean are penetrated by the scrutiny of this science; and with the same diligence with which it traced the currents and the tides, it explores the tangled sylvia of the world of waters, and recounts the vegetable wonders of the great deep. From the vegetable it proceeds to the animal kingdom, following round the globe, and from the equator to the poles, the disposition of the families of each order of animated being. The distribution of the tribes of insects, of fishes, of reptiles, of birds, and of the mammalia, are noted in due succession. Thus, though scarcely enabled by this long exposition of terrestrial phenomena to discover the laws or the reasons which link together the varieties of creation, associated in definite and ap-

appropriate localities, we are at any rate provided with rich materials for such an investigation, and are delighted with the full and complete portraiture of nature under all her visible forms and conditions which is presented for our study and admiration. The closing view of this vast panorama, as the final chapter of Mrs. Somerville's book, is devoted to man, unto whom the dominion over the creatures of the earth, and the enjoyment of its fruits, have been graciously accorded by the divine framer of the magnificent scene, through which we have gradually ascended, proceeding from the elementary forms of nature to its crowning achievement. It is not man, however, in his individual character and capacity, who is contemplated by Physical Geography, but mankind in the aggregate, as one of the constituent phenomena of the habitable globe. It is not man in his earthly trial and temptation, in his individual aims and caprices, in his passions, his moral duties, and his responsibilities, nor in his immortal hopes and final destiny, who enters into the composition of the picture, but man simply as one of the occupants of the soil, and so far as humanity has affected, or is affected by the other phenomena of the sublunary system. The marked distinctions which divide the human family into races, of different capacities, habits, tastes, tendencies, and destinies; the dissimilarities of language, feature, government, religion, social organization, and civilization, which seem connected with this diversity of race, and with its subdivisions; the geographical limits within which the fortunes of the nations have been respectively worked out; the comparative numbers of distinct peoples, and their reciprocal dependence upon the special economy of nature under which they have been developed; their separate and conjoint action in subduing the world to the uses of men, and in advancing, in dissimilar degrees, and by discrepant modes, the progress of humanity; the original abodes of the several races, and their voluntary, compulsory, or systematic migrations, and the results of this restlessness on the aspect and productions of the earth--these and their kindred topics, fall within the domain of Physical Geography, or may be

brought under its jurisdiction by the employment of a little violence.

This circumscription of the province of Physical Geography will afford a full and distinct, if not very compact idea of its objects and professions, and may render its character more intelligible than is done by Mrs. Somerville's condensed, but not more precise definition of the science. "Physical Geography," says she, "is a description of the earth, the sea, and the air, with their inhabitants, animal and vegetable, of the distribution of these organized beings, and the causes of that distribution." This is awkward at the same time that it is unsatisfactory. The perusal of her own volume, or of any other treatise on this subject, will prove that, in her own estimation, as in the view of other cultivators of this study, Physical Geography embraces much which is excluded by this definition, and neglects more which might be comprehended by these terms. The task of definition is always an exceedingly delicate and difficult one, and this is especially the case when the attempt is made to define concisely the objects of an incipient and unformed science, whose boundaries are still undetermined, or imperfectly traced. A provisional definition must be employed, although perceived to be faulty and inadequate; but it will subserve a useful purpose in indicating, rather than in limiting, the range of the science, and may be judiciously employed until further investigation has rendered greater precision both possible and indispensable in the specification of its functions. We do not notice the imperfections, then, of Mrs. Somerville's definition, which are perhaps inevitable, for the purpose of cavilling at them, or criticizing them; but simply to justify the more diffuse and tedious method, which we have preferred in order to give a clear and satisfactory elucidation of the nature and purposes of this novel branch of learning. We must add, too, in justice to her, that our specification of its several provinces, is, in the main, an abridgment of the table of contents prefixed to her book. And, in justice to ourselves, we must further state, that the numerous aberrations from a strictly methodical arrangement

of its several inquiries are due to our having followed, with almost unwavering fidelity, the thread which she had thus placed in our hands to guide us through the endless turnings and intricate labyrinths of this study. Had we been free to adopt our own course, we should, in many instances, have departed from the order which she has pursued, and would have sought a stricter concatenation, and a more symmetrical harmony between the diverse parts of this many-sided subject, by slight transpositions and modifications of its constituent members. So little regard, however, is ordinarily paid in these days, to any strictly logical method of treatment, and there is so little appreciation, in general, of the beauty, the simplicity, the perspicuity, and the philosophical precision thence resulting, that we should have earned but scanty gratitude by an elaborate re-arrangement of the several divisions, which to many persons might have seemed to be marshalled in as arbitrary a manner after any such labour, as before. Moreover, this effort, whether successful or not, would have occupied of itself the whole space accorded to a single essay; it would have been tedious and unacceptable to the majority of readers, and it would have compelled us to forego entirely the examination of other topics of more immediate importance and more general interest.

From the exposition already given it appears that Physical Geography proposes to itself the contemplation of our planet, as diversified in aspect and condition by the action of the general laws of nature, and not as distributed into states and territories by political organizations, or separated into fragmentary divisions by artificial lines and arbitrary boundaries. Political and arbitrary divisions are disregarded, the sea and the land are considered only with respect to those great features that have been stamped upon them by the hand of the Almighty, and man himself is viewed but as a fellow-inhabitant of the globe with other created things, yet influencing them to a certain extent by his actions, and influenced in return. Thus, the distribution of races, and the demarcations of geological formations and of vegetable or other districts, are con-

sidered to the exclusion of national organizations and territorial limits. It certainly, however, falls within the scope of this science to remark the tendency, which is daily becoming more manifest, towards an agreement between natural and national boundaries. The rapid extension of the United States, the proposed union between Portugal and Spain, the desire of the French to push back the frontiers of France to the Rhine, the agitation of a kingdom of Italy, the claim of Russia to an effective protectorate over the states of the Greek Church, the consolidation of Sweden and Norway, the long achieved union of England and Scotland—these, and many other instances, present themselves to our notice as exemplifications of the progressive tendency of events to substitute natural for artificial distinctions even in the constitution of states. It is true that all these measures, even if satisfactorily accomplished, would afford only a partial approximation to any intimate agreement between physical and arbitrary divisions; but they would confirm the tendency, and might suggest the probability of a close harmony with the further progress of change. For, it is obvious, that a difference of race is always accompanied by difference of character, and this alone is an element of dissociation where dissimilar races have been accidentally or violently linked together under a common government. The relations of Ireland and England, of Hungary and Austria, and the late war in Schleswig-Holstein, illustrate this. It is equally manifest that differences of climate and geological conformation, accompanied, as they necessarily are, by differences of production and of political and social requirement, occasion also diversities of interests, which, though they may be long harmonized, either by the watchful superintendence of governments, or by the spontaneous action of the people, while the population is flourishing and not too much crowded, nor too artificially developed, must ultimately produce serious discrepancies, and necessitate organizations correspondent with the range of the physical dissimilarities under which each is respectively placed. It is an enigma, which we are neither able, nor do we propose to solve, to determine

whether these tendencies will ever attain complete or extensive realization; all that we profess to do is, to indicate the existence of such a tendency, in order to show the intimate dependence which actually exists between the apparently arbitrary actions of humanity and the concomitant arrangements of nature. It has been shown by an able writer elsewhere,* that the distribution of the population of Great Britain among the cities, mines, seaports, and country; the location of the manufacturing towns, and the dispersion of races of different origin among their several settlements in the British Isles, are problems which receive an almost complete and satisfactory explication from the consideration of the disposition of the geological conditions alone. There is another point, too, connected with this question, which we will not undertake to solve. It is whether both modes of agreement with physical distinctions may not co-exist under the same national organization; that is to say, whether, in process of time, the great natural landmarks, mountain chains, rivers, seas, gulfs, deserts, &c., may not be adopted as the external boundaries of states, and their internal economy and sub-divisions be regulated at the same time by geological or other natural conditions. An example of this, and it is only as an example that it is proposed, would be afforded, if the river St. Lawrence, the chain of the great lakes, the line external to the head-waters of the Missouri, and the Oregon river, were to be taken as the northern boundary of the United States—a line not much divergent from the present political limit, and if the gulf of Mexico and the Isthmus of Panama were to form their southern boundary. With the Atlantic ocean on the east, and the Pacific on the west, the political demarcations would be almost completely natural, and would be scarcely rendered more so by extending the northern frontier to the Arctic ocean, or to the pole. Thus the political outline would cease to be arbitrary, and become consonant with the physical characteristics of the continent. If, at the same time, that this change was effected, the separate states were divided by mountain chains,

* Edinburgh Review. April 1849. Art. I.

bays, lakes, and rivers, as many of them are at present; and if these states were again sub-divided for their domestic government by such limits, or by the geological alterations of the soil, or by the changes of culture or production, or by differences in the race of the original settlers, if any colonization of distinct races should occur or be perpetuated, then the agreement between the natural and artificial distinctions of the country would be complete in its subordinate parts. Any one, who will run his eye over the map of the United States, especially if it be a geological map, and will bear in mind the history and economical character of its several parts, will be surprised to notice how closely this natural organization has been approached in the spontaneous growth and co-ordination of the country. These principles have not been uniformly observed, they have seldom indeed been consciously recognized, but the result proves that they have been very frequently adopted without design, by a sagacious instinct, in practice.

The case, which we have proposed, has been employed merely as an example. The same principles admit of much more minute and varied application, and this minuteness and variety would be both more beneficial and more likely to occur in proportion to the density of population, the division of labor, the concentration of capital, the multiplicity of avocations, and the augmentation of the causes of dissension or diversity of interests among the inhabitants. The question, however, is propounded merely as a speculation, except so far as its partial solution already indicates the concurrence of artificial arrangements with physical distinctions, or rather the tendency to such accordance.

The inquiry thus indicated, if entertained at all by Physical Geography, would properly belong to its latest speculations, although it has been suggested to our minds by Mrs. Somerville's opening remarks, and discussed in connection with them. It shows that the original divergence between Political and Physical Geography, which it is so important to note at the outset, and to bear continually in mind whilst the present relations of

states prevail, may, after all, be only temporary, and may ultimately admit of satisfactory elimination. Here, however, we trench so decidedly on the treacherous domain of future and contingent history, that it is advisable to arrest our footsteps, and return to the point whence we digressed.

Physical Geography proceeds from the simplest phenomena of matter, as these are exhibited in the present constitution of the globe, and, rising through all the complicated changes of the elements, and the progressive forms of life, it concludes with the consideration of the tribes of humanity, and the manner in which these have been affected in time and in space by the medium wherein the several acts and scenes of human history have transpired, or in which they have affected that medium itself. There is a double movement at all times going on; and every where, as well as in mechanics, the action and the reaction are proportionate to each other. The progress of man has been aided by the forces and conditions of external nature; it has been attended with great modifications of the appearance, production, and character of a large portion of the earth's surface; and it has suffered or been benefitted in turn by the spontaneous consequences of the changes which it has effected. All of these points receive partial illustration in the course of physical geography.

This branch of speculation, nevertheless, does not undertake to discover the laws of nature, or to determine the modes of their operation. It deals only with their results, and visible effects. It is a science of description, not of demonstration; of consequences, not of causes; of the classification of phenomena by the demarcations of place, not of the co-ordination of natural laws by their intrinsic interdependence. It is a science of combination, aggregation, and agglutination, not of spontaneous development. It is exogenous, not endogenous. It expands by the addition of foreign materials, not by the manufacture and provision of its own. It gathers the ripe fruits from all quarters, and only claims the merit of their skilful combination and application, so as to make them subservient to other uses than those contemplated in their growth.

It pre-supposes the knowledge of the laws and their operation, as distinct but necessary prerequisites for the teacher; it requires only the recognition and remembrance of the resulting phenomena, and the special truths borrowed from other sources, on the part of the pupil. In other words, it exhibits only the complete picture, with its blended hues, rounded figures, and significant groups; it does not explain whence the colors are obtained, how they have been tested, after what fashion they have been mixed, nor by what rules the outlines of the separate parts have been ascertained. Animals of the higher orders of creation require their nutriment to be in some degree prepared, digested, and assimilated to the fibre of their own bodies, in the great laboratory of nature, before it is suitable for their food. The rude elements and crude forms of matter must have undergone vegetation and often animalization, before they are adapted for human sustenance: but the plants and the zoophytes extract their support from the inorganic world without the intervention of any such intermediate elaboration. So Physical Geography employs the fruits already cultivated, organized, and matured by other sciences, and uses them as the *pabulum* for a new scientific organism.

Metaphors and analogies are always dangerous; and we have been betrayed by the similitude just introduced into the hazard of appearing to represent Physical Geography as a science more highly organized and of loftier character than the sciences on which it is founded. Such was not our intention; the position would be entirely erroneous. The descriptive sciences in general, Botany, Mineralogy, Anatomy, Geography, &c., constitute the lowest grade of sciences; though some even of these are gradually claiming, by their more extended and profound mode of treatment, to partake of the complexion of the demonstrative sciences, and to participate in their superior dignity. There is, however, another class of descriptive sciences, among which Physiology, Geology, and Physical Geography may be enumerated, which approximate much more closely to the demonstrative than to the descriptive sciences. In form, they resemble the type of the latter;

in development, they are assimilated to the former. This class of sciences does not restrict itself to the simple observation and registry of a particular circle of facts; but it combines into new systems, and in dependence upon all the laws of nature hitherto discovered, the results which have been arrived at by such discoveries. They are, therefore, in some sort, a summation of previous science, as well as new sciences themselves; and are consequently entitled to a high, though not to the highest rank among the sciences. Physical Geography is scarcely perfect enough as yet to occupy this eminence without challenge; but it makes pretensions to this dignity, which may be ratified by its subsequent development; and it already appropriates and incorporates the choicest treasures won by the other branches of scientific investigation. To estimate the value and test the accuracy of these materials, requires, of course, an extensive acquaintance with the whole circle of the sciences, whose laws it undertakes to apply, and whose conclusions it uses in the construction of its own edifice. Yet, indispensable as this knowledge must be, it is rarely suffered to appear otherwise than in its consequences; like the foundations of a palace, it is sunk deep in the ground below the walls which it sustains.

These considerations may enable us to appreciate the amount of information, and the range of scientific acquirement, which should be in the possession of any one who would write a reliable treatise on Physical Geography for either popular instruction or educational use. They afford strong intimations also of the caution, the tact, the skill, the patient and persevering industry, the philosophic fulness of comprehension, and the artistic capacity, which must be applied in order to separate the important from the unnecessary; to distinguish and exhibit the true significances; to combine the varied materials into one picture; to avoid incongruities and unwarrantable inferences; to place everything in its just light, giving it only its due proportions; and to render each part illustrative of the rest, so as to make the whole a grand and truthful ecomorama. It is a picture of the world to which we are in-

vited by this study ;—not a loose narration of its disconnected wonders, but a graphic delineation of the mighty scene of creation, as exemplified on the wide extent of the land and the broader expanse of the waters. The task is one of magnificent amplitude and calculated to reward the loftiest aspirations. It consequently demands for its adequate fulfilment remarkable talents and extraordinary attainments. Any literary botcher, with a copious library at hand, from which to borrow his paints and figures, could produce a daub, and besmear the whole surface of the large canvass with promiscuous colors, running confusedly into each other. But, to compose a work of scientific reliability and of high literary art, which shall embrace and fill the vast compass of the prescribed orbit, exacts the display of the highest attributes of genius.

Mrs. Somerville entered upon the enterprise with every prestige in her favour. Her industry, perseverance, and acuteness had been proved by previous successes in fields rarely cultivated by female intellects: her talents were acknowledged; and her remarkable scientific acquirements—peculiarly remarkable in a lady—were freely and cordially admitted. In the circles of science she had a known and honourable position; and the flattering testimonials which have been published relative to the work now noticed, establish her general reputation, even if they should appear more applicable to her accredited abilities than to the actual merits of the book. We are neither able, nor do we desire to deny, that she had given such previous evidences of scientific knowledge and talent, that a satisfactory treatise might have been confidently anticipated at her hands on the new but congenial subject to which she had directed her attention. Her “Mechanism of the Heavens” fully justifies her celebrity as a learned student and skilful expositor of astronomy. Her “Connection of the Physical Sciences” testified her possession of the rare capacity to discriminate between the general and the special,—the essential and the accidental; to discover analogies, affinities and intimate relations in the midst of the chaos of apparent discords; and to discern the principles and form of unity

through all the shifting shapes of multiform phenomena. Thus, many of the highest functions of intellect required for her new pursuit had been already exhibited by her in a very creditable degree; and the hope of excellence in the new production was easily transmuted into an expectation so assured that conviction of the fact seems in many instances to have preceded any careful examination. This, at least, is the only mode in which the reputation enjoyed without dispute by this book, and the numerous tributes to its extraordinary ability and perfection paid by eminent authorities, are rationally explicable in our estimation. High merits it does undoubtedly possess, and its truest praise is that it has thrown open the doors of a valuable and interesting science to a multitude of readers. But, whatever be the value of the knowledge compiled in it, whatever the skill of its general arrangement and execution, its success and distinction have, in our opinion, very far transcended its intrinsic excellences.

This is a perilous assertion, but it can be, we think, fully sustained. The success of the treatise is undeniable, and is scarcely to be regretted, for it has given currency to an immense body of useful and attractive information, which might otherwise have been tardy in percolating into the channels of popular knowledge. Its distinction, if not fully earned, may be a more serious misfortune, by ministering to the prevalent laxity of thought; and producing in the minds of its readers and students the impression of an excellence which does not exist; of accuracy, when its statements cannot be unhesitatingly received; of propriety and severity of speculation, when its reasonings are often illogical and therefore inconclusive. If science is to remain science, and to continue to subserve a useful purpose, its positions must be scrupulously and cautiously correct; its method orderly and perspicuous; and its inferences models of reasoning, which may be accepted with security, and imitated with advantage. If these excellences are not fully attained, the foundations of science are undermined, and rendered insecure, whether the failure be due, wholly or in part, to ignorance, carelessness, or awkward-

ness of utterance. We shall not venture to attribute the first of these defects to Mrs. Somerville, for we discover neither grounds nor necessity for the charge, which we would deem to be unjust. But the indications of the two latter faults are numerous in our opinion, and seriously impair the value of a book, which does not cease to be interesting in proportion to its inaccuracy of ratiocination.

Its current reputation might with propriety have been left undisturbed, if it had been calculated only for the perusal of those who could readily detect its errors and neutralize its paralogisms. But its very popularity, and especially its introduction into schools, demand a notice of its defects. For, a popular treatise, or an educational text book, more imperatively requires clearness, precision, and cogency of reasoning, than original essays on the like topics offered to the consideration only of those already initiated in their respective subjects. The course of instruction is otherwise impregnated with poison, and the very act of learning is rendered instrumental in destroying the tone and vigor of the mind which it was designed to strengthen and inform. There is no branch of literature which should be more carefully watched, or more scrupulously kept free from all taint of error, than elementary works, which furnish to the young and to the multitude their earliest, and very often their sole acquaintance with the studies to which they are devoted. Nor is this the only, nor the chief injury inflicted by negligence of this sort. Habits of carelessness and inaccuracy are generated, in the pupil, which can rarely be eradicated by any subsequent effort; and the mind is trained in a course of vicious practices, from which it can scarcely extricate itself in later years. These important principles, it is true, are very frequently disregarded both in the composition and estimation of such treatises; but neither their truth nor their importance is affected by this culpable indifference. It becomes, indeed, in consequence, a more urgent duty to insist upon these doctrines, and, on every favourable opportunity, to make a striking example of such essays as flagrantly violate the rule. It would be useless, however,

to select, for such exemplification, the trashy publications, whose dullness, ignorance, and blundering are manifest to the most incurious inspection. They bear their own sentence of condemnation, branded by voluntary indiscretion on their pages, and are either summarily consigned to the oblivion they deserve, or live on obscurely only to deceive and beguile those whose eyes could not be opened by any critical process to the nature and extent of the delusion. The instance chosen should, therefore, always be some illustrious example—the lesson taught should be *in insigni materia*—both to make manifest the insidious character of the danger to be avoided, and to instil caution even in those cases wherein the celebrated names of the authors might apparently render such caution unnecessary. These are the reasons which have induced us to question the reputation of the present volume, in the midst of its career of success and prosperity, and undeterred by the numerous and high testimonials which have bestowed on it its eminence.

Of the abilities and merits of Mrs. Somerville herself, we shall say as little as possible. We take pleasure in acknowledging that these are of a high order, and that great credit is due to her for their exhibition in a manner and degree rarely accorded to a lady; for the rough, and thorny, and tedious walks of science are well calculated to repel the delicate feet of ladies from any journey over their sharp pebbles, beyond a brief and occasional excursion. Nor shall we say much more in regard to the absolute merits of her *Physical Geography*, although we do not estimate these as highly as has been done by most others. But we shall not cavil at the extent to which praise has been accorded, where it has been really merited, even if indisposed to join as lustily as the rest in the eulogy. Mrs. Somerville exhibits great variety and abundance of information, an adequate acquaintance with the different branches of physics, a large comprehension of the relations of scientific truth, and a happy faculty of harmonizing the most dissimilar materials, and converting them to use. Had

she never abandoned the domestic avocations which constitute the ordinary pursuits of women, in order to achieve loftier aspirations, she might have earned celebrity by ingenious patchwork, if the same capacities had produced similar results, when employed on silks and calicoes, as when applied to literature and science. It is fortunate, however, that she exchanged needlework for intellectual pursuits, as she furnishes a noble example to her sisters of what woman may accomplish, even in those branches of speculation which seem peculiarly reserved for masculine culture, and has won an enviable reputation which many men of science might be proud to equal. We gladly avail ourselves of the opportunity of expressing our admiration in general terms for Mrs. Somerville and her labors; we take no pleasure in finding fault even with her present work, and the censure which we reluctantly express will not be pressed further than the imperfections noticed appear imperatively to demand. Her *Physical Geography* is a copious repertory of curious and suggestive facts relative to the constitution of the earth—it is interesting and instructive; but throughout there is a singular looseness in the statement of premises, and a reckless obliquity in the derivation of conclusions. These are defects which are unpardonable in any work pretending to be authoritative, and forming the only text-book calculated for general adoption in the acquisition of an important branch of study.

It was not until after we had perused a considerable portion of the volume, that our attention was arrested by the logical and other blunders which defaced the treatise; but when their occurrence had been once observed, a more careful scrutiny discovered their repetition to be so frequent that they could not be pardoned on the score of casual inadvertence, or of any of those excuses which charity is so ingenious in inventing, but were necessarily attributable to habitual recklessness, or to entire disregard of the conditions of correct reasoning. Indeed, these aberrations are so glaring, and in many parts of her book so numerous, that it is amazing how they escaped the detection of their author, for they are fatal

blemishes, not to characterize them by any harsher phrase. Their character, however, is such as to admit readily of future rectification; and a diligent revision of her work might so far succeed in eradicating them from its pages, that it might ultimately merit all the praises which have been lavished on it, and prove as valuable from its execution, as it is now interesting from the nature and abundance of its contents, and the magnitude of the subjects which it discusses. To produce this improvement, much stricter habits of thought and reasoning will be required than are exhibited by this volume in its present condition; but we do not conceive them to be unattainable by Mrs. Somerville, and they would achieve a very great amelioration of her book. That it may receive this final purification is our earnest desire, for there is no study more worthy of general encouragement than Physical Geography, and none which presents to all its cultivators a more immediate and available harvest of valuable fruits. That it may receive it from the hands of Mrs. Somerville herself is also our sincere hope, for she is in great measure entitled to be regarded as a pioneer in this science, so far as its diffusion in the English tongue is concerned.

We proceed to illustrate and sustain our censures. Among the numerous localities where gold has been found, the Siberian mountains were, until very late years, and may still prove to be, the richest in auriferous ore. The range of the metaliferous veins is known to be singularly extensive, but Mrs. Somerville stretches it beyond its ascertained limits by a mode of inference which is peculiarly inconclusive. She thinks that "as many of the northern offsets of the Altai are particularly rich, it may be concluded that the southern branches in the Chinese empire are equally so." This would be very hazardous as a conjecture, but it is wholly untenable as a deduction. The ordinary rule seems to be that, if gold is found on one side of a mountain chain, it does not exist on the other. It is found east of the Blue Ridge, where its spurs descend into the plain, it has not been discovered on its western slopes: it is found north of the Himalayas, it

is not found in their southern valleys. So far as we are aware, Mexico, California, Australia, the Andes and the Ural concur in the testimony which they render to the same effect. The rule is not universal because gold may appear on both sides of a mountain system if the geological character does not vary on the opposite faces. The probabilities are adverse to this supposition, which, even if just, would not authorize us to conclude, from the appearance of gold on one side of a mountain, that it occurred also on the other. But Mrs. Somerville is not satisfied with this violent induction; she forthwith adopts it as a certainty, and adds, as if the fact were established beyond possibility of doubt, "Thus, southern Siberia and Chinese Tartary form an auriferous district, probably greater in area than all Europe, which extends even to our dominions in Hindostan, where the formations containing gold are unexplored."* Such may ultimately be discovered to be the fact; but, so far as the evidence and argument adduced by Mrs. Somerville are involved, it remains a bare assertion, assuming the pretensions, without observing the conditions, of accurate reasoning.

We are informed, in regard to earthquakes, that, "for the most part the shocks are transmitted in the line of the primary mountain-chains, and seem often to be limited by them in the other direction."† It is difficult, if not impossible, to extract any definite meaning from this statement, which shall be in consonance with the terms employed; and no intelligible interpretation of the sentence can be given, which will not necessitate a contradiction, and exhibit the utter confusion of the logical connection of the ideas. If the primary mountain-chains form the axis of commotion, it must be a truism of universal occurrence that the agitation is limited by them in a transverse direction. Hence the terms "seem" and "often" would be inappropriate and contradictory. If this is not what is meant, then it is unintelligible how the mountain-chains could limit the earthquakes in any other line than their

* *Physical Geography*, chap. iv. p. 66.

† *Phys. Geog.* chap. xiii. p. 154.

own. It may be that all intended by the declaration is, that they are often confined to the mountain district—but in this case “the other direction” would mean only the breadth of the mountain system, and would be virtually included in the mention of the line of the primary mountain-chain. Mrs. Somerville probably contemplated, but certainly has not expressed, what is stated by Humboldt in regard to the phenomena of earthquakes, from his own experience and observation. “The propagation is most generally effected by undulations in a linear direction, with a velocity of from twenty to twenty-eight miles in a minute, but partly in circles of commotion or large ellipses, in which the vibrations are propagated with decreasing intensity from a centre towards the circumference.”* To this exposition Mrs. Somerville’s language may apply, but if it was so designed, it would never have suggested the explanation in the first instance, nor is it appropriate even when elucidated by Humboldt’s remark.

The most violent earthquakes felt in England and Wales are stated to have been “preceded by singular phenomena, as a sudden fall of the barometer, frogs, (this is undoubtedly an American misprint for fogs,) and unusual sultriness: the two latter are said to indicate these convulsions about Siend, and in the Maremma of Tuscany, where they have of late years been attended with very disastrous effects.”† The looseness of the induction is not in this case apparent from the tenor of the language, but is discovered by reference to Humboldt’s remark on the same subject. “In countries where earthquakes are of much less frequent occurrence, (as, for instance, in southern Europe,)” says he, “a very general belief prevails, although unsupported by the authority of inductive reasoning, that a calm, an oppressive heat, and a misty horizon are always the fore-runners of this phenomenon. The fallacy of this popular opinion is not only refuted by my own experience, but likewise by the observations of all those who have lived many years in districts where, as in Cumana, Quito,

* Humboldt’s *Cosmos*, vol. i, p. 199. Ed. Bohn.

† *Physical Geography*, chap. xiii. p. 154.

Peru, and Chili, the earth is frequently and violently agitated," &c.* Mrs. Somerville makes no reference to this contradictory testimony of Baron Humboldt, although, a few pages later, she makes use of other statements of the *Cosmos* which occur in connection with this refutation.

In speaking of the equatorial currents, and their dependence upon the different velocities, in diurnal rotation, of the surface at the equator and at points on either side of it, she informs us that "on that account, they are left behind, and consequently seem to flow in a direction contrary to the diurnal rotation of the earth. For that reason the whole surface of the ocean, for 30 degrees on each side of the equator, has an apparent tendency from east to west, which produces all the effects of a great current or stream flowing in that direction." † This interpretation is the received one, and must be accepted as correct till one more satisfactory is offered; but it is very indistinctly and inaccurately stated here. The causes assigned may produce only an apparent or relative motion, but they produce a real tendency from east to west; and they produce an actual current, not merely its effects, though how the effects of a great current could exist without the current itself, is not very easy of comprehension.

It may be alleged that the error here is altogether due to awkwardness of expression; and certainly the occasions where such carelessness results in the conveyance of a ludicrous and undesigned meaning, without, however, causing any misapprehension, or indicating any actual misconception, are sufficiently numerous. We are told "that the wood of a boat suddenly dragged to a great depth by a whale was found, when drawn up, so saturated with water forced into its pores, that it sank in water like a stone for a year afterwards." ‡ What is said here is very different from what is meant, though the latter is perfectly discernable.

* Humboldt's *Cosmos*, vol. i. p. 201-3; and see particularly the note on the passage.

† *Physical Geography*, chap. xvi. p. 197, 8.

‡ *Physical Geography*, chap. xvi. p. 190.

On the same page, we are assured that "the depth to which the sun's light penetrates the ocean depends upon the transparency of the water."

Mihi a docto doctoræ
 Domandatur causam et rationem quare
 Opium facit dormire
 A quoi respondeo,
 Quia est in eo
 Virtus dormitiva,
 Cujus est natura
 Sensus assonpire.

In the same paragraph we are told that "among the West India Islands, in 80 fathoms water, the bed of the sea is as clear as if seen in air:" and, in the next paragraph, that "the green (color of the sea) is produced by myriads of minute insects, which devour one another, and are a prey to the whale." "And thrice she slew the slain."

A few pages later the agitation of the sea by winds is explained, and the manner in which the waters are set in motion, and waves are produced by the friction in different parts of its surface, is summed up in the observation that "each impulse, combining with the other, produces an undulation which continually advances."† If any combination between different impulses takes place, we do not understand how each can produce an undulation. A still richer specimen of this kind of hiberniasm is presented on the next page in the declaration that "sometimes several waves overtake one another!"

What is meant by asserting that, "in passing to the earth, lightning follows the best conductors—metals by preference, then damp substances, which is the reason why men and animals are so often struck."‡ What is the reason here given, or designed to be given? Is it that men and animals are metallic, or is it that they are damp substances? and do they become any wetter in a thunder storm than a tree in full foliage, a grass field, or a pool of water?

† Phys. Geogr. chap. xvi. p. 194.

‡ Phys. Geogr. chap. xxii. p. 289.

There is a singular jumble of incongruous ideas and statements in this passage; "Far to the north the Atlantic penetrates the American continent by Davis's Straits, and spreads out into Baffin's Bay, twice the size of the Baltic, very deep, and subject to all the rigours of an arctic winter—the very store-house of icebergs—the abode of the walrus and the whale."* The following sentence is nearly as incongruous in its composition, and is also guilty of being awkwardly ungrammatical; "Lakes, being the sources of some of the largest rivers, are of great importance for inland navigation as well as for irrigation; while, by their constant evaporation they maintain the supply of humidity in the atmosphere so essential to vegetation, besides the embellishment a country derives from them."†

These later examples may be faulty only in expression, and may therefore be considered as venial errors; although this negligence of utterance is of itself not a slight indication of indistinctness of thought. And what clear logical concatenation of ideas can be traced through such sentences as we have cited? or what connection of ideas can have been distinctly present to the mind which could utter them? To examine only the last of these instances; the lakes, which embellish a country, are not usually those which are the sources of some of the largest rivers, nor are they generally important for internal navigation. This may or may not be the case with Lake Itasca; it is with the Lakes of Geneva and Constance; it is not with most of the Swiss, with the Scotch, and English Lakes. Those which are the sources of the largest rivers are not usually embellishments, otherwise than as the Ocean is such. Examples of this may be found in Lake Superior and the great northern Lakes of this continent; in Lake Tchad, and Lake Baikal, Mrs. Somerville has blended together in her mind, two distinct trains of reflection, and has uttered them by a single jet contorted and entangled together.

* *Physical Geography*, chap. xvi. p. 208.

† *Phys. Geogr.* chap. xi. p. 253.

But let it be granted that these are mere faults of expression, and we admit them to be comparatively trivial, the majority of her blunders are not of this inuocent aspect, but assume a much more serious form. The opening sentences of the twenty-first chapter are disfigured by inaccuracies of statement, as well as defects of expression. The atmosphere is declared to be "a mixture of water in an invisible state and of air." That water, in greater or less proportion, is at all times diffused through the atmosphere is certain, but it is not considered as one of its constituent parts, any more than smoke, the fragrance of flowers, or other odours. There would be the same propriety or impropriety in saying that the sea was composed of salt water and the remains of dead fishes and other trash. No frequency or abundance of a foreign matter can render it such a portion as to be admissible in a scientific definition. Other errors present themselves with the continuation of the sentence. "The air is not homogeneous," says Mrs. Somerville. This we deem to be merely a misapprehension of the meaning of a word, and its consequent misuse. The air is not simple, or uncompounded, but it is homogeneous; and, that it is so considered by herself is shown by the single form of composition which she assigns to it. This composition is, however, stated erroneously; but a slip of the pen or a misprint will account for the substitution of hydrogen for nitrogen, especially as azotic gas is added as a synonym for hydrogen. There is great inaccuracy, attesting a previous train of fallacious reasoning, before such a conclusion could be reached, as is contained in the further statement that, in addition to the ingredients of atmospheric air already mentioned, "there is a little ammoniacal vapour, and a small quantity of carbonic acid gas, which is sufficient to supply all the vegetation on the earth with wood and leaves." It is not the presence of these gaseous bodies which should be controverted, but the alleged sufficiency of the carbonic acid for the purposes assigned to it. Under ordinary circumstances the carbon of plants is derived from many other sources besides the atmosphere, and even so far as derived

from the atmosphere, this acts only as an exciting or conducting agency in many cases.

The paragraphs relative to atmospheric temperature and the phenomena of the central heat of the earth, contain many similar inaccuracies of statement and fallacies of inference; but we cannot do more now than indicate their existence. The observations on light, and especially on the chemical theory of atomic proportions,* are still more absurd and illogical; and display an entire misconception of the nature and consequences of the theoretic laws, which are thus loosely commented on. We are left in a maze as dark, intricate, mysterious and unintelligible as Leibnitz's theory of monads, when we are finally dismissed with the assurance that, "it is to the action of these particles, (the ultimate atoms of matter), on the light of the sun, that nature owes all her colors." It is true, that through the haze of the inappropriate and indistinct verbiage we can usually discern the ideas which Mrs. Somerville was anxious to convey, but this capability of correcting her errors neither rectifies nor excuses them,—nor does it justify the supposition that she had clearly entertained the conceptions which she thus clumsily, obscurely, and viciously expresses.

Here is another illustration of a similar disregard of what is really conveyed by her own language, and of utter inconsistency between the conclusion stated, and the latent premises by which it is supposed to be sustained. Mrs. Somerville would never have assented to the position, had it occurred in any other writer, which she unsuspectingly lays down, that, "The vitality of plants is a chemical process entirely due to the sun's light."† Such a thesis would not appear out of place in the "Vestiges of Creation," but it comes strangely from a writer sincerely believing in Christianity, and at all times ready to "justify the ways of God to man." Mrs. Somerville seems, however, as unconscious of its directly infidel tendency, as she is of its scientific fallacy. No infidel natu-

* Physical Geography, chap. xxii. p. 281.

† Phys. Geogr. chap. xxiii. p. 299.

ralist even, in the present day, would describe the vitality of plants as a chemical process, or attribute it entirely to the sun's light, though he might regard this as one of the principal agencies in its production. But there is no principle of science better established, or more generally accepted now, than that vital action is distinct from chemical action, and is generically different from it. Nor, with such an admission, could any man of science, no matter what his religious heresies might be, ascribe vitality entirely to the light of the sun. That the mistake in this instance is due to a radical misconception, and not to mere awkwardness of statement, is rendered evident by the repetition of the doctrine in different terms, when it is alleged that "the vivifying action of the sun brings about all the changes" which occur in the absorption and resolution of atmospheric gases by plants. But notwithstanding this double announcement of a definite but erroneous doctrine, we are afterwards most inconsistently told that "there is reason to believe that electricity, excited by the power of the solar light, constitutes the chemical vitality of vegetation."* Besides the inconsistency thus manifested, this last sentence introduces new heresies, logical and scientific; and the phrase "chemical vitality," involves as much potential infidelity as is embodied and expanded in the whole theory of the spontaneous development of creation.

The examples of confused or inconclusive reasoning, of inaccurate statement, and of slovenly and ludicrous expression, which have thus been briefly indicated, form only a small portion of those which we have noticed in this work. A few other errors were noticed in the article on Physical Geography in the London Quarterly Review, already referred to, and were there characterized as trifling defects. We leave our readers to judge whether all those which we have pointed out, and all the others which they may themselves discover, can be so leniently judged. We think that even the scanty gleanings, to which our space confined us, will fully justify our

* Physical Geography, chap. xxiii. p. 304.

strictures, and establish the necessity of a thorough revision and expurgation of the work, before it can merit the praises which have been heaped on it, or be safely adopted as an introductory treatise either for popular or academical instruction. We trust, indeed, that it may be entirely remodelled and purified in another edition, for the study of Physical Geography is one which cannot be too widely diffused, and there is no one to whom we would more gladly accord unstinted eulogy for her labours in connection with this science, than Mrs. Somerville, if she will only afford us, as she can do, the opportunity of doing so conscientiously.

ART. III.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF ARMINIUS.

THE WORKS OF JAMES ARMINIUS, D. D., formerly Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden. Translated from the Latin, in three volumes. The first and second by James Nichols, author of "Calvinism and Arminianism compared in their principles and tendency." The third, with a Sketch of the Life of the Author, by Rev. W. R. Bagnall, A. M. of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Derby, Miller & Orton, Auburn and Buffalo.

James Hermanson, better known as Arminius, was born in Oudewater, a small town in Holland, in the year 1560. The place was celebrated for the beauty of its situation, and the frugality and industry of its inhabitants. His parents were poor, and his father dying while he was yet an infant, left him, with two other children, to the care of a widowed mother, too indigent, it seems, to provide for his education. He early developed a capacity for learning which attracted the attention of Theodorus Æmylius, the worthy pastor of the church at Utrecht, a man of singular piety and erudition, who, being acquainted with the circumstances of the family, as-

sumed the charge of his education. He resided with this excellent man till his fifteenth year, when death deprived him of his patron and friend. Under the tuition of Æmylius he gave evidence of remarkable genius, and was carefully taught in the elements of science, and thoroughly instructed in the rudiments of the Latin and Greek languages. During his residence with Æmylius his religious training was not neglected; and his patron had the pleasure of guiding him to the Saviour, of counselling his open profession of religion, and of witnessing, at that early age, the proofs of an earnest and exemplary piety. Great as was his loss in the death of his patron, he was not left entirely destitute. A merciful Providence produced another in the time of need. Rudolph Snellius, a native of Oudewater, who had been constrained to leave his country on account of the oppression of the Spaniards, was just then on a visit to Utrecht, and becoming acquainted with his young townsman, took him under his patronage, carried him to Hesse, and entered him as a student at the University of Marburg. But here a new trial and a greater sorrow awaited him. Very soon after his removal to Hesse he received tidings of the utter destruction of his native place by the Spaniards. Full of apprehensions for the fate of his family he returned at once to his home to meet a sad realization of his worst fears. He found the soldiers of the garrison slain, the citizens butchered, and the houses burnt; and that his mother, sister and brother, together with his more distant relations, had perished in the general carnage. With a saddened heart he surveyed the wreck of all his home-joys, and returned to Hesse, performing the whole journey on foot. Hearing shortly after that a new college had been opened under the auspices of the Prince of 'Orange, he once more returned to Holland, and took up his residence at Rotterdam, in the family of Peter Bertius, the pastor of the church. He entered the University of Leyden in 1575, and remained in it six years. His proficiency was remarkable. Danæus, the Professor of Divinity, often commended his example as a Christian and a scholar to his fellow students. In 1582, having

been highly recommended to the Senate of Amsterdam as worthy of their patronage, they assumed the expense of his education, and sent him to Geneva, at the time the great seat of theological knowledge. Arminius gave the Senate his written bond pledging himself after his admission to holy orders to devote his life to the service of the church in Amsterdam, and to engage in no other work in no other place without their sanction. At Geneva he attached himself to Theodore Beza and his instructions, with all the ardor which his intense thirst for knowledge could inspire. He heard Beza explain the epistle to the Romans. His stay, however, at Geneva was not long: having given offence to some of the professors by defending the philosophy of Ramus in opposition to that of Aristotle, which was the favorite system of the college, he left and repaired to Basle, where he remained a year. Here his proficiency was so great that he delivered lectures on theology out of the regular college course. When leaving, the Faculty of Theology tendered him, at the expense of the college, the degree of Doctor, which he modestly declined on the ground of his youth. He again repaired to Geneva, where for three years he pursued the study of divinity. At the expiration of this period he visited Italy, attended for a short time the lectures of Zabarella, the eminent Professor of Philosophy at Padua, and went thence to Rome, and other places in Italy. He derived many advantages from this tour, especially in becoming familiar, by personal observation, with the practical character, and debasing influence of the Romish church. But it induced a report that he had turned Papist, which, false as it was, reached Amsterdam, and disparaged him, for a time, in the estimation of his friends and patrons in that city. This false report was easily corrected on his return to Holland in the autumn of 1587. In 1588, he was licensed to preach by the Classis of Amsterdam, and entered upon the work of the ministry in that city. He was from the beginning very popular, was soon elected unanimously to the pastorate of one of the churches, and was ordained in August of the same year. He continued in the active duties of his pastorate for thirteen

years; and in 1602, on the death of Francis Junius, Professor of Divinity at Leyden, he was invited to the vacant chair. He could not accept without the consent of the municipal authorities of Amsterdam, and they strenuously resisted it. The friends of the University persisted in their importunity, and ultimately succeeded in overcoming the opposition. He was installed as Professor of Divinity in 1603, having previously received the degree of Doctor of Divinity, on which occasion he delivered a most learned and profound oration on the Priesthood of Christ.

We have omitted, of design, and because of their connexion with the doctrinal aspects of the subject, some facts in the life of Arminius which had an important influence on his position and opinions, and deserve a prominent place in a review of his life and writings.

Since the earlier periods of the Reformation, the Calvinistic view of predestination, and its cognate doctrines, had diffused its leaven through the Reformed Churches. The system of religious doctrine taught by the Genevan Reformer had engulfed the better sentiments of Luther and Melancthon, and was rampant in every field of Protestantism. Arminius, educated under the general influence of this system, and more especially under the personal teachings of Beza, had gone with the current of popular opinion, without seeming to suspect the turbidness of the stream, or of anticipating the dead sea of error and obduracy into which it was flowing. In the pulpit, his zeal for the welfare of men's souls interdicted doctrinal disputations, and gave him an eminence and influence which ultimately led to a change in his religious opinions. This important event occurred in the year 1589. Its history may be briefly traced. "Coornhert, a deeply pious man, had in the year 1578, in a discussion with two Calvinistic ministers of Delft, in a masterly and popular manner, assailed the peculiar views of Calvin on predestination, justification, and the punishment of heretics by death. He afterwards published his views and advocated a theory substantially the same with that which was afterwards known as the

Arminian theory, though some of his phraseology was not sufficiently guarded. His pamphlet was answered in 1589, by the ministers of Delft, but instead of defending the Supralapsarian views of Calvin and Beza, which had been Coornhert's particular object of attack, they presented and defended the lower or Sublapsarian views, and assailed the theory of Calvin and Beza. The pamphlet of the Delft ministers was transmitted by Martin Lydius, professor at Franeker, to Arminius, with the request that he would defend his former preceptor. At the same time, the ecclesiastical senate of Amsterdam requested him to expose and refute the errors of Coornhert. He at once commenced the work, but on accurately weighing the arguments in favor of the Supralapsarian and Sublapsarian views, he was at first inclined, instead of refuting, to embrace the latter. Continuing his researches, he betook himself to the most diligent study of the Scriptures, and carefully compared with them the writings of the early Fathers, and of later divines. The result of this investigation was his adoption of the particular theory of predestination which bears his name." This result was as unexpected to him as it was disastrous to the theory of religious doctrine he had learned in the schools, and was deemed so competent to defend. If he had filled a lower place among the mighty men of his age and country, he might have remained a follower instead of a rival of Calvin; and might not have become the author of a religious system that, agreeing with the word of God and harmonizing with the nature and fallen condition of man, impeaches "the high mystery of predestination," as taught by the Genevan Reformer, as a reflection upon the Divine justice, and confronts it as a life-long mocker of the ineffable and immaculate goodness of Jehovah. He sat down to defend an error, at the time honestly believed to be true; he rose, an advocate of a better system of grace and good will, founded on better promises, and containing a better and a more enduring substance. He was convinced that Calvin erred, and Beza was mistaken in asserting that God, by an eternal decree of predestination,

had determined unconditionally to elect to eternal salvation, a certain number of those whom he had not yet created. Nor could he agree with the ministers of Delft, who maintained that God, having decreed to create, and foreseeing the fall, yet had determined to elect some, without any antecedent reference to Christ. On the contrary, he thought, with Melancthon and others, that God, considering man as created and fallen, had chosen to himself those who, by a holy faith, would become obedient to the heavenly calling. To these convictions he consecrated the rest of his life, with whatever of skill in their defence, or energy in their propagation, he possessed. He did not, it is true, enter upon their maintenance with the zeal of a new conversion, or seek, with proselyting recklessness, to win others to his newly acquired views of the doctrines of the Gospel. At first, and for the sake of peace, he avoided special reference to the subject. It was not long, however, before he became sensible that such a course was inconsistent with his duty as a public teacher of religion; and that to "hold the truth in the love of it," he must preach what he believed to be "the truth as it is in Jesus." Thenceforth he bore witness to the truth, testifying that Jesus Christ by the grace of God tasted death for every man, that whosoever will may come unto him, and whosoever cometh to him, he will in no wise cast out. He commenced this practice in 1590. In 1591, he expounded the seventh chapter of Romans; and in 1593, the ninth chapter of the same epistle. In these expositions, he presented the views which are contained in his treatises on those chapters embraced in the edition of his works now before us. They comprise a body of sound doctrine, upon a plan of exegesis, as just in its rules of interpretation, and logical in its processes of analysis and argument, as it is scriptural in its principles, and practical in its conclusions. But they did not pass off very quietly. His interpretation was, at the time, and frequently afterwards, during his life, opposed with great acri-

mony. And, no marvel! They put Paul and Calvinistic predestination in irreconcilable antagonism.

It was under these circumstances, while quietly pursuing his pastoral duties in conformity with his engagements with the Senate of Amsterdam, that he was called to the divinity professorship in the University of Leyden. His religious sentiments were known and read of all who were concerned in his selection and appointment to that important office. Yet he was scarcely seated in the chair he so worthily filled, before calumny opened its mouth, and, as if smitten with a physical fatality of speaking evil, it has not yet closed it, nor learned to speak other than false and bitter words of this eminent servant of Christ.* The Calvinistic party sought in various

* In proof of this take the following, written by Rev. A. T. McGill, D. D., in his introduction to *The Great Supper*, by Dr. Fairchild, and sent forth under the sanction of the Presbyterian Board of Publication. Dr. McGill says:

"The author of this system, (Arminianism,) was John Cassian—a man, whose morality was as loose at the foundation, as his divinity, for he taught with zeal, that it is right to lie in promoting a good end." P. ix. Again: "Arminius was the man for such a work. Gifted, plausible, and restless, having purity enough in his life to inspire confidence, and perfidy enough in his heart to practice any kind of means, he succeeded, by vamping it anew, in giving his own name to the system of John Cassian." P. xii. Last and worst. Arminius was a "corrupter of the faith," "dissembled profoundly," "pretended zeal for the Belgic Confession, while privately laboring to destroy it." By "such dissimulation" he got into the University as professor. "In that chair he pursued the same course of unprincipled duplicity." "baffled the Belgians with fresh pretences," "conspired with leading politicians of the country," "to have a majority when a trial could no longer be evaded." "In this condition of deceit, intrigue, anxiety and effort, he died." P. xiii.

We have an antidote to these odious falsehoods in the testimony of a distinguished contemporary of Arminius, an English Calvinistic divine, Sir Henry Wotton, then provost of Eton College. He says:

"In my travel to Venice, as I passed through Germany, I rested almost a year at Leyden, where I entered into an acquaintance with Arminius, then the Professor of Divinity in that University; a man much talked of in this age, which is made up of opposition and controversy. And indeed, if I mistake not Arminius in his expressions, I differ from him in some points. Yet I profess my judgment of him to be, that he was a man of

ways, and with very little regard to the morality of the means employed, to procure his removal ; or, failing in that, to destroy his influence by defaming his character. A history of these transactions, running through the whole period of his connexion with the University, would be a record of vexatious persecutions, influenced by party animosity, and characterized by repeated acts of flagrant injustice. Too sagacious to be entrapped into *private* conferences with his avowed opponents, in relation to things "they had *heard*" respecting certain "answers" of "a novel description" which some of the students had given to the questions propounded to them, in the examination preparatory to their admission to the Christian ministry, and which the students alleged to have been received under his tuition, he was reported and reproached as shunning an investigation ; and this, in the face of his proposition, and his claim as a matter of justice, to confront any such student, on every occurrence of the kind ; and to visit, for such a purpose, at his own expense, any town, however distant, his accusers might appoint for such an investigation. Besides, he knew, from the temper of his adver-

most rare learning. And I knew him to be of a most strict life, and of a most meek spirit. And that he was so mild, appears by his proposals to Mr. Perkins, from whose book—Arminius took the occasion of writing some queries to him, concerning the consequents of his doctrine, intending them to come privately to Mr. Perkins—and to receive from him a like private, and a like loving answer. But Mr. Perkins died before these queries came to him. And it is thought Arminius meant them to die with him ; for though he lived long after, he forebore to publish them."

We add, not so much as testimony against the discreditable calumnies of Dr. McGill, but as a fact sustaining the honorable, Christian and reliable statements of Sir Henry Wotton, an extract from the will of Arminius—a clause added to that instrument a short time before his death.

"Above all, I commend my spirit to God, its faithful Creator and Saviour, before whom I have walked in my profession and calling, with a good conscience, in simplicity and sincerity. I call him to witness, that I have advanced nothing but what, after the most attentive consideration, I have deemed the sense of Scripture : and that, in whatsoever I have advanced, I have had in view only to extend the knowledge of the religion of Christ Jesus, the worship of God, and the common holiness and peace of all."

saries, if he consented to such private conferences, they would find a satisfaction in multiplying the occasions of convening them, and of making them a means of constant annoyance. And yet, with greater reason he refused, because those who, of their own proclivity for intermeddling, sought those interviews, assumed the office of Deputies from the Churches, and might assume the right to report a private conference in a public meeting of the Synod. He knew them too well to place himself so completely within their power. This course of annoyance and injustice, commenced in 1605, was continued, with varying phases of bitterness and forms of opposition, until 1608, when, on the 30th of October, he delivered before the States of Holland, at the Hague, a Declaration of his Sentiments on "predestination, Divine providence, the freedom of the will, the grace of God, the Divinity of the Son of God, and the justification of man before God." In this noble defence of his conduct and opinions, he describes the unfair and unmanly course of his enemies in a manner so dignified, a spirit so calm, and by facts so clear and undeniable, that their confusion of face, and consciousness of injustice, must have entirely overwhelmed them, if they had not been indurated by a pre-determined and inveterate malevolence. However it affected them, it left a blight on their doctrinal system; and the marks of the infliction it then received remain on it to this day. Beyond this, and of greater importance, the Declaration comprises, on the points enumerated as its themes, a system of Divinity, at once rational and scriptural, and as clear, comprehensive and harmonious, as any age or nation has produced, or can be found in the writings of any man. For the sake of this well wrought and strongly compacted framework of theology, we are disposed, not altogether to be grateful to those whose evil dealings superinduced it, but to regard with leniency the hostility and injustice that shut him up to the necessity of defining and defending his religious sentiments.

Foiled in these efforts to lessen, or destroy the confidence of the guardians of the University in the personal integrity

and doctrinal soundness of Arminius, his enemies resorted to a method of injuring him more promising of success with the populace. They framed, either from what "they had heard," or from his Declaration of Sentiments, a series of *thirty-one* articles, or propositions, "novel and heterodox, erroneous and heretical," which were secretly and extensively circulated. In 1609, he published a masterly defence of himself against these malicious proceedings.

His reply is remarkable for its logical acuteness, its doctrinal clearness, and its profound and critical acquaintance with the writings of contemporaneous and ancient theologians. It is replete with just views of religious truth, of the nature and province of faith, of the inner and spiritual life of a new creature in Christ Jesus; and is, besides, a magazine, richly stored with weapons, offensive and defensive, against the subtleties of Calvinism. In connexion with his Declaration of Sentiments, it merits the careful study of those especially who affiliate with him in the system of doctrine bearing his name, and through whose potent agency, despite the machinations of his enemies, his name and fame will be borne to "the last hour of recorded time." Arminius was justly indignant and strongly incensed at this new and dishonourable phase of opposition. He defines it as calumnious, and protests against it as a gross injustice. Their nameless origin, and secret circulation stamp the articles with a birth of shame, and a life of iniquity. Such was the senseless and absurd character of some of those articles that he complains of their authors that, in their efforts to prove him a heretic, they make him a fool! Specimens of the absurd opinions, falsely ascribed to him, and secretly and industriously circulated to his disparagement, might be easily adduced, but it would swell our article beyond its appropriate limits. We content ourself with one additional fact to show the inordinate desire of the Calvinistic party to defame his character and injure his influence. Among the disorders of his latter days, one of his eyes was affected, and its sight was dimmed. This was deemed a just judgment of God upon his heterodoxy; and they had scripture to prove it.

Is it not written : " Wo to the idol shepherd that leaveth the flock ! the sword shall be upon his arm, and upon his *right* eye : his arm shall be clean dried up, and his right eye shall be *utterly darkened.*" Zech. xi. 17. Unfortunately for the credit of these interpreters of the word of God, it was his *left* eye that suffered, and it was only *dimmed*, not utterly darkened ! This is about as near the truth as Calvinism ever comes in interpreting the Scriptures.

A secret enemy during the life of Arminius, and a bitter one after his death, was Francis Gomarus, his colleague in the University. He was one of its professors when Arminius entered upon his duties. On the appearance of the opposition to the new professor, the ground was taken that the professors disagreed on certain doctrinal points, and a synod would be necessary to settle the matter. The opposition was partially appeased, but not entirely quieted, by an instrument of writing signed by the Rector, Arminius, Gomarus, and Frelcatus, declaring the perfect unanimity of the professors in everything fundamental. Gomarus had joined in the violent proceedings of the party who opposed the appointment of Arminius ; and, notwithstanding his participation in the effort to pacify public opinion as to the agreement of the professors in things fundamental, he was yet leagued with those who embittered the life of his colleague, and whose violent dealings, subsequent to his death, precipitated the infamous synod of Dort. Gomarus was a Calvinist after the most approved style of the age in which he lived : brimful of predestination ; bigoted, by virtue of eternal election ; prejudiced, to the full extent of his faith in the eternal reprobation of those who differed with him ; and violent to the utmost limit of the assurance of certain perseverance, he stands forth as a veritable type and exponent of the doctrinal views that burned Servetus with a green wood fire on the heights of Champel and hunted down Arminius, Episcopius, and the Remonstrants as so many wild beasts through the cities and villages of Holland. Balcanqual, a Scotch member of the synod of Dort, says, that in one of his speeches in the synod, Gomarus gave

utterance to "some expressions against the divines of Bremen, which could only proceed from the mouth of a mad-man."* The character of Arminius is a perfect contrast. Calm, in the maintenance of his opinions; patient, under repeated acts of flagrant injustice; forbearing, under systematic wrongs ceaselessly perpetrated; dignified, in the presence of enemies, vigilant to discover or invent a fault, and happy in proclaiming and prosecuting it; and fearless in the defence of his religious convictions, oppose them who might: he was the same, in the presence of the "most noble, potent, wise and prudent Lords" at the Hague, and among the students who thronged his lecture room to learn wisdom from the words that fell from his lips. The two men are representative types of their respective doctrinal systems.

* Clark, who was a great admirer of Gomarus' opinions, nevertheless states, in his *Marrow of Ecclesiastical History*, that he was too much given to indulge his passions, and charges him with ingratitude. The truth of this statement will appear from the account he gives of his conduct, not only to those who opposed his opinions, but also to his friends, who patronized him and his doctrines, and laboured to serve him. This was especially the case with Wallæus, who, when he found Gomarus determined to leave Leyden, hastened to entreat him to visit him at Middleburgh. Gomarus accepted his invitation. A short time after, Wallæus was offered, by the magistrates of this place, the professorship of Divinity Common-places of a public seminary they patronized in that city. Gomarus' bile was excited at the circumstance of thus being passed by, and, though a kind of guest with Wallæus, charged him with heresy. This person, who was an able disputant and good scholar, seems to have been an amiable and pious man, and at one time was the friend of Grotius, in common with Arminius and Episcopius, and long strove to stem the torrent and violence of the bigoted Calvinists, but finding this to be impossible he at length fell in with the stream, and became the defender of the Synod of Dort, its canons and decrees. On Episcopius being deprived of his professorship by the Calvinistic party, he was chosen to succeed him. In virtue of his office he was entitled, and frequently urged by the enemies of Arminius, to take possession of the house in which his widow continued to reside, through the influence of the friends of her deceased husband. He had, however, so much reverence for his memory that he refused to take possession of it, until this lady herself came and offered it to him. We shall have to notice some praiseworthy features in this clergyman's conduct toward Grotius, his former friend, when he was unjustly sentenced to perpetual imprisonment by the Calvinistic faction.

As a professor Arminius was eminently successful. When he entered upon his duties in the University he found many of the students in divinity addicted to questions which rather engendered strife than were promotive of personal piety, or improvement in religious knowledge. Leaving the Scriptures and those necessary truths which tend to edification, they busied themselves with abstruse speculations upon unimportant questions of philosophy and theology. His first care was to correct this vitiated taste, and to recover them from the pursuit of "knowledge which puffeth up," and bring them to the love that edifieth and the faith that saves. As in the pulpit, so in the professorial chair, it was his constant aim to restore religion to its primitive simplicity, as revealed in the Scriptures, that faith might stand, not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. "The end of theology is the blessedness of man; and that not animal or natural, but spiritual and supernatural." This was the stand-point from which he surveyed the whole system of divinity. Here he laid the broad foundation; and on it he erected a spiritual edifice, rising course by course, until its summit reached and was crowned by God, the author and finisher of the entire superstructure. He did not begin with God, his sovereign will, and his eternal decrees: but with man, the subject of his government, the object of his care, and the end of those means of salvation so wisely devised, so richly provided, and so mercifully and freely offered. Beginning here, he elaborated a system of theology, not only different from that commonly taught in the schools and in the pulpits, but superior, both as to its agreement with the Scriptures, and as to its adaptability to the great objects for which they were given. Judged by its practical effects, the true test of its divinity, as then, and since developed, it has all the legitimate marks and fruits of "the truth which is according to Godliness." A new light dawned on the University, and glowed in the life of its students. The spirituality derived from his instructions was transferred to the pulpits they filled, and the power of their preaching transformed society in every field of their operations. The good

seed sown by Arminius spread widely through the land, and ripened with an amazing rapidity: so rapidly, that, in nine years after his death, in 1618, the synod of Dort was convened to arrest the progress of his principles, and re-establish, as it vainly strove to do, by most iniquitous proceedings and persecuting edicts, the waning fortunes of a system which still staggers under the blow of his mighty arm. The Arminian side of the history of that synod, and its antecedents, the noble stand of its adherents, their manly defence of the faith they held, their dignified submission to the scoffings of reckless and insolent power assumed by the Calvinistic party and sustained by civil authority, and their patient subjection to outrageous wrong, and cruel sufferings, are facts, on which we rely for proof of the amazing success of the Arminian system, and of the fear with which it filled its opponents. Unwilling, or unable to meet it in the field of legitimate discussion they pronounced it a heresy, arraigned, tried and condemned its followers as heretics; and, true to the instincts of their founder, confiscated their property, confined them in prison, murdered them outright, or drove them into exile.

The writings of Arminius are chiefly controversial. If this be a fault, it is the fault of the times in which he lived. Protestantism was generated in a controversy that convulsed the Christian world. Popery had reduced religion to a debasing superstition. The purity of the gospel was lost, its native lustre destroyed in the false doctrines and vicious practices of the Romish Hierarchy. The controversies of Luther hinged on a solitary, but most essential, and central truth—that which represents salvation as attainable by the merits of Christ alone. It was to recover the doctrine of justification by faith alone from the mass of errors heaped upon it during the ages of Popish ascendancy, and restore it to its original position in the scheme of redeeming mercy as revealed in the gospel, that Luther braved the hostility and laughed at the thunders of the Vatican. His triumph was complete; but its power was neutralized, and its glory obscured by the introduction of a system of doctrinal teaching which transferred

the justification of a sinner from his own graciously assisted act of faith in Jesus Christ, to an act of God, electing him to salvation from all eternity, "without any regard to his faith or works." This doctrine was rife in the churches of Holland when Arminius entered the ministry. He had been trained under its most able and zealous teachers. When, therefore, under the circumstances already related, he embraced a different, and opposing system of doctrine; and, notwithstanding his altered and antagonistic sentiments, was placed in a position of great eminence and usefulness, the floodgates of hostility were let loose against him. We have seen with what ability and success he explained and defended his personal religious sentiments. But his own doctrinal system is set forth with a logical precision, a copiousness of illustration, and a force of right words, no less edifying than instructive and convincing. Besides, he analyzes, exposes and refutes the doctrines of the Calvinistic party, with a temper as calm, and a spirit as charitable, as it is dignified, energetic and truthful. Calvinism, greatly as it has been modified in its external manifestations, is an appalling religious system. As it was held and taught in the times of Arminius it was a system of horrors. Luther's vehement, and impetuous torrent of passionate words is vindicated upon the ground of the wicked principles and outrageous practices he was compelled to resist. If Arminius had followed his example, we might find, on the same ground, as ample a justification. But with similar excipients he displayed a milder temper; and needs no defence, as on this subject he is accused of no transgression. It is rare to find in such a mass of controversial writings so little of controversial bitterness. This fact constitutes a prime excellency of his truly valuable productions. Yet, considering Calvinism as it really was, a false accusation against the inflexible justice and immaculate goodness of God, he might have thrown his inkstand at it, with as good a reason as Luther had for throwing his at the devil. In justification of this remark, we need only refer to the doctrine as set forth in its distinctive propositions; and by standard writers.

“ I. God has ordained by an irrevocable and eternal decree, that a certain number of men (without considering their works) should be saved, and that others, whose number is much greater, should be damned, without any regard to their faith or works. Or thus, as stated by others :

“ II. God has considered mankind, as being fallen in Adam : he has decreed to save certain men by an effect of his mercy, and to leave the others under the curse, as so many examples of his justice, without any regard to their faith or unbelief. To this end, God uses means, by virtue whereof the elect are necessarily saved, and the reprobate necessarily damned.

“ III. Consequently Christ, the Saviour of the world, did not die for all men, but only for the elect.

“ IV. From whence it follows, that the Spirit of God and Christ works upon the elect with an irresistible force, to make them believe, and to save them ; and that a necessary and sufficient grace is not given to the reprobates.

“ V. That those, who have once received true faith, can never lose it wholly, how great soever their sins may be.”

The following are personal opinions, quoted by Arminius, from Calvinistic writers :

“ The way of reprobation is creation in the upright state of original righteousness.” Gomarus.

“ God has predestinated whatsoever men he pleased not only to damnation, but likewise to the causes of damnation.” Boza.

“ Men are predestinated to eternal death by the naked will or choice of God, without any demerit on their part.” Calvin.

“ Preparation unto destruction is not to be referred to any other thing than the secret counsel of God.”

“ Christ as Mediator is ‘ the subordinate cause of destined salvation.’ ”

This is a sample of the theology of the times of the Synod of Dort ; and of the men who presided over its execrable proceedings. No one can travel wide of the truth who turns his back upon it. Arminius, however, did not turn his back on it. He set his face against it ; and, like Paul, “ his spirit was stirred within him ” at every manifestation of its erroneous principles and pernicious influence. With “ the Sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God,” he entered the lists against it, and smote it on helmet and breast-plate until Europe, under the vigor of his warrior-blows, rang again with the clangor of a second Reformation.

The Five Points involved in the controversy between Arminius and the Calvinists, and which constitute the distinct-

ive peculiarities of the system he opposed, compose the *matériel* of nearly the whole of the three portly and remarkably good looking and well executed volumes in which the writings of Arminius are given to the American public. The substance of Calvinism is condensed in the five propositions selected to represent its doctrines. But they are not presented as an authoritative formula, or as expressing the harmonious sentiments of its numerous and learned divines. Agreeing in the general principles of the subject, *i. e.* heartily consenting to, and earnestly contending for the five distinct propositions of eternal predestination, election and reprobation, limited atonement, irresistible grace and certain perseverance, they differed in the manner of expressing them, and in the modes by which they arrived at the same conclusion. To take an example from one point only in proof of this statement: the doctrine of election was surveyed from different stand-points, and rested on different grounds. Some taught it as an independent act of God, by which he determined to save certain persons, irrespective of the fact of their creation, and without reference to the death of Christ—that these two facts or events were only *means* of accomplishing the eternal decree: Others, that the decree of election was independent of the fall of man, and of the sin and disobedience consequent upon it—that these were predetermined parts of the divine purpose; election the *end*, these its *means*: Others, that God, determined to create, and foreseeing the fall, decreed to save a certain number, and prescribed the means. A similar diversity is discoverable on the other points of doctrine. It is a peculiar excellency of the works of Arminius that they comprise all the varieties of opinion on these doctrines, with all the shades of meaning between their different terms and discordant propositions. He surveyed the system in its simplest and most repulsive principles, pursued it through all its ramifications, traced out its logical delinquences, staked off the metes and bounds of its antagonism to the wisdom, justice and goodness of God, mapped and marked its horrid and dangerous boundaries—and left it a moral waste, too dark in its

outline, too sparse in its population, and too fruitful of wretchedness to lie within the precincts of Immanuel's land. For the study of the original aspects of Calvinism, his works possess an inappreciable historical value. But they possess a higher interest to Arminians of the present day, as they display the personal trials and logical triumphs of the venerable man who so nobly labored, and so signally succeeded in checking and restraining a system of religious error that, desecrating the glory of divine grace, and the riches of redeeming love, was rapidly engulfing the doctrine of justification by faith, and sending the sinner, not to the Cross of Christ, but to the secret counsel and eternal decrees of God for hope and salvation.

An enumeration of the various subjects treated of in these volumes is forbidden by the limits within which we are to compress our remarks, nor can we indulge the disposition to enter upon an analysis, however comprehensive, of the more important portion of his works. But an earnest desire to promote their general circulation, and the diligent study of his writings, especially by the younger ministers of the Church, will not be content without a distinct, though brief and partial reference to some of them.

The orations on the Priesthood of Christ; the object of theology; the author and end of theology; the certainty of sacred theology; and on reconciling religious dissensions, delivered in the University, comprise a complete outline of Divinity as it relates to God, and Christ as he is God and man; and the nature, authority and evidences on which faith finds its assurance, and salvation its certainty, as solid in its principles as it is scriptural in its doctrines and edifying in its teachings. The union of God with man, to the salvation of the one and the glory of the other, is the foundation of his theological system, and he elaborates it with a simplicity and earnestness creditable alike to his understanding and his heart. If we mistake not, the author of the *Theological Institutes* was familiar with these excellent orations.

The dissertations on the seventh and ninth chapters of *Re-*

mans, considered as expositions of the true sense of the Apostle, or as bearing upon their controversial aspects and relations, are, in either case, of great excellency, and truly invaluable. Calvinism has always resorted to the first to vindicate its strangely compounded, as well as low and defective standard of Christian character; and to the other, to show the certainty of its theory of election and reprobation. Arminius despoils them of these grounds of authority for their doctrine, and vindicates the Apostle and God from all their impeachments of imperfection and partiality. Regarding Paul as describing his own religious character and experience in the seventh chapter, an old poet of the School has condensed the whole system of doctrine and interpretation into a couplet to be said or sung to the glory or shame of the religious system it so powerfully represents :

“ To good and evil equal bent,
I’m both a devil and a saint.”

Arminius denies the impeachments of the system against Paul, and vindicates the grace of God that was in him from all unholy equality with the devil. So does he also, here, and in the ninth chapter, vindicate the character of God from interpretations which constitute a standing reflection upon the perfections of his nature, the revelations of his will, and the teachings of his word.

An English Calvistic divine published a work entitled “ A Christian and perspicuous discourse concerning the order and mode of predestination, and the extent of Divine grace.” A review of this by Arminius comprises nearly two hundred and fifty pages of the third volume of his works. It was written to be submitted to Mr. Perkins; but he dying before it was sent, it was laid aside, and published after the death of Arminius by his sons. It comprises a learned and profound discussion of the points raised by Mr. Perkins; and presents the Arminian view of theology, in relation to the disputed points, in the clearest and strongest light. It is an unanswerable defence of his own scriptural doctrines, a thorough and

irretrievable refutation of the opposing system. This review, his discussion with F. Junius, his predecessor in the theological chair of the University, and the declaration of his sentiments, are, in our judgment, master-pieces of logical skill, profound acquaintance with systematic theology, and thorough and accurate knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. This praise, distinguishing as it is, can only be enhanced by adding that these qualities are adorned, as apples of gold in a framework of silver, by honesty of conviction, a sincere love of truth, a truly Christian patience of spirit and gentleness of temper, and, for the times, a remarkable dignity and propriety of language.

The student of these volumes will discover the secret of that vexed and ruthless spirit with which Calvinists have defamed his name and opinions from the day he renounced the system he had been taught by Beza down to the July issue of the *Theological and Literary Journal*, of the year of our Lord 1854.* Finding it impossible to refute his arguments, they adopted that last resort of defeated partizans; charged him first with Pelagianism, then with Socinianism, and finally with a heartless, formal, inoperative system, running down into infidelity. We will not retort by pointing to Unitarian Geneva, and Socinian, Unitarian and Universalist New England as fruits of Calvinism. But we deny with indignant emphasis the existence, either in the life or opinions of Arminius, of any just or reasonable grounds for these partizan assaults. Indeed, they are false and libellous. They are either "naturally engendered" of the system of Calvin, or they are the promptings of mortification, writhing under the long drawn agonies of an ever present sense of defeat.

Since we have given, on a preceding page, the articles of faith held by the Calvinistic party, it may not be out of place, before concluding this review, to present those of the Arminians, as they are spread out in the writings of Arminius, and were condensed and furnished, in their Memorial to the States

* This last calumny of Arminius and his theological system is from the Rev. Enoch Pond, D. D.

of Holland, by the Remonstrants. Except the doubt expressed in the fifth article, they are substantially the opinions of Arminians of the present day. They are comprised in the words and doctrines following :

“ I. That God from all eternity hath decreed to elect to everlasting life all those who through his grace believed in Jesus Christ, and in the same belief and obedience of faith persevere to the end : but the unconverted and unbelieving he had resolved to reject to everlasting damnation.

“ II. That, in consequence of this decree, Christ, the Saviour of the world, died for all and every man, so that by his death he hath ordained reconciliation and pardon of sins for all men ; nevertheless, in such a manner that none but the faithful really and effectually enjoy the benefits thereof.

“ III. That man could not obtain saving faith of himself or by the strength of his own free will, but stood in need of God’s grace, through Christ, to be made the subject of its power.

“ IV. Therefore this grace is the cause of the beginning, the progress, and the completion of man’s salvation ; insomuch that no one could believe or persevere in faith, without this operating grace, and consequently that all good works must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. Nevertheless, the manner of the operation of this grace was not irresistible.

“ V. That true believers had sufficient strength, through Divine grace, to resist and overcome Satan, sin, the world, and their own lusts ; but whether they might not through their negligence apostatize, and lose the power of holy, saving truth, the testimony of a well directed conscience, and forfeit that grace, must first be more fully inquired into under the guidance of the Holy Scriptures, before they could, with confidence and unhesitating minds, assert and teach it.”

On the subject of Apostacy from the faith they honestly declare that their minds were unsettled, and that before “ they could with confidence and unhesitating minds assert and teach it,” they must inquire more diligently under the guidance of the Holy Scriptures. Precisely similar is the language of Arminius. In his Declaration of Sentiments, vol. i. p. 254, he expresses himself as in doubt on this subject ; and yet the tendency of his mind was obviously towards the possibility of such an issue. As the point is one of great interest, historic justice requires that he be allowed to speak for himself. We therefore quote all he says on the subject.

“ My sentiments respecting the perseverance of the Saints are, that those persons who have been grafted into Christ by true faith, and have thus been

made partakers of his life-giving Spirit, possess *sufficient powers* [or strength] to fight against Satan, sin, the world and their own flesh, and to gain the victory over these enemies—yet not without the assistance of the grace of the same Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ also by his Spirit assists them in all their temptations, and affords them the ready aid of his hand; and, provided they stand prepared for the battle, implore his help, and be not wanting to themselves, Christ preserves them from falling. So that it is not possible for them, by any of the cunning craftiness or power of Satan, to be either seduced or dragged out of the hands of Christ. But I think it is useful and will be quite necessary in our first convention, [or Synod] to institute a diligent inquiry from the Scriptures, whether it is not possible for some individuals through negligence to desert the commencement of their existence in Christ, to cleave again to the present evil world, to decline from the sound doctrine which was once delivered to them, to lose a good conscience, and to cause Divine grace to be ineffectual.

“Though I here openly and ingenuously affirm, I never taught that a true believer can either totally or finally fall away from the faith, and perish; yet I will not conceal, that there are passages of Scripture which seem to me to wear this aspect; and those answers to them which I have been permitted to see, are not of such a kind as to approve themselves on all points to my understanding. On the other hand, certain passages are produced for the contrary doctrine [of unconditional perseverance] which are worthy of much consideration.”

A doubt on this subject is admissible, since it is not inconsistent with the general principles of the system of religious faith he avows, nor does it contradict any of its particular propositions. Final perseverance is not innate to the doctrinal system avouched in the four articles so distinctly antagonistical to the Calvinistic theory. It is not involved of necessity nor by consequence in either of the articles preceding it. It does not inhere in the doctrine of election as taught in the first article. It is not a legitimate deduction from the doctrine of atonement as set forth in the second. It is not connatural to the doctrine of “saving faith” as contained in the third. Nor is it necessary, either as a principle or a deduction, to the doctrine of grace so distinctly declared, and so scriptural, in the fourth. Nor is it a point, in itself, of such importance as to be ranked among the fundamental and essential truths of the Christian system. In the absence, then, of a settled conviction, a doubt was not

only legitimate, but harmless and defensible. Whatever, therefore, may be thought or said of the existence of a doubt then, on a doctrine whose lines are so distinctly marked and settled now, one thing is clear, the concession of the doubt is a demonstration of the honesty and fidelity of those who entertained it. As they would not swerve from the avowal of their real sentiments, in the face of formidable opposition and stern malignity armed with power to oppress and eager to punish, so neither would they avow an opinion that did not answer to their convictions, however it might conciliate their opponents, and neutralize or disarm their cruel hostility. They stood to their principles, and maintained their pious integrity despite the enmity of "unreasonable and wicked men" clamoring for their ruin. But no such defence could be plead for a Calvinistic doubter or disbeliever in the certain perseverance of the saints, as it is an inherent and essential element of the doctrinal system. It is not only congruous with, but born of the system. Without this element it would be incomplete and defective. It is a legitimate sequence of the particular election of a certain and definite number of persons from all eternity: as the election would prove abortive if one of these persons failed of eternal life. Particular redemption is the offspring of particular election; and particular redemption would meet with a disastrous defeat if any of these particular subjects were to miscarry in the path of life. The same is true of effectual calling, and irresistible grace. Final perseverance is the logical issue of the system, and of each of its separate propositions. An Arminian, therefore, may doubt on this subject; but a doubting Calvinist is a repudiator of the whole creed. He cannot hold to the one part of the doctrine and reject the other. The attempt to serve God and Mammon at the same time, and with equal fidelity, would be as rational and successful.

But we must recur more particularly to the religious principles set forth and maintained in the several propositions of this doctrinal creed. As a whole, and 'in each of its articles, it stands not only in perfect contrast, but in positive antago-

nism with the Calvinistic system. No theological chemistry can amalgamate them, or neutralize their opposing forces. They are without affinities, and are utterly irreconcilable with each other. Both cannot be true and scriptural. One must be erroneous and false. Weighed in any righteous balances, one will always "kick the beam." Tried by any tests, the pure ore of truth will be found always in one—the dross in the other. Let them be analyzed, compared with the Scriptures, the only standard of true doctrine, sifted as wheat, and the result will be always and invariably the same. If we judge these creeds by their agreement with the Scriptures, Arminianism harmonizes with its general doctrines and its particular teachings. If we judge by their views of God, his character as creator, lawgiver and judge, or his nature as good, merciful and just, Arminianism coincides with and represents God. If we judge by their relations to the atonement, its nature, design, extent, availability and efficacy, Arminianism quadrates with the atonement. If we judge by the office and work of the Spirit as an enlightener, regenerator, sanctifier and guide, Arminianism represents the Spirit. If we judge by their connexions with man as a sinner, guilty, and impotent; free in the use of his faculties, yet dependent upon God's good pleasure and grace for their right use and direction; capable of all things, yet incompetent without Christ; free to will yet needing grace to do; able to work out his salvation, yet only working when God works in him, and working no longer than God works with him; willing to accept life, yet only accepting as God gives him a ready mind and willing heart; anxious to "travel all the length of the celestial road," yet only travelling as God holds his hand and guides his feet; Arminianism represents man. Is Calvinism thus representative? Is it the anti-type of any type of God, of the atonement, of the work of the Spirit, of the true and actual character, condition, and circumstances of man? How abhorrent to every right religious sentiment is its representation of God in its doctrines of election and reprobation, by arbitrary eternal decrees. How depreciative of the grandeur and glory of the

redemption that is in Christ Jesus, "the *subordinate cause* of destined salvation." How meagre, rigid, and impoverished is the office, how cold, calculating and speculative the work of the Spirit, squared, compressed, and heartless in pursuit of an end fixed and foredoomed from all eternity. How "squat as a toad," and as cold and vapid is man with his necessitated will, his constrained submission, his ass-like march along his predestinated pathway. What a "maligu theology" is that which can define with so much skill and precision "the execution of the decree of God against reprobate infants is this:—as soon as they are born they are reprobated to eternal death; being left to themselves when dying, on account of native and original sin:"—one of whose phlegmatic votaries, in the joy of his solitary morning reflections, could write down in his diary the edifying words—"had some sweet thoughts this morning while meditating on God's mercy in damning little children." Such sentiments are enough to chill one's blood; yet they are "to the manor born." This contrast might be extended. But for the present we forbear; promising, if need be, to make good all we have said, by stronger facts and equally strong and legitimate deductions.

One word more. The theological system of Arminius rests upon the broad scriptural truth that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." This is its great first truth, around which all its principles revolve as a common centre of attraction and influence. In its comprehensive view the whole Godhead is engaged, not in superintending the comfort of a "certain and definite number of particular persons," elected from all eternity, and of consummating the destruction of all the rest of mankind, but in publishing the terms of salvation to all, through the gospel of peace and reconciliation. It is this that gives to the system its eminently practical character, and renders it so efficient and successful. It is a worker with God, and works for man. Its aims are as vast as its doctrines are grand. It stands in perfect contrast with Calvinism, with whose partial grace, and limited atonement it has no agreement; and can discover no resemblance

between its own conceptions of the magnitude of the redeeming love of God, the grandeur of the work of Christ, and the glorious mission of the Spirit, and the partial, repulsive and conflicting theory of unconditional election and eternal reprobation. All the ends of the Gospel, upon Calvinistic principles, might have been accomplished on a lower ground, and a less magnificent scale of operations than that which is revealed in the Scriptures; and it pays a very meagre tribute of praise to the glory of divine grace, when it supposes it can analyze eternal love, reduce the atonement to a commercial transaction, and circumscribe the work of the Spirit within its own narrow theological limits. This partial and selfish system is too contracted for the great heart-doctrines of Arminianism; its largest ideas are too small for a full respiration of its capacious and powerful lungs; and its boundaries are entirely too limited for the free exercise of its limbs. Lazarus, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes; and Lazarus, as Christ commanded, loosed, free, in motion ever, and working everywhere, define the qualities, and describe the difference between the spirit, energy, and productiveness of these discordant and defiant systems.

ART. IV.

“JUDAISM UNVEILED.”

Desbei vierzig Jahre von der Judenschaft mit Arrest bestrickt gewesene, nunmehr aber, durch Autorität eines hohen Reichs Vicariats relaxirte Johann Andreæ Eisenmengers, Professoris der orientalischen Sprachen by der Universität Heidelberg, ENTDECKTES JUDENTHUM, &c., &c., &c.

The foregoing is a literal transcript of the German title-page of a work called “JUDAISM UNVEILED.” But little is known of its author. John Andrew Eisenmenger was born at Mannheim, in 1654, and was Professor of Oriental Lan-

guages in Heidelberg. The work, at present under consideration, which is his only one aspiring to posthumous fame, was first published in 1700, at Frankfort on the Maine, in two large quartos. It is said to have been the result of nineteen years of close and uninterrupted application and industry; and the author had consulted no less than 193 Hebrew works in the course of its preparation, all of which he enumerates in the introduction to the book before us. The sensation and excitement created by its publication, among all religious parties, is said to have been most extraordinary. The Jews were so exasperated at it, that they petitioned the magistrates of Frankfort, to suppress the edition; but meeting with a refusal here, they next applied at the imperial court in Vienna; nor would they rest till they had obtained a decree, confiscating the whole edition of 2000 copies. It is even said that the Jesuits were on the side of the Jews. The Jews offered the author 12,000 florins, if he would consent to destroy every copy; but nothing came of this.

Meanwhile, the decree of confiscation notwithstanding, some ten or twelve copies found their way to the public. Various universities, as Cologne, Mentz, Giessen, and Halle, as well as some Catholic divines gave a favorable opinion of the work. On the strength of which, King Frederic I. of Prussia, disregarding the imperial decree, gave his permission to have a new edition printed in Konigsberg, in 1711. Some time afterwards the imperial decree was also repealed in favor of the author's heirs, and the original edition was sold in 1742. In conclusion, we may add that report says, that in consequence of the endless trouble and vexation in which this book involved Eisenmenger, he died (December 20, 1704,) at the early age of 51.

For these facts we are indebted to a little compendium on the history of the Hebrew language, called, "*Ædificium Salomonis*," published at Hannover, 1831. The name of the author, a Jew, is S. E. Blogg. Short notices of Eisenmenger may be also found in Rose's Biog. Dict., and in the *Biographie Universelle*. An abridgment of "*Judaism Unveiled*"

was published in London, in 1740, by the Rev. John Stehelin, under the title of "Traditions of the Jews."

A most arduous task our oriental professor must have had of it, to wander through the labyrinthian mazes of Talmudical, Rabbinical and Cabalistical literature; to transcribe and translate thousands of extracts from as many different books and manuscripts, embracing nearly every Hebrew work, then known. This volume, (lest I should forget to mention it,) contains no less than *two thousand one hundred and six* quarto pages—a most remarkable example certainly of that untiring and persevering industry, for which the author's countrymen have long since been proverbial. What, indeed, are all the twelve labors of Hercules compared with this? And the author deserves all the more credit for devoting his time and talents to so thankless a task; for honor or profit he certainly could expect none.

But now to the book itself; and lest the reader should apprehend to be bored with 2106 quarto pages, we will assure him at the outset, that it is not our purpose just now to translate the whole work, but only to give a few specimens, which we translated at our leisure, and now draw from our portfolio. One of the most remarkable of these is perhaps the following from SUIDAS. We shall give it just as we find it without note or comment, leaving it to your learned Thebans to test the authenticity of the extract, and the degree of credibility it deserves. We have no edition of Suidas within reach to verify it, but presume upon its exactness, as Eisenmenger gives the original text also in parallel pages.*

In the days of the pious Emperor Justinian there was a man, a chief among the Jews, by the name of Theodosius, well known to many Christians, and even to the emperor himself. There was at that time likewise a Christian, by the name of Philippus, and by trade a silversmith. He knew Theodosius well, and was acquainted with all his actions, whence he conceived a high opinion of his integrity, and often warned and exhorted him that he should become a Christian. One day he thus spoke to Theo-

* Cologne edition, 1619, p. 1228, under the word *Ἰησοῦς*.—Suidas is a Greek lexicographer, of whom nothing is known. The time in which he wrote even is extremely uncertain. See *Anthon's Greek Literature*.

dosius: "Since you are a learned man, and well know what is written in the Law and in the Prophets respecting Christ, why do you not believe in him, and become a Christian? for I am convinced that it is not from an ignorance of the promises and prophecies concerning our Lord and Saviour that you refuse to profess yourself a Christian. Haste thou to save your soul, and believe in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, that on the Day of Judgment you may not be in danger of eternal damnation, on account of your unbelief."

When the Jew had heard these words, he thanked the Christian kindly, and answered him thus: "I am deeply sensible of your love for me, and of your kind efforts to effect my salvation, by persuading me to become a Christian; and for this reason I will (before God, who knows and sees the secrets of our hearts,) speak with you candidly, and without deceit or dissimulation. I know very well, and to a certainty, that the Christ, who was foretold in the Law and in the Prophets, and who is adored by you Christians, has come, and I acknowledge this in confidence to you, my dear friend, who have never shown me anything but kindness. But as I am moved by worldly considerations, I do not embrace Christianity and thus effect my own damnation. For as I am a chief among the Jews now, I am highly honored, receive many presents, and enjoy everything that can be desirable in life. But on the other hand, though I should attain to the dignity of a *Patriarch* in the Catholic church, or receive greater honors and dignities from you, I should nevertheless not enjoy the same respect, as I do at present among the Jews. Now I neglect the future, and my immortal soul, that I may not lose this world's goods and honors, and I know that I am doing wrong in this. But that I may prove my sincerity to you, my dear friend, I will entrust you with a secret, which is kept concealed by us Jews, and from which we know to a certainty that Christ whom you Christians worship, to be the same, who is announced in the Law and in the Prophets; and we know this not only from the sacred writings, but more especially by this secret, which has been preserved in writing among us; and the following are the facts I allude to:

"Many years ago, when the temple was built at Jerusalem, it was the custom among the Jews to place as many priests in the temple as there are letters in our alphabet, which are twenty-two; hence we also have twenty-two books [in the Old Testament,] inspired by God. But there was a book in the temple in which was written the name of each one of the twenty-two priests, and also the names of their fathers and mothers, and when one of the priests died, the others met in the temple, and elected another in his place, and thus again completed their number. Then they would write in this book, that on such and such a day the priest N. N., son of N. N. and N. N. died, and that N. N., son of N. N. and N. N., was elected in his stead. Now it happened at that time, when this custom was in use, and when Jesus lived in Judea, that one of the twenty-two priests died, (before the time when Jesus began to teach in public, and to preach that men must

believe in him.) The priests assembled together in order that they might elect another in the place of their departed brother; and when each one proposed such a one as he thought worthy of the office, the others would always oppose his election, saying that he was not pious enough; or that he was otherwise unfit for the discharge of the sacerdotal functions. For even if he was a man of good sense and irreproachable morals, but had no knowledge of the Law or the Prophets, he was to be deemed unfit for the priesthood. When many had thus been proposed and rejected, one of the priests arose and said:—As many have been proposed and rejected by you. I will now mention a man who I think should be elected in the place of our deceased brother; for I do not think you will be able to find aught against him. And after the other priests urged him to tell the name of his candidate, he said: I wish you to elect JESUS, the son of Joseph, the carpenter, who although still very young, will be an ornament to us in his life, manner and conversation; and I do not think there ever was a man equally gifted in these respects, and I presume that this is well known to all of you who live here in Jerusalem, and will not be disputed. After the priests had heard these words, they accepted of the man, and said that Jesus was suited to the priesthood above all other men. But some averred that he was not of the tribe of *Levi*, but of the tribe of *Judah*; (since he was generally supposed to be Joseph's son;) and as he was of the tribe of *Judah*, and not of the tribe of *Levi*, he could not be elected to the sacerdotal office. But the priest who had proposed him first, said that he was of mixed ancestry; for many years before, there had been a matrimonial alliance between the two tribes, whence sprung the family of Joseph. Now when the other priests heard this, they agreed with him, and unanimously declared, that Jesus should be instituted in the place of the deceased priest.

“ But since it was customary, not only to write the name of the priest, but also that of his father and mother, in the book above mentioned; some of them said that his parents should first be summoned, that they may give their names, and testify that the said priest elect really was their son. This proposition met with general approbation. But he who had first nominated Jesus, said that Joseph, the father of Jesus, was dead. They then concluded that his mother should be brought before them, to declare whether Jesus was her son, and what was the name of the man who had begotten him. When this was approved of, they summoned the mother of Jesus, and said to her: As the priest N. N., son of N. N. and N. N., is dead, and we wish to receive your son Jesus in his stead, and as it is the custom to write down the name of the father and mother of a priest, we wish you to tell us whether Jesus be your son, and if he was born by you. When Mary had heard this, she said to the priests: I herewith declare that Jesus is my son, for I have borne him, which can be testified by the men and women who were present at the time of his birth: *but he has no father upon earth*; for when I was a virgin, and lived in Galilee, an angel of God appeared to me, when I was awake and not asleep, and announced to me the glad ti-

dings that I should bear a son of the *Holy Ghost*, whose name he commanded me to call *JESUS*. After I had seen this apparition, and being still a virgin, I conceived, and brought forth this son, *JESUS*; and remain a virgin to this day, even after I have borne this child.

“The priests were much perplexed at that which had been said by *Mary* and other women who had given testimony about her childbirth; and they said to *Mary*: Tell us in truth, that we may hear it from your own mouth whose son he is, that we may be able to enter him on the book; for those whom you will declare his parents, and none other, we will write down in the book. She then answered: I have certainly given birth to him, and know of no one on earth who is his father: but I heard from the angel that he is *the son of God*. Thus he is my son, and the son of *God*; and as I have never known any man, I am still a virgin. When the priests had heard this, they took the book, and wrote in it as follows: on the day *N. N.* died the priest *N. N.*, the son of *N. N.* and *N. N.*, and *JESUS*, the son of the living *God*, and of the virgin *Mary*, was elected priest in his place by the common voice of us all.

“This book was taken from the temple with great care, by some of the chief men among the Jews, at the destruction of the temple and of the city of *Jerusalem*, and is now in the city of *Tiberias*.* This secret is known to very few, and only the most faithful of our people, whence it was also communicated to me, as being one of the rulers and teachers of the Jewish people; for we are not only convinced from the law and the prophets that the *Christ* whom you Christians worship is the son of the living *God* who came to the earth for the salvation of mankind, but also from the above-mentioned book, which has been preserved to the present day, and is now at *Tiberias*.”

When the Christian had heard these things, he was filled with a holy zeal, and he said to the Jew, “I will immediately go and inform our pious and holy emperor of what you have told me, that he may send to *Tiberias* and bring this book to light, as an evidence of Jewish unbelief.” But the Jew said to the Christian, “Why will you bring condemnation on your own soul, and on that of our gracious emperor, when nevertheless you would not obtain what you so eagerly desire? for even if that should take place, there would be a fierce war, and great slaughter would ensue; and when the Jews of *Tiberias* would find themselves greatly reduced, they would burn the book. I have told you this as my beloved and faithful friend, to show you that I do not reject Christianity from ignorance, but from selfish motives only.”

When the Christian had heard and believed what the Jew had told him, he did not, indeed, inform *Justinian* of it, lest this emperor, actuated by a holy zeal for the divine glory, should be the cause of much bloodshed, and yet in the end would not attain his purpose:—but he communicated it to many of his friends and acquaintances. And as we [*Suidas*] learned these facts

* There was a celebrated Talmudical school at *Tiberias* at that time.

from those to whom Philippos, the silversmith, had told them, we took not a little trouble to ascertain whether the Jew had told the truth respecting this book. We therefore consulted Josephus, the historian of the conquest of the city of Jerusalem, (who is frequently referred to by Eusebius Pamphilus in his Ecclesiastical History,) who clearly states in the commentaries or books of his captivity, and of the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, that Jesus performed service in the temple with the priests. When we saw that Josephus, (who was an old man, and lived but a short time after the apostles,) had said this, we also looked in the inspired writings to find this matter confirmed; and we found in Luke iv. 16, 17, 18, that Jesus went into the synagogue of the Jews, where a book was given him, and that he read from Isaiah (lxi. i.): "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor." We also concluded, that if Christ had not been a priest among the Jews, they would not have given him a book in the synagogue to read to them. For among us Christians also, it is not permitted to any one to read in the church from the inspired writings, unless he was appointed thereto by the Church. We thus know from what Josephus says, and from what Luke the Evangelist tells us, that the Jew Theodosius did not invent what he had said to Philippos the silversmith; but in confidence and friendship imparted him this secret, which the Jews take such pains carefully to conceal.

So far Suidas, as found in Eisenmenger, p. i. chapter ii., page 122. This second chapter is devoted to the various opprobrious names applied to Christ, to be found in the Talmud and other Jewish writings. The persevering professor enumerates no less than twenty-eight of these, for each one of which he takes occasion to retaliate in kind. In the third chapter we have a Talmudical account of the life and miracles of Christ, with refutations of the various calumnies. These latter, though diabolical in their origin and design, are not without some degree of value, inasmuch as they tacitly admit the historical truth of our Saviour's miracles; and even find it necessary to account for them on the ground of sorcery. It thus appears that it never entered the heads of the earlier Jews to deny them altogether, for that would have been a much easier task than to have recourse to supernatural or diabolical agencies for their solution. The Rabbins differ, too, as to the means employed in the performance of these miracles. The most ordinary charge against Christ is, that he worked them by the *Shem Hamphorash*—"Ineffable

Name."* The manner in which he is said to have got possession of it is thus described in the *Toldoth Yeshu*,† a little tract of unknown authorship, but generally supposed to belong to about the sixth or seventh century. Its language is so gross, and its falsehoods so glaring, that the Jews have long since been ashamed of it, and for years have tried to suppress it. The extract we give here is found on p. 157 of the present work :

At that time there was in the temple the ineffable name engraven upon a solid stone, which David the king found when he dug the foundation of the temple, and deposited it in the holy of holies. And the wise men fearing that the young might learn and carelessly repeat the name, and thereby bring destruction upon the world,‡ (which may God avert,) made by magic art two brazen lions, and placed one on each side of the door of the holy of holies, so that whoever should enter and learn the name, when he went out they would roar at him and thus through fear he would utterly forget it again.

Jesus, however, the story proceeds to relate, by some stratagem learned the name, and performed sundry miracles with it. When the people asked for signs and wonders, the *Toldoth Yeshu* says, he thus addressed them :

"Bring me a dead man, and I will restore him to life." They ran immediately and opened a grave, but found nothing save bones ; and they said unto him, "We have only found bones." He said "Bring them hither." They brought them before him, and he placed them together, covered them with skin, flesh and sinews, and the man arose, and stood upon his feet, and lived. And they saw this, and were astonished. He again said unto them : "Does this seem marvellous to you ? Bring unto me a leper, and I will cleanse him." They having done so, he healed him by

* The *nomen Dei proprium*—*Jehovah*—is never pronounced or written (except in copies of the Bible) in full by any Jew even to this day. Sometimes it is called *Shem Hannichbad*—*Nomen gloriosum* ; or *Shem Hamyichud*—*Nomen appropriatum* ; or *Shem Hamphorash*—*Nomen separatum vel explicatum* ; sometimes it is simply called *Hashem*—the *Name* ; as in *Lev. xxiv. 11* : "And the Israelitish woman's son blasphemed the NAME ;" "of the Lord" being added by the English translators. The Targum Jonathan explains it here by "nomen magnum et gloriosum. The Targum Jerusalem comments thus upon it : "Nomen expositum, et veteres autem Doctores nostri appellarunt eum ita, quia omnis locus plenus est gloria."

† History of Jesus. Eisenmenger gives the whole of it in Hebrew and German. A copy of it with a Latin translation is also found in Wagen-seil's "Telea Ignea Satanae."

‡ Vide *Yalkut Shimoni* and *Medrash Tillim*.

the ineffable name. When they saw this, they fell at his feet, and worshipped him, saying: "In truth thou art the son of God."

The stone mentioned above as the foundation stone found by David, has been the theme of many Rabbinical extravaganzas. Some contend that the *Eben Shatyah* ("corner-stone") is the identical stone used by Jacob as a pillow, (Gen. xxviii. 11,) and that God afterwards sank it into the ground.* Others again aver, that God had sunk it at the creation of the world, with his name written upon it, and that the world is fixed upon this corner-stone, etc.† Eisenmenger then very gravely states that the *Toldoth Yeshu* must be a lie because, forsooth, how is it possible that this stone, which according to the Rabbis was sunk to the centre of the earth, should have been found by David when laying the foundation of the temple,—as if rabbinical imagination was to be limited by geometrical bounds? It is true he enumerates many other reasons to prove it a base libel, and malicious calumny, devoid of every shadow of truth; but we think he certainly took unnecessary trouble in refuting what no one would now have the audacity or impudence to maintain. However, this may have been otherwise in 1700.

But to return to the magic agencies by which the miracles were said to have been performed. Some of the Rabbis say it was not by the ineffable name, but by the aid of sorcery that he accomplished them. So we find in *Nizzachon*, p. 41, that "all his works were *magic*;" and in p. 239, "Know that he was a sorcerer, and that he did all his miracles by sorcery;" and p. 39, the same author says: "Rabbi Abraham the proselyte says, that Jesus did not know the ineffable name; for even in the days of Moses, which was a pious generation, they were ignorant of it; how much less was it known in later times? Hence we see that he did all these things by sorcery, for it is written in the gospel (?) that he had been two years in Egypt, and there learned magic; as it

* Vide *Yalkut Shimoni* and *Medrash Tillim*.

† *Yalkut Chadash*.

is written in the Talmud,* 'At the creation of the world there came down upon the earth ten measures of sorcery, nine of which found their way to Egypt, leaving but one to the rest of the world.'” Like all erroneous systems, the Talmudists here contradict themselves; for Eisenmenger quotes from the *Nishmath Chayim*, the opinion of Rabbi Manasseh ben Israel, who says, “*No sorcerer ever made the dead alive, produced rain,*” etc.

How much less faith is necessary to believe the sublime language of the divinely-inspired gospel, than to have recourse to such beggarly subterfuges, to accomplish the Saviour's miracles!

Concerning the ineffable name, above referred to, we add the following from p. 216 :

In Talmud, Tract. Sanhedrin, fol. 90, col. 1, we find, that he who pronounces the ineffable name [Jehovah] has no part in the world to come. The reason why it may not be pronounced is derived from an interpretation of Ex. iii. 15: “This is my name forever. The Hebrew words, *Shē Shēmi lēōlam*, are to be understood, “Thus is my name always to be pronounced; even as this *lēōlam* is written here without a *vav*,† so must the *vav* in *Jehovah* be left out;” whence the Jews now always read *Adonai*—Lord—in its stead. This exegesis is found in Talmud Shemoth Rabba, fol. 98, and in Yarchi, in *loco*. In Tract. Kidushin this subtlety goes still further, where it says; “*lēōlam* ('forever'), without the *vav*, reads *lēalem*, ('to be concealed,') and the clause now stands, ‘This is my name to be concealed.’” From this, the name of Jehovah is sometimes called *Shem haneklam*—the hidden name.

While on this topic, Eisenmenger proceeds to show, that the Jews, in their writings, admit that the name of Jehovah is also applied to the Messiah. Out of the numerous passages he adduces, we will only translate a few :

Rabbi David Kiruchi, in his commentary on the words in Jer. xxiii. 6—“The Lord [Jehovah] our righteousness,” says, “The Messiah is so called, because in his time, the righteousness of God will be our constant stay.” Rabbi Joseph Albo, in his *Sepher Ikkarim*, says: “The Scriptures call Messiah, Jehovah Zidkenu—‘the Lord our righteousness,’—because he is the Mediator through whom we must be made righteous; or more literally,

* Tract. Kidushin, fol. 49, col. 2.

† This word is generally written with a *vav*.

through whom we must receive the righteousness of God. The words in Micah ii. 13—"Their king shall pass before them, and the Lord [Jehovah] on the head of them," are also referred to the Messiah by several commentators. The Messiah is also understood by *Jehovah Zebaoth*—"the Lord of hosts;" for the Chaldaic paraphrast renders Isaiah xxviii. 5—"In that day shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory, etc.,—by "In that day shall the Messiah of the Lord of hosts be for a crown of Joy."

The fifth chapter is devoted to an investigation of the question, whether the Jews refer to our Savior those passages in the Talmud, in which mention is made of a certain Jesus, the disciple of Rabbi Joshua son of Perachiah. On page 228, Eisenmenger says :

Whenever the Jews are charged with blaspheming the name of Christ in their Rabbinical writings, they assert that the Jesus of the Talmud is not Christ, but a man who lived some 130 years before him. But this is a mere subterfuge by which they would deceive Christians; but in order that the true state of the case may be known, I will show what they say in their own writings concerning this matter, and what they have written about the disputation held at Paris, in 1240, before the Queen, between Rabbi Yéchiël and the convert Nicolao, and how they made the same assertion then, though Rabbi Yechiel afterwards acknowledged that he only had recourse to these arguments because of the consequences which might have arisen to the Jews had he owned that these passages of the Talmud referred to Christ.

The author then gives an account of this controversy, the various arguments brought forward to prove that Christ is not the Jesus of the Talmud, etc. He then goes to work, and shows the sophistry of all this Rabbinical reasoning, and quotes sundry Talmudical authors, referring to the passages in question, and who speak of them as alluding to Christ.

Chapter viii, embracing 160 quarto pages, treats of the Talmud—a fertile topic which, of course, our indefatigable Orientalist did not allow to pass unimproved. He opens his battery in the following strain :

As I gave an account, in the preceding chapter, how the wicked Jews speak of the New Testament, and call the holy Apostles and Evangelists wicked and unlearned men, who to prove facts they wished to establish, did not scruple to misquote sundry passages of the Old Testament—I thought it proper to devote the present chapter to an account of the Talmud, (i. e. the Babylonian Talmud, for that of Jerusalem is now but seldom used

among the Jews, and is but a small work, compared with the former.) This Talmud they foolishly pass as the word of God, although it contains many blasphemies, absurd tales, palpable falsehoods, ridiculous and puerile expositions of Holy Writ, and many things which are diametrically opposed to the Bible. Moreover, some of their Talmudical Rabbis have been persons of very questionable character, and some have openly led very infamous lives. I show these things that all may be convinced of the great blindness and obstinacy of this people, who reject the pure and holy teachings of the New Testament, and regard the false and absurd doctrines of the Talmud as the Word of God.

He now quotes what the Jews consider (or did then consider) good authority for giving the Talmud equal rank with the inspired writings. The pith of the matter is, that the Rabbis say, many of the Mosaic laws are too obscure to be understood without more minute directions concerning them; that to avoid innumerable systems and conflicting theories, which would necessarily arise from any great license in interpretation, God gave to Moses what they call the "oral law," at the same time and place when he gave him the written law. This oral law provides for every possible contingency that may occur, in regard to the explanation of the Pentateuch. It now generally goes under the name of Talmud. The following (from the Yalkut Rubeni, fol. 107, col. 2, 3,) is the Rabbinical account of the manner in which Moses received this oral law. It will be seen that he had not a little opposition to encounter, ere he succeeded in his mission.

"About the time when Moses was to go up to heaven, a cloud came, and lay down before him. But Moses our teacher, (on whom be peace) knew not whether he should ride on it, or whether he must only support himself by it. But immediately the cloud opened, and Moses stepped in, and went up into the firmament, just as a man walks on the ground, for so it is written in the law, (Ex. xxiv. 18.) 'And Moses went into the midst of the cloud.' But when he was observed by the porter, Kemuel, (who presides over twelve thousand adverse angels, who watch at the gate of heaven,) he spoke to him: O son of Amram, what business have you in the abode of the angels of fire? Upon which Moses answered: I did not come from my own accord, but with the permission of the holy and blessed God, to receive the law, and to carry the same down to the children of Israel. But when the porter would not let him pass, Moses struck and wounded him, then he went on in the firmament, till he met the angel, Hadarniel. This Hadarniel is said to be sixty times ten thousand miles

higher than all his comrades, and every word that proceeds from his mouth is accompanied with twelve thousand fiery thunderbolts. When he saw Moses, he accosted him very harshly, and said: O son of Amram, what hast thou to do in the place of the upper-saints? When Moses heard his voice he trembled and wept, and was ready to fall down from the clouds. But the holy and blessed God took compassion on him, and said to Hadarniel; from the day I created thee, thou hast been a seeker of strife. When in the beginning I wished to create man, thou didst object and say: 'What is man, that thou art mindful of him?' At which I became angry with thee, and burned thee with my little finger. And now, thou contendest with him, who is faithful in my house, and whom I sent for to receive the law, and carry it down to my chosen people; for if it were not for the law which the children of Israel receive, you would have no dwelling place in the firmament.*

"But when Hadarniel heard this, he said, O Lord of the universe, I did not know that he came hither with thy permission: now I will be his messenger and walk before him, even as a disciple goeth before his master; and immediately Hadarniel stooped down and went on before Moses, till he came to the angel of fire, Sandalfon. Then he said to Moses, return, for I cannot endure the fire of Sandalfon, lest he burn me. And when Moses saw Sandalfon, he was sore afraid, and trembled till he almost fell out of the clouds again, and tears flowed from his eyes. And when he had prayed for mercy, God heard him on account of the great love he bears to Israel, came down from the throne of his glory, and stood so long before Moses, till he had passed the fire of Sandalfon, as it is written, (Ex. xxxiv. 6.) 'And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed.' When Moses had now come past Sandalfon, he came to the Rigyon, the river of fire. But here, too, God led him past. Then he met Galizur, also called Rasiel, and Moses trembled when he saw him. And when God had taken him, and carried him past, he met a large number of the angels of terror, who surround the throne of glory, and who are the strongest and most powerful of all the angels. These attempted to burn him with the hot breath of their mouths, (because he had come to take away the law, which they wished to keep to themselves.) But God immediately covered him with his glory, and said to him, answer them. Then Moses said to them: It is written, 'I am the Lord thy God which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt.' Have you [angels] served in Egypt, and were you taken out of bondage, that you should need the law. It is written: 'Thou shalt have no other Gods;' is there any idolatry among you, that you should need the law? Again, it is written: 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.' Are you engaged in any kind of business, that you should have to swear an oath? Then it is written: 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.'"

* Alluding to a Talmudical opinion that God created the world for the sake of giving the law.

As you do not work, you need no Sabbath for rest. It is written: 'Honor thy father and thy mother,' but you have no father or mother whom you can honor. [Thus he goes through all the ten commandments.]

"On hearing these words, all the angels withdrew their opposition to Moses, and said to the holy and blessed God: O Lord, our king, how glorious is thy name in all the earth, who exaltest thy majesty even above the heavens. And God taught Moses the whole law in forty days. And when he came down again, and beheld those awful angels—the angels of terror, the angels of perspiration, the angels of trembling, and the angels of fear—he was so overwhelmed with fear, that he forgot the whole law again in that one hour. But God called Yefiyah, the angel of the law, who gave the law to Moses, well-arranged and preserved. And all the angels became his friends, and each one gave him some medical receipts and sundry other valuable secrets, the use of which they taught him, as it is written, (Ps. lxxviii. 18,) 'Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts.' The angel of death also imparted some secrets to him, as it is written, (Numb. xvi. 47,) 'And he put on incense, and made an atonement for the people.'"

This is an old Rabbinical legend, relating to the forty days Moses spent on Mount Sinai. The tradition of his ascension to heaven is founded on Prov. xxx. 4,—“Who hath ascended up into heaven or descended?” The Talmudical commentary or *Medrash*, *in loco* answers, “Moses.” The application of this text here, is not so far-fetched as Talmudical Scripture texts generally are, as the reader will have seen in the foregoing extract.

Nothing is too abstruse for Rabbinical inquiry; thus they have even asked and answered the query, how Moses knew when it was day and when it was night, during the forty days he was in heaven. In the *Medrash* for Ex. xxxiv. 28—“And he was then with the Lord forty days and forty nights”—we find:

“Whence did Moses know when it was day and when it was night? When the holy blessed God taught him the written law, he knew it was day; but when he instructed him in the oral law, he knew it was night; for day and night are alike to God, as it is said (Daniel ii. 22,) ‘And the light dwelleth with him.’ So also, it is written, (Ps. cxxxix. 12,) ‘Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee.’” In another place of the *Medrash* we read: “When he saw that the stars and the planets bowed down and worshipped God, he knew it was day, but when he saw that the globe of the sun bowed down and worshipped God, he knew that it was night, as it is

said, (Nehem. ix. 6,) ‘ And the host of heaven worshippeth thee.’ ” Yet another opinion is, that “ when he saw the angels bake the manna for the children of Israel, he knew it was day, but when the manna had fallen, he knew it was night.”

Eisenmenger then proceeds to show how absurd it is in the Jews to pretend that all this oral law is the word of God, since the Rabbis, who are its exponents, are so much at variance regarding many points, so that what one calls clean, the other pronounces unclean, etc., and especially is this the case in respect to the decisions of the rival schools of Hillel and Shammai. But all these contradictions notwithstanding, they contend for the infallibility of the Talmud. Thus we find in Tract. Eruvin, fol. 13, col. 2. that the House of Hillel, and the House of Shammai had had a controversy for three years; and when both parties contended for the victory, a voice from heaven* was heard, saying that the teachings of both were the word of God, but that the decision was according to the House of Hillel.

The reason they assign for this unfortunate propensity for quarrelling and disputing, (of which the Talmud is full,) is, that it is all owing to Moses having struck the rock against the command of God; that were it not for that, Israel would be one and without strife.

The law, they say, was taught to Adam in Paradise, and he delivered it to Seth his son, he again to Shem, the son of Noah, he to Abraham, (Gen. xxvi. 5.) and so on down to Moses, who first wrote it down. The patriarchs, are said to have studied it very much. Some Rabbins say that the death of Abel resulted from a quarrel he had with Cain concerning the interpretation of a particular passage in the law. (Numb. xv. 38, etc.) They could not agree about the fringes, (or *Zitsith*, worn now by every Jew.) But others think that the quarrel arose about the partition of the world; Abel was to have had all movable goods, and Cain the immovable. Abel then said to Cain, pull off the clothes thou wearest, for they belong to me, being a part of the *mabilia*; but Cain said, fly up

* The *Bath Kol*, or daughter of a voice was very like the ancient oracles.

into the air, for thou hast no part in the earth, and immediately he fell upon Abel and killed him.

The relative merit they set upon the study of the written law, (the Bible,) and the oral law, (the Talmud,) will be seen by the following comparisons :

“Our Rabbis tell us that those who study in the Bible, perhaps may be said to do something meritorious ; those who study the *Mishnah*, (the original Talmud,) certainly do something meritorious, and therefore will receive their reward : but those who occupy themselves with the *Gemara*, (the commentary and rabbinical disquisitions on the *Mishnah*,) merit the highest praise.”* Again, it is said in *Massecheth Sopherim* : “The written law is like salt, the *Mishnah* like pepper, and the *Gemara* like the finer spices : the world cannot do without salt, nor without pepper, but a rich man makes use of all three. In the same manner, the world cannot exist without the Bible, the *Mishnah*, or the *Gemara*.” Again : “He who studies the Bible and the *Mishnah*, but not the Talmud, (i. e. *Gemara*,) should not be in your company, as it is written, (Prov. xxiv. 21,) ‘Meddle not with them that are given to change.’” But in a book called *Shaare Zedek*, much stronger ground is taken, for here we have the following language : “A man who studies the Bible without the *Mishnah* and *Gemara*, is like one who has no God.”

Passages like these could be multiplied *ad infinitum*, but these are sufficient to give the reader an idea what our Saviour meant when he said : “Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition”—or when he charged them with “teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.”

Eisenmenger next shows what the Rabbis teach concerning the implicit obedience due to them. It will be seen that they are not behind the Jesuits in this respect. Thus Yarchi, in his comments on Deut. xvii. 11,—“Thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee, to the right

* Tract. Bava Meziash, fol. 33, col. 1.

hand nor to the left,"—says: "Though he [i. e. the judge, by which of course a Rabbi is meant,] tell thee that the right hand is the left, or the left the right, thou must nevertheless obey him." Again, in Tract. Sanhedrim we find: "Rabbi Chasda says, a man who contradicts a Rabbi or teacher, is as guilty as one who would contradict the Divine majesty, as is said, (Numb. xxvi. 9,) 'when they strove against the Lord.'"

This is also proven from Exod. xvi. 8, where Moses says: "Your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord." Then we find in Tract. Eruvin, that he who breaks any of the enactments of the Rabbis, shall be punished with death. "He who expounds the law in presence of his teacher, is worthy of death." "He who calls his teacher by name [and not Rabbi] is an Epicurean, [infidel,] and has no part in the world to come."

Now let us see what they say about the *Am Haäretz*, (literally, "the people of the country"—but in the Talmud always standing for an ignoramus, one unskilled in the law.) On page 338 of the *Entdecktes Judenthum*, we find the following from Tract. Pesachim, fol. 49, col. 2:

"Our Rabbis teach that a man should not marry the daughter of an *Am Haäretz*, or one who has not studied, for they are an abomination, their wives vermin, and of their daughters it is written in Deut. xxvii. 21, 'Maledictus qui dormit cum omni jumento.' The Rabbi also says that it is forbidden for the *Am Haäretz* to eat the flesh of any animal, as it is said, (Lev. xi. 46,) 'This is the law of the beasts, and of the fowl.' Those who are learned in the law may eat flesh of beasts and fowl; but those who are unlearned may not. Rabbi Eliezer said, 'It is permitted to cut the throat of an *Am Haäretz* even on the Day of Atonement.' Upon which his disciples said, 'Rabbi! not to cut his throat, say rather to slay him,' [in the ceremonial manner they kill clean animals.] But he replied: 'This [slaying] requires a blessing to be said during its performance, but cutting the throat needs none.' Rabbi Samuel, son of Nachmani, said that Rabbi Yochanan had said: 'It is permitted to split open an *Am Haäretz* like a fish.' Rabbi Maier said, that giving one's daughter in marriage to an *Am Haäretz*, is the same as binding her, and throwing her before a lion, etc.

"Our Rabbis teach further, that six things are said of the *Am Haäretz*. Testimony is neither given them nor received from them; no secret must be told to them; they are not made guardians over orphans, or keepers of

the poor-box;* no one must associate with them on the highway. Some also say that when they lose any article of property, no proclamation must be made [to assist them in getting it back again]."

Eisenmenger adds sundry other extracts from the Talmud to show the obscenity of some of these Rabbis. Then he goes on to show why the Talmud cannot lay any claim to being an oral law delivered by God, for it teaches many things contradictory to the divine character; many things contradictory to the Old Testament; that there have been men who kept the whole law, although the Bible tells us that "there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." Then the Talmud attempts to palliate the misdeeds of Hophni and Phinehas, sons of Eli, of Reuben, of the sons of Samuel, of David, and Solomon, and others—maintaining that these accounts must not be taken literally; and in one way or another they are all explained away. And the third chapter of Genesis notwithstanding, Adam is here declared innocent, and all the sin laid on Eve.

It cannot come from God, continues Eisenmenger, because it teaches astrology, permits usury, in some places enjoins drunkenness, (as for instance in Tract. Megillah, where it says: "It is a very meritorious act to drink wine on the feast of Esther till one is perfectly drunk.")

So great is the passion of these Rabbis for puerile quibbling, that no text escapes them. In Lev. xviii. 21, we find: "and thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech." But "Raf Acha, son of Rabba, says, when a man passes *all* his children through the fire of Moloch, he is not guilty because it is said [literally] 'Of thy seed,' and not 'of *all* thy seed.'"

The Talmud cannot be from God, because it says, it is wrong to praise him too much; because it permits one to ask counsel of devils.† It also says that Solomon had many thousand devils to assist him in building the temple, but after

* This reminds one of Judas.

† Here much is quoted which is contained in the article ANMODAI, S. M. Q. Rev. Oct. 1858.

he had sinned they served him no longer. (A contradiction, this, for elsewhere it is contended that he never sinned.) The Talmud allows sinning, so it is not done publicly, and brings no disgrace to Israel.* But the word of God commands us to be holy.

Sed jam satis! Why go on and multiply absurdities and puerilities, when perhaps scarcely a single reader followed us so far? We think we have shown now sufficiently what are the contents of the book with the unpronounceable title-page, printed at the head of this article. In justice to the Jews of the present day it should be said, that comparatively but very few believe in the divine inspiration of the Talmud; although the orthodox will not consent to give it up. They can assign no other cause for this inconsistency, than that they do *more majorum*, as their fathers did before them. The various fables and trivialities contained in it, they reject altogether; but cling more or less to its exposition of their ceremonial code. As it was in the time of our Saviour and his apostles, so is it now the great obstacle that keeps the mass of the Jews from embracing Christianity.

We may return to the work at some later period.

JOSEPHUS.

South Carolina.

ART V.

WESLEYAN METHODISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY HUMPHRY SANDWICH, M. D.†

(From the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, for July, 1854.)

It must on all hands be admitted, that the British public need some frank and friendly exposition of the real nature of

* Vide Chagigah, fol. 16, col. 1.

† This article was lately delivered as a lecture in the Hull West Circuit.

this system, and of its services to the commonwealth, with a view to correct the erroneous notions of those who contemplate it at a distance, and to efface the unfavourable impressions left on the minds of others by the misrepresentations of unfriendly critics. Instead of a strict analysis, therefore, of works issued of late years by Isaac Taylor, Vaughan, Pusey, and Steward, our chief aim will be to adduce evidence of the undeniable merits of a system which they all more or less undervalue. Moreover, the inroads of Romanism, and the sapping and mining efforts of Tractarianism, justify an honest attempt to interest public opinion in an inquiry into the claims of so active a system of evangelical religion. The more these are made known, the more highly, it is believed, will they be estimated by all Protestants capable of appreciating the services of Wesleyan Methodism at this crisis of our history. In the mean time, it must gratify its friends to observe that a more catholic estimate of its claims is beginning to gain ground in the most influential quarters. Thus at the last annual meeting of the Kirchentag in Berlin, Professor Stahl, in distinguishing between *separations* and *sects*, admitted "that separations had taken place which he could not regret, because they had become necessary; such as those of the Moravians, the Methodists, and the Free Church of Scotland." So also Professor Dr. Lange, of Zurich, in speaking of Methodism, said that "the Methodists were not a sect, but *had been cast out of the Church.*" He also cordially acknowledged their great services, and, in drawing a comparison between Methodism and the Jesuit Missions, affirmed that "the preaching of the Jesuits was as feeble as a shadow against the powerful preaching of the Methodists, which was attended with a great blessing."*

It would, indeed, be looking for "Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt," if we could challenge the respect of our readers for nothing lovelier than what appears in the caricatured representations of Wesleyan Methodism with which the world

* Evangelical Christendom, October, 1853, vol. vii., pp. 314, 315.

has of late been abused. But ours is the more agreeable task of unfolding the excellencies of a system which needs only to be fully understood to convert lukewarm supporters into ardent advocates, and, more especially, to imbue the ingenuous minds of the youth of our Connexion with that spirit of zealous devotion to its interests, to which, under God, Methodism has been largely indebted for its past successes.

We may venture to assume—what all competent judges have cheerfully admitted—that Wesleyan Methodism was well adapted to fulfil the pressing wants of the country in the eighteenth century. The age was, confessedly, dark, barbarous, demoralised. It needed another John the Baptist. Hence the terrors of the law, and the necessity of “the new birth,” were thundered into men’s ears, like the reverberated echoes of Mount Sinai. The heaven-inspired message was effective. Generation after generation repented like the Ninevites at the preaching of Jonah. The century closed hopefully, as “the Sun of Righteousness arose” on many a verdant spot redeemed from the dreary waste. Is there nothing in all this to bespeak our respect for the much-maligned system of Wesleyan Methodism? But, we have been told, it has undergone such changes in our day, that it has lost its power to benefit the world. We envy not either the head or heart of that Wesleyan who has not conceived so high an opinion of the system from its *past* successes, as to demand strong proof to convince him of such a metamorphosis. A little calm investigation will soon assure the candid inquirer, that in circumstantials only can any alteration be discovered; for in all essentials the system is still the same. And admitting the existence of certain changes in circumstantials, are they not for the better, and such as the altered state of society demands? Fully to answer this question, we must engage in a somewhat extended inquiry, while we contemplate Wesleyan Methodism in its adaptation to the wants of the age, and the existing phases of society.

Up to a late period, the nineteenth century has been marked more by discoveries in physical science and mechanical

inventions than by moral improvement ; although Christianity has waged, and still continues to wage, an active warfare with surrounding sin and darkness. Many marvellous events have occurred, to break in upon the monotonous repose of a more tranquil age. If it be asked, "What are the moral portents of our distempered times?"—we answer, The Roman Catholic Aggression, Tractarianism, Neology, popular Infidelity, Socialism, Mormonism, and a rampant agitation within our own borders ; while, in the political world, Catholic Emancipation, the Reform Bill, and Free Trade have effected immense changes in our social condition. To refer to some other matters :—Agriculture was in unexampled prosperity during the operation of the Berlin and Milan decrees ; but still the country could not boast of a virtuous peasantry, because the religious education of the children of the poor had been neglected by the landed interest. Nor has that reproach as yet been rolled away. In some of the southern counties, especially,—of which, it is well-known, Methodism has but feeble hold,—the same neglect of the moral culture of the labouring classes is still apparent. "Whoever would write the history of the English poor," says Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, in his own graphic style, "must record, that, though centuries have passed since the Missionary Priests of the Saxon cathedral penetrated the primeval forest, to preach beneath some stone-cross at the meeting of its glades, or at the door of some rude cell, or on the steps of some simple oratory, yet the wild foresters, the half-savage swine-herds, and the solitary shepherds of the downs, in those days, were probably as effectually instructed in their Christian duties, as is the pauper of our southern counties now."* It is admitted, on all hands, that the want of efficient religious schools is one of the most prolific causes of the demoralisation of the rural districts. Another is defective clerical instruction, partly from an insufficient number of clergymen, partly from the want of accommodation in churches, and partly from a certain shyness on the part of the parishion-

* Sir James Kay Shuttleworth's "Public Education, as affected by the Minutes of the committee of Privy Council," p. 143.

ers in their intercourse with their parochial instructor, who appears often too much of the scholar or the gentleman. Whatever other causes may be invoked to account for the facts, certain it is that the terrible machinery of law and police develops in the back-ground of a delusive moral landscape a festering mass of crime and debauchery, including the burglaries, the garotte robberies, the murders, the incendiarism, and the poisonings of our secluded hamlets. And here we may remark, that great injustice is done to our pure Protestant worship by dissociating it from the education of the school; because a certain amount of intelligence is necessary to prepare the people for the reception of so spiritual a religion. In the absence of this, the very simplicity of Protestant worship gives a positive advantage to the imposing ceremonial of the Romish Church, as well as to that of its Tractarian sister. And both these counterfeit forms of Christianity are everywhere on the look out, hovering over the most neglected of our rural and town populations; for "where the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together."

The prosperity of the manufacturing system of this country kept pace with that of agriculture; but the mill-owners had equally with the land-owners neglected to discharge their duties to the operative classes. The evil was in this case aggravated by the growth of large towns, with all the moral evils incident to over-crowding, and the want of sanitary purity. Competition urged on human labour to the farthest pitch of endurance. Childhood and youth were victimised to appease an insatiable cupidity, until legislative interference at length insisted on some cessation from toil for educational purposes. How much excessive week-day labour interfered, also, in the case of adults, with attendance on religious worship on Sunday, is matter of known fact rather than of inference. Moreover, the want of clerical instruction attaches to the manufacturing as well as to the agricultural districts. The operatives in Lancashire are in the habit of saying, "There is no church in England for the poor, there is only a church for the

rich."* Here, again, the social rank of the Clergy is too much removed above that of the poor. How often are the poor operatives never visited at all! And yet how else is religion to be spread among the masses of our town poor? Sermons will not do it."† We are well aware that there stand out not a few noble examples of laborious Clergymen, whose praise it is, that both by pastoral visitation, and great plainness of speech in the pulpit, numbers of the outcasts of society have been reclaimed to a life of virtue and godliness. Religious education, too, is beginning to exert its influence in the great centres of manufacturing and commercial life. But it is still restricted within very narrow limits. Nevertheless, the strongest possible motives exist, both of a religious and a political kind, to diffuse a sound Christian education as widely as the sphere of the demoralising agencies everywhere at work. Some of the most striking and revolting of those agencies are the bands of Socialists, Secularists, and Atheists, with their characteristic results in the conspiracies and strikes of the Trades' Unions. "In England, too," says Joseph Kay, Esq., "it becomes every day more and more important to decide how we shall endeavor to introduce conservative elements into the masses of operatives, which are so rapidly and so prodigiously accumulating in our northern counties. In another twenty or thirty years the population of Lancashire and Yorkshire will be ten millions of people, of whom almost all will be operatives. Republican or revolutionary opinions are spreading, and will continue to spread, among them. Are we prepared to let them spread without a check? Are we conscious of the dangers of a republican operative population of ten millions of people assembled on so small an area? Are we prepared to see the intelligence of those masses increase without some attempt to direct that intelligence by good schools, to impress a strong religious character upon that pop-

* "The Social Condition and Education of the People." By Joseph Kay, Esq., M. A., vol. i., p. 592.

† *Ibidem.*

ulation, and to endeavor to render them more conservative by the liberality of our institutions?"*

The connexion of a lawless democracy, subversive of the existing order of things, with popular infidelity, is forcibly illustrated by the following anecdote:—A Christian gentleman, traveling lately by railway, had his attention arrested by the activity with which a fellow-traveler was scattering and distributing tracts at the principal stations; and, picking up one of them, he found it to be an infidel production. He at once remonstrated with the zealous propagandist, who in self-vindication remarked, that his principal object was the propagation of republicanism, rather than of infidelity. But, he added, it had invariably been found impossible to succeed in diffusing the tenets of political ultra-liberalism, when Christianity had laid hold of the minds of the operatives; and, therefore, his policy was to root out Christian principles first, in order to secure the acceptance of his political creed. The extent to which popular infidelity has infected the operative classes of our cities and large towns, is, in truth, the most appalling feature of their demoralisation. Mr. William Gillespie, author of "An Exposure of Combe's Constitution of Man," published in 1837, tells us, that a society of Atheists existed in Glasgow, which numbered from two to three hundred members; that it employed its regular emissaries to go about the villages adjacent to Glasgow, to lecture on the Sundays on astronomy and other sciences, with a view, doubtless, to show how all things can be accounted for on their principles. These Glasgow infidels boast, moreover, that the atheistical societies in Scotland correspond with similar ones scattered throughout England, especially in the great manufacturing districts. There was a period in the history of this country when infidelity was patronised chiefly by lords and gentlemen, our Shaftesburys, Bolingbrokes, Mandevilles, Tindals, Collinses, and others. But the alarming fact is, that *now* the patrons of unbelief are found chiefly in the lower orders of the community.

* "The Social Condition and Education of the People," by Joseph Kay, Esq. M. A., vol. i., p. 285.

The same system of popular infidelity, under the less repulsive name of *Secularism*, is still zealously propagated among the same classes, who are taught to ignore the existence of a God and a future state, on account of their alleged uncertainty; to declaim against prayer as mischievous and useless; and to discard the Bible, because, as one of the oracles of the new sect tells us, "it is the ruin of progress, and an obstacle to all social and political reform." Of all the agencies of modern infidelity, the most powerful is the press. It has been ascertained, that, during the year 1851, there issued from the purely infidel press in London above twelve millions of publications! The issues of avowed Atheism, during the same period, amounted to upwards of six hundred and forty thousand; besides seventeen millions and a half of a negative and corrupting character. These facts show the alarming progress of *scepticism* among a people not, indeed, possessing so corrupted a Christianity as that of France before her first Revolution, or so indefensible a popular belief as that of the ancient republics of Greece before their overthrow. And yet our national faith is so weakened by various heresies, and especially by the misappropriation of the learning of the Tractarian Clergy, that Christianity has not fair play in her contest with popular infidelity. The two great lessons of history, to which we have just adverted, ought not to be lost upon us. We will not dwell on the admonitory one of the first French Revolution. But that of the overthrow of the ancient republics of Greece is so full of instruction as to demand more than a passing notice. "In the schools of the Grecian Sophists, not only was ridicule perpetually cast on the popular belief, which, with all its manifold defectiveness, was still closely connected with many feelings of a noble and dignified morality, which should have been carefully revered and preserved, so long as men had nothing better to be substituted in their room; not only did they heap together loose, vain, and despicable dogmas concerning the world and its first cause; they denied without hesitation the very existence of a Deity, and annihilated within their bosoms all perceptions either of truth or of

goodness. Through the prevailing influence of these opinions, the political purity of Grecian governments, which had long stood in jeopardy on the brink of an abyss of democratic lawlessness, was at last entirely overthrown; and sophistry had the merit of creating a spirit of corruption and debasement, which neither party strife, nor protracted wars, nor foreign bribery, nor bloody revolutions, had been able to produce."* There is a close parallelism, in all respects but the superiority of our national faith, between the state of England at this moment, and that of ancient Greece just before the process of sapping and mining by the sophistries of an atheistical philosophy ended in an explosion that annihilated her liberties.

From the joint operation of the above causes of national corruption, with others which will be incidentally glanced at hereafter, Great Britain has arrived at a critical period in her history, which obviously demands every appliance within her reach to stem the overflowing deluge. In great crises of danger, whether a city be on fire, or a fleet be scattered and reeling to and fro in a tempest, men often fly to any modes of relief but the safe, legitimate, and effective ones. In the case before us, on the one hand, a sense of the need of political and municipal reforms, at a certain period, seized the public mind; and in the general anxiety to appease popular disquiet by enlarging the bounds of practical freedom, a Reformed House of Commons removed those barriers which the wisdom of our Protestant ancestors had placed around the constitution, to secure it against the political machinations of Rome. On the other hand, a certain party in the National Church, looking through a mediæval telescope into the dim historical distance, fancied they saw in the architectural grandeur of churches, the processions of mitred Prelates and gowned Priests, the glare of wax-candles on the altar, and the chant

* Frederic Schlegel's "Lectures on the History of Literature, Ancient and Modern," vol. i., p. 83.—The point for which this quotation is made is sufficiently obvious. It is no part of our design, certainly, to accept the terms of the acute and elegant German as an adequate description of the "belief" to which he refers.

of human voices chiming in with the deep-toned peal of the organ, a panacea for the evils of a distempered age; providing only, they could obtain the control of public education, and subject "young England" to their priestly authority. This is egregious ecclesiastical trifling. Other counteracting agencies, not of the same suspicious character, have doubtless arisen, in the order of Providence, which have really co-operated to produce a better state of things. We may mention Bible Societies, modified Poor Laws, Savings-Banks, factory-legislation, sanitary reform, and, above all, religious education,—which, though still in its infancy, is, like Hercules in his cradle, manfully attempting to strangle the hydra of corruption; to say nothing of certain Commissions of Inquiry with a view to improve the state of our Universities, to abate the evils of bribery at elections, and to promote other substantial national improvements.

Now, amidst all these appliances to secure the regeneration of the country, there is one power pre-eminently adapted, in the estimation of its friends, to achieve much positive good itself, and to lend effective aid to all other conservative agencies. That power is Wesleyan Methodism. And here let it be distinctly understood, that our advocacy of its claims is not intended to disparage those of kindred churches, who share with us in the arduous attempt "to rescue a sinking nation." But we shall be met at the very threshold of the inquiry into its pretensions, by some who, like Dr. Vaughan and Isaac Taylor, think that it has outlived those circumstances for which it was primarily adapted by Providence; by others, who deny, as the Tractarians do, its claims to be considered a true branch of the church of Christ, and therefore insist that, as a counsel or work of men, it must come to nought; and by others, who conclude from recent convulsions within the body, that it is destined to perish by the parricidal blows of its own children. In the face of all such unfriendly observers, we venture to predict the continuance and increase of the system of Wesleyan Methodism, from its very adaptation to the wants of the age, and the existing phases of society. This assertion we

shall at once proceed to vindicate by a few illustrations; and shall afterwards challenge, from the prognosticators of speedy decline, a more respectful consideration for the system on which they declaim.

Who that feels we tread upon a volcano, and that from its smouldering fires the very earth vibrates beneath our feet, will think it expedient, or possible, without incalculable loss, to part with a system fraught, like Wesleyan Methodism, with so much benefit to the nation, to its colonies, and to the world? What would the country do without it, either in our agricultural or manufacturing districts? What has it not done for the former by creating among our farmers a class of men of sterling piety and intelligence, as well as by craning up the moral and intellectual *status* of our peasantry, wherever it has obtained a footing, by means of its pulpit and pastoral ministrations, its Sunday and day schools, and its Missionary Meetings? Villages and small market-towns have but few sources of amusement or instruction. The ancient wake and the modern fair have been the wonted modes of excitement. Contrast with these a Wesleyan Missionary Meeting, with the instructive speeches of the platform, and the edifying social intercourse which gives animation to the whole village,—the servants of both sexes being released from the bondage of labor, at least in Wesleyan families, in order that they may freely participate in pleasures at once rational and sacred. What an element of improvement is here presented to an ignorant peasantry! Then, as to the importance of Methodism to the manufacturing districts, we have a witness at hand both competent and generous enough to bear the following testimony. This was spoken by Lord Ashley in 1837: "It had been part of his business this year to make a short tour through some of the manufacturing districts; and close observation enabled him to say, that, in many districts, in that part of the land, the Established Church was so fettered and thwarted in its operations, and those committed to its charge had so outgrown its means, that, had it not been for the efforts

of the Wesleyan Methodists, there would have been such a mist upon the human mind, and such a darkness upon the human soul, of millions, that no desert in nature could be at all comparable to the moral wilderness that must have existed."*

But it is as the tried friend of religious education for the masses of the people, that the value of Wesleyan Methodism, of late creditably apparent, seems destined to appear still more conspicuous. All parties, Popish and Tractarian, High-Church as well as Evangelical, Dissenters as well as Methodists, are thoroughly alive to the supreme importance of education, as an instrument for forming the religious character of the rising generation. This fact is full of promise for the welfare of the country; for, had it been otherwise, that generation would have passed into the hands of the National Association, with all the chances of being moulded to the purposes of a godless philosophy. In the late conflicts of parties on this subject, it is gratifying to trace the educational efforts of the Wesleyans. In 1839 the High-Church party were made to feel their formidable opposition to the scheme of diocesan schools, which was a most intolerant one; and in the same year the Romanists encountered the same vigilant foe in their attempt to secure educational influence in the country. The Tractarians, with consummate tact, have repeatedly endeavoured to secure a bias in their favor in the plans of the Council of Education. Now, considering the Popish character of their teaching, and the illiberal exclusion of the children of Dissenters from the benefit even of secular education in their schools, except on impossible conditions, it is a valuable service which Wesleyan Methodism has rendered to the Protestantism of the country, and to civil and religious liberty in general, by upholding in 1846-7 the hands of a liberal Government in their resistance of Tractarian craft and policy. The Wesleyans had also previously, in 1842, joined the Dissenters in opposing the factory-clauses of the Bill brought in

* "Times" newspaper, February 20th, 1837; "Watchman," February 22d, 1837.

by Sir James Graham, but withdrawn in consequence of the opposition which it excited. On that memorable occasion it is impossible to forget in what courteous terms Sir James Graham, in a British House of Commons, signalized the Wesleyan protest as a most weighty document, commanding the respectful consideration of the House. Having defeated the designs of an exclusive High-Churchism, the Wesleyans afterwards supported a more comprehensive scheme of education proposed by the Committee of Council; and since that time their educational efforts have been of a magnitude to entitle them to the praise of a high-minded patriotism. For Wesleyan Methodism, though the most imposing embodiment of the voluntary principle in this country, has never yet placed itself in opposition to a legitimate agency on the part of Government in educational matters. Its eagle-eyed leading men, from the beginning, saw through the sophistry of a certain party in confounding education with religion, and in resisting all Government interference alike with education and religion, as equally pernicious. They perceived at a glance, that "public worship and popular education are not identical; nor will all the reasoning in the world, however ingenious, ever make them so."* The Wesleyans have, on the one hand, done much to vindicate this great work from ecclesiastical usurpation; and, on the other, to dissipate the day-dream of a fastidious voluntarism. They have done more than this. They have been among the most active of those religious parties whose exertions in the cause of education have defeated the original aim of the self-styled National Association to tax the community for the support of purely secular schools. The latest programme of this party concedes at length the incorporation of religious schools; which is an unwilling homage, on their part, to the religious principle at work in other directions.

"The number of Wesleyan schools taught by Masters or Mistresses trained by the Education Committee of the Conference, is 202; and there are 195 other schools in connexion with that Committee. The schools of both these classes are

* Dunn's "Calm Thoughts," p. 17.

subdivided into 54 boys', 56 girls', 247 mixed, and 40 infant schools,—altogether, 397: having an average attendance of 21,914 boys, 12,957 girls, and 3,752 infants, or, in the whole, of 38,623 scholars, being an average of 97 to each school.”*

In a complete review of the educational efforts of Wesleyan Methodism, we are bound to advert to Sunday-school instruction, (in which her labors have been truly gigantic,) as showing the large amount of good which religious zeal alone can accomplish. Nor is it immaterial to remark on the aptitude of the system promptly to meet a pressing emergency, rather than to allow the evils it sought to counteract to go on accumulating until a more perfect educational machinery could be brought into play. Its Sunday-school efforts thus became the platform on which was afterwards reared the more perfect system of day-schools, with its Normal Training Institution,—the whole being on a par with the more urgent wants and the higher demands of society, in everything but its extension; and that continues steadily to widen, “like a circle in the waters.”

Hitherto we have spoken of the education of the masses. But the Connexion had other cares of the same kind to occupy her parental bosom. There were the sons of her Preachers, her rising ministry, and the sons of her wealthy laymen, to be fitted by education for their respective spheres of usefulness. Hence the Kingswood and Woolhouse-Grove Schools; the Theological Institution; and the two Colleges of Sheffield and Taunton, affiliated with the London University. Now, all these institutions have successively arisen to meet some obvious and pressing necessity. And the fruit they have borne attests the wisdom of their establishment. That of the Theological Institution, especially, is as ominous of rich and increasing blessing, as the cluster of grapes cut down by the spies at the brook Eshcol gave promise of a land that should flow with milk and honey. Scholars, indeed, from all these schools have honorably distinguished themselves, and in

* Sir James Kay Shuttleworth's "Public Education, as affected by the Minutes of the Committee of Privy Council."

posts of high responsibility have done the State as well as the Church no small service.

In addition to her educational efforts, Wesleyanism has a literature of her own, of considerable importance in forming the minds of large classes of our countrymen. The names of Wesley, Benson, Clarke, Watson, Townley, Treffry, Powell, and others, will suggest works of divinity of which the Connexion may well be proud. Most of them, indeed, are a credit to our common Christianity. The admirable and immortal work of the late Mr. Treffry, on the Eternal Sonship of Christ, extorted even the high commendation of the organ of Tractarianism, the *British Magazine*. Ethnology, too, and the science of living languages, are not a little indebted to Wesleyan Missionaries, who have enlarged our acquaintance more especially with the dialects of Africa. And if, as we shall soon show, Wesleyan psalmody has won an easy conquest over the Tractarian lyre; so also may it be confidently asserted, that Wesleyan biography has put to the blush, in all that exalts human nature, by the exhibition of saving truth embodied in the blameless lives and happy deaths of Christian men and women, both Popish and Tractarian lives of saints, with all their puerile superstition, and frivolous miraculous pretensions. No stronger proof of the value of Wesleyan biography need be adduced, (in addition to every one's consciousness of edification who reads it,) than the well-known fact, that the late illustrious Robert Hall was wont to refresh and brace his Christian principles and sentiments by its earnest perusal. The *Wesleyan Magazine*, independently of its biography, is a periodical of high literary excellence, and replete with varied religious instruction. It keeps pace with the increased intelligence of its readers, and will not shrink from a comparison with contemporary religious journals.

There is another species of literature, more fugitive, certainly, but scarcely less effective, in the shape of lectures delivered to large audiences of young men athirst for information, in what are called "Mutual Improvement Societies." These Associations for the promotion of learning and science,

as well as of religion, in the middle and humbler classes, are greatly on the increase among us; and if properly controlled, give promise of an abundant harvest of moral and intellectual fruit. And their value, at a time when the infidel principles of "Secularism" have taken a wide sweep among the operatives in large towns, is incalculable. Whoever has read the volume of able Lectures against Socialism, delivered under the direction of the Committee of the London City Mission in 1840, (on which occasion Richard Matthews, barrister, and the Rev. George Cubitt, took a conspicuous part,) will be at no loss to estimate the importance of this species of literature. There is one excellence in these "Mutual Improvement Societies," which demands emphatic notice. It is this: If properly managed, they give religion its due place as the sun of their system of instruction, around which the subjects of science and literature revolve as so many planets, deriving from that centre all their warmth and inspiration. In this respect they possess a conservative influence unknown to our Mechanics' Institutes, and Literary and Philosophical Societies, which, under the pretext of getting rid of religious squabbles, too much ignore the paramount authority of revealed religion. Too much care, however, cannot be expended on the organization and management of these Societies. For observation has shown, that, when confided to inexperienced hands, to unpledged disputants, and dabblers in literature and science, they are almost sure to end in worthless debating clubs, in which scepticism soon plays a prominent part; and the result is, that they quickly lose whatever conservative influence they at first possessed, and cease to be the handmaids of religion, constitutional government, and social order. This is the language of sober truth; and we could, if necessary, substantiate the statement by fact. These cautionary remarks being borne in mind, the importance of a well-regulated movement of this kind can scarcely be exaggerated at a time when the nation is entering upon a loftier intellectual career. When the celebrated Niebuhr visited England some few years ago, he expressed great disappointment with the state of English society, as to

its literary and scientific acquirements. The effect of that censure has been felt, and the *élite* among us are straining every nerve to raise the intellectual tone. Meanwhile the British Association has already given a stimulus to the educational institutions of the country. The London University, also, has both widened the portals to the halls of learning, and raised the standard of acquirement, insomuch that Oxford and Cambridge have been compelled to extend their curriculum of study, in order to meet the demands of a more inquisitive age. Within the last few months Wesleyanism, by a spontaneous rather than an authorized effort, has taken a new flight, and, if we may be allowed to say so, has achieved creditable success in a more ambitious sphere of literature. A Quarterly Review has been brought out, which promises to exert a powerful influence on the more educated classes. Nor can it fail to compel a more general attention to the movements of an active and influential church of Christ, of which, but for such an advocate, many might have continued voluntarily ignorant; and, what is of more consequence, it will assist in leavening our national literature with the active ferment of evangelical truth.

In the periodical literature devoted to Wesleyan Methodism there is a weekly production, which claims some notice from its laudable aim to uphold the British Constitution. It is not strictly an official publication. We allude to the "Watchman." Some of the leading minds in our Connexion long ago foresaw, what Mr. Kay so forcibly predicts, the sure spread of republican or revolutionary opinions among the millions of our Lancashire and Yorkshire populations, and felt equally anxious with him "to enlist as many as possible of our poorer classes on the side of order, and to increase as much as possible the conservative feelings of the people" generally. Persuaded that the element of freedom and the element of authority require the constant interposition of religious principle to hold them in combination, and to regulate their respective forces, they established this weekly monitor on passing events, with the professed design of drawing off men's atten-

tion from mere party politics to objects of universal and everlasting obligation. Its principal aim was to promote that moral preparation of the heart which is essential to a right use of the understanding, and to place all public affairs in the clear and solemn light of eternity. And, true to these principles, the "Watchman" has long borne an honourable part with other journals associated in the same sacred mission, as the "Record," the "Scottish Guardian," the "Aberdeen Constitutional," the "Dublin Record," and others, in leavening the community with a wholesome Christian conservatism. These journals, by inculcating that Christianity is the only safe instrument of reform, and that Protestantism is the very cement of the British Constitution, are surrounding that Constitution with better bulwarks than standing armies.

There is one desideratum in the literary department of our system, which, possibly, less than another century's experience of the want of it will induce the Connexion to supply. We have had our Walshes, Clarkes, Townleys, Powells, Trefrys, and others, who have done good service to the Christian church at large by their defences of "the faith once delivered to the saints." But the demands on the active services of an itinerant Ministry brought most of these labourers to a premature grave, wherein lie buried magnificent projects which they felt themselves well fitted by previous studies to complete. In their case, of how much have the Connexion and the world been deprived by an infraction of the laws of overworked human nature! The desideratum to which we allude may be inferred from the following sentiment of the late Rev. Thomas Powell: "I almost long," said he, "to be in some Prebendary's golden stall, wholly at leisure to devote my days and nights to this work of defending the faith!" The Connexion needs about half a dozen men,—choice spirits, devoted and set apart to polemical divinity, general Christian literature, and scientific pursuits. But there are some among us, who, unconscious of the obligations of a comprehensive ecclesiastical policy, would rise up in wrath against such a proposal, as if the design were to thwart the objects of an itinerant Min-

istry, and to foster sinecures, and all sorts of corruption. These brethren, generally more intolérant than most others of friendly relations with the Church of England, are yet most unwilling to allow to Methodism, as an independent church, those additions to its existing establishments which the state of society and of the world demands at our hands. They cannot perceive that, without some such appendix of cloistered learning,—“a living fountain-head, not the dormitory, of literature,”—Wesleyan Methodism is no match for Jesuitism, Tractarianism, and other foes, and cannot stand on even ground with the Established Clergy. Yet what a blessing would it not have been to this country, if, during the career of the famous “Tracts for the Times,” we could have maintained a counteracting agency from the Wesleyan press, worthy of ourselves and of the great spiritual interests at stake! How would the Protestantism of the country, grateful as it has been for our platform assistances, have welcomed so seasonable an interposition of literary influence! Let our laity multiply their schools and Mutual Improvement Societies as much as they please,—providing they also allow the scholarship of their Ministers, which would be much promoted by the project just mooted, to rise in the same proportion; and, above all, cherish a more profound style of erudition in a few at the summit of the scale, in order that they may cope with the most erudite and accomplished of our adversaries. Society and the world, we trust, are destined at no distant day to feel, amongst other “weapons of our warfare mighty though God to the pulling down of strongholds,” the weight and edge of a more thorough Christian literature than we have yet wielded in the cause of God and His truth.

There is another mode of public usefulness, for which the training of a Wesleyan Minister admirably qualifies him, when he is a man of more than average ability,—and that is public debate. It was the opinion of the late Mr. Wilberforce, that the platform was destined to exert a mighty influence in this country; and every succeeding year yields fresh evidence in confirmation of that opinion. It is the vast lever by which

all the great voluntary institutions of the country are sustained and pushed forward. He himself was an illustrious example of its power. In an age, therefore, when there are so many itinerant orators abroad to mislead and corrupt the national mind on innumerable topics, a system which hews from the quarry of nature, and calls forth and cultivates so much native talent and eloquence in the cause of truth, is entitled to the esteem of all true patriots. The vast amount of corrective influence brought in this way to bear on education, slavery, and the slave-trade, Catholic emancipation, and other kindred subjects, by such men as the late Richard Watson and many of our living distinguished contemporaries, has been acknowledged by the most competent witnesses. Thus the late Lord Chancellor Eldon, in speaking of the platform-addresses on the subject of Catholic emancipation, emphatically said in his placé in the House of Lords:—"For his own part, having had multitudes of provincial papers transmitted to him, containing reports of the debates which had taken place at numerous meetings in the country, for the purpose of petitioning Parliament against further concessions to the Catholics, he had been astonished to observe the ability and knowledge manifested by the Ministers of the Wesleyan Methodists, who had taken part in these debates." Innumerable have been the cases in which these Ministers have stepped aside from the beaten path of pastoral instruction, and by a sort of moral gladiatorship grappled in close encounter with the advocates of error.

[*To be Continued.*]

ART. VI.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

If one of the offices of a literary journal, and especially of a Quarterly Review, is to keep its readers advised of the latest productions of the press, and to furnish them in advance with a general idea of their character, so as to guide their selection and to promote their information; we flatter ourselves, that no Southern periodical has surpassed ours in the fulfilment of this important object. Our table is laden with new books of great value to the lovers of literature. And we are peculiarly happy, in closing the present volume, to offer so enticing a catalogue to our patrons. We earnestly solicit, for the works themselves, and for their deserving publishers, that attention and patronage which every liberal mind will accord. If, in the large number of excellent volumes which we here enumerate, there shall be found a few of inferior merit, so far from depreciating the whole, it will be a matter of grateful surprise. What we chiefly deprecate is, that we cannot do full justice to their contents in the few paragraphs necessarily allotted to each. We shall discharge our duty with as much fidelity as our limits and our abilities will allow.

1. *Discourses and Sayings of our Lord Jesus Christ*, illustrated in a series of Expositions. By John Brown, D. D., Professor of Exegetical Theology in the United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh; author of "Expository Discourses on First Peter," "Discourses on the Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah," etc. Complete in two volumes. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854.

It must be acknowledged that the germ of all true theology; the key of all sound interpretation of the Holy Scriptures lies in the "discourses and sayings of our Lord Jesus Christ," whether we include the Old Testament or the Apostolic epistles. They are the rays of the Central Orb which shed their light backward upon the one, and forward upon the other, at the same time. To apprehend him in his redeeming personality, and them in their emanation from and relation to him, is the substance of the whole of revealed truth and the subsistence of the whole of spiritual life. This then is the kernel. These volumes are occupied exclusively with this interior inquiry, for the express purpose of placing the personal Saviour and his personal words immediately before our minds. How Dr. Brown has succeeded in a task at once so grand and so glorious, it would, perhaps, be ar-

rogant in us to affirm. He appears to us to have combined in his work all the qualities justly deemed essential to its execution ; a deep religious appreciation of his high theme ; a critical knowledge of the original language ; a wide and familiar acquaintance with theological learning, and a solid judgment. He is neither servile on the one hand, nor rash on the other, but both eclectic and independent in pronouncing a conscientious opinion. There will be found very little of that sprightliness of diction or novelty of conception which superficial readers desire ; but a characteristic gravity of matter and of manner. The exposition proceeds upon the harmony of the Gospels, grouping together in time and space, the several facts of the sacred narrative ; applying the very best hermeneutical skill ; educating the doctrine and enforcing its practical uses. Notes for the scholar are placed usually in the margin and at the end of the several expositions. The present beautiful edition consists of two large octavo volumes, of about six hundred pages each ; the second containing indexes of topics, texts, Greek words and phrases, and authors ; a treasure to the Christian man ; eminently so to the Christian minister.

2. *Daily Bible Illustrations*: being original Readings for a year. Especially designed for the family circle. By John Kitto, D. D., F. S. A. Evening series. The Apostles and Early Church. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854.

This is the eighth and concluding volume of the most thoroughly interesting work of the kind we have ever seen ; if, indeed, one of the kind be extant. The series passes over in a learned, pious, and yet familiar style all the principal passages of the Old and New Testaments, with all the lights which the various sciences cast upon them. There is, to our mind, a commanding beauty, purity, and grace in them all. We read them with unabated delight and continual profit. The volume now before us, if any superiority may be claimed, transcends the rest in the intense truthfulness and loveliness of its pictures. Taste, learning, life, piety, unite to make the ways of wisdom "pleasantness and peace" to the reader. Some of the discussions and sketches, considering their object and brevity, are almost inimitable. Read, "The Holy Ghost ;" "The new Apostle ;" "The gift of tongues ;" "Paul on Mars' Hill," &c. As it is not likely that we shall soon be favored with a family series of similar merit, we had better procure the entire eight volumes ; and be sure, the editor will not be censured for his advice.

3. *Morning and Evening Exercises*. By William Jay. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854.

This is a new edition of a work as long and familiarly known as "household words." The first publication of them met so obvious a want in the daily life of the Christian as to give them a very general circulation ; and

they possess an adaptedness to this end which will perpetuate their usefulness. As to the doctrinal tincture which they sometimes exhibit, they will be estimated by denominational preferences. But as their general character is highly evangelical, they can but be appreciated by all "spiritually minded" persons. While it would be difficult to substitute a work of this kind, it is much to be desired that some competent hand would prepare one, on the same general plan, in accordance with our own theological views and religious exigences. In the mean time, Jay's "Exercises" will never be out of place. The edition of Messrs. Carter contemplates four volumes. Two are before us on greatly improved paper and type, containing the "Exercises" for April, May, June, July, August, and September, in muslin, and beautifully lettered.

4. *Gratitude: an Exposition of the CIII. Psalm.* By the Rev. John Stevenson. New York: Carter & Bros. 1854.

Expository monographs, or explanations of single books, or chapters, or portions of the Scriptures are becoming much more frequent now than they were formerly. It indicates the increased study of the holy oracles and the continual development of their hidden fullness. They are exhaustless fountains; "wells of salvation" from which we may draw draughts of spiritual joy. The inspiring hymn here selected for contemplation is an exquisite self-invocation to praise, applicable to all times, places and persons. The perusal of it instantly raises the devout soul to higher and holier movements. Gratitude is its theme. The analysis of the author, catching its true idea, aims to amplify and illustrate this religious affection in itself, and in those manifold grounds, so copious and so pleasing, contained in the psalm. It does not deal in criticisms, but in reflections or meditations. It is a full, practical commentary, and though expanded into a duodecimo of 320 pages, it does not appear to be too diffuse for its object, but to be fruitful of thought, and nervous in expression.

5. *Daniel, a Model for Young Men.* A series of Lectures. By the Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., New Orleans. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1854.

The damnatory sentence of literary piracy has recently resounded from the press against the author of these lectures. When we saw it and the plausible evidence upon which it was framed, we also echoed his doom in a social remark. Alas for the haste and injustice of reviewers; the mischief which they perpetrate and the good they forestall by the pride of discovery! It is the duty of the press, in our judgment, to retract at least a part of its decision, and award to an authorship, in many respects meritorious, its inalienable rights. It is no doubt true, that Dr. Scott has drawn verbatim upon Dr. Cumming, perhaps to the amount of several pages, without an acknowledgment in the body of the work; but a little generous criticism would have vin-

licated his reputation. In his preface, he confesses that he is "especially indebted to Dr. Cumming, amongst others; and that the frightful ravages of the yellow fever during the summer and fall of 1853, utterly prevented the revision of his manuscript for the press. Had it not, there is the very highest probability that he would have credited the quotation with a formality which he deemed wholly unnecessary for his own delivery. A man of Dr. Scott's obvious sagacity, had he calmly re-read his manuscript, or been able to read the proof-sheets, could not have been so blind as not to perceive that it would require no extraordinary genius to detect so palpable an instance of appropriation. The whole is, as we think, an involuntary defect by no means impairing the integrity of the volume. Apart from this consideration, it possesses marked ability and power. The sentiments are those of a bold, cultivated thinker, and his style the free, copious, fearless, vivid utterance of an eloquent speaker. The matter of it is unquestionably fine, however much it may be compounded of foreign elements wrought in the alembic of his own mind. Let the reader understand that it is the character of Daniel, and not the prophecy of Daniel, with which the volume is occupied; and a better human model could not be inculcated upon young men. There is a grandeur and completeness in it which equally fills the imagination and affects the heart. We recommend Dr. Scott to our readers.

6. *Emblems, Divine and Moral.* By Francis Quarles. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854.

Of the sixteen works of Francis Quarles, the "Emblems" appear to be the only one which has survived. They bear the good old age of two centuries, and have been frequently reprinted; a fact which must be ascribed more to the principle of curiosity which they excite than to any inherent excellence which they contain, except the religious element which they embody. They are odd and quaint in the extreme, consisting of grotesque, symbolical and even ludicrous pictures in the infancy of the art, accompanied by poetic illustrations, which however scriptural in their character, are forced in their analogies, and awkward and crabbed in their expression. They abound nevertheless with noble passages, and are venerable for their antiquity, as well as interesting for that peculiar originality which, if devoid of the higher poetic invention, is always striking by its comparisons. Quarles was the first English poet who wrote on religious subjects. He died in 1665.

7. *More Worlds than One, the creed of the Philosopher and the hope of the Christian.* By Sir David Brewster. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1854.

The amplitude and the affluence of the physical creation, as unfolded by the discoveries of Astronomy, have not only widened the field of scientific but of religious contemplation. They accord with the scattered notices of

the Scriptures and with almost universal intuition. At least, the idea of other abodes for intelligent beings than the earth, is so congenial with the human mind as very easily to command belief. And such seems to have been the theory even of great philosophers down to the present day. Recently an essay appeared in England, now republished in this country, maintaining the opposite ground, entitled "Of a Plurality of Worlds," adopting what is known as the *nebular* hypothesis of the origin of worlds. Sir David Brewster was requested, by the editor of the North British Review, to give his opinion of it. Heartily entertaining the doctrine that the sidereal heavens are the homes of animal and intellectual life, he accepted the request, but soon found his task expanding into a volume instead of an article. That a man of powers so gigantic, of attainments so vast, and of a reputation so boundless should espouse the affirmative side of the question in which he conceived both astronomy and Christianity to be involved, invests his treatise with extraordinary interest. But a higher degree of it is awakened by the discussion itself, as the distinguished author approximates the sublime conclusion, by those analogical processes warranted by the deductions of science. His general plan is to give the proofs of a plurality of worlds and then to meet the objections urged by the author of the adverse essay. We cannot analyze his argument here; but suffice it to say, there is a felicity, an earnestness, a force, a magnificence which leave a transporting conviction on the reader's mind that the stars are not the waste places of the creation; the dismal and eternal solitudes of space; but godly garnitured mansions replenished with gifted families filled with light and love; and that the contrary theory is both unscientific and skeptical in its tendency.

8. *The Poets and the Poetry of the Ancient Greeks*; with an historical introduction, and a brief view of Grecian Philosophers, Orators, and Historians. By Abraham Mills, A. M., author of the "Literature and the Literary Men of Great Britain and Ireland." Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. New York: James C. Derby. 1854.

The resplendent lamp of Grecian literary genius has not only shed an enduring lustre upon its native soil, but has irradiated, for centuries, every civilized nation. The various forms which that genius assumed were so pure, definite and perfect, as to insure their perpetuity in all ages, to reproduce themselves in every stage of human progress, to stimulate the slumbering intellect of humanity, and to mould its manifestations. The more, therefore, we become acquainted with these models of taste, refinement, and power, the more general and direct will be their influence in the formation and in the pleasures of our mental habits. The labor of presenting them to the English reader with historical fidelity, cannot be lost. It is fruitful of good, and deserves the highest praise. This is exactly the ob-

ject of Mr. Mills. Beginning with a sketch of the history of Greece from the earliest period to the age of Alexander the Great, he gives biographical notices of all its celebrated poets, with copious specimens from their best productions in the most approved of our English translations, interspersed with judicious criticisms upon their respective merits. From the poets, he proceeds successively to the philosophers, orators and historians of Greece, of whom he gives a succinct, but a perspicuous and reliable account. Mr. Mills does not profess to be original, but to have consulted the ablest authorities. His style is wanting in vivacity, but is compensated by his industry and his judgment. He has done all that, perhaps, can be done to impart to the public a clear and concise idea of that intellectual wealth that, more than anything else, has rendered Greece so illustrious in the history of the world.

9. *History of the Protestant Church in Hungary*, from the beginning of the Reformation to 1850, with special reference to Transylvania. Translated by Rev. J. Craig, D. D., Hamburg. With an introduction by J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D. D. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. New York: James C. Derby. 1854.

The political features of Hungary, during the last few years, have awakened, throughout this country, a most astonishing sympathy, and the knowledge of its social and geographical features, have, in that time, been greatly increased. Its ecclesiastical condition, and especially, its Protestantism, as all readers know, have been a comparatively sealed page. The whole land has been shut up to us until recently. It is now opened, in the providence of God, and the scenes which it discloses are replete with novelty. Those of the church are full of tragic interest. Its struggles, its martyrdoms, its vicissitudes add a new section to ecclesiastical history. Its present condition under the tyrannical house of Hapsburg appeals to the whole Protestant world, as its political prostration does to the friends of constitutional liberty. We can but hope that the day of its religious and civil regeneration is at hand, and that the land of the Magyars and of Huss will yet become as the garden of the Lord. The present volume, endorsed as it is, by D'Aubigné, is a fountain of authentic information, and is well calculated to arouse the energies of the Christians of America in its behalf. It is not to be carelessly perused; but pondered and digested on account of the magnitude and intensity of the events which it describes. The introduction by D'Aubigné is an admirable preparative to its perusal.

10. *A Memoir of the Life and Labors of the Rev. Adoniram Judson, D. D.* By Francis Wayland, President of Brown University. In two volumes. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1853.

This is a book we have long desired to have, but which, it has not, until now, been our good fortune to possess. The place occupied by Dr. Judson

and the part which he performed in the great missionary enterprise of the 19th century makes his life an epoch in its records, and creates not only a desire, but a sort of necessity for its details. It is much to be regretted that, by a series of remarkable events, many of these have been lost. But without them, the official reports of the boards to which he belonged, and the reminiscences of his widow have supplied materials for two slightly volumes, wrought into the form which they bear, by the skill of Dr. Wayland. He performed the twofold achievements of spreading the gospel in Burmah and of translating the Scriptures into its language, thus opening the gate of divine knowledge to its teeming millions. The only chapter in his life, calculated to give pain to other denominations, is his change on the subject of Baptism, and consequently of his church relations. But in the grand aggregate of so useful and glorious a career, that shall not mar our pleasure or our admiration.

11. *Sunny Memories of Foreign Lands.* By Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." Illustrated from designs by Hammatt Billings. In two volumes. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. New York: J. C. Derby. 1854.

The visit of Mrs. Stowe to England was almost as remarkable as that of Lafayette to this country; but we must have the candor to say, for very different and discordant reasons. Abating the military pageantry of the latter, the former was distinguished by well nigh as much public and private display. She was greeted, caressed, applauded by gentry and nobility; in aristocratic halls, and public assemblies; at complimentary breakfasts and dinners, as the female impersonation of American glory. And for what! The authorship of one little duodecimo volume, wrought into a fiction, misrepresenting most egregiously the institution of domestic slavery in the South; in which, it is true, she has displayed dramatic talent in the representation of characters and of scenes. Her passage through England, Scotland and the Continent was an endless ovation in compliment to "Uncle Tom's Cabin," not so much as a work of genius, but of supposed facts, so stated by a woman, hitherto unknown to fame, as to vibrate upon that sentiment in the European mind which confounds the wrongs of the African slave-trade with the exaggerated pictures of domestic slavery in the south, drawn by the hand of an unscrupulous abolitionist. Mrs. Stowe has inflicted an irreparable injury upon southern reputation, which all her gorgeous compliments and "Sunny Memories" can never repair, nor obliterate. She has perpetrated a public and an imperishable libel against it. These "Sunny Memories" are the reminiscences of those scenes heralded by "Uncle Tom's Cabin." The notoriety and the flattery of them were indeed "sunny" to herself, and she returns the compliment by praising her admirers. Abstract from her letters the scenes of which she was the centre and the cynosura,

and but little remains to place her volumes above the level of clever notes of travel. So far as they delineate the incidents and social qualities of the higher classes into which "Uncle Tom" admitted her, and to which so few have access, they will be read with pleasure. On other topics, we should judge, that she is neither particularly shrewd nor discriminating. Yet the fame of the author, though it may be factitious, will ensure the circulation of her "Sunny Memories."

12. *The Principles of Chemistry, illustrated by Simple Experiments.* By Dr. Julius Adolph Stöckhardt, Professor in the Royal Academy of Agriculture at Fharand, and Royal Inspector of Medicine in Saxony. Translated by C. H. Peirce, M. D. Eighth Thousand. Cambridge; Published by John Bartlett. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1854.

Our examination of this work has made a most favorable impression on our mind, as a preparation for the higher departments of chemistry. It possesses many advantages. The clearness of its statements, the convenience of its classification, and the exceeding beauty and simplicity of its experiments are the principal. In this last respect, it has no superior amongst us. It puts it in the power of every student, at very small cost, to supply himself with the necessary apparatus for illustrating the laws of the science. This facility of experimenting is the very requisition needed to diffuse that practical knowledge of chemistry which is destined to work such wonders in all its endless application to the arts and to agriculture. To enhance its value, each chapter closes with a recapitulation of every essential principle stated in it. As a text-book for schools it is invaluable by the manner in which it unfolds the truths of the science and interests the minds of the students. We take great pleasure in calling the attention of teachers to this publication.

13. *The Recreations of Christopher North.* Complete in one volume. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company. New York: J. C. Derby. 1854.

The readers of Blackwood's Magazine are familiar with the venerable *soubriquet*, Christopher North, with which that wonderful periodical has become identified, and whose manifold genius infused a mysterious power into its pages. The veritable personage was John Wilson, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. He was amongst the contributors to, and finally became editor of the Magazine, after the death of Blackwood. His "recreations" consist of essays on a variety of subjects, characterized by great versatility of talent. Humor, wit, love of nature, critical acumen, all play their part in his lucubrations with an ease and a freshness which always please the imagination. His fondness for rustic scenes betrays the habits of his youth, and lends many a charm to his

felicitous pen. The collection of these into one volume places his scattered productions into a form which increases the library editions of the English classics.

14. *Critical and Miscellaneous Writings of T. Noon Talfourd*. Third American edition. With additional articles never before published in this country. Boston : Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1854.

Talfourd, as an essayist, possesses an elegance, a dignity, a grandeur peculiarly his own. His forte was the higher criticism, of which he was a perfect master. His philosophical and classical attainments gave him the command of this species of literature. He inspires the reader with an elevation which seems to have been a part of his intellectual nature. His criticism on Robert Hall is one of the most transcendent specimens of the art we have ever read. His writings are a model of the kind, and ought to be studied as a means of improvement in analysis and style.

15. *Outline of the Geology of the Globe, and of the United States in particular* : with two Geological Maps, and sketches of characteristic American fossils. By Edward Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D., President of Amherst College, and Professor of Natural Theology and Geology. Second edition. Boston : Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1854.

This work is already known to scholars, by the first edition ; and were it not, the *prestige* of such a name would ensure its acceptance, The design of it is comprehensive, but the unparalleled progress of this new science has furnished materials for constructing a universal system, and giving it a cosmical character. Nothing more is proposed than an "outline," concatenating the results of explorations into a whole. It was designed as a sequel to the Professor's "Elementary Geology," but by the aid of the large and elegantly colored maps with which it is accompanied, the "Outline" may be so filled up as to impart a general knowledge of this most fascinating study. To use his own words : "though the text be brief, yet the maps, by a few moments' inspection, teach more than many pages of letter-press." The aid which they afford is obvious at a glance.

16. *The Religion of Geology and its connected sciences*. By Edward Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D., President of Amherst College, and Professor of Natural Theology and Geology. Ninth thousand. Boston : Phillips, Sampson & Company.

Were we announcing a new work on so exciting a theme, we should feel it obligatory to be more minute than the repeated appearance of this volume requires us to be. The religious aspects of Geology have been more mooted than those, perhaps, of any of the sciences ; though each, in turn, and, in its immaturity, has been pressed into the service of infidelity. Further inquiries into them all have resulted, not in antagonism, but in a

beautiful harmony with Divine revelation. It is maintained by Dr. Hitchcock that this is true of Geology. The great point of difficulty is in the apparent controversy between the date of the creation as assumed by geologists and that stated in the first chapter of Genesis. The difficulty is a real one, if the first verse refer to the first day. But if it admit of a reference to an indefinite period preceding the first day, the difficulty vanishes. That it does, the author very forcibly argues. He is an orthodox theologian as well as a thorough geologist, and is familiar with the relative bearings of the sciences. The word of God is immovable. All science harmonizes of necessity with it, and confirms and illustrates its revelations. The book is well worth another nine editions. It is on a subject of vast importance to ministers of the gospel, viz; the aspects not only of geology, but of the sciences in general towards the Scriptures.

17. *The Poetical Works of John Milton.* A new edition. With Notes, and a Life of the Author, by John Mitford. In two volumes. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

18. *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Rogers; with a Biographical Sketch and Notes.* Edited by Epes Sargent. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

19. *Poems, Plays and Essays, by Oliver Goldsmith, M. B.* With a Critical Dissertation on his Poetry, by Henry T. Tuckerman, Esqr. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

20. *The Complete Works of Thomas Campbell; with an Original Biography, and Notes.* Edited by Epes Sargent. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

Of the merits of the four preceding works we have nothing to say. They are stereotyped forever. The new edition of them only claims our attention; and that is such as to enhance the value of the works themselves. They are in octavo, on very fair paper, in large, clear type, of uniform appearance, containing biographical sketches of the poets and notes upon the poems. As the pleasure of reading is greatly increased by the character of the page and the explanatory apparatus, we recommend to all, who desire a library edition of these poets, to obtain them from these publishers.

21. *The Conflict of Ages; or the great debate on the moral relations of God and man.* By Edward Beecher, D. D. Fifth edition. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

22. *Christ in History; or the central power among men.* By Robert Turnbull, D. D. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

Both of the books above named have been fully characterized in this journal, though not received from the publishers. It is unnecessary for us

to repeat our opinions. The former has reached the fifth edition in an exceedingly short time. Both are highly suggestive, though they contain defects, especially that of Dr. Beecher.

23. *Thoughts and Things at Home and Abroad.* By Elihu Burritt, author of "Sparks from the Anvil." With a memoir, by Mary Howitt. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

"The Learned Blacksmith" is the great American literary prodigy, whose entire life may be regarded as one of the most entertaining chapters in the "Curiosities of Literature." As his general history has ceased to be a novelty amongst us, we will forego a recurrence to it, and introduce the "Thoughts and Things" to our readers. To be consecutive, we begin with the engraving of the author. It is certainly an acquisition to the book. The whole physiognomy is exceedingly expressive of thought and resolution. Forehead, eyes, nose, lips, chin, exhibit intellectual power and concentration. The memoir by Mrs. Howitt is a life-portrait of this extraordinary man, drawn in a most felicitous manner. She is full of admiration and paints *con amore*. The essays were written at different periods, and evince considerable diversity as well as inequality of matter and style. They are short, earnest, and generally practical; yet they combine some of the very highest qualities of composition; proving that he is not a literary cormorant, but a soaring eagle; and he makes wide as well as graceful circles in his flight. His views are expanded, and his language is affluent. We were particularly struck with the richness of his descriptive faculty, and the delicacy of his sentimentality. Mr. Burritt's head is large; but his heart is larger still. It would harmonize the world. Some of his schemes are Utopian and some are defective. He is an abolitionist, more no doubt, by an unregulated benevolence, than by any of those inferior sentiments which designate this class of incendiary bigots. His "Thoughts and Things" are a treat served by a sumptuous host, raised, by self-application, from the drudgery of the anvil to a principedom in the kingdom of literature and science. It demonstrates above all other facts, what self-termination may accomplish under the most inauspicious circumstances.

24. *The Evidences of Christianity, as exhibited in the writings of the Apologists down to Augustine.* Hulsean Prize Essay. By W. J. Bolton, Professor in Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

This book possesses a feature which must inevitably attract attention, and place it in the hands, especially, of theological readers; and that is, its presentation of the arguments by which the ancient fathers defended Christianity against their opponents; Jews, Grecians and Romans. This old apologetic literature is new to us, since we have no treatise which brings it fully to our minds. It lies scattered through the scarce and costly vol-

umes of patristic learning, accessible only to the few. The Hulsean prize drew it forth in 1852, having been proposed by the trustees of the fund devised by the Rev. John Hulse in 1777. It proves manifestly the substantial identity of all infidel objections from the beginning, and the promptness and success with which they have been always refuted, and is confirmatory of the Divine origin of our holy religion. After a preliminary dissertation, the learned author shows that the following arguments, so frequently reproduced, were employed by the ancient defenders of the faith; "Antecedent probability;" "Antiquity;" "Prophecy;" "Miracles;" "The reasonableness of the doctrine;" "Superior Morality;" and "The success of the Gospel." Those who urged these arguments, and the manner in which they discussed them, and the occasions which gave rise to them, are presented with great ability. The utility and seasonableness of the essay cannot admit of a doubt.

25. *My Schools and School Masters; or the Story of my Education.* By Hugh Miller. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

Instances are comparatively rare in which men have worked their way to the pinnacle of virtuous fame through the rugged paths of poverty and misfortune. But such is true greatness that adversity only serves to intensify and promote its future development. Temples and laboratories are not the only avenues to knowledge. Nature has her schools and colleges and pupils, without the conventionalities of polite society; and though her degrees are conferred at enormous expense, their validity is attested by the robustness of her tuition. The great geologist received his first lectures on the seashore, in the quarries and in the mountains of Scotland, during the recreations of a common school and the intervals of his apprenticeship to a stone mason. Tutored amidst the scenes of his native rocks, he has grown to be a giant in the new science; a discoverer and a champion, whose Herculean strength has demolished false theories, and confounded the vaunting skepticism of the age, upon its own grounds. The "development hypothesis," so far as it laid claim to geology, was buried by him in the "old red sandstone." His school was nature, and his school masters were the incidents of a life full of friction. His narrative is the genial outpouring of an experience amidst the hardships of a Scottish laborer, and is enlivened by many a scene of Highland life.

26. *The Better Land; or the Believer's Journey and Future Home.* By Augustus C. Thompson, pastor of the Eliot Church, Roxbury, Mass. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

These pleasant pages are a memento from a pastor to his congregation on his departure to a foreign land. They were suggested by the dissolution of their former hallowed relations, and the hopes of a re-union in "The Better Land." While there is nothing of theological depth in them, they;

abound with those contemplations of the heavenly state which appeal to the devout affections of all true Christians, and are calculated to elevate their aspirations. The enumeration of the topics discussed, (and they are considerably amplified,) will show the tenor and indicate the character of the reflections indulged: "The Pilgrimage; Clusters of Eschol: Waymarks; Glimpses of the Land; The Passage; Recognition of Friends; The Heavenly Banquet; Children in Heaven; Society of Angels; Society of the Saviour; Heavenly Honor and Riches; No Tears in Heaven; Holiness of Heaven; Activity in Heaven; Resurrection Body; Perpetuity of Bliss in Heaven." The solemnity and the tenderness of these topics would disarm criticism, even if there were an occasion for its exercise. May we all arrive in "The Better Land!" O hope full of immortality!

27. *A Popular Account of the Ancient Egyptians.* Revised and abridged from his larger work, by Sir J. Gardiner Wilkinson, D. C. L., F. R. S., &c. In two volumes. Illustrated with 500 wood cuts. New York: Harper & Brother, Publishers. 1854.

In opening these volumes, we are filled with amazement at the results to which antiquarian researches have conducted us. The definite descriptions which they contain, and the spirited delineations with which their pages are bestrewn, of the customs, manners, costumes, pursuits, arts, amusements and institutions, of a people, whose glory was fading before that of Greece arose, transport us as it were into the midst of the living rather than of the mummied dead. The greatest marvel of this age is the restoration of Egypt and the reconstruction of its fallen grandeur from fragments of its sculpture and hieroglyphics. Here the whole, divested of its recondite inquiries, as in a panorama of living scenes, from temple and palace to the minutest incidents of pastoral and domestic economy, pass before our eyes. This curious work is an abridgement, by Sir Gardiner Wilkinson, of the elaborate one published by him in 1836, with additional matter and plates, representing the present state of Egyptian archæology; and although it is intended to diffuse a general knowledge of it among the people, it bears the stamp of the highest authority. With what little labor and expense may we all enjoy information which it has taxed the resources of wealth and the efforts of genius for years to bestow! The want of interest in it is a positive misfortune. Gentle reader, purchase forthwith, "The Ancient Egyptians."

28. *Sandwich Island Notes.* By A. Hæolè. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1854.

At a time when it is seriously proposed to annex these Islands to the United States, we may well be excused for gratifying our curiosity with respect to their condition and advantages. The author visited them in 1853, and is an ardent advocate for their annexation. In fact, he avows this as

the object of his "Notes." He avouches their accuracy, and cites his authorities. He describes the physical aspect of the Hawaiian group, sketches their scenery, portrays the appearance and habits of the population, and the influence of missions upon them. His remarks upon the geological structure of the Islands, the Christianity of the inhabitants, and their gradual depopulation since its introduction, are of profound importance to the Christian, philosopher and statesman. The last two chapters, the one, a survey of the race and their destiny, and the other, on their annexation to the American confederacy, are decidedly edifying. There are twenty illustrations of prominent objects in the Islands.

29. *Harper's Statistical Gazetteer of the World.* With special Reference to the United States and British America. By J. Calvin Smith. To be completed in ten numbers.

Five numbers of this great work now lie before us, in royal octavo, having made their appearance since the 1st of July. The grand scale on which it is projected, the immense labor which it cost, and the accurate and ample details which it gives of all the principal places throughout the world, with their statistics, entitle it to the patronage of the American people. In the general diffusion of literature amongst all classes of our population, and the vast range of relations established between us and the nations of the earth, a book of ready reference, such as this is, is of incalculable utility; especially, when it brings down to the last moment, the additions made to the mighty list of notable localities. The typography is that of the best English style for books of reference. Seven elegant maps, adapted to the work, to facilitate the reference, will accompany it. Three are attached to the numbers before us. The whole, when completed, will make a volume of 1800 pages. The price of the numbers is 50 cents each.

30. *A Practical and Commercial Arithmetic.* Containing definitions of terms, and rules of operations, with numerous examples. The whole forming a complete treatise for the use of Schools and Academies. By Gerardus Beekman Docharty, LL. D., Professor of Mathematics in the New York Free Academy. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1854.

An accurate knowledge of arithmetic has the twofold use of a perpetual application to the actual wants of life, and an induction to the higher mathematics. It must therefore be based upon scientific principles, in which all our works are sadly deficient. The increasing knowledge of the relations of numbers, and, above all, of the wants of the youthful mind, has infused itself into the Arithmetic. We will let the author state his own propositions as to the teaching of this useful branch of education.

"1. Its principles must be well understood. 2. The definitions must be concise and explicit, and the rules thoroughly committed to memory. 3.

Neat methods of working out must be adopted, and the reasoning upon which the rules are established, be acquired by the pupil."

With a view to these has this treatise been prepared, and their application in the use of it, he doubts not, will make a first-rate arithmetician, and enable one to pass through algebra with comparative ease.

31. *Guido and Julius ; or Sin and the Propitiator exhibited in the true consecration of the skeptic.* By Frederick Aug. Tholuck, D. D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Halle. Translated from the German by Jonathan Edwards Ryland, with an introductory preface by John Pye Smith, D. D. Boston : Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

Neither the title nor the size of this volume fairly represents its character. It is a production of uncommon ability ; and though thirty years have elapsed since its first appearance, it has evidently lost nothing by age. We are very much inclined to remark upon it somewhat extensively, but we are restricted to narrow limits. While a student at Berlin, Tholuck openly avowed infidelity, having imbibed the Pantheistic principles which then infected the German Universities. Towards the close of his course, his religious views underwent a radical change, principally through the agency of Dr. Neander. Upon the dismissal of De Wette from the Chair of Theology, Tholuck was installed, by royal authority, at the age of twenty-one ; on which occasion he determined to devote himself to the Christian ministry. At this period he published an elaborate work on the Pantheism of the Persians, indicative of his new opinions ; and not long after, the little tract which is now before us. While it is supposed to be the history of his own experience in his transition to the faith of Christ, it was intended to be an antidote to a pernicious treatise of De Wette, the object of which was to show how a skeptical student might reconcile it to himself to officiate in the Lutheran pulpit ; thus consecrating the skeptic to the sacred office. Tholuck, on the other hand, proposes the true theory of consecrating the skeptic ; that is, the adoption of right views on the questions of sin and a mediator, by searching inquiry and earnest prayer. In his argument on these points in opposition to the Pantheistic philosophy, there is a depth, a comprehension, a luxuriance of thought which enchains the reader, and completely demolishes the vaunting theory. It is conducted in the form of a narrative of the religious opinions and correspondence of two young men entangled in its toils, during which both abandon their infidelity and embrace the truth as it is in Jesus. Philosophy, genius and learning appear on every page. Some of his ideas are emphatically Germanic, but the argument, as a whole, is sound to the core and eloquently expressed. Dr. Pye Smith regrets that Tholuck is, in sentiments, an evangelical Arminian, and doubts not, had he read Edwards on the will, he would have been a predestinarian. The translator has performed his task with an elegance befitting the theme, and adapting it to the cultivated

classes for whom it was written. It is well suited to the meridian of the United States at this time, when German infidelity so faithfully follows German literature.

32. *Noctes Ambrosiana*. By the late John Wilson, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, Editor of Blackwood's Magazine, etc.; and Wm. Maginn, LL. D., J. G. Lockhart, James Hogg, etc. With Memoirs and notes by R. Shelton Mackenzie, D. C. L. In five volumes. Redfield: New York. 1854.

These celebrated papers were published in Blackwood, between the years 1822 and '33, purporting for the most part, to be the conversations of a literary club on all the passing events of the day, and especially, on literary and political questions, as well as characters; all of which are handled with the freedom and fearless independence of a private circle, who indulge their satires without restraint. They are the vehicles of the maturest information, the most sagacious views, the ablest criticisms, the richest wit and the sweetest poetry of the day. They are the effusions, as we learn from the title, of the most brilliant contemporary writers of Scotland, amongst whom Professor Wilson was the leading spirit. The personalities which they contained prevented their republication in England, but they were issued in this country in 1843, in four volumes, full of defects. The present edition consists of five, with biographies of the writers, and notes explanatory of their authors, for which the editor's intimacy with the characters treated of in the *Noctes* qualify him. As specimens of colloquial literature abounding with the genial light of humor and the exhibitions of varied talent it would be difficult to find a parallel.

33. *Fifty Years in Both Hemispheres, or Reminiscences of the Life of a Former Merchant*. By Vincent Nolte, late of New Orleans. Translated from the German. Redfield: New York. 1854.

If, as it is conceded, the recommendation of a biography, whether it be *auto* or *altero*, consists in the number and the character of its incidents, Vincent Nolte will bear off the palm from nine tenths, if not ninety-nine hundredths of all that have ever been written. It embraces elements rarely if ever combined in a personal narrative; the long and eventful period through which it extends, the immense space which it covers; the almost ubiquitous individuality which it represents, the historical scenes and personages which it describes, and the romantic vicissitudes which it portrays. Activity and alternation, contact and collision, elevation and depression, are incessantly diversifying the panoramic life of a business man, who is here, there, and everywhere, in this, that and the other condition, with a versatility which abhors monotony, and a restlessness which despises repose. And there is nothing mechanical in the perpetual motion of this man of the world. It is in obedience to the impulses of a soul which had absolved it-

self from the bonds of country, kindred and home with equal facility, and whose only bond to the race was the necessity of a casual intercourse with it. A life so stirring and a mind so keen have amassed such an amazing amount of curious topics as almost to startle credulity itself; yet authenticity is the only claim which the author exacts. If an equal degree of virtuous sentiment had shed its lustre over his Quixotic career, Vincent Nolte would have retired from the world as a benefactor, and with the "gay remembrance of a life well spent."

34. *History of Cuba; or Notes of a Traveller in the Tropics.* Being a political, historical, and statistical account of the Island, from its first discovery to the present time. By Maturin M. Ballou. Illustrated. Sixth thousand. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

Books and measures are so inseparable in our day that one is puzzled to ascertain whether our secular literature has its origin more in the diffusion of knowledge or in the acquisition of territory. Certain it is, the author favors the possession of Cuba by purchase, whatever be the object of his sketches. Though they are desultory, they are instructive, and meet the demand created by the popular interest universally felt upon the subject. We can say with confidence, that the historical and statistical parts of the work are valuable, and that the descriptive portions are drawn with a practiced hand. Several well executed plates embellish its pages.

35. *This, That, and The Other.* By Ellen Louise Chandler. With Illustrations by Rowse. Seventh thousand. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

Miss Chandler's *debut* has met with a flattering acceptance from the readers of fiction. For a young lady of nineteen summers, her effort at authorship displays an invention and a maturity beyond her years. The title, perhaps, indicates the disconnected character of the book, which consists of independent sketches of rather a serious and pathetic kind, evincing purity of sentiment and more than ordinary strength of conception. If Miss Chandler would apply her talent to the useful rather than the imaginative, she would make an enduring mark as an author.

36. *A Parisian Pastor's Glance at America.* By J. H. Grand Pierre, D. D., Pastor of the Reformed Church, and Director of the Missionary Institution in Paris. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

It is not often under so unpretending a title, and especially from a foreign source, that we find so much that is really praiseworthy. What is here recorded, was not intended originally for the American eye, but was published by the distinguished author, after his return from the United States, in a paper of which he is editor, for the benefit of the Protestants in France. It is in the highest degree laudatory of this country, and above

all, of its religious institutions. He confesses that many of his erroneous prejudices were corrected as to the piety and learning which distinguished the churches of every denomination. One important fact which he ascertained was, the wonderful efficiency of the voluntary principle in supporting the gospel. He has fallen into some mistakes with respect to denominational policy not at all ascribable to narrowness of spirit, but to the want of accurate information; and into the almost universal error of all tourists, of confining their observations to the Northern States, and giving them the credit of being America. Dr. Pierre is a very superior man, and a very competent judge of what he actually saw. Many of his observations are profound, and must have heightened the impressions on the continent of the unspeakable blessings of civil and religious liberty.

37. *A Complete Concordance of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; or a Dictionary and Alphabetical Index to the Bible, &c. &c.* By Alexander Cruden, M. A. New York: Published by M. W. Dodd. 1854.

The original work of Mr. Cruden has acquired so universal, and unequivocal a reputation, as a help to the study of the Holy Scriptures, as to render any attempt to enhance it utterly presumptuous. The great cost of it has, however, prevented many persons from obtaining it, and induced several publishers to put forth abridged editions of it, which, while they have been serviceable, have never represented the herculean labors of the author, nor supplied the wants contemplated by him. To obviate these faults, M. W. Dodd has issued an edition of the "Complete Concordance," in quarto, at the price of \$3 50, thus putting it in reach of all who desire it; and we can assure them that they will need no other book of the kind. It is to be hoped that it will find its way not only to the shelf of every preacher, but to the cases of private Christians, and the libraries of Sunday schools and Bible classes. The present edition is endorsed by the testimonials of many distinguished clergymen of all denominations.

38. *Confessions of a Converted Infidel: with Lights and Shades of Itinerant Life, and Miscellaneous Sketches.* By Rev. John Bayley, of the Virginia Annual Conference. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1854.

Our personal regards for the author, we are certain, have not betrayed us into the favorable opinion we entertain of his book. Of these we have endeavored to divest our mind in forming that opinion. The author is the subject of the "Confessions," and the history of his infidelity and of his conversion is deeply instructive and affecting. Some of its incidents possess an overwhelming pathos. The "lights and shades" are true to life, and present a picture of itinerant vicissitudes which multitudes will recognize and verify. The "Sketches" we regard as possessing a graphic merit; those respecting his visit to England especially. The whole is written

with that unaffected modesty and beautiful simplicity which win the heart, while it entertains the mind. The sweet spirit of the gospel pervades every page. We ascertain, with great satisfaction, that the first edition is nearly exhausted, and that the second will soon be issued.

39. *Is Christianity from God?* or, a manual of Bible evidence for the people. By the Rev. John Cumming, D. D. With an introduction by Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen. New York: Published by M. W. Dodd. 1854.

Large and elaborate treatises on the Christian evidences, of which there are many, are of no immediate utility to the larger portion of any community. They never reach them, or if they did, would never be read by them. And yet many infidel books and sentiments are current amongst them. Our literature contains very few antidotes adapted to the poison, and hence the pleasure with which we should hail a book of the kind before us, of whose fitness for this object we have a high assurance. Dr. Cumming has selected the most simple, direct and convincing proofs of the divinity of the Christian religion in that animated and forcible style for which he is justly celebrated. He has invested them with new beauty and power by the manner in which he applies them. We need such a book. It is a handmaid to the minister in the pulpit and out of it, and will do effective service in the great battle yet to be fought. It is small and cheap.

40. *The Closet Companion*; or, manual of prayer: consisting of topics and brief forms of prayer, designed to assist Christians in their devotions. With an introduction by Albert Barnes. Fourth edition. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1854.

Amongst the many helps to devotion, we know of none which occupy the same ground that this does. While it is scriptural and spiritual and catholic in its whole character, its principal object is to suggest topics of prayer. There is not only amongst private Christians, but amongst ministers of the gospel, a great want of propriety, fullness, variety and depth in their addresses to the throne of grace; and not unfrequently a high degree of embarrassment for want of suitable utterances on many occasions. This then is the exigency which our author proposes to meet. It is not a book of forms, but of ideas drawn from the word of God and the necessities of the Christian life, calculated to interest and to edify. As such we can recommend it, far more than a book of forms. The style of the book is at the same time tasteful and elegant. A vast variety of subjects are presented and amplified for the enlargement of prayer.

41. *The Westminster Shorter Catechism*. With analyses, scriptural proofs, explanatory and practical inferences, and illustrative anecdotes. By Rev. James R. Boyd. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1854.

The Larger and Shorter Catechisms, it is well known, contain the sub-

stance of the Westminster Confession of Faith, adopted by the Presbyterian Church in England and in the United States. They are the doctrinal summaries of the Calvinistic creed, of which it is not our business to speak in this place. The Shorter Catechism is designed to inculcate its peculiar views upon the youth of the church, and this edition is designed to render its teachings more attractive to that class. This the editor proposes to accomplish by modernizing the style of the answers, by analyzing the instructions, by giving them a practical turn, and by entertaining anecdotes. We are not competent to judge of his success. Those who wish to ascertain how the Calvinistic doctrines are taught to children can be gratified by the examination of this manual.

42. *Party Leaders*; Sketches of Thomas Jefferson, Alex'r Hamilton, Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, John Randolph, of Roanoke, including notices of many other distinguished American statesmen. By Jo. G. Baldwin. New York: D. Appleton Co. 1854.

The author of "The Flush Times of Alabama and Mississippi" has acquired a favorable notoriety, in the south, as a writer of sketches. The characters he here describes are such as impart interest, by their very names, and create a desire to know how they are drawn. Their biographies are given in connection with the stirring events of our early history, in which they performed so conspicuous a part. Mr. Baldwin is an enthusiastic admirer and a generous critic of these great political actors, and strives to award to each his due degree of merit. Energy and ease, as well as grace, are happily combined in his portraits. The south will no doubt patronize so fine a specimen of southern genius, and Mr. Baldwin will find a motive to complete the historical delineations so auspiciously commenced.

43. *A Lamp to the Path*; or, the Bible in the heart, the home, and the market-place. By the Rev. W. K. Tweedie, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

44. *Seed Time and Harvest*; or, sow well and reap well. A book for the young. By W. K. Tweedie, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

The Rev. author is wide awake at his post. His pious heart and his fruitful hand are all at work in bringing the Bible to bear upon the young and the rising generation. He views the gospel from its true practical stand point, and is not willing to risk its success upon the mere professional routine of the pulpit. These pages testify to his fervent zeal, his sleepless energy, and his sound wisdom in making evangelical truth the grand staple of human faith and of human conduct, not in its doctrinal, but its powerful, transforming influence. We hail these efforts with satisfaction, and welcome his valuable services to our homes and firesides. He is a master in Israel, though not of our name.

45. *History of Pyrrhus*. By Jacob Abbott. With engravings. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1854.

A continuation of the deservedly popular series of ancient heroes, by one of the most trustworthy writers in this country. Our youth are indebted to Mr. Abbott, not only for entertaining them with his elegant portraits of the renowned characters of heathen antiquity, but for his critical judgment in divesting them of the illusions of fable, as far as the records of authentic history will allow. No better series of ancient biography could be put into the hands of our children, either to fascinate or to improve their minds.

46. *Father Bright hopes* ; or, an old clergyman's vacation ;

47. *Hearts and Faces* ; or, home-life unveiled ;

48. *Burcliff* ; Its sunshine and its clouds ;

49. *The Tell-Tale* ; or home-secrets told by an old traveller ;

50. *A Peep at " Number Five ;"* or, a chapter in the life of a city pastor. Boston : Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1854.

These five little books, the first three by Paul Creyton, the last two by H. Trusta, are the liveliest sketches of domestic scenes which have yet fallen into our hands. We know not whether they be founded upon facts or not, which we strongly suspect, but we know that they strikingly resemble them. If they be not, there is much more of truth than of fiction in them ; and experience and observation must have invented this unsuspecting garb for the purpose of correcting those errors which impair the happiness of the private circles of society.

51. *The Woodcutter of Lebanon, and the Exiles of Lucerna* ; By the author of " The Morning and Night Watches ;

52. *Mabill Grant* ; A Highland Story ; By Randall H. Ballantyne ;

53. *Fritz Harold* ; or The Temptation ; By Sarah A. Myers ;

54. *Charles Roussel* ; or, Industry and Honesty ; By the Rev. T. T. Haverfield, B. D.;

55. *The Pastor's Family*. New York : Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854;

These, we have found upon examination, to be well written, highly entertaining and useful publications, illustrating the Scriptures, and inculcating religious and moral principles ; adapted especially to the rising generation. And we cannot forego the pleasure of a tribute to the Messrs. Carter for the inestimable boon which they are conferring by this peculiar character of their books for the young. To which we add :

56. *Florence Egerton* ; or, Sunshine and Shadow, by the same publishers ;

These are books that always leave a useful lesson behind them. No analysis we could give of them would be more satisfactory than to say, that their lessons are taught by example.

57. *Life's Lesson*. A Tale. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1854.
58. *The Scout* ; or The Black Riders of Congaree. By W. Gilmore Simms, Esq. New and Revised edition. New York : Redfield. 1854.
59. *The Youth of Jefferson* : or, a Chronicle of College Scrapes at Williamsburg, Va., A. D., 1764. New York : Redfield. 1854.
60. *Firmilian*. A "Spasmodic" Tragedy. By T. Percy Jones. New York : Redfield. 1854.

Of the volumes mentioned above, we have had opportunity to form a less accurate opinion than of the preceding ; so pressed have we been by our closing labors. We, however, give their titles, publishers and dates, that our readers may be aware, at least, of their existence ; and append to each a passing remark. "Life's Lesson," whose hero is a Mr. Kirk, concludes with a graphic sketch of a Methodist lovefeast, in which, after the lapse of many years, he recognizes, in one of the speakers, an intimate acquaintance, whose experience deeply affects him, and which resulted in his own conversion. "The Scout" is one of Simms' revolutionary romances. "The Youth of Jefferson" is a humorous story of college life ; and "Firmilian" is a powerful satire, by the present Editor of Blackwood's Magazine, W. E. Aytoun, son-in-law of Christopher North, upon several of the popular authors of the day. Carlyle, Gilfillan, Tennyson, and Alexander Smith are supposed to be among them.

ART. VII.

BIBLICAL, LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC MISCELLANIES.

In view of the increasing interest which is attached to oriental antiquarian investigations, especially as furnishing, in their marvellous results, illustrations and confirmations of the ancient records of our faith, we shall endeavor to keep our readers advised from time to time of their progress.

At the Royal Society of Literature, April 12th, the Rev. J. D. Heath read a paper "On the Select Hieratic Papyri," published by the British Museum in 1844, in the deciphering of which he has lately been making considerable progress. Mr. Heath believes that he has succeeded in discov-

ering that some of these, as the fifth and sixth of the Anastasi collection, which belong to the reign of Menephtah II., narrate the exodus of a "mixed multitude" from Egypt, and probably that of the Jews themselves. In the commencement of his paper Mr. Heath gave several reasons why he imagined that the exodus did really take place during the reign of this Menephtah II., though, if his theory be true, the date of that event is brought down as low as B. C. 1312; and he stated that he had been led to this conclusion by perusing some remarkable papers contributed by Miss Corboux to the "Journal of Sacred Literature." The contents of these Papyri Mr. Heath showed to be very various; each new subject being, generally, distinguished by red-letter headings; some are verses, sung by the tutor to the royal youths in the Harem; some are official orders to different officers; some are praises, not only of kings, but of individuals. In one instance there is a psalm, by a royal psalmist, and some are plain historical statements. The dates appended to some of the paragraphs are those of the copyist; for the same paragraphs are sometimes repeated in different handwritings. Mr. Heath then proceeded to give various portions of the Papyri translated, but necessarily in a very fragmentary form, in illustration of his theory and belief, with respect to their contents.—*London Paper.*

R. Fowler, Esq. says, in his work, "Hither and Thither," as quoted by the "Journal of Sacred Literature,"—"I visited, both by land and by water, the celebrated St. Paul's Bay. There is no reasonable doubt but that Malta is the Melita described by St. Paul as the scene of his shipwreck; and to hint even a doubt of this would be here the concentrated essence of treason. There is, perhaps, rather more uncertainty as to the exact spot: but there is a bay with an island at its mouth, which answers the description given of the scene of his shipwreck by St. Paul in the last chapter of the Acts of the Apostles: and therefore it is fixed upon reasonably enough as the place, and named accordingly. On the island is a colossal statue of St. Paul. Of course, too, there is a chapel dedicated to him, and the very spot is pointed out at which the vessel touched the ground. Here, as elsewhere, scepticism is invited to step in, by an attempt to prove too much. This is an error almost universal at places of traditional interest.

At the Royal Society, April 10th, Dr. Buist read a paper "On the Physical Geography of the Red Sea," illustrated by a large collection of charts, sections, and drawings. He stated that it was singular that we should know less of one of the most extraordinary estuaries in the world, traversed as it was by some scores of Englishmen weekly, and with men-of-war or packets of the Indian navy lying idle at its two extremities, than we did of Siberia, the Ural Mountains, or parts of the Arctic regions. The summit-level of the Wadi Arabá is stated, in the Transactions of this Society for 1848, to be 485 feet, but from a paper (Captain Wm. Allen, R. N.) lately

published in the 23d volume, it is evident that nothing certain is known either of the position or altitude of its water-shed. Sir R. Murchison said that, with regard to the Wadi Arabá, he had upon several occasions brought its desirability before the proper authorities. He expressed his great satisfaction in having occupied the chair when a memoir containing so many geographical data bearing on geology had been communicated in so clear and intelligent a manner, and hoped that the public authorities would employ so able a man as Dr. Buist in a special natural history survey of the Red Sea, by which we might obtain as accurate an acquaintance with it as we have obtained of the Mediterranean through the researches of Admiral Smyth.

At the Syro-Egyptian Society, March 14, the following papers were read : First, a letter from Constantius the First, Ex-patriarch of Constantinople, addressed to Dr. Loeme, in answer to an inquiry made by command of his late Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, respecting the twenty-four Hebrew Gospels, and the works of Flavius Josephus ; translated from the Greek by Dr. Loeme ; corrected by Mr. H. Black :

“ Honored Friend,—I have seen, by the letter with which you were pleased to honor me, that you have been travelling, for literary pursuits, in the country called by the moderns ‘ Land of the Nile,’ as well as in Upper Nubia, called by the ancients ‘ Ethiopia,’ also in Lower Nubia, situated between the first and second cataracts, and in the Thebaide, situated in Upper Egypt, where, I have no doubt, you were astonished to see the grand edifices erected, at the most, by the eighteenth Pharaonic dynasty ; and that, at length, after your arrival at Constantinople, you felt anxious to find some precious manuscript. But, friend, long oppression and powerful fate have, like a violent tempest, seized and destroyed all things ; and so in this once prosperous city, as in Alexandria, to the perpetual grief of all the learned, fanaticism hath swept them away. You ask me, ‘ What became of the twenty-four Hebrew Gospels ? ’ Some lessen that number, and others, like Calmet, increase it to thirty-nine. The reason is, because the same work became increased by the different titles which were given to it. Thus : the Gospel of the Hebrews was the same as the Gospel of the Nazarenes, the Gospel of the twelve Apostles, and the Gospel of St. Peter ; but all four do not differ from the Gospel of Matthew, except by some few alterations which Christians in Judea dared to make. The *Proto-Evangelium*, or first Gospel of St. James, was the same as that of the Genealogy of Jesus Christ ; the so named Gospel of Truth, that of Valentine ; that of the Infancy of Christ is that of St. Thomas ; the Gospel of St. Paul, that of Marcion, and is no other than the Gospel of Luke, from which the said heresiarch omitted the first two chapters, and altered several sentences. The Gospel of Tetian, or of the Encratites, is nothing but a harmony of the four Gospels, in which those heretics passed over in silence anything that was condemnatory of themselves. The Gospel of the Egyptians was the same as that of Mark, but falsified. The Gospel of Nicodemus was un-

known during the first four centuries, the Immortal Gospel being the composition of a certain Franciscan, who lived in the thirteenth century. Behold, then, how it is proved that the number of the apocryphal Gospels was exaggerated, and was really less! But even of them some were merely memorials, written by some insignificant and common men, who wrote without apostleship or authority. They may have been faithful, but they were common men; and their simplicity and great zeal persuaded them to admit and write down indiscriminately all that was reported abroad, without certainty of the deeds of the Lord Jesus Christ, and about which the four Evangelists had said nothing; moreover, others were works composed and formed by heretics—the Ebionites, Marcionites, Simoniacs, Gnostics, Manicheans, and others—for the purpose of causing credit to be given to their foolish errors.

“All those books, therefore, may be regarded as tares among the pure wheat of the four holy Gospels. Some of them were spurious, and uttered under false titles; and others, which were erroneous and blasphemous, have been condemned in the fourth and fifth century, by the Church in general, as profane and impure. They were rejected and thrown to waste; both the originals and translations of them were consumed by fire, so that nothing remains except a few extracts.”

The above is only a portion of the letter of the Expatriarch of Constantinople, “Constantius the First.” It is curious and interesting.

The second paper above referred to, was read by Mr. Samuel Sharpe, “On the Temple of Jerusalem.” He compared the ground-plan of the hill and of the foundation-walls, as published from Mr. Catherwood’s “Survey,” with the passage in the Old and New Testament which describes the several courts around the House of the Lord, and with the description in Josephus. Mr. Sharpe’s arguments went to prove that the sacred rock beneath the dome of the Mosque of Omar was the altar of burnt offerings; that the raised plat of ground on which the Mosque of Omar stands was the court of the altar; that the House of the Lord stood a little to the south of that court, on a plat of ground now marked out by its want of pavement, and used as a garden. He argued that the court of the Gentiles was the space on the north side between the Mosque of Omar and the Governor’s house, and that the Temple, properly so called, was the rest of the hill, exclusive of the court of the Gentiles, being a square space of about a stadium, or five hundred great cubits each way, which included the court of the altar and the house of the Lord, together with the other courts mentioned by Josephus. He further argued, that while the porch of the house was on the south side of the court of the altar, the porch of the Temple, with its two massive square towers, like the front of an Egyptian temple, was on the north side of that court, and that the wall across the hill, from fortification to fortification wall, which was the front of the Temple proper, and divided its sacred courts from the court of the Gentiles, was the middle wall of the

partition, which the spread of Christianity was figuratively said to have removed.

From the 31st Annual Report of the Asiatic Society, read May 20th, we learn the progress made in Assyrian discovery during the past year. One of the most recent results is the finding of a fourth obelisk at Nimrud, of very uncouth shape, but of fine material, and well wrought, covered with bas-reliefs and inscriptions. This obelisk, as we learn from Col. Rawlinson, was set up by Shamas-phul, the son of the monarch who erected the one now in the British Museum. The inscription begins by recording a domestic revolution, and goes on with a detail of the conquests of the king, and the enlargement of the power and dominion of Assyria. Col. Rawlinson has seen the Chaldean collection making in the south, by Mr. Taylor, British Consul at Bussorah, and, after a cursory examination, has drawn up a list of eighteen of the primitive kings of Babylonia. These Chaldean relics, it is hoped, will form the nucleus of a history of Western Asia, contemporaneous with, and even preceding, the establishment of the children of Israel in the Holy Land. The chronology of Assyria, during the past year, has received an important addition from an inscription of one of the early kings, which records the construction of a temple as far back as 1840, B. C. This discovery was first made by Dr. Hincks, and has since been fully confirmed by Col. Rawlinson, who has found a more perfect duplicate of the same document. Recent letters also state that Col. Rawlinson has read the name of Semiramis on a statue of one of the gods, and from this she would appear to have been the wife of Pul, King of Assyria, mentioned in the Book of Kings. Another curious and recent discovery is, that the Babylonian cuneiform alphabet was employed as late as the commencement of the third century B. C. Some tablets discovered by Mr. Loftus at Warka contain names which are unmistakably those of Seleucus and Antiochus. The Report then adverted to a question, sometimes asked, as to what dependence could be placed on these readings; and observed, that those who have given attention to the subject, and have watched the progress of decipherment—those, in fact, who are the best able to form a judgment on the point, are satisfied. The general truth of these discoveries must, however, be admitted by all, when it is seen that men, working independently, and far removed from each other, come to the same conclusion. It is, in fact, impossible to imagine a system of interpretation which could always produce consistent results from any number of given documents, unless that system were true. The establishment of the Assyrian Excavation Fund was next noticed, and its claims to the support of the members of the Society, and the public at large, advocated, the fruits already derived, as detailed in a recent report being very promising and important.

A new palace has been found at Nineveh, in the Mound of Konyunjik, which is reported to be a most beautiful palace, belonging to the son of Esar-Haddon. The sculptures are infinitely superior in variety of subject, in artistic treatment, and in skill and delicacy of execution, to everything

which has been before found. The palace, also, is of great extent, containing, perhaps, five hundred sculptured slabs, and the marbles are generally in a good state of preservation. This new palace is by far the most magnificent thing yet discovered in Assyria. Each hall, room and passage, is devoted to a separate subject, and where the series is complete, and the sculpture is well preserved, as not unfrequently happens, the series are of extraordinary interest. In fact the variety of subject, artistic grouping and treatment, high relief, richness of detail, and delicacy of execution, entitle the palace to be reckoned the *chef-d'œuvre* of Assyrian art. Some of the pavement slabs are most superb, and the animals, trees, and flowers, even the human figures, are much more natural and free from conventionalities than in any of the earlier palaces. There are between two and three hundred sculptured slabs already uncovered, and not above one half of the palace is yet explored. Colossal bulls and lions there are none, but monsters, centaurs, hippogryphs, &c., there are as many as you please. At one of the entrances there are a pair of round ornamental pedestals, which certainly supported columns; but as there are no remains of such columns, they must have been formed, I suppose, of wood. On one slab there is a city with a double wall, and within a temple, faced with a row of columns supported on the backs of animals. On another there is a mound, on the top of which is a castle, and to give more extent to the upper platform a causeway is run out from the top of the masonry, with sharp-pointed arches stretching down the side of the mound.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is earnestly engaged on a new edition of the Septuagint, from the Alexandrine text. It will be executed at Cambridge, under the care of Mr. Field, who edited some part of Chrysostom.

Mr. Wenger, of Calcutta, continues to devote much time and care to the Sanscrit version of the Scriptures. He has recently finished a metrical translation of the Book of Job, and transmitted a copy of it to England, with a request that it might be submitted to the examination of some competent Sanscrit scholar there. It has been submitted to the Baden Professor of Sanscrit, Oxford, who, on returning it said, "considered as a first performance, it is highly creditable to Mr. Wenger's care and scholarship, and will, I have no doubt, be found acceptable to natives of learning, for whom it is intended."

The Rev. Dr. King, who has undergone so much persecution on account of his courageous efforts to distribute the Bible among the Hellenes, is now enabled to report that "the whole Bible is now received in all the communal schools in the kingdom; and the director of the Polytechnic School in Athens, has lately, as I am informed, placed several copies of the Old Testament in modern Greek in that institution for the use of the students. And I have good reason to believe that it will be placed in the prison for the use of those who are there confined."

The United Presbyterian Synod have presented to the American missionaries resident in Persia a quantity of valuable books which had been furnished to the late Dr. Glen, to assist him in translating the Scriptures into the Persian language.

American Indians.—At the Ethnological Society, London, March 15th, a paper was read by Mr. J. Kennedy, "On the probable origin of the American Indians, with particular reference to the Caribs." The writer showed that the Americans were of the same race evidently as the Mongolians, and therefore that they had undoubtedly come from Asia, and that only comparatively recently, after Asia and the Asiatic Islands had become fully peopled. He judged this might have been 2000 years before the Spanish conquests, and quoted an opinion of Acosta to the same effect. He then combated the opinions of Robertson, Dr. Latham, and others, who had held the theory of particular localities, through which they had passed from Asia to different parts of America, at different times, and in different stages of semi-civilization or barbarism. He showed that the Indians inhabiting the parts of America on the east, now forming the U. States and the British Provinces, came from Tartary and Siberia, and those on the western side from the eastern and southern shores of Asia. The inhabitants of S. America he thought clearly traceable to the Polynesians. The semi-civilization of Mexico and Peru he thought to have been derived from Southern Asia, but the ancient civilization of Yucatan and Central America to have been distinct, and of probably Phœnician origin; on which he pronounced his opinion with less hesitation, as having personally inspected some of the ruined cities in those countries. He fully admitted the fact historically, not only of the Northmen having visited America many years previously to Columbus, but that various stragglers might have reached the new world, in accordance with the Welsh and Irish traditions. He had no doubt of the Phœnicians having done so, from the notices scattered through ancient writers of lands on the other side of the ocean. Finally, he contended that even African tribes had crossed over, and especially the Caribs, from whose physical and moral characteristics, manners, customs, and language, he showed a number of strong analogies in support of his arguments. *He concluded by denouncing the doctrine of a distinct creation of the human species in America, as being inconsistent with experience, and therefore as being unphilosophical, as well as contrary to the sacred records.*

Early Christian Hymns.—The following extract is from "Specimens of Greek Lyric Poets," by the Rev. James Donaldson, M. A., Edinburgh:

"St. Paul makes mention not only of Psalms, but of Hymns and Odes; (Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16;) so that in his times the Christians had begun to pour forth their feelings in songs of their own. Antiphonal singing is mentioned in the celebrated letter of Pliny (Epp. x. 97); and writers after him, that refer to the service of the church, allude to this part of the worship.

“The first specimen of a Greek Christian hymn, as far as I know, is the psalm of the Naasenes or Nahasenes, given in the recently found book Hippolitus, p. 122. It is written as the editor, Emanuel Miller, remarks, in logædic anapæstics; but it is in such a corrupt state, and so little is known of the doctrines of the sect, that not much sense can be made out of it. Perhaps there was never much sense in it.

“The next specimens we have are attributed to Clemens Alexandrinus, and are given in this selection. Several Christian poems are also published in the Anthology; and a whole book is devoted to the Epigrams of the celebrated Gregory of Nazianzen, who was also the author of the *Χριστὸς πάσχω*, a famous tragedy, mentioned by Milton in his preface to Sampson Agonistes.

“The principal hymn writers to the Christian church were Synesius and Cosmas. Synesius of Cyrene flourished in the commencement of the fifth century, and Cosmas in the eighth century. The hymns of Cosmas, the whole of which have not yet been published, are not written in metre; and this seems to have been the case with almost all the hymns of the ancient Greek church. In the services of the present Greek church hymns are still used, but they are not metrical. A kind of rhythm is often clearly distinguishable in them.”

A Chinese newspaper has been established in California, under the title of “Kin-chan-ji-sinlou,” which signifies “The Gold Mine Journal.” It is lithographed in four pages, and divided into columns, commencing at the right hand of the top of what with us would be the last page, as is usual with the Eastern writings. It opens with an address from the editor, setting forth the design of the journal, and soliciting subscriptions and advertisements. Besides these, commercial news and articles of intelligence likely to interest the Chinese, are noted. An eminent Chinese scholar of Paris, who has examined the newspaper, says that it displays talent and industry, but is not written in the choicest language or most elegant style.

New Board of Publication.—The General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church, at its late meeting at Hudson, resolved to establish a permanent board of publication, to be denominated the “Board of Publication of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church.” Rev. Drs. Berg, Bethune, Ferris, and a dozen others constitute the nucleus of the Board.

Massachusetts Sabbath School Society.—The Twenty-Second Annual Report of this society gives a detailed account of the operations of the society. We learn therefrom that the whole number of the society’s publications is 1678; of which 688 are bound library books, 51 question books and catechisms, and 6 music and hymn books. The sales of the past year amounted to \$28,976 66. A descriptive catalogue is published annually, at considerable expense, for gratuitous circulation. It gives a brief account of each

book, and is of great service to any one in selecting or replenishing a library. This catalogue makes a pamphlet of 84 pages.

The value of publications put in circulation the past year by the American Sunday School Union is \$172,041 30. The number of new publications fifty-one, of which forty-one are for libraries. Of the whole number, thirty-two are original works, and nineteen reprints. The society now publishes a complete library for Sunday Schools, containing 792 volumes, and three selections from the general library, of 100 volumes each, for \$10, and 75 volumes for \$5, besides a large variety of elementary books, cards, hymn books, &c. The committee of publication consists of twelve members, from different religious denominations.

The Wisconsin University, at Madison, Wis., is now in process of erection. It is to be built of stone. It stands on an eminence of 1,000 feet, a mile west of the capitol, in a park of 55 acres. It has a fund of 400,000 dollars, and will soon be a prosperous and flourishing institution.

The triennial jubilee of the Alumni of Harvard College took place on the twentieth of July. Prof. Felton was the orator of the day. About five hundred partook of the dinner served on the occasion, Josiah Quincy, Jun., presiding. Speeches were made by Judge Shaw, Prof. Pierce, and others. The old board of officers was re-elected with the exception of Judge Thomas, who resigned, and the Hon. Charles Sumner was chosen in his place.

The American Tract Society has scattered over the United States 154,000 copies of "Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress;" 657,660 copies, in the aggregate, of Richard Baxter's works; 141,567 of Doddridge's "Rise and Progress." Of modern works, 60,000 copies of "Sunny-Side;" 50,000 copies each of "Jane Hudson" and "Robert Dawson;" and within a short time 25,000 copies of "Hugh Fisher" have been issued.

Rev. Dr. Dempster, Professor of Theology in the Methodist Biblical Institute, Concord, N. H., has accepted the Professorship of Theology in the North Western University, near Chicago, and will enter upon its duties about the first of November.

The Trustees of Wesleyan College, at Middletown, Connecticut, have conferred the honorary degree of LL. D. upon Francis Hall, for so many years the efficient editor of the New York Commercial Advertiser.

Dr. Terrell has given \$20,000 to endow an Agricultural Professorship in Franklin College, Georgia. He has suggested Dr. Daniel Lee, the editor of the Southern Cultivator, and an editor of the Rochester American, as a suitable person to fill the chair.

The recent meeting of the American Institute of Instruction, (the 25th Annual,) at Providence, was an occasion of exceeding interest to the large number of delegates who took part in the exercises. Addresses were made

on educational topics by Rev. Dr. Wayland, Rev. E. B. Huntington, Elbridge Smith, Esq., Rev. E. Beecher, D. D., W. Hooker, M. D., and Geo. Sumner, Esq.

The American Institute, desirous of adding to its library such documents and works as have from time to time been published by the various State governments, municipal and other corporations, has appointed Messrs. John Disturnell, Ralph Lockwood, Alexander Knox, Robert Lovett, Wm. A. Whitbeck, Alanson Nash, William Hibbard and Edwin Williams an exchange committee to procure such works. The Institute having issued 8 volumes of its transactions from 1846 to 1853, each volume containing over 500 pages, bound, this committee is empowered to make exchange of these works with similar institutions in the United States and Canadas. The Institute has been twenty years in forming the library of 7,000 volumes now in its rooms at No. 351 Broadway, N. Y., and the object of this step is to make it yet more extensive and valuable.

A valuable theological library, consisting of about 4,000 volumes, a part of the estate of the late Dr. Philo, Professor of Theology at the University of Halle, has been purchased for Yale college, New Haven.

The valuable library of Gen. Davis, which embraced some 4,000 volumes of political works, pamphlets and papers, was destroyed at the recent fire at Troy. It was one of the best collections of the kind in the country.

Pastor's Libraries.—The "American Congregational Union" is making an effort which, if successful, will do much good directly and indirectly for a long time to come. They propose to raise a permanent fund of at least 12,000 dollars, the income of which is to be expended in assisting Congregational Churches to establish libraries for their pastors. It is an important feature in the plan, that no sum exceeding fifty dollars, is to be appropriated to any one church in one year, and no sum shall be appropriated to any church until at least an equal amount has been raised by that church to be expended at the same time for the same purpose. One gentleman is understood to have pledged himself conditionally to the amount of five thousand dollars. The trustees of the Union will be empowered to procure books for libraries, purchasing them at wholesale, and distributing them at cost. In isolated cases churches have already established such libraries, but this will open the way for founding many of them. The idea having become public property, other denominations will be very likely to endorse and adopt this plan of doing good. So may it be.

The Western Seaman's Friend Society have adopted a new system of colportage, with a view to the circulation of a better class of works than are usually peddled by newsboys on steamboats and rail-cars. Mere tracts and tract society books, have proved heavy reading for travelers, but this society "proposes to employ its peculiar advantages for securing the very best and first issues of popular works of history, science and travels, as well as

those of a more strictly religious character, and to establish depositories and reading rooms in railroad depots, connected with important harbors, and thereby supply a great means of elevation to the travelling public, especially to the increasing host of youth who are to be identified with our constantly increasing commerce.

Orestes A. Brownson, the Roman Catholic fire-eater, it is said, has accepted the invitation tendered him by the Rev. Dr. Newman and the directors of the Irish University, to become a professor in that university. His salary to be about \$3,000 a year. He is now preparing his first course of lectures. He will continue his Review.

Mr. Rutlege, a publisher in London, announces that he has sold 35,000 copies of Bulwer's "Pelham;" 27,000 of "Paul Clifford;" 27,000 of "Eugene Aram;" 23,000 of "Rienzi;" 23,000 of "Last Days of Pompeii;" 18,500 of "Pilgrims Rhine;" 18,000 of "Last of the Barons;" and 18,000 of "Ernest Maltravers."

As a pleasing offset to the above, we gladly present the following:—

The Religious Tract Society of London.—The fifty-fifth annual meeting of this parent society was held in Exeter Hall, May 5th, S. M. Peto, M. P., in the chair. Addresses were made by Rev. Messrs. Millar, Bickerstith, Noel and others, and by E. Ball, Esq., M. P. The receipts of the Society for sales, and in donations and legacies, were £ 76,175, about 370,000 dollars. The issues of the publications were 27,376,575, being an increase of 1,524,724. The total grants, at home and abroad, were £ 11,206, about \$ 55,000. The circulation of the "Leisure Hour" is about 80,000 weekly. The Society has commenced a periodical entitled, "The Sunday at Home." All its enterprises seem to be prosecuted with their usual vigour, and with the Divine favour.

Popularity of American Tracts.—A single monthly number of a valuable Edinburgh journal contains six of the Tracts of the American Tract Society, namely: "What is it to believe on Christ?" "Convictions Stified;" "If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink;" "Who slew all these?" "For Ever;" and "Am I self-deceived?" One of them is duly credited; another is acknowledged as "re-printed from a tract;" and another is attributed to an American newspaper, which took it without credit. The same number contains a sermon by an American divine; three articles from an American newspaper; several articles from American books; and several from the "American Messenger," and "The Child's Paper."

A Foreign Missionary Finding a Field at Home.—Rev. E. W. Syle, of the Protestant Episcopal Mission at Shanghai, now on a visit to this country, has recently been labouring among the Chinese in New York. A number of those he visited understood the English language. Others were found in a sailor's boarding-house, at their favourite amusement of gambling, in circumstances of great want, having had hard usage in this Christian

land. Mr. Syle collected and preached to about 40 in the old St. George's Church, where they were seated around the vault in which rest the ashes of the sainted Milner. He used a copy of the newly-finished version of the book of Genesis in Chinese, and the Chinese book of Prayers which he had so often offered in the midst of his little flock at Shanghai. In his own land he was permitted to preach to an audience of the very people to whose countrymen he had long been a missionary of the Gospel.

The Girard College.—Stephen Girard, the founder of the Girard College for Orphans, in Philadelphia, required by his will that the boys should be instructed in the purest principles of morality, but that no clergyman should be allowed to enter the institution. As no text-book was prescribed, the officers of the college took it for granted that they must use the Bible, as it is recognized as of the highest authority by the greatest number, and accordingly the Bible is daily read there without note or comment. And as in teaching astronomy and other high sciences, it is necessary to give a previous instruction in the elementary departments of mathematics; so to teach morality, they find it necessary to teach that on which morality depends, and accordingly they teach religion.

Wheel of Prayer.—A missionary among the Tartars, hearing that a Celmuck princess had pitched her tent near him, determined to visit her to inform her of the true God and his Son Jesus Christ. On going to her tent he was invited in, and found her at prayer. In the back part of the tent was the family god, a rude, carved image of wood, painted black. Before its face was a wheel, in the rim of which were many niches, into which were put small written prayers, that had been purchased at great expense. The princess sat on the ground, turning the wheel so as to bring each prayer before the idol's eyes, allowing it a short time to read the prayer before she turned up another.

Great Deeds of Great Men.—A lecturer on the heroes of the English Commonwealth says, it was Hampden who established in the English mind the idea of liberty, Cromwell who established the idea of toleration, Blake the idea that Britain must be master of the seas, and Milton the idea of the liberty of the press. This was the special work of these four men, all puritans, the fathers of British liberty.

Jenny Lind.—It is stated that Mrs. Goldschmidt expects to settle permanently in the United States, mainly on account of her child, a bright little boy.

Dr. Duff at Home.—Rev. Dr. Duff, on his return to Scotland, made a speech of four hours before the Free Church Assembly, giving his observations during his recent trip to America. Probably no foreigner ever had more favorable impressions of the United States.

Russia.—No associations for religious purposes are tolerated in Russia; the Bible is not permitted to be printed, or to be introduced, in the language

the people can read. No Bibles have been printed in Russia since 1823. No Christian missions to those nominally connected with the Greek church in any part of the Empire are tolerated.

Care for Others.—The native congregation, under the care of the missionaries at Beyroot, Syria, sent 1000 piastres, and the church at Hasbeiya 700 piastres, to aid in furnishing a million copies of the New Testament for the Chinese.

Japan.—During the recent visit of the American squadron to Japan, the chaplain of one of the ships, Rev. E. C. Bittenger, made several excursions on shore. He visited two large cities, one of which he supposed contained 200,000 inhabitants; he estimated them to be six miles long; they had wide and well-formed streets. There were vast crowds of Japanese in the streets, who cleared a passage for him at the wave of a band of their officers. The houses he entered were neat, clean and comfortable. In some were Japanese clocks. They understood the difference between the Protestant and Catholic religion.

Ready to Enter In.—It is a providential coincidence, that just as Japan is opening to the trade of other countries, efforts should be made for giving the Japanese the Scriptures in their own language. Dr. Bettelheim, a medical missionary connected with the Loochoo missionary society of London, is about visiting Hong-Kong to take measures for printing his Japanese and Loochooan version of the Scriptures. In Japanese the four Gospels and the Acts, and in Loochooan, Luke, John, the Acts, and the Epistle to the Romans, are ready for publication, the work of Dr. Bettelheim, who has long been secluded in Loochoo.

No Puritans.—The German Liberals of Boston, in concert with those at the West, demand a number of modifications in the constitution and laws of the country, involving among other things, the repeal of the laws in favor of Sabbath observance and temperance, and the exclusion of the Bible from schools.

The Soldier's Pocket Bible.—Governor Washburn, in a recent speech before the Massachusetts Bible Society, said, "Observe the causes which made Cromwell and the Commonwealth. In the army, every man had a Bible in his knapsack, and daily read it and sung the praises of his God; and the result was what has been seen in the history of Puritanism." "The Soldier's Pocket Bible" consisted of appropriate selections from the Scriptures, and was printed on a single sheet, making sixteen pages. It is said that the success of Cromwell's army commenced immediately on its publication, and that they never after lost a battle.

On the night of April 16, the City of San Salvador was totally destroyed by an earthquake. More than 200 lives and \$4,000,000 worth of property were destroyed in less than a minute of time.

The Bible is now a "stamped" book in France. In consequence, it can be lawfully sold in all the Provinces by colporteurs of books and pamphlets, who are now brought completely under the control of the government.

It is said that the subscription for the monument to Professor Wilson progresses most favorably. The subscriptions already exceed £ 900. The sum required is about £1,400.

The next Actonian Prize of £105 is to be awarded by the Royal Institution, in 1558, for the best Essay illustrative of the Wisdom and Beneficence of the Almighty, as manifested by the influence of solar radiation. The productions of competitors must be sent to the Royal Institution before the end of December 1857, and the adjudication will be made on the 12th of April following.

It is stated that the Rev. Charles Kingsley, author of "Alton Locke," "Hypatia," &c., is soon to visit the United States. He will preach the sermon on the dedication of the new Episcopal church in Kensington, Philadelphia.

A society has been formed in London and Manchester, called the "Union for the Discouragement of Vicious Advertisements," which by the circulation of tracts, calls upon the public to set their faces against papers admitting such advertisements as are commonly inserted.

At a meeting of the Royal Irish Academy, Messrs. W. H. Prescott and T. B. Macaulay were elected, after a most careful consideration, as honorary members, distinguished in polite literature, to fill the vacancies occasioned by the death of Moore and Wordsworth.

The author of the essay on the "Burial of Moses," in the last number of the Journal of Sacred Literature, says:

"I have somewhat incorrectly stated that the 1260 days of the testimony of the two witnesses coincide with the 42 months of the degradation of the holy city.

"If we may identify the holy city of Rev. xi. 2 with the literal Jerusalem, the 42 months of its degradation may commence at the sack of the city (Zech. xiv. 2), and terminate with the destruction of the antichristian enemy. (Zech. xiv. 3 and 13.)

"But after the close of their testimony (*ὅταν τελίωσι τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτῶν*) 'the beast that ascendeth out of the abyss shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them.' This making war against, and overcoming the witnesses, may imply an interval of days or even weeks between the close of their testimony and their martyrdom.

"I hope to have an opportunity of discussing in the J. S. L. the question—'Is the holy city of Rev. xi. 2 to be identified with the literal Jerusalem?'

"I am disposed to think that the power indicated by the revived seventh head of the apocalyptic beast (Rev. xiii. 8) is to be identified with the wil-

ful king of Dan. xi. 40-45—that this wilful king, when he enters the glorious land (Dan. xi. 41) inflicts the desolations on Jerusalem predicted in Zech. xiv. 2—and that the destruction of the antichristian host in Dan. xi. 45 is the same as that which is foretold in Zech. xiv. 13. If this view can be received as correct, then it is not improbable that the 42 months of the revived seventh head of the apocalyptic beast are to be specially limited to the period of his sovereignty over the holy city. The wilful king is evidently possessed of vast power before his entry into the glorious land, and capture of Jerusalem (Dan. xi. 40). But may not the 42 months of Rev. xiii. 5 commence at the sack of Jerusalem, and terminate at the battle of Armageddon? And as the 1260 days of testimony end, at least, a short time before the battle of Armageddon, the two witnesses must have entered upon their task of prophetic testimony previous to the capture and sack of the holy city, and must have finished their task, and suffered martyrdom, before the close of the victorious occupation of Jerusalem by the antichristian gentile power, and the destruction of this power at the battle of Armageddon.

“ If we may suppose the 1260 days of the fugitive woman’s sojourn in the wilderness to be literal days, they appear to commence before the rise of the seventh head of the beast. For after vainly pursuing the woman, the dragon prepares to make war with the remnant of her seed; and, with this view, stands on the sea shore to see the beast rise up out of the sea (Rev. xiii. 1), through whose agency he seeks to carry on his work of persecution. Thus the woman’s 1260 days would seem to begin even before the dragon had given his power and throne to the seventh head, which, as we learn from Rev. xvii. 10, is to continue only a short time—and even before the commencement of the testimony of the two witnesses. It is however not impossible that the 1260 days of testimony may coincide with the 1260 days of concealment in the wilderness.

“ It may seem strange that after the duration of the concealment in the wilderness had been expressed plainly, as of 1260 days, it should *afterwards* be more obscurely described, as of ‘ a time, times, and half a time.’ (Rev. xii. 14. This may have been done by the Holy Spirit, with the express intent of teaching the Church to compare this portion of the Apocalypse with the predictions in the book of Daniel.”—*Journal of Sacred Literature*.

Among announcements from the press, and new publications, we note the following :

Little & Brown announce as being arranged for publication the correspondence of the late Daniel Webster, in two volumes, supervised by his son, Mr. Fletcher Webster.

Miller, Orton & Mulligan announce “ Webster and his Master-Pieces—His Life and Great Oratorical and Forensic Efforts, by B. F. Teft, D. D., in 2 vols. 12mo. 1075 pp., with portraits. Price \$ 2 50.”

Robert Carter & Brothers announce the Autobiography of the late Wil-

liam Jay, of Bath, England; Hours of Devotion, from the German of Tholuck; Henry's Commentary, a new and elegant edition on large type, 6 vols. quarto; A Harmony of the Four Gospels, by Isaac Da Costa, LL.D.; Israel and the Gentiles, by the same author; Howell's Remains; Words to Win Souls; A new volume of Discourses by Bishop McIlvaine of Ohio, 8vo.; Matthew Henry's Miscellaneous Works, 2 vols. royal 8vo.

Recently published:

The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, by Rev. W. J. Connyhease, and Rev. J. S. Howison, 2 vols. 8vo., with maps and engravings. C. Scribner, New York.

Messrs. Jewett & Co. have published Cumming on Romanism, perhaps the most important of his publications.

Cumming's minor works have also appeared from a press in Philadelphia.

Crosby, Nichols & Co. publish The Belief of the first three centuries concerning Christ's Mission to the Under World, by Frederick Huidokaper, of Meadville, Pa.

ART. VIII.

CLOSE OF OUR FIRST AND COMMENCEMENT OF OUR SECOND SERIES OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH.

1. The termination of our quadrennial duties, as editor, will justify a slight recurrence to the manner in which we have attempted to discharge them. Few of our readers have an adequate conception of the labor and responsibility of the post to which we have been assigned; and none, perhaps, of the superadded pastoral care to which we have submitted. During our entire term of service, we have been occupied, day and night, in the regular work of an itinerant minister, and during the last two years, at the distance of an hundred and fifty miles from the office of publication. Our toils, with brief intervals, have been immense, and our solicitude frequently embarrassing. Our retrospect, however, is one more of pleasure than of pain. While we are conscious of having fallen short of our wishes, we are happy in recognizing the hand of God in prospering our exertions, and the approbation of those who appreciate all honest efforts to promote a higher periodical literature in the circles of Southern Methodism. We have edited four large duodecimo volumes of 640 pages each; in all 2560

pages, containing a great variety of articles, some of them possessing a merit of which we challenge a comparison with the best Reviews in the United States. We have brought to the notice of our readers hundreds of the best American publications, and a quarterly *resumé*, gradually improving, of the current literary intelligence of the day. Yet neither the great body of our ministry nor of our membership have rendered us the support due to the only periodical of the kind authorized by the Church. That it has deserved more ample encouragement, notwithstanding its imperfections, we cannot doubt, nor will any one doubt, if he will take the four volumes together, and consider the amount and quality of the matter which they contain.

2. We have been appointed to another four years' superintendence of the Review, and expect to issue, on the first of January, the first number of our new series. We enjoy several special advantages in resuming our task, and hope to make them apparent in the improvement of the work. We bring some experience, however painfully acquired, into the field: we have been maturing better plans for enriching our pages; we are authorized, in the exercise of our maturest discretion, to secure the ablest contributors, and we anticipate more leisure in the supervision of the press. It is our purpose to intersperse, as we may be able, amongst our critical articles, essays on experimental and practical religion. We have made arrangements with our General Agents, to accompany the ensuing numbers with elegant engravings of our distinguished men. Although we shall add, as we trust, to the intrinsic merit of the Review, at an increased expense, its cost to the subscribers will continue at the exceedingly small price of \$2 a year, in advance; except to our ministers, to whom it is put at \$1 50 a year, if paid within six months. Nothing remains but to entreat our brethren to take that interest in this Quarterly Organ, which the prosperity of the Church and its actual value demand. You must have a journal of the kind. It cannot be substituted, except by the Reviews of other denominations. Every reading man will have a Review. All other churches are represented by this species of literature. We can equal, and we will endeavor, for the next four years, to *surpass* them. We hope to anticipate the English journals, on their arrival to our shores, in foreign intelligence. We humbly beg, for the sake of a cause so intimately interwoven with the destiny of the Church, as well as for yourselves, children and neighbors, that you will immediately renew your subscriptions for 1855; and obtain new subscribers. We ought, in our vast and wealthy territory, to send out four thousand copies quarterly. Help, men of Israel! Begin forthwith, that our January number may go forth to the world with a greatly enlarged patronage, and that we may be able not only to meet the expenses of publication but bring a revenue to the funds of the Church.



32101 063841934

DATE ISSUED	DATE DUE	DATE ISSUED	DATE DUE
MAY 1	JUN 8	31	

