





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

APRIL, 1832.

ART. I.—REVIEW.

Book on the Soul, First part. Book on the Soul, Second part. By the Rev. T. H. Gallaudet, &c.

THERE is, perhaps, no field for benevolent enterprise, which has been more neglected, or which promises a richer harvest to the cultivator, than the preparation of suitable books for children. It is somewhat surprising that the attention of philanthropists has been so little turned to this subject, and that while so much has been published of late on the importance of education, and of commencing our efforts early, so little has been done in the way of furnishing the means of communicating knowledge to the minds of children. At first view, it seems an easy task to prepare such books as are needful for the instruction of youth; yet when we come to ponder the subject deeply, we cannot but confess, that it is a work of extreme difficulty. We do not speak of the elementary books which are needful to teach the art of reading: these, however useful, communicate no instruction to the mind; they only furnish one means of acquiring knowledge. We refer to books adapted to the minds of children in the several stages of their development, and which are calculated, especially, to train the thoughts, 'to teach the young idea how to shoot;' and by which their

VOL. IV. No. II.—T

faculties may be invigorated, and habits of distinct and correct thinking established. It is, in our estimation, a common and pernicious error in education, that the first and principal object should be to store the mind with knowledge: for the chief end at which we should aim is, to prepare it for the acquisition of knowledge. Until the faculties are developed, exercised, and invigorated, the communication of knowledge, to any considerable extent, is impossible. The memory may, indeed, be loaded with ideas on a great variety of subjects; but this is not the way to acquire useful knowledge: The mere accumulation of ideas in the memory, tends rather to weaken than to strengthen the mind. Even the best books are in a great measure useless, until the mind, by various exercises, becomes so disciplined, as to be susceptible of improvement from the writings of profound thinkers. Injudicious parents are often misled on this point. They hear a particular author extolled by persons in whose judgment they repose great confidence; and without considering the age or improvement of their children, they insist upon their studying the work which has been so highly recommended. Even grave instructors often fall into this error, and put into the hands of children, books which, however excellent at a future period, can be of no manner of use at the present. We have known a case, where a boy of twelve years of age, feeling a desire to begin a course of useful reading, upon applying to his reverend instructor, had the *Tutler* put into his hands, which he found he could neither understand nor relish. In going into the house of a friend, we observed a little girl poring over an octavo volume; and upon inquiry, found that she was studying "Watts on the Improvement of the Mind." Often such works as Locke on the Understanding and Butler's Analogy are read when they can be of no real use to the pupil, and when the only effect produced is a distaste for those authors, which cannot afterwards be overcome, without great difficulty. Education is thus far a mere matter of experiment: and we are restricted from making new experiments which might lead to important discoveries, by the preciousness of the material on which we operate. No man, who is wise, is willing that his son or daughter should be conducted along some untried course, to verify some new hypothesis. Still there are many empirics who profess to work wonders with the human mind; and there are parents foolish enough to credit their pretensions,

and to subject children to their new processes of improvement.

But when it is conceded, that the primary object of education is the development and invigoration of the faculties, and the constitution of good habits and associations, it may still be a question of great importance, whether we should hasten the development of the intellectual faculties by such stimulants and exercises as may have that effect, or wait until nature brings forward her work, and then endeavour to guide and assist her efforts. This is a point which has not been sufficiently considered; and, therefore, there has been no hesitation among parents and teachers in accelerating, as speedily as possible, the development of every faculty; an early indication of the mental power is hailed as a happy omen of success; and the more premature the development of any faculty may be, the more pleasure, as well as wonder, does it excite. But all analogy is in favour of following, rather than going before nature, in her operations. Vegetables forced in a hot bed, produce earlier fruits than those which come forward under the common influence of the elements, but these precious fruits are seldom as good as those which arrive at maturity in the usual way; and it is so common for such plants to decay soon, that the fact has given rise to a proverb in many languages, that, *that which is soon ripe is soon rotten*. The same remarks are applicable to the growth of animals. And as far as there are facts within our observation, we cannot but think, that the analogy holds good in regard to the business of education. Hence it is, that many who are considered prodigies, when children, never arrive at any eminence of talent in mature age. Hence also, those children who are most constantly under the tuition of officious teachers, do not improve ultimately as much as some others whose education has been greatly neglected. In this, as in many other things, we do injury rather than good, by interfering too much with the processes of nature. There is a culpable vanity in most parents with regard to their children. They are extravagantly elated by their apparent success in literary pursuits; and both by parents and teachers the principle of emulation is too much excited; which, though natural and innocent in its proper exercise, readily degenerates into a vicious ambition; and in this form it is commonly found to exist in schools and colleges, where it is much calculated on as a means of accelerating the literary progress of the scholars.

It is admitted, that there is a certain period of human life, at which the mind has attained its highest vigour; when all the faculties are finally developed, and are in their freshest vigour. After this period, knowledge may be acquired even with more facility and celerity than before, but we expect no new strength to be added to any of the faculties of the mind. Now this period of time occurs much later in life with some minds than others, and it deserves to be well considered, what relation this may have to the mode of education; and whether it is not a fact, that precocity of intellect reaches this acme much earlier than that which is slower in its progress. And it should also be considered, whether an undue maturity is not followed by feebleness, and a premature decay. We observe, in regard to this last particular, a remarkable diversity. The mind of one man begins to fail at the age of forty-five or fifty, while that of another flourishes in vigour to the advanced period of eighty. And this cannot be attributed to the more sound state of the body in one case, than in the other; for in regard to this, there may be no difference; or the advantage as to bodily health, may be altogether on the side of the person whose mind is subject to an early decay. Indeed, in general, strength of mental powers has a slender connexion with health; a soul of mighty energies may dwell in a frail tottering tabernacle.

And, while on this subject, we would remark, that we know of no method of postponing the decay of the intellectual faculties so effectual as to keep them in vigorous exercise. Let the old man never indulge the thought, that the time for mental exertion is over—let him never suffer his mind to sink down into indolence and apathy—let him still keep his eyes open, and his attention awake to all the objects of knowledge which interest others, and thus the rust of the mind will be prevented from accumulating.

Another mistake in education, which has some affinity to the one already considered, is, that of giving undue exercise and disproportioned energy to some one faculty, while the others are neglected. It is possible to concentrate much of the strength of the body, we know, in particular members; or so to direct and exercise its energies, that it shall be rendered capable of performing extraordinary acts of a particular kind. Thus blacksmiths and hammermen, have unusual power in their hands and arms; and balance-masters, vaulters, &c. are able to do what is impossible to others. But it

has not been found, that this mode of training the body is of any real use in preparing it for the performance of the necessary and useful labours of life. In the works requisite, in peace or war, by land or sea, these men are not found superior to those who have been educated in the common way. Indeed, that disposition of bodily force, and facility of putting it forth into action, which is equally adapted to all useful purposes, and which brings into vigorous exercise all the parts of the body, is evidently the best. Just such is the fact in regard to the mind. By a peculiar course of education, a particular faculty is exercised and invigorated to the neglect of others; or a habit of performing certain intellectual operations with facility, is acquired. Thus, by constant exercise, the memory may be trained to remember words in their connected series, while not the least attention is paid to the relations of ideas expressed by them; and by artificial associations with things easily recollected in a certain order, this power of memory may be improved to a degree which appears wonderful. Persons skilled in the art of mnemonics are able, therefore, to perform exploits with this faculty, which, prior to all experience, would appear almost impossible. Indeed to one, whose mind has been much neglected, it seems a prodigious exertion of memory to be able to repeat exactly all the words of a discourse, which it requires an hour or more to deliver; but, by exercise and long practice, this can be accomplished by many, after a second reading. It has also been found by experience, that children may be easily made to perform calculations by figures, which greatly exceed the powers of sensible adults who have never been exercised in these things. And in some systems of education, the teachers, availing themselves of this susceptibility of the human mind, seek to excite attention, and to obtain celebrity in the business of developing and training the mental faculties, by the extraordinary feats, which, under this mode of instruction, the pupils are able to perform. But all these attainments, however wonderful, are no better, as it relates to the education of the mind, than the ability to perform the feats of a wire dancer, or circus-rider, in the useful education of the body. Some persons seem to have by nature, or to have early acquired from some unknown cause, an extraordinary aptness to perform certain intellectual operations, which are far beyond the ability of other children, or even of most adults. The extraordinary developement of a faculty, by

means of which the person is able to perform operations of a particular kind, has, in several remarkable instances, been witnessed in relation to arithmetical calculations. Now, it has been found in some instances of this kind, that this extraordinary talent was accompanied by a remarkable deficiency in the other faculties of the mind. A man of colour, as we have been informed, in Rhode Island, who possessed the extraordinary faculty of telling, after a moments consideration, the result of the multiplication of a number of figures, was so stupid in other matters, that he could never be taught to read. And in other cases which have fallen under our observation, we have never known this extraordinary faculty to be united with other mental powers in just proportion, so as to constitute a well-balanced and vigorous mind. We are persuaded, that in the business of education, it is not wise to attempt to elicit and strengthen one faculty, while the others are neglected; for, however successful the means used may be, and however extraordinary the talent which may be acquired, it is nothing more than giving undue vigour to one faculty at the expense of all the rest, which are found to exist in a state of proportionable ability. The vanity of the parents and friends of such children may be gratified by the extraordinary things of which they are capable, but the wise and considerate will prefer to have all the mental faculties brought into exercise and vigour in just proportion. We are led from this subject to remark, that all persons who engage with ardour in intellectual pursuits, which require the exercise of some one faculty, are very apt to contract a twist or distortion in their mental constitution; and to this cause much of that obliquity and eccentricity, for which some men are remarkable, must be attributed. The whole force of their mind is concentrated in some one faculty. Thus a man may pursue mathematical studies with so much ardour, that after awhile he becomes incapable of weighing the force of moral or analogical reasonings; and may appear so destitute of taste, that it may be doubtful whether any vestige of this faculty is left. We have, ourselves, known men who have made high attainments in mathematics, who did not appear to have more sense than a mere child about common affairs. And most persons have heard the anecdote of a celebrated mathematician of the university of Cambridge, who was particularly requested by a friend to peruse Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and give his opinion of the work; and who, when he returned the

book, gravely said, that he had read it from the beginning to the end, but had failed to meet with a single demonstration in the whole work. Yet the danger of destroying the proper balance of the mind is not peculiar to those who are occupied too ardently in the pursuit of the exact sciences. The same thing more frequently takes place in those who become absorbed in studies, when the imagination is the faculty which is brought principally into exercise. Thus it has been found, that the study of the Prophecies has proved dangerous to men of imaginative minds. By degrees, they come to see coincidences which are concealed from other minds; and, at length, fall into a degree of extravagance in their opinions, which clearly indicates, that the proper balance of the mind has been disturbed. In all such cases, there is contracted a certain degree of insanity in relation to the favourite object of pursuit; and it is the more important to give precautionary counsels to prevent this aberration of mind; because, when it is once contracted, advice comes too late. It is one symptom of this disease, to adhere to the suggestions of a disordered imagination with a confidence which no arguments can shake; and in this state of mind, nothing is more natural than for the enthusiast to believe that he possesses light which others do not see; and their incredulity is attributed to their ignorance, or want of attention to the subject. How far it may be practicable by a judicious system of education to prevent this evil, we cannot say; but certainly, dangers of this kind are more likely to be avoided when seasonably pointed out, than when persons are permitted to go forward without any warning.

But it is time that we should take some notice of the little, unpretending volumes, which have been recently presented to the public, by the Rev. Mr. Gallaudet, of Hartford, Conn. It ought to be a subject of immense congratulation with the friends of education, that a gentleman, every way so well qualified, has undertaken the humble, but very important work, of preparing elementary books for children. Plato thought, that the state of the world would be felicitous, when kings should all be philosophers; but after the trial of the inefficacy of philosophy alone, for several thousand years, we may be permitted to say, that the prospects of society will be bright, when pious, Christian theologians, shall condescend to become the teachers of children. Mr. Gallaudet has enjoyed peculiar advantages for studying the developement of

the human mind, during the long period in which he has been engaged in superintending the instruction of the deaf and dumb; and the American public owes him a debt of gratitude, for his patient, persevering, and successful efforts, in establishing institutions for this benevolent object in our land; and in the page of the impartial historian, he will undoubtedly be enrolled as one of the benefactors of his country.

It will readily occur to any one, that the successful instruction of mutes requires a knowledge of the faculties of the mind; but it is known to few how necessary it is, in this kind of instruction, to enter into a discriminating analysis of the various modes of thinking: nor is it understood by most, what a circuitous course must often be pursued to communicate to this unfortunate class of pupils, some one single idea. Now, as the success of the instructor will depend very much on the ingenious devices which he adopts for the purpose of conveying ideas to the minds of those who cannot acquire them in the usual way, teachers, whose minds are fertile in resources, will naturally be led to study the relations of thought with an attention which is uncommon with other persons; and in a long course of such studies, they will make discoveries of leading principles in the exercises of mind, which may be very beneficial in promoting education in general. For occasions such as these, we are much gratified to find a gentleman of Mr. Gallaudet's talents and experience, turning his attention to a system of education adapted to young children; for we are persuaded, that any plan which is effectual must commence with the pupil at an early age. And from what we know of the character of Mr. Gallaudet, we are not acquainted with any person better qualified to give a right direction to this momentous concern. We must not, however, expect too much from the efforts of any man, when so much rubbish lies in the way. Even to make an auspicious beginning, in a business so vital to human happiness—merely to lay a good foundation, on which others may hereafter build, is doing a great deal.

In two respects, *the Book of the Soul* demands our unqualified approbation. The first is, the unaffected simplicity of the style. The words selected are generally pure English; and while every idea is presented in the plainest and most perspicuous manner, there are none of those diversities, into which most persons naturally fall, when they write books for children. Our author has happily shunned the

common extremes, of being too learned on the one hand, or too quaint and vulgar on the other. Although, to a superficial observer, it may seem to be the easiest thing in the world, to write in the plain simple style of these little volumes; yet, we have no doubt, that it has cost the writer more sedulous attention and labour, to write in this manner, than to compose in that florid and elegant style, in which many admired books are written. But while we wish to bestow high commendation on the purity, simplicity, and unaffected ease of the style of these little volumes, there are some trivial points on which we would remark. It did not strike us favourably, that the word *think* is so repeatedly used, where the mental exercise intended to be expressed is *willing*. *I think* to move my hand, is a form of expression which sounds very awkwardly to us, and we do not see why the appropriate word might not be as well used. *I will* to move my hand or feet, is, in our opinion, as intelligible to a child, as the form of expression here adopted. We are of opinion, that no form of speech should be used in such an elementary work which is not correct, and which it would be improper for the child to use when the age of infancy is past. In other instances, when the author has occasion to use a word not likely to be understood by children, he seizes the opportunity of explaining its meaning; and thus a new word is learned by the pupil. And it appears to us, that this would have been the correct course here; for sooner or later, the proper word to signify that act of the mind termed *willing*, a volition, must be known; but the child, having been accustomed to the phraseology here employed, will be long subjected to embarrassment.

The only other thing which we have observed in the style of these volumes, which calls for a remark, is the occasional use of the sign of the infinitive mode, without expressing the verb itself, when it can readily be understood: an idiom, which as far as we know, is confined to the inhabitants of New England and their descendants in the other States. In answer to the question, *Do you go to town, to day?* they say, *I intend to*, or *I want to*. Now, however, this method of abbreviation may be tolerated in familiar conversation, it ought not to be admitted in any written composition; and especially in a book from which thousands of children will form their habits of speaking the English language.

The other particular in which Mr. Gallaudet seems to us to have formed a correct judgment of the true principles on which a system of early education should be founded, is the inculcation of one thing at a time, and the continual repetition of the same idea, until it is completely understood. No fault is more common than the attempt to teach children too much at once; and this is connected with the passing from thing to thing in too much haste; by which means nothing is learned well, and a strange confusion of ideas is produced in the mind of the child. This fault our author has carefully avoided. He has proceeded upon correct knowledge of the state of the infant mind, and has attempted the inculcation of truth in a very gradual manner; and will not be hurried forward too rapidly even by the impatient curiosity of the pupil, until by a distinct knowledge of the primary ideas, the way is prepared for a further developement of the subject. This gradual and distinct method of conveying knowledge, is, in our view, of the utmost importance to the improvement of the human mind. In the whole of the first of these volumes, nothing further is aimed at, than to give the child a distinct idea of the soul, and how it is distinguished from the body; and in the second it is attempted to give him some idea of the leading attributes of God. This, upon the whole, is well executed, but we think is susceptible of improvement. The dialogues on the power of God are too much extended, and the subject is made to assume too abstruse a form for the feeble intellects of children. We are of opinion, that the simple idea of God as the Creator of the world, without much enlargement or explanation, would answer best. That every thing must have a cause, is a truth which is apprehended by children as soon as any other; and from the fact that God made the world and all things in it, the idea of his power can be easily inferred. And we confess, that we were disappointed in not finding an allusion to the Saviour of sinners, in the whole of these two books. We entertain no doubt, but that the author intends to bring this subject forward distinctly in a future volume; but we should be better pleased, if this most interesting of all subjects had been presented to the mind of the child, in some aspect, before it has proceeded so far. But we may be here charged with a departure from our own principles, in requiring this part of the divine character to be exhibited before every notice is taken of his moral attributes, or of the moral law. Well, we will

agree to suspend our judgment on this point, until the author has proceeded further in his analysis; but we have a strong impression, that the best method of conveying to ignorant minds the true knowledge of God, is not to proceed systematically, but to rush, as it were, into the middle of the subject, and to present such ideas as are most likely to seize the attention, and engage the feelings. If light is let into the mind from any radiant point of divine truth, it will illuminate every other point which has any relation to the one which is the object of primary contemplation. Perhaps we have taken up this idea from the facts which have been reported by the Moravian missionaries, in relation to the methods of instruction which they found most successful in their attempts to instruct the ignorant heathen; and which have been generally pursued by other evangelical missionaries. But we are not sure, that this idea may not fairly be deduced from the practice of the Apostles themselves, who made Christ crucified, the centre of all their preaching. Method is a very excellent thing, and knowledge, to be most useful, must be reduced to system, but we doubt, whether, in the earliest acquisition of knowledge, the systematic order of ideas is useful; we are rather inclined to the opinion, that it will often be found best to begin with whatever is likely to interest most, and to make the deepest impression.

The remarks last made, suggest to us what we believe will be found to be the most material defect in these elementary books. They will not be so attractive to most children as is desirable. This opinion we have formed, not merely from the nature of the subjects treated, but also from some trial with children of a somewhat volatile disposition, but fond of reading entertaining stories. They read these little volumes without any manifest dislike, but did not seem to have their feelings much interested: and while some children of a serious, or contemplative turn will not only be gratified but delighted with the dialogues, the majority will not be so much interested, as, of their own accord, to read the work a second time. Now, we would respectfully recommend to the author, that he would study some embellishments or attractions, which might be interspersed through these books: and if anecdotes or narratives could be introduced, which would bear to be connected with the didactic matter, it would be so much the better.

The truth is—and it is an important fact in education, as

well as in commerce—that there must be a want created before much exertion will be made to obtain a supply. As far as our experience goes, this *desideratum* is the main thing in leading children or adults to pursue knowledge with ardour. Now, a general sense of duty, or feeling of interest, is not strong enough to counteract the numerous temptations to idleness and sport, which are presented to all children. It is necessary, therefore, to furnish books which will afford present pleasure; so that the child will prefer taking his book to read, to going to play. There is, no doubt, much danger lest this appetite should become morbid, and should crave unwholesome food. This danger cannot, however, be avoided by a rigid prohibition of all works of fiction and fancy: nor by attempts to keep children from all opportunity of looking into such books. Restraints of this kind may be maintained, while children are under the immediate eye of their parents; but when they are grown up, and go abroad, they will be in danger of resorting with uncommon avidity to this species of reading, as we have known to be the fact in more instances than one. While, therefore, we are deeply convinced that the great mass of fictitious writings have an injurious tendency, we are of opinion, that the only effectual remedy against this evil, is to furnish a substitute;—to prepare such books for children and youth as shall be entertaining, and, at the same time, moral and religious in their character. Why should it be supposed, that no books can be prepared which will captivate and delight the youthful mind, but such as have a tendency to corrupt it? And why is it unlawful to avail ourselves of the disposition in children to become deeply interested in connected narrations? How far it is lawful or expedient to go in making fiction the vehicle of instruction and moral improvement, is a question on which there exists some difference of opinion, and it is a point which it would be out of place to discuss here. We are pleased, however, to observe, that those narratives which are founded in fact, do unceasingly gain a preference with the religious part of the community over works of fiction, however good and pious their tendency. And we believe, that if pains were taken to collect facts, narratives might be formed for the entertainment and instruction of youth, which would be as interesting as any of those fictitious stories which are found to be so fascinating to young persons. And such histories would, in one respect, possess a decided advantage. It always produces an unplea-

sant revulsion of feeling, when the reader comes to the winding up of a fictitious narrative, in which he has been much interested, to reflect, that there is no reality in the whole affair. But when we read what we have reason to believe is a true statement of facts, and a true description of persons, even if we were not so much interested while reading, as we might have been in some highly wrought fiction; yet, afterwards, the reflection on the scenes which have occupied our attention, will be far more agreeable, when we entertain the belief that they were real, than if we know them to have no foundation in fact.

We are not acquainted with Mr. Gallaudet's plan for future publications: but, as we hope that he will devote the remainder of his life to this important work, which he has commenced in the composition of these two little volumes; so we trust, that he will take a comprehensive view of the subject on which we have now made some remarks. Could not some well selected histories or anecdotes, be every where interspersed between the dialogues? And although they might not have a very close connexion with the subject discussed, this would make no material difference. What we want is something to attract and interest the minds of volatile children. We are persuaded, that the ingenious author, although he has probably thought much more profoundly on the subject of early education than ourselves, will readily pardon the freedom of our remarks, and the officiousness of our suggestions, in relation to the work in which he is engaged. The spark which is attended by the most momentous effects, is produced by the collision of different substances. If we should be so happy as to be able to suggest one new idea, or to confirm one truth by our remarks, we shall be satisfied with this as an adequate reward for what we have written.

ART. II.—THE CHARACTER OF THE GENUINE
THEOLOGIAN.

Preliminary Remarks.

THIS article which follows is a translation from the Latin of Witsius. The elevated thought and ardent piety of the whole, together with the manifest importance of the subject, and the known wisdom of the author, will suggest themselves to the reader as sufficient reasons for its insertion. As the original discourse is an Inaugural Oration, pronounced when Witsius assumed the theological chair at Franeker, there are local allusions which are entirely omitted. A few paragraphs have been passed over for the sake of brevity. The date of the discourse is April 16, 1675.

THE THEOLOGIAN, as I use the term, is one imbued with the knowledge of God and divine things, under the teaching of God himself; who celebrates his adorable perfections, not by words alone, but by the ordering of his life, and is thus entirely devoted to his Lord. Such, of old, were the holy patriarchs, the inspired prophets, the apostles by whom the world was enlightened, with some of those luminaries of the Primitive Church, whom we denominate the Fathers. Their knowledge consisted, not in the acute subtilities of curious questions, but in the devout contemplation of God and of his Christ. Their chaste and simple method of instruction did not gratify the itching ear, but by sealing the impression of sacred things on the heart, enkindled the soul with love of the truth. Their blameless life was apprehended even by their enemies, and being in correspondence with their profession, fortified their teaching with irrefragable evidence, and was a manifest token of intimate communion with the Most Holy God.

In contemplating the character of such a theologian, let us inquire, first, in what schools, under what teachers, by what methods, he attains to a wisdom so sublime; secondly, in what manner he may best communicate to others what he has thus acquired; and finally, with what habits of mind and excellence of life he may adorn his doctrine. Or, more concisely, let us view the genuine Theologian, with reference to

his *learning*, his *teaching*, and his *life*. For no one teaches well, who has not first learned aright. No one has learned aright, who has not learned for the purpose of teaching others. And both are useless, unless reduced to practice.

To begin then, at that which is fundamental; the man who merits the honourable title of a genuine Theologian, must have the basis of his learning in the lower school of Nature, and must gather from the structure of the universe, and the wonders of divine providence, from the monuments of ancient and modern history, the recesses of the several arts, and the beauties of various tongues, those things which, deposited in the sacred treasury of memory, may become the foundation of a nobler edifice, when he advances to a higher school. It is not without design that God has impressed upon his works the visible tokens of his attributes; that he has introduced man endowed with sagacity of mind into the august theatre of the universe. It is not without design that all things in the government of the world, and the changes of human affairs, are conducted with so harmonious a variety, and so wise a choice. It is not without design that he hath so ordered the works of nature, as to afford some type of the works of grace and glory, and as it were, the rudiments of a better world. It is his will, that we should learn, from an attentive observation of these things, what and how great he is; Eternal, Infinite, most Almighty, most Wise, at once the greatest and the best, most fully sufficient for his own plenary happiness, since he gives to all life and breath and all things; most worthy, in short, to be served and imitated, and to be Supreme in our love and our fruition. It is his will, that we should contemplate his majesty diffusing the beams of its effulgence in our inmost hearts, there giving laws, awarding swift vengeance to sin, and to good works the mildest approbation, and the sweetest tranquillity of soul. He has chosen, that in view of the transitory, evanescent and glass-like frailty of the things which have been falsely deemed eternal, we should aspire to that which is heavenly, and thus to himself the Lord of heaven, who remaining unmoved is the cause of all motion.

Nor should the Theologian limit himself to the works of God, but labour to discover all that the industry of men has effected for leading the soul in pursuit of truth, and for so perfecting language as to render it the suitable interpreter of the mind. He should most assiduously consult the masters

in logic, grammar, and rhetoric; using these as Israel used the Gibeonites, who were hewers of wood and drawers of water for the sanctuary. The first of these will deliver to him precepts for definition, division, and arrangement; the other will instruct him in the art of uttering his sentiments, purely, tersely, elegantly, and persuasively—both herein ministering to the ministers of the sanctuary. He should glean precepts of virtue from the sayings of philosophers, and examples from the records of history; these will condemn the baseness of languor and inaction, though they may not avail to incite him towards more sublime objects. He should sedulously acquire various languages, especially those in which God has chosen to convey his sacred oracles, so as to understand them in their own proper idiom, and that God may not need an interpreter with him whose office it is to interpret the divine will to others. All that is sound and reasonable in human arts, all that is elegant and graceful in the array of refined literature, emanates from the Father of lights, the unwasted fountain of all reason and truth and beauty; this should therefore be collected from every source, and instantly be consecrated to God. Are these things minute and earthly? Minute and earthly as they are, they are the glasses by which the most refined images of supernatural things may be more clearly discovered by our renovated eyes.* These are the rudiments of the future Theologian; if they are superciliously contemned, he will hardly find the desired fruit when called to higher walks, or answer to his title and his office. Yet these are merely the rudiments.

The Theologian is not to spend his life in these things. Let him ascend from these lower instructions of Nature to the higher school of revelation; and sitting at the feet of God his Master, learn from His mouth those hidden mysteries of salvation, which eye hath not seen nor ear heard; which none of the princes of this world have known; which no reason, however disciplined, can reach; which angelic choirs, even in contemplation of the face of God, desire to look into. In the secret books of the Scriptures, and no where else, at the present time, the mysteries of the more sacred

* There is a figure in the original which can scarcely be admitted into grave discourse in our language: *Attamen minuta ista acus sunt, quibus aurea veritatum cœlestium fila introducamus, et animis nostris firmiter insuamus.*

wisdom are unfolded. Whatever is not derived from these, whatever is not founded on them, whatever does not exactly agree with them, is vain and futile; even though presenting a show of more sublime knowledge, or corroborated by antiquity of tradition, consent of doctors, and cogency of argument. "To the law and to the testimony." Whoso speaks not in accordance with this judgment shall never greet the brilliant dawn. These celestial oracles, the Theologian should embrace; these he should ply with daily, and with nightly toil. In these he should be conversant, from these he should learn; with these he should compare every sentiment, nor embrace aught in religion which is not to be there found.

Let his belief be dependent on no man, no prophet, no apostle, nor even on angelic teaching, as though the dictates of man or angel were to be his standard. In God, and God alone, must his faith be reposed. For the faith in which we are instructed, and which we inculcate, is not human but divine; and is so jealous of mistake, as to account no basis sufficiently firm, except that only foundation—the authority of the infallible and ever true God. There is, moreover, in the assiduous study of the Scriptures a certain indescribable fascination.* It fills the intellect with the brightest ideas of heavenly truth, which it teaches purely, soundly, with certainty, and without mixture of error. Soothing the mind with ineffable sweetness, it allays the craving of the soul as with streams of honey and of oil; penetrates the intimate seclusions of the heart with insuperable efficacy, and so firmly engraves its instructions on the mind, that the believer as confidently acquiesces in them, as if he had heard them uttered in the third heaven by the voice of God himself. It influences the affections, and every where exhaling the fragrance of holiness, breathes it forth upon the pious student, even in cases where he does not realize all that he learns.

No one can tell how much we impede our own progress by a preposterous method of study, which is too prevalent, and according to which we first form our conceptions of divine things from human writings, and then, in confirmation of them, seek for passages of Scripture, or, without further examination seize upon those suggested by others, as referring to the question in hand: whereas we should deduce our ideas

* ελκυστικόν.

of divine truth immediately from the Bible itself, using the compositions of men simply as *indices*, allotting these passages to the several topics of theology, from which we may learn the doctrine of the Lord.

And here, I cannot forbear adducing the opinion of the subtile Twiss, with reference to John Piscator, and his method of study. After having stated what was remarkable in his doctrine and religious science, he proceeds thus: "I shall only add, that I look with high regard upon the Theologian, who, professing sacred letters alone, and using the ordinary discipline of grammar, rhetoric, and logic, (in which he is a proficient) as merely subsidiary, has attained to such a method of treating theology, not in a popular but scholastic way, as leaves him without a superior, and almost without an equal among the schoolmen. As if, in this speculative age, so ambitious to blend secular with sacred erudition, it had pleased the Father of mercies to afford us an example of what we might attain of accurate and scholastic learning, in things pertaining to life, by the simple study of the Scriptures, assiduous meditation, and exposition—with the total neglect of all the schoolmen, summists, and masters of sentences." (Vind. Grat. 254. col. i. c.) So thought, and so spake this undaunted champion, concerning the method of study which we commend. His words are not cited with the view of banishing the commentaries of the learned from the hands of the Theologian, and thus leaving him to learn from the worst of all teachers—*himself*, that is, from mere presumption, with the Scriptures misunderstood as a cloak for his errors. Great men of the Church, raised above the cares of life and devoted wholly to God, loving him, and beloved by him, have discerned many things in Scripture, which they have extracted, and presented in the clearest light. Amidst the darkness of life, these things might have remained forever hidden from us; and we might never have discovered them, by our unassisted powers, in the depths of their concealment. And although, we may discover much by our own study of the Scriptures, it is, nevertheless, delightful, and corroborative of our faith, to see, that the manifestation of the same truth, from the same source, has been previously granted to others by the same Lord, who has vouchsafed to shed light on our difficulties. We admire the modesty of Jerome, who professes that, with regard to the sacred volume, he never confided in his own single abilities, nor formed an opinion from

his own simple endeavours; but, that he was accustomed to take counsel, even on those passages which he supposed himself to understand, but especially on those of which he was dubious. And Athanasius, in the beginning of his Oration against the Gentiles, applauds a Christian friend to whom he is writing, because, though himself competent to discover in the Scriptures those doctrines about which he consults Athanasius, he still listened with modesty to the opinions of others. This one idea I would reiterate, that the asseveration of no mortal, as to the sense of Scripture, is to be believed, unless he fixes conviction on the mind from the Scripture itself, so that while man is the *index*, we may become wise unto salvation, from the teaching of God himself. This is loudly proclaimed by the most eminent expositors. "I would not," says Cyril of Jerusalem, "that you should give credence to my simple declarations of these things, unless you obtain from the Scriptures a demonstration of what I preach:" adding a sentiment which deserves to be perpetuated: "For, the saving efficacy of our faith arises not from any eloquence of ours, but from the demonstration of the Holy Scriptures."* With this the remark of Justin Martyr is coincident, "I assent not to men, even though multitudes concur in their declarations; since we are taught by Christ himself, to yield our faith, not to the doctrines of men, but to those which were preached by the prophets, and revealed by Himself."† It is wisely observed by Athanasius, who has been already quoted, that even the apostle Paul did not make use merely of his own authority, but confirmed his doctrine by the Scripture. And if this was done by one who was permitted to hear ineffable words, who was the interpreter of mysteries, and who had Christ speaking in him, how perilous, in this day, to rely on any authority but that of the Holy Scriptures! The sum of what has been said is this; that the genuine Theologian is an humble student of the word of God.

The Scriptures, then, are the sole standard of what is to be believed; but in order to a spiritual and saving understanding of their contents, the Theologian must commit himself to the inward teaching of the Holy Ghost. The student of the Bible must be at the same time the disciple of the Spirit. No one who regards heavenly things with the perverted eye of

* Catech. iv. Cap. de Sp. Sancto.

† Dial. cum Tryph. p. 63. edit. Steph.

nature can perceive their native splendour and beauty; he contemplates only a mistaken image; for they differ greatly in themselves from the impression made on the minds of such as view them so obliquely. In order to apprehend spiritual things, there must be a spiritual mind. The mysteries of Scripture elude the perspicacity of the most penetrating human intellect; and the natural mind perceives them no more than one sense can receive the objects of a different sense. The Holy Spirit, the great Instructor of the soul, coming in aid of this infirmity, communicates to his disciples a new and heavenly mind, on which he pours a most clear illumination, so that celestial mysteries may be seen in their true light. Together with divine things, he bestows a mind to appreciate and comprehend them. He grants the things of Christ together with the mind of Christ. Taught in this spiritual and heavenly school, the Theologian not only learns to form correct ideas of divine objects, but is made to participate in these very objects, a treasure truly above all price. The teaching Spirit does not present mere words, and naked dogmas, nor vain dreams and empty phantasms: but, if I may use the expression, the solid and permanent substances of things; introducing them to the soul which truly comprehends them, and embraces them with every affection and every power of the heart. The pupil of this school does not merely know, nor merely believe, but sometimes realizes what is meant by remission of sin, adoption, communion with God, the gracious indwelling of the Spirit, the love of God shed abroad in the heart, the hidden manna, the sweet tokens of Christ's love, and the pledge and earnest of perfect bliss. There are in this mysterious wisdom many things which you can never learn but by having, feeling, tasting them. The new name is known only by him who possesses it. And the spiritual Teacher causes his disciples to taste and see the preciousness of the Lord. He leads them into his banqueting house, his banner over them is love; he saith, eat my friends, yea drink my beloved; and then crowned, not with heathen garlands, but with those of the Redeemer, they acquire a clear vision of celestial things.

The truths which are thus learned by experience, are so deeply fixed in the soul, that no subtilty of argumentation, no assault of the tempter, shall avail to remove the impression of the seal. To all objections there is a triumphant reply at hand; for it is vain to dispute against experience.

For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, will such be able to say, when we have believed "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but have been eye-witnesses of his majesty; and we cannot but believe those things which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled of the Word of life. Since, then, it is only in the school of the Spirit that these things are learned, so clearly, so purely, so happily, is it not evidently necessary above all things, that the Theologian should consign himself to the guidance of this Instructor? To be here received, he must renounce his own wisdom, and in his own estimation, become a fool that he may be wise. The world of Theology is created, like the natural world, out of nothing. By actual love draw near to God, and love will be followed by the communication of his counsels. "If a man love me, my Father will love him, and we will make our abode with him"—is the promise made by the faithful Jesus to his disciples. Lay up the instructions of the Spirit in a retentive mind, and recal them again and again to view by frequent meditation. Pursue this study, not by reading only, but by prayer; by communion not merely with men in ordinary discourse, but with God in supplication, and with the soul in devout thought. The soul of the saint is like a little sanctuary, in which God dwells by his Spirit, and where the Spirit, when sought unto by ardent prayer, often reveals those things which the princes of this world, with all their efforts, are unable to attain. In a word, give all diligence to keep the mirrors of the soul untarnished, and spiritually pure, that it may be fitted to receive that pure Spirit, and his spiritual communication. *Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.* By these several steps, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the Theologian will at length reach such knowledge, that, in the light of God, he shall contemplate God, the fountain of light, and in God and the knowledge of him, shall rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

From this celestial teaching of the Spirit, the Theologian will acquire the happy *art of instruction*, which we have already noted as the second requisite. There is a marked difference between the veteran commander, who has led armies, possessed cities, disclosed the stratagems of the foe, and made himself an adept in all the tactics of war—who has often forced his way through opposing hosts, and by long use has learned

Res gerere et captos ostendere civibus hostes,

and the loud and swaggering Thraso, who, with an unstained shield, wages a war of words, but has beheld battles only in description. Such is the difference between the disciplined Theologian, who, like Paul, has traversed the course of Christianity, and, by honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report, is as dying, yet alive, as unknown, and yet well known, as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing, as poor, yet making many rich, as having nothing, and yet possessing all things:—and the scholastic pedant, and index-learned rhapsodist, who, feeble in mind and heart, but mighty in memory and words, deems himself the very Alpha of Theologians.

It is not enough for the Christian teacher to proclaim truths with which he is familiar, unless he does this with pure love. If he regards with affection the divine Giver of all wisdom, and those committed to his charge, as sons or brethren, and also the truth consigned to him, he cannot but strive with all his powers to gain many for God; that there may be many who, with him, shall adore that sole wisdom, which he can never alone glorify to his own satisfaction.

The same love will prevent him from declaring any thing except what may be sure, sound, solid, promotive of faith and hope, tending to piety, unity, and peace; avoiding all prejudice, abstaining from unfairness and perversion, most sedulously omitting novelties of expression, and unmeaning verbiage; and holding himself aloof from the odious strife of words, and from curious, idle, or irregular controversies, which disturb the minds of the simple, rend the Church, fill it with suspicions and surmisings, *within*, and present a delightful spectacle to enemies, and to Satan himself *without*. O man of God, flee these things, nor ever catch at the disgraceful reputation which springs from novelty of inventions! Through divine grace, we possess, in our churches and seminaries, a precious deposit of heavenly truth, so clearly demonstrated by Scripture, so ably defended against every adversary, approving itself to the conscience by so rich an exuberance of consolation, and so great power of promoting holiness, and confirmed by the blood of so many martyrs, beloved of God, that it cannot be doubted, that we have all which is necessary to conduct believers to salvation, and to perfect the man of God for all good works. The mind is ungrateful, and unobservant of its own good, which complains of darkness in the very midst of such evangelical light; and which, in our

reformed Churches, trembles, as if the path lay through man-
uoirs unvisited by the sun,

Et loca senta situ, noctem que profundam.

What, then, shall we say of that unseasonable prurience of innovation, by which truths long since delivered to us safely, plainly, and cautiously, are sometimes destroyed, sometimes deadened, and sometimes implicated in strange and unprecedented forms of expression? We might exclaim to the actors in this work, as did Chrysostom to the innovators of his time: "Let them hear what Paul saith, that they who innovate in the smallest degree, pervert the Gospel."* Let it not however be supposed that we desire to stand in the way of improvement. Nothing can be more delightful to the believing soul, nothing more advantageous to the Church, than to make daily increase of scriptural knowledge, to form more clear ideas of spiritual things, to descry more distinctly the concatenation of salutary doctrines in one chain of admirable wisdom, and with evident and ingenious arguments to corroborate the ancient truth; to shed light upon obscurities, to search with fear and trembling into prophetic mysteries, to apply to the conscience the powerful demonstrations of Christ and the apostles, to compare the symbols of ancient ceremonies with Christ the anti-type, and in this cause to act as a scribe well instructed in the kingdom of heaven, bringing forth from his treasury things new and old. On this point let us concentrate all that we possess, of erudition and diligence. Let this be done, and no good man will object, the Church will rejoice, Satan will be disappointed, the efforts of the saints will be prospered by God, who has predicted that in the latter time many shall investigate and knowledge shall be increased. Yet away with these idle, curious, rash, and perverse speculations, flattering some with the mere charm of novelty, and attempted by others from party zeal, which result in no profit, but rather engender strifes, than "Godly edifying which is in faith."

In seeking this edification, the Theologian should hold the truth in its purity, without the interposition of trifles from human philosophy, which disfigure the oracles of God. The great things of God need not swelling words, but rest on their own strength, and transcend all understanding:

* Chrys. ad Galat. I. v. 9. *Ακουετωσαν τι φησιν ο Παυλος, οτι το Ευαγγελιον ανετρεψαν, οι και μικροτερον καινοτομουντες.*

these should not be reduced to the categorical arrangements of the logicians, nor should the attempt be made to invest the Master with the livery of the servant. The things of God are best explained in the words of God. And he errs, who supposes that he can expound the secrets of theology more accurately, clearly, and efficaciously or intelligibly, than in those terms and phrases, which the Apostles (after the prophets) made use of; terms dictated by him who gave the faculty of language, who formed the hearts of all, and who therefore best knows, in what manner the heart should be instructed and moved. He that speaketh, let him speak as the oracles of God, not as the idle and repulsive barbarity of the schoolmen, but as the Holy Ghost giveth utterance. Let the man of God believe me, that it is neither for his own honour, nor that of the wisdom which he professes, to vex these august mysteries with the obscure forms of dialectic skirmishing, to bring in the tedious comments, the grandiloquence, the ludicrous expressions, and the sonorous emptiness of the schools, as the very vitals of Theology, and to bind the queen of sciences with pedantic fetters of clanking technicalities.

Speak simply, if you would duly maintain the honour which has been mentioned; not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. Aim, in all your instructions, not to fill the minds of your hearers with vain fancies, but to edify them in faith, to excite them in love, that they may shine in holiness, and rise to the likeness of God. O that henceforth that holy method of theologizing, longed for by so many saints, might prevail in the reformed Seminaries, which should not sink into servile musing, nor evaporate in litigious strife, but shine with vivid lustre in the mind, light up living fire in the heart, and transfuse our Nazarites into the mould of heavenly truth! But with what feelings, and with what success, will that man labour, who has not first framed his own life in a manner conformable to God? And this brings us to the last thing mentioned as requisite to complete the Theologian,—an unblemished purity of morals answerable to his profession. It is the Lord's will to be sanctified in all that draw nigh unto him, and that his priests should be clothed with righteousness. Unless they are examples to believers in every Christian virtue, and can say with Paul, "Those things which ye have learned, and received, and heard, *and seen in me,*

do:" and "Be ye followers of me, even as I also follow Christ,"—they destroy more by a bad life, than they build up by sound doctrine; they disgrace religion, insinuate a scepticism as to what they preach, and open a wide door to libertinism and atheism. And indeed I might ask, how is it possible for one who knows the truth as it is in Jesus, not to be inflamed with the love of Christ—not be made holy in the truth? Surely he in whose tabernacle God vouchsafes communion, must needs walk with him, as did Enoch and Noah. He whose soul has experienced and tasted heavenly things must have his conversation in heaven. He who daily contemplates the attributes of God, shining in the face of Jesus Christ, and is surrounded on every side by the light of grace, cannot but be transformed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord. So that I hesitate not to asseverate, that he is no genuine Theologian, and has seen no ray of the divine mysteries in any suitable manner, whose knowledge of truth has not led him to escape the pollutions of the world and the dominion of sin. For thus saith the Lord: ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. *Intellectum intelligendo omnia fieri*, is an ancient axiom of the philosophers. It was this which the Platonists chiefly sought in the contemplation of the divine ideas, by the sublime knowledge of which man becomes a god, so far as man can be made participant of the divine condition, as Hierocles elegantly remarks. But that which philosophy could not accomplish for her followers, exhibiting the divine perfections only by the unfavourable light of nature, Theology richly furnishes to hers, displaying to their contemplation the glories of God and of his Christ in the refulgence of grace, and thus making them partakers of a divine nature; as the inspired apostle Peter speaks. For God is holiness. By holiness, I intend the sum of all virtues, which it would be here inappropriate to discuss particularly. Desire of heaven; contempt of the world; unfeigned sobriety; modesty, diligent in its own affairs, and not prying into those of others; a temper as studious of peace as of truth; fervent zeal, attempered with bland lenity; long suffering under rebuke and injury; prudent caution, as well with regard to times as actions; rigid self-inspection, with forbearing mildness towards brethren; and whatever else pertains to this sacred constellation—these, these not only *adorn*, but *constitute* the Theologian. I figure to myself a man, who while intent on

voj. iv. No. II.—Y

heavenly meditations, simulates no gravity of visage or garb, but panting for high and eternal things, holds in contempt the splendour of the rich, and the earth with all its gold and silver. Contented with the grace of Christ the Saviour, and the fellowship of the indwelling Spirit, he looks from an eminence down on all the blandishments of earthly vanity, and craves no wealth, nor pleasure, nor fame. Fully intent upon the care of souls, and the guarding, protecting and extending of Christ's spiritual kingdom, and on beautifying what is already possessed, he owes nothing to the forum, the camp, or the court. He looks for no office, preoccupies no rostrum, courts no patronage, seeks favour of no authority, plays no oratorical part, but justly discriminating between the church, the college, and the court, limits himself to the pulpit or the chair. The higher his flight in the contemplation of heavenly things and the practice of piety, the less does he seek to obscure a brother's honour; measuring himself not with himself, but with those who are above him, and especially with the perfect law of God. In all that concerns the cause of God, the salvation of souls, the defence of the church, and the protection of divine truth, he is all on fire with zeal for God, and would rather endure a hundred deaths, that concede one iota to an adversary in that which is not his own, but the Lord's. Yet for himself he avenges no wrongs, meekly bears the maledictions which are hurled at his head, and in the warmest contest, lays no stress on his own imaginations, but yields every thing for peace and concord. Such an one, to use the expression of the ancients respecting Athanasius, is, to those who strike, an adamant; to those who differ, a magnet. With prudence in counsel, he attempts nothing rashly, accomplishes nothing turbulently; and with a humility not feigned nor outward, but with all the simplicity of candour, casts himself at the feet of all, exalts himself above none, and prefers each to himself. Show me such an one, and I will salute him as the genuine Theologian, with veneration, with embraces, acknowledging that he is the glory of Christ, and that the glory of Christ is in him.

ART. III.—ON THE USE AND ABUSE OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

A SYSTEM of theology is a methodical disposition of scriptural doctrines, with due connexion and arrangement, so far as they are susceptible of a scientific form. Such a work may contain either a simple enunciation of truths under appropriate topics, or the body of proof by which these are sustained. But within the latitude of our definition are comprised, not only the volumes of professed theologians, but even confessions, catechisms, and other symbolical books of churches.

The origin of systems is to be sought in the laws of the human mind. The Scriptures present us with divine truth, not in logical or scientific order, but dispersed irregularly under the various forms of history, precepts, promises, threatenings, exhortations, and prophecies. It is scarcely left to the option of the reader whether he will classify these truths in his own mind; for this classification begins and is pursued, spontaneously, with regard to all departments of human knowledge. Every man, whose reasoning faculty rises above that of the idiot, is conscious of an attempt to refer each successive acquisition of knowledge to its proper place in the general fund of his recollections, and to connect it with its like among that which is already known.

It is very evident that the order of truths as they are presented in the Scripture is not intended to be the only order in which they shall be entertained in the mind. If this were the case, all meditation would be useless, since this exercise does not reveal new doctrines, but, by giving rise to comparison of those already known, in various connexions, discovers the relations and dependencies of all. The illustration of Lord Bacon is well known: the water of life as contained in the fountain of the Scriptures, is thence drawn and set before us, very much in the same manner as natural water is taken from wells. For when the latter is drawn, it is either first received into a reservoir, whence, by divers pipes it may conveniently be conducted abroad for general use; or it is at once poured into vessels for immediate service. The former methodical way, adds this philosopher, gives origin to systems of theology, by

which scriptural doctrine is collected in scientific form, and thence distributed, by the conduits of axioms and propositions, to every part.*

No primitive Christian could have answered the question, *What is Christianity?* without proceeding to systematize its truths in a greater or less degree: and every reader of the Holy Scriptures undesignedly pursues the same method. For instance, the various attributes of God are revealed in Scripture, not in theological order, nor consecutively, but in various places, by means of scattered examples, sometimes figuratively, sometimes by implication, and never all at once. Now it is manifestly desirable that every man should have a connected idea of the perfections of Jehovah; and the reader of the Bible will necessarily lay together the various representations, and thus conclude that God is spiritual, eternal, infinite, immutable, omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, most true, most holy, most wise, and most good. This aggregation of truths is, in fact, a system, and it is precisely thus that systematic theology has its origin. No man can converse with a Scottish mechanic, who happens to be a good textuary, without discerning that he has his heads and topics to which he refers all his scriptural knowledge, and that the doctrines which he believes are reduced to a classification more or less exact. Indeed, each of us may bring the matter to a speedy test by looking within and inquiring whether such an arrangement of our religious tenets is not constantly going forward, with the gradual increase of our settled opinions. This will be clear or obscure, logical or confused, according to the correctness and extent of our knowledge, and the sagacity and vigour of our intellect. It may be vitiated by the addition of that which is extraneous, or by false expositions of Scripture; but such a syllabus of divine truth is possessed, in memory, if not in writing, by every Christian, whether wise or simple.

The association of ideas affords a natural ground for classification; though by no means the sole ground. Mere similarity of particulars may serve as a basis for technical arrangement, as in the Linnæan system of botany, but this is scarcely a philosophical method. The more any department of knowledge partakes of the character of a pure science, the greater is its susceptibility of being systematized; and this is eminently the character of divine truth. There was a time, indeed,

* De Augm. Scient. lib. lx. c. i. § 3.

when the question was mooted, whether theology is a science, but that time has gone by, and with it should have vanished the occasion of the present argument.

There is danger, however, that we shall be charged with disrespect to the understanding of our readers, in offering serious proof of a position so tenable, and which, but for party zeal, would never have been controverted. For what are all theological discussions, but so many systems? Every didactic sermon is a systematized chapter of the great book of revelation. Every essay or discourse upon any scriptural truth is an attempt to arrange, under certain topics, and with conclusive arguments, the scattered testimony of inspiration in favour of that truth. The only effect of banishing professed systems would therefore be, to repress all endeavours to present the subject as a harmonious whole, and to leave us in possession of schemes characterized by undigested crudity.

The logical and systematic arrangement of a science has various important uses. It affords aid to the memory; since a thousand insulated and disjointed truths can scarcely be kept in remembrance, while, in their regular connexion and mutual dependency, they may be tenaciously retained, and clearly communicated. The knowledge of a subject may be said to be adequate, only when it is thus known. The heterogeneous mass is clarified and reduced to order, by being ranged under topics according to the inherent differences of the several species, and set off into departments, with reference to the distinction of elementary, secondary, and inferential positions. Thus, in the study of natural history, although the classification of the received systems is in a measure arbitrary, (that is, independent of the philosophical connexion of cause and effects) those things which are homogeneous are placed together, and the mind is enabled to comprehend what would otherwise be "a mighty maze, and all without a plan." In the progress of study, as knowledge is augmented, it is highly advantageous to have a predisposed scheme, to some niche of which every new acquisition may immediately be referred, as to its proper place in the system. This is true, even when the scheme is framed in a merely technical and arbitrary manner. Such was the classification of minerals, as practised before the late discoveries in crystallography; and such the science of chemistry continues to be in many of its departments. But the advantage is immensely greater, when, as is true of theology, the subject admits of a natural, exact, and philosophical dispo-

sition. It is only under such a form of arrangement that we can be in the highest degree made sensible of the admirable and divine harmony of all religious truth, which necessarily escapes us in the examination of detached and dissociated fragments. The system, however brief or imperfect, affords a convenient test of propositions which might otherwise pass unsuspected, and a guide in applying the analogy of faith to interpretation.

But it is as affording a special facility for communicating instruction to others, that we wish to be considered as recommending the systematic arrangement of theology. The history of catechetical instruction, in every age, furnishes a commentary upon this remark. In applying ourselves to the study of any science, we have our choice between two discrepant methods. By the one, we make a commencement, indifferently, with any separate fact or proposition, without reference to its place in the general scheme; and travelling onward from this point, through the whole, we attempt to acquire the knowledge of all the parts; traversing in succession departments the most remote and unconnected. As if, for example, one should attempt to acquire the science of astronomy, by commencing with observations on the ring of Saturn, thence passing to the milky way, or the moon's libration, and then assailing the obliquity of the ecliptic. By the other method, we commence with simple, acknowledged, and fundamental principles, proceed to the demonstration of elementary propositions, and thence by regular deduction to the ramifications of the subject. The latter is the systematic method, and cause is yet to be shown why it should not hold good in theology, as well as in other sciences. The history of the Church, shows us that from the earliest ages it has been deemed advisable to abstract the truths of revelation in a systematic form, for the convenience of instructors and pupils, for the aid of memory, and for the purpose of displaying the completeness and coherence of the entire plan of scriptural knowledge. In certain periods, it is true, flagrant abuses have been connected with these methods, especially during the reign of the Peripatetic philosophy; yet there has been an entire unity of opinion as to the general expediency of the plan. It may not be inappropriate here to advert to some of the predominant schools of systematic theology.

Omitting any particular notice of the patristical systems,

we shall name a few of those writers who contributed to the mass of doctrinal theology before the Reformation. There are those who trace the origin of the scholastic divinity to as high an epoch as the monophysitic controversy in the fifth and sixth centuries; yet it is more usual to consider John Scotus Erigena, a theologian of the ninth century as the founder of this method. It was, however, the Platonic philosophy, by which he endeavoured to elucidate divine truth. He signalized himself as an antagonist of the predestinarians, in the court of Charles the Bold. The Schoolmen, or Scholastics are supposed to have been so called from their training in the theological schools of Charlemagne. This training was little else than regular instruction in the Latin version of Aristotle, the writings of Boethius and Porphyry, and the Peripapatetic dialectics. Three periods are noted by Buhle: the first ends with Roscellinus (A. D. 1089), or the contest between the Realists and Nominalists; the second with Albertus Magnus (ob. 1230), at which time the metaphysics of Aristotle were generally known and expounded; the third extends to the revival of letters in the fifteenth century.* The renowned Englishman Alexander de Hales, holds an eminent rank among the ancient scholastics, as is commonly cited as *Doctor Irrefragabilis*: until the time of Aquinas, his commentary on Lombard was a universal text-book. Thomas Aquinas, *Doctor Angelicus*, and a saint of the calendar, was the pupil of Albertus Magnus, and so close an adherent of Aristotle that he left fifty-two commentaries upon the works of the latter. It is unnecessary to advert to the estimation in which he has ever been held by the Romanists; although it has been satisfactorily shown by Protestants that this truly great man, diverged in a multitude of instances from the doctrines of the Catholic faith, as they are now defined.† Next in eminence was his great competitor, John Duns Scotus, whose dialectic acumen was proverbial, and who is denominated *Doctor Subtilis*. From this rivalry of sects, arose the familiar distinctions of Thomists and Scotists. During the third period, flourished the celebrated Durand, called, on account of his independent boldness, *Doctor Resolutissimus*. This remarkable man was bishop of Meaux, and died about the year 1333. He went out from

* Brockhaus Real-Wörterb. vol. ix. p. 835. Buddei Isagoge, p. 326. Hornii hist. Phil. l. vi. cii. p. 297.

† DORSCHÆUS. Aquinas Confessor Veritatis.

the ranks of the Thomists, and, without going over to the opposite sect, became the founder of a new school. He is supposed by Staudlin to have contributed greatly to the downfall of the scholastic system. To these may be added Occam, an English Franciscan, who opposed the papacy, and encouraged a more liberal method in theology; and Bradwardin, who openly attacked the scholastic system, and maintained that the genuine or Augustinian doctrines had been exchanged for mere Pelagianism. His work *de Causa Dei contra Pelagium*, contains much that savours of a purer theology.

This was the dawn of a brighter day for religious investigation. In looking back from this point upon all the dialectic school, we are struck with the darkness which overspread the field of theology, in consequence of the multitude of sects; the introduction of foreign principles and speculations; the contempt thrown upon sound exegesis; the almost divine honours paid to philosophers and doctors; and the barbarous roughness with which every subject was handled. The bounds of human reason were overleaped, and a recondite sophistry usurped the place of candid argument. It is not, therefore, in this period that we are to seek for any thing like purity in theological systems.

The Reformation gave birth to a new school of dogmatic theology. Luther indeed, though celebrated as a logician, left no work, strictly pertaining to this class; but in the *Loci Communes* of Melancthon, we have model which might do honour to the brightest age of scriptural investigation. It is pleasing to observe with what deference this good man was regarded by his bolder coadjutors. The first edition of this earliest system reformed theology appeared at Wittemberg, A. D. 1521.* Luther characterized the work, as "invictum libellum, et non solum immortalitate, sed quoque canone dignum."† In the Reformed Church, we need not remind the reader of the compendious works of Zuingle, and the Institutes of Calvin. The latter work has passed through innumerable editions, and has appeared in the Latin, French, Spanish, English, German, Dutch, Hungarian, and Greek languages. In the Lutheran Church might be mentioned the leading names of Calixtus, Chemnitz, Striegel, Gerhard, Horneius, Henichius, Hulsemann, Calvius, and Koenig: in the

* Buddeus, p. 346.

† Luth. Op. ii. 241. Wittemb.

Reformed Church, Beza, Bullinger, Musculus, Aretius, Heidegger, Turretine, and Pictet. It would be unjust to the memory of the divines of Holland, who, more than all others, cultivated this field, to omit the names of Rivet, Maresius, Hoornbeeck, and the Spanheims, all of whom followed the philosophical school of Voet; and Burmann, Heidan, Wittichius, Braunius, Witsius, Leydecker, and Hulsius, who pursued the system of the covenants, as marked out by Cocceius.

But time would fail us in following down the stream of systematic writers. This was the age of systems, and a lifetime would scarcely suffice to study those which it produced. Most of these last mentioned were free, to a remarkable degree, from the technical distinctions of the schools, and may be used with profit. It is at least desirable that every theologian should be acquainted with the history of religious opinion. We have fallen upon days in which works of this nature are little prized, and in which essays, pamphlets, and periodicals are almost the only vehicles of theological discussion. Of this it is needless to complain, yet it is mortifying that so much unmerited contempt should be cast upon the learned labours of other days. There are few eminent scholars, it is true, who join in this cant; yet scarcely a week passes in which our attention is not drawn to some ignorant and captious disparagement of all productions of this kind. There are persons who never deign to mention systematic theology without a sneer, and whose purposes seem to demand that they should represent all books in this department as assuming a rivalry with the sacred Scriptures. We disavow the wish to attribute these sentiments and objections to any particular school, or to connect them with any doctrinal opinions held by our brethren; except so far as this, that they are usually avowed by those who contend for greater latitude in speculation, and who protest against any interference with their innovating projects. No very distinguished writer has presented himself as their advocate, and they are usually heard to proceed from youthful and hasty declaimers, yet the arguments even of these demand a refutation when they spread their contagion among the inexperienced; and we would gladly contribute towards a disentanglement of the question.

It would be an unwarrantable hardihood to deny that, among the volumes of past ages, there are systems which lie open to valid objections; but the faults of some are not to be attributed to the whole class. Thus, for instance, it is

common to charge the whole of the continental theologians with the scholastic subtleties of the middle age. The systems of the schoolmen are, indeed, notoriously chargeable with dialectic refinements, and it is not strange, that some of the same leaven should betray itself in the writings of the early reformers, just emerging, as they were, from the dreary night of barbarism. The objection lies against most of the Romish systems. Revelation is here confounded with philosophy; the Scriptures are perverted into accordance with traditions and the schools; and the questions which perpetually arise are, in a majority of instances, frivolous and ridiculous, or knotty and ostentatious. Such, however, are not the faults of our received works, and the only trait which they have in common with the former, is that they profess to communicate the doctrines of the faith, in regular connexion, with scientific order and method, and sometimes with the technical language of the then predominant philosophy. The terminology of the reformers and their immediate successors is a dialect of which no literary antiquary will consent to remain ignorant; it is a source of alarm to students who consult their ease, and even grave divines among us have been sadly disconcerted with the *materialiter, formaliter, &c.* of the seventeenth century. Yet the history of theological opinion can never be learned, in its sources, without some knowledge of this peculiar phraseology.

The plan, or schedule, according to which a system is arranged, may be artificial, unnatural, arbitrary, or otherwise inconvenient. It is not every mind which can be satisfied with the method pursued by so many eminent divines, especially in Holland, in arranging the whole circle of truth with reference to the covenants. Others are as much displeased with a historical or chronological plan, which has been attempted. Or the whole work may labour under a fault of an opposite character, namely the want of method, and, under the title of a system, may be an unsystematized farrago. Yet in all such cases, though the objection is granted to be valid, yet the excellence of systems, as such, is no whit disparaged by the failure of special attempts: and, indeed, it is not upon these grounds that the exception is usually taken.

Again, the system may be objectionable, as being incautiously and hastily framed, upon insufficient testimony of the Scriptures. Every methodized body of theological doctrine may be considered as a general theory of the whole sphere of

divine truth. As such, it should be deduced directly from the Scriptures, after a most careful survey, and impartial comparison of all its doctrines. (The work of the theologian here resembles that of the philosopher who reasons from natural phenomena.) There is, indeed, this important difference, that the philosopher is mainly employed in observing the sequence of cause and effect, and in assigning all the changes in natural objects to their true causes, and to as few causes as possible; thus, by induction arriving at general laws:—whereas the theologian is called to arrange isolated truths, already revealed in the form of propositions, and by reducing these to order, to discover the plan and harmony of religious science. In both cases, however, there is the same process to be observed; facts or propositions must be ascertained, generalized, placed in the same category with analogous truths, and reserved until new light enables us to refer them to more comprehensive laws or principles. Now, if in physical science it is so highly important that caution should be used in this process; so as to avoid leaping to a conclusion without a sufficient induction, how great should be the patience, self-distrust, and hesitancy of one who undertakes to pronounce upon the great mysteries of revelation. “The liberty of speculation which we possess in the domains of theory is not like that of the slave broke loose from his fetters, but rather like that of the freeman who has learned the lessons of self-restraint in the school of just subordination.”* This is the dictate of sound philosophy in every investigation; it teaches us not to reject system, but to systematize wisely. It is the neglect of this rule which has given occasion to the scores of heresies with which the Church has been rent. Doctrines taken up from the superficial and apparent meaning of a few texts, have been made the foundation of theories which have possessed scarcely a trait of genuine Christianity. Yet even when a system is absolutely false, the objection prostrates only that particular scheme which is proved to be erroneous. And the question still remains open, how far systematic arrangement is conducive to the progress of sound theology.

The favourite argument of many is this: The Scriptures do not admit of being systematized. This cannot be more impressively stated than in the words of Cecil: “The Bible scorns to be treated scientifically. After all your accurate

* Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy. § 201.

statements, it will leave you aground. The Bible does not come round, and ask your opinion of its contents. It proposes to us a Constitution of Grace, which we are to receive, though we do not wholly comprehend it.”* In this argument the premises are stated with sufficient clearness, but we confess ourselves unable to make the necessary deduction of the conclusion. This was the position of the Anabaptists and the Quakers.† It may mean either, that divine truth is in its own nature insusceptible of a regular scientific arrangement, or that it is impracticable for human minds so to arrange it. We contend that so long as it is granted that the propositions contained in Scripture are so many truths, that these are harmonious and accordant, and that some flow by necessary inference from others, it follows that the doctrines of revelation may be topically arranged, exhibited, and discussed. Some religious truths do, indeed, surpass our reason, but it is a mere sophism to argue that they are therefore thrown beyond the limits of any conceivable system; for this very characteristic may designate their place among ultimate propositions. If it is asserted that the imbecility of human minds is such that they cannot arrange and classify the whole of divine truths, inasmuch as these are absolutely intractable, and refuse to arrange themselves under any of our general topics,—we reply that this would put an end to physical philosophy itself, for the same remark holds good in nature. There are exempt cases, extreme phenomena, which are, as yet, explicable by no laws of science, and which must remain beyond the range of all systems as elementary facts. Such are the attraction of gravitation, and the principle of animated life. Still there are a thousand truths which continue to be free from these difficulties, and which may be methodized with profit.

If it should be urged that the simple method in which God has been pleased to arrange truth in the Bible is the only proper method, and that this beautiful simplicity is vitiated by the artifice of systems, we reverently acknowledge that the order of divine revelation in the Scripture is the best conceivable for the immediate end proposed. Yet the nature of truth is not altered by a change in the arrangement of propositions; nor is its simplicity taken away by scientific disposi-

* Remains, p. 118.

† Barclay's Apology, Orig. Thes. x. §. 21. Van Mastricht. lib. 1. c. i. § 6.

tion. Moreover, the argument destroys itself by proving too much. For, by parity of reason, all discourses and essays on theology, all sermons and exhortations of a religious kind, must equally violate this divinely prescribed order; since they cull and dispose the passages of Scripture, not in the method observed in the sacred volume, but with reference to some truth or truths attempted to be established. No one can fail to perceive the frivolity of an argument which would restrict all theology to the regular consecution of chapters and verses in the Bible.†

It has been alleged, that the use of systems has had a tendency to restrict the belief of the theologian within certain prescribed limits, and thus to arm the mind against conviction from passages which, to an unsophisticated reader, would be clear and decisive; and that what is called the Analogy of Faith is a barrier against independent investigation. The application of any such analogy to the exposition of Scripture has been strenuously opposed in modern times. That the principle may be abused, is too evident to admit of denial. Yet, unless the interpreter pursues the course of neological commentators, utterly careless whether the sacred penmen contradicted themselves or not,—this rule, or something tantamount, must be applied. It is the dictate of reason that—a revelation from God being admitted—all real contradictions are impossible. Hence, when a class of truths is satisfactorily deduced, all those which do not quadrate with these, in their obvious meaning, must be interpreted with such latitude as may bring them into unison with the whole. In all interpretation of works, sacred and profane, single passages must be understood in accordance with the general tenor of the discourse. Indeed, so plainly is this a principle of hermeneutics, that we should never have heard the objection, if certain unwelcome doctrinal positions had not been involved. There are truths which lie upon the very surface of the Scriptures, and are repeated in almost every page: these taken together give origin to the analogy or *canon* of faith. The force of reasoning from such an analogy must vary with the extent of the reader's scriptural knowledge, and the strength of his convictions. Every man, however, whether imbued or not with human systems, reasons in this manner. It is by the analogy of faith, that we pronounce the literal interpretation untenable, in all those cases which represent God as the author of moral

evil, or which attribute to him human members and passions. So long, therefore, as God "cannot deny himself," we must resort to this very principle.

The simple inquiry appears then to be, whether the use of a judicious system opens the door for the abuse of the analogy of faith. It is contended, that it necessarily does so, by expanding this analogy so far as to make the whole of a certain theological system a canon of faith, which nothing is suffered to contravene. There are slavish minds in which this effect will doubtless be produced; but the result in such cases would be the same, if, instead of a written system, the learner availed himself of the oral effusions of some idolized errorist. And in this whole controversy, let it be observed, the choice is at last between the dead and the living, between the tried systems of the ancients, and the ill-compacted schemes of contemporaries. We forget the place which has been assigned to the theological system, when we hold it responsible for excesses of this kind. It is by no means a rule of faith, else were it needless to refer to the Bible. It may be compared to the map of a country over which a geographer travels, and which affords convenient direction, while at the same time the traveller does not hold it to be perfect, but proceeds to amend it by actual survey. Without it, he might lose his way, yet he is unwilling to give implicit faith to its representations.

There are many problems in analytic mathematics, in which the unknown quantity is to be sought by successive approximations. In these cases, it is necessary to assume some result as true, and to correct it by comparison with the data. Not unlike this is the process by which we arrive at certain conclusions in the other sciences, and in theology among the rest. If, in the course of our investigation, we are met by scriptural statements which positively contradict any position of the system which is assumed as approximating to the truth; the consequence will be a doubt, or an abandonment of the system itself. Precisely in this way, every independent thinker knows that he has been affected by the difficulties of Scripture. The case would not be rendered more favourable, if he had in his hand no system. As it is manifestly impossible for any one to come to the study of the Word of God without entertaining some general scheme of divine truth as substantially correct, we can see no reason why the student should not avail himself of that which he esteems true in its great outline. It will be no bar to just inquiry, that he is

hereby prevented from hastily catching at specious error, by perceiving that it varies from his guide. Life is too short for every man to be left to the hazard of running through the whole cycle of errors and heresies, before he arrives at the truth; and this is prevented only by presenting to the learner some beacon against seductive falsehoods. He may—as many have done—conclude, upon due inquiry, that his own impressions are right, and his system wrong.

We have compared the theological system to the hypothesis by which the natural philosopher directs his inquiries. The comparison is good for the present instance. The system, like the hypothesis, is not unalterable. It is to be studiously scrutinized, and even suspected; adopted if verified, and rejected if proved to be false. There is a well-known process by which natural philosophers arrive at the primary physical laws, viz. “by *assuming* indeed the laws we would discover, but so generally expressed, that they shall include an unlimited variety of particular laws; following out the consequences of this assumption, by the application of such general principles as the case admits; comparing them in succession with all the particular cases within our knowledge; and lastly, *on this comparison*, so modifying and restricting the general enunciation of our laws as to *make the results agree*.” *Analogous to this is the process according to which, by the hypothetical assumption of a given system, we proceed to determine upon its truth.

But we are here arrested by an objection urged against this whole method of proceeding, which comes in a specious shape, and with the air of sincerity, and therefore demands a serious examination. We are addressed in some such terms as these: “The whole method of investigating theological truth by the advocates of systems is erroneous, because it is diametrically opposed to the principles of the inductive philosophy. Instead of framing a system *a priori*, and making it a bed of Procrustes, to which every declaration of the Bible is to be forcibly adapted, the only safe method is to reject all the hypotheses of divines, to come to the examination divested of all preconceived opinions, to consider the scattered revelations of Scripture as so many *phenomena*, and to classify, generalize, and deduce from these phenomena; just as the astronomer or the botanist uses *physical data* in framing a

* Herschell’s Discourse, § 210.

sound hypothesis. The study of theology should be exegetical, and the obsolete classifications of past ages should be entirely laid aside." We have endeavoured to state the objection fairly and strongly, and we shall now inquire how far it operates against the positions which we have taken. The objection assumes an analogy between theological investigation of revealed truth and physical inquiry into the system of the universe. This analogy we have already noticed, and in reply to so much of the objection as concerns the original investigation of divine truth, we grant that nothing can be more unphilosophical or untheological than to receive any system as true, previously to examination, however it may have been supported by consent of antiquity, or wideness of diffusion. This were to forsake the great principles of the Reformation, and revert to the implicit faith of the apostate Church. We ask no concession of private judgment on the part of the learner; we acknowledge that the final appeal is, in every instance, to the Scriptures themselves. We go further, in meeting those who differ from us, and accept their illustration. Let the Scriptures be considered as analogous to the visible universe; and its several propositions as holding the same place with regard to the interpreter, which the phenomena of the heavens do with regard to the astronomer. Let it be agreed that the method of arriving at truth is in both instances the same, that is, by careful examination of these data, from which result generalization, cautious induction, and the position of ultimate principles. Let it be further conceded that exegesis answers to experiment or observation in the natural world, and consequently that the theologian is to consider exegetical results as the basis of all his reasonings. In all this there is not so wide a separation between us, as might at first appear. We avow our belief that the theologian should proceed in his investigation precisely as the chemist or the botanist proceeds. "The botanist does not shape his facts," says a late ingenious writer. Granted, provided that you mean that the botanist does not *wrest* his facts, to a forced correspondence with a hypothesis. Neither does the genuine theologian "shape his texts," nor *constrain* them to an agreement with his system. But both the botanist and the theologian do, in this sense, "shape their facts," that they classify and arrange the fruits of their observation, and gather from them new proofs of that general system which has previously commended itself to their faith.

There is an entire agreement between the contending parties, as to the independent principles upon which original investigation for the discovery of truth is to be conducted, in every science. It is the method which bears the name of Bacon, though practised, to a limited extent, by the wise of every age. It is the method of Newton, which, in his case, resulted in the most splendid series of demonstrations which the world has ever known. Up to this point we agree, yet we have left the main question still untouched—whether in pursuing this method it is absolutely necessary to reject all the results of precedent labours. It is not merely concerning the way in which original investigation should be pursued, but also the way in which the results of such investigation are to be communicated. The former would be the inquiry how to make a system—how to deduce it from its original disjoined elements; the latter is the inquiry how the general truths thus deduced, may be made available to the benefit of the learner. Systems of theology are in their nature synthetical. They are the result of the toilsome analysis of great minds, and they are to be put to the test by a comparison of all the separate truths, of which they purport to be a scientific arrangement. That they are convenient helps, in the transmission of such results as have been attained by the wisdom and diligence of our predecessors—results which else would have perished with their discoverers—is made evident by reference to the very analogy above stated. In every science, it is by such synthetical arrangements that the observations and inductions of philosophers are embodied, in order to facilitate the advance of those who follow. Thus, for instance, when the Abbé Haüy, by a tedious and laborious induction of particulars, had traced up the apparently amorphous crystals of the mineral kingdom, to certain clear and primitive figures, he reduced the whole of his discoveries to the form of a *system*, so that future crystallographers might with less toil follow out his inquiries, and with immense advantage take up the subject where he left it.

But, lest we should be suspected of the slightest misrepresentation or evasion of the argument, let it be supposed that the gist of the objection is, not that systems are useless, but that they should not be put into the hands of learners, lest they fill their minds with doctrines unproved and unexamined, and close the door against manly and independent inquiry. Far be it from us to lay one shackle upon the chartered free-

dom of the theologian! We would that there were a thousandfold more independence in the search of truth—and that so many hundreds were not enslaved by the prejudice of novelty, whilst they clamour against the prejudice of authority and antiquity. To the objection, under this new phase, we reply: the only possible method of making the labours of past theologians available and profitable to the tyro, is by presenting to him the fruits of these labours in some compendious form. In every other case, the learner is despoiled of all the aids afforded by superior wisdom and learning, and reduced to the condition of one who has to build the whole structure for himself from the very foundation. But it is rejoined, “The Bible is the text-book: Theology is to be pursued exegetically; let the student, with his hermeneutical apparatus, come to the investigation of the Bible itself, to the neglect of all systems of human composition.” Again we reply, that in correspondence with the analogy above suggested, exegesis is the true instrument of discovery, and the test of all pretended results. It may be compared to the glasses and quadrant of the astronomer. But is this all that is afforded to the inchoate astronomer? Let the analogy be pursued. We suppose a professor in this new school of physics to say to his pupil, “Here are your telescopes and other instruments, your logarithmic tables and ephemeris—yonder is the observatory. Proceed to make your observations. Be independent and original in your inquiries, and cautious in your inductions. You are not to be informed whether the sun moves around the earth, or the earth around the sun. This would be to prepossess you in favour of a system. Ptolemy and Copernicus are alike to be forgotten!” What is our estimate of such a method of philosophizing? The unfortunate youth is not permitted to take a glance at Newton’s *Principia*, lest his mind should librate from its exact poise, towards some preconceived opinion. He is reduced to the very condition of the thousands who grope in disastrous twilight, for want of direction. He is called upon to be a Galileo without his powers, or a Kepler without his previous training.

To an unprejudiced mind it must commend itself as reasonable, that the beginner in any science should be furnished at least with some syllabus of its details, which may serve as a clew in the labyrinth of his doubts. In order to discover truth, it is not the safest nor the wisest plan to reduce the mind to the unenviable condition of a *tabula rasa*; although

such is the assumption of certain modern writers. It is highly useful to be informed as well of what has been held to be true, as of what has been proved to be false. For lack of the latter knowledge—the knowledge of preceding errors—our improved theologians are daily venting, with all the grave self-consequence of discovery, the stale and exploded blunders of the dark ages; which the perusal of any single work of systematic divinity would have taught them to despise. The impartiality of the mind is in no degree secured by the banishment of all previous hypotheses. There is a partiality of ignorance, a partiality of self-will and intellectual pride, a partiality of innovation, no less dangerous than the predilections of system. Or, to bring the whole matter to a speedier issue, the condition of mind *in equilibrio*, which it is proposed to secure, is utterly impossible—the merest *ens rationis*—which was never realized, and never can be realized by any one in a Christian country. It is like the chimerical scepticism of the Cartesians, the creature of an overheated imagination. For when you have carefully withheld all orthodox systems of theology from your pupil, he comes to the study of the Scriptures, emptied indeed of all coherent hypotheses, but teeming with the crude and erroneous views which spring up like weeds in the unregulated mind.

The true light in which a system of theology should be viewed by one who uses it as an aid in scriptural study, is as a simple *hypothesis*, an approximation to the truth, and a directory for future inquiries. Every position is to become the subject of a sifting examination, and comparison with what is revealed. Without some such assistance, in the mind, or in writing, the student might spend a life-time in arriving at some of those principles, which, if once proposed to him, would commend themselves instantly to his approbation.

But it is queried: “What if your system should be false?” Let us then go so far as to suppose that it *is* false. It would be no very difficult task to prove that, for this purpose, even a false system, if scientifically arranged, might not be without its uses. Every one who commences the study of the Scriptures, does so with some system, true or false, symmetrical or crude, written or conceived. If he is influenced by no living idols in the world of theologians, and bows to no Calvin nor Arminius, he has within him those causes of error which spring from his own character and education, (or to use Ba-

con's expressive terms) *idola specus et fori*, if not *idola theatri*.* When Kepler began his observations, he no doubt held the old erroneous doctrine of the sphere; but in the progress of inquiry he discovered such irregularity in the orbit of Mars, as was altogether incompatible with a circular motion. Hence he arrived at the truth that all the planetary orbits are elliptical. In this we have an example of a fact impinging upon a system, and causing it to be abandoned. The same thing may be instanced in the case of Martin Luther. It may not be too much to say, that if they had been ignorant of the opinions of their fathers, and had practised upon the rule above-mentioned, their names would never have come down to us. But all this is gratuitous. We are not bound to prove that an erroneous system may have its uses. We put into the hand of the pupil, the nearest approximation to truth, which we can procure, even that which we cordially believe ourselves; and then, to add new guards to the mind, we exhort him to use it simply as a history of what the Church has held; leaving it to his judgment whether it is consistent with the Scriptures. It is the method in which the study of all sciences must be begun; and as all lectures in theology are systems—indeed no other systems are enjoined to be studied in our seminaries—it is in accordance with this very method that candidates for the ministry are every where instructed. There may be a time, at some later period, when a method purely analytic may be attempted; but no man is competent to institute such an analysis, until he has mastered the leading hypotheses of those who have gone before him: and about one theologian in a thousand has the taste for investigations of this kind.

It is not a little surprising that the very persons whose delicate susceptibilities lead them to shrink from the contact of an orthodox system or exposition, lest they should receive some undue bias, are at the same time under no apprehensions from the contagion of German neology. There are, for instance, ministers of our acquaintance who avowedly banish from their shelves the works of Turretine, Scott, and Henry, but who daily refer to the innocuous commentaries of Rosenmueller, Kuinöl, Koppe, and Gesenius. Is it so then, that the only partialities against which we need a caution, are towards what is called orthodoxy—the system of doctrines to

* Nov. Org. Lib. i. Aph. 41.

which we have subscribed? Are there no vicious leanings of the mind in favour of plausible heresies, lofty rationalism, or imposing novelty? Let him answer who has learned the deceitfulness of the human heart.

If systems of theology are assailed upon the ground that they have usurped the place and authority of the sacred canon, we leave our opponents to try the issue with those who are guilty of the offence. We are conscious of no such wish. The formularies of our Church have borne many violent assaults; and, in their turn, all doctrinal works which coincide with them have been denounced. We have no hesitation in "postponing the Confession of Faith to the Holy Scriptures."* If systems of divinity have been raised to a co-ordinate rank with the Word of God, let those answer for it, who are guilty of the impiety. The books themselves are chargeable with no part of it, since they unanimously declare that the Bible only is the standard of faith. Yet shall we deny to any the liberty of making any scheme of doctrine his own *confession of faith*? No constraint has been used to bring any man to such a declaration; nor have we heard of any man who has been required to conform himself to such a system, unless he had previously, of his own free will, confessed it to be a statement of his faith. We may, therefore, dismiss the cavil, as scarcely pertaining to this inquiry.

In view of the absolute impracticability of the visionary scheme now controverted, and the absence of any attempted exemplification of it, we are constrained to look somewhat further for the secret cause of the clamour against systematic theology. And when we regard the quarter from which it issues, we are convinced, that the real objection is, not that systems are exceptionable *qua tales*, but that doctrine is systematized on the wrong side. Systematized heterodoxy is attacked upon its own merits; systematized orthodoxy is opposed because of its form and arrangements. The great standard works in this department are the results of labour, the monuments of tried doctrine; while the ephemeral fabrics of innovators do not live long enough to assume a regular shape. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ!* When the late Robert Hall was arraigned by a certain loyalist, as having written in favour of parliamentary reform, he replied, in terms not inapplicable to this subject: "The plain state of the case is, not

* See Rev. E. Irving's late Letter in Frazer's Magazine.

that the writer is offended at my meddling with politics, but that I have meddled *on the wrong side*. Had the same mediocrity of talent been exerted in eulogizing the measures of ministry, his greetings would have been as loud as his invective is bitter." If the system is false, let this be made to appear,—let its errors be exposed—but until this is done, let no arrangement of divine truth be decried as injurious. In conclusion, we apprehend no evils to our rising theologians from scholastic systems, for the best of all reasons—they know nothing of them. The literature of the day has extended its influence to the domain of theology, and the weekly, monthly, and quarterly receptacles of religious discussion, consume too much of our attention, to leave opportunity for poring over the works of our ancestors.

ART. IV.—ARABIC AND PERSIAN LEXICOGRAPHY.

A Dictionary Persian, Arabic, and English, with a dissertation on the language, literature, and manners of eastern nations. By John Richardson, Esq. F. S. A., of the Middle Temple, and of Wadham College, Oxford. Revised and improved by Charles Wilkins, Esq. LL. D. F. R. S. *A new edition, considerably enlarged by Francis Johnson.* London, 1829, quarto.

A TRULY splendid specimen of British typography, and an invaluable addition to the apparatus of the Oriental scholar. Richardson's Dictionary has been long known to the public. The original form was folio. The quarto edition of 1806 was superintended by the famous Orientalist, Charles Wilkins, who added twenty thousand Persian words from native dictionaries, reformed the orthography, and had type cast under his own inspection. There can be no doubt, that the work received immense improvement by passing through his hands. Richardson was a laborious compiler—Wilkins a philological genius and a finished scholar, who takes precedence of Jones, in point of general depth and accuracy, as well as of chronological priority in Sanscrit learning. In his edition of Richardson, however, he betrayed one weakness. He applied to that vast work his awkward plan for representing

eastern words in western letters. This could not be effected, without introducing a variety of dots and points, which make confusion worse confounded. We have often wondered at the excess to which some learned men have pushed this useless labour. In a popular work, where the object is to give the reader some conception of an unknown sound, the thing is proper. It is appropriate even in more learned works, where sounds are to be distinguished which are apparently the same. But to carry out the scheme in all its minutiae, where the words of the original are also given, does to us appear wasteful and ridiculous excess. That it does not answer the intended purpose, may be learned by experiment. In Wilkins' edition of Richardson, the word *tawzif* is printed with a dot under the first letter, four dots over the fourth, and a horizontal stroke over the fifth. Now let it be recollected, that the nice distinctions thus noted are to nineteen out of twenty, who consult the book, impossible in practice. What do we learn by the dots? That such and such letters are used in the original—while the original itself is before the reader's eyes. It is surely as easy to remember the power of the Persian *za*, as that of a Roman *z* with four dots above it. This blemish Mr. Johnson has removed, retaining nothing in addition to the consonants and vowels, but the horizontal sign of lengths in prosody.

This, however, is the least of his improvements. The work is, indeed, a new one, and he the real author; and we admire his modesty in making no pretensions to the title. The slightest changes, even for the worse, are looked upon by some as a sufficient pretext for assuming authorship.

It is well known that the study of the Persian language owes its extent, if not its origin, in England, to commercial and political relations. That strange phenomenon in history, the conquest of Hindostan by the East India Company, created a demand for English functionaries in the Eastern Empire. To these a knowledge of the Persian language was soon found to be absolutely necessary. For though it is in no part of the peninsula the vernacular tongue of the mass of the people, a previous revolution,* also very singular, had rendered it the language of politeness, diplomacy, and legal process. After a short experience of the perfidy of native agents, the Company insists on a knowledge of this language

* The conquest of Northern India by the Persians and Moguls.

in all their civil servants. It was to meet the case of these that Richardson projected and performed his task. His work was therefore meant to be, and was in fact, a *Persian* dictionary. But another revolution, still further back,* had brought the languages of Persia and Arabia into so singular a relation to each other, that although a man might study Arabic, and study it successfully, without a tincture of Persian, no man could possibly peruse a Persian book without a smattering of Arabic.

By this concatenation of remote occurrences, we obtain an explanation of the mongrel character of Richardson's great work. What we have said will also explain the disproportionate attention paid to Persian by the English literati, both at home, and in the East. Arabic has seldom been with them an object of critical attention. For the most part, their acquaintance with it has been superficial, and has arisen out of its relations to Persian lexicography and grammar. To those who are acquainted with both tongues, we need not say, that such a mode of study could avail but little, there being, perhaps, no two living languages, more radically different in genius and essential structure.

Richardson did nothing to advance the study of Arabic apart from Persian. Even his Arabic grammar was designed to aid the Persian student, and to all others it is useless. It ought never to be used by any one who wishes to obtain a thorough knowledge of the subject. The simple circumstance, that he has treated the punctuation as a thing of minor import, if it does not fasten upon him the charge of ignorance, fastens upon his grammar that of gross deficiency. His Dictionary, as we have already hinted, gives, or rather aims to give, just Arabic enough to master the Persian, and gives it in such a form, that to the careful student of the former language it is absolutely useless. The Arabic words, which are introduced at all, are introduced as Persian words, and only so far as they are such, without regard to the forms of Arabic grammar. No finite verbs are given, and the infinitives are uniformly set down as nouns substantive, the form which they assume as Persian vocables.

It is *a priori* evident, that such a Dictionary can afford no aid to one who studies Arabic for its own sake; a truth which has been confirmed by fair experiment. But even this was

* The conquest of Persia by the Caliph Omar.

not all. As a Persian lexicon, the work of Richardson, as might, indeed, have been expected from the author's opportunities and aids, was imperfect. It was, in fact, as Mr. Johnson well observes, a limited translation from the *Treasury of Meninski*. It was liable, therefore, to be wanting in two points, accuracy and copiousness. Mistakes in translation were almost inevitable in so large a work; and the translator was left to guess whether certain Arabic words were likely to occur in any Persian writers. That he frequently guessed amiss, is no discredit to his scholarship, though a great disadvantage to the student who consults his work. As a Persian lexicon, it was much improved by Wilkins, agreeably to what we have already stated. The Arabic department, we believe, underwent no considerable change. It was reserved for the present editor, not only to enhance its value to the Persian student, but to give it a place among authorities in Arabic philology. It is now, in fact, an Arabic lexicon of no small value—not for beginners, but for those who are somewhat advanced. A firm foundation cannot possibly be laid, in Arabic philology, without the careful use of systematic works like that of Golius. An attempt to learn the rudiments by means of Richardson's Grammar, and to commence a course of reading with the help of his Dictionary, even in its most improved condition, would be worse than unsuccessful; for it could hardly fail to generate a superficial scholarship, more contemptible than unassuming ignorance. But to those who have already learned to grope their way, with some success, through the mazes of the most intricate and scientific grammar in the world—and especially to those who have their eye upon the Persian, as a collateral or ulterior object—Mr. Johnson has presented an expensive, but a very welcome aid.

It may here be proper to state the amount of the improvements, as asserted by their author, and partially confirmed by a limited inspection of the work itself. As to the Persian—many thousand words of purely Persian origin have been inserted from the celebrated work *Burhani Kati*, and from a manuscript dictionary compiled by a learned native of the East, from twenty-four native writers, under the inspection of Mr. Haughton, late Professor of Hindu Literature in the East India College, Hertfordshire. This work, in which the definitions are sustained by copious citations from the classics of the language, commands the student's confidence in the results which it has furnished. As to the Arabic—Richardson's

definitions have been carefully collated with those of Meninski, and the errors rectified. Many thousands of words given by the latter, though omitted by Richardson, have been inserted. In all cases of doubt, an appeal has been made from Meninski and Golius to the Camus; from which source likewise thousands of words are added, which were overlooked by Golius. What we have mentioned would be quite enough to set the work immeasurably above the first edition. But the half is not yet told. The whole of Willmet's excellent lexicon, adapted to the Koran, Hariri, and the Life of Timur, is incorporated here. And as only a small portion of Hariri had been published, when that work appeared, the definitions given in the Arabic Scholia to Hariri, contained in De Sacy's beautiful edition, (1 vol. fol. Paris, 1822,) have been translated and inserted in their places.

A slight comparison convinced us, that the original work had undergone surprising changes; but we must confess that we were somewhat startled by the assertion of such large improvements, especially the incorporation of so great a mass of valuable matter—even of whole books. To satisfy our scruples, we have resorted to experiment, trying the dictionary upon certain passages taken promiscuously from the Koran and Hariri. Though we dare not vouch for the perfection of so large a work, we freely say, that so far as we have gone, the editor's pretensions have been fully verified.

Besides the improvements which have been already mentioned, there is another of considerable moment. Regard has been had in this edition to the forms of Arabic grammar. Roots are given and defined as such, and in various minor points, an effort has been made to render the book subservient to the study of that language, independently of the Persian. Add to this, that many medical, rhetorical, botanical and legal terms, and the peculiar local signification of many others, have been supplied, and we are ready for the Editor's assertion, that "from various and authentic sources he has been enabled to enrich the present work by the addition of more than thirty-eight thousand words, Persian and Arabic; also to arrange and supply numerous important meanings that had been overlooked, or purposely omitted, in more than half the words contained in the second edition."

The confidence of the scholar is further increased by a knowledge of the fact, that this third edition comes forth with

the sanction of the celebrated scholar who prepared the second; Dr. Wilkins having examined every sheet before the final impression.

We have said thus much about this sumptuous and colossal book, because the increasing taste and zeal for Oriental studies give an interest to every thing adapted to facilitate and forward them. We have no idea that it will find its way into many private libraries; but we do think that it should have place upon the shelves and tables of those public institutions, where the taste for such pursuits is generally fostered, and sometimes created, by accidental contact with a work like this. A larger supply of philological appliances, and a freer access to them, on the part of students, would, we think, without constraint, or even formal exhortation, do a great deal for the benefit of biblical, classical, and oriental learning. Many scholars, both in Europe and America, can, no doubt, trace their relish for the course of study which they have pursued, to incidents almost too trivial for remembrance; the opening of a book, a casual conversation, or an item of intelligence. Philological reading-rooms have done much good, not so much by direct operation on the intellect, as by their indirect influence upon the taste. Why may they not be multiplied?

ART. V.—HISTORICAL STATEMENTS OF THE KORAN.*

THE Mohammedan imposture is, in some respects, the most remarkable of all false religions. The specious simplicity of its essential doctrines, and its perfect freedom from idolatry, distinguish it forever from the gross mythology of classical and oriental paganism. But besides these characteristics, it displays a third, more interesting still. We mean the peculiar relation which it bears to Christianity. Whether it happened from a happy accident or a sagacious policy, we think it clear that Islam owes a vast proportion of its vast success, to the fact that Mohammed built upon another man's foundation. Assuming the correctness of the common doc-

* The citations in this article are chiefly in the words of Sale, with occasional departures from his phraseology, too minute to need specification. Where there is more than a verbal difference, the reader is apprized of it.

trine that the impostor was a brilliant genius, though a worthless libertine, and that his book is the offspring, not of insane stupidity, but of consummate artifice, there certainly is ground for admiration in the apparent union of simplicity and efficacy in the whole design. The single idea of admitting freely the divine legation of the Hebrew seers, and exhibiting himself as the topstone of the edifice, the Last Great Prophet, and the Paraclete of Christ, has certainly the aspect of a master stroke of policy. Besides conciliating multitudes of Jews and soi-disant Christians, at the very first, this circumstance has aided the imposture not a little ever since. It relieves the Moslem doctors from the dire necessity of waging war against both law and gospel. Whatever can be cited from the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, without disparaging Mohammed, they admit as readily as any Jew or Christian. Whatever, on the contrary, is hostile to his doctrines or pretensions, or at all at variance with the statements of the Koran, is disposed of, not by an absolute rejection of the Bible, but by a resort to the convenient supposition of corruption in the text. It is not the policy of Islam to array itself against the Jewish and the Christian dispensations, as an original and independent system; but to assume the same position in relation to the Gospel, which the Gospel seems to hold in relation to the Law—or, in other words, to make itself the grand dénouement of that grand scheme, of which the Old and New Testaments were only the preparatory stages. Indeed, if we were fully satisfied that the Rasool Allah* had any plan at all, we should be disposed to account for it in this way. He was acquainted with three forms of religion, Judaism, Christianity, and Paganism. Disgusted with the latter, he was led, we may suppose, to make some inquiries into the points of difference, between the Jews and Christians. This he could not do, without discovering their singular relation to each other—the Christians acknowledging the Scriptures of the Jews, but adding others to them, and regarding Jesus Christ as the Messiah—the Jews on the other hand rejecting the New Testament, and bitterly denying the Messiahship of Christ. This fact might very readily suggest the project of a new dispensation—a third one to the Christian, and a second to the Jew. The impostor would thus be furnished with an argument *ad hominem* to stop the mouths of both. To the Jews he

* The Apostle of God. We are not aware that Mohammed ever called himself a prophet.

could say, Did not Moses tell your fathers that a prophet should rise up in the latter days, greater than all before him? I am he. Do you doubt it? Here is a revelation just received from Gabriel. Do not all your sacred books predict the coming of a great deliverer, a conqueror, a king? I am he. In a few months you shall see me at the head of a thousand tribes going forth to the conquest of the world. If this was the ground really taken at first, how striking must have been the seeming confirmation of these bold pretensions, when Mohammed and his successors had in fact subjected, not Arabia only, but Greece, Persia, Syria, and Egypt.

To the objection of the Christians, that the line of prophets was long since completed, he could answer, Did not Jesus come to abrogate or modify the law, when its provisions were no longer suited to the state of things? Even so come I, to supersede the Gospel—not to discredit, but to render it unnecessary, by a more extensive and authoritative doctrine. So far from being antichrist (as some no doubt objected) I am the very Comforter whom Jesus promised.

That such sophistry might easily have undermined the faith of renegadoes and half-pagan Christians, is certainly conceivable. Whether this was in fact the course adopted in the infancy of Islam, will admit a doubt. Be that as it may, it is certain, that the impostor considered it expedient to incorporate the leading facts of sacred history into his revelation, so far as they were known to him. That his knowledge of the subject was imperfect, need not excite our wonder. The sources which probably supplied his information, could scarcely be expected to emit a purer stream than that which irrigates the pages of the Perspicuous Book.

Sale's Koran is a very common book, and has passed through a surprising number of editions, considering its character. The text is, however, of necessity so dull, that nobody can read it patiently for fifteen minutes, without taking refuge in the more amusing matter of the notes and preface. Were there any continuity, connexion, consistency, or unity to be discovered in it, this would be of less importance. But in such a jumble of discordant elements, it is hard to get any information by just reading on in course. Remote parts must be brought together, and arranged, in order to enucleate the mysteries of Islam; a task which most would look upon as vastly disproportioned to the value of the object. And yet it is important that the Koran should be better understood.

It is daily growing more important, and will very soon be thought imperatively necessary. Theological students who look forward to the missionary service, are too apt to under-rate one class of difficulties, while perhaps they magnify another. You will find a man hesitating whether he shall run the risk of being bastinadoed, or of dying with the plague, while he forgets that if he had a perfect security against infection, and corporeal violence, he might still be disappointed and defeated in his whole design. That a man should go to convert the Moslems, with an impression on his mind, that they are fools or children, is not merely proof of ignorance on his part, but a melancholy omen for the cause which he espouses. It would be well, therefore, if at this time, when the Mohammedans are objects of so much attention to the friends of missions, a little preparatory study could be spent upon the Koran. It is certainly desirable that he who undertakes the instruction of a Mussulman, should know what the false opinions are which he must combat. If he expects to find the mind of his catechumen a *tabula rasa* on the subject of religion, he will find himself most grievously at fault. Such strength of prejudice has rarely been exhibited, as that which is the product of a thorough education in the doctrines of Mohammed, aggravated, as it must be, by the fixed belief of fatalism. No less erroneous, on the other hand, is the opinion, that the Moslem's creed is wholly false, and must be utterly destroyed before the truth can find admission. There are two questions, therefore, which the missionary should know how to answer: what are the peculiar dogmas of Mohammed's system? and what has it in common with the true religion? It ought to be considered as a great advantage, that the facts of sacred history are not wholly unknown to the Mohammedans. For though they may consider our intelligence as borrowed from their Book, it is, nevertheless, something to be able to appeal to striking facts, by way of illustration, confirmation, or induction. This might, as it were, present a vulnerable point, when all the rest is shielded in impenetrable prejudice. A beginning might be made by a judicious use of facts which they believe as well as we, from which occasion might be taken to correct the errors of Mohammed's narrative, and eventually to demonstrate and explain important truths.

What are these facts, then? or, in other words, how large a portion of the sacred history has been wrought into the Ko-

ran, and thereby placed beyond the reach of cavil on the part of all true Moslemin?

There is but one passage in the Koran, we believe, where a connected account is given of the creation of the world, though it is frequently mentioned incidentally as God's immediate and almighty act. The passage alluded to occurs in the forty-first chapter, and is very brief. The amount of it is, that God made the universe in six days, two of which were employed upon the earth, two more upon its products, and the remaining two upon the heaven. The latter, we are told, was made of smoke into which it is again to be resolved hereafter.* This element was moulded into seven distinct heavens, each having its own office. In the lowest of the seven the great lights were placed.

In glancing at this passage, we have had occasion to observe Sale's assiduity in striving to impart coherence and significance to his author's text—not by false or loose translation, nor by sheer interpolation, but by adding something to fill up the yawning chasms of the porous and Perspicuous Book. In a word, he makes Mohammed say in English, not what he does, but what he should have said in Arabic; a harmless artifice, so far as substance is concerned, but disingenuous, so far as it conveys too high a notion of the pseudo-prophet's merits. For example, after stating the creation of the earth, Mohammed says, he blessed it, and provided therein its food, or their food, (for the words admit of either sense). What says Sale? "He blessed it and provided therein the food of the creatures designed to be the inhabitants thereof." To the last eight words there is nothing corresponding in the Arabic.

One thing more in this account of the creation may deserve our notice, "He said to the heaven and the earth, come either obediently or against your will; they answered, we come obedient to thy will." This was obviously intended as a match for that inimitable sentence, "God said, Let there be light, and light was." One can hardly help smiling at the Irish sublimity of poor Mohammed's master-piece, the alternative proposed to two nonentities, and their sagacious choice. It is but just, however, to admit, that the language may be considered as addressed to the heavens and the earth after they were created, but before they were arranged and beautified.

* See the chapter entitled *Smoke*. Sale, vol. ii. c. 41. Lond. 1801.

The Genii, we are told in the chapter of Al Hejr,* were made of *subtle fire*, as Sale translates it. The original words are *nar semum*,† the latter term properly denoting the hot wind of the desert called *simoom* by travellers. There is something poetical in this idea, which would, no doubt, strike the fervid fancy of a Bedouin with mighty force. The account of the creation and fall of man is scattered piecemeal through the Koran. The narrative is given, more or less completely in the second, seventh, eighth, fifteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth chapters. By putting together the *disjuncta membra*, we make out this story. After the earth and angels were created, God announced to the latter his intention to create a *khalif* or vicegerent upon earth. The angels are represented as remonstrating, and saying, "Wilt thou place there one who will do mischief and shed blood, whereas we celebrate thy praise and glorify thee? What suggested their forbodings is not mentioned. The only reply was, "I know that which ye know not."‡ Agreeably to this annunciation, a body was formed of black mud and dried clay, into which God breathed a spirit.§ Adam, thus produced, was taught by revelation the names of all the animals, which were then presented to the angels with these words, "Declare the names of these, if ye are upright!" They said, "God forbid! we have no other knowledge than that which thou hast given us: thou art the Knowing and the Wise!" He said, "Adam, tell them the names of these!" When Adam had told their names, God said, "Did I not tell you that I knew the mysteries of heaven and earth?"|| The angels were then required to worship Adam. All did so except Iblis, who, Mohammed says, "was of the genii, and resisted the commandment of his Lord."¶ From this it appears that the Jinn or Genii were included under the term Angels or Malayic. Whether they were before this *evil* spirits, we are left to guess. The prophet's notions seem to have been exceedingly confused.

In another place we find the following dialogue between the Almighty and the devil.

Allah. 'O Iblis, what hindereth thee from worshipping that which I have created with my hands? Art thou elated with vain pride, or art thou really one of exalted merit?'

* c. xv.

§ xv. 25. 28.

† xv. 26.

|| ii. 30, &c.

‡ ii. 30.

¶ xviii. 50.

Iblis. 'I am better than he; thou hast created me of fire, and hast created him of clay.'

Allah. 'Get thee hence, therefore, for thou shalt be driven away from mercy, and my curse shall be upon thee till the day of judgment.'

Iblis. 'Oh Lord respite me till the day of resurrection.'

Allah. 'Verily thou shalt be one of the respited.'

Iblis. 'By thy might I swear, that I will surely seduce them all, except thy servants who shall be peculiarly chosen from among them.'

Allah. 'It is a just sentence: I speak the truth: I will fill hell with thee, and with such as follow thee.'**

The same account, substantially, is given in the seventh and fifteenth chapters. In one of these passages, Iblis is made to say, 'Because thou hast seduced or deceived me (*Sale* says *depraved*,) I will lie in wait for men in thy strait way; and I will come upon them from before and from behind, and from their right-hand and from their left, and thou shalt not find the greater part of them thankful.†

Such is the account of the apostacy of Iblis. Its immediate consequence was the fall of man, which is related thus: "God said to Iblis, Get thee hence, despised and driven away! Verily, whoever shall follow thee, I will surely fill hell with you all. But as for thee, O Adam, dwell thou and thy wife in the garden, and eat of it wherever ye will, but approach not this tree, lest ye be of the wicked. And Satan (i. e. the adversary, as in Hebrew) whispered to them that he would reveal their nakedness which was concealed from them. And he said, your Lord has not excluded you from this tree, except for fear that you should become angels or immortal. And he sware to them, I am one of those who give good counsel. And he caused them to fall by his deceit. And when they had tasted of the tree, their nakedness appeared to them, and they began to join the leaves of the garden upon themselves. And their Lord called to them saying, Did I not forbid you this tree, and tell you that Satan was your avowed enemy? They said, Our Lord we have sinned against our own souls, and unless thou forgive us and have mercy upon us, we shall certainly be of those who perish."‡ "And Adam learned words (*of prayer*, *Sale* adds) from his Lord, and he turned unto him, for he is easy to be turned

* xxxviii. 76—86.

† vii. 16, 17.

‡ vii. 18—23.

and merciful. And God said, Go down, the one of you an enemy to the other, and there shall be a dwelling place for you on earth and provision for a season.”* “Therein shall ye live and therein shall ye die, and therefrom shall ye be taken forth (Sale adds, *at the resurrection.*)† “There shall come to you a direction from me, and as many as obey that direction shall be free from fear and grief; but as many as disbelieve and charge our signs with falsehood, shall be companions of hell-fire. Therein shall they dwell forever.”‡

The account of Cain and Abel is very brief. Brief as it is, however, there was room for one sheer fabrication, borrowed from the Rabbins. “Tell them the story of the two sons of Adam truly. When they offered an offering, and it was accepted from one of them and not from the other, he said, (*Cain said to his brother, quoth Sale*) I will kill thee. He said (*Abel said, id.*) God accepteth gifts from those who fear him. If thou stretch forth thy hand against me to slay me, I will not stretch forth my hand against thee to slay thee, for I fear God the Lord of the Universe. I am willing that thou shouldst bear my iniquity and thine own iniquity, and that thou shouldst become one of the companions of hell-fire; for that is the reward of the unrighteous. And his soul permitted him to slay his brother, and he slew him, and become one of those who perish. And God sent a raven which scratched the earth, to teach him how he should hide his brother’s nakedness. Then he said, wo is me! am I unable to be like this raven that I may hide my brother’s nakedness? And he became one of the penitent. On this account, we prescribed it to the children of Israel, that whoever slays a soul without a soul (i. e. probably, *without having slain a soul*) or without having acted wickedly in the earth, shall be as if he had slain all mankind, and he who saveth a soul alive, shall be as if he had saved the lives of all mankind.”§ This last fine sentiment is finely countenanced by the repeated order to exterminate the infidels, and the many promises of everlasting happiness to those who die upon the field of battle.

It will be observed, that in the narrative just given, the names of Adam’s sons do not occur at all, except in Sale’s translation. We have no recollection of their being mentioned elsewhere. Noah, the Koran says, was sent to warn his

* ii 36, 37.

† vii, 26.

‡ ii, 38.

§ v. 29—34.

contemporaries, and remained among them “a thousand years save fifty.”* The only persons, who submitted to his guidance were obscure and abject; the nobles and the wealthy stood aloof. At length it was revealed to Noah, that all had believed who would believe, and he was directed to construct a vessel. While engaged upon this task, he was treated with general derision and contempt. At last the appointed time arrived, “and the oven poured forth boiling water.”† The narrative then proceeds as follows: “We said unto Noah, carry into the ark of every kind of animal one pair, and thine own family (excepting him on whom sentence had already passed) and those who believe. And there believed not with him except a few. And Noah said, embark upon it in the name of God, while it floats and while it is at rest. Surely my Lord is merciful and gracious. And it floated with them upon waves like mountains; and Noah called to his son who was separated from them, Oh my son embark with us and be not with the unbelievers. He said, I will ascend a mountain which will secure me from the water. He said, there is no security to day from the decree of God except for him on whom he shall have mercy. And a wave passed between them, and he was one of the drowned. And it was said, oh earth swallow up thy water, and oh heaven withhold! And the water subsided, and the decree was accomplished, and it (the ark) rested on Al Judi; and it was said, away with the ungodly people! And Noah called upon his Lord and said, oh my Lord, my son is one of my family, and thy promise is true, for thou art the most just of those who judge. God said, Noah, he is not one of thy family; this is not a righteous work (viz. his intercession). Ask not of me that of which thou hast no knowledge, I admonish thee not to be one of the ignorant.”‡ Noah then acknowledges his fault, leaves the ark, and receives a benediction. At the close of the history the prophets adds, as if apprehensive that some of the faithful might have been beforehand with him, “This is a secret history which we reveal unto thee; thou didst not know it, neither did thy people before this.”§

With respect to Abraham,¶ there are many statements and allusions in the Koran. The substance of his history is this. While yet a boy, he was led to disbelieve in the idolatrous religion of his father and his countrymen. Having secretly

* xxix. 14.

§ xi. 49.

† xi. 40.

¶ Ibrahim.

‡ xi. 40—46.

renounced the worship of images, he was in doubt, to what object he should pay his adorations. He first pitched upon the sun and moon, but afterwards reflected that their setting every day rendered them unworthy of divine honours. He came at last to the conclusion, therefore, that he would worship God alone.* Having formed this resolution, he remonstrated with his father on the folly of idolatry. Ezer, however, as Mohammed calls him, rebuked his son severely and threatened him with death.† Even this, it seems, did not deter the young reformer from playing a bold and witty trick upon his pagan friends. Absenting himself from one of their festivals, “he went into the temple where the idols stood, and he brake them all in pieces except the biggest of them, that they might lay the blame upon that. And when they were returned and saw the havoc which had been made, they said who hath done this to our gods? He is certainly an impious person. And certain of them answered, We heard a young man speak reproachfully of them: he is named Abraham. They said bring him therefore before the eyes of the people, that they may bear witness against him. And when he was brought before the assembly, they said to him, hast thou done this unto our gods, oh Abraham? He answered, nay, but that biggest one of them hath done it; ask them if they can speak. And they came to themselves, and said one to the other, verily ye are the impious persons. Afterwards they turned down upon their heads (i. e. *relapsed*) and said, verily thou knowest that these cannot speak. Abraham said, do ye therefore worship besides (or instead of) God that which cannot profit you at all, neither can it hurt you! Fie on you and upon that which ye worship besides God! Do ye not understand? They said, Burn him and avenge your Gods. (And when Abraham was cast into the burning pile‡) we said, oh fire be thou cold, and a preservation unto Abraham. And they sought to lay a plot against him, but we caused them to be the sufferers.”§ After this miraculous preservation, he boldly inveighed against idolatry in public, but without effect. Lot alone believed, in company with whom Abraham forsook his native country “to go to the place which the Lord had commanded him.”||

* vi. 74—79.

† xix. 46.

‡ These nine words are interpolated by Sale.

§ xxi. 58—69. (Sale, vol. ii. p. 158. Lond. 1801.)

|| xxix. 26.

The reader will have observed, amidst the fiction and obscurity of these details, not a few glimpses of the truth from which they were derived. We find the case the same as we pursue the narrative. The very next step brings us to a lamentable travesty of Genesis, xv. 7—12. “Abraham said, Lord show me how thou wilt raise the dead. Dost thou not believe? He said, yes, but that my mind may be at ease. He said, take then four birds, and divide them, and place a piece on every mountain. Then call them and they will come to thee in haste; and know that God is mighty and merciful.”*

The visit of the angels is related with laudable accuracy as to some particulars, and woful want of it in others. The object of their coming and the mode of their reception, are correctly stated. But the laughter of Sarah is made to precede the promise of a son.† This slight anachronism has occasioned an incredible deal of pains to the Mohammedan commentators who, we need not say, are very numerous, voluminous, minute, and silly. They have attempted in vain to account for Sarah’s laughter, and the ground of its connexion with the promise which ensued. The son thus promised is correctly stated to have been called Isaac;‡ and yet that patriarch is treated, both by the Koran and the commentators, as a very obscure and unimportant personage. He is only mentioned incidentally, and then but briefly. Ishmael§ is constantly brought forward as the leading character. The reason of this is plain. It was intended to exhibit his descendants, instead of the Jews, as the chosen people. The only wonder is, that he was not made the child of promise. We mention it as an instance of the clumsy manner in which Mohammed put his stuff together.||

The account of the incidents immediately preceding the awful overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, so far as it goes, is tolerably accurate. Abraham’s intercession, and the outrageous conduct of the wretched Sodomites, are stated briefly but distinctly. On reaching the catastrophe, the reader is surprised to learn that it was effected by a storm of brickbats! Sale gives it thus, “And when our command came, we

* ii. 259.

† xi. 71.

‡ Is-hak.

§ Ismail.

|| It may have been because the etymology of Isaac’s name would suggest the same idea to an Arab as a Jew, viz. laughter.

turned those cities upside down, and we rained upon them *stones of baked clay*, one following another.”*

The facts in relation to the sacrifice of Isaac, are stated in the thirty-seventh chapter of the Koran, without any material departure from the truth, but also without the touching simplicity and circumstantiality of the original. The last passage which we shall advert to, in the history of Abraham as scattered through the Koran, is purely Koranic, and was obviously designed to trace the imposture of the camel-driver up to the father of the faithful. We give it in the words of Sale, inserting brackets to denote interpolations. “God said, verily I will constitute thee a *model of religion*† unto mankind: he answered, and also of my posterity? God said, my covenant doth not comprehend the ungodly. And we appointed the [holy] house [of Mekka] to be a place of resort for mankind, and a place of security; and said, take the station of Abraham for a place of prayer; and we covenanted with Ismael and Abraham, that they should cleanse my house for those who should compass it and those who should be devoutly assiduous there, and those who should bow down and worship. And Abraham and Ismael raised the foundations of the house, saying, Lord, accept it from us, for thou art he who heareth and who knoweth. Lord, make us all **RESIGNED** unto thee, and of our posterity a people resigned unto thee, and show us our holy ceremonies, and be turned unto us, for thou art easy to be reconciled and merciful. Lord, send them likewise an Apostle from among them, who may declare thy signs unto them, and teach them the book, [of the Koran,] and wisdom, and purify them; for thou art mighty and wise. Who will be averse to the religion of Abraham, but he whose mind is infatuated?‡” This last triumphant interrogatory harmonizes well with the assertion elsewhere made that “Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but a Hanif, or orthodox believer.§

In the passage just quoted, we find the religion of Mohammed identified with the *millah Ibrahim* or religion of Abraham. We also find the origin of the distinctive name of the imposture. The Arabic word which Sale translates *resigned*, is *Moslimin*, a participle. The verb *Aslama* means to yield one’s self up unreservedly. It is used to denote entire resignation to God’s will, and devotion to his service. The par-

* xi. 82. † (Arab.) an Imam. ‡ ii. 124—130. § iii. 67.

tiple Moslim, (plural moslimun, moslimin) is the proper equivalent to our word Mohammedan, which they seldom employ, and signifies one resigned and devoted. The infinitive of the same verb is Islam, resignation and devotion, the term used by Moslems to denote their own religion. and one which might well supersede the uncouth European form, Mohammedanism.

Dr. Scott says, somewhere in his correspondence, that the history of Joseph is worse murdered in the Koran, than his brothers ever wished to murder him. Comparitively speaking, this is quite too harsh a judgment. That narrative, compared with others which Mohammed gives us, is a model of coherence and correctness. There are fewer anachronisms and interpolations here, than in almost any other of his attempts at history. Joseph's dream concerning the sun, moon, and stars, and its effect upon his brethren, are correctly stated. In order to gratify their spite, they are represented as requesting Jacob to send Joseph to the pastures with them. The proposal to kill him, and Reuben's interference, are distinctly mentioned, but without the name of Reuben. They are said, moreover, to have left him in the well, and carried the report of his death to Jacob. "And certain travellers came, and sent one to draw water for them; and he let down his bucket, and said, good news! this is a youth! And they concealed him, that they might sell him as a piece of merchandize."* He is carried to Egypt and sold. The wickedness of his mistress, and his constancy, are related with substantial accuracy; but by an awkward blunder, Joseph is sent to prison after being pronounced innocent. The dreams of the baker and butler, Joseph's interpretation of them, Pharaoh's dream, and Joseph's liberation and promotion, are given, without much deviation from the truth. He is made, however to propose his own elevation to the chair of state.† The famine in Canaan, the journey of Jacob's sons to Egypt, Simeon's detention, the restoration of the money, Benjamin's visit, the recognition of Joseph, and Jacob's emigration are all mentioned. Some embellishments are introduced, no doubt. Jacob is blinded by weeping for the loss of Joseph, and restored to sight by the application of Joseph's under garment. The following nonsense is put into the mouth of the venerable patriarch, on sending his sons a second time to

* xii. 18.

† xii. 53.

Egypt. "My sons, enter not into the city by one and the same gate; but enter by different gates. But this precaution will be of no advantage unto you against the decree of God, for judgment belongeth to him alone." By a ridiculous anachronism, Joseph is made to reveal himself to Benjamin, before the discovery of the cup; and thus the stratagem is left without an object. Joseph's messengers despatched to bring his brethren back, offer a reward of a load of corn, to the man who should produce the cup. His brethren are made to say, "If Benjamin be guilty of theft, his brother Joseph hath been guilty of theft heretofore!"

Still, as we said before, the narrative, compared with others in the book, may be said to be consistent, continuous, and even accurate. At the same time, it should be mentioned as an interesting fact, that from beginning to end, there is no approach to pathos, nor the slightest indication of that masterly acquaintance with the human heart, which shines in the inimitable and divine original. And we venture to say, that no one, after reading the Koran in its native dress, however much he may be pleased with many rhythmical and sonorous passages, will be able to recall one solitary sentence which evinces either tenderness or purity of feeling. Let those who would see this difference between a genuine and spurious revelation exhibited in very striking contrast, read the twelfth chapter of Sale's Koran in connexion with the history of Joseph in the book of Genesis. The comparison is fair; for both are literal translations from cognate dialects. To take a single stroke from either picture as a specimen, we give the account of Joseph's making himself known, as recorded by Moses and Mohammed. "Then Joseph could not refrain himself before all them that stood by him; and he cried, cause every man to go out from me. And there stood no man with him while he made himself known unto his brethren. And he wept aloud. And Joseph said unto his brethren, I am Joseph. Doth my father yet live? And his brethren could not answer him; for they were troubled at his presence. And Joseph said unto his brethren, come near to me, I pray you; and they came near. And he said, I am Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt. Now, therefore, be not grieved nor angry with yourselves, &c. &c. And he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck and wept." (Gen. xlv.) "Wherefore Joseph's brethren returned into Egypt: and when they came into his presence they said, noble lord, the famine is felt by us and

our family, and we are come with a small sum of money: *yet give unto us full measure, and bestow corn upon us as alms*; for God rewardeth the alms-givers. Joseph said unto them, do ye know what ye did unto Joseph and his brother, when ye were ignorant of the consequences thereof? They answered, art thou Joseph? He replied, I am Joseph and this is my brother. Now hath God been gracious unto us. They said, now hath God chosen thee above us; and we have surely been sinners. Joseph said, let there be no reproach cast on you this day. God forgiveth you; for he is the most merciful of those who show mercy." (Kor. xii. Sale, vol. ii. p. 50. Lond. 1801.)

The twenty-eighth chapter of the Koran, called The Story, opens with these words: "In the name of God most merciful, T. S. M. These are the signs of the Perspicuous Book. We dictate unto thee some of the history of Moses* and Pharaoh† with truth for those who believe." And accordingly we have a very copious account of the great lawgiver, both in this same chapter and in several others. In reading it over we are struck with the illustration which it yields of the way in which these shreds of sacred history were gathered by the pseudoapostle. We can perceive throughout an effort to retain as much as possible of what he had been told, without regard to the causes and connexions of events. Facts, which are stated in the Scriptures as the natural results of antecedent facts, stand here detached and unaccounted for. This would indeed be in Mohammed's favour, if he were alluding to events already known, as such—just as the allusions in the Psalms and Prophets prove that the Jews were acquainted with the Pentateuch. But such is not the case. Here, as elsewhere, he professes to reveal what was before unknown, and by so doing proves himself a liar. Our object is, to show how much of the Scripture history is borrowed, and how much new matter is interpolated. He mentions Pharaoh's tyranny, and speaks of it as general, though most excessive towards the Hebrews. He mentions the sanguinary edict with respect to Jewish children, and the signal deliverance of Moses from the water, his adoption by Pharaoh's wife (not daughter,) and his strange restoration to his mother as a nurse; his killing the Egyptian, and his flight to Midian,‡ his behaviour

* Musa.

† Firaun.

‡ Madian.

at the well, and his introduction to the family of Jethro, who is here called Shoaib. We are then told, that he served eight years for Shoaib's daughter, a circumstance borrowed from the history of Jacob, who is scarcely ever mentioned except in the history of Joseph, and in a few other cases where his name is joined with those of Abraham and Isaac. Having fulfilled the term of his engagement, he set out for Egypt with his family. While on his journey, he perceived a fire upon the side of Mount Sinai which he turned aside to, with a view to warm himself and ascertain the road.* On his approach, however, a voice commanded him to put off his shoes because he was in the holy valley Towa. The two miracles are then recorded, without any reason for them being given. That of the serpent is correctly stated, but the other is ridiculously misrepresented. The account given by Moses himself is, that he thrust his hand into his bosom and drew it out leprous as snow (*m'tzoraath casshalag*). Whether the former of these words was wanting in the copy of the law which, more or less remotely, furnished Mohammed with his information, or whether his Jewish teacher did not know its meaning, or whether he himself remembered only half of what he heard,—these questions must forever keep their place among the mysteries of which he talks so much. Certain it is, however, that he says not a word of leprosy, and makes the miracle consist in his drawing out his hand *white and uninjured!*† To make the aspect of the thing a little marvellous, the Moslem commentators tell us that Moses was very swarthy, and that his hand underwent a miraculous change of complexion! How much perplexity may be occasioned by the misconception or omission of a word! And oh, how hard, how impossible it is, for awkward imposture to ape the consistent simplicity of truth!

The fact of the prophet's hesitation and reluctance to obey the Lord's injunction, is here mentioned; but the grounds of it are strangely jumbled. "Moses said, oh Lord, I have slain one of them, and I fear they will put me to death; but my brother Aaron§ is of a more eloquent tongue than I; wherefore send him with me for an assistant, that he may gain me credit; for I fear lest they accuse me of imposture."||

Pharaoh charges them with a design to dispossess him of his land by magic, and challenges them to a competition with the

* xxviii. 1—30.
§ Harun.

† Exodus, iv. 6.
|| xxviii. 34, 35.

‡ Koran, xx, 22.

sorcerers of Egypt. Moses accepts the challenge, and a great feast-day is appointed for the contest.* The people assemble, and the magicians come prepared with cords and rods, which they make by their enchantments to appear like serpents. The rod of Moses swallows up the rest, whereupon the magicians publicly acknowledge their belief in the God of Moses and Aaron. Pharaoh, enraged with this defection, threatens them with the severest punishment.

In this part of the narrative, there is a single sentence which is itself a curiosity. Pharaoh said "Oh Haman, burn me clay into bricks, and build me a high tower, that I may ascend unto the God of Moses."† Here we have Haman burning bricks in Egypt, in the days of Moses, for the purpose of building the tower of Babel! We say the tower of Babel, because there is no notice taken elsewhere in the Koran of that striking incident in sacred history, and because the motive here ascribed to Pharaoh is so near akin to that mentioned in Genesis. Gross as the anachronism seems to us, however, the Moslems stedfastly maintain that Haman was prime minister to Pharaoh.

The Egyptians refusing to believe on Moses, were punished by a flood, locusts, lice, frogs, and blood, distinct miracles."‡ These being removed by the intercession of Moses, they broke their promise and refused obedience.‡ Moses was then directed to withdraw with the Israelites at night. Pharaoh pursued them. The sea was divided into twelve parts, separated by as many paths, through which the Hebrews passed, while the Egyptians were all drowned.§ The Israelites proceeding on their journey, came among a people who worshipped idols, whereupon they requested Moses to give them idols also. This he refused; and in obedience to the divine command, fasted forty nights, after which God wrote the law upon tables, and delivered them to him. During his absence, however, the people made a calf *which lowed*, and which they worshipped. The chief agent in this business was one Al Sameri, who declared that he had given life to the calf by sprinkling on it a handful of dust from the footsteps of the Messenger of God. The calf was burnt and pulverized, and Al Sameri condemned to say to every one who met him, Touch me not. A singular speech of Aaron's is recorded here. He is made to say on the return of Moses, "oh, son of my mother, drag me not by my beard nor by the hair of

* xx. 59.

‡ vii. 130, 131.

† xxviii 39.

§ xxvi. 53—67.

my head.”* In a parallel passage it is stated, that Moses threw down the tables, and seized his brother by the hair.†

The division into tribes, which is spoken of as arbitrary, the appointment of the seventy elders, the smiting of the rock, the giving of manna and of quails, are all-recorded.‡ In connexion with these incidents we find the following, which has occasioned no small difficulty to the hapless commentators. “We said, enter into this city (no city had been previously mentioned) and eat of the provisions thereof plentifully as ye will; and enter the gate worshipping and say *Hittaton!* We will pardon your sins and give increase to the well-doers. But the ungodly changed the expression into another different from what had been spoken, &c.”§ The following passages, are no less valuable. “Ask them concerning the city by the sea, when they profaned the Sabbath; when their *fish* came unto them on their Sabbath day, appearing openly on the water, but on the day whereon they did not keep the Sabbath, they came not unto them * * * And when they proudly refused to desist from what had been forbidden them, we said to them, be ye transformed into *apes*, driven away from the society of men * * * And we shook Mount Sinai over them as though it had been a covering.”|| Having despatched the fish and the apes, we must by no means overlook the *cow*, since it has given name to one of the longest chapters in the Koran,¶ and since it affords a proof of the divine legation of Moses, which he has himself forgotten to record. The story may be gathered from the following dialogue:

“*Moses.* God commandeth you to sacrifice a cow.

People. Dost thou make a jest of us?

M. God forbid that I should be one of the foolish!

P. Pray for us unto thy Lord, that he would show us what cow it is.

M. She is neither an old cow nor a heifer, but of middle age between both: do ye therefore what ye are commanded.

P. Pray for us unto thy Lord, that he would show us what colour she is of.

M. He saith, she is a yellow cow, intensely yellow: her colour rejoiceth the beholders.

P. Pray for us unto thy Lord, that he would show us

* xx. 94.

§ ii. 58, 59.

† vii. 146.

|| vii. 153. 156. 161.

‡ ii. and vii.

¶ The second.

further what cow it is; for several cows with us are like one another; and we, if God please, will be directed.

M. He saith, she is a cow not broken to plough the earth or water the field; a sound one, there is no blemish in her.

P. Now hast thou brought the truth.”*

“Then” says the Book, “they sacrificed her; yet they wanted but little of leaving it undone. And when ye slew a man, and contended among yourselves concerning him, we said, strike the dead body with part of the sacrificed cow. Thus God raised the dead to life.”† Among the many animals for which the Moslems entertain a high regard, none, we believe, not even Ezra’s ass, nor the seven sleepers’ dog, is more esteemed than this middle-aged, intensely yellow, cow.

In connexion with the history of Moses, Karun must be mentioned. He is the Cræsus of oriental history and fiction, being described in the Koran as immensely rich. Nothing more is there related of him, except that on account of his presumption and ingratitude, the earth opened and swallowed him up, which identifies him with the Korah of the Pentateuch.‡

The only other incident related of Moses, is a purely fictitious one. It is interesting, however, in itself, and also because it has furnished the conception and the leading incidents of a well-known poem, Parnell’s Hermit. Where Mohammed got it, is a matter of dispute. Lord Teignmouth, we believe, has traced it into Hindostan. The passage in the Koran occupies some pages of the eighteenth chapter.

From Moses, the false prophet takes a sweeping stride to Saul whom he calls Talut. As if to compensate for this yawning chasm, he contrives to bring into connexion with this prince, two facts belonging to two other periods. After mentioning the application made by the Israelites to their prophet (Sale adds *Samuel*, in capitals) for a king to command their hosts, he says that they objected to the person chosen. To remove this difficulty, they were told that a proof of his divine vocation should be given. “Verily the sign of his kingdom shall be that the ark shall come unto you: therein shall be tranquillity from your Lord, and the relics which have been left by the family of Moses and the family of Aaron.

* ii. 67—71.

† ii. 72, 73.

‡ xxviii. 77—83.

The angels shall bring it. Verily, this shall be a sign unto you, if ye believe.”* The word, which Sale here renders tranquillity, is *sekinah* or *sekinaton*, the Hebrew *schechinah*. To the Arabic commentators it seems to have been exceedingly mysterious.

The enemy against whom Talut led the Hebrews, was Goliath, here called Jalut. The form in which these names appear, is easily explained. It is well known, that to an elevated style oriental rhetoric makes jingle an essential requisite. This may result, in part, from organic sensibility, since rhyme is confessedly a product of the east, and since the Hebrew Scriptures furnish some examples of paronomasia.† The proximate cause of this perverted taste, however, is the usage of the Koran, that standing miracle of perfect eloquence, in which not only pages, but whole chapters, have a rhythmus and a rhyme, which to our ears is paltry, but to a Turk’s or Arab’s is the music of the spheres. This childish weakness leads the orientals to take undue liberties with foreign names. The Greeks who were above this folly, had another of their own. Every thing with them must have a meaning, sense or nonsense; and accordingly they tortured Persian and Phœnician simples into Attic compounds. With the Arabs on the other hand, and their disciples, sense must yield to sound. Names historically cognate, must likewise rhyme together. Thus in the case before us, Jalut really varies very little from Goliath, the radicals being the same. But poor Saul is made to rhyme with the Philistine. *Talut and Jalut* is a combination full of beauty to an Asiatic ear. So is *Harut and Marut*, which occurs in this same chapter.‡ So is *Habel and Cabel*, the Mohammedan improvement upon *Cain and Abel*.

In the account of Talut’s campaign against Jalut, the other

* ii 247.

† We say *some* examples, for a part of those collected by Gesenius cannot be fairly reckoned as belonging to this class. His remarks upon the subject have a tendency, indeed, to make the reader think, that the Bible is deformed throughout with this most offensive form of rhetorical affectation, which he calls a *lieblingszierde* of the Hebrew language! We venture to affirm that a large proportion of the cited instances are purely accidental, and might easily be matched by German phrases from the *Lehrgebäude*; and that as to the rest, they almost all occur in peculiar idiomatic and proverbial phrases, not as in Hariri, at the end of every clause of every paragraph, prosaic or poetical.

‡ ii. 102.

misplaced incident, which we referred to, is inserted, Gideon's method of selecting his followers, by their drinking, is transferred to Saul.*

Jalut is killed by David, who is abruptly introduced for the purpose, and correctly spoken of as Saul's successor.† Of David we are elsewhere told, that he was a true penitent, that he was endued with strength, that he was inspired with the art of making coats of mail, that the mountains sang in concert with him, and the birds also, a notion founded probably on the frequent personifications and apostrophes in the book of Psalms.‡ The passage, which we are now about to quote, is an instance of Mohammed's skill in divesting his stolen scraps of all historical, rhetorical, and moral worth. It surpasses even the example before given from the history of Joseph, as a specimen of the Koranic process for the transmutation of pathos into bathos. Let the reader turn to the exquisite parable, by means of which the prophet Nathan touched his master's conscience.§ With that passage fresh in his mind, let him read as follows. "Hath the story of the two adversaries come to thy knowledge; when they ascended over the wall into the upper apartment, when they went in to David, and he was afraid of them? They said, Fear not, we are two adversaries who have a controversy to be decided. The one of us hath wronged the other: wherefore judge between us with truth, and be not unjust and direct us into the even way. This my brother had ninety and nine sheep; and I had only one ewe: and he said, give her me to keep; and he prevailed against me in the discourse which we had together. David said, verily he hath wronged thee in demanding thine ewe as an addition to his own sheep: and many of them who are concerned together in business wrong one another, except those who believe and do that which is right; but how few are they! And David perceived that we had tried him by this parable [what parable?] and he asked pardon of his Lord, and he fell down and bowed himself and repented. Wherefore he forgave him this fault [what fault?] and he shall be admitted to approach near unto us, and shall have an excellent place of abode [in Paradise]."|| Of this poor parody, Sale says with great sang-froid, "it is no other than Nathan's parable to

* ii. 248.
§ 2 Sam. xii.

† ii. 250.

‡ See ch. xxi. xxxiv. xxxviii.
|| xxxviii. 22—26.

David, a little disguised.”* A little disguised! disfigured, mangled, massacred, he surely meant to say.

That Solomont acts a most conspicuous part in oriental fiction, is known to every reader of the Thousand and One Nights. For this distinction he is indebted, remotely to the Rabbins, more directly to the Koran. In the latter may be found the germ—the crude and shapeless elements—of that extravagant, but fascinating, species of romance, which the western Asiatics doat upon so fondly, and which, in the hands of their prolific writers, has grown up like an enchanted palace full of mysteries and wonders, of ethereal spirits and of airy tongues that syllable men’s names. There is something in the eastern tales of genii and faries, most agreeably contrasted with the sombre aspect of the Gothic legends which people our nurseries with grisly goblins. There is something gross, as well as dismal, in the latter, which offends the taste, while it agitates the nerves. The eastern fables, on the other hand, are airy and poetical. Their fictions savour of the palm-grove and the fountain, ours of the churchyard and the charnel-house. Both are equally unreal and unprofitable. But their very unreality (to coin a word) is different. Both are mere dreams. But theirs are the dreams of childish gaiety, ours are the *somnia ægri*, the visions of disease. And as to their unprofitableness, when we consider the effects of ghost stories heard in childhood, we can boldly say, that if we must have the stimulus of falsehood, we would rather have the exhilarating gas of eastern fancy than the harrowing opiate of home-brewed superstition. Of that sort of fiction, which has led us into this digression, the embryo exists in the Koranic account of Solomon. He is represented, not only as remarkable for wisdom, but as gifted with sundry supernatural advantages; as empowered to control the winds, † as acquainted with the language of animals; § as possessed of a fountain which emitted molten brass; || but above all, as invested with absolute authority over the *Jinn* or *Genii*. We have said, that with respect to this class of beings there is some obscurity in the Koran. It would seem from certain passages, that they are what we call demons; ¶ and yet the oriental fabulists do not exhibit them precisely in that light. The probability is, that there has been an amalgamation of the

* Vol. ii. p. 319. London. 1801.

† Suleiman.

‡ xxi. 81.

§ xxvii. 17—19.

|| xxxiv. 12.

¶ E. g. ch. xxxviii. 38, where the word used is *Shayatin*, or Satans.

Jewish doctrine with another from a different quarter, probably from India. Accordingly, it seems to be the popular opinion in the west of Asia, that between the good angels and the devils there are two intermediate orders—the one, called Peris by the Persians, excluded from heaven, yet allowed to hope—the other, whom they call Divs, unhappy and depraved, yet not condemned to hell. The Arabic word Jinn sometimes denotes the devils, sometimes the Divs just mentioned. In which sense Mohammed used it, we do not know. Most probably, he did not know himself, or rather employed it to express the vague idea suggested by his converse with the Jews on one hand, and the Magians on the other. Be that as it may, he constitutes king Solomon, sole monarch of Jinnistan, the oriental Faery-land. For him the genii dived and quarried, carved and built, and rendered other services recorded in the Koran, which we have not time to copy.* It might be a question of some interest, how far these fables may be traced to misconceptions of the Scriptures. The fountain of molten brass and the mysterious manufacture, by unseen hands, of dishes like fish ponds, and gigantic cauldrons,† have certainly more than a fortuitous connexion with the works of Hiram as described in Scripture.

The only real incident in Solomon's history which is distinctly mentioned, is the visit of the queen of Sheba, and even that is loaded with embellishments. The marvellous account of Solomon's march at the head of an army of genii, birds, and men—the intelligence brought to him from Sheba by a lapwing—his letter to the Queen—the transportation of her throne through the air by the agency of genii—the sudden conversion of herself and all her nobles to the true religion (Islam)—and other equally authentic statements—may be seen, at large, by turning to the twenty-seventh chapter in Sale's Koran.

Some of the statements and allusions in this history are so concise and obscure, that they seem to imply a previous acquaintance with the facts which they relate to, on the part of those who were to read the Koran. For example: "When the horses standing on three feet and touching the ground with the edge of the fourth foot,‡ and swift in the course

* xxxviii. 38.

† xxxiv. 13.

‡ The sixteen words in *italics* correspond to three in the original: of course the meaning must be very dubious.

were set before him, &c. (See Sale.) Again, "We also tried Solomon and placed on his throne a counterfeit body. Afterwards he turned unto God and said, oh Lord forgive me."* And again, in relation to his death: "When we had decreed that Solomon should die, nothing discovered his death unto them, except the reptile of the earth which gnawed his staff."† This the commentators explain by saying, that the time of his death arrived before the temple was completed, and that in order to keep the genii still at work, his corpse remained in a standing posture leaning on his staff, till they had performed their task. This they did in about a year, at the end of which time a worm gnawed the staff in two, and the body fell. This gloss is favoured by the words immediately succeeding in the Koran, "Then the genii plainly perceived, that if they had known what was secret, they had not continued in a vile punishment." Sale justly observes, that this story has perfectly the air of a Jewish invention.‡ But even though it had not been forthcoming from that quarter, there would have been no difficulty in the exegesis. The orthodox expounders of the Koran have a very easy process for solving the enigmas, and salving the absurdities of the sacred text. On a single fact, or an obscure allusion, they erect a superstructure of minute details by way of explanation, descending even to dates, genealogies, and surnames. Thus Al Beidawi does not scruple to enumerate by name the Egyptian magicians placing Simeon (Simon Magus?) at their head; though on this important point he is probably at sword's points with his brother Jallalodin; for, of course, each commentator is at liberty to manufacture stories at his pleasure, and he whose fables are the most ingenious, bears away the palm. This license notwithstanding, they prefer, where it is possible, to borrow from the Rabbins, through the medium of the Sonnah or canonical traditions.

The only other characters transferred from the Old Testament history to the Koran, are Job and Jonah. The account of them is so concise that we give the substance of it in Mohammed's words. "Remember our servant Job,§ when he cried unto his Lord, saying, verily Satan hath afflicted me with calamity and pain;|| and thou art the most merciful of those who show mercy! And we answered his prayer and

* xxxviii. 35, 36.

† Vol. ii. p. 289. Lond. 1801.

‡ xxxiv. 14.

§ Ayyub.

|| xxxviii. 42.

delivered him from his distress.* And it was said to him, strike with thy foot. This is for a cold bath and a drinking place. And we restored to him his family and as many more with them, through our mercy, and for an admonition unto those who are endued with understanding. [And we said] take in thy hand a handful [Sale adds, of rods] and therewith strike [Sale adds, thy wife.] And break not thine oath. Verily we found him a patient person; how excellent a servant was he, for he was one who frequently turned himself to God.”†

Jonah is, in the Koran, called by two names, *Yunas* and *Dhul'nun*. This last denotes about the same that *Fish-man*, or *He of the fish* would in English. His story is as follows: “Jonah was one of those sent by us. He departed in a rage, and thought that we could not exercise our power over him. When he fled into the loaded ship; and they cast lots; and he was condemned; and the fish swallowed him, for he was culpable. And if he had not been one of those who praised God, verily he had remained in its belly unto the day of resurrection. And he cried aloud in darkness. There is no God besides thee! Praise be to thee! I am one of the wicked. And we answered him and delivered him from his distress. And we cast him on the naked shore; and he was sick; and we caused a gourd plant to grow up over him; and we sent him to a hundred thousand persons or more, and they believed. Wherefore we prolonged their lives for a season.”‡

The account of John the Baptist in the Koran, approaches very nearly to the truth. We are not told who Zacharias was, but are informed that he prayed for a son because he was afraid of his heirs at law. An answer was brought by angels to his chamber, assuring him that he should have a son, and should call his name *Yahya* (John), a name never borne, as he was told, by any one before. Zacharias doubted and desired a sign. He was, therefore, informed, that he should not speak for three days except by gesture. He was also told that his son should be a holy man, and should bear witness to the WORD, which the Moslems properly apply to Christ, referring the name, however, to his miraculous conception, produced by the mere command or word of God. Nothing more

* xxi. 82, 83.

† xxxviii. 43—45.

‡ xxi. 87. xxxvii. 138—146.

is said of John except what follows. “[We said to him] receive the book [of the law] with resolution [to observe it;] and we gave him wisdom when a boy, and mercy, and purity, and he was devout and dutiful to his parents, and was not proud or rebellious. Peace be on him the day of his birth, and the day of his death, and the day of his resurrection.”* Not a word is said of his peculiar mode of life, nor even of his office as baptizer.

The statements of the Koran, in relation to the Virgin and our Saviour, when picked out and arranged, form the following narrative. The wife of one Imran (whom Mohammed seems to confound with Amram, notwithstanding Sale’s denial) in expectation of a son, devoted him to the service of the Lord. The child, however, proved to be a daughter, whom the mother named Mariam, or Mary, and solemnly commended her to the divine protection. The care of the child was, after a time, committed to Zacharias the father of John, who was surprised, when he visited the chamber, to find her supplied with food without his interference. Mary, on being questioned, answered “It is from God. He supplieth whom he will, without measure.”†

The Annunciation, and miraculous conception of our Lord, are distinctly mentioned. God is said to have conveyed the intelligence to Mary by his Spirit, as, in another place,‡ he is said to have sent down the Koran by his Holy Spirit. Both these expressions the Mohammedans apply to the angel Gabriel, in which point they agree verbally with those Christian writers, who consider Gabriel a name of the Holy Spirit. The annunciation was in these words: “Oh Mary, verily God sendeth thee good tidings, that thou shalt bear the Word, proceeding from himself: his name shall be Christ Jesus the son of Mary, honourable, honourable in this world and the world to come, &c. He shall speak to men in the cradle, and when he is grown up; he shall be one of the righteous.”§ Not a word is said of Joseph, or of any espousals. Nor are the stable and the manger mentioned. The suspicion, which by Matthew is ascribed to Joseph, is spoken of as common to her friends and relatives. One of the reproachful speeches here set down begins, “Oh, sister of Aaron!” a sufficient proof that the Miriam of the Pentateuch was stu-

* xix. 1—15. iii. 38—40.

† xvi. 102.

‡ iii. 35—37.

§ iii. 45, 46. xix. 16—28.

pidly confounded with the Mary of the Gospel. Yet even in the face of this strong fact, Sale is "afraid" that the charge of anachronism cannot be sustained!

"But she made signs to the child [to answer them;] and they said, how shall he speak to us who is an infant in the cradle? Whereupon the child said, verily I am the servant of God; he hath given me the book [of the Gospel] and hath appointed me a prophet. And he hath made me blessed wheresoever I shall be; and hath commanded me to observe prayer, and give alms, so long as I shall live; and he hath made me dutiful to my mother, and hath not made me proud or vicious. Peace be on me the day whereon I was born, and the day whereon I shall die, and the day whereon I shall be raised to life. This," says Mohammed, "was Jesus the son of Mary, the Word of truth concerning whom they doubt. It is not worthy of God, that he should have a son. God forbid! When he decreeth a thing he only saith unto it, Be, and it is. And verily God is my Lord and your Lord; wherefore serve him; this is the right way. Yet the sectaries differ among themselves concerning Jesus, but woe be unto those who are unbelievers, because of their appearance at the great day."* A very respectable Socinian sermon, with the exception of the concluding woe, which is rather too illiberal.

To the children of Israel, Jesus offered to perform the following miracles; to make a bird of clay and then animate it with his breath; to give sight to one born blind; to heal the leprous; to raise the dead; and to declare by inspiration what they ate, and what provision they had stored away. This last appears to strike the Mussulman with special force, as it holds a conspicuous place among Mohammed's own alleged performances. A full detail of this pretended wonder may be found in the treatise written about twenty years ago, by Aga Acber, a Mollah of Shiraz, in reply to Henry Martyn. A large part of the tract is given, both in Persian and English, by Professor Lee in the "Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism.†"

Jesus also informed them, that he came to confirm the truth of the Law revealed before him, but at the same time to abrogate some of its restrictions. The Jews, however, charged him with imposture, and ascribed his miracles, as usual, to

* xix. 29—37.

† Cambridge, (Eng.) 1823.

magic. Jesus then asked them who would be his helpers in the cause of God? To this appeal none responded but the apostles or Hawariyun, a word which signifies *sincere* or *candid*, but is applied by Mohammed to our Lord's immediate followers.*

In the chapter called The Table, being the fifth in order, we find a story which was probably derived, remotely and obliquely, from the scriptural account of our Lord's last supper, and may have been designed to account for the solemn and mysterious observance which was seen to prevail among the oriental Christians. The statement is, that the apostles said to Christ, "Oh, Jesus, son of Mary, can thy Lord cause a table to come down to us from heaven?" He replied, "Fear God if ye be true believers." They persisted, however, on the ground that they must have some satisfying proof of his divine legation. Jesus then said, "Oh God our Lord, cause a table to come down to us from heaven, and let the day of its descent be a festival day† to us, to the first of us, and to the last of us, [i. e. to us and our successors] and do thou provide food for us; for thou art the best provider." God replied that it should be done, but declared that all who withstood such evidence should inevitably suffer an aggravated punishment.‡ It may be well to add, that among the remarkable days in the Mohammedan calendar is one called Yd-Mesiah, or the Festival of Christ, being that on which this table is supposed to have descended.§

No other of the acts of the apostles is recorded in the Koran, if we except an obscure and confused statement in the chapter called Ya Sin. We are there told that two of Christ's apostles came to a city, for the purpose of preaching, and were joined on their arrival by a third believer. The name of the city is not mentioned in the text, though Sale has inserted ANTIOCH in capitals, according to the commentators. The people, instead of hearing them, forbade their preaching upon pain of death by stoning. The apostles continued, however, to exhort them, and while they were so doing, "a man came hastily from the farther parts of the city," and made a very unintelligible speech in the apostles' favour. The nar-

* iii. 49—52. lxi. 6.

† Literally, let it be a festival.

‡ v. 112—115. There is a remarkable coincidence between the language of the Apostles here and that of the Israelites, Ps. lxxviii. 19. Mohammed may very possibly have mingled the events. No elements are too discordant to enter into his untenpered mortar.

§ Richardson's Dictionary, p. 1038.

rative then proceeds abruptly, "It was said to him, enter into paradise," leaving us to infer that he was stoned, which inference is introduced by Sale into the text. Here, it would seem, we are presented with the death of Stephen and that of the penitent thief in a compound state. We are informed moreover, that the city was destroyed.*

The next passage that we shall advert to, is the famous one with which the zealous Moslem stops the mouth of Christian cavillers, and which, in his opinion, is abundantly sufficient to decide the controversy, wholly and forever. It is as follows, "Jesus, the son of Mary, said, oh, children of Israel, verily, I am the apostle of God sent to you, confirming the Law that was before me, and bringing good tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, named Ahmed."† All that need be said, in explanation, is, that *Ahmed* and *Mohammed* are regular derivatives from one root, and are nearly synonymous, the latter meaning Praised, and the former Praise-worthy, or in the superlative, Most Laudable. Whether the pseudoapostle was actually known, in common life by both names, is of little moment. To an Arab, the very sound would be sufficient to identify them, even if tradition had not fixed the application far beyond the reach of oversight or error. It admits of doubt, whether this false citation was a sheer invention of Mohammed's own, or whether it was palmed upon him by his Christian accessories. The question depends upon the general view, which is taken of his character and that of his imposture. On the supposition, that he was himself a dupe, in whole or in part, it seems most likely that this forged prophecy was furnished by another; for if he had manufactured it, he would probably have shunned all ambiguity by using his real, or his most familiar name. If, on the contrary he laid his plans sagaciously, which is the common theory, this very equivoque resolves itself into a stroke of policy, a sly contrivance to elude suspicion, by affecting the obscurity which most men look for in a bona fide prophecy.

This notable prediction is of course regarded by all *true believers*, as an accurate quotation from the uncorrupted Gospel. For they admit that there was once a Gospel pure and undefiled, now utterly disfigured by malicious mutilation. Here is a spot of ground on which the champion of the cross must be prepared for battle. It is easy for us, assuming all the

* xxxvi. 13—29.

† lxi. 6.

controverted points, to laugh at the Mohammedan opinion. But on missionary ground, in actual conflict with intelligent, though prejudiced and obstinate opponents, a laugh will hardly do. Nor will a simple charge of falsehood and absurdity, however gravely urged, decide the contest. Its only result, most probably, would be a volley of Arabic or Turkish curses, and, where the necessary power was possessed, a summary *reductio ad absurdum* in the shape of the bastinado. How could it be otherwise indeed? To make Mohammed out a liar, you urge the very fact, which they employ to prove the corruption of the Christian Scriptures. You tell them, that their Book is false, because it puts words into the mouth of Jesus which he never uttered. They tell you that your Book is garbled, for it omits a most remarkable and memorable prophecy. Can such recriminations prove a point? Surely not. The only human means that can avail in such a case is argument, legitimate argument, logically accurate, historically just. Now, we ask, is it probable that men who cannot reason at home, will be able to reason at Cairo or Algiers? And in view of the efforts which are likely to be made for the conversion of the Mussulman, we also ask, would it be prudent, would it be right, for minds without strength or discipline, to be enlisted in this war? Let those who think that Moslems cannot argue, read their subtle arguments, and bear in mind the fact, that Martyn, the first mathematical proficient in his class at Cambridge, found no cause to repent the rigid discipline of St. John's and the Senate House.* We have chosen to express these opinions in connexion with the main point of controversy between Islam and the Gospel.

The Moslems, it is well known, like the Cerinthians and other early heretics, deny the crucifixion of our Saviour. The Koranic doctrine, upon that point, may be gathered from the following quotations. "They [the Jews] contrived a plot; but God is the best contriver of plots. And God said, oh Jesus, I am about to make thee die, and to take thee up to myself; and I will cleanse [or free] thee from the unbeliev-

* We take this opportunity of asking for the ground of the assertion sometimes vented, that Martyn was a man of very common-place abilities. His course of life precluded a display of brilliant talent, and his printed sermons cannot furnish a criterion, considering the light in which pulpit performances are viewed by English churchmen. We are acquainted with no *proofs* of his inferiority, and his standing at Cambridge is at least a presumption in favour of his powers.

ers, and I will place thy followers above the unbelievers, at [or until] the day of resurrection.”* “They [the Jews] say, We have killed Christ Jesus [Ysa the Messiah] the son of Mary, God’s apostle; whereas they did not kill nor crucify him, but he was counterfeited [or personated] to them.† And those who differed respecting him were in doubt about it; and indeed they had no knowledge, but followed mere conjecture. They did not really kill him; but God took him up to himself, and God is mighty and wise.”‡

To set Mohammed’s unitarianism in a clearer light, we need only quote a few sentences from different parts of the Koran. “They are certainly infidels who say, that God is Christ the son of Mary. For Christ himself said, oh children of Israel, worship God, my Lord and your Lord. Verily he who gives God a companion shall be excluded from paradise by God, and the fire shall be his dwelling place. Surely they are infidels who say that God is the third of three; whereas there is no God but one God, and if they do not cease from what they say, grievous torments, &c. &c.§ “Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, was an apostle from God, even his Word, and a Spirit proceeding from him. Verily God is one God. Far be it from him that he should have a son. Christ does not disdain to be God’s servant, &c. &c.|| “When God said” [Sale renders it, *when God shall say at the last day*; but the verb is in the past tense, without any thing to modify it] “oh Jesus, son of Mary, didst thou say to men, Take me and my mother for deities besides God? He replied, God forbid! I have no right to assert what does not truly belong to me. I have told them only what thou didst command me, to wit, serve God my Lord and your Lord.”¶ “He is only a servant whom we have highly favoured, and set forth as an example to the children of Israel, and verily he shall be a sign of the Hour, (viz. the last).”***

“Verily, Jesus, with respect to God, was just like Adam. He created him of dust, and then said to him, Be, and he was.”††

Besides the denial of our Lord’s divinity, the attentive reader will observe, throughout these sentences, another strong resemblance to a certain class of writers, in the clamorous as-

* iii. 54, 55. † He was represented by one in his likeness.” Sale.

‡ iv. 155—157.

§ v. 74, 75.

|| iv. 168, 169.

¶ v. 116, 117.

** xliii. 58—61.

†† iii. 59.

sersion of some tenets, as peculiar to themselves—such as, that God is one, that there are not three Gods, that Jesus Christ was the servant of God—tenets which all true Christians hold as fully and as firmly as any Socinian or Mussulman on earth. It is but just, however, to repeat, that the Arab's creed breathes too much of a fire-and-faggot spirit to please the fastidious taste of a latitudinarian.

We believe we have now noticed all the fragments of the sacred history, occurring in the Koran. It must be observed, however, that some of the stories are repeated half-a-dozen times over, in as many different places. In that case, we have selected the most minute and circumstantial of the narratives, adding the facts which it omitted from the parallel passages.

Besides the statements which may thus be traced to scriptural originals, there are a number of stories and allusions in the Koran which derive their origin exclusively from profane history, rabbinical traditions, monastic legends, or the romantic fictions of Arabia itself. It is true, that even those purloined from Scripture have received embellishments from all these quarters, but we now refer to such as rest entirely upon that foundation. Of this kind are the celebrated story of the Seven Sleepers, the account of the Prophets Hud and Saleh, the obscure and scanty notices respecting Dhu'lkarnein, commonly supposed to be Alexander the Great, and other minor passages in historical form. How far some of these might be identified as mutilated fragments of the Bible and Apocrypha, we do not now inquire. At first view they have no such aspect, and our only object here has been to give a connected view of those whose pedigree is obvious.* We are aware that we have been employed upon a very humble task, in collecting and arranging the absurdities and falsehoods of an impudent impostor. Perhaps, however, we have done for our readers what they would not have been willing to do for themselves, and what some of them may find it just as well to be acquainted with. Our hasty and imperfect, but methodical synopsis will, at least, present a clearer view of the Mohammedan belief upon the points in question, than could possibly be gained by a continuous perusal of the book itself.

* In doing this we have confined ourselves, in almost every instance, to the text of the Koran. The commentators explain every thing abundantly, as may be learned from the specimens in Sale. We have chosen rather to exhibit its native imperfection and obscurity.

We have also had occasion, here and there, to point out instances of Sale's strange fondness for interpolations tending to raise his author in the reader's estimation. We have often been at a loss to reconcile his scrupulous precision as a mere translator, with the disingenuousness of his latent glosses and disguised interpolations. Some one has said that "Sale was half a Mussulman;" but this we think incredible. That he was not a very zealous Christian, may be safely granted, but we cannot think it fair to push the accusation further. Our own explanation of the matter is, that he was biassed by the feelings which all scholars feel in relation to their favourite pursuits, and to the subjects of their diligent and long continued study. That Sale did study both the Koran and the commentators deeply and successfully, no one can doubt who has carefully inspected his translation. As to the rest, we suppose that he was led to interpolate a little, by a natural unwillingness to look upon the object of his toils as wholly worthless. When we have spent time and labour on a thing, as valuable, we are loth to see it treated with contempt. This explanation we prefer, because we would have justice done to a distinguished orientalist, even in stripping a deformed imposture of its borrowed garments.

We shall add a few words with respect to the study of Arabic. It is highly desirable, on various accounts, that a knowledge of this noble and important language should become more common. Biblical learning and the missionary enterprise alike demand it. What we most need, is a taste for the pursuit, and a conscientious willingness to undertake the task. The great deficiency is not so much in grammars, as in men to study them. We observe that Mr. Smith, the American missionary, now at Malta, has declined to undertake an English version of Ibn Ferliat's grammar. His views are such as might have been expected from a man of sense and learning. It may, indeed, be stated as a general truth, that translated grammars are as likely to be hinderances as helps. A grammarian cannot possibly explain the phenomena of a foreign language, except by appealing to the structure of his own, or of that in which he writes. Now as every language has its peculiarities, both great and small, no two can stand in the same relation to a third. Latin and French agree where French and English differ. The same form of speech in Latin, therefore, which must be explained to English learners, may be as clear, without elucidation, to the

Frenchman, as if founded upon some fixed law of nature. Give the latter the same comments that you give the former, and you not only do not aid him, but you really confound him. For we need not say, that the attempt to explain what is perfectly intelligible must have that effect. The same remark may be applied to any other case. For a familiar instance, we refer to Josse's Spanish Grammar, as translated into English by Mr. Sales of Cambridge. The original work was designed for Frenchmen, and as the translator, we believe, is himself a Frenchman, many rules and statements, in themselves just, and in their proper places useful, are wholly unintelligible to the English reader. Analogous cases will occur to every scholar, abundantly proving, that the servile transfer, not of language merely, but of rules, arrangements, proofs, and illustrations, is unfriendly to the only end which grammars should promote. While we believe, with Dr. Johnson, that the practice of translating (in the proper sense, and on an extensive scale) is injurious to the purity of language, we likewise consider it injurious to the interests of sound and thorough scholarship. To avoid the former evil, we would substitute the transfusion of thoughts for the translation of words. To remedy the latter, we would have bilingual scholars to study, sift, digest, remodel, reproduce. By this we should avoid the needless introduction of an uncouth terminology and the practical paralogism of attempting to explain *ignotum per ignotius*. By this means, too, a freshness would be given to our learned works, very unlike the tang contracted by a passage over sea. This too would serve to check the strong propensity of young philologists towards a stagnant acquiescence in the dicta of their text-books, which is always attended with the danger of mistaking form for substance, and forgetting the great ends of language in the infinitesimal minutiae of a barren etymology. In Germany, that great philological brewery, the extreme of stagnation has been long exchanged for that of fermentation, and although we do not wish to see the eccentricities of foreign scholarship imported here, we do believe that much of their advancement may be fairly traced to their contempt of mere authority, their leech-like thirst for indefinite improvement, and their practice of working up the material of their learning into new and varied forms without much regard to pre-existent models. Let us imitate their merits and avoid their faults.

Let us mount upon their shoulders, not grovel at their feet. Let us take the *stuff* which they provide for us, and mould it for ourselves, to suit our own peculiarities of language, habit, genius, wants, and prospects. Let our books be English, not Anglo-French or Anglo-German. Let us not make them as the Chinese tailor made the tar's new jacket, with a patch to suit the old one.

To return to grammars—though what we said above may seem directly applicable only to those written in one language to explain another, it applies, *a fortiori*, to what are called *native* grammars, which are merely designed to reduce into systematic form the knowledge previously gathered by empirical induction. To those who have become familiar with a language in the concrete by extensive reading, such works are highly useful and need no translation. To beginners they are useless; for they presuppose the knowledge which beginners want. Besides, they are *untranslatable*, as Mr. Smith justly affirms—with special reference, indeed, to *Bahth El Mutalib*, of which we know nothing but through him. We may add, however, that even if that work admitted of translation, it would scarcely throw more light upon the subject than de Sacy's lucid digest (pre-eminently lucid after all deductions, drawbacks, and exceptions) the fruit of most laborious and long continued study of numerous authorities—a work, too, which has had more indirect influence on biblical philology than many are aware of.* When de Sacy has been mastered and exhausted, he may very fairly be condemned and thrown aside. To those who would prefer a shorter grammar and the Latin tongue, Rosenmüller's book may be safely recommended. It is Erpenius re-written, with improvements from de Sacy. Meanwhile, we look with some impatience for the forthcoming work of Ewald, whose acuteness, ingenuity, and habits of research, afford the promise of a masterly performance.

It must be owned, however, that we do need reading-books, or Readers, for beginners. Most of the Chrestomathies prepared in Europe appear to presuppose some acquaintance with the Koran.† For us this will not answer. Here, where the study is, at most, but nascent, we need an introduction to

* No one, we think who is familiar with de Sacy's noble work, can fail to recognise its agency in giving form, perspicuity, and richness to the famous Lehrgebäude of Gesenius.

† See, for example, the preface to de Sacy's Chrestomathie Arabe, Paris, 1826.

the Koran itself. We have often thought, that a selection of historical passages from that book, reduced to order, with grammatical notes and a vocabulary, would answer the ends of a chrestomathy for mere beginners most completely. It is highly important that the learner's first acquaintance with the written language, should be formed upon the Koran. Amidst all the dialectic variations of a tongue which is spoken from the great Sahara to the steppes of Tartary, there is a large proportion, both of words and phrases, every where the same. These are the words and phrases of the Koran, which religious scruples have preserved from change, and religious use made universally familiar. He who is acquainted with the language of the Koran, has the means of oral access to any Arab, and to almost to any Mussulman. He may not understand as yet the many variations of the vulgar from the sacred tongue, much less the local diversities of speech; but he has the foundation upon which these rest, the stated formula from which they are mere departures. He will also have acquired a measure of that knowledge, with respect to facts and doctrines, which no man can dispense with, who would either vanquish or convert the Moslem.

ART. VI.—ON CERTAIN ERRORS OF PIOUS STUDENTS IN OUR COLLEGES.

IT is pleasing to observe that, in our Church, almost all disputes with regard to the importance of an educated ministry have died away. Great as is the demand for labourers in the Lord's vineyard, it appears to be acknowledged that ample literary and scientific discipline is equally demanded. Hence the eyes of Christians are turned with peculiar interest towards the hundreds of young men, who are at this time engaged in preparatory studies, with a view to the sacred office. Of these, a large number are to be found within the walls of our colleges, engaged in that part of their preliminary discipline, which, when we look to its bearings on future usefulness, must be seen to yield to no other in momentous importance. It may be assumed, as a maxim universally conceded, that the first steps in all mental and moral training are most carefully to be directed and watched, as giving character to

all that follow. Yet next in the order of importance to the earliest lines of intellectual discipline, we are constrained to place that part of education which is effected at college. It is here that the boy, just rising to adolescence; and escaping from the more arbitrary rules of the ordinary school, begins to contribute towards the formation of his own character, undertakes to judge for himself, and marks out his future path, with some degree of boldness and independence. It is here that the nobler foundations of the structure are to be laid, in the acquisition of languages, sciences, literature, history, and the principles of taste, philosophy, and morals. And from the critical period of human life in which these acquisitions are made, the tone of future character is usually taken, and that for life, during the academical course.

If this statement, even in general, or to any considerable extent, is just, it needs scarcely to be added that no caution can be superfluous, no solicitude unwise, which is directed towards the regulation of minds, subjected to concurrent influences so varied, perilous, and operative, at this turning point of life. Much of the hope of the church is staked upon the faithfulness, diligence, and discretion of the beloved youth who are placed in these circumstances, and it cannot be inappropriate to present some hints and cautions, with special reference to their necessities and danger.

There is a measure of humble docility, which is absolutely requisite in every one who sustains the character of a learner. This is due, under all circumstances, from youth to age, from the incipient scholar to the learned guardian and mature instructor; but more especially under circumstances like these, where the voluntary pupil submits himself to the guidance of experienced wisdom, and in order to usefulness in the Church, enters that path which the Church has marked out. The Christian student is bound, for a season, to suspend his private judgment, as to particular branches of study, in filial reliance upon the prudence of those whose superior opportunities and experience enable them to make a wise decision. It is worthy of consideration by our youthful candidates, that the course of study in all our colleges is substantially the same; and that, as it now exists in most of them, it has been framed with reference to the Church, and in a great number of instances by those who have been taking counsel for the education of ministers. Hence every scholar might be justified in the presumption, that it is the course most approved by the

unanimous wisdom of discreet and pious men, and therefore worthy of a fair trial.

We regard this docile temper, and modest subjection of mind, in the young, as no small part of that moral discipline which collegiate education promotes, and which is necessary for future advancement. Youth is proverbially impatient, and fond of seeking compendious methods, royal roads to science and active usefulness. Those who are tempted to such irregularities, should be reminded, that it is just here they should apply the curb to their restive propensities, and check the inordinate desire of freedom; that their situation, time of life, and inexperience, unfit them for judging aright with respect to the path in which they ought to walk; and that the most honourable, the safest, and the most Christian course, is to consign themselves, with undeviating regularity, to the guidance of those under whose care they are providentially placed.

A little observation upon this subject, under circumstances not unfavourable for a correct estimate, has led us to believe that the error to which we have alluded is common in all our institutions; and, unfortunately, oftener observed in candidates for the ministry than in others. For this there is an obvious reason. Young men of zeal and piety long to be actively employed in the Lord's vineyard, and view every thing as an unwelcome hinderance, which does not appear to them to have a direct and immediate bearing upon their great work. They judge thus of many subjects, indeed, which are of the greatest moment, and sometimes neglect the very discipline which their minds most need. There are some, for instance, who, from sloth or impatience, become disgusted with the study of the languages. They are unable to perceive what connexion there is between classic poesy or heathen fables, and the preaching of the Gospel. Forgetting how much of a faithful minister's life should be spent in examining the original Scriptures, and how much the knowledge of one language contributes to the acquisition of all others, they suffer the only period of life in which they have all the necessary facilities for this attainment, to pass by unimproved.

A more frequent occurrence is a similar judgment with regard to mathematical science. Ignorant persons can scarcely ever be made to understand how abstract reasoning about number and quantity, ratio and equality, can be of any use: and ignorant students are often found to cast aside (as far as

they can) the pursuit of these studies, with the pitiful sophism, that they never expect to be surveyors, almanac-makers, or navigators. It is only necessary here to allude to the truth that it is the intellectual habits formed by these studies which give them value in a collegiate course. Tradition attributes to Dr. Witherspoon the adage that *Euclid is the best teacher of logic*; and in this pithy saying the whole argument lies in a nutshell. When we have heard a young man decrying the study of mathematics, we have generally found that it was precisely the kind of culture which he needed to systematize his vagrant thoughts, discipline his feeble reason, and give some stability to his vacillating judgment. No man ever undervalued the science who knew any thing about it. And since the ministry of the gospel demands minds trained to habits of close and rigid investigation, there is no part of our academical education which should be more sedulously cultivated. The idle and imbecile should not be encouraged in their discontents by youth who are preparing for usefulness in the cause of the Redeemer. Let the latter take counsel of learned friends, and they will soon be convinced, that deserters alone speak evil of this cause.

Similar observations might be made respecting almost every item on the catalogue of studies. To every objection, there is one answer, which we desire to be pondered by pious students. No young man, at the commencement of his course, is qualified to pass judgment upon any part of it. It is absurd to pronounce upon a way before one has travelled it; or, standing at the entrance, to receive the testimony of the feeble or fearful renegades who rush backwards with precipitation, taking offence, peradventure, at the impracticable *pons asinorum*, and, like a certain fabled fox, desiring to inveigle others into the same fellowship of ignorance. Let those be consulted who have mastered the difficulties of the journey, and, with one voice, they will exhort to the undertaking.

It is one of the signal advantages of a public education, that it trims down the arrogance of youth with regard to the studies which they shall pursue. The private scholar is governed by his likes and dislikes, his caprices and disgusts; and as it is usual to *hate* an enemy whom we cannot *conquer*, it is common to hear every science in its turn maligned by those who have left it unmastered. In a well regulated college, there is a force put upon these petulant whims, and the pupil is constrained to go so far in each walk of varied know-

ledge, as to bring his powers to the test. The false independence of the home bred and conceited youth is visibly reduced by the wisdom of established plans, and the competition of rival minds. Now the Christian student ought to be free from many of these influences. From conscience, from experience, he ought to distrust his own judgment. As the servant of the Church, charged with this particular duty, and laid under an obligation to acquire certain mental furniture, he ought as scrupulously to comply with every requisition, as if it were the great business of his life—which, indeed, for the time being, it is.

The secret cause of this indisposition to certain parts of academical labour, is too often simple *sloth*. This it is the undoubted duty of the pious student to mortify. He should learn “to endure hardness” in mental, as well as bodily toils. “I find nothing,” said David Brainerd, “more conducive to a life of Christianity, than a diligent, industrious, and faithful improvement of precious time. Let us then faithfully perform that business which is allotted to us by Divine Providence, to the utmost of our bodily strength, and bodily vigour.” And it was remarked by Buchanan, in a letter to the venerable Newton, that although the mathematical studies of the university were little to his taste, and scarcely connected, by any link which he could perceive, with his future labours, yet he diligently pursued them, put a constraint on his natural predilections, and yielded himself to their absorbing abstractions as a part of his Christian *self-denial*. This is an example worthy of every Christian student. The “greatly beloved,” Martyn was influenced by the same motives in those toils which caused him to be designated, while at Cambridge, as “the man who never lost an hour.” It is with pleasure that we hold up the last mentioned servant of Christ, for the imitation of Christian students. To our surprise, we find him treated by some American writers as a man of eminent piety and indefatigable diligence, but as being by no means distinguished for natural endowments and extraordinary genius. Here we must again dissent. It was something more than plodding assiduity which placed him at the head of hundreds in the university, both as a classic and a mathematician. This was no ordinary competition, and with no ordinary men. In all his subsequent labours, compositions, and controversies, we discern the evidences of genius, rare and eminent. We especially deprecate this derogation from his

native talents, because it countenances the cant of idlers in our public institutions, who are disposed to attribute all laborious study to the dull and toiling drudge, and to make diligence incompatible with genius.*

It is a rash judgment for any young man to pronounce any portion of his prescribed course of study to be useless: for no one can determine where his lot is to be cast. If a missionary, he may, at some future time, regret that he cannot, as Martyn once did in the Persian court, defend the true system of the universe; or like our countryman, Mr. Poor in Ceylon, correct the errors of heathen astronomers. Viewed as disciplinary toils, all these pursuits are important, and "in all labour there is profit." It will be too late to regret these neglects, when such acquirements are proved by sad experience to be necessary; and it is plainly the safer course, to gain the knowledge, when the opportunity is afforded, rather than hazard the sorrow and mortification of future days.

The practical error to which we have adverted, in the case of those students who single out favourite subjects, to the neglect of their prescribed employments, is pregnant with evil consequences to themselves and others. The very habit of self-will and self-pleasing, which is thus fostered, is alien to the character of a disciple. It should be laid down as a principle of action by every candidate for the ministry, that his time and his talents are not his own, but belong to Christ and his Church; and in accordance with this, he should avail himself of all the light which shines in the results of long experience. These results are embodied in the ordinary literary and scientific arrangements of our colleges; and while many desire to see the academical curriculum extended, and enriched by the addition of new topics, no sound scholar will

* How different is the judgment of one who knew him well—the Rev. C. J. Hoare. "Mr. Martyn," say he, "combined in himself certain valuable, but distinct qualities, seldom found together in the same individual. The easy triumphs of a rapid genius over first difficulties never left him satisfied with past attainments. His mind, which naturally ranged over a wide field of human knowledge, lost nothing of depth in its expansiveness. He was one of those few persons, whose reasoning faculty does not suffer from their imagination, nor their imagination from their reasoning faculty; both, in him, were fully exercised, and of a very high order. His mathematical acquisitions clearly left him without a rival of his own age; and yet, to have known only the employments of his more free and unfettered moments, would have led to the conclusion, that the classics and poetry were his predominant passion."

consent to curtail it in any of its dimensions. Every young man should labour, during his enjoyment of these privileges, to treasure up such knowledge, and form such habits, as the past experience of the Church has shown to be available towards the defence or propagation of religion. An erratic and imperfect course of study must always end in the same result—shameful ignorance of many things which every minister is expected to know: habits of soft indulgence and dread of mental labour; and a mind undisciplined and unsymmetrical in its actings and growth.

But we must likewise have some respect to the influence of such neglects upon the whole literary community of a college. No where is the youthful believer more like a city set upon a hill, than in our great institutions. No where is he watched with a more lynx-eyed scrutiny, by irreligious companions. Every line of Christian example here rises to importance, and the pious student is bound to be a pattern of regularity, attention, obedience, and diligence, as well as of private piety. When we consider the motives which conspire to urge such an one forward, we might well expect that Christian students should be, as a class, the most distinguished scholars in every college. And were this the case—were it seen that in study, as in all things else, the pious youth is influenced by considerations higher than mere ambition—what a lustre would thereby be reflected upon the profession of godliness, and how greatly would the standard of piety be elevated among the rising generation!

In a number of instances which have come under our observation, candidates for the ministry have neglected certain important branches of learning, under the pretext that they wished to dedicate the time thus gained to the study of theology, or to active labours of religious benevolence. We are constrained to say, that the conscience which approves such a course is strangely unreasonable and unenlightened. *Festina lente* should be sounded in the ears of such precipitate theologians. In a certain sense, the study of theology should employ the whole life of every Christian: that is, he should be engaged in the daily study of the Scriptures, and of instructive and practical works. But the application to the science, *ex professo*, has its proper place at a later period. The wisdom of the Church has decided, that, as a general rule, the two parts of preparation for the ministry should be kept distinct. The college and the theological seminary are not to encroach upon

one another. Such are the arrangements of our colleges, that nothing becomes a subject of instruction which is not necessary; and the aggregate of these subjects is great enough to shut the door, in the case of every conscientious student, against all other employments, except in the brief intervals of leisure, which are little enough to be conceded to devotion, exercise, and recreation. In a well ordered institution, there are no hours left for extraneous pursuits. And if we have already succeeded in showing that no department of science can be neglected without serious loss, it follows that the pretext of studying theology is idle and insufficient.

The time must indeed seem long to many an ardent candidate, before he can enter upon the peculiar and sacred path of his future work. Yet it is never to be forgotten, that we serve our Master as truly by due preparation, as by faithful execution. Our duty is always that which is due *to day*. Labours, like sufferings, are allotted to us day by day; and sufficient to every hour is its own proper employment. Even if, like David, the pious student should never actually begin to build the temple of the Lord, but be cut off by death before he has finished his preparations, he will not fail of his reward; he will be accepted as one who has "had it in his heart" to devote himself to God.

There is no possible advantage in thus anticipating a study which will soon arise in its proper place. In order to pursue it now, much of present duty must be neglected; it must be conducted in the most hasty manner, and under great disadvantages. The greater the interest of the student in these irregular employments, the more flagrant will be his irregularities with regard to college obligations. And, what is most unfortunate, the under-graduate who is betrayed into this path, is apt to make this passing glance at a vast and important subject, a pretext for neglect of it in his subsequent course. If the motive be a wish to proceed more rapidly than the prescribed term of preparation, he is deceived by a fallacy, which has already introduced scores of unfurnished men into the ministry. This haste is inordinate and most injurious. Great as are the necessities of the Church, she asks for those who are "thoroughly furnished." It may be seriously questioned, whether the cause of religion would not gain more by the addition of one or two years to the preparatory course of each individual, than she would lose by this delay in their entrance. She would gain, in the strength, maturity, learn-

ing and wisdom of well disciplined and experienced minds; just as an army would gain by taking recruits from adult men, able to bear fatigue, rather than from beardless youth, whose feebleness might sink under the first labours of the campaign. At the invaluable period of youth, within which a collegiate course falls, one year may be said to be worth any two years of subsequent life, with reference to these particular attainments. The sciences which come under review during this period, if they are now neglected, will be, in all probability, neglected for ever. Let the pious student hearken to the experience of those who have gone before him, and remembering that the duties of the theological student are distinct, and severally important, let him reject every temptation to abridge his present opportunities. The same specious reasoning which leads the under-graduate to employ himself about studies not comprised in the college course, will be sufficient to hurry him through the theological seminary, and perhaps, after a twelvemonth of direct preparation, into the ministry. It is painful to observe the readiness of so many candidates, to content themselves with a bare smattering of science, and to hasten through their appropriate trials, as if they were the merest formalities.

All these remarks apply with full force to the case of those who neglect certain branches of their studies in college, upon the pretext that they are employed in active labours of an evangelical kind. Every thing is beautiful in its season; and this is the season for patient and conscientious preparation. "There is a time to every purpose under heaven: a time to keep silence, and a time to speak;" and we regard the premature engagements of pious students, in teaching and exhortation, to be unseasonable and unrequired, just so far as they detract from the completeness of their academical pursuits. To a certain extent, it may be desirable, for under-graduates in our colleges to employ themselves in Sabbath schools, and other religious efforts; but we have known some who have so far exceeded the limits of duty and propriety, as to make these their principal engagements, and thus to exhibit a deleterious example of irregularity and unscholarlike carelessness.

The ingenuous and conscientious student, may gather from what has been said, the following plain conclusions. *First*, that providence, by placing him among the privileges of a college, has made it his duty to task his utmost vigour in the ac-

quisition of every important subject there taught. *Secondly*, That it is the part of modesty, duty, and wisdom, to confine himself to the circle of attainments, prescribed by the academical corporation. *Thirdly*, That the special and appropriate preparations for the ministry, and the active labours of the same, should not be anticipated at this important period.

The details of the foregoing observations may appear to some of our readers to be unimportant and uninteresting, yet nothing should be so considered which bears directly upon the training of the ministry. The noble resolution of the Assembly's Board of Education, to take on their funds every qualified young man who shall apply to them for aid, will call forth at once an army of youthful candidates. Many of them will be placed in our colleges, and be exposed to the temptations which have been mentioned. Those who are specially charged with their supervision will be the last to consider these suggestions unimportant.

ART. VII.—ARTICLES OF THE SYNOD OF DORT.

The Articles of the Synod of Dort, and its rejection of errors, with the history of events which made way for that Synod, &c. Translated from the Latin, by Thomas Scott, rector of Aston and Sandford, Bucks. Utica, William Williams, Genesee street.

THE history of the Synod of Dort, from which Dr. Scott translated this work, was drawn up by the delegates from South Holland, at the request of the Synod; and when the Acts of the Synod were published by authority, this narrative was prefixed. It was probably written by *Festius Hommius*, who was one of the deputies from South Holland; and a man of great worth and learning; who, from the commencement, had as much to do with this controversy as any other person. No Synod has ever met in the Reformed Churches, the proceedings of which were so important and interesting as that of Dort. It was not merely a national Synod, but received delegates from most of the Reformed Churches in Europe. Those who were about to attend from France, were, for some political reasons, prevented from tak-

ing their seats in the Synod: but from Great Britain, from Germany, and Switzerland, theologians of the highest reputation for learning and piety, were sent, who patiently and laboriously assisted in the discussions and transactions of the Synod, until the business was brought to a close.

Seldom has there been a more truly venerable, orthodox, and learned body of divines. The papers which were read before the Synod, on the five points of controversy, contain a body of sound theology, and solid scriptural argument, which has seldom been exceeded.

The doctrinal articles agreed upon, and established by this Synod, are such as are admitted by all consistent, moderate Calvinists: and when we use the word *moderate*, we do not mean, that any one article of this scriptural system of faith, is obscured or denied; but that they are not pushed to such extreme consequences as they have been by some supralapsarian theologians formerly, and by some who pretend to have improved the Calvinistic scheme, in our own times.

The theologians who composed the Synod of Dort, were not agreed among themselves in every particular. On several points of some importance, the views expressed by the deputies, in the papers read before the Synod, were different; yet this discrepancy, in minor matters, did not in the least interrupt their harmony; and their general articles were so worded as to accord with the sincere belief of every individual; while, if either party had insisted on a perfect conformity in every particular, there could have been no agreement in adopting a creed which they could all subscribe. To give an example of the diversity alluded to, we would mention, *the extent of the atonement*. On this subject, the learned and highly respectable theologians who attended as delegates from the British churches, while they agreed with their brethren from the churches on the continent, on every other point, yet on this explicitly expressed their opinion in favour of a general atonement. Therefore, in drawing up the article on the subject of redemption, care was taken to express the doctrine in terms to which all could subscribe. After speaking of the substitution of Christ, and the vicarious nature of his sacrifice, they say, "This death of the Son of God, is a single and most perfect sacrifice and satisfaction for sins; of infinite value, and price; abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world"—"Moreover, the promise of the gospel is, that whosoever believeth in Christ crucified,

shall not perish, but have everlasting life. Which promise ought to be announced and proposed, promiscuously and indiscriminately, to all nations and men, to whom God in his good pleasure, hath sent the gospel, with the command to repent and believe. But because many who are called by the gospel do not repent nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief, this doth not arise from any defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice offered by Christ on the cross, but from their own fault."

The narrative which Dr. Scott has faithfully translated from the Preface to the Acts of the Synod of Dort, goes back to the origin of those troubles and controversies, which at length induced the STATES GENERAL to call a national Synod; and to invite to it learned theologians from all the Reformed Churches in foreign countries.

The conduct of James Arminius was the primary occasion of all the disturbances which for so many years agitated the churches of Holland. And he has the honour—if it may be so considered—of giving his name to a system of doctrines, which has been received with great favour by a large portion of nominal Christians.

Arminius, a man of cultivated mind and various learning, pursued his theological studies at Geneva; but seems early to have taken up strong prejudices against the rigid opinions of Calvin and Beza, respecting the decrees of God, and some other abstruse subjects. His doubts on these points he communicated to Grynæus his preceptor. After completing his studies, he travelled into Italy as far as Rome; and, on his return to Holland, was called to the pastoral office over one of the principal churches of Amsterdam. Here, in a course of lectures on the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans, he began to broach some of his new doctrines; but being resolutely opposed by the Presbytery with which he was connected, he ceased to inculcate his erroneous opinions any longer in public, but still privately propagated his favourite tenets among his particular friends, and among the pastors of some of the Dutch Reformed Churches. He appears to have been seized with such an itch for novelty, that it was enough to discredit an opinion with him, if it was commonly received. The errors which he embraced were akin to those of Pelagius; or rather, agreed exactly with the system which had been denominated semi-pelagianism. He paved the way for his errors, by depreciating the cha-

racters of such celebrated men as Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, and Martyr; and he was so confident in his own opinions, that he challenged Francis Junius, the most celebrated professor of theology at Leyden, to a conference on the disputed points.

But when, A. D. 1602,—Junius, to the great grief of all the Belgic Churches, was snatched away by death, Arminius was strongly recommended by Utenbogard to the trustees of the University of Leyden, as a suitable person to fill the vacant chair of theology. This proposal, however, gave much uneasiness to the deputies of the churches; for they greatly feared, that if a man whose orthodoxy was so suspicious, should be placed in a situation so important as that of professor of theology at Leyden, the effects would probably be contentions and schisms in the churches; they, therefore, earnestly entreated the curators, that they would not expose the churches to those perils, but would rather think of appointing some other suitable person. And they also admonished Utenbogard, to desist from recommending a person who did not enjoy the confidence of the churches; but he disregarded their admonitions, and did not cease until he had accomplished his object, and Arminius was invited to the vacant theological chair in the University of Leyden. At first, the classis or presbytery of Amsterdam hesitated to dismiss Arminius, lest a man whom they knew to be so fond of innovation by being advanced to be a professor in an institution in which so many youth were trained for the holy ministry, might be the cause of incalculable evils. But the curators of the University, and Utenbogard the special friend of Arminius, pressed their suit with so much earnestness, that, at length, all obstacles were overcome, and it was agreed that he should be translated to Leyden, on condition that he should consent to hold a conference with Francis Gomar, a learned and orthodox professor of theology in the University, in which he should remove from himself all suspicion of heterodoxy, by an explicit declaration of his opinion, on all the principal heads of doctrine; and, also, that he should solemnly promise that if he held any *peculiar* opinions, he would never attempt to propagate them among the students. To all this, Arminius readily consented, and the conference was held in the presence of the trustees of the University, in which he, in the most solemn manner, renounced the errors of Pelagius, respecting grace, freewill, predestination, original sin, perfection in this life, &c. and declared his agreement with Augustin and the

other fathers who had written against Pelagius. He, at the same time, solemnly promised, that he would never inculcate any doctrine different from that received by the churches; upon which he was admitted to the professorship of theology. And in the course of this same year, he laboured to remove from himself all suspicion of heterodoxy, by holding public disputations in favour of the doctrine of the Reformed Churches.

But after Arminius had been established in his office a year or two, he began, both in public and private, to attack the commonly received doctrines of the Reformed Churches, with the same arguments which were used to impugn them, by the Jesuits and Socinians; and it has been ascertained, that he circulated among the students compositions of his own in manuscript, in which he treated contemptuously the characters of Calvin, Beza, Zanehius, and Ursinus; while he extolled the writings of certain authors who were suspected of being inimical to orthodoxy. And he now openly avowed, that he had many animadversions to make on the commonly received doctrines; and his scholars, when they left the University, petulantly insulted the Reformed Churches, by disputing, contradicting, and reviling their doctrine.

When these things were understood, the deputies of both north and south Holland, to whom the care of the churches had been committed, went to Arminius and told him what rumours were every where circulated about him and his doctrines; and entreated him, if he had discovered any thing defective or erroneous in the system received by the churches, that he would sincerely and ingenuously open his mind to his brethren, that there might be an opportunity of removing his difficulties, by a friendly conference, or by carrying the whole affair before a lawful Synod. To which he answered, that he had never given any just cause for these rumours; nor did he deem it expedient to enter into any conference with them, in their official capacity, although he had no objection to confer with them as private pastors, on condition, that if there should be found some difference of opinion between them, no report of their conversations should be made to the Synod. But this the deputies declined, as now calculated to remove the uneasiness which existed in the churches; and so they departed without accomplishing their object; but they learned from the other professors of the University, that since the coming of Arminius, various questions were agitated

with great earnestness among the students, which had not been before.

Being a member of the church of Leyden, he was admonished by two highly distinguished men, who were elders in that church, that he should hold a friendly conference with his colleagues, before the consistory of the church of Leyden, concerning those things which he disapproved in the received doctrine. To which he replied, that he could not consent to that, without permission from the trustees of the University; neither could he see what advantage would accrue from such a conference.

When the time arrived for the annual meeting of the Synods of north and south Holland, a statement of *grievances* was laid before the Synod of south Holland, by the classis of Dordrecht, the purport of which was, "that rumours are heard that certain controversies, concerning the doctrines of the Reformed Churches, have arisen in the University and Church of Leyden, therefore, this classis has judged it necessary to bring the matter before the Synod, that the requisite steps to settle these controversies may be seasonably taken." Arminius was much displeased with this proceeding, and strove with all his power to obtain a recal of the complaint; but failing in this, by the aid of the curators of the University, he obtained a testimonial from his colleagues, in which it was declared, "That more things were disputed among the students than was agreeable to them; but that among the professors of sacred theology themselves, as far as it appeared to them, there was no dissension in fundamentals." The Synod, after mature deliberation, were of opinion, that this spreading evil must be seasonably counteracted; and that the remedy ought not to be procrastinated, under the uncertain hope of a national Synod. They, therefore, directed the deputies to petition the curators, that a mandate might be given to the professors of sacred theology, to declare openly their opinions, on the points disputed among the students, that the churches might be satisfied as to the agreement or disagreement with one another. The Synod also commanded all the pastors, for the sake of testifying their consent in doctrine, to subscribe the Confession and Catechism of the churches, which in many classes had fallen into disuse; and by some had been refused.

The deputies having diligently examined into the state of affairs in the University, exhibited to the curators nine ques-

tions, concerning which they had understood that there were controversies, and requested that the professors of theology might be requested to explain fully, their opinions on these points. But the curators declined a compliance with this request, upon the pretext that there existed a hope that a national Synod would soon be called, and that it was expedient, that the consideration of these points should be reserved for them. And all those pastors who had adopted the opinions of Arminius refused to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Catechism.

The churches were now more alarmed than ever, when they perceived that their pastors, relying on the favour of certain persons of influence, despised the authority of the Synod. They therefore applied to the States General for a national Synod, and were informed that such a measure had been judged expedient by all the States; but that some of them had annexed particular conditions to their resolution relative to the objects which should be presented for the consideration of a national Synod.

The Belgic churches rejoiced greatly, that at length there was a prospect of a national Synod; although they felt some solicitude about the clause in the letters of the States, which provided, that the Confession and Catechism should be brought under revision; for they feared, that this would render those more daring who were endeavouring to make innovations in the doctrines of the Church.

It was also resolved by the States General, that a certain number of distinguished theologians should be selected from the provinces, to whom should be committed the whole business of determining respecting the time, place, and circumstances of the meeting of the national Synod. These men, fifteen in number, resolved by a concurrent vote, that the time of the meeting should be as early as possible, in the next following year, A. D. 1608; and that Utrecht would be the most suitable place; and as to the manner of conducting the business, they agreed, 1. That the grievances should be brought up from the provincial Synods. 2. That from each of the several Synods, four pastors and two elders, should be deputed; in the place of which last, distinguished men not holding any ecclesiastical office might be delegated. 3. That the Synod, thus constituted, should have the power not only of deliberating but of determining, on all matters which might regularly come before them. 4. That the rule of judgment should be

the written Word of God only. 5. That the churches without the limits of the United Provinces, who were united with the Belgic churches by holding the same Confession and Catechism, should also be united to send deputies. 6. That the States General should be requested to send deputies of their own body to preside in the Synod. 7. And finally, that all professors of sacred theology, should be invited to take a seat in the Synod.

In these points they were all agreed, but Arminius and Utenbogard, endeavoured to have other articles introduced, which did not meet the approbation of the majority. The points on which they insisted were, 1. That by the decision of the Synod should be understood, not only the votes of those present, but also of their constituents. 2. That it should be permitted to the deputies to retire, upon any emergency, for the purpose of consulting their friends. 3. That a revision of the Belgic Confession and Catechism was altogether necessary; and that this should be inserted in the letters of convocation. The other pastors were of opinion, that that should be considered the definite judgment of the Synod, which should be determined by a majority of the members; that the deputies might be allowed to withdraw to consult their friends, when they judged it necessary; but that this should not be made a pretext for interrupting the regular course of business; and that, as to the Confession and Catechism, the Synod should possess full power to bring them under revision, if they should judge this to be necessary; and that any of the deputies should have liberty to offer any animadversions on these formularies, which they might think proper; but that to insert a clause of this kind in the letters of convocation, would be likely to give offence to the churches. This dissension in the convention served to throw new obstacles in the way of a national Synod, for they who had hitherto resisted its convocation, seized with avidity on the occasion to hinder its being called.

In this convention, of which both Arminius and Utenbogard were members, they were most earnestly entreated to make a full and free manifestation of their opinions; but they declined doing this, on the ground that the convention had not been called for such a purpose; and that they were only responsible to the States General for the course which they pursued in that body.

The next year the Synod of south Holland, met at Delph, inquired, whether the order to send up remarks on the Con-

fession of Faith and Catechism had been complied with, when it appeared that nothing of this kind had been done; upon which the former injunction was renewed, in more peremptory terms.

It was at this meeting made known to the Synod, that every where in the churches dissensions had increased; and that most of the pupils of Arminius coming from the University of Leyden, when they came before the classis, concealed their true opinions, but as soon as they were introduced to the ministry, moved new disputations, and contended earnestly for their opinions; and openly avowed that they had various objections to make to the received doctrine. And now disputations between pastors in different parts of the country became common; and these contentions were not confined to the pastors, but agitated the people also. The prospect of a national Synod being now distant, for reasons already mentioned, the Synod applied to the States General to permit the two Synods of north and south Holland to unite, and to take cognizance of these matters. But Arminius, dreading to have his cause brought before an Ecclesiastical court, applied to the States General to permit the supreme civil court of the nation, to hear it; and accordingly, both he and his learned colleague Gomar, who also was his antagonist in this controversy, were required to appear before this court; and the persons composing the Ecclesiastical convention, already mentioned, were invited to be present. The deputies of the churches were greatly dissatisfied with this arrangement, and again earnestly entreated that a Synod might be called; as being the proper tribunal before which a cause of this nature should be tried. The *States* answered, that although they had committed the cognizance of the affair to the supreme court, the final decision should be reserved for a provincial or national Synod.

After much altercation between Arminius and Gomar, as to the proper method of proceeding, the conference took place; but the writings which were communicated on both sides, the *States General* ordered to be sealed up, and not made known to any mortal, until the meeting of a national Synod. The churches were therefore more disturbed after this conference had taken place than before; for they were generally of opinion that this concealment was in favour of Arminius, that his true sentiments might not be generally known. In compliance with the urgent entreaties of the deputies of the churches, the States General promised, that a provincial Synod

of north and south Holland should be called in the next October, A. D. 1603, which should be convened for the trial of this cause; but when the time arrived, the convocation of the promised Synod was postponed for two months, and Arminius being exceedingly pressed to bring forth his animadversions on the Confession of Faith, took an opportunity of delivering an oration against the doctrines of the Belgic churches, in the presence of a convention of the States General, in which he inveighed against these doctrines, "as repugnant to the nature of God, his wisdom, justice, and goodness; as inconsistent with the nature of man and his free-will;—with the work of creation—with the nature of life and death eternal—and with the nature of sin;—that they took away the divine grace—were inimical to the glory of God, and pernicious to the salvation of men—took away all pious solicitude—lessened the desire of doing good—extinguished the ardour of prayer—removed salutary fear—made way for desperation—subverted the gospel—hindered the ministry of the word, and finally, subverted, not only the foundation of Christianity, but of all religion."

Gomar having heard this discourse, thought it incumbent on him to answer it, lest the minds of the States General should become prejudiced against the truth. He undertook, therefore, to exhibit the real opinions of Arminius, and to show how egregiously he erred, on several important points; and pointed out the disingenuous methods by which he disseminated his tenets; artfully concealing them in public, and assiduously propagating them in private; showed how industriously he had laboured to enervate the arguments adduced in favour of the truth by orthodox theologians, and how completely he had followed in the steps of the Jesuits and other errorists. He also exposed his insidious policy in seeking pretexts for delaying an impartial examination of his opinions, in order that he might have the opportunity of drawing over a greater number of pastors to his opinions, and of occupying the churches with his adherents. In the close of his discourse, he again earnestly entreated the STATES GENERAL to provide a remedy for the continually increasing evils of the church, by calling as soon as possible the promised national Synod. In which petition, he was joined by the deputies of the churches; but through the influence of Utenbogard and others, the thing was still further deferred. Another thing which increased the solicitude of the churches, was,

that Peter Bertius, the regent of the theological college had evidently declined from orthodoxy to the opinions of Arminius, and pursued the same disingenuous course, in relation to the concealment of his true sentiments.

In consequence of the unhappy state of things, described above, the pastors who were attached to the party of Arminius, became every day more bold, in avowing and disseminating their erroneous tenets; and some of them began to inculcate opinions, which evidently appertained to the systems of Pelagius and Socinus. The deputies, therefore, did not cease to press upon the government the necessity of calling speedily a provincial Synod; but Utenbogard and his associates, to prevent this, and create a still further delay, proposed a conference between Gomar and Arminius before the convention of the States General; each being permitted to call to his aid and counsel four pastors of his own party.

When the parties met, Gomar and his friends made two requisitions: 1. That the conference should be carried on entirely in writing. 2. And that these writings should be afterwards delivered to a national Synod for their judgment. The States General, however, determined that the conference should be in the first place *viva voce*; and that afterwards, the arguments on both sides should be committed to writing and reserved for the consideration of a provincial Synod. Here again, a difficulty arose respecting the order in which the points in dispute should be taken up. Arminius insisted, that the subject of predestination should first be examined; but Gomar thought, that it was more proper first to consider the subject of justification; and this opinion was agreeable to the States General. This subject was then first brought under discussion; next, that of predestination; thirdly, they disputed respecting grace and free-will; and finally, concerning the perseverance of true believers. Arminius, however, declared that he never had opposed the doctrine of perseverance; nor was he now willing to oppose it; since there were testimonies of Scripture in favour of it, which he was not yet able to answer.

Having gone over these points, they were asked whether there were any other subjects of disagreement between them; to which Gomar replied, that there were, and mentioned the doctrine of original sin; of Providence; the authority of the sacred Scriptures; assurance of salvation; the perfection of man in this life, and some others. But the health of Armi-

nus not admitting of a longer continuance of the conference, it was broken off; but Gomar and his friends were assured, that they should have an opportunity of fully discussing these points in a provincial Synod, which was still promised, but still delayed. It was enjoined on the parties respectively that they should commit their arguments to writing within fourteen days, that they might be submitted to the provincial Synod. Gomar had his ready within the time prescribed; but Arminius excused himself on account of declining health; and his disorders of body so increased upon him, that he departed this life, October 19, 1609. As he, in his lifetime, had been the chief occasion of the disturbances in the Church, it was hoped, that at his death they would have ceased; but this hope was not realized; for so many pastors had embraced his opinions, that the evil could not be so easily exterminated. These men at length formed themselves into a body distinct from the other pastors, and prepared and presented to the States General a supplication, which they called *a remonstrance*; whence, afterwards, the whole party were denominated *Remonstrants*. In this paper, they greatly misrepresented the doctrines of the Reformed Churches, concerning predestination and the perseverance of the saints; and so disguised their own errors, by wrapping them up in ambiguous words, that the dangerous tendency of them was, in a great measure, concealed. The particular object of this paper was, to solicit from the government protection against the ecclesiastical censures to which they had exposed themselves.

These proceedings, amounting to open schism, greatly affected the Belgic churches; and when they endeavoured to obtain a copy of the remonstrance, they were unable to accomplish it. And what greatly aggravated their affliction was, the prospect of having Conrad Vorstius, a man strongly suspected of Socinianism, introduced into the chair of theology at Leyden, as successor to Arminius.

In the remonstrance above mentioned, the points in dispute were reduced to five, and the Arminians endeavoured to obtain an order from the government, that no candidate for the ministry should be urged, on his examination, to go further than was expressed in these five articles.

These articles were as follows:—

1. "That God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation on those, who, as he foresaw, would persevere unto the end in their faith in Christ Jesus, and to inflict everlasting

punishment on those who should continue in their unbelief, and resist to the end of life his divine succours.

2. "That Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, made an atonement for the sins of mankind in general, and of every individual in particular; that, however, none but those who believe in him can be partakers of that divine benefit.

3. "That true faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, or from the force and operation of free-will; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable of thinking or doing any thing good; and that, therefore, it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be *regenerated* and renewed by the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ.

4. "That this divine grace or energy of the Holy Ghost, which heals the disorders of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to perfection every thing that can be called good in man; and that, consequently, all good works are to be attributed to God alone, and to the operation of his grace; that, nevertheless, this grace does not force the man to act against his inclination, but may be *resisted* and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner.

5. "That they who are united to Christ by faith, are furnished with abundant strength, and with succours sufficient to enable them to triumph over the seductions of Satan, and the allurements of sin and temptation; but that the question, whether such may fall from their faith, and forfeit, finally, the state of grace, has not yet been resolved with sufficient perspicuity."

Afterwards, however, the Arminians adopted the opinion positively, that the saints might fall from a state of grace. It is easy to see, that in these five articles, as here expressed, the poison of error which lurks underneath a heap of ambiguous words, does not appear in its true character.

It was now determined to hold another conference at the Hague, on the five points; and six distinguished theologians were chosen by each party, who met March 11, 1611. The remonstrants refused to enter into a conference with the other six pastors, as with the deputies of the classes of Holland, lest they should seem to be the adversaries of the churches. When this obstacle was removed, it was agreed that each party should express, in writing, the arguments in favour of his own opinion, and afterwards discuss the points *viva voce*. But before they entered on the conference, the pastors of the

churches produced an answer to the remonstrance, a copy of which they had at length obtained.

Much time was spent in this conference, and when the discussion was brought to a close, the parties were required to express their opinion, how these dissensions could be most effectually healed. The remonstrants answered, that, in their judgment, the only method to promote peace, was to grant mutual toleration, and liberty to each party to teach and inculcate its own opinions. The answer of the pastors was, that the proper remedy was the calling of a national Synod. On this subject, the States General divided, and went to different sides.

After much controversy and many petitions and solemn warnings from various quarters, it was determined, that VORSTIUS should remove from Leyden, where he had taken up his residence, and that SIMON EPISCOPIUS, a leader among the Arminians, should be the successor of Arminius. Before this, GOMAR had resigned his office, and POLYANDER, an able and orthodox theologian, was put in his place.

A. D. 1613. Another attempt was made to promote peace and restore order to the agitated churches. Three men were selected by each party, who should confer together on the best method of bringing about a better state of things. This new effort was made, at the earnest suggestion of the Count of Nassau, who took a deep interest in the concerns of the afflicted and agitated church. He applied to Utenbogard and to Festus Hommius, begging them to consider and inquire whether some practicable method of restoring peace to the church might not be discovered. And as all attempts to change the opinions of the parties by conference or disputation had proved abortive, whether some plan of mutual toleration could not be devised. The remonstrants had continually pleaded for toleration; but it was such a toleration as would virtually nullify the Confession and Catechism of the Belgic churches. The deputies of the churches, therefore, had uniformly resisted their demand; especially, on the ground, that many of the Arminians entertained opinions of a Pelagian or Socinian kind, which were utterly subversive of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel.

Festus, in answer to the applications from the Count of Nassau, declared, that if the remonstrants held nothing more objectionable than what was contained in the five articles published in their remonstrance, that, in his opinion, a plan

of reconciliation and mutual toleration might be agreed upon; but he alleged, that there were other points of difference, and more important than these, which had not been brought forward. And he expressed the opinion, that the only method of establishing such a plan that would be at all satisfactory to the churches, would be by a national or provincial Synod.

When the illustrious the States had heard that such a plan of conference was in contemplation, they highly approved it, and directed that it should immediately be carried into effect. The persons selected on the part of remonstrants were, Utenbogard, Borrius, and Grevenchovius. On the part of the orthodox, Beccius, Bogardus, and Festus Hommius. In this conference, the remonstrants still insisted on unlimited toleration as the only effectual plan of peace; the other pastors considered it necessary to obtain from them a declaration, that they received the fundamental doctrines of the Confession; and they still urged the calling of a national or provincial Synod, as the most regular and only probable plan of quieting the disturbed churches. This conference, therefore, ended as all former ones had done, without any other effect than to increase the uneasiness of the churches, and to render them more suspicious of the designs of the remonstrants. But the Arminians being in favour with the ruling powers of the State, by various artifices, succeeded in obtaining a decree for such a toleration as they had always demanded. As the churches considered this decree as repugnant to the fundamental principles of the Belgic constitution, many of them resisted it, and chose rather to incur the displeasure of the States General, than give their consent to an arbitrary decree on the subject of religion, when the matters contained in it had never been submitted to the judgment of a lawful Synod.

A state of miserable confusion and even persecution now ensued. Many of the orthodox pastors were suspended, and others driven from their charges, because they could not conscientiously receive the remonstrants into the communion of the church.

By these commotions on account of religion, the very pillars of the state were shaken, and things were manifestly approaching a crisis, when James I. King of England, addressed a friendly, but admonitory epistle, to the States General, in which he earnestly recommended the calling of a national Synod, to restore tranquillity and the genuine doctrines of the reformation. This occurred early A. D. 1617.

The same thing was urged, with great earnestness, by MAURICE, the illustrious Prince of Orange, and Governor of confederated Belgium. When the remonstrants saw that their opinions were in danger of being subjected to the judgment of a national Synod, they had recourse to several expedients to prevent it; but proving unsuccessful in these attempts, they began to manifest and encourage, in many places, a spirit of revolt and sedition. But these disturbances only served to show in a more convincing manner, the necessity of calling, with as little delay as possible, a national Synod. Accordingly, a decree was made by the States General, that a national Synod should convene on the first of the next November, and letters were addressed to each of the States of each of the provinces. The method prescribed for the constitution of the national Synod was, that a provincial Synod should meet in each of the provinces, from which six persons should be delegated, and the letters of convocation required that their deputies should be learned and pious men, and greatly loving peace; three or four of the six were required to be pastors; the others, persons well qualified to sit in the general Synod, and examine and remove the existing controversies.

Special and equitable regulations were prescribed for appointing deputies from those classes in which part held with the remonstrants, and a part were opposed to them.

In addition to the letters of convocation addressed to the United Provinces, the States General addressed letters also to James I. King of England; to the Reformed Churches of France; to the Elector Palatine; to the Elector of Brandenburg; to the Landgrave of Hesse; to the four reformed Republics of Helvetia; to the Counts of Correspondentia and Wedevarica; and to the Republics of Geneva, Bremen, and Emben, requesting them to send of their own theologians, excelling in learning, piety, and prudence, to aid the deputies of the Belgic churches to settle the controversies which had arisen, and to restore peace to the same.

All these preparatory steps having been taken, the Synod, according to appointment, convened at Dort, or Dordrecht, on the 13th day of November, A. D. 1618.

Deputies from all the provinces of Holland, and from all the foreign reformed churches which had been invited, attended; except that the theologians of the reformed churches of France were prohibited by the King from attending.

Papers containing elaborate discussions of the five points of controversy, were also sent to the Synod by theologians of eminence, who could not attend, which were read, and inserted in the acts of the Synod.

The theologians who composed the Synod, were among the most learned, pious, and moderate, who ever met in any ecclesiastical council. And that the divine blessing might be obtained on the labours of this venerable body, a day of fasting and prayer was appointed by the government in all the Belgic churches, to deprecate the wrath of God, and to implore his gracious assistance. The Synod being met, and the divine aid and blessing being solemnly invoked, every member bound himself by a sacred oath, THAT HE WOULD TAKE THE HOLY SCRIPTURES ALONE AS THE RULE OF JUDGMENT; AND ENGAGE IN THE EXAMINATION AND DECISION OF THE CAUSE WITH A GOOD AND UPRIGHT CONSCIENCE.

The result of the deliberations of this venerable Synod, may be seen in the translation of the decision to which they came on the five disputed points, as given by Doctor Scott, in the little volume from which we have abridged the above history; and we believe that a knowledge of the facts here stated, may be useful to the American churches at the present time.

But to those who are capable of reading them, we would strongly recommend the perusal of the whole of the acts of this very important Synod, and of all the theological discussions which were read before it; all of which have been printed, and furnish as able a defence of the doctrines of grace, as can be found in any language. And as to the small diversities of opinion which appeared among the theologians of this Synod, they only serve to prove, that while they were firm and zealous in defending the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, they knew how to exercise a tolerant and liberal spirit towards those who differed from them in matters of minor importance.

Dr. Scott, in speaking of the solemn obligation under which the members came to judge of all matters according to the Holy Scriptures alone, gives this testimony: "In fact, I must give it as my opinion at least, that they did fulfil their solemn engagement; and must confess, THAT FEWER THINGS APPEAR TO ME UNSCRIPTURAL IN THESE ARTICLES, THAN IN ALMOST ANY HUMAN COMPOSITION I HAVE READ ON THE SUBJECT."

ART. VIII.—MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOSEPH STIBBS
CHRISTMAS.

Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Stibbs Christmas. By E. Lord. New York, Haven & Leavitt. 12mo. pp. 213. 1831.

THIS is a memorial of a remarkable young servant of Christ, who, to highly respectable talents, added fervent piety, unwearied activity during his short course in the cause of his Master, and those peculiarly attractive and amiable qualities which excite ardent affection, as well as respect, and which rendered his early removal by death, a peculiarly mournful event to those who knew him.

Joseph Stibbs Christmas was born in Georgetown, Beaver county, Pennsylvania, April 10th, 1803. His father was a native of England, who had settled in this country a number of years before. He very early manifested an ardent thirst for knowledge, and an elegant taste in the imitative arts. After passing through the usual preparatory academic course, he entered Washington College, Pennsylvania, in which institution he graduated in 1819; the first honours of his class having been, without hesitation, conferred upon him by the Board of Trustees. In the summer of that year, while a member of college, his mind underwent a happy revolution on the subject of religion. In his own opinion, and that of his friends, he then practically embraced the faith and hope of the Gospel. It was not, however, until the month of May, 1821, that he united himself in full communion with the Church. The account of his religious experience, which he delivered, in writing, to the Church Session, on that occasion, is preserved in this memoir, and affords a pleasing proof, at once, of the intelligence, the candour, and the piety of the writer.

Soon after thus becoming united with the Church, he resolved to devote himself to the work of the ministry; and, with that view, in the autumn of 1821, he entered the Theological Seminary at Princeton. Here he continued nearly three years; and in the course of his connexion with the institution, manifested that piety, talent, love of knowledge, amiable temper, and polished manners, which distinguished him to the end of his course.

Mr. Christmas was licensed to preach the Gospel, by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, in the month of April, 1824, a few days after he had completed his twenty-first year. He immediately received an urgent invitation to visit a Presbyterian Church, which had been recently organized in Montreal, Lower Canada, with which he thought it his duty to comply. After preaching to that flock three or four Sabbaths, he was unanimously called to become its Pastor. This, also, he was prevailed on to accept. And having transferred his relation, as a licentiate, from the Presbytery of Philadelphia to that of New York, he was, by an act of the latter Presbytery, ordained to the work of the ministry, and installed Pastor, in the city of Montreal, August 1st, 1824, when he took his seat as a member of the Presbytery by which he had been set apart to the ministerial office.

In the month of June, 1825, he formed a matrimonial connexion with Miss Louisa Jones, daughter of Mr. Perez Jones, of the city of New York, a young lady who, as the writer of the memoir assures us, "by her piety, intelligence, and wisdom, her meek and affectionate spirit, and the dignity and amiableness of her manners, was singularly well suited to him, and to the station she was called to occupy."

In Montreal he continued to reside, and to labour with indefatigable diligence for about four years. The climate, indeed, was soon found to be too rigorous for his delicate constitution; and the inconveniences and disabilities to which he was subjected by the operation of the ecclesiastical establishment, under the malign influence of which Canada is placed, threw many obstacles in the way of a comfortable discharge of his duty. Nevertheless, amidst infirmity, opposition, and many trials, with zeal, firmness, and perseverance, he held on his way: and God was pleased to crown his labours with a very gratifying degree of success. Early in 1827, his ministry was attended by a powerful revival of religion, as the result of which, about one hundred souls appeared to be savingly benefited, and were added to the communion of his Church. In the autumn of the same year, his ministrations were blessed to the hopeful conversion of about thirty more, residing at St. Andrews, a town about forty-five miles west from Montreal, to which he paid a visit of a few weeks. And near the close of the same year, a renewed religious attention appeared in his own pastoral charge, and about twenty more were added to the communion of the Church.

It is gratifying to find, from this memoir, that amidst all the active labours which were necessarily connected with these revivals of religion, and amidst all the trials of his faith, arising from infirm and frequently interrupted bodily health, and the obstacles thrown in his way by government, and by individual adversaries, he was not only sustained in remarkable constancy and fortitude of mind, and animated, from time to time, with new degrees of zeal and ardour of pursuit; but that he also redeemed time enough to make very sensible progress in the cultivation of his mind, and the enlargement of his knowledge. Besides preparing for the pulpit, he studied daily to improve his acquaintance with the original languages of Scripture; to become more intimately familiar with every part of the English Bible; to extend and mature his acquirements in systematic theology; and to make a liberal use of his pen, composing a number of small works, several of which were subsequently published. This was a noble example. It is deeply to be lamented, that so few occupants of the sacred office, even in early life, seem to take this view of their obligations, or to be inspired with this laudable thirst for knowledge. That pastor who is called upon to address the same people from Sabbath to Sabbath, for a considerable time, who does not, besides making immediate preparation for his public services, take pains to enlarge his stores of knowledge; above all, to become more intimately acquainted with the Bible, and, in some good degree, to keep pace with the progress of literature around him—may be a zealous preacher, may be in some measure useful, and may maintain an ephemeral popularity; but he cannot “feed the people continually with knowledge and with understanding;” he cannot “let his profiting appear unto all;” and he will be apt, by and by, to sink down into a dull, vapid repeater of his own “common places,” and to fall into mental imbecility, for want of that intellectual exercise and aliment which our better part, as well as our corporeal nature, undoubtedly demands.

When Mr. Christmas left Montreal, he seems to have seized upon the occasion, as an epoch in his life, to settle the account of his acquirements while there. He drew up a general statement of what he had attained and done; the books he had read; the works he had written; the departments of knowledge in which he thought he had made some progress, &c.; to which he added, what he called “an esti-

mate of his knowledge and ignorance, together with a plan for future acquisitions." Exercises of this kind are often as useful and as important in intellectual pursuits, as keeping regular books and often balancing his accounts are to the adventurer in mercantile enterprise. They indicate sincerity and earnestness in intellectual culture, a desire to know how the account with ourselves really stands, and a willingness, at once, to profit by our past mistakes, and to make a more faithful use of our time in future. For want of such a settlement and record, many know not *how little* they read, or how great their ignorance: and others are not aware *how much* they have accomplished in a given period, and how great reason they have to be encouraged for the time to come. Order is the soul of business, and intelligent, honest adjustment of order.

Another commendable practice of Mr. Christmas, during his preparation for the Gospel ministry, and in the course of his pastoral life, is worthy of particular notice here. We refer to the unwearied pains which he appears to have taken to attain the *grace* as well as the *gift* of PRAYER. By the *grace* of prayer, we mean that large participation of the spirit of faith, love, humility, and filial confidence, in other words, that genuine taste for intercourse with God, through a Mediator, which renders prayer delightful. By the *gift* of prayer, we understand a *happy talent* of giving utterance to our desires in simple, natural, fluent, happy language, without hesitation, and without impropriety. In short, by the *grace* of prayer, we mean a truly and deeply devout spirit; and by the *gift* of prayer, the power, at all times, of giving expression to our requests with readiness, judgment, and taste. These are not always found *united*. We have known, on the one hand, both private Christians and Ministers, who appeared ardently and even peculiarly pious, whose manner of conducting social prayer was by no means judicious or happy. And, on the other hand, we have been acquainted with a few instances—not many indeed—but with some remarkable instances of those, who, with a very peculiar and impressive talent for leading in prayer, manifested, when nearly approached, very little of the genuine spirit of devotion. Mr. Christmas seems to have possessed *both* in rather an unusual degree. He took more than ordinary pains to cultivate both; by devoting special attention to the subject; by reading the best authors who had treated on it; by making an extended

and minute analysis of the several departments of prayer; by writing much on the subject; by composing many prayers, particularly on special occasions; and by committing to memory large portions of Scripture, which he deemed peculiarly adapted to furnish proper topics and language for this elevated exercise. By these and other allied means, in connexion with an unusual share of devotional spirit, he seems to have become qualified for leading in this part of the public service of the sanctuary, in a deeply solemn, acceptable, and impressive manner.

“It may well be supposed,” says Mr. Lord, “to have been owing, in no small degree, to his having so faithfully studied this subject, and enriched his mind with it, that he excelled so remarkably as he did in public prayer. Highly interesting as his public ministrations were wont to be, generally, no portion of them was more edifying and impressive, or gained more upon the attention of his hearers, than his prayers. They were characterized, not only by variety, copiousness, and fervency, but by a happy method and arrangement, an appropriateness and ease, a singular felicity of expression, a dignity, propriety, and reverence which could hardly fail to be observed by every one. This was evidently a most agreeable exercise to him; and being performed with all the natural ease and sweetness of his voice and manner, it won the attention and sympathy of the hearer, and seemed to abstract him from the world, and carry him, with the speaker, up to the throne of grace.”—pp. 33, 34.

We fully concur with the respected biographer of Mr. Christmas, when he remarks:

“To excel in public prayer is by no means common. How seldom, indeed, is this service performed in such a manner as to fix the attention, and impress the mind of the hearer! How often, on the contrary, do public prayers exhibit almost every species of fault, in regard to the general spirit and manner, the topics introduced, the careless, affected, drawling, or hurried pronunciation, the frequent repetition, and perhaps, irreverent use of the sacred names, the introduction of unusual and inappropriate words, and of highly figurative language and allusions, of long and involved periods, of didactic and controversial matter, of laboured description, hyperbole, and metaphor? How often, instead of a calm and collected state of mind, do we witness haste, effort, and irreverence; and instead of what would be appropriate, a surprising crudeness and flippancy in matter and manner, which would not be tolerated in a sermon, and would be very ill thought of in a closet?”

If any ask, how these evils shall be avoided, and the opposite excellencies attained? We answer, we know of no methods more direct and effectual than those which were adopted by the subject of this memoir. Let that candidate for the holy ministry who desires to excel in public prayer, devote early, habitual, and close attention to the subject. Let him, first of all, and above all, labour to cultivate a devotional spirit, by daily communion with God; by a devout study of the Scriptures; and by a deep and intimate familiarity with the throne of grace in secret. Let him read and think much on the great subject of prayer; not merely on its *duty* and *importance*, but likewise on its *nature*; its constituent *parts*; and the best *sources of aid* for its acceptable performance. Let him often embody, and express on paper his thoughts in relation to these points. Let him carefully peruse the best works, both on the general subject, and on particular branches of it, which he may be able to find. Let him abound in devotional composition; in other words, let him, every week, for a number of years, exercise himself, more or less, in composing prayers, more particularly on special and interesting occasions. Let him labour, by thus putting his devotional thoughts in writing, to acquire a simple, natural, filial, humble, tender mode of addressing the High and Holy One. Let him carefully commit to memory, every day of his life, for the first ten years—and frequently afterwards—select portions of Scripture, the spirit and language of which may appear peculiarly adapted to the exercise of prayer. Let him sacredly avoid all high-flown, rhetorical, quaint, ostentatious modes of expression, in this solemn, elevated service. Let it be his constant aim to have incorporated in his prayers as much as possible of the diction, as well as the spirit, of the word of God; remembering that no language can possibly be more appropriate, more suitable, more touching, and more likely to move and impress than that which is drawn immediately from the sacred oracles. Let him, whenever he is called upon to perform any public devotional service of a peculiar kind, adjust his thoughts for the purpose by careful, devout premeditation. In a word, let him labour, in all the variety of ways, which will readily occur to an active and pious mind, to lay up in store the richest materials to which he can obtain access, and which may help to prepare him for performing this part of his public work, not only with acceptance, but with the deepest impression. And, finally, after

making every other preparation, let him always, as far as opportunity will allow, go from his knees in secret, to meet the public assembly, and to become its mouth to the throne of the heavenly grace.

Let none say, that this is taking too much pains with the subject before us; and that so much study and labour will tend to restrain rather than cherish the aid of the Holy Spirit. This is an utter delusion. Why should preparation for public prayer tend more to restrain or banish the influences of the blessed Spirit, than preparation for public preaching? The truth is, the more thoroughly any man will enter the *whole system* of preparation which has been described, the more richly will he experience the result which the lamented subject of this memoir experienced. The more he will live in the element of prayer—the more its spirit, as well as its diction, will fill his mind—the more ready, pertinent, affectionate and abundant will be the flow of expression as well as of feeling. The more his whole soul will be kindled into those sacred fervours in which light and heat together hold a united and consecrated reign. Does any man restrain the Spirit, by importunately seeking his aid, studying his inspired word, aiming to speak as he speaks, and trying to catch the holy flame which he kindles? Of all the absurdities which inconsideration can admit, surely this is one of the most strange and unreasonable.

We have been told, that the late Dr. Witherspoon, when addressing those who studied theology under his direction, on the subject of conducting public prayer, was accustomed to relate the following anecdote. The Doctor was an early and intimate friend of the celebrated Dr. Gillies, the compiler of the well known work, entitled “Historical Collections,” the object of which was to record the triumphs of divine grace in some of the most remarkable revivals of religion, both in Europe and America. Dr. Witherspoon remarked, that of all men with whom he had ever united in public prayer, Dr. Gillies was decidedly the most able and edifying: that there was in his public prayers, a richness, a variety, an appropriateness, a fervor, an ease, a tenderness, and a scriptural character throughout, which, on the whole, exceeded what he ever heard from any other man. He stated that, on a certain occasion, in the freedom of intercourse with his venerable friend, he asked him by what means he had been so happy as to attain this unusual excellence. Dr. Gil-

lies replied to the following effect:—"I know not that my prayers are entitled to any such commendation as you have thought proper to bestow upon them. But it is certain that I have taken no small pains to prepare myself for that part of my public duty, as well as for preaching. For many years I never wrote a sermon, without writing what I deemed an appropriate prayer, particularly adapted to the subject of the discourse, and to be used in connexion with it."

We are not prepared to recommend precisely this kind of stated preparation for the service in question; but we *are* prepared fully to recommend all the measures in relation to prayer which the subject of this memoir adopted, and those which we have above suggested. In truth, we believe that the chief value of the careful *composition of prayers*, consists, not in the subsequent committing them to memory, and making use of the *ipsissima verba*, in public (though this, to many persons may be entirely advisable); but in the influence which the process of composition will naturally exert, as an intellectual and moral discipline, in habituating the mind to proper arrangement, to suitable matter, and to chaste, simple, and scriptural diction in prayer; and this influence might remain of great value, even if every prayer, in five minutes after being prepared, were committed to the flames.

Among many other characteristics of remarkable excellence in Mr. Christmas, on which we might dwell, did not our prescribed limits forbid, we shall notice only one more, and that is the *ardent love to immortal souls*, and especially to the people of his pastoral charge, which is so strongly impressed upon every record that remains either of his conduct, or his pen. The persevering diligence and zeal with which he laboured for the spiritual benefit of his fellow men; his unwearied efforts, in the midst of febleness and ill health, to spread the knowledge of the Saviour; and the long and affectionate farewell letter with which the volume closes—all evince the ardour of love to souls by which he was continually actuated. And what drudgery would his course have been without this governing affection! His toil had been without sweetness; his privations and sufferings without countervailing enjoyments. But it really seemed to be "his meat and drink" to do good; nay, "he counted not his life dear to him, that he might finish his course with joy, and the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus."

Here lies the great secret of a happy ministry, and one of

the best pledges of a successful one. Let a minister truly and ardently love the souls whom he addresses from day to day; let him take a deep and tender interest in their temporal and eternal welfare; let him desire above all things to be the happy instrument of bearing them onward with him to the heavenly world; and he will be willing to "spend and be spent" in promoting their eternal well being. He will find labours, and even privations, sweet. He will experience an impulse more effectual than a thousand rules can impart in attaining a hallowed and elevated eloquence. He will cheerfully consent to suffer and to die if he may be the means of "winning souls" to Christ. If we were about to give a single comprehensive counsel to one who was just entering on this most delightful of all employments, when pursued from proper motives, we should say to him, "Let LOVE CONSTRAIN YOU; let your WHOLE HEART be in the great work of doing good, and all will be well."

The remainder of Mr. Christmas's course was short and eventful. He left Montreal in the summer of 1828, with some faint hope of regaining his health, and of continuing his pastoral labours in that city. Finding, however, after a few weeks, that relaxation and travelling failed of restoring his strength, he solicited a dissolution of his pastoral relation, to which the people of his charge reluctantly consented; and his connexion with them was dissolved, by the Presbytery of New York, in the month of October following.

In December, of the same year, he prepared for a voyage as chaplain of one of the ships of the United States, which he hoped might prove beneficial to his health; but finding that the ship was not likely to sail so soon as he had expected, and as was thought his health urgently required, he gave up that engagement, and, early in January, 1829, went to New Orleans, as an agent for the American Bible Society. The climate of that place, however, proving unfavourable to his health, and being unable to engage in any active service in pursuance of his mission, he soon returned to New York, where he had left his wife and two children. In a few days after his return, both his children were removed by death; and in August following, Mrs. Christmas, whose health had been, for several months declining, sank under the pressure of a rapid pulmonary consumption, and in the exercise of a joyful hope, fell asleep in Christ. She appears to have been an excellent woman.

To a mind of such peculiar sensibility as that of Mr. C., these repeated and sore bereavements were, of course, heavy indeed. But, though afflicted, he was not forsaken. Though "cast down, he was not destroyed." Sustained by his Master's grace, and feeling as if his own tenure of life was peculiarly frail, (soon, alas, realized) he seems to have cast about at once for some suitable sphere, in which he might make the most of what remained of life for his Master's glory.

In the following October, he accepted the unanimous call of the Bowery Presbyterian Church in the city of New York, to be its pastor; and was installed on the 14th of that month. Here, for a short time, his indefatigable labours were highly acceptable, and decisively blessed to the spiritual benefit of numbers. But in the midst of usefulness, and when sanguine hopes were entertained that his health might be restored to more than its wonted firmness, he was unexpectedly called, after a short illness, in the month of March, 1830, in the 27th year of his age, to follow his beloved companion, and their children, to a better world. Thus, in less than twelve months, in the mysterious providence of God, this whole interesting family, his two children, his wife, and himself were in rapid succession translated to that blessed society, where sin and suffering are alike unknown.

The last illness of this lamented young minister, was violent and rapid. Neither he nor his friends were at all aware of the approaching event, until within a very few hours of its occurrence. In this short season, however, he was enabled to feel and exemplify, in the most unequivocal manner, the preciousness of "a good hope through grace" in a dying hour; and to give such testimonies in favour of the glorious gospel which he had preached, as will never be forgotten by those who witnessed them.

We should be glad to transcribe, with expressions of affectionate concurrence, many of the general statements and remarks with which Mr. Lord closes the memoir before us: but the space to which we are confined forbids it.

The compiler of this biographical sketch has subjoined to the memoir a sermon on "Christian Intercession," written while Mr. C. was a student in the Theological Seminary at Princeton—a "Discourse on the nature of that Inability which prevents the sinner from embracing the Gospel"—and the "Farewell Letter which he wrote to the American Presbyterian Society of Montreal." All these compositions furnish

honourable testimonials of the piety and talents of their author. With some of the *theology*, however, of the "Discourse on Inability," we are not able to concur. To pass over some common-place remarks on the much vexed question of "natural and moral ability," into the discussion of which we have no desire, at present, to enter, we were greatly surprised to see, from the pen of Mr. C. the following remarks:

"If men possess natural ability to do and to be all that God requires, it follows *that they are not passive in regeneration*. The common opinion, that depravity consists in a depraved heart, existing anterior to depraved feeling; that it is a constitutional and *physical* depravity independent of our will; and that regeneration, which remedies it, is a miraculous creation of a new nature, from which holy feelings spring; the production of a *new faculty*, which the sinner never possessed before; and the infusion of a new principle, which must be possessed in order to render him capable of holy feelings, is inconsistent with man's natural ability to do all that God requires; or, shall we not rather say, that the doctrine of man's natural ability is subversive of such an idea of his passivity in regeneration. God commands men to make them new hearts, and a new spirit. He makes it their duty to be regenerate. And men have natural ability to do and to be all that God commands. But if regeneration be the creation of a new *physical faculty*, an operation in which man is passive, he has no ability to be regenerate. Nay, if God requires that of us in which we are *passive*, he requires *nothing* of us. He requires that we should be *acted upon*, not that we should *act*," &c. &c.

On this passage, taken in connexion with some of the sentiments which precede and follow it, we have three remarks to offer. We offer them with the most unfeigned respect for the memory of the beloved and lamented youth whose opinions we are constrained to question. But while we shed a paternal tear over the early grave, and the blighted promises of "a choice young man and a goodly," fidelity to his Master and ours compels us to be faithful in maintaining what we deem truth in relation to an important point in Christian theology. In truth, the more excellent, and the more worthy of admiration and love his character was, the more likely will be any erroneous opinion which he may have patronized to exert a baneful influence.

The *first* remark we have to make is, that the opinion here opposed is not fairly stated. Nothing is more certain than that the amiable author *intended* to state it fairly and correct-

ly; but it is quite as certain that he has not done so. The opinion which he professes to oppose, he says, is "the common opinion," that is, the opinion commonly entertained by writers esteemed orthodox, or Calvinistic, according to the old nomenclature. Now, we are constrained to say, that, in all our reading or hearing, we never met with a theologian who maintained that the change which occurs in regeneration was a "physical" change, or consisted in the "creation of a new physical faculty." On the contrary, we have scarcely ever read or heard a formal discussion of this great subject, either in the pulpit, or from the press, in which it was not maintained, that it consists, *not* in the creation of a new faculty; but in giving a new impulse and direction to our old faculties. Not in infusing into the soul any new power; but, by a divine moral influence, producing a new disposition or tendency in the soul, disposing the man to make a proper use of his old powers—to choose and love the most worthy objects. How it happens that a disclaimer so explicitly and constantly made, and so frequently repeated, should be either so entirely overlooked, or so strangely misapprehended, we cannot pretend to explain. No one entertains the opinion which Mr. C. professes to reject, at least in the form in which he states it.

Our *second* remark is, that we regret to observe the use which is made in this sermon of the doctrine of the venerable President Edwards, as exhibited in his Essay on the Will. There is no writer in the English language who has more clearly, strongly, and abundantly maintained the doctrine which Mr. C. here opposes, than President Edwards. If there be any theological writer who has placed beyond all doubt, by the most explicit declarations, and the most formal reasonings, that he believes in the existence of a *disposition, tendency, or propensity* of soul, anterior to moral acts—and leading to them—it is the illustrious Edwards. In his work on the Will, above referred to, and in that on Original Sin, if any opinion is taught, *this* is taught. Mr. C. indeed, has not directly asserted in this discourse, that President Edwards did not hold this opinion; but he has quoted from him, with approbation, a doctrine so closely and necessarily allied to that which he (Mr. C.) has rejected, that his readers will be apt to suppose that he considers himself as agreeing with the venerable man whom he so respectfully cites, in reference to the whole subject. We have felt the more willing to offer this remark from having observed, that in several recent pub

lications, and by men of no mean powers, President Edwards is confidently cited as maintaining that there is, and can be, no moral character in any thing but voluntary exercises! If that great man has not taught a doctrine *directly opposite to this*, as clearly and decisively as it can be expressed in words, then we despair of being able to prove that he ever taught any doctrine whatever.

Our *third* and *last* remark is, that there must, surely, have been some misapprehension in the mind of Mr. C. respecting the common meaning of terms, or he could not have expressed himself as he does in the sermon under consideration, in maintaining that man is *active* in the production of his own new nature. There must be either a strife about words, or a serious error here. While Mr. C. contends, as we have seen, that man is not passive, but active in his own regeneration, he grants, at the same time, that a new heart is *God's gift*. That man is naturally unwilling to serve God; but that the Spirit of God *makes him willing*; and that when he thus removes his obstinacy, and makes him willing to love, repent, and believe, he is said in Scripture, to *give* him love, repentance and faith. Now, the question is not, whether man is *active* when he really *exercises* repentance, faith and love. These are *acts* of the soul; and surely no one will maintain that the soul is *passive* in *acting*. But the question is *this*: Is it the power of the Holy Spirit which, in all cases, leads, prompts, disposes the impenitent sinner to repent and love God? Does this power or influence of the Spirit on the mind always *go before* the first holy act or choice? Do this power and the consequent act stand in the relation of cause and effect to each other? If so, then this operation of the Holy Spirit always *precedes*, and efficiently *causes*, the first holy act in man. Of course the sinner is not active, in any holy sense, anterior to this first act; and, consequently, he is the *subject* of a gracious operation; in other words, is *acted upon* by the Spirit of God, anterior to his first act of holy choice. Now, these acts of the Holy Spirit are not the acts of the man, but *cause his first acts*. In these previous acts of the Spirit, then, is the sinner active or passive? We doubt not that the moment spiritual life is imparted, he begins to put forth holy acts. But is he active in those divine acts of the Great Sanctifier, which, by the concession of our opponents, must necessarily, at least in the order of nature if not of time, precede his own first holy acts? Now this divine,

efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit on the soul, exciting and disposing to holy acts, is what we, and all of the old Orthodox divines, call regeneration. Conversion, consequent upon it, is man's own act. But to suppose that man is active in the first production of his own spiritual life, is, we must believe, *either* in the first rank of absurdities, or a virtual adoption of the Arminian doctrine of the self-determining power of the will—a doctrine which we do not believe Mr. C. adopted; but which we cannot, for a moment doubt, is really the basis of some old, but newly vamped and circulated opinions, which we are aware have a plausible appearance in view of many, but which, we trust, will have only a confined and transient popularity in our country.

ART. IX.—GIBBS'S MANUAL LEXICON.

A Manual Hebrew and English Lexicon, including the biblical Chaldee. Designed particularly for beginners. By Josiah W. Gibbs, A. M. Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological School in Yale College. Second edition, revised and enlarged. New Haven. Hezekiah Howe. 1832. 236 pp. 8vo.

WE are heartily in favour both of manual lexicons and manual grammars, as preliminary and auxiliary to more copious works of reference. The extreme opinions upon this point will, we trust, be soon exploded, if they have not been already, by the publication of a few such books as this. Even adepts and proficient may congratulate themselves on seeing scholars like Professor Gibbs employed in this way. For ourselves, we must confess, that we are glad, now and then, to escape from the leviathans of lexicography. If there is a mental exercise which may be called laborious, it is that of threading the inextricable mazes of a first rate lexicon. After literally sweating through a few such articles as those of Wahl upon the Greek prepositions, or almost any in Barker's New Thesaurus, in quest of something which we never find, it is truly refreshing to escape into the columns of a work containing a mere statement of *results*. In the one case, we are treading the wine press of philology; in the

other, we are quaffing the pure juice of the grape. But this is a matter of mere taste and feeling. To beginners, works of this sort are not only useful, but, in our opinion, necessary. The use of books in one stage of study, which are properly adapted to another, is not merely inconvenient; it is positively hurtful. As to grammars, we shall here say nothing. With respect to lexicons, the case seems very clear. If the student dives at once into the depths of a detailed and laborious analysis, his first impressions will be false impressions. What is clear and what is not clear will be equally mysterious. The parade of authorities and arguments on points both small and great, will lead him to suspect a difficulty every where. If, on the contrary, he enters upon study with the aid of a vocabulary, in the proper sense, he will learn to distinguish between light and darkness. What is simple and easy he will look upon as such, and where difficulties do arise, necessity will drive him to the proper source of more explicit information. This we believe to be the natural and salutary^r process, which, if steadily pursued, would exterminate that misty and perplexed mode of study which is staying the chariot wheels of biblical philology.

But we must not, in discoursing upon manuals in general, forget Professor Gibbs in particular. The volume before us is a neat and accurate reprint of a work already too well known to need description. A circulation of three years among students of theology and others, has no doubt brought its merits to a decisive test. As we have not the original edition at hand, we are unable to determine, by comparison, the actual amount of the improvements promised in the title-page. We can say, however, and we do say freely, that Professor Gibbs, here, as elsewhere, shows himself to be possessed of high qualifications as a lexicographer. It is true, the work before us is intended for beginners; but so far is this from impairing the proof of the compiler's skill, that it really enhances it; not only because it is harder to write for beginners than proficients, but because defects and errors are more glaring and offensive where results alone are given, than when allowed to lurk amidst the multiplied details of a *Thesaurus*. This unassuming volume certainly shows traces of that peculiar tact, precision, and acuteness, without which the richest materials and most untiring industry could only generate a shapeless mass of unprofitable erudition. On Professor Gibbs's philological taste and judgment, we have much reli-

ance, and wherever he appears to have trusted them himself, there is little to desire. The only exceptions to our general commendations owe their existence to an undue deference for every high, yet fallible authority. "In this work," says the author in his preface, "I have adhered to the philological principles of Gesenius. Only in a few instances have I found it necessary to dissent from his opinion." The adhesion, however, is extended to particulars which can hardly be referred to philological principles, and upon one of these we make bold to animadvert. We mean what is called the alphabetical arrangement, as contradistinguished from the radical arrangement of the older lexicographers. In a case where the fresh-water current of authority sets so strong against us, we shall endeavour to avoid the imputation of presumption, by using the interrogatory form of speech. We ask, then, whether it has ever been proved, by experiment or logic, that this change is for the better? And is not the reason which is commonly assigned, to say the least, a very strange one—its *convenience* to the student? Is it not a convenience which aids him for a week or two, and thenceforth only serves to aggravate his difficulties? Would not the same reason justify the use of "skeleton grammars," verbal translations, and Hamiltonian quackeries? Are they not convenient? Do not they save time? If time is wasted in finding the root of a word, is it not wasted in finding the word itself? Does not the convenience here consist in precluding the necessity of independent effort? And if so, is not the evil supposed to be remedied, a real benefit? Will not the depth and precision of any man's acquaintance with any language be proportioned to his knowledge of its radical structure and modes of derivation? Is it not true, as a general fact, that Greek is more thoroughly studied in our schools than Latin, though a greater surface may be covered in the latter? And is it not because the genealogy of words is more clearly exhibited in Greek grammars and lexicons, and in the prevailing mode of instruction, as well as more obvious in the language itself? Will not any scholar who has made extensive use of works like that of Scapula, admit that the mental exercise attending that use, and the view which it affords of the multiform relations of that most majestic language, abundantly compensate for any inconvenience in consulting it? Will not any teacher who has made the experiment, acknowledge that a great change may be wrought upon a pupil by increased attention

to this mode of study? And can this mode be used with full success, without the synoptical view afforded by the radical arrangement? And if this is true of Greek, where the endless variety of compound forms makes the use of such a lexicon unquestionably troublesome, is it not true of Hebrew, in which a compound is an anomaly, and of which one grand characteristic is its uniform and systematic modes of derivation? How is it with the cognate tongues? Would any but a very superficial orientalist hesitate to choose between Golius and Meninski?* Moreover, does not the use of the old fashioned lexicon enable a student to use any other sort, while an exclusive use of the promiscuous arrangement almost unfits him for consulting any other? Now, if these things are so, can they all be set aside by Gesenius's authority? Is it perfectly clear that he adopted the promiscuous arrangement upon philological principle? May not another explanation be, at least, imagined? May it not possibly be part and parcel of his darling plan to divest Hebrew learning of a scholastic aspect, and to place it on a footing of genteel equality with what we palaeologists are wont, in our simplicity, to call profane literature? Is there not evidence of his desire to do away the old monastic notion of a *Lingua Sacrosancta*, and to place the study of this ancient tongue precisely on a par with that of German or Italian? And if so, are we bound to follow him in violating the genius of the language, and discouraging sound scholarship, in order to aid him in demolishing a prejudice which may have been excessive, but was never vicious, and is only disagreeable to him because it favours feelings which he laughs at, and a creed which he abhors?

We drop the person of the catechist to say, that we hope to see the time when every Greek and Latin lexicon intended for our schools shall, at least, be furnished with a systematic index, exhibiting the words in a radical arrangement, and when every Hebrew lexicon, both small and great, shall be

* As Meninski's famous *Thesaurus Linguarum Orientalium* was one chief means of giving currency to this unlucky change in Oriental lexicography, we copy here the very just remark of a late French writer. "On sait," says he, with reference to Meninski, "on sait, qu'il écrivait pour ceux qui se dévouent à la carrière qu'il avait parcourue avec tant de succès, ou pour ceux qui, pressés d'acquiescer une connaissance usuelle des langues de l'Orient, n'ont qu'un léger intérêt pour la connaissance de la haute littérature." (*Biographie Universelle*. Vol. xxviii. p. 308. Paris. 1821.) We have no doubt that this was the design of that most laborious work; but we have yet to learn that such is the design of our Greek and Hebrew lexicons.

constructed wholly on that principle. Not that we wish to see the old pedantic usage of reducing all derivations to a single and invariable rule, brought back. On that point, we have no doubt that Gesenius is right. He has clearly shown that no one part of speech can be regarded as the universal root-house of the language; and if he had been contented with reforming lexicography just so far as this principle would lead him, he would certainly have done philology a great and unmixed favour. We would discard all forced deductions and fictitious roots, and exhibit primitives as primitives, derivatives as derivatives, whether verbs, nouns, or participles, without adopting the exclusive theories of Buxtorf on the one hand, or of Lee upon the other. Because the older writer pushes the radical arrangement to extremes; Gesenius has dismissed it altogether. We are for reverting to the *juste milieu* which both have rashly passed. It may be asked, whether we wish to see all dictionaries of the modern languages constructed in this manner? We answer, that whoever wishes to acquire a critical acquaintance with a language, not merely as a means to some ulterior end, but in order to investigate its own peculiarities, must, from some point or other, view the language in this systematic light. It is plain, however, that, with scarcely an exception, the modern languages are learned for other purposes. For cursory reading or colloquial intercourse, analytical research into the forms of speech is needless. If this were the maximum of Hebrew learning which the state of things among us calls for, there can be no doubt that the promiscuous arrangement would be altogether preferable. But so long as it is thought expedient to fathom the darkest depths of etymology, and to weigh the very dust and straws of criticism, in order to discover the mind of the Spirit, just so long ought the slightest tendency towards superficial study to be checked and censured. And though the point to which these observations are directed, may be thought a very trivial one, *principiis obsta* will be found a useful maxim even here.

There is yet another matter, in regard to which we should have been glad to see Professor Gibbs more free from foreign influence. The writings of Gesenius which have furnished his materials, not only do not recognise the inspiration of the Scriptures, but contain statements which either explicitly impugn that doctrine, or are wholly inconsistent with it. These last are, of course, rejected in the work before us. But we

are sorry to see the negative errors, the defects, of the original, left in *statu quo*. We are sorry, not because the few omissions sensibly detract from the practical utility of this little volume, or render it pernicious; but because it sets the author's sentiments on some important points in a questionable light, or rather darkness. We shall not go into a discussion of the principles involved, nor inquire how far Professor Gibbs's views are variant from our own. We need scarcely state it as our doctrine, that if Christianity is the religion of both Testaments, there must be Hebrew words and phrases which imply their identity in this respect; that if the testimony of Jesus is indeed the spirit of prophecy, if Moses and the Psalmists did indeed write of him, it is inconceivable that every word in the Old Testament can be fully explained without a syllable of reference to him, or what he taught. This we maintain upon "philological principle." Lexicographers acknowledge themselves bound to resort to every method of eliciting the true sense and the full sense of the language. Hence the appeal to analogy, to contexts, to the *usus loquendi*, and to critical authority. Now in carrying out this principle, we think it not unreasonable to allow the Saviour and inspired apostles, at least as high a place, among interpreters of Scripture, as the Talmudists and Rabbins. Maintaining, as we do, upon divine authority, that Christ was not unknown to the believing "elders," but that all who of old were justified, were justified by faith, we cannot suppose that he is never mentioned in the very record upon which their faith was founded, or only mentioned ἐν ἀνιγματι. We do not say that Professor Gibbs maintains this, but we do say that he has not made the contrary apparent, and has let slip opportunities of stating his dissent upon this point from Gesenius. We have as yet seen nothing in his Manual to which that very learned infidel might not subscribe. The most conscientious Jew might use it without scruple. Now this is what we stumble at. It is not because Professor Gibbs thinks thus or thus, that we are startled, but because he thinks precisely as Gesenius does, so far as we can discover what he thinks at all. We do not mean, of course, that he goes as far, but that he goes no further. He has nothing to add, though he finds much to reject. Now it is so very rare for two accomplished critics to agree in all points of interpretation, even when in doctrine they are only not unanimous, that we cannot but marvel at this coincidence of judgment between a Trinitarian and a German

Deist. Be it remembered, that we now refer simply to what appears upon the face of the record. It may be, that Professor Gibbs has reached the same conclusions by legitimate deduction. It may be, that he believes on philological principle, that SPIRIT OF GOD was never meant to convey to the pious Jew the remotest intimation of any thing more than "the life-giving breath or power of God in men and animals, which moved over the chaos at the creation, and operates through the universe, and produces whatever is noble and good in man, by making him wise, and leading him to virtue, and by guiding him generally; but that it is especially applied to extraordinary powers and gifts." (Manual, p. 200.) It may be that his own researches have convinced him that SON OF GOD is only applied "to angels or inferior gods," or "to servants and worshippers of God," "to kings and magistrates," as such, (p. 12) for this is no new doctrine. It may be, that, aside from all example and authority, he thinks it proper to explain the word *Messiah* without even hinting at the coincidence between that term and *Christ*, and indeed to exclude from his volume all allusions to the existence of a later and a better dispensation. All this, we say, may be the fair result of personal inquiry, and as such it calls for refutation, not for censure or complaint. But what surprises us is the appearance of uniform agreement with Gesenius, and the fact that some of the definitions upon these important points are taken unaltered from articles, the object of which is to explain away the inspiration of the Scriptures and the truths of revelation. Can the detached parts of a rotten system be so uniformly sound? We have not forgotten, in the course of our remarks, that sentence of the preface, which informs the reader, that "the plan of this work excludes all supposititious meanings resting only on inference and analogy." This explanation might have satisfied us, had we not perceived that some meanings are excluded as "supposititious," which to us seem direct and as clear as noon-day, while others are inserted which are not even founded upon inference and analogy, but rest on mere conjecture. The only reason that we can assign for the distinction is, that Gesenius rejects the former and admits the latter. *His* inconsistency can be explained on other principles than those of mere philology. Of the omission, we have already given specimens. Of the unauthorized insertions (unauthorized, we mean, by the rule laid down in the preface) an instance may be found upon the last page of the

book. SHIPS OF TARSHISH, literally means ships either bound or belonging to Tarshish. We are told, however, that the phrase denotes "large merchant ships bound on long voyages (perhaps distinguished by their construction from the common Phœnician ships) even though they were sent to other countries than Tarshish." Is this self-evident? It is worth while just to trace the operation of the principle in this case, and the more as it has no bearing upon controverted doctrines. Professor Gibbs's definition we have given above, and are entitled to conclude, on the strength of his assertion in the preface, that it rests on other grounds than those of inference and analogy. On turning to Gesenius, we find this significant expression in a parenthesis, "wie Indienfahrer oder Grönlandsfahrer in der heutigen Schifffersprache." What is this but analogy, remote analogy? We also read that this interpretation, so familiar to Gesenius, was wholly unknown to the author of the Chronicles! What is this but conjecture, sheer conjecture? Is the conjecture of Gesenius to outweigh the authority of Christ and his apostles? Is the analogy of modern sea-slang a safer guide than the ANALOGY OF FAITH? We do not dispute the ingenuity or truth of this interpretation, nor object to the means by which it has been reached. But if there may be deflexions from a philological principle, why not deflect upon the side of truth as well as that of falsehood? Why should Gesenius and Professor Gibbs, at variance as they are in theological opinion, break their own rules in perpetual unison?

These things are individually slight, but they have a tendency—remote it may be, yet direct—towards the fatal error of believing, not because a thing is true, but because it is asserted, and of suffering the acknowledged merits of a school or system to protect its vices. All that we ask is, that this hackneyed charge against the use of creeds and articles, may be applied, with even-handed justice, to philological principles and modes of exegesis. Let every Christian scholar ask and answer for himself, whether the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Assembly were not quite as trustworthy as the Ordo Theologicus of Goettingen or Halle; whether Augustine and Calvin ought not to have as fair play as Eichhorn and Gesenius; and whether, if after abjuring all idolatrous dependence upon fathers and reformers, we should fill their empty niches with the rationalists, and pyrrhonists, and pantheists,

of Germany, our last state might not *possibly* be worse than the first.

We need scarcely add, that our remarks derive whatever weight they may possess, from their applicability to future works, of which we look for more than one from the same authoritative quarter. There is one thing which we wish to see Professor Gibbs at work upon—an original and independent lexicon, upon the larger scale. Original, we mean, in reference to matters, upon which he is as competent to legislate as Gesenius himself; independent, as to form, plan, manner, and disputed points. The public would be glad to hear such scholars speaking in their own voice, and uniting firm consistency of doctrinal belief with a becoming deference for critical authority. We do neither say nor think that these are not united in Professor Gibbs; but we do say that the fact is not apparent in his writings. We are therefore the more impatient for a work which shall distinctly tell us what so competent a judge does, or does not, himself believe. We wish it for the sake of his testimony in behalf of truth, and for the sake of those whose first impressions, as to some important principles of biblical philology, may be derived from him.

The work before us we can honestly commend, both to students and to scholars. To the former it is almost indispensable; to the latter it must needs be very welcome. Aside from the faults which we have shown it to have in common with its celebrated model, the one merely formal, the other merely negative, and affecting scarcely half a dozen articles, the plan is a good one and admirably executed. This, we believe, is the first specimen of Hebrew printing from the New Haven press. May the streams of this fountain be perennial, copious, and, above all, pure!

ART. X.—THE NEW DIVINITY TRIED.

Review of "The New Divinity Tried;" or, An Examination of the Rev. Mr. Rand's Strictures on a Sermon delivered by the Rev. C. J. Finney, on making a new Heart. Boston. Pierce & Butler, 1832. pp. 44.

WE learn from this pamphlet, that the Rev. Mr. Finney delivered, sometime last autumn, a sermon on making a new heart, founded on Ezek. xviii. 13. The Rev. Mr. Rand, being one of his auditors, took notes of the discourse, which he published, attended with a series of strictures, in a periodical work of which he is the editor. As these notes, in the judgment of Mr. Finney's friends, presented an imperfect view of his sermon, one of their number obtained the outline used by the preacher himself, and sent the requisite corrections to Mr. Rand, who availed himself of the aid thus afforded. The notes and strictures were afterwards published in a pamphlet form under the title, "The New Divinity Tried." It is the review of this pamphlet, by an anonymous writer, of which we propose to give a short notice.

We are not prepared to justify the course pursued by Mr. Rand, in thus bringing Mr. Finney before the public without his knowledge or consent. The considerations which evince the general impropriety of such a step are obvious, and are forcibly stated in the Review. That there may be cases in which the evil produced by a popular preacher constantly presenting erroneous views in his discourses, is so serious, that the usual etiquette of literary proceedings should be sacrificed in order to counteract its influence, we do not doubt. Nor do we question that Mr. Rand felt the present to be such a case. As the publication has not only been made, but noticed by the friends and advocates of Mr. Finney, there can be no impropriety in our calling the attention of our readers, for a few moments, to the contents of this Review. It is an elaborate production, distinguished both by acuteness and research, and pervaded by a tone of moderation. These are its favourable characteristics. On the other hand, it is lamentably deficient in open, manly discussion. Instead of a clear and bold statement of the distinguishing principles of the New Divinity, and a frank avowal of dissent from the Old Divinity of New Eng-

land, there is an anxious attorney-like mincing of matters; a claiming to agree with every body, and an endeavour to cast off his opponent into the position of the solitary dissentient, and overwhelm him with the authority of great names. The evidence on which this judgment is found will appear in what follows, of its correctness the reader must judge.

We gather from the review itself, (for we have in vain endeavour to obtain, in season, a copy of Mr. Rand's pamphlet) that the leading objections to the New Divinity are those which have been urged from various quarters against some of the doctrines of the Christian Spectator. Indeed, the reviewer, to show that Mr. Rand was not obliged to publish the notes of an extemporaneous discourse, in order to bring the opinions which it advocated, before the public, tells us the doctrines of the sermon are those which have been repeatedly presented in the Spectator, and elsewhere. We need therefore be at no loss for the distinguishing features of the New Divinity. It starts with the assumption that morality can only be predicated of voluntary exercises; that all holiness and sin consist in acts of choice or preference. When this principle is said to be one of the radical views of the New Divinity, neither Mr. Rand nor any one else can mean to represent the opinion itself as a novelty. It is, on all hands, acknowledged to be centuries old. The novelty consists in its being held by men professing to be Calvinists, and in its being traced out by them to very nearly the same results as those which the uniform opponents of Calvinism have derived from it. Thus Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, presents it as the grand objection to the doctrines of original sin, and original righteousness; and in defending these doctrines President Edwards laboriously argues against this opinion. Yet it is in behalf of this radical view of the new system, that the authority of Edwards, Bellamy, Witherspoon, Dwight, Griffin, Woods, as well as Augustine and Calvin, is quoted and arrayed against Mr. Rand. Almost every one of these writers not only disclaims the opinion thus ascribed to them, but endeavours to refute it. Thus President Edwards, after stating Dr. Taylor's great objection to the doctrine of original sin to be, "that moral virtue, in its very nature, implieth the choice and consent of the moral agent," and quoting from him the declaration, "To say that God not only endowed Adam with a capacity of being righteous, but, moreover, that righteousness and true holiness were created with him, or wrought into his nature, at the

same time he was made, is to affirm a contradiction, or what is inconsistent with the very nature of righteousness," goes on to remark, "with respect to this, I would observe, that it consists in a notion of virtue quite inconsistent with the nature of things and the common notions of mankind." That it is thus inconsistent with the nature of things, he proceeds to prove. In the course of this proof we find such assertions as the following: "The act of choosing what is good is no further virtuous, than it proceeds from a good principle, or virtuous disposition of mind. Which supposes that a virtuous disposition of mind may be before a virtuous act of choice, and that, therefore, it is not necessary there should first be thought, reflection, and choice, before there can be any virtuous disposition." "There is no necessity that all virtuous dispositions or affections should be the effect of choice. And so, no such supposed necessity can be a good objection against such a disposition being natural, or from a kind of instinct, implanted in the mind at its creation."* Again, p. 409, in showing Dr. Taylor's inconsistency, he says, "If Adam must *choose* to be righteous before he was righteous," then Dr. Taylor's scheme involves a contradiction, &c. A mode of expression which clearly shows the position against which he argues. Again, "Human nature must be created with some dispositions; a disposition to relish some things as good and amiable, and to be averse to other things as odious and disagreeable * * * * *. But if it had any concreated dispositions at all, they must have been right or wrong;" and he then says, if man had at first a disposition to find happiness in what was good, his disposition was morally right—but "if he had a disposition to love most those things that were inferior and less worthy, then his dispositions were vicious." "This notion of Adam's being created without a principle of holiness in his heart, taken with the rest of Dr. Taylor's scheme, is inconsistent with" the history in the beginning of Genesis, p. 413. It would, however, be an endless business to quote all that might be adduced to prove that Edwards did not hold the opinion which the reviewer imputes to him. There can, it would seem, be no mistake as to his meaning. These are not mere casual expressions, which he afterwards retracts or contradicts. Neither is there any room for doubt as to the sense in which he uses the words disposition, principle, tendency, &c.

* Works, Vol. II. 407, 408.

Because he carefully explains them, and characterizes the idea he means to express by every one of the marks which the reviewer and others give, in describing what they spurn and reject under the name of "principle," "holy or sinful taste." They mean something distinct from, and prior to, volitions; so does President Edwards; it is that which, in the case of Adam, to use his own word, was "concreated;" it was a disposition to love—not love itself—a relish for spiritual objects, or adaptation of mind to take pleasure in what is excellent; it was a kind of instinct, which, *as to this point*, (i. e. priority as to the order of nature to acts,) he says is analogous to other instincts of our nature. He even argues long to show, that unless such a principle of holiness existed in man prior to all acts of choice, he never could become holy. Again, the "principle," or "disposition" which they object to, is one which is represented as not only prior to voluntary exercises, but determines their character, and is the cause of their being what they are. So, precisely President Edwards, "it is a foundation laid in the nature of the soul, for a new kind of exercises of the faculty of the will."* This he assumes in the case of Adam to have existed prior to his choosing God, and determined his choice; what in the case of men since the fall he assumes as the cause of their universally sinning; and in those which are renewed, as the cause of their holy exercises. If President Edwards did not hold and teach the doctrine which the reviewer rejects and denounces, then no man ever did hold it, or ever can express it. The case is no less plain with regard to Dr. Dwight, who also gives the two characteristic marks of the kind of disposition now in question, viz. its priority to all voluntary exercises, and its being the cause of the character of those exercises. Both these ideas are expressed with a frequency, clearness, and confidence, which mark this as one of his most settled opinions. Take a single specimen: "There is a reason," he says, "why one being is holy and another sinful." This reason, or "cause of moral action is indicated by the words *principle*, affections, nature, habits, tendency, propensity." That he does not intend by "this cause of moral action," an act, exercise, volition, is plain; first, because he says, "these terms indicate a cause, which, to us, is wholly unknown;" secondly, because he expressly and repeatedly asserts the contrary. "We

* Treatise on the Affections, p. 232.

speak of human nature as sinful, intending *not the actual commission of sin*, but a general characteristic of man, under the influence of which, he has committed sins heretofore, and is prepared, and is prone to commit others. With the same meaning in our minds, we use the phrases *sinful propensities, corrupt heart, depraved mind*; and the contrary ones, holy or virtuous dispositions, moral rectitude of character, and many others of like import. When we use these kinds of phraseology, we intend that a reason exists, although undefinable and unintelligible by ourselves, why one mind will either usually, or uniformly, be the subject of holy volitions, and another of sinful ones. We do not intend to assert, that any one, or any number of the volitions of the man whom we characterize, has been, or will be, holy or sinful, *nor do we mean to refer to actual volitions at all*. Instead of this, we mean to indicate a state of mind generally existing, out of which holy volitions may, in one case, be fairly expected to arise, and sinful ones in another.* Again, "When God created Adam, there was a period of his existence after he began to be, antecedent to that in which he exercised the first volition. Every man, who believes the mind to be something besides ideas and exercises, and who does not admit the doctrine of casualty, will acknowledge, that in this period *the mind of Adam was in such a state*; that it was propense to the exercise of virtuous volitions, rather than sinful ones. This state of mind has been commonly styled *disposition, temper, inclination, heart, &c.* In the Scriptures it usually bears the last of these names. I shall take the liberty to call it disposition. This disposition was the *cause* whence his virtuous volitions proceeded: the reason why they were virtuous, and not sinful. Of the metaphysical nature of this cause, I am ignorant." "This cause, of necessity, preceded these volitions, and therefore certainly existed in that state of mind which was previous to his first volition."† This idea enters essentially into his views of several important doctrines. Thus, he says, Adam was created holy; i. e. with holy or virtuous dispositions, propense to the exercises of holy volitions. See his Sermon on Man, and that on Regeneration. Again, he makes original sin, or depravity derived from Adam, to consist in this sinful disposition—a contaminated moral nature—and

* Works, vol. i, 410 and 11.

† Works, vol. ii. p. 419.

argues that infants are depraved before they are "capable of moral action." And, again, he represents regeneration to consist in "a relish for spiritual objects, communicated to it by the power of the Holy Ghost," and explains his meaning by a reference to "the state of mind of Adam in the period antecedent to that in which he exercised his first volition." "The soul of Adam was created with a relish for spiritual objects. The soul of every man who becomes a Christian, is renewed by the communication of the same relish. In Adam, this disposition produced virtuous volitions. In every child of Adam, who becomes the subject of virtue, it produces the same effects."* It is impossible, we should think, for any man to force himself to believe that Dr. Dwight held the doctrine, that "moral character is to be ascribed to voluntary exercises alone." To reconcile all the declarations which we have quoted, and a multitude of others with which his works abounds, is an impossibility. Unless, indeed, we admit that he did not really believe what he over and over declares to have been his faith, and really adopted an opinion against which he earnestly protests and ably argues, or that he was so little master of the English language as to be unable to communicate ideas at all. The reviewer may possibly say, that he does not deny that Dr. Dwight and others held to the existence of a metaphysical something, as the cause of moral actions; but they did not attribute to this something itself a moral character; that it was called holy or sinful not from its nature, but only from its effects. To this, however, the reply is obvious; Dr. Dwight not only speaks of this disposition as virtuous, or vicious, calls it a sinful or holy propensity, principle, nature, habit, heart; terms which, in themselves, one would suppose necessarily imply that the thing to which they apply had a moral character; but he in so many words, declares it to be "the seat of moral character in rational beings;" it is that which mainly constitutes the moral character; it is what we mean, he says, when we use the phrases, *corrupt heart, depraved minds*; or the contrary ones, holy disposition, moral rectitude, holiness of character. He tells us he intends by these phrases "a state of mind," which is not a voluntary exercise, but the cause of volitions. "This cause is what is so often mentioned in Scripture under the name of *the heart*; as when it is said, 'The heart is deceitful above

* Vol. ii. p. 214.

all things, and desperately wicked.'” Will the reviewer have us believe Dr. Dwight taught there was no moral character in this cause of voluntary exercises, which he supposed the Bible meant, when it speaks of a desperately wicked heart? Besides, he tells us, the communication of a holy disposition, or relish for spiritual objects, constitutes regeneration—is not the moral character changed in regeneration? Has that no moral character, the reception of which constitutes a man a new creature in Christ Jesus? Yet this, Dr. Dwight says, is not a volition, (p. 418. vol. ii.) but “a relish for spiritual objects,” “a disposition which produces virtuous volitions.” Again, the very same objections which the reviewer and other advocates of the New Divinity, urge against the idea of moral principles prior to voluntary exercises, and determining their character, Dr. Dwight considers and refutes. And, finally, the reviewer tells that he and his friends agree on this point with the advocates of “the exercise scheme,” the very persons from whom Dr. Dwight most earnestly dissents as to this very point, which, he says, no one but a friend of that scheme, or of the liberty of indifference, would think of maintaining. Very much to the same purpose, President Edwards says, that this opinion concerning virtue, (as entirely depending on choice and agency,) “arises from the absurd notions in vogue concerning the freedom of the will, as if it consisted in the will’s self-determining power.”*

If any thing could be more wonderful than the reviewer’s claiming the authority of Edwards and Dwight, in favour of the opinion under consideration, it would be his claiming Dr. Griffin in the same behalf; a theologian who is almost an ultra on the other side. Our limits and time utterly forbid our exhibiting the evidence in every case of the lamentable misrepresentations by the reviewer of the opinions of the authors to whom he refers. In the case of Dr. Griffin, it is the less necessary, as his Park Street Lectures are so extensively known, and as he has so recently proclaimed his dissent from the New Divinity in his sermon on Regeneration. We refer the readers to these works. In the former, they will find him speaking of sin as an “attribute of our nature,” derived from our original parents, “propagated like reason or speech, (neither of which are exercised at first,) propagated

* Works, vol. ii. p. 410.

like many other propensities, mental as well as bodily—propagated like the noxious nature of other animals.” p. 12.

As to poor Augustine and Calvin being represented as holding the radical doctrine of Pelagius, we must think it a great oversight in the reviewer. It destroys the whole verisimilitude of his story. It forces the reader to suspect the writer of irony, or to set down his statements with regard to less notorious authors, for nothing. Calvin defines original sin “an hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature, diffused through every part of the soul, [strange definition of a voluntary exercise,] which first makes us obnoxious to the wrath of God, and then produces those works which the Scriptures denominate the works of the flesh.” Do not the “works of the flesh” include all sinful exercises? and is there not here asserted a cause of those exercises, which has itself a moral character? Infants, he says, at their birth, are liable to condemnation, “for though they have not at that time produced the fruits of their unrighteousness, yet they have the seed inclosed in them; nay, their whole nature is a mere seed of sin, so that it cannot but be odious and abominable to God.” *Institutiones*, Lib. ii. Cap. 1. 8. And in another place, he speaks of men being sinners, “*non pravæ duntaxat consuetudinis vitio sed naturæ quoque pravitate.*” Is this the language of Mr. Finney? Could any advocate of the New Divinity say with Calvin, that the “whole nature” of man, prior to the production of the works of the flesh, “is odious and abominable to God?” If not, why quote Calvin as agreeing with them as to this very point, that all sin consists in voluntary exercises? The reviewer himself represents Calvin as teaching, that original sin consists in “inherent corruption,” a mode of expression constantly employed by such writers, to indicate moral depravity as distinct from actual sins, and prior to them.

With regard to Augustine, the case is still more extraordinary. The reviewer quotes from De Moor the following passage from this father: “Sin is so far a voluntary evil, that it would not be sin if it were not voluntary,” in proof that he also held, “that a moral character was to be ascribed to voluntary exercises alone.” And yet De Moor immediately adds, in answer to the appeal, which, he says, Pelagians make to this passage, that Augustine did not wish the declaration to be understood of original sin, but restricts it to actual sin, and quotes in proof from his work against Julian, an explicit state-

ment that the principle was to be so restricted. "*Hoc enim,*" says Augustine, "*recte dicitur propter proprium cujusque peccatum, non propter primi peccati originale contagium.*" "This is properly said in reference to the proper (or actual) sin of each one, but not of the original contagion of the first sin." With this declaration before his eyes, how could the reviewer make such a representation?

It is this reference to such men as Edwards, Bellamy, and Dwight, besides older writers, as holding opinions which they not only did not hold, but which, in every form, expressly and by implication, they rejected and condemn, that we consider unfair and uncandid. We are painfully anxious to have this course on the part of the reviewer and others explained. We wish to know on what principle such statements can be reconciled with honesty. We take it for granted, they must have some esoteric sense, some private meaning, some *arriere pensée*, by which to clear their consciences in this matter; but what it is, we cannot divine. This has become so common and so serious an evil, that we are not surprised to find some of the leading theologians of Connecticut saying, "It is surely time that the enemies of truth were relieved of the burden of making doctrines for us, or of informing us what we ourselves believe."* It is just as easy to make Mr. Rand agree with Mr. Finney, as it is President Edwards or Dr. Dwight. All that is necessary is, to take some declaration which is intended to apply to one subject, and apply it to another; and adopt the principle, that language is to be interpreted, not according to the writer's views of the nature of the subject, but according to those of the reviewer. If he say with Dr. Griffin, "men are voluntary and free in all their wickedness;" or, ask with Dr. Witherspoon, "Does any man *commit* sin but from his own choice? or is he hindered from any duty to which he is sincerely and heartily inclined?" Then he holds, "that a moral character is to be ascribed to voluntary exercises alone." These identical passages, referring, as the very language implies, to actual sins, are quoted by the reviewer in his defence of that position, and as implying that a moral character can be ascribed to nothing anterior to such voluntary exercises. It matters

* See the Prospectus of a new monthly Religious Periodical, to be entitled the Evangelical Magazine, and to be conducted by the Executive Committee of the Connecticut Doctrinal Tract Society.

not, it would seem, that these declarations are perfectly consistent with the belief in moral principles, dispositions, or tastes, as existing prior to all acts, or that their authors express such to be their belief. This is gross misrepresentation of a writer's real opinions, whatever be its motive, or on whatever principle its justification may be attempted.

We have already admitted that there was no novelty in this fundamental principle of the New Divinity, but that the novelty consisted in its being adopted by nominal Calvinists, and traced to much the same results as it ever has been by the open opposers of Calvinism. Thus, Mr. Finney says with great plainness, "a nature cannot be holy. The nature of Adam, at his creation, was not holy. Adam was made with a nature neither sinful nor holy. When he began to act, he made it his governing purpose to serve God." This declaration is, at least, in apparent opposition to the statements so constantly occurring in theological writers—that the nature of Adam was holy at his creation—that the *nature* of man since the fall is sinful, and others of similar import. The method which the reviewer adopts of reconciling this apparent discrepancy, is, as usual, entirely unsatisfactory. He tells us there are three senses in which the word nature is used, as applied to moral beings; first, it indicates something which is an original and essential part of their constitution, not resulting at all from their choice or agency, and necessarily found in them of whatever character and in whatever circumstances;" second, it is used to designate the period prior to conversion, as when Paul says, "we are by nature," i. e. in our unregenerate state, "the children of wrath;" and "a third sense is, an expression of the *fact* that there is something in the being a thing spoken of, which is the ground or occasion of a certainty, that it will, in all its appropriate circumstances, exhibit the result or quality predicated of it." What the preacher meant and only meant, according to the reviewer was, "that holiness was not an essential part of Adam's constitution, at his creation, so as not to result at all from his choice and agency." p. 9, 10. There is in all this statement, a great want of precision and accuracy. The reviewer uses the expressions, *essential* part of the constitution, and "not resulting from choice or agency," as synonymous; though he must be aware that Mr. Rand, and the great body of Christians, agree in saying, that holiness and sin are not and cannot be essential attributes, in the sense of the reviewer. An es-

sential attribute is an attribute which inheres in the essence of a thing, and is necessary to its being. Thus the attributes of thought and feeling are essential to mind; without them, it is not mind. Whoever maintained, that holiness was so an essential part of man's constitution, that he ceased to be man when he lost it? Who ever maintained, that either sin or holiness resided in the essence of the soul, or was a physical attribute? The reviewer knows as well as any body, that this Manichean and Flacian doctrine was spurned and rejected by the whole Christian Church. But does it follow from this, that holiness and sin must depend entirely on choice and agency; that there can be nothing of a moral character prior to acts of preference? Certainly not. For this simple reason, that while the Christian Church has rejected the idea of the substantial nature of sin and holiness, it has with equal unanimity held the doctrine of moral propensities, dispositions, or tendencies, prior to all acts of choice. It is in this sense that they have affirmed, and it is in this sense the New Divinity denies, that "a nature may be sinful or holy." And this denial, as Mr. Rand correctly states, is a denial of the doctrines of original righteousness and original sin. "The doctrine of *original righteousness*, or the creation of our first parents with holy principles and dispositions, has a close connexion," says President Edwards, "with the doctrine of original sin. Dr. Taylor was sensible of this; and, accordingly, he strenuously opposes this doctrine in his book on original sin." "Dr. T.'s grand objection against this doctrine, which he abundantly insists on, is this: that it is utterly inconsistent with the nature of virtue, that it should be created with any person: because, if so, it must be by an act of God's absolute power, without our knowledge or concurrence; and that moral virtue, in its very nature, implieth the choice and consent of the moral agent." This is the notion of virtue, which he pronounces quite inconsistent with the nature of things. Human nature, he afterwards says, must be created with some dispositions; these concentrated dispositions must be right or wrong; if man had a disposition to delight in what was good, then his dispositions were morally right. Vol. ii. p. 406 and 413. This is the view which has been well nigh universal in the Christian Church; this is the idea of original righteousness, which the New Divinity rejects, urging the same objection to it which Dr. Taylor, of Norwich, and Pelagians and Socinians long before him had done. We are not,

any more than the reviewer, discussing the truth of these doctrines, but merely endeavouring to correct his very uncandid representations, as they appear to us.

It is further objected to the New Divinity, that it rejects the doctrine of original sin. This the reviewer denies. What is this doctrine? If this point be ascertained, the question whether the objection is well founded or not, can be easily answered. Let us advert then to the definitions of the doctrine as given in the leading Protestant Confessions. In the Helvetic Confession, the *Confessio et Expositio brevis*, &c. cap. viii. after stating that man was at first created in the image of God, but by the fall became subject to sin, death, and various calamities, and that all who are descended from Adam are like him, and exposed to all these evils, it is said, "Sin we understand to be that native corruption of man, derived or propagated from our first parents to us, by which we are immersed in evil desires, averse from good, prone to all evil," &c. "We therefore acknowledge *original sin* to be in all men; we acknowledge all other sins which arise from this," &c. The Basil Confession of 1532. We confess that man was originally created in the image of God, &c. "but of his own accord fell into sin, by which fall the whole human race has become corrupt and liable to condemnation. Hence our nature is vitiated," &c. The Gallican Confession, 1561. "We believe that the whole race of Adam is infected with this contagion, which we call original sin, that is, a depravity which is propagated, and is not derived by imitation merely, as the Pelagians supposed, all whose errors we detest. Neither do we think it necessary to inquire, how this sin can be propagated from one to another," &c. The ninth article of the Church of England states, "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the fault and corruption of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit." The Belgic Confession says, "We believe, that by the disobedience of Adam, original sin has been diffused through the whole human race, which is a corruption of the whole nature, and a hereditary depravity, by which even infants in their mother's womb are polluted, and which, as a root, produces every kind of sin in man, and is so foul and execrable before God, that it suffices to the condemnation of

the human race." The Polish Confession, Art. iii. "All men, Christ only excepted, are conceived and born in sin, even the most holy Virgin Mary. Original sin consists not only in the entire want of original righteousness, but also in depravity, or proneness to evil, propagated from Adam to all men." The Augsburg Confession, Art. ii. "This disease or original depravity is truly sin, condemning and bringing even now eternal death to those who are not renewed by baptism and the Holy Spirit." And the *Forma Concordantiæ*, "Not only actual transgressions should be acknowledged as sins, but especially this hereditary disease should be regarded as a horrible sin, and, indeed, as the principle and head of all sins, whence, as from a root, all other transgressions grow."

We have referred to the leading confessions of the period of the Reformation to show that they all represent as the constituent essential idea of original sin—a corrupted nature—or hereditary taint derived from Adam, propagated by ordinary generation, infecting the whole race, and the source or root of all actual sin. This is not the doctrine therefore of Calvinists merely, but of the Reformed churches generally, as it was of the Catholic church before the Reformation. It is the doctrine, too, of the great body of Arminians. It is unnecessary to refer to individual writers after this reference to symbols which express the united testimony of thousands as to what original sin is. That the more modern Calvinists, (with the exception of the advocates of the exercise scheme) unite in this view, is as plain, and as generally acknowledged, as that it was held by the Reformers. Thus President Edwards defines original sin to be, "an innate sinful depravity of heart." He makes this depravity to consist, "in a corrupt and evil disposition," prior to all sinful exercises. He infers from the universality and certainty of the sinful conduct of men, first, "that the natural state of the mind "of man is attended with a propensity of nature to such an issue," and secondly, that their "nature is corrupt and depraved with a moral depravity." He speaks of this propensity "as a very evil, pernicious and depraved propensity;" "an infinitely dreadful and pernicious tendency." He undertakes to prove "that wickedness belongs to the very nature of men." He devotes a chapter to the consideration of the objection, "that to suppose men born in sin without their choice, or any previous act of their own, is to suppose what is inconsistent with the nature of sin;" and another, to the objection, that "the doctrine of native

corruption" makes God the author of sin. Precisely the objections of the New Divinity, to the common views on this subject.

Dr. Dwight is not less explicit, he makes this depravity to consist in "the corruption of that energy of the mind whence volitions flow, and which is the seat of moral character in rational beings."—Vol. I. p. 488. He proves that "infants are contaminated in their moral nature," from the sinful conduct of "every infant who lives long enough to be capable of moral action." Here then is moral pollution prior to moral action.

Dr. Woods also maintains the doctrine of depravity as natural, innate, and hereditary, in his letters to Dr. Ware. "Sin," according to Dr. Griffin, "belongs to the nature of man, as much as reason or speech, [which we do not believe, but it serves to show to what lengths the reviewer has permitted himself to go, when he quotes this writer in support of the position, that all sin consists in voluntary exercises] though in a sense altogether compatible with blame, and must be derived, like other universal attributes, from the original parent; propagated like reason or speech, (neither of which is exercised at first,) propagated like many other propensities, mental as well as bodily, which certainly are inherited from parents, propagated like the noxious nature of animals." He afterwards argues, "if infants receive their whole nature from their parents pure," "if they are infected with no depravity," when born, "it is plain that they never derived a taint of moral pollution from Adam." "There can be no conveyance after they are born, and his sin was in no sense the occasion of the universal depravity of the world, otherwise than merely as the first example."*

We think it must be apparent that Mr. Rand was perfectly justifiable in asserting that the New Divinity rejects the doctrine of original sin. What is the meaning of this assertion? Is it not, that the idea commonly expressed by that term is discarded? This idea, as we have shown, is that of natural hereditary depravity, or of a corrupt moral nature derived from our first parent. Sometimes indeed more is included in the term, as the idea of imputation. Sometimes the phrase is explained with more, and sometimes with less precision—some resolving the idea of corruption into its constituent parts—

* Park Street Lectures, p. 12—15.

the want of original righteousness and tendency to evil—and others not; but with an uniformity almost unparalleled in theological language and opinion, has the idea of innate corruption been represented as the essential constituent idea of original sin. The very distinction between original, and actual sin, so common, shows that the former expression is intended to convey the idea of something which is regarded as sin, which is not an act or voluntary exercise. The obvious sense, therefore, of Mr. Rand's assertion, is correct.

The reviewer's answer is a little remarkable. He tells us there are various senses in which the phrase "original sin" has been used in orthodox confessions and standard writings, in some one of which senses Mr. Finney may, and doubtless does, hold to "original sin." p. 13. He then undertakes to enumerate eight different senses, mainly by representing as distinct, different modes of stating the same idea. 1. The first sin of the first man. 2. The first sin of the first man and woman. (Is it not clear the reviewer was anxious to swell his list?) 3. Natural or inherent corruption. 4. Want of original righteousness and inclination to evil. (Identical with the preceding.) 5. Imputation of Adam's sin, and the innate sinful depravity of the heart. 6. Something not described, but distinct from natural corruption, and that came to us by the fall of Adam. (This specification is founded on the answer given in the Form of examination before the communion in the Kirk of Scotland, 1591—to the question, "What things come to us by that fall? Ans. Original sin, and natural corruption. Where it is plain that by original sin is meant, the guilt of Adam's first sin.) 7. The guilt of Adam's first sin, the defect of original righteousness, and concupiscence. 8. The universal sinfulness of Adam's posterity as connected with his first sin by divine constitution.—*Dr. Hopkins.*

No one, we presume, could imagine that Mr. Rand intended to charge Mr. Finney with denying the fact that Adam sinned, when he said he denied the doctrine of original sin. The first and second, therefore, of the foregoing specification might safely have been omitted. As to all the others, excepting the last, they amount to the simple statement of President Edwards, that the phrase is commonly used to indicate either the guilt of Adam's first sin, or inherent corruption, sometimes the one and sometimes the other, but most frequently both conjoined. The cases in which original sin is said to include both the want of original righteousness and

corruption of nature, are, as we before remarked, but examples of greater precision in the description of the thing intended, and not statements of an opinion diverse from that expressed by the single phrase, innate depravity. The absence of light is darkness, the absence of heat is cold, the absence of order is confusion, and so the absence of original righteousness is depravity, and this is all that President Edwards intended to express in the passage quoted by the reviewer, in which he says, there is no necessity, in order to account for a sinful corruption of nature, yea, a total native depravity of the heart of man, to suppose any evil quality infused, but that the absence of positive good qualities is abundantly sufficient. The reviewer, we presume, knows very well that this is the common view adopted by those who hold the doctrine of *physical* depravity, as it is styled by the New Divinity. He knew that, according to their views, it is just as supposable that man might be created with an "instinctive" disposition to love God, as with the disposition to love himself, love society, his children, or any thing else; that Adam was actually thus created, that this disposition was not constitutional in the sense in which the instinct of self-love is constitutional, but supernatural, resulting from his being in communion with the Spirit of God; that the human soul, instinct with the dispositions of self-love, natural appetite, &c., and destitute of any disposition to take delight in God or holiness, is not in its normal state, but in a state of moral degradation and ruin; that they believe there is a great difference between the state of the soul when it comes into existence, since the fall, and the state of Adam's soul; between the soul of an ordinary man and the state of the soul of the blessed Jesus; that this difference is prior to all choice or agency, and not dependent upon them, and it is a moral difference, Adam being in a holy state, instinct with holy dispositions, and men being in a state of moral corruption, at the moment of their coming into existence. He doubtless knew also, as his own enumeration shows, that the phrase, original sin, has been, with great unanimity, employed to designate this state of the soul prior to moral action, and that the fact that all men actually sin, and that their sinfulness is *somehow* connected with the sin of Adam, is not the fact which the term has been employed (to any extent) to express; that on the contrary the one fact (the universally sinful conduct of men,) has been the standing argument to prove the other fact, viz: innate inherent depravity; and he should,

therefore, have seen that it is preposterous to assert, that the fact of all men actually sinning, and that this is *somehow* connected with Adam's sin, is the fact expressed by the term original sin. If this be so, then all Pelagians, and all Socinians, and all opposers of the doctrine of original sin, still hold it. For they all believe that men universally sin, and that this is *somehow*, (by example, &c,) connected with Adam's sin. The reviewer's saying "that men sin, and *only* sin until renewed by the Holy Ghost," although it may make a difference as to the extent of the wickedness of men, makes none in the world as to the doctrine of original sin. This doctrine, as it has been held by ninety-hundredths of the Christian church, he rejects just as much as the Pelagians do.* We presume this will be called an *ad invidiam* argument. It little concerns us, what it is called, if it is but just and proper in itself. What is the state of the case. Here are a set of men, who hold certain opinions, which they assiduously and ably advocate. Not content with allowing them to stand on their own merits, they seek to cover them with the robes of authority, asserting that this, and that, and almost every man distinguished for piety and talents, has held or does hold them. When currency and favour are thus sought to be obtained for these opinions, by claiming in their behalf the authority of venerable names, is it not a duty to say and to show that this claim is unfounded, if such be really the case? What means this arraying against Mr. Rand, the authority of Augustine, Calvin, Edwards, Bellamy, Dwight, &c. &c.? What is the object of this array, if it is not to crush him, and sustain Mr. Finney? And yet we presume, there is no fact in the history of theological opinions more notorious, than that, as to the points in debate, they agree with Mr. Rand, and differ from Mr. Finney. The earliest advocate of some of the leading doctrines of the New Divinity, the author of *Views in Theology*, instead of pursuing this objectionable and unworthy course, came out with a distinct avowal of dissent from the generally received doctrines on these subjects. The same honourable course was taken by Dr. Cox; by the late Mr. Christmas, in

* The appeal which the reviewer makes to writings of the disciples of Dr. Emmons, is, as he must know, entirely unsatisfactory. Though as to the verbal statement, that sin consists in voluntary acts, there is an agreement, the whole view and relations of the doctrine as held by him and them are different, and some of the most zealous opponents of the New Divinity, are these very Emmonites, to whom he is constantly appealing for protection.

his sermon on Ability; by Mr. Duffield, in his recent work on Regeneration, and we venture to commend it to the reviewer as the right course, and, if such a consideration need be suggested, as the most politic. We have little doubt some of the advocates of the New Divinity have suffered more in public confidence from taking the opposite course, than from their opinions themselves. And we suspect the reviewer's pamphlet, will be another mill-stone around their neck.

Another inference from the leading idea of this new system is, that regeneration is man's own act, consisting in the choice of God as the portion of the soul, or in a change in the governing purpose of the life. Mr. Finncy's account of its nature is as follows: "I will show," says he, "what is intended in the command in the text (to make a new heart.) It is that a man should *change the governing purpose of his life*. A man resolves to be a lawyer; then he directs all his plans and efforts to that object, and that, for the time is his governing purpose. Afterwards, he may alter his determination, and resolve to be a merchant. Now he directs all his efforts to *that* object, and so has changed his heart, or governing purpose." Again, "It is apparent that the change now described, effected by the simple volition of the sinners mind through the influence of motives, is a sufficient change, all that the Bible requires. It is all that is necessary to make a sinner a christian."

This account of making a new heart, the reviewer undertakes to persuade the public is the orthodox doctrine of regeneration and conversion. This he attempts by plunging at once into the depths of metaphysics, and bringing out of these plain sentences, a meaning as remote from their apparent sense, as ever Cabbalist extracted from Hebrew letters. He begins by exhibiting the various senses in which the words, *will, heart, purpose, volition, &c.* are used. We question the accuracy of his statements with regard to the first of these terms. He is right enough in distinguishing between the restricted and extended meaning of the word, that is, between the will considered as the power of the mind to determine on its own actions, and as the power to choose or prefer. But when he infers from this latter definition, that not only the natural appetites, as hunger and thirst, but also the social affections, as love of parents, and children, &c., are excluded, by Edwards and others who adopt it, from the will, we demur. Edwards says, that "all liking and disliking, inclining or

being averse to, being pleased, or displeased with," are to be referred to the will, and consequently includes these affections. However, it is not to our purpose to pursue this subject. The reviewer claims, as usual, to agree with Edwards, and excludes all such affections as love of parents, love of children, &c., from the will until they involve a preference or choice. As though every exercise of these affections did not in their own nature involve such a preference, as much as love, when directed to any object. He then makes the will and heart synonymous, (thus excluding love of children, &c. from the heart) and proceeds to enumerate the various classification of volitions into *principal, ultimative, subordinate, immanent*, and *imperative*, and winds up his elucidation and defence of Mr. Finney's statement, by making his "governing purpose," to be equivalent with an "*immanent volition*," or "the controlling habitual preference of the soul." We cannot understand by what rule of interpretation this sense can be got out of the preacher's expressions in their connexion in the sermon. Certain it is, the common usage of language would never lead any reader to imagine that, in a plain popular discourse, not in a metaphysical essay from an avowed advocate of the exercise scheme, the phrase a "governing purpose," meant an immanent volition; or "to alter a determination," meant, to change the supreme controlling affection or choice of the soul. The reviewer himself betrays his conviction that this is not the proper acceptation of the terms. For he complains of Mr. Rand for making Mr. Finney's governing purpose mean no more than a mere determination of the mind; and yet the preacher substitutes one of these expressions for the other, as in his own view, synonymous. He tells us "a man alters his determination, and so has changed his heart or governing purpose." But supposing we should admit that, taken by themselves, the words "governing purpose" might bear the sense the reviewer endeavours to place under them, how is this to be reconciled with the preacher's illustrations? "A man resolves to be a lawyer, then he directs all his plans and efforts to that object, and that for the time as his governing purpose; afterwards he may alter his determination, and resolve to be a merchant, now he directs all his efforts to *that* object; and so has changed his heart or governing purpose." What is the nature of the change involved in the alteration of a man's purpose, with regard to his profession? Is it a radical change of the affections, or is

it a mere determination of the mind, founded on considerations of whose nature the determination itself can give us no certain information? As one man may make the change from one motive, and another from another, one from real love to the pursuit chosen, and another from extraneous reasons, it is evident the change of purpose does not imply, nor necessarily involve a change in the affections. When, therefore, Mr. Finney tells his hearers that the change required of them, is a change analogous to that which takes place when a man alters his determination as to his profession, and that this is all that is required, all that is necessary to make a sinner a Christian, he is justly represented as making religion to consist in a mere determination of the mind. Whatever may be his esoteric sense, this is the meaning his words convey, and his hearers, we have no doubt, in nine cases out of ten, receive. This impression would be further confirmed by their being told, that it is a very simple change, effected by a simple volition of their own minds; and that it is a very easy change, it being as easy to purpose right as wrong. The reviewer's defence of this mode of representing a change, which is said in Scripture to be effected by the mighty power of God, strikes us as singularly weak. He tells us, "there are two different senses in which a moral act may be said to be easy or difficult to a man; the one referring to the nature of the act, and the capacity of the agent, that is, his possession of the requisite powers for its performance; and the other referring to the disposition and habit of his mind in reference to the act." p. 11. Thus we may say, it is as easy to be generous, as covetous; and that it is very difficult for a covetous man to be generous. It is admitted, then, that it is very difficult for a man to do any thing contrary to the disposition or habit of his mind, and of course it must be exceedingly difficult to make an entire and radical change in the affections. But Mr. Finney says it is very easy to change the heart—to alter one's purpose. Would not this prove that he supposed the thing to be done was not the thing which the reviewer represents to be very difficult? Does it not go to confirm the impression that he makes the change in question to consist in a mere determination of the mind, to the exclusion of a change in the affections? When the ease of the work to be done, is urged as a motive for doing it, we have a right to suppose that an easy work is intended. But the transferring the affections from one object to another of an opposite character; to love

what we have been accustomed to hate, and to hate what we have been in the habit of loving, is a difficult work, and therefore, not included in a mere alteration of one's purpose, which is declared to be, and in fact is, so easy. Not only, therefore, the mode of expression employed, in describing a change of heart, but the illustrations of its nature, and the mode of enforcing the duty, are adapted to make precisely the impression which Mr. Rand received from the sermon, that conversion, in the judgment of the preacher, is a very trifling affair, effected as easily as a change in our plans of business; and we have reason to know that this is the impression actually produced on the minds of hearers by the preachers of this class; and on the minds of the friends and advocates of the new system themselves. Such, we think, is the natural and fair impression of the popular mode of representing the subject. And we very much question whether the metaphysical explanation of it amounts to any thing more. It is one of the most singular features of the review under consideration, that although the writer seems willing to take shelter under any great name, his principal reliance is on the advocates of Emmonsism. Yet it so happens that his system and theirs are exactly the poles apart. In the one, divine agency is exalted to the real exclusion of that of man; in the other, very much the reverse is the case. According to the one, it is agreeable to the nature of sin and virtue to be created; according to the other, necessary holiness is no holiness, there cannot be even an "instinct" for holiness, to borrow President Edwards's expression. The same expression, therefore, in the mouth of the advocate of the one theory, may have a very different meaning from what it has in that of an advocate of the other; and even if the idea be the same, its whole relations and bearings are different. It is not, then, to the followers of Dr. Emmons we are to go, to learn what is meant by the imminent volitions, primary choices, or governing purposes of the New Divinity. We must go, where the reviewer himself, in another part of his pamphlet sends us, to the advocates of the new system itself. We find that when they come to give their philosophical explanation of the nature of regeneration, it amounts to little more than the popular representations of Mr. Finney. In the *Christian Spectator*, for example, we find regeneration described, as the choice of God as the chief good under the impulse of self-love, or desire of happiness. The sinner is, therefore, directed to consider which is adapted to make him most happy, God or the world; to place the case

fairly before his mind, and, by a great effort, choose right. This, as we understand it, is a description, not of an entire and radical change in the affections, but of a simple determination of the mind, founded on the single consideration of the adaptation of the object chosen to impart happiness. If I determine to seek one thing, because it will make me more happy than another, (and if any other consideration be admitted, as determining the choice, the whole theory is gone,) this is a mere decision of the mind, it neither implies nor expresses any radical change of the affections. On the contrary, the description seems utterly inappropriate to such a change. Does any man love by a violent effort? Does he ever, by summoning his powers for the emergency, by a volition, and in a moment, transfer his heart from one object to another? Was it ever known, that a man deeply in love with one person, by a desperate effort, and at a stroke, destroyed that affection and originated another? He may be fully convinced his passion is hopeless, that it will render him miserable; but he would stare at the metaphysician who should tell him, it was as easy to love one person as another; all he had to do was to energize a new volition and chose another object, loving it in a moment with all the ardour of his first attachment. As this description of an immanent volition, does not suit the process of a change in the affections in common life; as no man, by a simple act of the will, and by a strenuous effort, transfers his heart from one object to another; so neither does it suit the experience of the Christian. We have no idea that the account given in the Spectator of the process of regeneration, was drawn from the history of the writer's own exercises, nor do we believe there is a Christian in the world who can recognise in it a delineation of his experience. So far as we have ever known or heard, the reverse of this is the case. Instead of loving by a desperate effort, or by a simple volition effecting this radical change in the affections, the Christian is constrained to acknowledge, he knows not how the change occurred. "Whereas I was blind, now I see," is the amount of his knowledge. He perceives the character of God to be infinitely lovely, sin to be loathsome, the Saviour to be all he needs, but why he never saw all this before, or why it all appears so clear and cheering to him now, he cannot tell.

We cannot but think that the impression made by the mode of representation adopted by the New Divinity of this important subject, is eminently injurious and derogatory to true religion. That the depravity of the heart is practically repre-

sented as a very slight matter, that the change and the whole change necessary to constitute a man a Christian, is represented as a mere determination of his own mind, analogous to a change of purpose as to his profession; that a sense of his dependence on the Spirit of God is almost entirely destroyed, and of course the Spirit himself dishonoured. This latter evil results not merely from the manner in which the nature of the change of heart is described, and the ability of the sinner to effect it is represented; nor from the fact that this dependence is kept out of view, but also from the ideas of the nature of agency and freedom of the will, which, as we have before had occasion to remark, appear to lie at the foundation of the whole system, as it has been presented in the *Christian Spectator*, and from the manner in which the Spirit's influence is described by many of the most prominent advocates of the theory. These views of human agency are such that God is virtually represented as unable to control the moral exercises of his creatures; that notwithstanding all that he can do, they may yet act counter to his wishes, and sin on in despite of all the influence which he can exert over them consistently with their free agency. If this be not to emancipate the whole intelligent universe from the control of God, and destroy all the foundations of our hopes in his promises, we know not what is. When sinners are thus represented as depending on themselves, God having done all he can, exhausted all his power in vain for their conversion, how they can be made to feel that they are in his hands, depending on his sovereign grace, we cannot conceive. What the nature of the sinner's dependence on the Spirit of God, according to Mr. Finney, is, we may learn from the following illustration. "To illustrate the different senses in which making a new heart," says the reviewer, "may be ascribed to God, to the preacher, to the truth or word of God, and to the sinner himself, Mr. F. supposed the case of a man arrested, when about to step over a precipice, by a person crying to him, *stop*. And said, This illustrates the use of the four kinds of expression in the Bible, in reference to the conversion of a sinner, with one exception. In the case supposed, there was only the voice of the man who gave the alarm; but in conversion, there is both the voice of the preacher and the voice of the Spirit; the preacher cries *stop*, and the Spirit cries *stop* too." p. 28. On this subject, however, the advocates of the system profess not to be united. Mr. Finney and others maintain, that there is no mystery about the mode of the Spirit's operation; the review-

er is inclined to think there is; the one says "there is no direct and immediate act;" the other, if he must adopt a theory, is disposed to admit that there is an immediate influence on the mind. The reviewer lays little stress on the difference, as both views, he says, have not only been held by many Calvinistic divines, but in connexion with a firm belief of the absolute necessity, and universal fact of the special agency of the Holy Spirit in producing conversion. We are aware of the diversity of representation as to this special point, among orthodox writers, but we are fully persuaded, that whatever may be the private opinions of those who preach as Mr. Finney is represented to have done in this sermon, the impression made on their audience of the necessity of divine influence, of the sinner's dependence, is immeasurably below the standard of the divines to whom the reviewer appeals in their justification. For an audience to be told, that all the Spirit does for them is to tell them to *stop*; that, antecedently even to this influence, they *may* and *can* do all that God requires; and, what is part of the system of the Spectator, that subsequently, or during the utmost exertion of this influence, they *may* and *can* resist and remain unconverted, is surely a representation from which those divines would have revolted, and which has a necessary tendency to subvert what the reviewer calls the fundamental doctrine of the absolute necessity of the special agency of the Holy Ghost in producing conversion.

We believe that the characteristic tendency of this mode of preaching, is to keep the Holy Spirit and his influences out of view; and we fear a still more serious objection is, that Christ and his cross are practically made of none effect. The constant exhortation is, to make choice of God as the portion of the soul; to change the governing purpose of the life; to submit to the moral Governor of the universe. The specific act to which the sinner is urged as immediately connected with salvation, is an act which has no reference to Christ. The soul is brought immediately in contact with God; the Mediator is left out of view. We maintain that this is another Gospel. It is practically another system, and a legal system of religion. We do not intend that the doctrine of the mediation of Christ is rejected, but that it is neglected; that the sinner is led to God directly; that he is not urged, under the pressure of the sense of guilt, to go to Christ for pardon, and through him to God; but the general idea of submission (not the specific idea of submission to the plan of salvation through

The New Divinity Tried.

Jesus Christ,) is urged, or the making a right choice. Men are told they have hitherto chosen the world, all they have to do is to choose God; that they have had it as their purpose to gain the things of this life, they must now change their purpose, and serve God. Our objection is not now to the doctrines actually held by these brethren, but to their characteristic method of preaching, the effects of which we have had some opportunity of learning. Conviction of sin is made of little account; Christ and his atonement are kept out of view, so that the method of salvation is not distinctly presented to the minds of the people. The tendency of this defect, as far as it extends, is fatal to religion and the souls of men. The happiness is, that sinners are not under the influence of this kind of preaching alone; their religious character is not entirely formed by this mode of representing what God requires; but, when excited by the pungency and power with which these brethren frequently address the conscience, and when aroused to the necessity of doing something to secure the favour of God, they are influenced by the truth already lodged in their minds, or derived from the immediate perusal of the Scriptures, and hence, under the influence of the Spirit of God, instead of following the directions of their teachers, which would lead to God, in some other way than through Christ, they feel their need of the Saviour, and go to him as the Gospel directs. It is in this way, we have no doubt, much of the evil of this lamentable neglect of the grand doctrines of the Gospel is prevented. But just so far as this defective mode of representing the mode of salvation has any influence, it is to introduce a radically new system of religion. We again remark, we do not doubt, that if these preachers were asked if they meant to leave Christ thus out of view, and to direct sinners to God without his intervention, they would answer, No. But we are not speaking of what they may believe on the subject, but of the manner in which, both from the press and the pulpit, the great duty of the sinner under the Gospel is presented.

It was our intention to call the attention of our readers to the panacea which the reviewer has discovered, (or rather undertaken to recommend) for the cure of all doctrinal differences. But our notice of his pamphlet has already been protracted to three times the length we originally intended, and we therefore have time to say but little on the subject. His prescription is, to draw a distinction between the doctrines of religion and the philosophy of the doctrines, which

he justly remarks, is an important distinction, which it is of the highest moment should be understood and properly applied. “*The doctrines of religion are the simple facts of Christianity. The philosophy of the doctrines is the mode adopted of stating and illustrating those facts, in their relations to each other, to the human mind, to the whole character and government of God.* From this distinction, results the following most important practical principle of Christian fellowship and of theological discussion. *All who teach the leading facts or doctrines of Christianity are orthodox, though they differ greatly in their philosophy of those doctrines.*” p. 31. The reviewer gives these passages in *italics*, to note his sense of their importance. We are constrained, however, to think, that although they contain a very obvious and familiar truth, they are of little consequence for his purpose. The truth they contain is, that there is a distinction between the essentials and not essentials of a doctrine. We care little about his calling doctrines *facts*. But how is this to aid any one in deciding on what is heresy, and what is not? The reviewer chooses to say, that the fact which all the orthodox must receive respecting sin is, that it exists, and that it is a dreadful evil. But how its existence is accounted for, is philosophising about it. But if I assert, it exists by the immediate efficient agency of God, do not I assert a fact, as much as when I say it exists? Or, if I say it exists because God cannot control a moral agent, do not I assert a fact? Again, the orthodox fact about man’s natural character is, that in consequence of the fall of Adam, men sin and only sin, until renewed by the Holy Spirit; the philosophy is in accounting for it. But is it not obvious, that when the Church declares, that the universality of actual sin is to be accounted for by a sinful corruption of nature, she means to declare, that the Scriptures account for one fact by another? When it is said, we are condemned for the sin of Adam, is it not a fact again asserted? We think, therefore, the reviewer’s distinction between facts and the philosophy of them, perfectly futile. The use he would make of it, is still worse. “All who teach the leading facts of Christianity, are orthodox.” But what are these facts? Let the reviewer state them, and then he is orthodox; let Edwards state them, and he is a heretic. The substance of the fact regarding man’s character, is, that *somehow*, in consequence of the fall, he sins and only sins, &c. Is not this a bald *petitio principii*? That *somehow* may be the very thing which the Scriptures clearly

reveal, and reveal as a *fact*. Again, it is a fact that we are saved by the death of Christ—this we have seen stated as the *doctrine* of atonement. Yet, as so stated, there is not a Socinian in the world, who is not orthodox on this point. This fact is not all that the Scriptures teach, nor that it is necessary to believe. The death of Christ saves us, and saves us as a sacrifice. That it operates in this mode, and not in another, is as much a matter of fact, as that it operates at all. Again, it is a fact, that men are renewed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. But here again, all Arminians, Pelagians, and even Socinians are orthodox; for they admit the fact as much as the reviewer does, (allowing them to make the Spirit of God mean “divine energy.”) They and he might philosophise rather differently about it; but the fact they all admit. How the Spirit does the work, is matter of explanation, some say, by an immediate influence on the mind; others by moral suasion, or presenting motives; others by having revealed the truth in the Scriptures—so that the result may be ascribed either to the truth as the immediate cause, or to its revealer, the Spirit. And so, finally, though illustrations might be multiplied without end, the Scriptures are a divine revelation; here is a fact, in which, it would seem, all might acquiesce, and be orthodox, without asking, how God reveals truth to man. Yet this fact, the neologists of Germany hold and proclaim. It is true, when they come to the *philosophy* of the fact, they tell us they mean that the Scriptures are a providential revelation from God, in the same sense as the Dialogues of Plato.

It is too obvious to need comment, that the reviewer’s position is all that any man in the world, who professes any form of Christianity, needs, to prove his orthodoxy. Let him have the stating of scriptural facts, and he will do as the reviewer in many cases has done, state them so generally, that Arminians, Pelagians, and Socinians, as well as Calvinists can adopt them, and, according to this standard, be orthodox.

We have spoken of this anonymous pamphlet with sincerity: that is, as we really felt. We view it as highly objectionable in the respect to which we have principally referred. Whoever the writer may be, we think he has more reason to lament having given occasion to the Christian public to ask, how his statements can be reconciled with notorious facts, than to be offended at the strictures to which it may, and ought, to subject him.

Select List of Recent Publications.

THEOLOGICAL.

Waibel, Dogmatik der Relig. Jesu Christi. Augsburg.

Teplitz, Ethica Christiana. Prague.

Originis Opera, cum notis Lommatzsch.

A text book of Popery, comprising a brief history of the Council of Trent, and copious extracts from the Catechisms published by its authority, with notes and illustrations; intended to furnish a correct and complete view of the theological system of Popery. By J. M. Cramp. Repub. New York. pp. 451.

Bates' Harmony of the Divine Attributes, with an introductory essay by Dr. Alexander, being the fourth number of the Library of Religious Knowledge. New York.

The New Divinity Tried; being an examination of a Sermon delivered by Rev. C. G. Finney on making a New Heart. By Asa Rand. Boston. pp. 16.

Review of "The New Divinity Tried." Boston. pp. 44.

When does the Sabbath begin? A careful examination of the passages of Scripture which are thought to favour the beginning of the Sabbath on Saturday evening at sunset. By Melvin Copeland. Hartford. pp. 18.

Lectures on Universalism. By Rev. Joel Parker, Pastor of the Free Presbyterian Church, New York.

The Christian Doctrine of Regeneration. By J. H. F. Blanchard, of Harvard, (Mass.) Boston. pp. 81.

Coup-d'œil sur la controverse chretienne depuis les premicres siecles jusqu'a nos jours. By the Abbe Gerbet.

The Apostolicity of Trinitarianism; or the testimony of history to the positive antiquity and apostolical inculcation of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity By George Stanley Faber. London. 2 vols.

The Select Works of Archbishop Leighton. Prepared for the practical use of Christians, with an introductory view of the life, character, and writings of the author. By Geo. B. Cheever. Boston. pp. 569.

Spiritual Life, or Regeneration illustrated in a series of disquisitions relative to its author, subject, nature, means, &c. By George Duffield, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Penn. pp. 613.

The Writings of the late John M. Mason, D. D. consisting of Sermons, Es-

says, and Miscellanies; including Essays already published in the Christian Magazine. Selected and arranged by Rev. Ebenezer Mason. New York. 4 vols.

Lectures on Christian Theology. By George Christian Knapp. Translated by Leonard Woods, jr. Abbot Resident, Andover Seminary. 2 vols.

Dr. Gregory's edition of the works of Robert Hall. New York. 3 vols.

BIBLICAL AND PHILOLOGICAL.

Questions and Notes, critical and practical, on the book of Genesis. By George Bush. New York. pp. 467.

Mauser, Commentar. üb. das Buch Josua. Stuttgart.

Paulus, exegetisches Handbuch über die drei ersten Evangelien. Heidelberg.

The Prophetic blessings of Jacob and Moses respecting the twelve tribes of Israel, explained and vindicated. London.

Second edition of Gibbs's Manual Hebrew and English Lexicon. New Haven.

A series of Sermons on the xxxiii. chapter of Deuteronomy. By Wm. Parkinson, Pastor of the First Baptist Church, New York. 1st vol. pp. 554.

It is proposed to publish in London, a condensation of all the English Commentaries on the Old and New Testament.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.

Journal of the Life and Religious Labours of Elias Hicks. Written by himself. 2d edition. pp. 451. New York.

A general view of the progress of Ethical Philosophy, chiefly during the 17th and 18th centuries. By Sir James Mackintosh. Philadelphia. pp. 304.

A short view of the whole Scripture History, with a continuation of the Jewish affairs from the Old Testament to the time of Christ, and an account of the chief prophecies relating to him. By Dr. Watts. Revised and enlarged by Rev. R. S. Shimcall. New York. pp. 506. With a chart.

The Life of Wicliff. By Charles Webb Le Bas. London.

Reminiscences of the Rev. Robert Hall. By J. Greene. London.

Origines Hebrææ, or the Antiquities of the Hebrew Republic. By Thomas Lewis. London.

Memoirs and Confessions of Francis Volkmar Reinhard, S. T. D. Court Preacher at Dresden. Translated from the German, by Oliver A. Taylor, Resident Licentiate at Andover Seminary.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

The Pleasures of Luxury unfavourable to the exercise of Christian Benevolence. Preached in the South Church, Boston. By Rev. John J. C. Hopkins.

Religion the only safe-guard of National Prosperity. Preached in Trinity Church, Boston. By Rev. John H. Hopkins.

Spruce Street Lectures. No. 3. The Use of the Means of Grace. By Rev. Dr. S. B. How, of Carlisle. No. 4. On Church Discipline. By Rev. Alexander M'Farlane, of Carlisle. Philadelphia.

Baccalaureate Address, pronounced on the Sixth Anniversary Commencement of the University of Nashville, October 5th, 1831. By Philip Lindsly. pp. 38.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Essay on the application of Abstract Reasoning to the Christian Doctrine. By the author of the Natural History of Enthusiasm. Boston. pp. 163.

Saturday Evening. By the same author. Boston. pp. 340.

Works of Paley, in 1 vol. Philadelphia.

Family Library, No. 27. Palestine, or the Holy Land. By Rev. Michael Russell, LL. D.

The Book of Private Devotion. A series of Prayers and Meditations chiefly taken from the Works of Hannah More. New York.

Moral and Religious Gleanings; or Interesting Stories. Compiled from various authors. By Thomas Latimer. Philadelphia.

On Political Economy, in connexion with the moral state and moral prospects of Society. By Dr. Chalmers. pp. 566. Glasgow.

The Seven Apocalyptic Churches. By Charles Macfarlane. With etchings. London.

A Treatise on the Happiness arising from the exercise of the Christian Faith. By O. Blewett, Esq. London.

The Christian Philosopher. By Wm. Martin. London.

The Records of a Good Man's Life. By Rev. Charles B. Tayler, author of 'May you like it.' London.

Christian Library. The Travels of True Godliness. By the Rev. Benjamin Heatch. Revised and improved, with Notes and a Memoir, by Howard Malcom. Boston.

Remarks on the Moral and Religious Character of the United States of America, supported by numerous extracts from the best authorities. London.

Hints, designed to aid Christians in their efforts to convert men to God. [By Rev. Dr. Skinner and Rev. E. Beecher.] 2d ed. Philadelphia. pp. 36.

Burder's Village Sermons, in 1 vol. New York.

A Guide for Young Disciples of the Holy Saviour, in their way to immortality, forming a sequel to *Persuasives to Early Piety*. By J. G. Pike. New York.

The Listener. By Caroline Fry. Philadelphia. 2 vols.

Sturm's Reflections, in 1 vol. Philadelphia.

Considerations for Young Men. By the author of "*Advice to a Young Christian*."

The Pilgrim's Progress, with a Life of Bunyan, by Robert Southey. Illustrated with Engravings. Boston.

