THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

1843.

VOL. XV.

PHILADELPHIA:

M. B. HOPE—EDUCATION ROOMS, 29 SANSOM STREET.

JOHN T. ROBINSON, PRINTER, PRINCETON.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV.

NO. I.

NO. II.

NO. III.

NO. IV.

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1843.

No. I.

ART. I.—1. *Report from Select Committee on the State of Education, with the minutes of Evidence and Index.* August, 1834. pp. 257, folio.

2. *Report from the Select Committee on Education in England and Wales, together with the minutes of Evidence, &c.* August, 1835. pp. 237, folio.

3. *Report from the Select Committee on Education of the poorer classes in England and Wales, with minutes of Evidence, &c.* August 1838. pp. 171, folio.

4. *A Letter to the Most Noble the Marquis of Lansdowne on National Education.* By Robert Isaac Wilberforce. pp. 65, 18mo.

5. *Second Letter from same to same.* pp. 73, 18mo.

6. *National Education, the Question of Questions, &c. &c., with brief notes on Lord Brougham's bill.* By Henry Dunn. pp. 48, 8vo.

7. *Speech of Rev. Francis Close at Freemason's Tavern, February* 9, 1839. *With a reply, strictures, &c.* [Several Pamphlets.]

8. *The Mission of the Educator, an appeal for the Education of all classes in England.* pp. 64, 8vo.

9. *Lectures on National Education.* By W. I. Fox. pp. 80, 8vo.

10. *National Education: ought it to be based upon Religion?* A Sermon preached at Bridport, February 24, 1839. By Philip Harword.

11. *Recent Measures for the promotion of Education in England.* pp. 112, 8vo.
12. *Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education,* 1839-40. *With 23 beautiful plates, illustrating plans of School houses, &c.* pp. 218, folio.
13. *Has the Church or the State the power to Educate the Nation?* A course of Lectures, by Frederick D. Maurice, A. M., Chaplain to Guy's Hospital. pp. 364, 8vo. 1839.

It is not strictly within the design of our Review to discuss systems or theories of secular education; but it is obvious that many of these systems involve the most important principles of philosophy, and the highest interests of truth and humanity, and to these it is peculiarly our province to direct public attention.

In former numbers of our work* we have examined some of the leading characteristics of the educational schemes of the United States and Ireland, and we propose now to present to our readers some of the peculiarities of the English system.

The religious-education question has been debated more fully and fearlessly in England than in any other country, and there are local circumstances which give it special interest.

There are many in England (and they have upon their side the influence of one or more powerful newspapers) who protest against every scheme and form of State patronage, or supervision of public instruction. Their language is, in substance, as follows:

"We see great mischief and peril in the very principle of an interference on the part of government to organize and keep under its own control a scheme of public education. There is despotism in it; there is an attempt, or at least a tendency in it, to supplant private relations and domestic duties with municipal regulations; it aims at a dislocation and disturbance of the immutable combinations and self-acting powers of natural society, for the sake of concentrating in the managers of the political machine a control over the entire moral and intellectual development of the national mind. Against this we protest, and more especially under the present circumstances of the world in general, and this country in particular, which make it impossible for any government to establish a machinery of public instruction which shall be religious without being intolerant, or tolerant without being irreligious."

Recent proceedings in some portions of our own country give no little colour to the position here taken.

* July, 1841, and January, 1842.

On the other hand, Mr. Hume, a distinguished member of Parliament, said, laconically, in a recent debate, "The business of education ought to be conducted by the government, and not left in the hands of a sect." And by a sect he intended any religious body or party, whatever.

Most of the opposition is directed against the influence of the establishment. Thus in a late parliamentary debate Mr. Gibson observed, amidst frequent cheers, that

"The national schools, as they were called, gave nothing but mere *Church catechism* instruction, with no information calculated to interest the mind or expand the understanding."—"It was fervently to be hoped that, for the growing generations of this country, Parliament would, ere long, provide at least a really sound and salutary system of *secular* instruction."—"Let them adopt a sound system of education for the national schools, and not leave them to the mere lifeless and mechanical teaching of the *Church catechism*."

There are also those who object to the introduction of religious subjects into schools under any circumstances, and they would even prove that it is attended with imminent danger to the spiritual welfare of the young! A respectable periodical* lately attempted to establish, by grave argument, the three following propositions:

"First, that the practice usually pursued, and declared to be indispensable in a system of education, namely, of teaching the doctrines of Scripture—during childhood and in school—and after the manner in which ordinary instruction is given, so far from being favourable to the formation of Christian character, has a powerful tendency to impair the true influence of religion, to render the belief in it formal and inoperative, and even to endanger its hold on many minds.

"Secondly, that there are in society abounding evidences of this tendency, in the kind of influence which religion exercises over men professedly zealous, and the extent to which a spirit of sectarianism is substituted for the spirit of the gospel, sufficient to warn us against the application of the practice to the instruction of the poor.

"And lastly, that *scriptural instruction* does not in itself imply what is properly understood by a *religious education;* that such education, up to a certain period, may be most judiciously conducted without it, and should in all ordinary cases be left to the parents of youth, aided in due time by the Christian minister, whose office it is, and not that of the schoolmaster, to teach the doctrines of religion."

The Protestant religion, as such, is part and parcel of the British government; so incorporated into its very structure, that those who are in authority are bound to sustain, even by compulsory means, a particular form of religious doctrines and ceremonies. And the government very naturally insists upon its right to use the educational institutions of the country, to further its own religious interests, which they, of course, regard as identified with the interests of the people.

* The British and Foreign Review, Jan. 1841.

Hence they steadfastly maintain the principle that the State is bound to furnish ample means for instructing the children of the country in the State religion, which may be called Protestant Episcopal.* This doctrine is of course stoutly resisted by the dissenting community, and to discuss this question, in its various bearings and relations, is the object of the larger part of the publications at the head of the present article.

It is not our object to treat of the educational policy of England any farther than it reveals the working of the *mixed* principle as it is called. This is well worth examination, inasmuch as the circumstances in which it is applied are totally different from those of Ireland and the United States.

The British government has not until lately concerned itself in the details of public instruction, and even now its power has been exercised rather to procure accurate and minute statistical details upon every branch of the subject, than to improve or extend the system. Recent official inquiries have drawn out a mass of the most important and instructive information respecting the state of education, especially in the densely peopled districts of the kingdom.

In 1820 Lord Brougham proposed an educational measure, which entrusted the bureau of public instruction to the clergy exclusively, and identified the schools with the church. The plan was resisted by Dissenters, but the opinion is widely entertained that but for the political differences growing out of the prosecution of the Queen at that time, the measure might have succeeded.

At a late period a scheme was suggested by Mr. Hume, which confined education, to mechanics, natural history, philosophy, and other useful sciences, strictly so called; "as if," says a cotemporary writer, "it was not as important to know how to be happy, here and hereafter, as it is to know the principles of machinery, and the habits of alligators and hippopotamuses."

We are told that the present views of the government, (though not sufficiently settled to give a positive character to the system, especially in its religious bearing,) lean very much towards those entertained by that able and pious prelate, Daniel Wilson, bishop of Calcutta, as they are disclosed

* "It is quite enough for me to know that the practice of the Constitution has been, and that the law of the country, at this moment, is to support that ONE church which the legislature has adjudged to be the church of the country." *Mr. Gladstone's speech against extending Parliamentary grants.* Parl. Deb. 3d. Series, Vol. xlviii, p. 629.

in his plan of instruction for a literary institution in India. The benefits of the institution were to be extended to all persons, "without distinction of creed;" and in August, 1835, the bishop suggested a plan of instruction which he thought would be acceptable to the five main divisions of the Christian world—viz. the English, Scotch, Roman Catholic, Greek, and Armenian churches. As our readers may be curious to know what opinions were supposed to be common to the several communions just named, we subjoin a synopsis of them.

1. The being of a God: his unity and perfections.
2. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, a revelation inspired by the Holy Ghost.
3. The mystery of the adorable Trinity.
4. The Deity, incarnation, atonement and intercession of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.
5. The fall and corruption of man; his accountableness and guilt.
6. Salvation through grace, by the meritorious sacrifice and redemption of Christ.
7. The personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit, and his operations and grace in the sanctification of man.
8. The indispensable obligation of repentance towards God, faith in Christ, and continued prayer for the grace of the Holy Spirit.
9. The moral duties which every Christian is bound to perform towards God, his neighbours, and himself, as they are summed up in the Ten Commandments, &c.

In submitting the plan, the committee (with the bishop at their head) express their confidence that "by this union of public religious instruction, on the basis of the great doctrines of redemption held by the universal church, with the private inculcation of what regards church discipline, the sacraments and other matters of controversy, the practical blessings of a Christian education may be conveyed to the children without indifference and latitudinarianism on the one hand, or a spirit of debate and proselytism on the other."*

This is the scheme which, it has been supposed, was regarded with much favour by the Education Committee. How far that committee might be disposed to sanction it we pretend not to say, but there is no doubt, we think, that the

* Recent Measures, pp. 70—73.

religious instruction now given in the best of the public schools of England, embraces the leading features of the Calcutta scheme. And that this state of things accords with the governing principle of the committee may be inferred from the following passage in their instructions to the government inspectors :—"Their Lordships are strongly of opinion that no plan of education ought to be encouraged in which intellectual instruction is not subordinate to the regulation of the thoughts and habits of the children *by the doctrines and precepts of revealed religion.*"

It has been the practice of the British government for some years to make annual grants for educational purposes. And the distribution has been entrusted from year to year, in different proportions, to the *National Society* and the *British and Foreign School Society.* In April, 1839, a committee of the Privy Council was charged with the superintendence of the application of any sums voted by parliament for the purposes of education. And in June, following, the committee recommended that the sum of $50,000, granted by parliament in 1835 towards the erection of Normal or Model schools, should be given, in equal proportions, to the two national societies above mentioned, and that whatever remained of the grants of 1837 and 1838, together with the whole of the grant for 1839, should be chiefly applied in aid of subscriptions for the support of schools connected with those societies. The committee express their conviction that "the most useful application of the parliamentary grant would be the establishment of a Normal school *under the direction of the State,*" but "so difficult is it to provide for the instruction of children and teachers in the principles of the Christian religion, without any infringement of the rights of conscience, that they think the subject must be postponed until greater concurrence of opinion is found to prevail." The committee farther recommended that no grant be made for the future, without reserving to the government the right of inspection; in order to secure a conformity to the regulations and discipline established in the several schools, and such improvements as might be suggested from time to time by the committee. The inspectors, however, were not to interfere with the religious instruction, discipline, or management of the school. Among other terms of distribution agreed upon, were the following: that no building should be aided in which six feet square of room is not appropriated to each scholar; that

for every $2 50 granted, the means of educating at least one child for a year should be provided; that the private subscriptions should be received, expended, and accounted for, before the payment of any grant; and that no aid would be given to a building for a school not connected with one of the two national societies, unless under very special circumstances.

The sum voted in 1839 was $150,000, and the applications were for nearly $250,000.

The great bugbear in this arrangement of the government seems to have been the *right of inspection*. The established church claimed to be the proper guardian of the public morals, and of course of public instruction, as the medium through which moral truth is inculcated; and hence she strenuously contended for exclusive and peremptory jurisdiction over this whole subject. The Dissenters as a body, as resolutely opposed their pretensions, and have the sympathy of many distinguished and prominent adherents of the establishment; foremost among whom is that zealous and indefatigable advocate of universal religious education —*the Lord Bishop of Norwich.*

So far as the religious principle is concerned both parties on this subject were sound, and both exerted their influence on the community through strictly scriptural associations. And it is essential to a proper understanding of the question that we direct our attention for a single moment to the position of these societies at the early period of their history.

In 1803 Joseph Lancaster published in London, an account of a plan of instruction which he had successfully pursued, and urged the organization of a society for the purpose of facilitating the means of education among the labouring poor. A review of this pamphlet in one of the most influential religious periodicals of that day, called public attention to a difficulty suggested by Mr. Lancaster himself, but not overcome, viz. to bring about a concurrence of the various Protestant sects. His plan was to establish a society on "general Christian principles" But who shall determine what these general principles are? May they not be so general as to coalesce as well with Deism as with Christianity? "Let the friends of youth," said Mr. Lancaster, "among every denomination of Christians exalt the standard of education, laying aside all difference of religious opinion, and pursue two grand objects, the promotion of good morals and the instruction of youth in useful learning adapted to their respective situations."

The reviewer conceives, however, that "something more than this plan proposes may be admitted among the topics of instruction, without alarming any Christian parent, of whatever denomination he be, with a fear that his child may be led to forsake the society to which his father belongs. The authority of God; a future state of rewards and punishments; love to God and man; the evil of sin; the necessity of repentance; the duty of prayer; and the obligation of attending public worship, are subjects of indispensable necessity, by the acknowledgment not only of Christians of all denominations, but, we believe, of many Deists. But what right they have to be considered as Christians, who deem it unnecessary to introduce into their plans (of education) any reference to the salvation purchased for us by Christ, we are at a loss to imagine."

"By the exclusion of every topic of Christian instruction from our schools, and imparting to them such moral lessons merely as a Socrates or a Seneca would have thought themselves bound to give, religious bigotry indeed may be avoided, but there is another evil against which this procedure does not guard, and that the greatest which can befal a nation—irreligion—ignorance of the true God and of Jesus Christ whom he has sent."*

Another writer,† of considerable celebrity, "hesitated not to declare his conviction that this plan, though put forth under the liberal idea of teaching only those points of religions faith in which all denominations agree, was really a plan for poisoning the minds of the poor with a sort of potential infidelity." He therefore denounces the Lancasterian schools, "as pernicious beyond all power of compensation by the acquirements it could furnish."

In 1808 the British and Foreign School Society was established, "for promoting the daily instruction of the children of the labouring poor on scriptural and comprehensive principles." In May, 1811, a public meeting was held in London—the Duke of Bedford presiding—at which a very favourable report was made of Mr. Lancaster's success. It was affirmed that children, to the number of a thousand in one school, might be taught reading, writing and arithmetic, (before they are old enough to work,) at an expense

* Christian Observer, Vol. iii. p. 161. Is not this the extreme to which the prevalent system of public instruction in the United States is tending with fearful certainty?

† Coleridge.

of $1 25 per head, and that the pious wish of the then reigning king, George III., would soon be realized, that "every poor child in his kingdom might be able to read the Bible." With respect to religious instruction it was stated as an inviolable law of the institution, to *teach nothing but the scriptures themselves.* "The children are trained to the habit of reading the Bible, but it is left to their parents and friends to explain and comment upon it."*

In the course of the same year a sermon was preached at the request of the "*Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge,*" that attracted a great deal of public attention, as it was supposed to express the views and feelings, not only of the preacher, but of the bishops and clergy of the established church generally. The following passage from this sermon will serve our purpose:

"It is well known that a system of education conducted by a very intelligent and active dissenter † in this country, a system in which, of course as he himself conducts it, the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England form no part, has during the last seven years received very extensive patronage from men of all ranks and professions. This system he conducts on the avowed principle that education ought not to be subservient to the propagation of the peculiar tenets of any sect. Hence no other parts of Christianity are there professed than what he terms its uncontroverted principles. Whether our religion when thus curtailed does not lose the character of Christianity altogether, or whether enough of it remains to satisfy the demands of any other religious party in this country, it is certain that the doctrines of Christianity as taught by the Church of England have no admission there." &c. &c.

Among the consequences of this sermon was another meeting held in London in October of the same year, (1811) at which the prelates of the established church took the lead, and which resulted in the organization of the "*National Society for promoting the education of the poor in the principles of the established church.*" For the framework of their plan they adopted the *Madras* system, as it was called, having been applied by Dr. *Bell* to certain schools at Madras, which conformed, in their religious character, to the principles of the established church. The sole object of the system was declared to be, "to instruct and educate the poor in suitable learning, in works of industry, and in the principles of the Christian religion as held by the established church."

These passages from cotemporaneous history show, very conclusively, that the line of future controversy was clearly and precisely discerned. The church-party was bold and

* Christian Observer, Vol. x. p. 321. † Joseph Lancaster.

explicit in its avowal of a design to make the schools subservient to church purposes. Their opposers or rivals were the zealous friends of religionus instruction, but they thought it could be given in such a general manner as to please all parties.* The problem to be solved was, in plain words, how to furnish religious instruction without furnishing it? How to seem to give, and yet actually to withhold, or how to seem to withhold, and yet actually give. The solution of it has posed the skill of many wise and strong men, and is as deeply hidden now as when the problem was first proposed.

The government scheme, to distribute the annual grants through both these channels, was certainly very liberal. It was quite satisfactory to the British and Foreign School Society, but the suggestion of inspection alarmed the fears of the established clergy lest a door should be opened for undue secular influence, and thus the educational interests of the country should be thrown into irreligious or indifferent hands.

Of course it was quite natural that one of the earliest attacks on the British and Foreign School Society should be aimed at its equivocal religious character; and it was charged, in no very measured terms, with a virtual abandonment of every thing beside or beyond the simple reading of the text of the holy scriptures. It could not be denied that this was the original position of the society. The passages we have quoted fully and unequivocally declare it; and even as lately as May, 1838, Lord John Russell, in his opening speech as chairman of the society's annual meeting, set forth the following as two of the fundamental principles of its operations:

* We mean the line of controversy between the positive and negative religious character of the two systems; for it is important to distinguish between this feature of the controversy and that between Papists and Protestants. On this latter point the most decided ground was taken from the earlilest of the educational reform in England. The select committee of the House of Commons, appointed November 30, 1837, "to consider the best means of providing useful education for the children of the poorer classes in large towns throughout England and Wales," consisted of fifteen members, of whom Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Wyse were two. At a meeting of the committee, July 10, 1838, present eight members, exclusive of the chairman, the following resolution was proposed:—"That where there is any large number of poor Roman Catholics or other poor persons who, from religious scruples, are unwilling to send their children to either of these schools (British and Foreign, or National,) it is desirable that government should afford assistance to them on satisfactory proof that the holy scriptures (in any version,) are used and taught in their schools;" and it was NEGATIVED by a vote of six to one.

1. That lessons from the Bible should form a great part of the occupation of the schools, that the minds of the young should not only be taught the duties of morality, but that those duties should be enforced, &c. by giving them in the *words of scripture truth.*

2. That without deciding or pretending to decide among various religious bodies, in the country, while they gave, *in the words of the Bible*, truths which all communities, with small exceptions, allowed (and with no very considerable exceptions in the same words which they allowed,) yet that catechisms, whether drawn up by the church or by other religious bodies should not be enforced as a necessary part of education.

It would be difficult to avoid the conclusion that upon these principles (honestly carried out,) religious instruction must be nearly or quite confined to the reading or repeating the words of the Bible. And we are corroborated in this view by a cotemporaneous declaration, made under the society's sanction, and by its principal secretary, that "the introduction of the Bible WITHOUT NOTE OR COMMENT, involves fewer difficulties and offers greater advantages than any plan then has yet been devised for the religious instruction of the population."*

But aside from all opinions, the peculiar organization of the schools on Mr. Lancaster's plan, would seem to forbid the systematic inculcation of religious truth, except by reading the text of the Bible. The subdivisions of the school being under monitorial superintendence, it would be very difficult to blend religious instruction with the ordinary exercises of the school, and the general oral instruction of so large a number of various ages, capacities, and circumstances, would require far more time and skill than most teachers possess.

All arguments to the contrary notwithstanding, the Brit-

* National Education, the Question of Questions, by Henry Dunn: London, 1838, p. 9. As to the effect of the scheme thus highly commended, it was asserted by Lord Elliott on the floor of the House of Commons, that "owing to the system of teaching the scriptures without note or comment, *the children were absolutely ignorant of the very principles of religion*; that they were ignorant of the meaning of what they read, and that they learned it, like parrots, purely by rote. This was the opinion of men of impartiality."

"Events," said Lord Stanley, "proved that they (the Irish Education Society,) undertook that which was in its own nature impracticable; they endeavoured to give a scriptural education to all classes of the Irish people, and in attempting to accomplish that they insisted that the Bible should be read without note or comment, thus making their pupils better acquainted with the language than with the substance of the sacred writings."

ish and Foreign School Society do assure us that religious truth is fully, fairly, and unreservedly inculcated in their schools, and in the late expositions of their plans and principles, they certainly show abundant room for it. The very document from which we just now extracted a declaration of their secretary, distinctly and repeatedly recognizes the principle, that the religious instruction in their schools extends to the TEACHING as well as the reading of the holy scriptures. And but a few weeks before Lord John Russell's speech was made, to which we have referred, the society memorialized him (then in office,) on the subject of appointing a Board of National Education, proposing among other things, that "the holy scriptures should be read and TAUGHT in all the schools,—such *instruction* to form part of the usual order of occupation in the school, and to be communicated by the schoolmaster—but that the children of Roman Catholics and Jews might, if their parents required it, be absent at such times, and that the children of dissenters should not be compelled to learn any religious formulary or catechism to which their parents objected." It would seem that the schoolmaster would on these principles, be constituted a religious teacher in every sense.

Our readers will keep in mind that our present inquiry is confined to the religious relations and bearings of a school-system which professes to be based upon religious principles, without conflicting with denominational peculiarities or prejudices. A very different case, as we have already suggested, from that in Ireland or in the United States. The British and Foreign School Society start with the principle that the Bible shall be freely read in their schools, though without note or comment. "We do not ask for the Bible simply because we believe it to be the inspired Word of God, (firmly as we hold such belief;) but because being a book recognized as divine by all religious denominations, the book on which the laws and morals of the country are alike based, its admission into schools does not involve the violation of any man's conscience. We claim the Bible" "as the *common foundation* on which all our denominations rest, as the ground work of all our creeds—without which we can never be in a position to decide betwixt truth and error."* And again, "The simple introduction of the Bible into schools does not favour one sect nor prejudice another."† Of course one would infer, that in

* Question of Questions, p. 26. † Ibid. p. 33.

schools, using the Bible for the purpose and in the manner thus described, the pupil receives the evidence from the pen of the inspired witnesses and weighs, compares and decides for himself. Should the teacher—feared, respected, revered, perhaps loved—come in with a construction, or question, or comment, the relation of the parties is essentially changed. The teacher then occupies the place of a catechism—a creed—a pastor—a priest. The dogma in type is no more formidable than the dogma on the tongue—nay, by no means so formidable—for the type sustains no relation to the pupil to give to its language the most impressive sanction and authority, but the relations of a teacher often do (and always should) give him a prodigious influence over the pupil's mind. And besides all this, (an opponent might say) the printed page is unchangeable. Its contents may be known and read of all men. Its errors may be seen and shunned. But the teacher may be a fickle, unstable, though well-meaning man, and do evil where he intends good, and where there is no one to detect, or rectify his errors.

But perhaps no such rigid interpretation, as we have supposed is intended to be put upon the rule. Indeed if we rightly understand the author of "Question of Questions," (and surely he ought to know well his ground,) he would have the schoolmaster instruct the pupil in the doctrines of the Bible. "A religion which does not effect our sanctification is a superstition." "There cannot be any such thing as true virtue apart from belief in the doctrines of the gospel. Faith is the parent of holiness, and virtue the result of belief. Strip the Bible of this peculiarity, (and you do so whenever you attempt to separate the precepts of scripture from the motives and sanctions which are to be found only in the doctrines of scripture,) and it is no longer adapted to the present condition of human nature."*

This sound and sensible position is scarcely taken however before we are sent back again "to the place of beginning," as the surveyors say. "The distinction is obvious," says our author, "between Christianity and the sect—the Bible and the creed—the book and its interpretation."† So say all. Therefore, Christianity, the Bible and the book—these three—we take. The sect, the creed, the interpretation—the other three—we reject. Let us go apart now and examine our stock.

First, then, we have Christianity. And what is Chris-

* "Question of Questions," p. 28, &c. † Ibid p. 36.

tianity? "The Church of Rome gives *authority*, the Church of England gives *evidence*, as the basis of Christianity. The latter appears as a *faithful witness* of the sacred records and of the interpretation which was put upon them by the first believers—the former as an *infallible teacher* drawing her doctrines and institutions from herself, or from a secret store of tradition which is independent of the written word and the key of which has been committed to her custody (as she says,) by the founder of our religion. In one system the church is nothing, without the scriptures, in the other the scriptures are nothing without the church—its power and doctrines might have been as they are, had the New Testament never been written."* Have we not here two distinct forms of Christianity; two sects of Christians? Do we not find a radical, irreconcilable difference at the very threshold of an attempted compromise? Do professed Christians agree that we have Christianity in the authorized, or in the unauthorized, or indeed in any version of the scriptures? Have we then, what we thought we had, Christianity without a sect?

Item.—The Bible. Have Protestants the Bible? This is denied by more than one half the nominal professors of the Christian faith. And even if it is the Bible, we cannot *instruct* children from it; we cannot *inculcate its truths*—we cannot illustrate and enforce its precepts without presenting objects for the exercise of faith. There must be faith in the inspiration of the writings—faith in the existence and character of God. And do not these articles of faith constitute a creed? What is the Bible without belief in it, and what is belief in the Bible itself but a creed? Have we the Bible, and if so, have we it without a creed?

We need not examine the remaining item of our inventory, for we have already seen that it has only an imaginary existence, (at least as a text book of religious instruction,) if the mouth of the teacher is sealed. And if we look a little farther into the matter, we shall find that, in truth and fact, Christianity and the sect—the Bible and the creed—the book and its interpretation, go hand in hand, even under the very efficient and benevolent arrangements of the British and Foreign School Society, with Mr. Dunn's very valuable aid. Hear the society of whose views he is the organ:

"The necessity of basing all that is taught (in the schools) upon the sacred

* Reply of the Archbishop of Dublin, to Thomas Frankland Lewis, Esq., President of the Commissioners of Education Inquiry for Ireland, 1837.

scriptures—of fairly and fully inculcating *the whole counsel of God* without the aid of human creed, or formulary, and through the agency of persons themselves, it may be hoped (as far as man may judge) under the influence of divine grace—these were the views and principles which animated the founders of the institution; and these principles, recognizing as they do the sufficiency of scripture, the rights of conscience, the claims of humanity, and the authority of God, have proved sufficient," &c.—"Your committee have never wished to separate the morals of the Bible, from the motives, and sanctions, and principles of the Bible. Firmly believing that sound morality can only be inculcated in connexion with the hopes and fears which spring from *a cordial reception of the leading doctrines of the gospel*—they do not sanction any thing short of a fair and open inculcation of the whole mind and will of God as revealed in the scriptures."

And then hear him again, in his own proper person—before the committee of Parliament.*

Starting, as before, with the principle, that government should stipulate for secular instruction, and the simple *reading* of the scriptures, the moral and religious instruction to be given under the direction of the local committee—he is asked:

"Does the master explain the scriptures to the children in your schools?"

"He interrogates them, as they read daily, upon the plain and obvious grammatical meaning of the text."

"According to his own understanding of the text?"

"It must be so."

"Then if the children, in the course of that questioning, appear to have drawn what, to the master, seems an erroneous impression regarding the meaning of the scriptures, does the master give them a more correct opinion upon that point?"

"I think he will in many cases. In all cases the character of the moral and religious instruction must and will depend upon the teacher."

"Do you not think that the advantage to be derived from the reading of the scriptures in school will depend more upon the spirit and manner in which it is done, than upon any given quantity being read at stated hours?"

"Most certainly I do, and therefore I hold that no man is fit to *communicate religious instruction, who is not himself a religious man.*"

"Do you not think it would be painful to a sincerely religious man not to be allowed to inculcate, and forcibly inculcate, those points of doctrine which he himself as a sound Christian, believes to be essential to salvation?"

"I think in many cases it might be so, but I think that in communicating the text of scripture, as it stands, he cannot fail to communicate all the great leading doctrines of the Bible. It is on this ground the objection (of the Unitarians) to which I have referred, is made."

"Do you not think that a sincerely religious man, being a teacher of a school, would think that he was bound, by a solemn responsibility, if he entertained those (Unitarian?) opinions, to teach those children with the same spirit and the same force as he would teach his own children?"

"I think he has no right, as the teacher of a school, to communicate any (religious) opinions which are peculiar to himself, however important he may deem those opinions to be. I think those views of truth which are common

* Minutes of Evidence, 1838, pp. 43—62.

to the great body of Christians, both in England and on the continent, and in other parts of the world, will necessarily come out of the plain, obvious meaning of the text."

"Then are we to understand that these teachers, so undertaking to teach the children, likewise undertake to withhold the inculcation of those doctrines which they themselves think to be absolutely essential?"

"No, they are not required to undertake any thing of the kind. They are required solely to teach the Bible. Certainly, if a man thought it essential that every child should be brought up to believe in the Episcopal form of government as divinely constituted, he would have no right to teach that in the school, and would be prevented; and so in respect to every other particular form of church government."*

"Supposing that this master, a sincerely religious man, when teaching a child, saw that that child was wrong upon a point, that he, the master, deemed essential to salvation; would the master allow the child to continue in his error, or would he set before him what he believed to be true?"

"I cannot tell what the master might do under such circumstances. All the essential doctrines of the Bible are plain and obvious."

"But what would be the view taken by the directors of the British and Foreign School Society, if they found that the master did set this child right upon a point which he thought essential to salvation?"

"They would hold it to be his duty to confine himself to the simple teaching of the scriptures."

The vice is then screwed up closer and closer until at last, the iron flies out.

"Would the teacher be dismissed if he was found to go beyond that?"

"Very much would depend upon how far he went beyond, and what was the nature of the instruction he had given."

Not a very definite or tangible boundary, certainly.

In another stage of the same examination the witness is asked—

"Is it the practice in the British and Foreign schools to accompany the reading of the scriptures with an explanation on the part of the teacher, or instruction bearing upon the sense of the passage in question?"

"They are asked the meaning of it; it is not without *explanation* though *without comment.*

"But is that explanation purely grammatical?"

"Yes."

"When the teacher questions the child, if the answer of the child is not in accordance with the opinion of the master, and he thinks the matter important, would he offer a comment to set the child right?"

"I think it very likely that the master would; but his business is not to offer comment, but to teach the scripture as it stands."

"Is it, or is it not, the positive rule of the British and Foreign schools, that the scriptures should be given without any explanation on the part of the

* How would the case stand if the local committee required it? For the declaration of the society is, that "while the faithful reading and teaching of the scriptures are required, and the use of catechisms is forbidden, every thing else is left to the local committee"—the selection of the teacher, the discipline and exercises of the school, and the precise character of the religious instruction; and of course, if the local commitee say so, the teacher may inculcate what views he pleases, even upon church government.

teacher, or is he left to judge whether an explanation should follow the passage or not?"

"He is left to judge as to the kind of explanation which should be given; the children are interrogated always as to the meaning of what they have read."

"Are they interrogated as to the doctrinal meaning of the passage?"

"I scarcely know to what extent that is to be understood, inasmuch as the doctrinal points are taught as well as the practical, and as the plain and obvious meaning of the text is required the doctrines are certainly taught in that way. We do not recognize the schoolmaster as a commentator, but we do recognize him as a person bound to see that the child takes up an idea, and does not merely read the words."

"If I understand you rightly, the master asks if the child understands the passage; and if not, he explains the great doctrine contained in it, but in such a manner that the master shall not impress upon the child any peculiar creed of any one sect of Christians. Is that the case?"

"He simply takes up the obvious meaning of the text as it stands, the plain grammatical meaning of the authorized" (but as Roman Catholics contend, sectarian) "version."

"And it is his duty to abstain from inculcating any tenets peculiar to one sect of Christians?"

"Yes."

"Practically, in the schools of the British and Foreign School Society, do the schoolmasters give the children the tinge of their peculiar creeds, or not?"

"They do not."

"If the master has the power of selecting passages of scripture and to puts his interpretation" (the book and the interpreter thus come together again) "upon passages which require explanation, is it not clear that impressions derived from that reading and explanation to the children must be coloured somewhat by the peculiar views of the master himself?

"I think it is very possible that in all cases, to a great extent, the opinions of the master will colour (tinge?) any explanation he may give, however simple those explanations may be."

But we forbear farther extracts. Those we have already made must, we think, satisfy any unprejudiced mind that whatever may have been accomplished in other countries, the British and Foreign School Society has not discovered the secret of educating the human mind religiously, without biasing it towards some particular form of religious belief. No one can fail to infer from the general tenor of the foregoing interrogatories and answers, that their system contemplates thorough religious instruction, and to this end requires a religious man or woman at the head of the school, and authorizes and expects daily and faithful instruction to be given in the true and proper meaning of the holy scriptures, as they are read. This is all wise and right, and commends itself to the judgments and consciences of the great body of religious men—but still it is open to precisely the same *class* of objections that are urged against the National schools. The British and Foreign School Society gives its master a text—the National Society gives its master both

text and sermon. Those who favour and patronize the latter have agreed on a certain interpretation of the scriptures, and have thrown it into the forms of a creed, catechism, &c. Under the other scheme, each master "hath an interpretation," suggested, if you please, by the simple, obvious, grammatical, construction of the text as it stands, but still his own interpretation of the inspired passage, and hence the conclusion is inevitable, that one class of schools is under a steady, uniform, definite, powerful sectarian influence and the other under various, uncertain, indefinite, and perhaps for these causes, weaker influences of the same character. To be consistent with the principles of their organization, as declared by themselves, the British and Foreign School Society must be more or less sectarian. It is perfectly obvious that without swerving a hair's breadth from these principles, they would by their mere negative influence, utterly subvert (and that at no distant day, if counteracting influences were not vigorously employed,) the church establishment, as such; and make Episcopacy in England what it is in this country, one of some dozen sects, all depending for their influence, and for the extent to which their doctrines and usages shall be received, upon the judgment, conscience, education, or caprice of their fellow-men.

There is another point, closely connected with that we have just dismissed, and peculiarly interesting and important to us at this juncture. We refer to the British and Foreign School Society's method of disposing of Roman Catholics, Unitarians, Jews, and that large class who have no religious associations, (including deists and infidels,) and whose voice is raised against every kind and degree of religious influence. For the purpose of showing the position of the society, as defined by themselves, we must return for a moment to the volume of evidence.

1. *As to Catholics and Jews.* "Do you think," (said the Commissioners to Mr. Dunn,) "that in the British and Foreign School Society, any plan might be devised by which the children of Catholics should be admitted, even if their parents had an objection to the (authorized) version of the scriptures being used, by means of its being read at a certain time and their children not being required to come at that time, but to come subsequently?"

"I am inclined to think that the Catholics and Jews will always prefer to be educated alone; they will never mix generally with the rest of the population."—"I think the Catholics, generally, will not be content with any system of instruction which is not, to some extent, under the influence of their own priests."—"We find that, generally speaking, the Catholics prefer educating their own children. The great body of all classes of Protestant dissenters feel very strongly on the point that the scriptures should be recognized in the schools."

2. *As to Unitarians.* "Do you think that a considerable portion of valuable religious instruction may be conveyed to children, so as to have a highly beneficial effect upon their future conduct and character, in a manner which shall be generally acceptable to the great body of Christians, leaving those abstruse points upon which men are inclined to differ, to be taught in whatever degree the parents of these children may wish, in a more private manner?"

"I think it is the case, with the exception of the *Unitarians.* The differences between the Unitarian and all other bodies of Christians, are so great and relate so much to the very groundwork on which all proceed, that I should utterly despair of any master thoroughly satisfying a Unitarian and a Trinitarian, if both were determined to watch narrowly the working of the system."

3. *As to deists, infidels, and irreligious men generally.* In a pamphlet to which we have already referred, Mr. Dunn had said that—

"With the exception of certain trifling differences, as to translation, &c., the religious portion of the community agree in receiving the Bible as the word of God; their consciences therefore are not wounded by its introduction into schools. *The irreligious man is not in a condition to plead conscience.* His objection does not arise from that which alone claims regard—because it alone justifies resistance to law—viz. the recognition of a higher authority in matters of religion; but from a disbelief in God and religion, altogether."

In reference to this paragraph, Mr. Dunn was asked by one of the committee, (Mr. Gladstone,) in what sense he used the term "irreligious man?"

"I simply meant the man who does not believe in revelation."

"Your opinion is that a man who does not believe in revelation has no fair plea, to which the government of the country ought to defer, against the introduction of the scriptures into the schools?"

"Not any."

"You would say that a man who disbelieves in revelation is necessarily a man who has no conscience?"

"No; but I would say respecting the man who disbelieves in revelation, that his objection to the Bible must stand upon the same ground as he might object to a book of history or any thing else. He might dislike the book as he might doubt its authenticity, but he can have no *conscientious* objection to it. I think all depends upon what is meant by a conscientious objection. I have used the term simply as the objection of a man who feels that higher authority presses upon him. I call the objection of a member of the Society of Friends, for instance, to the payment of a war tax, a conscientious objection. I may, as an individual, disapprove of a particular war, but I cannot on that ground refuse (conscientiously object) to pay the tax."

"But if a person believes in a God, and in the authority of God, but does not believe that the Bible is a revelation of His will, do you not think that he may have a conscientious objection to the circulation of a book as emanating from the authority of the Supreme Being, which, in his opinion, does not emanate from his authority, and which, therefore, circulates under a false title?"

"I doubt the existence of such a case."

"Is this the effect or cause of your doubt, that you consider that those who do not admit the Bible as a revelation, have not, in general, a practical idea of God as the governor of the world?"

"Believing, as I do, that infidelity arises from moral causes, I do not consider it a fair case to put."

It is not necessary to examine the working of the *National Society's* system, as we have that of its coadjutor or rival. It is certainly a wise and efficient agency to bring and keep children under the watch and guidance of the established church, and to train them up in the knowledge of her doctrines, usages and institutions; and they do not disguise this object. It is certainly legitimate and laudable, and we see not how the principle on which they act can be invalidated by any class of the friends of strict religious education. There may be other and kindred principles more generic, elastic, or comprehensive, upon which a system of a less denominational or exclusive character may be established. *But if religious instruction is tolerated, it must and will be doctrinal*—for, as we have seen, the very reading of the Bible introduces the sectarian stumbling block—inasmuch as all religious sects do not agree as to what is the Bible, nor do they agree in the nature and authority of the book, let it be what it may. This very point divides Christendom into its two principal sects.

Upon the whole, then, we see that the attempt made by British educators to solve the problem we have stated, has succeeded no better in England than in Ireland. We unfeignedly rejoice that religious teaching is so general in the British schools—that children who frequent them are so well taught the doctrines and duties of revealed religion. But they can yet show us no plan by which the children of Protestants and Catholics can attend the same school, and enjoy the least degree of useful and efficient religious instruction in consistency with their respective systems of faith. The text-book—the revelation of God's will—the source and foundation of all religious instruction, (certainly of all *Christian* religious instruction,) is in the way—the religious opinions of the teacher are in the way—the principles of discipline—the standard of right and wrong—the very liberty of the human mind are points of interminable dispute. And hence we maintain that it is utterly impossible for the State, as such, to distribute money to any school in which there is the least vestige of religious instruction, without aiding to propagate opinions which are repudiated by some religious sect or community.*

* "So far from caring little for religion, (in systems of education,) we consider it of so inestimably important a nature, that it never can be made the subject of compromise and concession, and that therefore it cannot be taught to children of one sect by professors who belong to another."—*Lord Brougham.*

The two Societies, whose operations are so influential upon the public instruction of the British kingdom, exert their power chiefly through the medium of Normal and Model Schools. By the latest report it appears that the National Society within the last year opened an establishment at Stanley Grove, near London, for the training of youth to be schoolmasters; with a model school, already containing 110 pupils. The original outlay on this establishment, with eleven acres of land, was upwards of $100,000. The annual expenses are restricted to $10,000, exclusive of the amount received from students. The term of study in the training school varies from one and a half to three years, at the rate of $125 annually. Each pupil, after a probation of three months, is apprenticed to the society till he is twenty-one. It is designed to give each teacher just so much and such a kind of knowledge, as shall fit him "for a parochial schoolmaster or teacher of the poor." "The branch of knowledge of which he will learn mostly, will be that most important to himself and his future scholars—*the knowledge of the gospel.*" A similar establishment for female youth has also been recently opened, where forty candidates for the office of teacher will be trained for at least twelve months, at a charge of $75 a year. The whole annual cost of this institution is estimated at $3,750.

The Society has also two establishments for training male and female adults to be teachers. One hundred and seventy-one individuals have been instructed in these institutions during the last year. In all these a model or practising school is also maintained. There is also a class of persons employed by the National Society, called "organizing masters." They are required to visit schools and suggest improvements. The Bishop of Chester in moving the acceptance of the last report, said—"with such a system as this spreading through each diocese, they might venture to look forward with feelings of much satisfaction *to the spread of education among the poor, in the principles of the established church.*"

At the last annual meeting of the *British and Foreign School Society*, Lord John Russell presided and made a speech. It appears from the report that 55 new schools were established during the preceding year. In the model schools eleven hundred boys and girls have been received, Total of boys and girls taught in the model school since its commencement, 52,828—total of teachers trained in the Nor-

mal school 221. The new and spacious buildings at the Borough Road establishment are nearly completed—and the grant and subscription fall but about $25,000 short of the estimated expense.

ART. II.—*The Religious Instruction of the Negroes in the United States.* By Charles C. Jones, Savannah. Published by Thomas Purse. 1842.

THIS is an interesting publication. Its author, the Rev. Mr. Jones, has as good a claim to the name of a philanthropist as any one with whom we have had any acquaintance. Possessed of learning and talents, not only sufficient to command an eligible situation in the church, but to render him distinguished, he has chosen to forego all the flattering prospects of ease and honour, connected with such stations, and to devote himself, with apostolic zeal, to the instruction of negro slaves. And this benevolent enterprize he undertook at the suggestion of his own heart. When a student at the seminary, he had formed his purpose, and the outlines of his plan, and zealously endeavoured to enlist others in the cause of the neglected slaves. And no sooner was he invested with authority to preach the gospel, than he commenced his self-denying labours among this degraded people, in his own native country; and, with a very short interruption, has continued, indefatigably and successfully, to give instruction to the slaves on such plantations, whose owners were disposed to encourage him in his labour of love. The public, who are unacquainted with Mr. Jones, may form an estimate of his learning and eloquence, from the single fact, that when a professor of sacred rhetoric and ecclesiastical history was wanted in the Southern Theological Seminary, at Columbia, S. C., he was selected as a suitable person to fill that office. Being reluctant to leave the humble field of labour, which he had marked out for himself, Mr. Jones, at first declined this honourable call: but when the desire to obtain his services in the seminary was so great that the call was repeated, he was induced by the urgent persuasion of many friends, to accept the invitation. But when he reflected on the destitute condition of the congregations of coloured people whom he had begun to in-

struct, but who were now left without a teacher, he could not be contented in his new and honourable station, but magnanimously resigned his professorship, and returned to his flock, who received him with open arms. And from that time to the present, Mr. Jones has continued to labour among the slaves in Liberty county, Ga., without intermission. A book from such a man, containing a succinct history of what has been attempted and effected, for the instruction of the African race; and which gives, in detail, the methods of instruction which have been proposed or adopted, and the success which has attended such efforts, surely deserves the attention of the public. And such is the volume before us. The "historical sketch" is divided into three periods, the first reaching from 1620 till 1790, the second from 1790 till 1820, and the third from 1820 to 1842.

The slave trade had been carried on for more than half a century by the Spaniards, with whom the nefarious traffic commenced, before it was engaged in by the English, and then it was carried on in English ships to Spanish settlements, before the British possessed any colonies on the continent of North America. The commencement of the trade by Sir John Hawkins, under queen Elizabeth, was in the year 1562; forty-five years before the settlement of Jamestown, in 1607. The first vessel which imported slaves into the colony of Virginia, was a Dutch man-of-war, from which were landed twenty negroes, from the coast of Guinea. From this time slaves were gradually introduced into all the British colonies, but generally, "contrary to the wishes of the colonists." The first cargo was brought into Boston in 1645. "And though their introduction was denounced, and the negroes ordered to be returned, at public charge;" yet the trade was afterwards permitted, and many engaged in it. Slaves were imported into all the colonies, but the greater number was carried to the southern states, as there their labour was more needed, and the climate better suited to them. All the vessels, however, engaged in this trade, belonged either to Great Britain or New England.

At the declaration of Independence in 1776, the number of African slaves, in the thirteen colonies, was a little rising half a million. At the first census under the federal constitution, the number of slaves in the United States was 697,697, and the free coloured persons 59,481—making a total of 757,178 of coloured persons.

Among the earliest efforts for the instruction of this en-

slaved race, is a set of "Directions to Masters in foreign plantations, who have negroes and other slaves." These directions are found in Mr. Baxter's "Christian Directory," and are worthy of the serious attention of masters, even at this day.

The first direction calls upon masters to understand well how far their power over slaves extended, and what limits God had set thereto. "Remember," says the author, "that they have immortal souls, and are equally capable of salvation with yourselves, and therefore you have no power to do any thing which will hinder their salvation. Remember, that God is their absolute owner, and that you have none but a derived and limited property in them: that they and you are equally under the government and laws of God; that God is their reconciled, tender father, and if they be as good, doth love them as well as you: and that they are the redeemed ones of Christ—therefore, so use them, as to preserve Christ's right and interest in them."

2d. "Remember that you are Christ's trustees, or the guardians of their souls; and that the greater your power is over them, the greater your charge is of them, and your d.. them. So must you exercise both your power and love to bring them to the knowledge of the faith of Christ; and to ... et obedience of God's commands."

3. "So serve your necessities by your slaves as to prefer God's interest, and their everlasting happiness. Teach them the way to heaven, and do all for their souls which I have directed you to do for your other servants. Though you may make some difference in their diet and clothing, yet none as to the furthering of their salvation. If they be infidels use them so as tendeth to win them to Christ, and the love of religion, by showing them that Christians are less worldly, less cruel and passionate, and more wise, and charitable, and holy and meek, than any other persons are. Wo to them that by their cruelty and covetousness do scandalize even slaves, and hinder their conversion and salvation."

The 7th and last direction is, "Make it your chief end in buying and using slaves to win them to Christ, and save their souls. Do not only endeavour this, by the by, when you have first consulted your own commodity, but make this more your end than your own commodity itself; and let their salvation be far more valued by you, than their service, and carry yourself to them, as those that are sensible that they are redeemed with you by Christ, from the slavery of

Satan, and may live with them in the liberty of the saints in glory."

As "the works of this eminent servant of God had an extensive circulation, these 'Directions' may have been productive of much good on the plantations of those owners into whose hands they fell."

In the year 1727, Gibson, Bishop of London, addressed a letter to the masters and mistresses of families, in the English plantations, abroad; exhorting them to encourage and promote the instruction of their negroes in the Christian faith. What the condition of the slaves at that time was, in relation to Christian instruction, may be learned from the introduction to the bishop's letter, where he says, "I find the numbers are prodigiously great; and am not a little troubled to observe, how small a progress has been made, in a Christian country, towards delivering those poor creatures from the pagan darkness and superstition in which they were bred, and the making them partakers of the light of the gospel, and of the blessings and benefits belonging to it. And, which is to be yet more lamented, I find there has been not only very little progress made in the work, but that all *attempts* towards it have been by too many industriously discouraged and hindered; partly by magnifying the *difficulties* of the work beyond what they really are; and partly by mistaken suggestions of the change which baptism would make in the condition of the negroes, to the loss of their masters."

The Bishop of London's letter is very much occupied in answering objections, which were made by the planters, to the instruction and baptism of the slaves; and he appeals especially to the principles of Christianity, which should have weight with Christian masters.

He, at the same time, addressed a letter to the missionaries in the English plantations, exhorting them to give their assistance towards the instruction of the negroes of their several parishes, in the Christian faith. In this letter, he says, "I would also hope, that the schoolmasters, in the several parishes, part of whose business it is to instruct youth in the principles of Christianity, might contribute something, towards carrying on this work, by being ready to bestow upon it some of their leisure time; and especially on the Lord's day, when both they and the negroes are most at liberty, and the clergy are taken up with the public duties of their function. And though the assistance

they give to this pious design, should not meet with any reward from man, yet their comfort may be that it is the work of God, and will assuredly be rewarded by him; and the less they are *obliged* to this, on account of any reward they receive from men, the greater will their reward be from *the hands of God.* I must therefore entreat you to recommend it to them, in my name, and dispose them by all proper arguments and persuasions to turn their thoughts sincerely to it, and to be always ready to offer and lend their assistance, at their leisure hours."

Bishop Berkley, after having resided two years in Rhode Island, preached a sermon before the "Society for propagating the gospel in Foreign Parts," in 1731, in which he mentions the negroes. "The negroes," says he, "in the government of Rhode Island, are about half as many more than the Indians, and both together scarce amount to a seventh part of the colony. The religion of these people, as is natural to suppose, takes after that of their masters. Some few are baptized; several frequent the different assemblies, and far the greater part, none at all." This excellent and philanthropic man, in a "Proposal to establish a college in Bermuda," remarks, "Now, the clergy sent out to America, have proved, too many of them, very meanly qualified, both in learning and morals, for the discharge of their office."—"To this may be added, the small care that hath been taken to convert the negroes of our plantations, who, to the infamy of England, and the scandal of the world, continue heathen, under Christian masters, and in Christian countries; which would never be, if our planters were rightly instructed, and made sensible that they have disappointed [frustrated] their own baptism, by denying it to those who belong to them; that it would be to their advantage to have slaves, who should 'obey in all things their masters according to the flesh, not with eye service, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, as fearing God;' that gospel liberty consists with temporal servitude, and that their slaves would only be better slaves, by becoming Christians."

The labours of the Presbyterians, in Virginia, in the instruction of the slaves, commenced with the settlement of the Rev. Samuel Davies, in that colony, in the year 1747. Mr. Davies furnished such as could read, with Bibles and Watts' hymns; and pains were taken to teach the young to read. We have seen persons, born in Africa, who were baptized by Mr. Davies, and by his care had been taught

to read: and have seen in their hands, the books given to them by this eminent preacher. Mr. Davies was soon joined in his labours by the Rev. John Todd, who was installed in Louisa in 1752. In a letter written by him to a member of the Society, in London, for promoting Christian knowledge among the poor, dated 1755, he says, "The poor neglected negroes are so far from having any money to purchase books, that they themselves are the property of others. Who were originally African savages, and never heard of the name of Jesus or his gospel, until they arrived at the land of their slavery, in America; whom their masters generally neglect, and whose souls none care for, as though immortality were not a privilege common to them with their masters. These poor ignorant Africans are objects of compassion, and I think the most proper objects of the society's charity. The inhabitants of Virginia are computed to be about 300,000, the one half of which number are supposed to be negroes. The number of those who attend my ministry, at particular times, is uncertain, but generally about 300, who give a stated attendance; and never have I been so struck with the appearance of an assembly, as when I have glanced my eye, to that part of the meeting-house where they usually sit, *adorned*, (for so it has appeared to me) with so many black countenances, eagerly attentive to every word they hear, and frequently bathed in tears. A considerable number of them (about a hundred) have been baptized, after a proper time for instruction; having given credible evidence, not only of their acquaintance with the important doctrines of the Christian religion, but also a deep sense of them in their minds, attended by a life of strict piety and holiness." "There are multitudes of them, in different places, who are willing and eagerly desirous to be instructed, and embrace every opportunity of acquainting themselves with the doctrines of the gospel. And though they have generally very little help to learn to read, yet to my agreeable surprize, many of them, by dint of application, in their leisure hours, have made such progress, that they can intelligibly read a plain author, and especially their Bibles." Mr. Todd mentions their great fondness for music, and their delight in singing Watts' hymns. He informed his friend, that on one sacramental occasion, "he had the pleasure of seeing forty of them around the table of the Lord, all of whom made a credible profession of Christianity, and several of them gave unu-

sual evidence of sincerity, and he believed that more than a thousand negroes attended on his ministry, at the different places where he alternately officiated."

In 1757, Mr. Davies writes to Dr. Bellamy, "What little success I have had, has been chiefly among the extremes, of gentlemen and negroes. Indeed; God has been remarkably working among the latter. I have baptized about one hundred and fifty adults; and at the last sacramental solemnity, I had the pleasure of seeing the table *graced* with about sixty black faces. They generally behave well, as far as I can hear, though there are some instances of apostacy among them." The counties in which Mr. Davies laboured were, Hanover, Henrico, Goochland, Caroline, New Kent and Louisa; but he yearly took long preaching tours, through the southern counties of the Colony, in all which he directed special attention to the slaves.

Another minister, of the Presbyterian church, who laboured faithfully and successfully among the slaves, was the Rev. Robert Henry, who divided his labours between Cub Creek and Briery. At the former place he collected a large congregation of blacks, to whom he preached regularly, and as many as a hundred were hopefully converted, and received into the church, by baptism; and admitted, after examination, to full communion. This congregation of slaves continued steadily to attend to the preaching of the word long after Mr. Henry's death. It was, indeed, an interesting sight, to see nearly a hundred black faces around the Lord's table at one time. Many of these learned to read the New Testament by their own industry, and some of them maintained the character of eminently pious persons; and by their upright and consistent conduct gained the confidence of their masters and mistresses; so that they were often intrusted with a superintendence over their fellow servants, in the room of overseers; and were selected for house servants. And as the conduct and character of the black communicants could not be so well known to the elders, as to themselves, it was customary to appoint two or three of their number to exercise a supervision of the rest; to admonish and reprove them, as occasion required, and when any of them were guilty of such misconduct as required the notice of the session, their case was duly reported to that body; and there was reason to think that these overseers acted with great fidelity in the trust committed to them. Though this congregation contained much the lar-

gest number of communicants, of any other among the Presbyterians, yet there was a considerable number in all the churches, in eastern Virginia; and in Prince Edward and Cumberland counties, the number who attended public worship was large. Often the minister, after preaching to his usual audience, would congregate the negroes in the church, by themselves, and address to them a discourse in plainer and more familiar language than the usual style of sermons.

In the latter part of the last century, the Methodists and Baptists spread themselves over the southern states; and as their preachers were mostly unlearned men, and were animated with a fiery zeal, they attracted the attention of the slaves, and many negroes were received into both these societies. Unhappily, the discourses of the preachers were better calculated to move the passions of their ignorant hearers, than to give them sound instruction. In consequence, the slaves became infected with a spirit of enthusiasm, and often disturbed the worshipping assemblies where they attended, by their shouting and outcries; for they seemed to think that religion consisted in violent excitement, and that God was glorified by their shouts. Many preachers rose up among themselves, so that after a while most of the blacks separated from the congregation of the whites, and attended on the preachers of their own colour. Among these black preachers, however, were found some men of extraordinary talents, whose untutored eloquence surprised all who heard them.

Some idea may be formed of the success of both the Baptist and Methodist denominations, among the slaves of the south, from the numbers added to each of these societies. In 1793, those in communion with the Baptists, numbered, between eighteen and nineteen thousand. And from 1791 to 1795, the numbers in the Methodist society were from twelve to sixteen thousand. The behaviour of these professors is stated to have been such, as to gain the confidence of their masters, and the protection of the civil rulers, though they laboured under the disabilities incident to a state of servitude. In 1813, the coloured communicants in the Baptist churches had arisen to the number of 40,000; and in the Methodist society, in 1816, the number was 43,304.

We find also, in the statistics of the Episcopal church for 1813, above three hundred communicants mentioned, most of whom were in Charleston, S. C. "And Bishop Dehon

seems to have had his good feelings excited in behalf of the negroes." He, therefore, endeavoured to promote among their masters, in his diocese, a concern for their eternal salvation. The Rev. Dr. Dalcho, of the Episcopal church, Charleston, in the year 1823, issued a valuable pamphlet, entitled, "Practical Considerations, founded on the Scriptures, relative to the Slave Population of South Carolina." There were then three hundred and sixteen coloured communicants in the Episcopal churches of Charleston, alone; and two hundred children in their Sunday schools.

Bishop Bowen, of the diocese of South Carolina, prepared, at the request of the convention, and printed, "A Pastoral Letter, on the Religious Instruction of the Slaves of members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the State of South Carolina," to which he appended "Scripture Lessons," for their use.

The Rev. George W. Freeman, late Rector of Christ's church, Raleigh, N. C. published two discourses, "On the Rights and Duties of Slaveholders," in which he urges upon masters, the duty of religious instruction. Bishop Meade, of Virginia, made a report to the convention of his diocese, "On the Best Means of Promoting the Religious Instruction of Servants;" the result of his extended observation and long experience in this department of labour.

Bishop Gadsden, of South Carolina, devotes a considerable portion of his address to the convention, to the subject of the religious instruction of the negroes. In it, he thus speaks: "Of that class, peculiar to our social system—the coloured people—many are members of our church; as are the masters of a very large number of them, who as yet are not converted to the gospel. To make these fellow creatures, who share with us the precious redemption, which is by Christ Jesus, good Christians, is a purpose of which she is not, and never has been, regardless. The interest and efforts of this cause have increased. But the feeling ought to be much deeper, and the efforts more extended. Consider the large number who are yet almost if not entirely without the restraints, the incentives, the consolations, and the hopes of the gospel; under the bondage of Satan, and on the precipice of the second death. I speak more particularly of those, the smoke of whose cabins is in sight of our ministers; who live on the same plantations with members of our church. Can nothing—ought not every thing that can, be done, to bring such persons to the knowledge and

obedience of Christ?" From the parochial reports, in this diocese, it appears, that there were in communion, coloured members amounting to eight hundred and sixty-nine, and yet no reports were received from nearly one-third of the parishes. There were 1,450 scholars in the Sunday schools for coloured children. Eight of the clergy preach on plantations, as well as at their respective churches, and give especial attention to their coloured congregations. It is the practice of the Episcopal church, in this diocese, to baptize the infants and children of negroes, who are members of the church.

But still the Methodist society takes the lead in this interesting and important enterprize. Their system of itinerancy is peculiarly favourable for reaching this population; so widely scattered on separate plantations. The total of coloured communicants in that connexion for the year 1841, is no less than 102,158, of which the South Carolina Conference has 30,481.

The Presbyterian church has made less effort in the instruction of the blacks in late years, than they did formerly. But a new impulse has been given to their zeal by the labours and success of the Rev. Mr. Jones. The first thing attempted by Mr. Jones, was to form an "association" among the planters, to promote the instruction of the negroes. The first annual report of this association, which has taken the name of the "Liberty County Association," was published in 1833. From the reports of this association for the years 1840, 1841, it appears that an extensive revival commenced among the negroes in 1839, and continued for two years, in almost every part of the country. The labours of Mr. Jones have been indefatigable, and his success very gratifying, as appears by the published reports referred to above.

In Mississippi, the Rev. James Smylie, an aged minister, the Rev. Mr. Archibald, and the Rev. Wm. C. Blair, late a missionary to the Chickasaws, laboured among the blacks, on the plantations of such masters as were willing to have their slaves instructed. And for several years past, Mr. Thomas Ogden has succeeded Mr. Blair, who has gone as a missionary to Texas. And we have understood that Mr. Ogden's labours have been attended with the hopeful conversion of a number. The Rev. Robert Finley, lately agent for the American Colonization Society, has also turned his attention to the instruction of the slaves in the upper part of

Louisiana, with good prospects of usefulness. No doubt, many pastors whose charge includes numerous slaves, are diligent in giving them instruction, as a part of their flock, for whom they have an account to render.

The Rev. C. C. Jones, after finishing his historical sketch, of which we have given a brief abstract, proceeds to consider some of the hindrances to this work. The principal of these are, 1. "Our intimate knowledge of the degraded moral character of the negroes." 2. "Our difference of colour, and our superior relations to them, in society." 3. "Our latent, and, in many instances, manifest disinclination to the full disclosure of the moral and religious condition of the negroes." 4. "The difficulty of attaining an insight into the negro character." He then proceeds to give an account of the circumstances of the negroes which affect their moral and religious condition. As to early education, in most families, it can scarcely be said, that the negro children have any education. Even pious masters have been too negligent in the instruction of the children of their slaves, and ministers of the gospel have not paid that attention which was practicable to this subject. These children have seldom any opportunity of attending either on family, or public worship. And as to the scriptures, they have no access to them; because, by the laws of the most of the slave-states, it is forbidden to teach them to read. Still, some do by their own efforts, learn this important art, but the number is comparatively very small. When arrived at adult age, the negro slave has still very few opportunities of religious instruction. On many plantations they assemble, and have singing and prayer among themselves; and if any one be present who can read, a chapter in the Bible is read. On the Sabbath, they are permitted to attend public worship, but thousands of them never avail themselves of the privilege. We were gratified to find Mr. Jones declaring, "I have never known servants forbidden to attend the worship of God, on the Sabbath day; except as a restraint temporarily laid, for some flagrant misconduct."

As to the religious knowledge of the negroes, it is necessarily very imperfect, and confused. They of course are liable to fall into many practical errors. They are "inclined to place true religion in profession, in forms and ordinances, or in excited states of feeling; and are easily misled by enthusiastic notions of having divine communications by dreams, visions, and voices. Like all ignorant peo-

ple they are prone to superstition. They have implicit faith in charms, apparitions, second sight, and witchcraft. Some of their superstitions were imported from Africa; especially in what relates to witchcraft, and the power of conjurors. Persons of this description sometimes obtain an unbounded influence over the negroes, so that they dare not disobey them, whatever they command. But just as far as the gospel is received, these superstitions are dispelled. The negroes are very little sensible of their obligations to improve religious privileges, when within their reach. They are, therefore, very apt to neglect attendance on preaching when it takes place on the plantation. They often plead in excuse for their remissness, that they are wearied by their labours. But this is a mere excuse, for slaves in the south fall short at least one-third of what free white labourers perform. Their standard of morals is low, even in those who are members of the church; and cases of discipline are very frequent. The crimes to which they are most addicted are adultery, fornication, and theft. Profane swearing, Sabbath-breaking, and quarrelling and fighting are very common vices. Drunkenness would be prevalent if they had the opportunity of indulging their inclinations. As it is, numerous instances of this vice may be met with among those who inhabit towns and villages. The low state of morals among the free people of colour, we need not mention, as their degraded condition among us, is too well known to need any information from abroad.

Our author next considers the obligations resting on the church, to afford the gospel to the negroes. He offers the following weighty considerations, 1. "They are the most dependent of all people upon us, for the word of life." In the eye of the law, they are *property*, but the law makes no provision whatever, for their religious improvement, but rather throws formidable obstacles in the way of their instruction. Thei rsituation is such, that no access can be had to them by benevolent persons from abroad. Formerly, preachers from among themselves were tolerated, but now they are entirely suppressed. They have no church organization of their own, separate from that of the white people. They are certainly the most needy of any people in our country, having no education, no capacity to read the scriptures, no teachers of their own colour, and a very small number of white teachers. And they are the most accessible to us of any people on earth. There is no occasion

to cross the wide ocean, or to traverse mountains and deserts to reach them, for they are in our midst. The missionary here, has no necessity of acquiring a difficult foreign language, before he can preach the gospel. This people speak no other language than that used by the rest of the people. There are no prejudices of caste to hinder them from associating with Christians; but every effort for their benefit, by white men, they would consider to be great condescension; and all their prejudices are in favour of Christianity, in the general. Even the slaves of open infidels are never found professing infidelity. And although the laws, very injudiciously, we think, forbid them to be taught to read; and in some States, prohibit separate assemblies of black people; yet in no State is there any law against oral instruction, nor any hindrance to their attending on the preaching of the gospel, on the Sabbath day.

The obligation of the church to engage in this work, may be argued, from the providence of God, by which a multitude of these people have been thrown into the possession, and are placed under the guardianship of the members of several Christian denominations. Is it not evident then, that they, who in the providence of God have authority over them, and who enjoy the fruit of their labours, should provide for their religious instruction? Do these Christians contribute freely towards the evangelizing the heathen world, and will they deny the gospel to those who are so near to them, and so much in their power? As no one now doubts that they are a branch of the human race, does not the law of love, binding on us toward all men, oblige us to promote the best and highest interests of this unhappy race? As they are deprived of liberty, and of all the privileges of freemen, do for Christ's sake, and for the sake of their immortal souls, let them have the opportunity of securing happiness in the world to come. Are you not bound to do to them as you would, upon a change of situations, have them do unto you? And do you value the gospel so little, that if you were destitute of it, you would not wish, above all things, to have it communicated to you? And you are more especially bound to do this, because it would not only make them better men, but more faithful servants.

But this obligation does not rest solely on our own reasoning. It is a matter of express divine revelation. "The word of God recognizes the relation of master

and servant, and addresses express commands to us, as *masters*." In the first covenant made with his chosen people, in the family of Abram, servants constituted a large majority of the little community, and were expressly included, and received the sign of the covenant, in their flesh. And the command to the father of the faithful was peremptory: "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, *he that is born in the house, or bought with money* of any stranger, which is not of thy seed." And of this eminent patriarch it was testified by the Almighty, "For I know him, that he will command his children and his *household* after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord; to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abram, that which he hath spoken of him." And servants, when initiated into the church of God, had a title to all the privileges of his house. They are particularly recognized in the law of the Sabbath: "And the man servant, and the maid servant" were to participate in the feasts at which the free-will offerings and other sacrifices were eaten by the family. And in the New Testament, masters and servants are addressed, as belonging to the same churches, and heirs of the same grace of life. The author asks: "What kind of servants are here intended? *Slaves;* the original teaches us so, while the very duties enjoined on servants, and observations made upon their conduct, (1 Cor. vii. 20,) confirms the fact, that they were *literally slaves*. And the kind of slavery that existed among the Jews, was that allowed in the Old Testament, which may be considered identical with that which prevails among us, at the present time. And no one will deny, that the slavery which existed among the Romans and Greeks, and Gentile nations, was identical with our own." "When, therefore, the New Testament addresses us as *masters*, we who are masters, are as expressly addressed, as when we are, as *fathers*. And what are the duties which in the New Testament are enjoined upon masters toward their servants? They are such as these: 'And ye masters do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening, knowing that your master is also in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him.' Ephes. vi. 9. As servants are exhorted to fulfil their duties to their masters, 'as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart;' so also masters are exhorted, to do the same things, to fulfil their duties to their servants,

from the same principle of obedience to God. 'Masters give unto your servants, that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a master in heaven.' Can any one doubt that among the duties of masters is that of imparting, and causing to be imparted to them, the gospel of salvation?" The following remarks show strikingly the inconsistency of those who are zealous and liberal in contributing to other objects of benevolence, but neglect their own slaves. "As philanthropists and Christians, we are contributing of our substance, and offering up our prayers, that Christ's kingdom may come, and that his gospel may be preached to every people under heaven. We have assisted in sending missionaries to the heathen, thousands of miles from us, and to multitudes of white settlements in our own country; in founding theological seminaries, and filling them with students, that the demand for labourers in the great harvest might be supplied. We have assisted in having the gospel preached in our public prisons, in the harbours of our sea-port cities, and along the lines of our canals on the great waters. . . . . This is all as it should be. But what have we done, systematically, and perseveringly, for the negroes, in order that they might enjoy the gospel of Christ? Why are they as a class overlooked by us, in our benevolent regards and efforts? What blindness hath happened to us in part, that we cannot see their spiritual necessities, and feel the claims which they undeniably have upon us?" "We cannot cry out against the Papists for withholding the scriptures from the common people, and keeping them in ignorance of the way of life; for our inconsistency is as great as theirs, if we withhold the Bible from our servants, and keep them in ignorance of its saving truths, which we certainly do, while we will not provide ways and means of having it read and explained to them." He says, "The celebrated John Randolph, on a visit to a female friend, found her surrounded with seamstresses making up clothing. 'What work have you in hand?' 'O sir, I am preparing this clothing for the Greeks.' On taking leave, seeing some of her servants in need of the very clothing which their tender-hearted mistress was sending abroad, he exclaimed, 'Madam! madam! the Greeks are at your door.'"

But it is time that we should notice briefly, the means and plans which this experienced and devoted missionary proposes for the instruction of the slaves. He recommends

"that ministers should devote a portion of each Sabbath to the regular preaching of the gospel to the negroes." And that, when it is possible, give a lecture to them some evening in the week. Also, "that Sabbath schools should be instituted for their benefit. The great hope of permanently benefiting the negroes," says he, "is laid in Sabbath schools, in which, children and youth may be trained in the knowledge of the Lord." Such schools should be connected with every church, in our southern country; and with ordinary effort, may be kept up from year to year. "I am," says he, "acquainted with schools which have been in existence from seven to nine years. The effect of them has been to increase, in a high degree, the religious intelligence of the people generally, to benefit their manners, improve their morals, elevate their character, and make them greater respecters of the Sabbath, more regular in their attendance on the public worship of God, and more mindful of the various duties of life; and when converted, more lasting and consistent members of the church."

"In addition to the Sabbath school," he recommends, "that ministers of churches ought to have stated seasons, for the gathering together of all the coloured members, that they may form a more intimate acquaintance with them." At which seasons, "let," says he, "the coloured children of the church and congregation, be assembled by the pastors for catechetical instruction." "Pastors should attend the funerals which occur in their coloured congregations. They are children of affliction and sorrow, as well as others, and need as much the consolations of religion, and the sympathies of Christian ministers and friends." "They should also solemnize their marriages, and at their own houses; and at such times as may suit their convenience." "The formal solemnization of their marriages is of great importance, if their improvement in morals and religion is the object sought after." "Another duty required of ministers is, that, with their sessions, they attend diligently and punctually to the discipline of their coloured members. They should appoint committees of instruction to attend to inquirers, and to suspended and excommunicated members."

Another means of promoting the instruction of the coloured people, in the south, and certainly one of the greatest importance, if it can be carried into effect, is, "That ministers should endeavour to awaken their church members, especially masters and mistresses to the great duty of afford-

ing suitable instruction to the negroes." It is recommended, that they should preach on the subject, and converse on it, in private; and not only so, but they should suggest plans, and put the people upon an active discharge of duty and assist them in establishing a system of plantation instruction, in the way of weekly schools and evening prayers. "The work of religious instruction," says our author, "lies neglected in many a region of our country, for no other reason than that those to whom the people look for guidance, are silent and inactive."

The next thing recommended is, "that ministers of the gospel be employed as missionaries to the negroes. There are extensive regions of country in the south-west, especially those bordering on river courses, and embracing river bottoms, and the most fertile lands, which are inhabited by a dense population of negroes, and by a small population of whites—such regions, if ever to be supplied with the gospel, must be supplied through the instrumentality of missionaries. The missionaries," says he, "should be southern men; or men, no matter from what country, identified in views, feelings, and interests with the south, and who possess *the confidence of society.*" "To supply the wants of the negroes in the southern states, large numbers of missionaries are necessary, but where shall they be obtained? The harvest truly is plenteous but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth labourers into his harvest.'" He thinks that if a demand for missionaries is created, the supply will be obtained. We are of opinion that this maxim, which generally holds good in the affairs of commerce, will not apply to religious instruction. There is now a demand for hundreds of missionaries, more than can be had, or sustained. But it is pleasing to know, that several ministers of the Presbyterian church, have been, and are now engaged in missionary labour, in Mississippi and Louisiana, and that they have been much encouraged by the apparent success which has attended their labours; and we have understood that the Episcopal Methodists have at least thirty missionaries constantly employed in this field.

Mr. Jones suggests the following plans for sustaining missionaries among the people of colour in the south. 1. That Missionary Societies take in this population as a field for missionary labour. 2. That presbyteries, conferences,

associations, and other ecclesiastical bodies, attend to it within their own bounds, and have collections taken up in their respective churches, to support missionaries to give instruction to the slaves. 3. A few contiguous churches might unite their contributions for the support of a missionary. 4. One or more planters, well disposed to this cause, might employ and support a missionary to their own people. This has been done in several instances; and there is reason to believe that the duty is more and more felt to be obligatory. Or, finally, let a number of planters unite to support a missionary. Let his salary be fixed at $500, and ten planters, by contributing $50 each, can pay it; or fifty planters by contributing only $10, each.

But owners of slaves must engage, in good earnest, in giving instruction to those, who in the providence of God are placed under their care; and who have no means of supplying themselves with the means of grace. They should urge upon them the duty of attending public worship. They should establish Sunday schools in their neighbourhoods, and see that the children and youth punctually attend. They ought also to improve the physical condition of the slaves. Let them have more convenient and comfortable houses; and let each house have appended to it, a small garden, well enclosed, with the privilege of raising pigs and poultry. The clothing of the people ought also to be attended to, and habits of neatness and cleanliness should be promoted. The provisions of the plantation should be good and abundant, and as various as the circumstances of the planter will allow. The labour required of them should be moderate, and time should be given them, to attend to their own little affairs. Punishments should never be inflicted but upon the guilty, and in moderation, not in anger or wantonness; and let there be a resort to corporal punishment as seldom as possible. Although the owner ought not to use coercion in matters of religion, yet he may, and ought to suppress open vice, and not permit cursing and swearing, quarrelling, Sabbath breaking, &c., to be practised by his slaves. There should be provided on every plantation, where slaves are numerous, "*a house of prayer*," where worship might be attended in the evening, and on the Sabbath. Let this house be furnished with a desk, and with convenient seats, and made comfortable in winter, as well as summer. In this house, worship should be conducted every evening, with all that can be induced to attend.

Here, also, the Sabbath school may be held, and when a preacher is present, it will serve as a place for preaching. The slaves do not like to attend worship in the houses of their owners: they are far more comfortable when they can meet in a place of their own.

But it is incumbent on pious owners of slaves, to become themselves their instructors. They should endeavour to have a school formed for the children, in which they may be collected and taught, every day, for an hour or two; or, at least, several times in the week. Often the young misses of the family might be induced to engage in this benevolent employment. Let the adults also be collected in the "prayer-house," every evening, and a chapter read to them out of the Bible, a hymn sung, and a few questions propounded, together with plain and brief answers. But let the whole exercises occupy only a short time. Sometimes there will be found among them, persons who can lead in prayer, and conduct the exercises of worship, when it is inconvenient for the owner to be present.

Private conversation should also be held with the slaves, as often as may be; and when any of them are under serious impressions, the favourable opportunity of giving religious instruction should not be neglected. Serious impressions, unaccompanied by sound instruction, seldom eventuate in any permanent change of character. Great pains should be taken to instruct such as are candidates for admission into the church; otherwise, there will be a necessity for much discipline. One of the greatest impediments to the religious instruction of the slaves, is an enthusiastic notion that religion consists in violent emotion, expressing itself often, in various forms of vociferation. They should be taught that there is no religion in such extravagance; but that it is offensive to God, and tends to disturb his worship, and to injure themselves. As to the kind of preachers which should be sent among the slaves, Mr. Jones says: "We need, for the continued and successful instruction of the negroes, as well educated and as intelligent preachers as the church can supply. It is the experience of all those who have entered on the work of the religious instruction of the negroes, that instead of requiring less talents and learning, they have needed more than they possessed; and they found the benefit of all the knowledge they had acquired."

The character of the minister to the negroes, and the

style of his preaching, are thus described by our author: "His address and intercourse should be polite, frank, condescending, and uniformly kind, and at the same time independent. And in order to secure the confidence of the people, he must treat them with respect, and manifest by word and deed, his interest in them. Whining and simpering familiarity, and a courting of popularity, will destroy his influence. He must be accessible to all, and should notice the children and youth, especially. He must scrupulously avoid personal disputes and quarrels with them, and be no party to such disputes among themselves. But should act prudently, hear both sides, judge justly, and show the reasons of his decision. He should be among them as their spiritual adviser, guide, and friend, and let the people look upon him as their minister; and should put himself to inconvenience to serve them at their funerals and marriages; and and show that he is not ashamed of them, nor their service." "His manner should be grave, solemn, dignified, free from affectation, hauteur or familiarity, yet ardent, and animated."

"Sermons should be plain in language, simple in construction, and pointed in application." "As to the subjects of sermons, they may embrace the whole round of the doctrines and duties of Christianity, dwelling upon those most applicable to the people. There is not a single doctrine, however elevated, or deep and mysterious, which may not be profitably exhibited." . . . "The preacher to the negroes ought to deal much in parables, historical events, biographies, and in expository preaching." . . . "This last is eminently calculated to advance the people in knowledge, and is most improving to the minister himself."

"The strictest order should be observed at all the religious meetings of the negroes, and punctuality in commencing at the appointed time. No audible expressions of feeling, in the way of groaning, cries, or noises, should be allowed. On dismissing the congregation, the minister should always remain, until the people have gone from the place."

ART. III.—*The Works of Jonathan Edwards, D. D., late President of Union College, with a Memoir of his Life and Character.* By Tryon Edwards: in two volumes. Andover. Allen, Morrill & Wardwell. 1842.

THE editor and publishers of these volumes are entitled to the thanks of all who concern themselves with polemic theology, for the service they have performed, in making the productions of their distinguished author, accessible to the present generation. If we except President Edwards the elder, no theologian has been more quoted and appealed to as authority, in theological discussions among the divines of New England, and those divines elsewhere who have taken their fundamental bias from the standard theologians of New England. Indeed we are not sure that even this exception ought to be made, with regard to many of the later New England polemics. In proportion as they have been prone to innovation, or what they call discoveries and improvements in theology, they have also been disposed to cite more freely from the younger than the elder Edwards, to set forward the former in bold relief and keep the latter in the back-ground; to magnify the excellencies of the son, and disparage or pass unnoticed the excellencies of the father. In short, we have seen something like an effort to make them change places in the estimation of mankind, and by one stroke to lift the son to the summit of theological authorities, and strike down the father from his pre-eminence. This predilection for the son, is doubtless owing to the fact that he broke ground in the field of theological innovation. He proposed and strenuously urged some important deviations from the track pursued by most Calvinistic divines before him, especially in regard to the atonement. He advocated the general notion of improvements in theology, and enumerated in terms of high praise, those made by a class that he styled "the followers of President Edwards," of which he might safely say, *Quorum magna pars fui.* Hence he is referred to with the greatest respect and veneration, by those who esteem him a sort of pioneer in an enterprize in which they have far outstripped him. They appeal to the modifications of doctrine which he introduced, his love of metaphysics, and above all, to his belief that the science of theology, like other sciences, is a field for discovery and invention, as a warrant for their own adventurous flights, in which they soar far above his utmost daring. But while

his writings have thus been appealed to by controversialists, they have been so long out of print as to be inaccessible to the great body of American ministers. A good service has therefore been done, in thus enabling them to ascertain for themselves, what principles he espoused, and what he repudiated. Withal, these volumes contain a great amount of matter, which is original and instructive, and gives them a higher than merely polemical value. Dr. Edwards, as is manifest from these volumes, had an original, profound and logical mind, coupled with most unwearied industry and perseverance. Moreover, he was annointed with an unction from the Holy One, and held all his great powers sacred to the cause of God and Truth. For these reasons, we are much gratified with the publication of these volumes, and consider them an important contribution in our religious literature.

The memoir of Dr. Edwards's life and character by the editor, is well done. It has the rare merit of brevity, with as good a degree of completeness, as his scanty materials would allow. It is neither dry nor tame, but sufficiently spirited to be readable. We get from it a succinct but clear view of the author's lineage, the important events of his life, the characteristic qualities of his mind and heart, the principal works he wrought, and results he accomplished, without being obliged to plod through a barren waste of insipid and irrelevant matter.

It appears from the memoir that he was the second son and ninth child of the senior President Edwards, and was born at Northampton, Mass., on the twenty-sixth day of May, 1745. In 1751, he removed with his father to Stockbridge. This place being at that time mostly inhabited by Indians, he acquired a greater familiarity with their language than with his mother tongue, so that his thoughts then ran in it, and through life he often dreamed in it. His father, observing his proficiency in this respect, sent him, at the age of ten years, among the Six Nations with the Rev. Gideon Hawley, to learn their language, and become qualified for the missionary service among this people. After a short season, he returned from this expedition to his father's house at Stockbridge. From this place he went to Princeton with his father, on his taking the presidency of the College of New Jersey, in 1758. As all know, he was shortly afterwards left an orphan, by the sudden demise of his parents. Although his inheritance was too small to defray the ex-

pense of a liberal education, yet by the aid of family friends he succeeded in going through Princeton College, at which he graduated in September, 1765. During his connection with this college, under the powerful preaching of Dr. Finley, he was awakened, and hopefully converted, and made a public profession of religion, which he adorned by his whole subsequent life. He then began the study of divinity with Dr. Bellamy, of Connecticut, his father's most prominent coadjutor. He was licensed to preach the gospel in October, 1766. After preaching in various places, in 1767 he became Tutor of the college at which he was educated, and remained in that office two years. During this time, he was chosen Professor of Languages and Logic in the same institution, but declined the appointment. He was settled as pastor over the White Haven church and society, in New Haven, Conn., Jan. 5, 1769, where he continued till May 19, 1795. His separation from this people, arose mainly from the adoption of Unitarian and other errors by some of the leading men of the parish. In the January next following, he was again settled in Colebrook, a country parish of Connecticut. His ministry in this place, though short, was remarkably prosperous and happy. He was called from this situation to the presidency of Union College, which he assumed in July, 1799. His career in this important office, though auspiciously commenced, was terminated by his death, Aug. 1, 1801. Thus his own projects of usefulness, and the hopes of the friends of the college, and of religion and learning generally, were suddenly blighted by an inscrutable Providence.

Passing from the memoir to the works of Dr. Edwards, it strikes us that the editor has made the order of their respective excellence, the order of his arrangement, putting the best first. At the threshold, we are introduced to his great refutation of Universalism, in reply to Dr. Chauncey. As this is the largest, so, in our judgment, it is decidedly the ablest treatise contained in these volumes. By this, more than by any other single work, perhaps more than by all his works combined, he has earned for himself the reputation which he enjoys.

Dr. Edwards's "Salvation of all men, strictly examined," exhausts the subject, and leaves little unsaid, that can be said in refutation of Universalism. It is a prostrating, mortal blow at the system, and all its advocates and supports. He first compares the leading arguments of his antagonists

with each other, and shows, that in a variety of particulars, they mutually contradict, and utterly destroy each other. Having thus gained a vantage ground at the very onset, he proceeds to examine all their pleas in behalf of their doctrine, singly on their own independent merits, whether purporting to be founded on scripture or reason, and shows their absurdity with an almost mathematical strictness and clearness of demonstration. He tears their specious webs of sophistry into shreds and tatters. He is careful to leave nothing unnoticed which his opponents have alleged to help out their cause, nay, he imagines many retreats which they may possibly make as he successively corners them, and pursues them till they are thoroughly vanquished, and are left without a solitary refuge. Having thus demolished all the supports of their cause, he proceeds to adduce the positive proofs of the falsity of their doctrine, and the truth of the contrary. By several independent trains of reasoning, each conclusive, in itself, and all conspiring to one result, he perseveres with a coolness and patience that never faint, to press upon them the argument cumulative, till they sink under its crushing weight. Throughout the whole, he discovers polemical gifts of a high order. He first states clearly the point he is about to discuss: he then keeps rigidly to the point in hand, till he has made out his case. He deals in no empty declamation. He never substitutes railing or invective for argument. He does not seize merely or chiefly on the weak points of his opponent's reasoning, and expose their absurdity, while he leaves his strong points untouched, and then exult with airs of triumph, as if he had fairly conquered. Much less does he, by garbled and unfair extracts, affix to them the stigma of sentiments or reasonings of which they were never guilty. On the contrary, he delights to seize and grapple with the strongest arguments of his foes, and on these he spends his own strength.

We do not of course intend in these encomiums, to endorse the accuracy of every statement, argument, or exegesis which occurs in this treatise of Dr. Edwards. If its beauty is in a few instances marred by a crude suggestion, its strength remains unimpaired. It still remains the greatest monument of the author's genius, and constitutes his strongest title to enduring renown.

Next in order, in these volumes, as also in our view, in the order of merit; is his "Dissertation on Liberty and Ne-

cessity." This treatise is designed chiefly as a vindication of his father's work on the Will against the strictures of Dr. Samuel West. As the fulfilment of this design, it is complete and masterly. From beginning to end we see the same clearing up of all ambiguities, the same honest abiding by his definitions, the same dialectic skill and subtlety, the same mastery of his subject, the same fairness towards his opponents, the same patient perseverance in tracking them through all their hiding places, which mark his more elaborate treatises. Still his weapons are all forged and made ready to his hand in his father's great work. He simply takes them, and aims and discharges them at his father's assailants.

In regard to the will, metaphysicians have always been divided into two great parties, which for convenience, may be respectively denominated the Calvinistic and Arminian. Both agree that choice is in its own nature free. But the former contend that choices are governed by a previous necessity, or rather certainty, that they should be what they are, and not otherwise, and that this certainty no way militates against their liberty. The latter contend that choice cannot be governed by any antecedent certainty without thereby losing its freedom. But the former class use the word necessity in a peculiar sense, which they are careful to define. Their necessity is not such as forces the subject of it to act against his will, or admits of any real opposition, or endeavour of will against the choice made; for this would not be any real choice, but the contrary of it. This would be, what they call, natural necessity. But it is a *previously constituted certainty that the agent will choose as he does choose.* Thiscertainty is based on the prior existence of a cause adequate to excite the will freely to choose as it does choose, and on the sure connection between that cause and its effect; this they style moral necessity. When necessity is thus defined, most of the Arminian reasonings against it lose their force, because they are directed against a necessity which is supposed to force the will contrary to its own free choice. Thus they waste their strength against a fiction for which nobody contends, and keep up a shadow-fight against a word foe. Arminians, on the contrary teach that the will, in each volition, is free to determine itself either way, and is undetermined by any previous cause, making it certain that its choices will be what they are, and not otherwise. Correspondent to the distinction between natural and moral necessity, is the distinction between natural and moral

inability held by many Calvinistic divines, and especially the Edwardses. Inability is the reverse of necessity, and is natural or moral according as the necessity to which it stands opposed is natural or moral. Thus as every act of the will is necessary by a moral necessity, or a previous certainty of its being put forth, so there is, in the nature of the case, a moral inability for the contrary choice. In those events which are brought to pass by a natural necessity, there is a natural inability to cause the contrary events. Now the great doctrine of Calvinists in regard to the will is, that all its acts are determined by antecedent causes, which without impairing their freedom, make it certain that they shall be what they are and not otherwise. We need not inform our readers which of the two conflicting doctrines on the will Dr. Edwards advocates. He maintains a moral, and denies a natural necessity of its actions. He holds a natural inability to the opposite actions, but denies all ability opposed to the moral necessity or previous certainty of those actions, i. e. he holds to moral inability.

That we have not mistaken the Edwardean notion of liberty and necessity, as held by father and son, we think will readily appear from the following account of them given by the author, at the very opening of his treatise. As his first object was to clear away ambiguities, and show exactly the point in dispute, he begins with quoting his father's statements on this subject, and then proceeds with the following comment:

"This is the account given by President Edwards of the distinction which he made between natural and moral necessity. Moral necessity is the certain, or necessary connection between moral causes and moral effects. Natural necessity is the connection between causes and effects which are not of a moral nature. The difference between these two kinds of necessity lies chiefly in the nature of *the two terms* connected by it. Natural necessity admits of voluntary, but ineffectual opposition from him who is subject to the necessity; the immediate effect produced by that necessity may be opposed by the will of the subject. But with respect to moral necessity, which is a previous certainty of the existence of a volition or voluntary action, it is absurd to suppose that *in that act*, the will should either oppose itself or the necessity from which the act arises. The distinction between natural and moral inability is analogous to this. Inability is the reverse of necessity."—Vol. i., p. 300.

With the exception of Mr. Tappan, who was bold to combat Edwards on the will, and who if rash, had also the merit of being frank, and who failed of success in this enterprize, not so much from any moral as from a purely natural and innocent inability, we believe that all the present advocates of self-sovereignty, indifference, or liberty *ad utrumque*,

have attempted to shelter themselves under the ample shield of Edwards's authority. They have at least tried to obtain some semblance of sanction from him for opinions which it was a principal labour of his life to refute. For this purpose, they sometimes cull out a few passages, which if they do not favour, at least seem not, if taken by themselves, to discountenance their scheme. But a more common and adroit method is, to represent the son as the expositor of the father, and that we cannot understand the writings of the latter, except as we view them through the explanations of the former. They then seize upon those passages in the son's book which resolve all necessity of volitions, into simple certainty. By a pitiful play on the word certainty, they apply it to the mere certain truth of an identical proposition, e. g. that whatever is, is, or that whatever will be, will be, instead of the certainty of future events, made sure by decisive and effectual causes. Now, say they, the certainty that whatever will be, will be, does not make it certain what shall be, or militate against the most perfect contingence, and liberty to either of two opposite volitions in every act of will, or, as they style it, "power of choice, with power of contrary choice." Moreover, they say that Dr. Edwards, in allowing the natural power of contrary choice, expressly asserted the self-sovereignty of the will in volition for which they contend. Now it has already been shown that all that he meant by natural power to any act, was simply that the will is not prevented from it by a natural necessity, i. e. a necessity which coerces it in spite of its own choice or endeavour to the contrary. But it is not a power opposed to moral necessity, or capable of defeating the previously established certainty of the action. Therefore it is no liberty either way—or such power of contrary choice as is adequate to the production of that choice. As the real sense in which Dr. Edwards used the terms *certainty* and *natural ability* is important to be understood, on account of its bearing on recent controversies, we will cite a single passage on each of these points. Speaking of Dr. Clarke's illustration of the nature of moral necessity by this case, "that a good being continuing to be good, cannot do evil," he says,* "This last account implies no other necessity, than that a thing must be when it is supposed to be; which amounts to the trifling proposition, that *what is, is.* But the certainty implied in the divine prediction that the

* Vol. i. p. 308.

world will continue to a particular period, is a very different matter." On the subject of natural power, he says,* "I grant that we have a *natural* power to choose or refuse in any case; but we have no moral power, or power opposed to *moral* necessity; for moral necessity is the previous certainty of a moral action; and a power opposed to this must imply a previous uncertainty. But no event, moral or natural, is, or can be, uncertain, previously to its existence."

The radical question between the two parties is, as we have already seen, whether the acts of the will become what they are and not otherwise, in virtue of antecedent causes which are effectual to excite the will to those particular volitions and prevent the putting forth of any others, or whether they become so, by virtue of a self-determining property of the will, which is such that while it is unbiassed either way by any antecedent and extrinsic influence, it does by its own inherent and isolated power of willing, exert itself in one way rather than its opposite, in every act of choice. In answer to the question, why a man chooses one thing rather than another, is the act sufficiently accounted for, by replying that he has the faculty of will, and power of self-determination either way? Or is it a more correct and satisfactory solution of the fact to say he was induced to that choice by certain reasons and motives, which were effectual to fix his choice? On this subject, every man's consciousness must testify for himself. But it seems to us that the statement of the question leaves it susceptible of but one answer. For who ever made a choice, who can conceive of one, in which the person choosing has not some reason or inducement prompting him to elect the object chosen, in preference to its opposite? It matters not what that reason or inducement may be, whether a prior inward bias or propensity, or intellectual view, or attractiveness in the object chosen, or which is generally the fact, some or all these combined; still if it be something antecedent to choice, which effectually excites the mind to one volition rather than its opposite, then is the will determined by causes, other than its own act, or power of willing, or of self-determination.

Some deem it a sufficient answer to the question, why does the mind make a particular choice, instead of the con-

* Vol. i. p. 313.

trary? to say that it has the power of choice, with power of contrary choice. This may account for the mind's choosing at all. But how does it show why it makes any given choice instead of the contrary? It may be enough to account for our seeing objects to say that we have eyes. But does this account for our seeing mountains instead of plains? If the conception of a choice of any object, that does not on some account appear eligible, is possible, we confess that we are strangers to that conception. Now what is more obvious, than that it depends on the intellectual view, and the state of our various passions, propensities, and all the susceptibilities of our sensitive nature, what objects shall appear most desirable, and what shall appear otherwise? This being granted, which cannot be denied, it follows conclusively that the will inclines to any particular choice, in consequence of causes aside from and antecedent to its own self-activity in that choice.

And pursuing this line of thought a little further, it is manifest while the will is in a state of indifference, or equipoise towards any object, it can neither incline for or against, it can neither choose nor refuse it. In order to a volition which either elects or rejects any object, that object must be viewed with a previous correspondent complacency or aversion. On any other supposition, choice must proceed from the most motionless stupefaction and insensibility, which is a contradiction in terms. The activity of a rational and sensitive being, must be in the way of perception and propensity, through which the object chosen becomes arrayed before him with such apparent qualities, as render it an object of desire, and excite to a choice of it. And, as we conceive, no other foundation of choice in a rational being, is conceivable.

This view of the will is so obviously true, that even the most earnest advocates of the power of contrary choice, contingence, &c., cannot write long on this subject, without unconsciously maintaining it. Thus Dr. Taylor, although he insists on "a power to act despite all opposing power" as essential to all moral agency, and the back-bone of all enlightened theology and metaphysics, likewise insists that "of all specific voluntary action the happiness of the agent in some form is the ultimate end." Now this last proposition cannot be true, unless the will always elects that object, which is viewed as most conducive to the agent's happiness. For if it refuses this object, and chooses in preference one which is less promotive of his happiness, then in

making this election, the agent has some other "ultimate end" besides his own happiness. The same conclusion follows from his great proposition, that "self-love is the primary cause of all voluntary action." If this be so, then how is any "voluntary action" possible, that is opposed to the dictates of "self-love?" That either of these propositions is true, we deny. But this makes them none the less conclusive on the part of their author, as contradicting his "power to act despite all opposing power."

Mr. Tappan likewise* maintains that "the only escape from necessity is in the conception of a will as above defined—a conscious self-moving power, which may obey reason in opposition to passion, or passion in opposition to reason, or obey both in their harmonious union; and lastly, that may act in the indifference of all, that is, act without reference either to reason or passion." Again:† "But to a necessitated will, we have nothing to oppose except a will whose volitions are not determined by the correlation of its nature with certain objects, a will indeed which has not its nature correlated to any objects, but a will indifferent." But then in attempting to show the consistency of his scheme with the divine prescience,‡ he observes, "the connexion on which we base the prediction of human volition, is the connexion of will with reason and sensitivity in the unity of the mind and spirit. Secondly: By this connexion, the will is seen to be designed to be regulated by truth and righteousness, and by feeling subordinated to these." This is a queer specimen of a will "not correlated to any objects," acting in sublime indifference to all the dictates of reason and passion! Again,§ he observes, "The will has efficiency or creative and modifying power in itself—self-moved, self-directed. But then without reason and sensitivity, the will would be without objects, without designs, without rules,—a solitary power, conscious of ability to do, but not knowing what to do." We ask, then, whether that which furnishes the will with "objects, designs and rules," and teaches it "what to do," has or has not any influence in making its choices what they are, rather than otherwise?

From this, we ascend a step higher. We observe that dependence is a necessary attribute of all created power. Perfect independence and self-sufficiency belongs only to the Uncreated One. All power in creatures is therefore

* Review of Edwards, pp. 226–7. † p. 221. ‡ p. 270. § p. 244.

subject to innumerable limitations and restraints. They have, by the fact of being creatures, what some divines have styled a *passive power*, i. e. a susceptibility to be affected by influence, *ab extra*. From this liability no one can exempt himself, and still remain a creature. This extrinsic influence therefore becomes a necessary element among the reasons why the actions of creatures are what they are. Suppose what power of will you may, still the man does not exist, whose actions are not affected by the circumstances in which he is placed, and would not be different, were his surrounding circumstances different: i. e. if he remains a free agent and chooses freely. This demonstrates the reality of an influence extrinsic to the agent in determining volition. On any other view, Divine Providence is reduced to an impossibility.

Many confound internal liberty, or liberty in an act of choice, with external liberty, or power to execute that choice. It is conceded that if a man be willing to do a good deed, but be prevented by insurmountable obstacles, frustrating any endeavour he may make, he is not to blame for the non-performance of it, because he is hindered from executing his choice by a natural necessity. Now many reason against the determination of the acts of the will by any influence out of itself, as if in spite of its utmost endeavours, it were forced to choose contrary to its own liking, i. e. its own choice—and were therefore prevented by a natural necessity from executing its own choice. But the bare act of choosing, excludes the supposition of any contrary choice, and therefore cuts the sinew of all objections founded on its supposed existence.

But although this may be a satisfactory account of free-agency, so far as the subjects of it are concerned, a grave and difficult question arises from it in relation to the holiness of God, and the manner of justifying his ways to man. It is constantly objected by the advocates of self-determination, that if volition be determined by antecedent causes, which are themselves controlled and appointed of God, and at any rate are traceable to him as the Great First Cause, then God is the author of sin, and sin is his own work, the product of his own direct efficient and creative operation. Any scheme against which this objection lies, is crushed and annihilated by it. For to say that God works iniquity is blasphemous, and undermines the foundation of all religion. So serious an objection, all Calvinistic writers on the will, have found it necessary to repel, not by a few random

remarks, but by most faithful and elaborate argumentation. Dr. Edwards did not fail to see its fundamental importance, and devoted to it one of the most laboured chapters of his dissertation, in which he evidently tasks his controversial skill and adroitness to the utmost. But we confess that this is to us the least satisfactory part of the treatise. And we here detect his first deviation from the temperate zone of Reformed and Puritan theology, into the arctic regions of Hopkinsianism. For he followed Dr. Hopkins, more closely than his father.

Whenever his father encounters the objection to his scheme, that it makes God the author of sin, he always at once threw out that broad and adamantine shield, which most Calvinists have made their defence against this objection. He always began by maintaining that depravity originates not in a *positive* but a *privative* cause, not from *divine agency*, but *the absence of that agency*. He said the principles which belonged to human nature essentially, and which in the state in which they came from God are innocent, when combined with liberty and that susceptibility to influence which we have already shown to be inseparable from created power, would inevitably run to excess, disorder and depravity, unless graciously counteracted by the direct agency of God, infusing into the soul higher principles of true holiness and righteousness. Thus whenever God puts forth any positive influence in the human soul, holiness is the result. When he withholds or withdraws that influence, sin ensues. His concern in the production of sin, is not that of production, but of non-prevention. As darkness does not come from the sun, but from the absence of the sun. In one sense indeed, God is creator of all things, he is a cause *sine qua non* of sin, and this must be conceded in every system of divinity. In the same sense a father is the cause of the sins of his children, or a law-giver of all the violations of his laws. But to be a cause of sin in this sense, none will contend, is to be its author, or in any manner tainted with it. So as God has power to prevent it, but sees fit for most wise ends not to prevent it, and in this sense, appoints and decrees its existence, he is a negative cause, but not an author or creator of sin.

Now President Edwards the elder, whenever he found it necessary to combat the objection under consideration, made this his grand defence, that sin proceeds not from any positive agency of God, but from a "defective or privative

cause," and thus vindicated his Maker's holiness. Thus he says: "It would be strange arguing, indeed, if because men never commit sin, but only when God leaves them *to themselves*, and necessarily sin when he does so, and therefore their sin is not *from themselves*, but from God; and so that God must be a sinful being; as strange as it would be to argue, because it is always dark when the sun is gone, and never dark when the sun is present, that therefore all darkness is from the sun, and that his disc and beams must needs be black."*

But our author makes no use of this great shield, which is his father's chief reliance. His constant reply to the arguments of Dr. West on this point is, that they apply with equal force to the divine infliction of pain, calamity, and other natural evils upon men. Thus he meets the objection, that "if God so order things that sin will certainly follow, he is the cause of sin, and therefore is sinful himself,"† by saying, "if this argument be good, God is the subject of pain, sickness and death, since he is the cause of them." This is his constant retort throughout the chapter, by which he parries all the blows of his antagonists on this subject. We give one more example. Dr. West is represented as arguing, that "if God had so disposed events, that sin certainly follows, it is his work; and to be opposed to sin is to be opposed to God's work, and so to be opposed to God."‡ Dr. Edwards rejoins, "So calamity is the work of God, and to be opposed to that, is to be opposed to God's work, and to be opposed to God. And will Dr. West admit that every one who wishes to escape any calamity, is in a criminal manner opposing God?" In remarking on an assertion of Dr. Hopkins, that "moral evil and holiness are equally the consequence of the divine disposal, but whether by the same mode of operation he could not tell,"§ he simply vindicates it against the exceptions of Dr. West, without calling it in question himself. He formally repudiates his father's great weapon of defence on this subject, viz. that sin results not from the exertion, but from the negation of divine influence in the following terms. "It may be added that through darkness a mere nonenity may take place in the withdrawment of light; yet malice, envy and inordinate self-love,

* Edwards's Works, New York Edition, vol. ii. p. 251. See also the same idea more completely developed in his treatise on Original Sin, in the same volume, pp. 532–8, which we have not room to quote.

† Edwards's Works, Vol. i. pp. 441–2. ‡ p. 450. § p. 457.

positive acts of the mind, will no more take place in consequence of the mere withdrawment of influence, than benevolence or supreme love to God."* He vindicates the assertion of Dr. Hopkins, that "if God be the origin or cause of moral evil, this is so far from imputing moral evil to him, or supposing that there is any thing of moral evil in him, that it necessarily supposes the contrary."†

His great argument to show that God's purity is unsullied in the causation of sin, is the same by which he is justified in the allotment of calamity, i. e. that he does it in order to the greatest good. He will more promote the interests of the intelligent system with it, than without it.

But the question arises, have he and Dr. Hopkins really improved upon the theology of President Edwards and the old Calvinists, in making God an efficient cause of moral evil, and vindicating him therein on the same grounds on which they vindicate the infliction of natural evil? We think not, and for the following reasons.

1. That which shows that the infliction of pain or calamity is consistent with the highest moral purity and goodness, does not prove that the intentional causing, inducing or impelling of men to sin, is consistent with perfect holiness. A father may inflict much pain upon his children for their profit, but may he purposely incite or allow them to sin, that good may come in this way? Although a moral being may not only without impurity, but in consequence of his purity, inflict much suffering, yet can he exert an active and direct agency in diffusing wickedness, without contracting any taint therefrom? If a surgeon may inflict excruciating pangs for the benefit of his patient, may he therefore induce him to do evil, that good may come?

2. The natural evil inflicted on moral agents is the punishment of their sin. If it were otherwise, how could we justify the ways of God to man? How then can that which proves this consistent with the equity of God, prove the efficient causation of sin, consistent with his purity?

3. Although the Hopkinsians say, that God causes sin as a means of the highest good, and therefore, that this instead of being a stain upon his perfections, evinces the largest benevolence, yet this only reveals another crudity of their scheme, which is, that all moral perfection in God and crea-

* p. 463. † p. 457.

tures, consists in benevolence. This answer, therefore may satisfy themselves; but it satisfies no others. This resolving of all moral attributes into benevolence, seems to us one of the most groundless and inexplicable of all errors. We do not see what could have been the original temptation thus to disorder all our primary and intuitive moral perceptions. Under an affectation of simplicity, it throws into confusion and perplexity, all our first and surest intuitions. Under the pretext of doing "the greatest good," it tends in its ultimate consequences to corrupt morality at the core. To declare one just, is not to declare him benevolent, and to declare him benevolent is not to declare him just. This will ever be so, while language is a vehicle of thought; for the ideas conveyed by these respective terms are radically different. On this scheme, what defect attaches to his moral character, who does evil that good may come? Even the trite maxim, "be just before you are generous," impeaches this dogma. We happen to know a glaring case of the consistent exemplification of the principle that all moral excellence consists in doing the greatest good. An officer of a Christian church is now imprisoned awaiting his trial for forgery. The reason he assigns, for perpetrating his crime is, that he could not otherwise avoid failing in business, and loading religion with discredit! Those who know him, believe that he was really and honestly influenced by that consideration! This system is only a form of placing the morality of an action, not in its nature but its consequences, which in our opinion is the bane of morals. Indeed, Dr. Edwards formally maintains, in an essay on this subject, that "the foundation of moral obligation is happiness to the intellectual system."* To say that God is very benevolent in producing sin, is no answer to the objection that he is the author of sin, and that his holiness is thereby impeached.

4. It is difficult on this scheme to see why men are not as much indebted to God for sin as for holiness. Dr. Hopkins, as already quoted, cannot tell whether or not they are "produced by the same mode of operation." Dr. Edwards has a sermon entitled "God the author of all good volitions and actions," from Phil. ii. 13.† It is a purely metaphysical discussion about liberty, contingence, &c. After a careful examination of it, while we find it abun-

* Vol. ii. p. 541. † Vol. ii. pp. 348–60.

dantly urged that all volitions, evil as well as good, are caused by extraneous influence, we cannot find any distinction intimated, in regard to the modes in which they are respectively produced. Nor have we noticed such a distinction in any of his writings. We think no follower of his, would imbibe the notion of such a distinction from his works. And we think so clear headed a reasoner, would not have failed to lay great stress upon it, if he had held it, when he wrote so much on topics that are so greatly affected by it. At all events, rejecting as he did, the idea of a privative origin of sin, and attributing it to the divine efficiency, we see not what remains, but that most revolting feature of the systems of Hopkins and Emmons, that we are as much indebted to God for sin as holiness! a thought that shocks every Christian heart, and is absolutely monstrous and intolerable. It follows, moreover, that God is not more the special cause of holiness than of sin, and there is no special grace in conversion, only as God makes some holy, while he makes others sinful. When this system became matured in the hands of Emmons, so that its deformities were no longer obscured, but glaringly paraded in bold relief, and in the fearless assertion that God was the author of all sinful as well as holy exercises, and that the soul itself was but a chain of these exercises, it was too much to be long endured. Men could not long be held to the belief that God was the author of all sin. They, therefore, retained that part, which confines all moral character to exercises, but they renounced that part which attributes them to the divine efficiency, and held that men were the authors of their own exercises, evil and good alike. This is about the substance of what has been current for some time past under the title of New Divinity. It has been the habit of this class of divines to acknowledge their obligations to Dr. Emmons, for a clew to their discoveries. A noted one among them is reported to have said to him, well we agree "that all moral character consists in exercises." "Yes" replied the Doctor, "but we differ as to where they come from." It has been shrewdly observed, that "Taylorism is Emmonsism with the divine efficiency part cut off."

But from all the foregoing objections, and others that might be urged, the views of President Edwards the elder are exempt. Simply to permit or not hinder sin, when good and holy ends are to be answered by not interposing

to prevent it, argues no moral defilement in God or man, and no way makes them the authors of sin.

Taking our leave of this treatise, we find remaining in the first volume, a treatise on the language of an Indian tribe, which he had learned in youth, and which is worthy of its author; also, "Remarks on the improvements made in theology by his father, President Edwards," which themselves would furnish fruitful matter for an entire article, but we are now obliged to pass without further notice—with some smaller pieces. But we must hasten from them to the second volume, which is filled with sermons of various merit, and short pieces on theological subjects which he contributed to the magazines of his day. What we wish chiefly to notice is the three sermons on the Atonement, which in magnitude rank next after the two works we have already noticed, and in the influence they have exerted on New England theology, probably equal or surpass them. His biographer observes concerning these sermons, that they "may perhaps be said to have laid the foundation of the views on that subject now generally held by the evangelical divines of New England." We have often heard the same opinion expressed by those who are best qualified to judge. This fact renders the peculiarities which mark them, of great interest and importance.

In the introduction, he represents himself, and many others as being puzzled with a difficulty, which he thus states: "If we be in the literal sense forgiven in consequence of a redemption, we are forgiven on account of the price of redemption previously paid. How then can we truly be said to be *forgiven;* a word which implies the exercise of *grace?* And especially how can we be said to be forgiven according to the *riches of grace?* This is at least a seeming inconsistency. If our forgiveness be purchased, and the price of it be already paid, it seems to be a matter of debt, and not of grace." By this difficulty, he states, that some have been led into Socinianism, and he himself has always regarded it as one of the gordian knots of theology. In these discourses he attempts to disentangle it.

In pursuance of this endeavour, he admits and contends for the Socinian notion, that if Christ paid the price of the sinner's redemption, and discharged the demands of divine justice and law against him, then forgiveness is not a matter of grace, but of strict justice. The plain answer to this is, that the discharge of the sinner's dues by Christ, is

not of his own, but of God's procuring, so that in the gift and proffer of it to the sinner, it is a matter of pure grace towards him. Just as if a king, should make his son with his own consent, a substitute for rebels against his throne in the endurance of punishment, and on this ground should proffer pardon to them: would not this be an act of mingled justice and grace? Against the sufficiency of this answer he strenuously contends.* He then proceeds to argue, that no debt was due from us to God, and consequently none was paid by Christ. He asserts† that the terms *redemption, ransom, bought with a price,* applied in the scripture, to the atonement, "are metaphysical expressions, and therefore not literally and exactly true. We had not deprived God of his property; we had not robbed the treasury of heaven. God was possessed of as much property after the fall as before; the universe and the fulness thereof still remained his. Therefore, when Christ made satisfaction for us, he *refunded* no property." Again, "We neither owed money to the Deity, nor did Christ pay any on our behalf. His atonement is not a payment of our debt."‡

It is painful to witness the motley mixture of weakness and strength, which a great mind always displays in maintaining a bad cause. Who ever supposed, or maintained, that sin had taken from God money, or any species of material or commercial property, or that Christ restored it? What then? Is there no other sort of indebtedness, no obligation to render to God any thing besides commercial values? Do not children *owe* obedience to their parents? Do not beneficiaries *owe* gratitude to their benefactors? Does not the criminal *owe* to the law which he has injured a compensating punishment? Do not men *owe* to God all love, homage, and devotion, and failing to yield them, do they not *owe,* are they not under obligation to endure the just penalty of their offence? And may not Christ, as their substitute, endure this penalty for them, and thus discharge the debt they owe to the divine justice? Is, in short, "property," in Dr. Edwards's sense, the only thing that men can owe to God? And if the words *redemption, ransom,* &c., imply not the payment of money, does it hence follow, that they imply the payment of nothing? We like the remark of some old divine in regard to scrip-

* Vol. ii. pp. 25–26. † p. 26. ‡ p. 30.

tural metaphors: viz. that the Holy Spirit unquestionably uses those terms in conveying truth to us, which are most fitted to give us a just conception of it. We are surprised that Dr. Edwards should have undertaken to refute a doctrine, which many of the best divines have maintained, by imputing to them, and then demolishing, a fiction of his own, which nobody holds. We see not, but that by undermining the foundation of his reasoning we likewise overturn the superstructure he has reared upon it; and with it those horrible caricatures constructed upon it, entitled "Commercial views of the atonement," which have been so much admired by certain divines.

Dr. E. makes justice of three kinds,* 1. "*Commutative* justice respects property and matters of commerce solely, and secures to every man his own property." 2. "*Distributive* justice. . . . To treat a man justly in this sense, is to treat him according to his personal character or conduct." 3. "*General* or *public* justice comprehends all moral goodness. . . . To practice justice in this sense, is to practice agreeably to the dictates of general benevolence." Here we see justice and benevolence again made identical. How true is it, that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?

Now he says,† "it is only the third kind of justice before mentioned that is *satisfied* by Christ." As to the first which relates solely to property, it of course has nothing to do with the subject. "Nor is *distributive* justice satisfied. If it were, there would indeed be no more grace in the discharge of the sinner, than there is in the discharge of a criminal, when he hath endured the full punishment, to which according to law he had been condemned." He says, moreover,‡ "With regard to the *third* kind of justice, as this is improperly called justice, as it comprehends all moral goodness, it is not at all opposed to *grace;* but comprehends that as well as every other virtue, as truth, faithfulness, meekness, forgiveness, patience, prudence, temperance, fortitude, etc." He says,§ that the word *just* is used in this sense in Rom. iii. 26. Now the simple, naked result of all this, after evolving it from all the circumlocutions in which it is expressed, is that Christ suffered to satisfy not God's justice, but his benevolence; and that in strict propriety of speech, the above verse should read—To declare

* Vol. ii. p. 29. † p. 47. ‡ p. 30. § p. 33.

his *benevolence*, that he might be *benevolent*, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. Comment is superfluous. The way in which such language strikes the ear of the humble, experimental believer in God's words, is enough to determine its merits. But yet how obvious a corollary is it, from that scheme which resolves all the attributes of God into benevolence. Still, in this respect, he had grown wiser than his teacher. For Dr. Hopkins did not drive his metaphysic plough through the atonement. He says, "that by the death, the blood of Christ, full atonement is made for sin; the curse of the law is executed on the Redeemer, by which he has bought, redeemed his people from the curse, and opened the way for their pardon and complete redemption."*

It is not difficult therefore to account for the following observation, which we find in a recent pamphlet: "In sentiment, he (Dr. Edwards) was, in general, a *Calvinist*, in particular, a '*Hopkinsian*'; indeed the founder of the Hopkinsian school, more, perhaps, than Hopkins himself. He made very decided *improvements* in Calvinism; and ranked himself among the New Divinity men, rather than among Calvinists. He was, so far as I can learn, the first to state and defend those more rational and philosophical views of the *Atonement*, which are now generally adopted through New England, and by a large part of the Presbyterian Church in the United States."†

In the sermons on the Atonement, on which we have animadverted, many important truths which are maintained by all evangelical divines on this subject, are ably defended. So far forth they are valuable. But we believe we have shown in the preceding extracts, that fundamental deviation from the Reformed doctrine on this subject, which he originated, and which, according to the testimony of friends and foes, has ruled in New England theology ever since. All other peculiarities of opinion in these discourses, are derivatives from this, and stand or fall with it. We are constrained to add, that aside from this radical obliquity of opinion, the whole development of the subject is more after the "rational and philosophical" than the scriptural method, and rather leads the famished soul into an arid waste of soulless and lifeless metaphysics, than in the green pastures

* Works, Boston Edition, vol. i. p. 475.

† *History of the North Church in New Haven.* By S. W. S. Dutton. pp. 73—4.

which feed the soul with the simple, tender, foodful, vivifying statements of inspiration, the words which are "spirit and life."

And now we ask, *cui bono?* If we try this system by its fruits, what can be said in its behalf? If it has been the New England doctrine of the atonement, has the preaching of Christ and him crucified, been the *forte* of New England preachers, the department in which they have shown their greatest strength, and appeared with pre-eminent advantage? Or is it not rather a fact confessed and deplored that whatever may be the characteristic merits of their ordinary preaching, it is far from being affluent and powerful, in unfolding the person, work, offices, and glory of Christ, and that great article, *stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*, of justification by faith alone? For ourselves, and we speak not without some opportunities of knowledge, we are obliged to say, that this is not the field in which they have most excelled. Of mighty and ponderous discourses on election, decrees, sovereignty, special grace, repentance, moral agency, moral and natural ability, there has been no lack. But there has been too great a poverty and leanness in that which is above all, *the* way, *the* truth, and *the* life, *the* power of God, and *the* wisdom of God unto salvation. The defect is as great as the barrenness of Edwards the younger, in comparison with Edwards the elder, or old Dr. Owen in their exhibitions of this fontal truth of the gospel.

We should be glad to submit some observations on other sermons and pieces in this volume, but we are admonished that we have already outrun our limits. As a matter of historical interest in regard to a question now agitated, it may be stated, that in one sermon preached before the ministers of Connecticut, by their request, in 1792, he strenuously argued that the marriage of a deceased wife's sister was unlawful. The attentive reader can scarcely avoid observing, that whenever he touches any doctrine of the gospel, and upon doctrine he spent his force, in ordinary discourses, he is exceedingly apt to recast what he takes from scripture, in his metaphysical mould; and in most cases, it comes out, as we think, not improved, but somewhat distorted from its naked beauty, and shorn of its original brightness. This result we regard, not as peculiar to his, but to all metaphysical preaching. The foolishness of God is wiser than men. Metaphysics indeed have their place; but preaching is not their place. They only taint and render unwholesome the

bread of life. "Not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." Many of the sermons of Dr. Edwards are little less than metaphysical disquisitions. This we reckon among the chief causes, why his power, success and popularity as a preacher, were so far beneath his father's, and his own real intellectual stature. Of this we judge that he himself at last became satisfied. For his biographer remarks, "In the later periods of his ministry, and especially after he left New Haven, his preaching became less metaphysical and argumentative, and more experimental and tender."

We think, if we had the space, it might easily be shown that some things, which he specifies under the title of "improvements made in theology by his father," were things that his father expressly discarded and opposed. In short, there is evidence that Drs. Hopkins and Edwards were regarded by the great body of ministers in their day, as forming a separate and new party in divinity, and as making serious encroachments upon Calvinism. In the historical discourse of Mr. Dutton already alluded to, are found two extracts from an unpublished diary of Dr. Stiles, President of Yale College, before Dr. Dwight, which shed much light on this subject. We should be glad to print them entire, but for want of space must refer to pp. 68, 73–4 of that discourse. From these it appears that Dr. Stiles abhorred what he calls the "new tenets" of Dr. Hopkins and others; that he styled them, "*unintelligible and shocking new points, Eurekas of New Divinity;*" that he believed in the old Calvinistic doctrines," and thought that the decay of religion, of which Dr. Hopkins complained in Newport, was owing to "Brother Hopkins's New Divinity:" and that the people "would gladly attend such preaching as Dr. Owen's or Dr. Doddridge's, or preachers of far lower abilities, provided they were *ejusdem farinae* with the first Puritan divines."

It appears further that Dr. Edwards told him, in 1777, that "there were three parties in Connecticut. . . . Arminians, who he said were a small party; the *New Divinity Gentlemen*, of whom he said he was called one, who were larger, he said, but still small; and the main body of the ministers, which he said were *Calvinistic.*" These few intimations speaks volumes.

On the whole, we feel that we have been handling the writings of a great and good man. He was an original

thinker, and adroit logician, a mighty polemic, a great divine, and a devout Christian. Still, we study his writings with most satisfaction, when he is refuting some noisome heresy, that is best baffled by metaphysical ingenuity and tact. This is pre-eminently his sphere. When he passes from polemic to didactic theology, and proceeds to the positive statement and inculcation of the Christian scheme, there is an abatement of our satisfaction, as we have already intimated. We think he mars its wondrous beauty, with certain crudities of his own invention; and that even in his ordinary sermons, he was too fond of filtrating the word of life through his own metaphysics. As it is common to compare him with his father, we have no hesitation in declaring him to be in all essential respects, decidedly his father's inferior. Dr. Emmons, in one of those mystic responses, which are so much revered by his admirers, said that "the father had more *reason* than the son; but the son was a better *reasoner* than his father." This, like many of his oracular sayings, was more smart than true. As the father's mind was confessedly more prolific and brilliant; as it swept a wider compass and embosomed greater resources; as it was more profound and far-sighted, as it illuminated a greater variety of subjects, and was surer to avoid all deflections from the true orbit of evangelical doctrine; so he was the more powerful reasoner, and formidable antagonist in a controversy. If the son was seemingly more nimble and dexterous in some of his logical movements and evolutions; the father was the more sure-footed, ponderous and irresistable in his onset upon his foes. If the father sometimes seems more languid and faltering in his movements, it is only because he descries some snare or pitfall, by his masterly insight into all the aspects of the case, which it requires great caution and circumspection to shun. If it be granted that with premises equally good, the son would outstrip the father in reaching the conclusion, it must also be granted, that the father, by reason of his deeper insight, was more sure of having his premises unquestionable, and therefore his conclusions were more impregnable. And as securing the premise, is the most material part of good reasoning, the father was the greater reasoner. A still greater superiority appears in all the father's sermons, and writings on practical godliness, above those of the son. They are far more rich, scriptural, tender, moving, instructive, and nutritious; they have far more unction and spirituality;

they are less metaphysical, frigid and jejune. The father resorted to metaphysics, because he was driven to them for the refutation of error; and when he could avoid them, preferred the style and teachings of scripture, to the method of the schools. The son resorted to metaphysics, because he loved them, and his mind inclined to cast all subjects in their mould. Such is our view of the relative rank and attributes of these remarkable men.

Jas. W. Alexander.

Art. IV.—*The Evils of an Unsanctified Literature.*

It has been common to speak of the books which men read, as their companions; and it is as just to infer the character of men from their reading, as from their associates. Men will be like their books, and this for a twofold reason: first, because the literary productions of a country are the fruit of its intellect and heart, and secondly, because they act with a mighty influence on society. It is therefore by no means uninteresting to the philanthropist to inquire, *What will be the reading of our posterity and countrymen, fifty years hence.* If it be pure, heathful, and fraught with wisdom, the generation will be exalted in holiness: if it be frivolous, or false, or corrupting, or godless, the generation will be perverse and abandoned. In the remarks which follow, an attempt will be made to show, that an unsanctified literature is threatened, and that it is our duty to avert so dire a calamity; for which purpose, a series of observations shall now invite attention, in such method as seems to promise due perspicuity.

I. A Christian literature is possible, and is earnestly to be sought. There is nothing incompatible with true religion, in the attainments of secular wisdom, or the delights of taste. The union of Science, Letters, and Art, with the revealed truth of God and the sentiments of grace, has been suggested and applauded a thousand times, until, so far as abstract statements are concerned, the topic is already hackneyed. The ever-blessed God who is the author of Nature, and the creator of our powers and susceptibili-

ties, is he who gave the Bible, who provided the great Redemption, and who made the gracious affections of the believer what they are.

This is however but a feeble statement of what is intended. Not only does Christianity admit of a connexion with literature and science, but all literature and science must fail of perfection, if they lack this crowning excellency of renewed human nature. And if the public mind is susceptible of great impressions and movements from topics of high moment, it must be granted that language cannot be summoned to convey aught that is more sublime, awakening, or pathetic, than the themes of religion. Let us think of the multitudes who at a given moment are, with avidity and delight, availing themselves of the fruits of the press, in the permanent book, or the fugitive sheet, which enter every reading household; and then let us ask, What are the topics, which, thus presented, should engage the highest affections of these inquisitive and immortal minds? In the expectation of an eternal state, impending so nearly over them and us, what should be the great themes of interest, which the parent should lay before his child, or read at the fireside, and which a thousand presses should scatter broadcast over the mind of the nation? The answer requires no delay: it has already arisen to the lips of every sincere Christian. Nothing conceivable should or could so awaken these souls, or so mightily prompt them to action, or so excite curiosity, or so purge the soul by means of the passions of fear and love, as the themes of revelation; the mystery of their nature, their fall, their peril, their escape; their death, judgment, and eternity; the love of Christ, and the heaven to which it leads. Add to this the records of prophecy, the prospects of the race, as opened in the promise of the latter glory, and the kingdom of Christ which is to absorb and supersede all other dominions. The language of man can utter nothing loftier or more affecting than these, and whatever impulse or charm can be attached to words by the discoveries of science, the cogency of reasoning, or the refinements of taste, may well be applied to the work of carrying these tremendous realities home to every human bosom.

These, after all, are the truths for which the soul was made. The heart which has not been reached by them has susceptibilities as yet altogether latent. These are the subjects which above all others will yet agitate society to its

remotest fibres. It would be folly to assert then that religious considerations cannot be made interesting to the common mind. Compared with these, what are the things which our current literature—if literature it can be called—offers to the myriads of eager readers! What, in such a view, are the fugitive tales, the feigned embarrassments and escapes, and catastrophes, the unnatural plots, the picture of life high or low, the song and jest, all which are gaped after and hunted out, with an avidity which not even the nightly work of the press, and the importunity of the newsboy can satisfy! The day has been when masses of the people were convulsed by these very truths. This is the subject, these are the very propositions, which broke the sleep of the Gentile world, wherever apostolic teaching made its way; which ran through Northern and Middle Europe, in that amazing revival which we call the Reformation; which penetrated every branch of the great Anglo-Saxon tree, in the seventeenth century; and which were so familiar and so dear to the settlers of New England, that to this day they are the acknowledged cause of the eminent intelligence and success of that happy land. The reading of the people just mentioned was, at these eras, almost exclusively, religious reading. It will be so again, among every people, with all the aids and embellishments of science and learning suited to the progress of the race.

There is not a department of science, or a walk of innocent letters, which does not claim of us, to be wedded to religion. To dissever the two, is to shut out heaven from earth. Natural philosophy and natural history, in their largest acceptation, stand ready to become religious sciences, by merely turning their face toward God, whose they are, and whom they serve. The history of man, aside from the plan of Providence, is a labyrinth without a clew. Poetry and Music, always claiming to be sacred, miss their proper themes, when banished from the sanctuary. And, if we are true to our vocation as Christians, we shall be restless and unsatisfied, until we shall have secured the teaching, of whatever is worth teaching at all, in subserviency to God's grand scheme of civilization, by means of holy scripture, and regenerating grace.

In particular cases, and with various degrees of success, we see how kindly may be the union of Science and Literature with Divine Truth; for we see on the one hand, a Bacon,

a Newton, and a Pascal, and on the other, a Milton and a Cowper. We see it exemplified in the education which every gifted Christian gives to a son or a daughter, and this by means of books, or what might be conveyed by books; and the sight should prompt us to diffuse the benefit, and promote the sacred union, as far as our united strength can reach.

II. NO COUNTRY HAS YET HAD A THOROUGHLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE. Every Christian country has had the blessing for a time, and in a portion of its population; but none has been leavened in the whole mass. Enough has been effected, on a small scale, at seasons of heavenly excitement, to show us what might be done; but thus far the majority of authors and readers have been of the earth, earthy. The world has yet to look for a sanctified literature. The seeming exceptions would not detain us long, even in detail. Individuals there have been, who have laid their science and learning at the feet of Christ.

> Philosophy, baptised
> In the pure fountain of eternal love,
> Has eyes indeed: and viewing all she sees
> As meant to indicate a God to man,
> Gives him the praise, and forfeits not her own.
> Learning has borne such fruit in other days
> On all her branches; piety has found
> Friends in the friends of science, and true prayer
> Has flowed from lips wet with Castalian dews.

But in no country has the prevailing taste for any length of time been governed by such minds; and, in most, the religious compositions of the age have flowed in a fertilizing but narrow stream through a land of carnal pleasure and godless learning. The Reformation had giants of literature, but more giants were left within the walls of Rome; and while the holy scholars of Great Britain were labouring for the gospel, the liveliest writers of the age of the Charleses were sweetening a cup of poison, to be handed down even to our day.

It is reserved for another era, to see a whole nation drinking with eagerness from the wells of salvation; and no instructed Christian can refrain from praying that God would confer this unspeakable benefit on our own land, and our own generation.

III. THE LITERATURE OF OUR COUNTRY IS IN A FORMING STATE. Not merely in the strict and accredited use of the word, Literature, is this true; but in regard to the sum of

all the reading of our people. There are rapid changes in public taste and habit, which some of us have lived to see; but there are tendencies of which we descry only the beginning, and the termination of which may be disastrous. The influences which move upon our immense reading public are powerful and innumerable, as we may infer from the very extent of the book-trade, the number of imported works, the presses in every city and town, and the multitude of periodical publications. But these influences are not uniform and homogeneous. The plastic condition of the common mind receives a moulding touch from every great intellect, at home or abroad, whether good or evil, and especially from the fictitious, sportive, and periodical compositions of the hour.

That a mass so ductile should be subjected to chance, or to the blind or sinister impulses of those who write from self-interest, alone, and who are ready to cater for the vilest appetites and passions of our nature, is what the Christian world should not brook for a moment. That the millions who read, and who, in regard to the inner man, live by what they read, should be left a prey to licentious, infidel, or, at best, trifling and carnal authors, is an evil of such injustice as would shock us, if we could see it in its proper colours. And to do this the more fully, it is desirable to inquire, how far the general reading of our people deserves the name of Christian.

IV. The literature of our country is to a great extent irreligious. Not that it is infidel or anti-christian, in a positive degree, but that it is not so imbued with Christianity, as that wherever it goes, it carries with it the savour of divine things. Laying out of view, for a little, those works which inculcate infidelity or vice, it must be acknowledged, of the large number which remains, that religious truth enters into a small portion. This is true of the daily reading of all classes, of the books used in schools, and of those which by thousands form the solace of the leisure hour. The people of the United States are more extensively a reading people, than any upon earth. And in estimating the influence of what is read, we are not to confine ourselves to the large volume, but include the magazine, the newspaper, the song-book, the stitched play or tale, and the monosyllabic primer of the child. Our presses are prolific in due proportion to the labour-saving devices of the arts. All censorship of books is absent.

Every class of minds is addressed by the teeming periodical press, and publishers vie with each other, in affording this luxury of modern times, at the lowest possible price. The statistics of the newspaper press alone are enough to astonish one who comes newly to the calculation. Or, in default of this, a single walk through one populous thoroughfare, or a single hour on a steamboat-wharf, or a Sunday visit to a dozen working-men, will suffice to show how welcome the closely-printed journal is to every class of our people, and how sedulously it is studied, even by the hackney-coachman on his box, the operative on his scaffold, and the poorest wayfaring man, who has a penny at command. From being a succinct account of the more important news, the journal has come to embrace every thing which human curiosity can crave, and especially the record of all the crimes of all the convicted felons of the land, with every disgusting detail of evidence, until even children learn not to shudder at bloodshed or blush at uncleanness. The very advertisements of popular newspapers now tell of enormities, and intimate escapes from the ills of vice, at which our fathers would have grown pale. Whole works, of some length, are in this shape spread before multitudes who would not otherwise obtain them; and these, in many cases, works of more than doubtful character. With many, this is almost the sole reading; and it would be enough, if quantity were all; for it occupies many an hour in the week, and much of the holy Sabbath. And if we are reminded that there are public journals which nobly subserve the cause of morals and religion, we cannot but remember that there are others which as openly do the work of destruction; while, between these extremes, there is an extensive series, which are the too faithful mirror of every folly and every transgression of our sinning people. Of much, then, in this portion of our literature, no Christian characteristic can be predicated.

Next in general interest we may name the rapidly increasing class of fictitious works; tales, novels, and romances. Without taking that high ground, from which severe moralists have condemned all of this species, we may surely say that, in point of fact, these books are not only void of any religious tendency, but that they cultivate a taste for momentary gratification, distemper the mind in regard to all solid acquirement, and in many instances convey the seductive poison of error and voluptuousness. As the mat-

ter now stands, it is to be feared that half the reading, of those who most need the improvement of books, is confined to this class, and that thousands of the young, in the labouring circles, devour every thing accessible of this sort, with an undiscriminating voracity.

Rising from these inferior paths, we shall find to our sorrow, that of what may be called the solid instruction of our age, much is absolutely irreligious. Science, in all its circle, is taught as if the God, whose workmanship the objects of science are, were to be studiously disregarded; and a course of thorough scientific study, embracing the very materials of natural theology, might be made out, from authors of reputation and ability, which might be perused without finding an allusion to the design and benevolence of an Almighty Creator. The same is true of a great portion of historical literature, both old and new. From whom do we so generally learn the annals of the Roman empire, annals inseparably connected with the rise of the church, as from Gibbon? To whom is the inquirer concerning the next period oftener directed than to Russell? Who is the most popular and fascinating historian of our own ancestry, if not Hume? Or what general survey of the fortunes of the race at large is in wider circulation than that of Rotteck? Inferior but less sceptical writers abound, who nevertheless have no sentence which lifts the soul to God.

Even where learning is genuine, therefore, and solid, it is irreligious, in the sense of being divorced from religion. The parts of truth, in order to be communicated, are dissected away from their native connexion with the great truth of the system. Where religion is introduced, it is, in a very large class of able and popular works, such religion as will present no foolishness to the Greek and no stumbling-block to the Jew; such religion as will equally please the Papist and the Socinian; in a word, a cold Deism which even Islam would not reject. And this in a land professedly Christian, and in books which make no little shew of devotion. By such a literature our posterity must be educated, unless we substitute a better. A development of mind, furthered by such discipline, is disproportioned and monstrous; and the more so, the higher the intellectual attainment. That science which takes no cognizance of God's most valuable revelations can never be wisdom. From such a circle of knowledge, however useful on a petty earthly scale, God is excluded; and we revel in a godless literature, in a world of

which every lineament signifies his presence. So that where this prevails, he who would learn the things of God must go apart, inquire elsewhere, and resort to strictly religious works.

But our reflections become still more melancholy, when we find the same studied omission in works deliberately prepared for the instruction of youth in elementary schools. Consider the necessary tendency of training a child, day by day, and year by year, to exclude God! Contemplate ten thousand schools, and millions of youth perpetually learning, and yet learning nothing which can save their souls; taught to tread the very ground where God's presence should be felt at every step, with a total absence of the idea of God! Can such a method fail to promote the habit of excluding God from the thought?

School manuals and school libraries are formed, or are in progress, in several of our states. They have been prepared with care and by men of sound learning. But they have in more than one instance been produced in accordance with the very principle which we deprecate. Natural religion, that is, so much of truth as may carry the assent of the Mohammedan, the Jew, and the Deist, they do sometimes contain: but Christ crucified, they do not contain. They teach many things, they teach them well; but they teach nothing as to the great end for which man lives, and without which it were better for him that he had never been born.

Not every book denominated religious, contains evangelical and saving truth. The spirit of unscriptural concession is gaining upon us. Even moral and religious works appear, and gain public favour, which exclude the very vitals of piety. The grand, central truths are left out. The reader moves in a circle which keeps Christ and Redemption always out of sight. This, though a negation, is one of which the consequences are positive, and ruinous. No better scheme could be devised for the introduction of practical infidelity, or for educating a generation of intelligent readers to be the prey of destructive error. And every pious patriot must shrink from the anticipation of a whole people trained by means of a Christless literature.

The field would open too widely for our present limits, if we were to show, how fatal is the error of supposing that intellectual discipline and acquisition, however great, can prove a real national blessing, without religion. We can

only take time to show the gigantic power of unsanctified learning, by pointing to the great names of unbelievers; to Voltaire in universal literature; to Bentham in jurisprudence and statesmanship; to Lamarck in natural history, and La Place in the highest mathematical analysis. Let the blasphemy and murder of the French Revolution record the malign power of great intelligence abandoned of God.

V. We must have a Christian Literature. All that has been said tends to this point. We must have it, lest we become a ruined people. If Knowledge is Power, it is, when separate from religion, disastrous power; and forces of this kind are multiplying every day. We must have a Christian literature, because our people are increasing with unprecedented rapidity; because readers are multiplied with every effort in the cause of schools; because books are more numerous and more accessible, as the inventions of art advance; because our country is to be the theatre of unexampled events; and because unless we bestir ourselves the enemy will have pre-occupied the ground.

The expectation of a universally prevalent literature such as Christianity demands, may be set aside as chimerical. Yet before admitting the justice of the censure, it is right to say, that as Christians we are living in the hope of this very thing: 'for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.' And we are bound to labour as those who look for such a consummation. We cannot blindfold ourselves to the progress of society, the diffusion of light and freedom, the strides of science, the approximation of continents by means of art, the systematic energy of education; we behold all this tending to something which the world has not seen; we tremble to observe these forces, in some seasons and regions, operating towards evil. But in every one of them we behold a mighty weapon, which the Lord will seize, for his own purposed uses, when his time shall have come; and we know of no means within our reach so potent as the communication of divine truth.

Though the public taste is vitiated, and demands an aliment which is noxious, and though the existing literature is supplied in correspondence with this morbid appetite, we are far from despairing. We hope both to correct the taste, and to improve the nutriment. Because every thing cannot be done, we will not be content to do nothing. Every good book which goes abroad, does its part towards

forming a healthful taste. Every conversion to God causes a desire for the sincere milk of the word. Every extensive revival of religion enlarges the demand for truth. As holy productions spread themselves, more persons will find what delight may be afforded by compositions which they lately rejected as dry and needless. The tide will turn, as it regards popular fiction. The cloyed appetite will crave genuine nourishment. If all who have ever hung with rapture over the Pilgrim's Progress, or the Saint's Rest, could be summoned to testify of their satisfaction, even the novel-readers and haunters of the playhouse would learn new pleasures. Thus while suitable works, adapted to every capacity, are produced and disseminated, there will, in an increasing ratio, be a demand for more; and wherever grace strikes in with the effort, in its regenerating power, the geometrical progression will be such as to dissipate all our unbelieving fears.

We must have, through the length and breadth of the church, a settled, operative conviction, that the common reading of the nation is not to be left to chance; and that it is of the highest moment, for our children and our country, that all which they read should be according to the will of God. It is to public taste and public conscience, and not to the arm of power that we look for this revolution. We can endure no establishment to enforce a uniformity of creed; we ask no censorship to paralyze the corrupting press; but our hope is, to send abroad so much of heavenly truth, as shall win and retain the affections which are now wandering. And the work will be so much the easier, if Christian parents and teachers will only exercise their prerogative by restraining those entrusted to them, from the idle, enervating, and poisoned entertainments afforded by a profligate press; from the foolish fiction, the profane or licentious drama, and, what is no less fearful, the daily print, redolent of vice, pointing the way to unhallowed amusements, chronicling the particulars of crime, and trumpeting to ten thousand families vices and inventions which should be buried as deeply as the cities of the plain.

VI. IN PROMOTING THIS OBJECT, THERE IS AMPLE GROUND ON WHICH ALL EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS MAY UNITE. To argue this point, would be to vindicate the fundamental principle of our national societies. Their avowed friends need no such argument. But there is reason to believe, that not a few truly benevolent Christians

are withheld from giving a hearty support to the cause, by doubts respecting this very proposition. Even against the common enemy, they scruple to wage any warfare, but under their peculiar banners. To such it may be right to say, that these humble suggestions proceed from a source which is far from being lukewarm in the cause of the strictest ecclesiastical institutions. It is the excellence of the Tract Society's enterprise, that it trespasses upon no principles of evangelical churches, not even those which are highest and most exclusive in their own sphere; but it cannot go forward, unless the brethren of different persuasions consent to join hands in setting forward that vast portion of truth in which they are agreed. How much this is, may best be learnt from the publications which they have made. The ground is wide enough on which such men meet as Baxter, Bunyan, Mather, Hall, Fuller, Richmond, Wilberforce, Cunningham, De Vinne and Gurney; all speaking the same things, and all reserving to themselves the right of promoting to the utmost, in other connexions, the inculcation of their respective tenets. So long as the unconverted millions belong to no sect, great portions of them must be left untouched, unless the true disciples of all sects unite to strike the blow. And the American Tract Society and the American Sunday School Union have been showing for a course of years, how safe, and how effectual is such a guarded association of evangelical effort.

VII. It is our immediate duty to unite in furnishing a Christian literature to our country. The time of our earthly labour is short, and we are hastening to meet our countrymen at the bar of God. It has been calculated, that within the lifetime of some now living, the territory of our Union will contain a hundred millions. The tide sets so strongly into the unsettled regions, as to outstrip all the stated and ordinary means of supply. We have cast on the stream of the present generation sixty millions of Tracts, and ten millions of books; under the favour of the Divine Spirit, we humbly believe that even this will appear 'in that day' to have been saving to a great multitude. But we can do more; we ought to do more; with God helping us, we will do more.

Our beloved land is just the stage on which so great an action may fitly be presented. In all the freshness of unencumbered freedom and the bursting health of exuberant increase, in union and unbroken peace, we find ourselves at

the very point where a grand experiment may begin. The genius and learning and zeal of the church need only to be concentrated; the latent or diverted talent needs only to be brought into this channel; education and authorship need only to be sworn into the service of Christ, in order to move the mighty population of America. And what heart is not swelling with hope and exultation, at the bare prospect of such an effort; in which Christians shall unite as Christians, and consecrate every endowment of themselves and their sons to the cause of Christ!

The demand is no ordinary one; it calls for such reading for a great nation, as shall include the very highest fruits of human reason. But in what cause shall great sacrifices be made, if not in the cause of Him who died for us, and who is going forth to subdue the world? We are called upon, in some way or other, to flood the land with books which shall have a direct bearing on the eternal state. They must be provided, and thrown into every college, school, and household. The same Spirit who prompts the effort, will graciously second it. When the great conversions and mighty revivals of a better day shall be more frequent and nearer together, the reading of our people will be worthier of immortal minds. Will it not be a good day for our blessed country, when the thousands yet unevangelized shall be absorbed in eternal things; when at every fire-side, every group of citizens, and every assembly, the politics of this world shall be less animating than the spread of the truth, and the dispensation of the gospel to the heathen!

There are signs even in the army of the aliens, that a change must come. The human soul cannot feed forever on a hollow, fantastic literature. No extravagance of stimulated invention can avail to slake the thirst of mankind for nobler excitement. Secular fiction has tried its utmost, and falls back upon itself; so that it is more true than when the sainted Cowper penned it, that

> "authors hear at length one general cry,
> Tickle and entertain us, or we die.
> The loud demand from year to year the same,
> Beggars invention and makes fancy lame,
> Till farce itself, most mournfully jejune,
> Calls for the kind assistance of a tune;
> And novels (witness every month's review)
> Belie their name and give us nothing new."

Yet our people are becoming rather more, than less, susceptible of high emotions; and have only to feel the electric

awakening of heavenly themes, to find that truth may possess the soul more strongly than fiction; that the glories of humanity are imaginary, until the gospel be embraced; and that all the amusements, nay, all the trade and politics and warfare of the world, are trifles, when compared with the work of God in bringing back the nations to himself.

Amidst the disheartening moral evils which prevail, and the irruptions of false science and corrupt literature, which wound the church on every side, it is our privilege to go about Christian labour under the enthusiasm of a lofty hope, derived from prophecy; for we know the time is coming, when truth shall drive out error; when the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be seven-fold, as the light of seven days, in the day that Jehovah bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound.

ART. V.—*The Thirty-eighth Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society.* 1842. pp. 252. London.

ONE cannot turn over the leaves of this large pamphlet without gratification at the extensiveness, and apparent efficiency of the means now in operation for the diffusion of the scriptures in all languages. The annual reports of this institution, in addition to the details of its own operations, furnish notices of the transactions of the principal societies of the same kind in all countries; so that we we may view at a glance the whole system of translating, printing and circulating the holy volume. According to the compendious tables annexed to the Report, there are three Bible societies in Western Europe, six in Northern Europe, thirty-one in Central Europe, twelve in Switzerland and Italy, one in Greece and Turkey, two in Russia, five in India, and two in the United States, the American and Philadelphia. This enumeration is intended to include only the chief or parent societies. The auxiliaries would add thousands to the list. In the thirty-eight years of the British and Foreign Bible Society's existence it has expended, in all its operations, a sum equal to about fourteen millions of dollars, in our currency. The number of copies of the scrip-

tures which it issued in whole or in part, in all languages, during the same period, was about fourteen millions. The languages and dialects in which the Bible is now found approaches to one hundred and fifty. For the different regions of India alone, there are thirty-four translations provided; eight for Africa; twelve for Polynesia. In most Christian communities there is some provision for the cheap sale or gratuitous bestowment of the Bible, for the benefit of all classes. The editions in our own language which are continually in the course of production are innumerable. The arts have been strained to the utmost to produce the costliest and the cheapest forms. The possession of a copy of the Bible in an indispensable mark of civilization wherever English is the vernacular, and it is cited as the mark of the lowest stage of degradation, when one of our species is found among us who can give no general account of what the holy book contains. Not only are the production and supply of the Bible provided for, but who can calculate the amount of labour that is continually in exercise to promote the reading of it? To make the estimate, we shall have to find the statistics of Christendom in reference to the sermons, lectures, addresses, and exhortations of the ministry; the Sabbath and other schools, Bible classes, and households, where the Bible is systematically studied; and the private reading of the whole Christian world.

But when we compare this extensive knowledge of, and deference to the scriptures, with the evidence of their actual influence upon mankind, we discover a wonderful disproportion. Regarding any community where the Bible is theoretically held to be the supreme law, and looking soberly at its citizens in their various relations, public and private, in their principles of business, in their legislatures, courts of justice, and political assemblies, we shall find in the debates, the arguments, the bargains and the plans, little evidence that the principles of the revealed will of God are practically regarded and authoritatively appealed to, any further than these principles may have been incorporated into established constitutions and laws, or into habits that have grown out of them. If we go into the family circle, how seldom do we find the Bible evidently and avowedly followed as the standard of right and wrong, of the duties of husband and wife, parents and children, master and servant! How much is it regarded as of authority in the attention that is given by municipal provision, or private

charity, to the poor, the stranger, the widow and orphan? It must, we think, be admitted by Christians that both as it respects their own "conversation," and the general conduct of the Bible-believing world—making all due allowance, too, for human infirmity and imperfect grace—there is a sad disproportion between the light and the practice.

In looking for a solution of the fact, we have no doubt that a fair investigation will bring us to the result that it is not to the want of Bibles, nor to the neglect of reading them, so much as to the method of using them, that the evil is attributable. We should start in this search with the principle that the scriptures must be familiarly and constantly studied, in order to produce their proper influence on human conduct; the kind of study which was indicated by the divine authority when the moral law was formally announced. "These words which I command thee this day shall be in thy heart, [or, as subsequently recited, 'shall ye lay up in your heart and in your soul,'] and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up; and thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes: and thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house and on thy gates." It is true there was a peculiar necessity for this method of diffusing and transmitting a knowledge of the divine will, when there was no adequate mechanical power for multiplying copies of the law; and the small bulk of the scriptures at that period rendered such a method as that just quoted, of comparatively easy practice. But the principle itself is founded in human nature, and is universal. It is not what we formally and scholastically learn that becomes incorporated into our very frame, but rather what we imbibe from our earliest associations, imperceptibly but constantly, not only through teaching, but as it is dropped in the house, by the way, at the table; unceremoniously, unintentionally, unconsciously. How do children acquire the opinions of their parents? What is the law of this descent? What is the philosophy of that *caste*, which as a general rule binds families to the same opinions from one generation to another? Does not our experience reply, that we trace these results not to the lessons of school or college, of church or forum, but to the extemporaneous impressions made by sentiments and conduct which took their silent ef-

fect at the fireside, in the walk, through the twilight chat, the nursery tale, and bedside prayer? When we try to recall the origin of our present sentiments, there are few, we apprehend, who can fix the date or the method of their ingrafting in their minds, or who can give any more definite history of them than that they formed the atmosphere of home, and grew with their growth. The preacher or professor may have helped us to our terms, arrangements, and verbal rules; but our philosophy, religion, politics and so forth, are in their substantiality, derived from our familiar, and for the most part, our domestic associations.

To exemplify the operation of this principle in religious instruction, let us suppose a contrast in the method pursued in two different families. In one, we will imagine that the Sabbath is the exclusive time devoted to this purpose. Tasks in the Bible, catechism, and psalm-book are regularly assigned and strictly required, during the intervals of public worship, and the evening is spent by each with his Bible in hand, or one reading for all. Is it not easily seen, that in such a case, although the Bible has been the prominent object at home throughout the whole day, there is danger, in the first place, of its being treated merely as a task-book and of there being nothing worthy of the name of instruction received: and in the second place, that the associations connected with the knowledge thus obtained will make its future revival in the mind an unwelcome effort? Let us further suppose, that after the sabbath is passed, the Bible is shut up in that house for the six successive days, excepting at the reading of the chapter in family worship. The father pursues his business, the mother her housewifery, the children their trades or studies, day after day, until the Lord's day returns. The conversation in the family is of business, of news, of political prospects and domestic affairs. What the parents say to their children relates to their lessons, amusements and other incidental matters; but of the divine precepts they have not spoken all this time as they sat in their house, walked by the way, as they lay down and arose.

Suppose, on the other hand, the case of another family, in the same circumstances as the one just presented, as to rank, intelligence, piety and religious privileges, but where the parents take a different course with their household. They do not neglect to teach their children to read and commit the scriptures, but in doing so they use them emi-

nently as authoritative and practical. They hold up the great use of the word, to be as "the rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy" God. In their domestic government and discipline it is their chief law and guide. Does a child disobey, or otherwise dishonour a parent; does he treat a servant with unkindness or the poor with contempt; is he guilty of falsehood, or in his juvenile way evince anger, jealousy, covetousness, or the germs of any other evil disposition? in such a case the first reference is, not to the command of the parent disobeyed, or to the greatness of the mischief done, but to the spirit of the divine law which has been violated. The requirements of the Bible are so placed before the family, that they learn to regard them—not as abstruse doctrines or Sunday statutes, or as relating only to great crimes, like profaneness, falsehood and theft—but as the rules which bind them every day and hour, in all relations, and which hold them accountable first of all to God, of whose laws their parents are, as to them, the administrators. They find that to do, as well as to believe, is involved in the reception of the divine revelation. Parental example teaches them this. They are accustomed to hear the recognition of a superintending Providence in all the events of life; they have witnessed how their father has directed his course in business by the rules of gospel morals, and been elevated by these holy principles above the artifices, grand or petty, of trade; how he has shunned the sin of debt as well as flagrant dishonesty; how he has learned benevolence, and not parsimony, from the bountifulness of God to him, and has brought all his plans and desires into subordination to the primary duty of consecrating all to Him. The scriptures, in such a family, are treated as if they had a real relation to every day's actions. They are cited, for doctrine, for reproof, for historical example, or in the expression of devout thoughts; not sanctimoniously, nor flippantly, but as if they were received with authority.

In which of these imaginary families will the Bible be most likely to impart a permanent influence? Which approaches nearest to the mode of inculcating divine truth enjoined by the lawgiver himself? Which is most accordant with the very character of the Bible, which makes all our duties, duties to God, whatever creature may be the immediate object of them; which reveals a Deity, not for homage only, like the unliving gods of the heathen, but for

obedience and affection; which extends its rules to all classes of men, to all their conduct, and to their very thoughts and intents? This being the character of the revelation, and it alone instructing men in the knowledge of what God is and what he requires, and furnishing the standard by which they are to be judged, it is evident that, in the nature of the case, the Bible must be familiarly studied and used in order to have an effect commensurate with its design. It must be in this sense, the every-day book, the family-book, the school-book; the book of the legislature, the court, the government; the book of ruler and subject, master and servant, buyer and seller; the book of the infant, the child and the man. To confine a book of this authority to one day in seven, or to one sacred place, would be infinitely more absurd than for a parent to limit the exercise of his influence over his famity to one day in the week. Or, what would be the state of society if our civil laws were known only as they could be learned from the casual scenes of the public court, in the discussions of the bar, the opinions of judges, and the verdicts of juries; or even if this knowledge depended on the popular reading of the statute-book? It is because constant use and application of the law all around them, makes men familiar with it, even without formal instruction, that the justice of the maxim is admitted, that ignorance of it is no excuse to the transgressor.

The necessity of such a familiar use of the scriptures as we have referred to, is evident from their very bulk. Reverting to the inspired example already cited—the method enjoined upon the Israelites—it may be remarked that the advantage which printing gives us over them is counterbalanced, in the respect now alluded to, by the increased size of our volume; which has swelled from the few chapters particularly comprehended in that injunction—or the four books, if we comprise the whole canon as it then existed—to sixty-six books, and nearly twelve hundred chapters. Now, if to maintain the due recollection of so small a portion demanded such a plan of perpetual familiarity, how much more strongly does the reason apply to us, though we have the whole volume in our hands, seeing that its various lessons, conveyed in history, prophecy, psalmody, proverbs, gospels and epistles, have swelled beyond the capacity of memory and the power of tradition! To accomplish a single perusal of the whole Bible in one year

requires the reading of more than three chapters daily; or in the proportion of five chapters every Sabbath, and three on each other day. This, we may remark as we pass, is certainly a small demand on any one's time—not exceeding that which most men give to each day's newspaper—yet have we not reason to dread that an investigation, even among Christians, would not bring their average reading of the scriptures to this point?

And though it be true that the whole law may be comprehended in one precept—love; and the whole gospel in another—believe; yet there is nothing superfluous in the Testaments. All scripture is profitable. Nothing becomes obsolete here. Its history and biography are not mere matters of chronicle—they are given us for our example. Its prophecies, even those long since fulfilled, are the eternal monuments of divine truth and omniscience. Its ancient ritual is an almost indispensable key to the mystery of redemption. However diversified its precepts, illustrations and exhortations, none can be spared. They repay the whole attention of the profoundest students, and their riches are an inexhaustible mine. For notwithstanding the confidence some may have in their own intimate acquaintance with the Bible, and in the supposition that the mass of Christian people are at home in every part of the volume, we apprehend that the deficiency is very palpable. Let the experiment be made with some of the most prominent portions of the book; such as the different kinds of sacrifice and offering; the services of the day of atonement—that glorious exposition of imputed sin, vicarious punishment, and complete redemption; the statutes of the Levitical code in relation to wages, the protection of the deaf and blind, the provision for the poor in harvest, the veneration of the aged, the care of strangers—and the common ignorance will soon be apparent. How meager is the knowledge commonly possessed of the Jewish history contained in the books from Joshua to Esther! How few could give, at once, the distinctions of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, tell the chronology of the prophets, or characterize their writings! How often are readers perplexed to fix the part of the volume in which some of their books stand, until they have turned to the old table "Genesis hath chapters" &c. &c.! How many portions there are of which we have impressions of their most scenic and dramatic incidents—such as the death of Abel, Isaac on the altar of sacrifice, the death of Ananias and

Sapphira—but the dates, connexion, cause or result of which are a blank in our minds! "How many precious texts are there," says Hervey, "big with most rich truth of Christ, which we cannot comprehend, which we know nothing of; and of those we do know how few do we remember!"

Though the Bible may be much read, it is little studied; in the way which is open to the mass of readers. They seldom compare its parts and phrases, the statements of the evangelists for instance, or the quotations in the New Testament from the Old, or trace an argument through an epistle, without regard to the division of chapter and verse, or seek to know the times and places of the sacred events. Many of our readers would probably be surprised at the result if they should open the New Testament at any page for the purpose of discovering the proportion of passages which are in familiar use, to those which seldom occur in meditation or in citation. Many texts, that are the most familiar, are so detached in common use from their proper connexion, that their scope is often wholly mistaken and their meaning distorted; and large portions are continually read without the least discernment of the chain which binds them together, and without the perception of which they fall into as disconnected a form as a selection of Solomon's proverbs would be. We might almost venture the assertion that not one person in ten can write down from memory the Lord's Prayer, and find it accurate when compared with either of the forms in the evangelists. To the restricted use of the Bible in the pulpit and in our private reading, and the neglect of expository comments and lectures by preachers, much of this effect is attributable. The course now commonly pursued makes certain parts familiar, whilst others are strange; and the repetition of these familiar parts creates an impression that the whole book is known. The directions given to the Jews for the transmission of the divine laws and ordinances by means of oral instruction, familiar conversation, hereditary privileges, and the explanation to their children of the various rites and ceremonies which they witnessed, secured the intended effect in a manner which attested the wisdom that established the plan. Our Lord constantly appealed to the Jews as familiar with all parts of their scriptures. "Have ye not read what David did when he was an hungered"—"have ye not read in the law that how on the Sabbath day the priests in the temple," &c. "What is

written in the law? how readest thou?"—"thou knowest the commandments"—"as touching the dead, that they rise, have ye not read in the book of Moses." "Have ye not read that he which made them in the beginning made them male and female?"—"ye have heard that it was said by them of old time"—"did ye never read in the scriptures, the stone which the builders rejected?" Such expressions denote our Saviour's assurance, that even in that degenerate age the Jews had not forgotten or neglected to study the inspired word. So his allusions to their contents were as to matters which were perfectly well known to his hearers, such as his various references to the Levitical law, the history of Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrah, incidents in the history of David, Jonah, Lot, the queen of Sheba, Elijah and the widow of Sarepta, Elisha and Naaman, Noah, Moses and the Serpent, &c. In like manner he cited the Psalms, and the prophecies of Daniel, Isaiah, and Malachi. With the Jews he could "begin at Moses," and from him and "all the prophets expound unto them in all the scriptures concerning himself," and prove that "all things must be fulfilled," which they knew "were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and in the psalms concerning" the Messiah. For it was not only the chief advantage of the Jews that to them were committed the oracles of God, but that they knew his will, and approved the things that were more excellent, being instructed out of the law, and were confident (according to the apostles' testimony) that they were guides, light, and teachers of all others. From incidental circumstances in the evangelists it would seem that the common people, as well as the scribes and priests, were conversant with the details of their holy writings, so that without research or reference they could produce at the moment of discussion, the appropriate passages. The book of the Acts and the Epistles give interesting evidence to the same point, and show that even those, who in common and unprejudiced estimation were "unlearned and ignorant men," were mighty in the scriptures.

And, surely, this is not more than might be reasonably expected to be the case in our Christian communities, where not in every synagogue only, but in every family, copies of the scriptures abound. Were it so, we might hope that we were nearer the time when the word of God shall be regarded as supreme in every household, in all systems of education, in legislation and jurisprudence, and in all go-

vernments. For all these spheres the Bible is adapted; to all of them it is directed; and, until it is admitted to its place, men will fight and enslave; and justify violations of the moral law, under the pretexts of necessity, expediency, national honour and policy; and the training of the young and the rules of society will be more and more worldly.

The objection that familiarity with the scriptures tends to impair their influence, is sometimes heard from intelligent and conscientious sources. But it seems to us that apart from the necessity of the case, as presented in the preceding considerations, there are two replies which must be conclusive. One is, that the Divine wisdom has sanctioned a method which requires the utmost familiarity, not only with the law, but the mode of instilling it. The revelation was not to be communicated only to the minds that could fully understand and appreciate its subjects, but it was to be made known to the children. The privilege of instructing these was not confined to the hierarchy, but the people themselves were diligently to teach their families. Nor was it only at set seasons, and in a formal manner that this instruction was to be conveyed. It was to be "talked of" at home as opportunity was opened, upon rising in the morning, or retiring at night; or as the parents walked abroad with their children; and so common must the Divine precepts be made, that they should be, as it were, bound upon the hand, fixed between the eyes, and inscribed upon the very posts and gates of the dwelling.

The other reply to the objection in view is that it is contradicted by analogy. Does familiarity beget indifference in the minds of those who are most thoroughly conversant with the elements of the professions, sciences, or other pursuits in which they excel? Is it not superficial knowledge that creates distaste? Is it not the mere smatterer who becomes weary, and that because his mind does not advance far enough beyond the elements to derive any true benefit from them? This is the secret of the facts upon which the opinion is built that the Bible may become too familiar. One knows the story of Joseph, of Samson and Daniel, the sermon on the mount, and the common passages of these kinds, and concludes that he has exhausted the volume. Yet most probably, this same one could not tell the scope, connexion, or argument of any one of the epistles, or repeat five verses of any given page of the New Testament after the book of the Acts. Let us open the works of those who

have been at once the most profound and most devout students of the scriptures—even such as, like Jerome, have intelligently committed the whole scriptures to memory—and see whether their relish for the holy truth was impaired, or whether their familiarity with it made them but dull reciters of the text. Our objectors must think meanly of the taste of the good martyr Ridley when he said, "the walls and trees of my orchard, could they speak, would bear witness, that there I learned by heart almost all the epistles; of which study, although in time a greater part was lost, yet the sweet savour thereof, I trust I shall carry with me to heaven." David's habits, in reference to the scriptures, disclose the true way of attaining an unwearied attachment to them, "Oh how love I thy law! *it is my meditation all the day.*"

It is on the ground we are now reviewing, that the Bible is commonly objected to, as improper for the use of schools. But it could easily be demonstrated by a visit to almost any public school, that the alleged distaste has not been the result of too perfect an acquaintance with the contents of the Bible, but of the mode in which it has been used. The unfavourable effect will be found to be attributable to causes much more latent, such as the want of judgment in adapting the portions read to the age and condition of the scholars; the irreverent manner in which the holy book is turned into an exercise for reading or the memory; in making it a mere task, without an effort to render it intelligible by explanations and illustrations; and neglect to treat the Bible in all methods as the practical rule of the learners' duty in every moment of life, the standard of their character, the foundation of their responsibility, and the law by which they are to be judged. It is the practical degradation of the sacred volume by the teachers of youth, that brings it into contempt—not the intelligent intimacy of the pupils with its contents. There is a kind of familiarity which will degrade any subject, and destroy any authority. It may be allowed by a parent to the destruction of filial reverence; it may be permitted in sacred things until the very table of the Lord may become a place of carousal; and so an ignorant use of the first models of eloquence and poetry, may degrade them in the associations of the youthful mind. In all these instances there is flagrant abuse. Let the Bible be abused in similar ways and the same effects will follow; but when this effect occurs, let the blame lie on those who are guilty of the perversion.

ART. VI.—1. *Carmina Sacra, or Boston Collection of Church Music, comprising the most popular Psalm and Hymn Tunes in general use, together with a great variety of new Tunes, Chants, Sentences, Motetts, and Anthems, principally by distinguished European Composers: the whole constituting one of the most complete Collections of Music for Choirs, Congregations, Singing Schools, and Societies, extant.* Second Edition. By Lowell Mason, Professor in the Boston Academy of Music; Editor of the Boston Handel and Haydn Collection of Church Music, the Choir or Union Collection, The Boston Academy's Collection, The Modern Psalmist, and various other musical works. Published under the sanction of the Boston Academy of Music. Boston: J. H. Wilkins and R. B. Carter. 1841.

2. *Sacred Songs for Family and Social Worship: comprising the most approved spiritual Hymns, with chaste and popular Tunes.* Published by the American Tract Society. 12mo. pp. 343.

IT seems to be generally agreed that our church music is not what it ought to be; it might as generally be admitted that it is not what it might be. If this be so, it follows that there is a fault somewhere, and as the subject forms an indispensable part of public worship, the fault is no less than the offering, as a religious service, of that which is blemished and imperfect, and imperatively demands examination and a cure. Such an examination we propose now to make, with the hope that the remedy will not be found to be unattainable or very difficult.

The perfection of church music would be—alas! that our phrase must indicate only a possibility—that the whole congregation should join in the service; that they should perform it in such a manner as to indicate earnest and elevated feeling; that both the spirit and the understanding should be engaged; that the words employed should be purely devotional, suited to the solemn and most interesting relation existing between the worshippers and the Being whom they worship; that the music should be chaste and correct, adapted to the language with which it is associated and the sentiments to which it gives expression; in fine, that the performance should be instinct with life, informed by knowledge of the art it uses, and glowing with the piety which prompts it.

Let us see what various and large deductions and allowances must be made before we get down from this standard to the actual condition of things in respect to music, in almost all our churches. And to obtain a more impressive view of this condition, observe a congregation about to enter upon this service. The preacher calls upon his hearers to unite in worshipping God by singing. How many of those who are thus invoked are prepared in any degree properly to obey the call. Of those who have the necessary skill, or think they have, how few present a service acceptable to Him who looks into the heart. Of those whose feelings are in a pious frame, how few possess the knowledge and skill indispensable to make their offering any thing better than a lame and halt and blind substitute for that which should be, and, but for a blameworthy neglect, would be a sacrifice without spot. The result is that, instead of a strain of solemn and delightful harmony, combining all voices and absorbing all hearts, half the congregation do not sing at all, and of those who attempt it the half had better be silent. In those places where the custom is retained of following a single leader, the music is generally of the lowest character with respect to the manner of performance; yet here there is often an appearance of a more general and hearty joining in the exercise by the congregation. This however is a mere appearance, deceiving only the unskilful, and results from the fact that the music itself being inferior, the sounds familiar from long use and frequent repetition, and knowledge to detect the numerous and glaring faults totally deficient, a larger number feel at liberty to use their voices. But what a mass of confusion, orderless, unformed, without meaning and without effect! —here men's voices upon a part where only the trebles should be heard, there females singing notes intended for the tenors, and ever and anon a roaring bass carrying to the lowest depth of the scale a strain adapted to the soprano, as though the heavy violone or fagotto would attempt the bright and silvery intonations of the flute. Such a style may please where there is no taste to be shocked, and no knowledge to be offended; where the demand is for amount of sound without regard to its quality. Even the solitary precentor almost lost amidst the confusion which he has himself let loose, yet striving with vast effort to maintain the eminence of his position, may feel a peculiar complacency at the exhibition of his fancied powers. But to the

ear of a pure and correct taste, and to the sense of quiet and chastened piety, there is neither music nor devotion in such a scene. The few who possess a more improved knowledge and skill, finding themselves an overwhelmed minority, are compelled to silence, while their more numerous and noisy neighbours have it all in their own way. No more irksome duty can be laid upon an intelligent and competent musician, than that of conducting the devotional singing in such a congregation as we have described, dragging along their heavy and untimely movements, and straining his own voice in the vain hope of preserving some control over theirs, and of retaining in the tune something of the beauty and power imparted to it by the composer. The unlucky individual, so situated, will naturally look about him for aid, and will endeavour to associate with himself those of the better sort who may render assistance in his laborious duty. Thus will be laid the foundation for a choir; and thus we are brought to consider this other method of conducting the musical services of the church.

Where this method is in use, the music will generally, yet not always, be better; that is, the choir having the advantage of proper instruction and practice, and being under the influence of a certain desire to excel and to gratify their own musical taste, the tunes will be selected with better judgment and adaptation, and the whole style of performance will be superior. But if, in these respects, the plan of a choir offers advantages, it is too often attended again with faults and improprieties, which seem to make it difficult to decide which of the two methods is to be preferred in a consideration of the subject in all its relations. The leader and some or most of the choir may possess a moral character which renders them utterly unfit for the place and duty committed to them. It cannot but be shocking to every sense of propriety, that persons who, through the week, may be found in the haunts of vice and frequenting scenes of revelry and profaneness, should on the Sabbath be employed in conducting a prominent part of religious worship; that lips even yet reeking with the odour of intemperance, or echoing with a recent oath or jest, should open to utter the words and tones of devotion. It is an odious mockery, offensive both to God and man. But the character of the singers may be every way better than this, and still fall below the proper standard. If they are not themselves under the influence of the religion whose expressions they seem to

use, there is still a grievous defect. Regardless of the true purpose of the service required of them, they are apt to feel as if their interest in the employments of the sanctuary respected only the immediate duties of their place; and thrown, by their position, somewhat from under the restraining power of a view of the congregation, they often indulge in practices improper and offensive. We have sometimes been greatly pained by such exhibitions of levity and thoughtlessness. A choir of serious and orderly deportment is an acquisition which no church can too highly esteem. But even when in these particulars there is no room for blame, there are other disadvantages which attach to the employment of a choir. Their own skill in performance often leads to the selection of tunes, which are beautiful and scientific in themselves, but wholly above the comprehension of the congregation and their power to follow, and thus one great design of this branch of worship is defeated. Or the tunes selected, though well adapted to particular stanzas or lines, in connexion with which they are arranged, may be entirely unsuited to others in the same hymn, and this to such a degree as to produce ill-timed and ludicrous effect. Again, the very excellence of the musical performance of a choir may be the source of another fault on the part of the congregation, of very serious moment. How often does it happen, nay how uniformly is it the custom in some places, that the people generally sit silent, absorbed in listening to the performance by others of what it is their own duty to join in, paying to it the same regard as if it were something devised for their gratification in the intervals of other duties, and apparently forgetting that it is they—the church—who ought to worship God in the use of the faculties which he has given them. This too is a grievous fault, and not to be excused on the plea that the music is above their ability.

We have now pointed out some of the evils attending both the ordinary methods of conducting the sacred music of the public assembly. We have shown that these evils are numerous and of grave importance; that it is not easy to decide which are the most tolerable or the most easily cured; and that they are so far inherent in their peculiar methods respectively, that there is not much hope of melioration while the methods remain as they are. That these evils are great is evident also from the frequently vexed, yet still unsettled state of the question, which of the two methods is to be preferred. In deciding between the two, if

we must be shut up to so narrow a choice, we do not hesitate to declare in favour of the choir, because, while the music is unquestionably improved, and thus a most important point secured, the faults accompanying this method may be remedied by a degree of attention on the part of the congregation and the session, which, though enjoined by our Directory, and by a sense of ordinary propriety, is shamefully withheld. In our judgment, however, the highest degree of improvement in church music is not attainable by either of the plans in ordinary use, and in indicating, as we design to do in the sequel of our remarks, that which we think to be in all respects the best and the true one, we claim for our opinion whatever may be due to earnest inquiry and observation, no little experience, and much reflection on the subject.

Church music is a part of religious worship in which the congregation, in God's presence and to Him, using poetical language and musical intonation, express their praise and adoration, their thanksgiving and gratitude, their penitence, faith, love, and other religious affections. This is not done when the people attempt ignorantly to follow their leader with harsh and discordant utterance, even though it may be with devout hearts. It is not done when the singing is confined to a choir, however numerous and skilful, while the people remain silent, whether their silence arises from a desire to listen or from unwillingness to join in music which is really, or is supposed to be, beyond their ability to execute. As it is not done when there is any want of devout feeling, so neither is it done when its musical character falls below the highest attainable degree of excellence. God has endowed us with certain physical powers, which, under the guidance of our moral sentiments, may be used in his service and worship. He calls upon us so to use them both by the natural promptings of duty and by special injunction; and, with accustomed benevolence, connects with such a use of them a high and pure enjoyment. Both the ability and the obligation exist; and they are consistent and commensurate. How shall the duty be best performed?

Our scheme, then, in a few words, is *that the whole congregation shall be the choir*. This sentence may not at once exhibit all its meaning, but it will be found to bear reflection. We fully believe it will be found to meet the wishes and satisfy the anxieties of those who have vainly sought for relief in either of the old plans. It secures all the musical taste and skill which can be imparted by the perform-

ance of an instructed and practised choir on the one hand; and with these qualities it combines the devotion, the efficiency, the majestic power derived from the union of a multitude of voices inspired by intelligent and glowing piety. It excludes the vices and faults of each of the present methods, while it extracts all that is good and beautiful in both, and unites them in one harmonious and powerful whole. Our opinion is not disturbed by the plea which may be offered, that there is not sufficient musical knowledge among the people to render such a scheme practicable, for this plea itself involves a fault which ought not to exist. It is true there may not be, at present, the requisite degree of skill; but what is this but an admission of a culpable inattention and neglect? It is this very deficiency that we would supply. Shall the church require of their preacher diligent and painful preparation for the duties of his office, and shall they neglect or refuse to qualify themselves for the service which is due from them and which they only can perform? How long would a minister be tolerated, who should manifest the same indifference to his part of the service of the sanctuary which the people exhibit to theirs? Let us look at the matter. Singing is an indispensable part of public worship; it must be performed, if at all, by the congregation; it cannot be performed without a due cultivation of the faculties exercised in it; such a cultivation is not possessed by congregations in general; and therefore their singing is altogether below what it ought to be.

The people must be taught to entertain a more deep and serious impression of their duty in this respect. They must consent to bestow whatever time and labour may be requisite for the improvement of their musical skill. They ought to acquire a knowledge of the elements of musical science sufficient to enable them to sing an ordinary church-tune; and these elements are neither mysterious nor difficult. They ought, once in a week, or two weeks, or a month, as may be found convenient, to hold congregational meetings for the purpose of practising the music which is performed on the Sabbath; and such meetings will be found both useful and highly pleasant. At these meetings the pastor ought to be present, when his other engagements permit, alike for his own improvement, for the encouragement of the people, and for the purpose of conducting the religious services which should occupy a portion of the time. There is a suitable place here too for the select and more experienced

choir, who will form, both in these meetings and in the regular service of the public assembly, the main foundation and leading, conducting power for the congregation in their musical performances. A leader also of competent skill, taste and judgment will be found to be, more than ever, an important and indispensable functionary; for upon him devolves the task of taking care that every thing is conducted in the most appropriate manner, both in a musical and a spiritual view. Now these things, which must be considered as essential elements in the arrangements for the sacred music of the church, will not grow up of themselves, nor, after so long a continuance of the abuses and errors heretofore pointed out, will they, perhaps, be very readily brought into operation. But they come, properly and of right, within the cognizance and charge of those officers of the church to whose control all its spiritual interests are committed. Let the church sessions no longer sleep over this matter. Let them no longer leave so important an interest to be attended to in any way and by any body. They must not sit by indifferently, while others, disqualified perhaps by character and habits, and prompted only by caprice or fitful inclination, attempt a service which ought to be under their official supervision. They ought to see that a chorister is procured, possessing the requisite qualifications of piety, musical knowledge, skill and judgment, and general intelligence, and permanently connected with the congregation. It will be all the better, both in appearance and effects, if the chorister should be himself a member of the session. It is a part of no little labour and anxiety, and the incumbent has a claim upon the respectful regard of those for whose benefit he exerts himself; a claim which we have seen with pain sometimes denied. The session ought to have an influential voice in the selection of those who compose the choir. It should include a suitable number of the elder and graver members of the congregation, both for the increased musical power and weight to be thus acquired, and that it may not be left, as it too commonly is, entirely to the young, giddy and excitable. Having secured these two important points, they ought to make suitable provision for the musical instruction both of the choir and the church. This is a matter in which there is a common failure, and it is one requiring considerable caution and judgment. It will not do to accept, without scrutiny, the offered services of the various itinerant singing-masters, who go up and down the land loudly proclaiming their own abilities, and sometimes slandering those

much their betters. These too often lack all the necessary qualifications of scientific knowledge and personal character, and impose upon their unsuspecting employers, much to the scandal and disrepute of their profession. The instructer ought to be a permanent resident of the place where the church is situated, or better still, a member of the same congregation, if he is not himself the chorister; for there is then a better opportunity to judge of his ability, as well as a more urgent sense of responsibility.

An objection may be urged here, drawn from the supposed impracticability of bringing up a congregation to any higher method of performance than the usual one of catching a tune by frequent repetition. This objection may seem to be well founded, if we look at the general character of congregational music through the greater part of our country, but it will be found on examination, to be due to the vices of the manner in which the thing has been conducted, and not to any intrinsic stubbornness. If there is anything in the objection, it must be either that there is an inherent unintelligible mystery involved in the elements of the musical art, or that there is an essential dulness and insensibility among our people. The contradiction of the latter is amply uttered, even if other references were wanting, in the political phenomena of the last two or three years, and in the recent practices of the temperance reformers, in both of which the power of music, even of inferior kind, to move the minds and feelings of masses of men, has been abundantly manifested. We have no belief in national indocility or inaptitude in relation to music, for this has its natural promptings in the affections of the human heart, and has no knowledge of territorial metes and limits. National peculiarities may effect its manifestations, but do not reach its source and essence. The gloomy grandeur of the German, and the sunny brightness of the Italian, are kindred yet exterior investments of the feeling whose central fibre runs back into the same human heart. They are styles, which may be modified by external scenes, by custom, and by education. But church music should have its own style, and its style should be common to all who have the same feelings, rejoice in the same hopes, and worship the same God.

Nor is there any more substance in the other ground of the objection under consideration. There is nothing in the elements of musical science occult or mysterious; nothing,

in such a knowledge of the art as is required for plain and proper church music, beyond the grasp of any common intellect. We have seen a large class under the instruction of a competent teacher, rendered able to take their several parts in any plain tune, in a very short time; and such facts are of constant occurrence in some parts of the country. The power to perform such music is the joint result of the understanding of certain simple rules and the imitating of certain audible examples—these rules and examples forming the substance of the musical lessons. Now the intellect and the power of imitating sounds may vary in different individuals, but certainly very few are totally deficient in both respects. When the ear therefore is capable of distinguishing between the variety of sounds, and the vocal organs have power to utter these sounds in their diversity of pitch, force, and duration, we cannot comprehend what is wanting to enable any person so qualified, to utter such sounds in any given order of succession. If it be granted that nothing more is needed, the point is gained; for such a succession of sounds agreeable to the ear constitutes melody, and is within the capacity of performance. There are, beyond doubt, some who need to give a greater degree of attention and more extended and repeated practice than others; and this is equally true of many other subjects of knowledge and art. But our opinion is clear, and confirmed by the unanimous consent of those experienced in the matter, that there is a mistaken judgment with regard to most of those cases which are decided to be deficient in musical capacity, or, as the phrase is, to have no ear. It is true that many, discouraged by a first failure, or even several repetitions, give over the pursuit and patiently acquiesce in the excluding sentence in their case. It is the conviction of experience, however, that even these might, under the care of a judicious and competent teacher, be brought in due time to a very creditable performance.

We trust then that we have removed all the grounds for this objection to our plan for congregational instruction and practice in sacred music, and shown that there is nothing, either in the musical sensibilities of our people or the art itself, disturbing the entire feasibility of our scheme. This being true, and the imperative duty of employing this art in the public service of the sanctuary being inferred directly and necessarily from the injunctions of scripture, from natural propriety and fitness, from the custom of the people

of God in all ages, and from the example of our Saviour himself; and the duty of performing at all involving of course the duty of performing in the best manner; where shall the church rest an excuse for continued indifference to a matter embracing some of its highest and most interesting obligations?

There are other points belonging to this subject which require consideration. In the discussion of every scheme for the improvement of sacred music, the question arises whether instrumental aid may properly be employed. We would treat with the utmost tenderness the religious scruples which are entertained respecting the introduction of instruments into the service of the church. Nay more, we will yield all that is needed to satisfy these scruples, if those who entertain them will, on their part of the compromise, bestow upon their vocal powers that degree of cultivation which will bring them to their highest perfection. It cannot be questioned that human voices, trained, purified and educated, are capable of producing, by their variety, flexibility and volume, effects unequalled by any instrumentation whatever. Whenever in a congregation this point of perfection is attained, the aid of instruments may be dispensed with. Till then, however, the plea for the use of them, as subordinate and only auxiliary to the voices, is a good one, and derives strength from the example of the ancient church, in which they were employed without reference to the merely levitical ceremonies; from the practice and opinions of many excellent men of later times; and from repeated intimations of their use in celestial worship. This argument would seem to be at least as strong on one side, as the religious scruples and prejudices on the other; and the question, being so nearly balanced as to its religious bearings, is left free to be decided by expediency and the promise of advantage. It cannot be denied that instruments do render essential aid in correcting, purifying and sustaining the vocal tones.*

Of those which are more commonly used for this purpose, the violin, flute, and violoncello blend very sweetly with the

* The opinions expressed above, on the subject of instrumental music, are adverse, as is well known, to those which have prevailed, and continue to prevail in the Presbyterian church. As a calm and guarded vindication of a practice which we would by no means be understood to recommend, we have given place to expressions from which our readers, no less than ourselves, may choose to dissent.—[Ed. Bib. Rep.]

voices of the singers, and are exceedingly effective. They form by themselves an orchestra of great power and richness, and combined with the voices of the choir are capable of producing the most delightful effects. But they are all liable to objections which seriously affect the propriety of their use. The slightest deviation from a correct tone introduces discord, misleads the singers, and increases the very mischief they were designed to remedy. The nicest judgment is required to prevent them from being urged out of their proper, subordinate place, and thus becoming prominent and obtrusive, when they ought to be merely subsidiary. And again their universal employment in the secular music of the dance, the concert, and the theatre, gives them a character which, from such association, is offensive to many religious persons, and renders their use in the church of very doubtful propriety. There is another instrument, however, which, while it is entirely free from these objections, is calculated in a remarkable manner to meet all the exigencies of sacred music. The organ, from its very structure and the peculiar nature of its tones, seems fitted to occupy a place in the church. Its character is grave, grand, and solemn. It is capable of every variety of expression from the gentle streaming melody of penitence and love, to the full, overwhelming diapason of the most rapturous triumph and praise. Its sounds have a fixedness and unwavering permanence of strength and duration, which are of great value in sustaining the voices, and preserving them from fatigue in the execution of tunes containing many long and exhausting notes. It has no affinity for the light and trifling music of the parlour and the ball-room; it refuses consent to their gay and rapid movements, but opens all its powers and capabilities to the grave and solemn harmonies of the church. There is no fear of unhallowed associations, for the giddy and the profane have recourse to other instruments more suitable to their purposes, leaving this, with all its power to tranquillize the heart and dispose the mind to calm and profitable reflection, to its appropriate employment in religious worship. It seems indeed entitled, from its whole character and influence, to be considered as a sacred instrument. Nevertheless we would by no means be thought desirous of urging the use of organs in violation of scruples seriously and conscientiously entertained. But we confess we should not be very sorry to see such scruples giving way, as we have little doubt they would, before an

impartial consideration of the subject and an unprejudiced experiment. It has been our lot to witness such an experiment, and to see the instrument in question, under the control of a kind regard for the scruples and prejudices which at first opposed its introduction, gradually dissipate them all and win for itself the hearty concurrence and good will of the whole congregation.

It must not, however, be forgotten, that, when an organ is used, the necessity of a nice regard for the sacredness of the place and the occasion for which its aid is employed has a still more extended and imperative application. If the singers should be persons of unblamable deportment, and devoutly respectful to the religious character of their services, not less requisite are these qualifications for an organist. He has beneath his finger and answering to his touch a vast power for good or for evil. Upon his judgment and sense of propriety it depends, whether this power shall be used in subservience to its legitimate design of aiding, sustaining, and giving effect to the vocal music of the church, or be perverted to the unholy purposes of musical display, than which nothing can be more ill-timed, inappropriate and offensive. He ought, therefore, not only to possess a competent knowledge and skill in his art, but to be quickly sensible to all the proprieties of his office, and above all to be a man of piety. He has no right to avail himself of the power which his instrument gives him to obtrude himself upon the attention of the people, and divert their thoughts by an exhibition of his own performance. He ought to know that both he and it should occupy a secondary position, and that, as it has been well said, an organist best performs his duty, when the congregation are least sensible of the assistance they receive from him. Let him understand well his exact relation to the religious service in which he performs his part; let him confine himself strictly to the duties which that relation imposes; let him rather restrain than urge forth the powers which he has at command; let him avoid all mere exhibitions of art in the way of voluntaries, protracted interludes, and misplaced embellishments, and especially the introduction of extracts from fashionable secular music; and he will do more than a hundred arguments, towards removing the objections to the use of organs.

It was said, early in the course of these remarks, that the words used in the musical part of worship should possess

a peculiar character; that they should be purely devotional and adapted to the solemn relation existing between the church and Him in whose presence and to whose ear they give utterance to their religious sentiments. It is, therefore, not a matter of light importance what style or character of hymns may be used. Without stopping at the question, whether it was right ever to depart from the very language of the Bible for the purposes of sacred music, we shall say a few words upon the subject, as it is presented in the usage of our own church in common with others. What then is a hymn of the kind required? If this question has not been sufficiently answered in the first sentence of this paragraph, we repeat that, beyond its poetical language and metrical form, it is in substance the utterance of some pious sentiment or emotion, prompted by the contemplation of the character and attributes of God, as displayed in the works of Providence and, more especially, of Grace. We behold his power and terrible majesty, and reverence and awe become our tongues. Mercy and benevolence demand our songs of praise. We feel our vileness and ingratitude, and the heart overflows in the language of penitence and contrition. Christ and his cross are an unceasing theme, exciting by turns all the various emotions of the believer's soul. Now let these and other kindred sentiments take a poetical form of expression, and there is a hymn, which the church may with propriety be called upon to sing. Generally a hymn involves the idea of an address, because the sentiments it embodies must necessarily have a special object; otherwise it would seem to be a vague and unmeaning exclamation. Or it may embrace a train of thought and meditation upon some sacred, spiritual topic; or it may express ardent desires for the growth of holy affections; or it may include mutual exhortation and encouragement to the discharge of duty; yet even in such cases, though the terms of direct address may not be employed, it utters its language as in the presence and hearing of God, clearly indicating from its very coaptation to a devout and elevated frame of mind, that there is an immediate reference to Him who is the supreme object of worship. It is indeed objected to this view of the proper character of a sacred ode, that some of the Psalms of David, which are without doubt the true model for such compositions, have not the form of addresses. But, while it must be admitted that much the largest part of them have this form and style, it will be

found that even those which have not may yet be included under some of the modifications above designated, and with the slightest change of language may, without violence be converted into direct appeals or addresses. Nor have we any opinion inconsistent with the duty of 'teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs.'

It must be remembered, moreover, that all poems on religious subjects, highly poetical and beautiful though they may be, are not therefore necessarily hymns adapted to the purposes of public worship. With respect to the external form of a hymn, it might seem superfluous to insist upon the use of correct, pure and even elevated language, were it not that in many collections, those may be found which are rendered offensive by mean, vulgar and frivolous expressions, and which ought to be excluded on that account, even though their sentiment may be unexceptionable.

It remains now that we consider whether any peculiar style or character of music is more than another adapted to the use of the Church. Here is a subject on which every body has an opinion, and feels little hesitation in expressing his opinion, however little opportunity he may have had to form a correct one. Nothing is more common than to hear one and another say that this or that tune is a very fine one, or that such music is very appropriate, or that such a performance had a very powerful effect; when if the truth could be discovered, it would be found that the judgment uttered was founded upon some association of memory, or some accidental influence, or upon anything more than the intrinsic character of the music. There is commonly, too, a strong preference for 'old tunes,' by which however are to be understood in fact, though not so meant, tunes to which the person himself has been accustomed, the term 'old,' having much less respect to the actual date of the musical composition, than to individual habit and use. Now this abundance of opinion on this matter, while its vagueness greatly reduces its value and weight, does yet evince that there is a general sentiment of propriety or adaptedness required in music designed for religious use. There is in truth such adaptedness, and we shall endeavour to show in what it consists.

Musical sounds, as those of ordinary speech, form a language, having a great variety of intonations, inflections, rhythm, force, rapidity, &c., and capable by means of these varied qualities, of combining with and giving efficient utter-

ance to the diversified emotions of the heart, to which they most punctually correspond and by which indeed they are prompted. As the varying circumstances and conditions of men, exciting various emotions, effect corresponding changes of speech, so do they give rise to diverse and suitable modes of musical enunciation. The dance, the battle, the triumph, the burial, the farewell, all have their appropriate movement and expression, which, whether in words or music, are readily understood and felt. And when man comes into the presence of his Maker and feels the influences of the relation he sustains, shall he find no fitting strains in which to express his penitence, his love, his reverence and his devotion? The roar of the cataract, or the chirping of an insect has not a more distinctive character, than has the devotional music of a religious assembly. It has its plaintive tones in which to mourn over ingratitude and sin; it moves sadly and slowly when its theme is the price of man's redemption; it rises to a sweeter and more lively strain when it would celebrate a Saviour's love; or rolls its full swelling diapason, when, catching the echoes of the celestial choir, it ascribes all praise to 'Him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb.' It is true, the susceptibility of impression by the power of music is greater in some than in others; but in all it is capable of improvement, and he, who neglects to cultivate it, neglects a moral power which tends to promote both his own happiness and his ability to render an elevated worship, and which, having been bestowed by the Creator, brings with it a responsibility for its proper use.

Metrical psalmody being the only kind of music admitted into the usages of our church, to the exclusion of chants, masses, and other varieties, it is to this that our remarks are intended to apply. Music proper for this purpose should be grave and simple; easy of comprehension and of execution; in melody graceful, flowing and expressive; and in harmony natural and plain, with only such inversions and discords as may be necessary to give it liveliness and energy, and to avoid unlawful progressions and a disagreeable monotony. It does not admit of those artistic graces and embellishments, the only use of which is to exhibit the skill of a mere professional performer, and which could scarcely be executed by a number at once. The running of divisions, or the application of several notes to one syllable, is in most instances entirely out of place. The re-

petition of lines and especially of parts of lines is generally productive of a bad effect, sometimes highly ludicrous, and in some cases results in a collocation of words perfectly blasphemous although of course undesigned. The introduction of solos and duetts, if performed as such, demands a nice judgment and taste to avoid improper effects. The truth and necessity of these principles will become evident on considering two things :-the nature of the musical composition, and character of the assembly performing it For the former, it must be considered that a hymn tune comprises generally but a single stanza, seldom more than two, and must needs be repeated to the successive stanzas. It often occurs in a hymn that the nature of the sentiment in the first part differs entirely from that in the latter, as in hymn 139th of the collection in use, beginning

"Plunged in a gulf of dark despair,"

in which it will be seen, that music nicely adapted to the first stanza would be quite incompatible with the last. It has been proposed in such cases to employ two different tunes, but for many reasons this plan is impracticable. The proper method is to select a plain simple tune, which may, by a nice adjustment of force, rapidity and accent, be varied to express the changing sentiment of the words. The composer, having a particular stanza in his mind and influencing his imagination, is apt to fit his music so precisely to it as nearly to preclude the tune from being applied to any other words. Those who would see some examples of the absurdities resulting from the repetition of parts of lines, may be referred to the chapter on Phraseology in Gardiner's Music of Nature. For the last of the two considerations above suggested, as it is the very design of sacred music to engage the whole congregation, the too frequent and indiscriminate introduction of solos and duetts is obviously improper. When *all* the people are called upon to sing in the worship of God, who shall say that some must be silent while a strain or more is performed by one or two voices? We admit that there are cases in which the propriety and effect of the musical service are greatly promoted by this means, but we object to the too great fondness for tunes of this character, especially as they tend so strongly to nourish the desire for mere scientific display, by the opportunities which they afford for it. To this statement of some of the qualities which render music suitable for the purposes of

the church, it may be added that no tune which has been associated, in the minds of the people, with any secular or profane use, ought ever to be employed in religious worship. There is neither wit nor truth in the saying, by whomsoever uttered, that 'the devil ought not to have all the good music;' which is often quoted to justify the adaptation of some favourite secular melody to the words of a hymn. Among the infinite combinations and progressions of which musical sounds are capable, there is ample room for exclusive appropriation; and, while the parlour, the ball-room, and the theatre, may have their own proper styles, the church need never, and should never, enter either of them to seek contibutions to its own noble and peculiar psalmody. It is, we would say in this connexion, a most ignorant and mistaken opinion entertained by many, that church music is inferior in character and scientific properties. Many a pert miss will turn with a sneer from the grave but rich harmonies of a sacred composition, who will strum over the unmeaning accompaniment of a paltry song without an idea of the genuine science. We assert confidently that there is no better method of acquiring a thorough knowledge of music than the study and practice of that which is written for the church.

A glance at the train of remarks upon some of the evil practices connected with the subject of church music, reminds us of the omission of one or two which ought not to be passed without notice. If there is often just cause of complaint against the misconduct of the singers during public worship, there is also too frequently room for censure at the other end of the church. The choir may often deserve blame, but there is sometimes a proper subject for it in the pulpit too. The minister himself is apt to commit errors, which, if practised after his attention is directed to them, would surely be inexcusable. He gives out a hymn and proceeds to read it through. The leader chooses a corresponding tune, which it will take the singers some little time to find. When all are ready, they are suddenly thrown into confusion by hearing the minister give some arbitrary directions about omitting certain stanzas, which omission in many instances destroys the adaptation of the tune. This annoying result he may easily avoid by previously informing himself of the whole character of the hymn intended to be read, and giving all the required directions before the reading. There are also personal habits which are impro-

per in themselves and produce an unhappy effect. It would seem as though he considered the interval of singing to be devised merely to give him an opportunity to attend to certain little matters of personal convenience. He starts the congregation upon a hymn, like an instrument wound up to go for a given time, and then proceeds to remove an extra wrapper from his neck, or to find the next hymn, or to arrange his notes and his collar, or if it is the last tune, to indue his overshoes. Now all these things indicate a want of thoughtful regard for the solemn proprieties of the occasion, and cannot fail to have a very undesirable influence upon the minds and conduct of all who notice them. The singing is as much a part of the service of the house of God, as the prayer or the sermon, and the last to fail in a proper observance of this part should be he who in person conducts the others.

There is need of reform in another particular of no slight importance. The estimation in which the members of the choir are held by the congregation is often unfair and injurious. How often are they spoken of slightingly, criticized without candour, rebuked without proper cause, sneered at by those who fancy themselves superior in place, or utterly unnoticed and neglected. This is all wrong; it is unjust; it never fails to produce deplorable consequences in the feelings and conduct of the singers; and it is precisely one of the main sources of the difficulty so often experienced in procuring and sustaining a reputable performance of sacred music. It ought not be so. We have already said that a leader and a choir with proper qualifications form an acquisition which no church can too highly prize. They ought to rank next in estimation to the pastor and the session. They have a fair claim upon the kind regards of the people whom they serve, and should be treated always with respect and attention. A little of this due return for important services rendered, a slight manifestation of a sense of obligation, would convince the choir that their labours were appreciated, would encourage them to a more cordial and zealous performance of duty, and would cure the evils arising from the fickleness and disposition to rove which so greatly impair the value of a choir. And this furnishes an additional argument in favour of our plan of combining the choir and congregation in meetings for the practice of music. The intercourse of these meetings could not fail to beget kind feelings and mutual respect, the influence of which

upon the state of the church must be eminently happy and desirable.

It was a principal part of our design to examine some of the compilations of music intended to be used in public worship, but our remarks have already occupied perhaps their full proportion of space. It will be proper, however, to make a brief and rapid application of the principles formerly inculcated, to some of these publications. Among the most recent of them are, the Carmina Sacra, published under the patronage of the Boston Academy of Music, and a volume entitled Sacred Songs for Family and Social Worship, issued by the American Tract Society.

The first of these makes its appearance under the veteran and accomplished editorship of Mr. Lowell Mason, of whom we shall make bold to say, unmoved by the local jealousy and opposition which would detract from his well-earned fame, that to no one man is the church more indebted for a copious supply of admirably selected and arranged music. The numerous editions of the Handel and Haydn Collection, the Choir, the Psalmist, and other similar works, have built up for that gentleman an abiding reputation; and, while we have no wish to do less than full justice to the merits of other distinguished editors, we must give our opinion that none have succeeded so well as he, in furnishing the church with music possessing the appropriate and requisite characteristics. An examination of the Carmina Sacra, has served to confirm our opinion. It abounds in music of a very superior order, in tasteful and beautiful melodies, and in harmony, rich, accurate, and scientific, yet so plain and natural as to be within the execution of a properly trained choir and congregation. The lovers of old tunes will not be disappointed in finding such as Old Hundred, Wells, St. Martin's, Mear, &c.—glorious old tunes, which our fathers sang and handed down to us; time-honoured, full of power and deep religious influence, and which we are bound to use, and send down, unchanged and pure, to those that are to come after us. It is pleasant too, to find that the former harmonies of these old pieces, after having been much altered in some recent books, are in this restored, as far as it could be done with due regard to scientific rule. A leader of more grave and sombre disposition, will be at no loss for tunes such as he would select, while one inclined to greater spirit and variety, will find himself amply furnished. The collection of Motetts, Set Pieces, Anthems, &c. is very

extensive, and combines in an unusual degree the qualities of variety, novelty, and musical excellence. There is enough to satisfy the taste, and to exercise the skill of our church choirs; and, while none of it is too difficult for a choir at all qualified for the place they fill, it is yet sufficiently so to try their powers, and to afford them profitable practice.

Having thus freely praised, we feel the greater freedom in finding fault, and shall select from this same excellent volume examples of what we have before pointed out as unsuitable and but sparingly admissible in sacred music. The tune called Baden, p. 119, is a beautiful composition, and will win favour wherever it is performed with any degree of taste; yet it exemplifies two of the faults to which we have objected, not as such in themselves, but in their use by a congregation. The third and fourth lines are a duett between the trebles and performed *Soli*, or by a single voice on each part, and then repeated in chorus. Now who shall say that out of the whole congregation only Miss A. and Miss B. shall lift up their voices, however melodious, while all the rest remain silent? And with respect to the repetition, there are many hymns, otherwise beautifully adapted to this tune, in some stanzas of which the fragment repeated will make nonsense. There is another feature in the book before us which, while it imparts greater variety and life in mere musical practice, certainly impairs its fitness for use in the public assembly. It is the changing of time and movement in the midst of a tune. A stanza of four lines is too short to admit of such a change. Besides, however good the effect may be to those whose knowledge enables them to understand it, to the congregation at large it must be only unintelligible and perplexing. It cannot be well performed without a book; and, though we earnestly advocate the general use of note-books through the church, the present state of things is far below this necessary point. In this view we consider the arrangement of the tunes, Melbourn, Cambridge, Rubic, and others like them as objectionable. It is proper here to point out one or two errors in time: the sixth measure of Name, p. 151, and the sixth measure of Chesworth, p. 158, are both incorrectly filled; the former having two crotchets, and the latter one, too many. We mention but one more fault, which occurs indeed, so far as we have observed, in only a single instance, yet it is a grievous one, violating directly the rule against secular associations. The introduc-

tion of the English National Chorus, albeit it is dubbed America, occasions surprise and regret; and we would blot it from the book as decidedly as we would strike out from Mr. Mason's Choir the tune called Sudbury, which is nothing but the familiar air of "Nid Noddin'."

A general remark applicable to all these matters now adverted to as objectionable, is that they serve to promote some of the worst tendencies of choir singing. If the leader is not under a religious influence, and deeply impressed with a sense of the proper duties of his office, his selection of tunes will clearly evince his partiality for those in which duetts, repetitions, and changes of movement occur, affording opportunity for the display of mere musical skill, while those of a more grave and simple style, partaking of the character of choral music, will be almost entirely laid aside out of use.

The second of the two volumes named above is somewhat different in its character from that which has just been examined, and is designed to occupy a different place. It is intended for use in the exercises of the social meeting, and the still more private devotions of the family and the closet. It is true there would exist no reason for a distinction of this kind, were the plan of instructing the congregation in the knowledge of music, and then having them supplied with proper note books, carried into successful practice. There is no reason why the same music should not answer for the worship of the church, the prayer meeting, and the family. If we supposed that this volume was calculated to prevent such a consummation, we should not hesitate to condemn it on that account. But in the actual condition of sacred music, it must be admitted that there is a want of some such compilation as the book before us purports to be. It embraces more than three hundred hymns, most of them of standard excellence, arranged under appropriate subjects, and about one hundred and eighty tunes. It is beautifully printed, and its whole appearance is attractive to the eye, while its price is certainly very moderate. All these circumstances, together with the influence and the facilities for distribution of the society which issues it, will probably secure for the book a very extensive circulation. It becomes, therefore, the more important to examine the tunes with reference to their character and the influence they are likely to exert upon sacred music. We wish we could in this respect, bestow unqualified praise, but feel compelled to say

that there are many points in which a decided alteration is necessary before the object aimed at shall be fully attained. To these points we shall briefly direct attention.

The presence of such tunes as those called Forest, Illinois, and Golden Hill, though dignified with the title of Western Melodies, is an unseemly blot upon any book sent out to the public at this day. There is little melody in them, and it is no easy matter to give them a harmony satisfactory to a correct ear. It will not do to say that such tunes are popular in certain parts of the country, for that would open the door for the admission of a large class, which, under the condemnation of even a slightly cultivated taste, will, it is to be hoped, die out of use entirely.

Little more favour should be shown to another class, of which Ortonville may be named as a specimen and representative. There is a frothy sweetness about them which, at the first hearing, is apt to prove attractive, but their emptiness will not bear examination, and a little use wears them utterly threadbare. Compare the tune here named, with Baden, in the Carmina Sacra, and the tame insipidity of the one will be found strongly contrasted with the grace, nerve, and enduring beauties of the other. It is a great demission, so to speak, of the standard of taste, to send forth such music into the hands of the people. Again, let any one place the tune Yorkville by the side of Franconia, and Norwich with Rothlay, and he will be satisfied that at least two pages might have been spared. There is an inexcusable looseness in the manner in which the metrical abbreviations are applied, as in the use of the letters C. P. M., C. M. L., &c., which ought to be explained, if they are intended to render assistance to the chorister. This fault, however, is not peculiar to this book, but it often misleads and perplexes, and ought to be corrected. We have been struck not very favourably, with the large proportion of the tunes which bear the editor's initial, as original compositions. With all our sincere respect for that gentleman, the praise of whose taste and zeal is in very many of the churches, we should have been better pleased, had he restrained somewhat the exuberance of authorship, and, omitting many of these tunes, supplied their places with a judicious selection from some of the many sources which are doubtless within his reach. The inequality in their merit is so great as to excite surprise that such pieces as Chester and Zion, could have come from

the same hand with Ortonville, Retreat, and some eight or ten others. The rule stated in the preface, "to preserve only those tunes which promised extensive and enduring usefulness," did not, it is to be feared, govern the selection, in every instance. Nor will "the permanence and stability, the basis of which is furnished by those melodies which delight the ear and affect the heart of the devout Christian more and more," be found to attach to a large number of the compositions which have been admitted into the volume. If it shall be favourably received, and extensively used, it will owe its reception chiefly to the many excellent tunes which have been transferred to it, as well from other publications of the editor, as from other compilations. Yet with all the faults which have been noticed, we are ready to award the praise due to a plan promising much good, and to a partially successful execution. The book is greatly superior to such compilations as the Spiritual Songs, and especially the Christian Lyre; nor can we name any volume of its kind which is better fitted to the wants of the public.

After all, however, we fear that the church at large, is not yet ready to enter upon the work of improving and elevating the character of its sacred music. There is so much indifference, so much misapprehension, such a readiness to suffer the work to pass into unauthorized hands, that it will occasion no surprise to find we have again borne our testimony in vain. Yet we feel it to be incumbent upon us to hold up this great matter before the church, and to strive to draw to it the interested attention of our church authorities. And we hope yet to see the time when all our pastors and sessions, will acknowledge their duty, and exercise over this department of devotional services, an intelligent, efficient, and fostering control.

ART. VII.—*Free Institutions, Regulated Liberty, and Pure Religion. Three National Blessings.* A Discourse delivered in the Associate Reformed Church, Hamilton, Ohio, December 2, 1841. Being the day recommended by the Governor of the State of Ohio to be observed as a day of Thanksgiving. By D. Macdill, D. D. Published by request. Rossville: 1841. 12mo. pp. 22.

In this sermon the author has rendered an acceptable service to the cause of law and order, by drawing clearly and justly, the distinction between true liberty, and the licentiousness which so often usurps its name. Never was there a time, in our country at least, when sound doctrine on this subject was more needed. It is high time, when the first principles upon which our social organization rests, are called in question on every side, that the pulpit and the press should utter, unceasingly, the voice of sound instruction. The Christianity which Paul taught, required its ministers to put the people "in mind to obey magistrates, and be subject to principalities and powers." It carried the duty of loyalty, and submission to that civil power, that centered in the persecuting emperors of Rome, quite as far as any of us, born under republican institutions, would have thought of carrying it. And if there was then a need and propriety of the Christian ministry bringing its support to the operation of the civil law, there is no less now. There is always a spice of a rebellious spirit in man; and with many, an ill-concealed repugnance to submit to law, an ignorance of what they owe to wholesome laws, a conflict of private interest or caprice, with their public duty—which makes them tinder to every flying spark of sedition, and engages their sympathies against the government, under whose shelter they repose, and enlists at least their feelings and approbation, in every movement to obstruct the peaceable operation of law. And of late, the tendencies of the public mind towards disorder, and organized effort to introduce it, have increased. Riotous proceedings are becoming more frequent. Crimes appear to be multiplying. One whole state has recently had a taste of civil war. Unusual obstacles are thrown in the way of the administration of justice, by combinations of men, claiming the right to review and guide judicial proceedings. And, added to all the rest, a new sect in religion has come up, the main essence of whose religion is, opposition to law—who preach anarchy as the very sublimation of benevolence, and the ultimate point of Christianity—who operate in organized society, against all organizations; and with whom preaching sedition is a matter of business and of conscience. It is indeed a systematic combination, to engage all the hallowed sympathies and aspirations of men for freedom, and the rights of man, in a crusade against the laws of the land. Non-resistance, which in other days, coupled with

passive obedience, declared the duty of obeying the grossest tyranny because of a sacredness attached to law, has now taken the opposite extreme, and become a term for—"Down with the law," and "Down with the magistrate." The magistracy and laws are classed with intemperance, slavery, and other giant sins, which the spirit of Christian reform is invoked to sweep away.

In view of the disposition, thus extensively manifested, to set at nought the authority and restraints of law, and destroy the safeguards of our civil liberty, we propose to examine, with more of fulness than could have been fitly used within the limits of a sermon, the relations between Christianity and civil law.

With minds that have entered fully into this mighty scheme of reform and of emancipating the world from the dominion of law; and are glowing in expectation of the fame consequent on so vast an achievement, it would be useless to reason, much less to reason out of the scriptures. Though we are invited to believe, that this reform is one of the sublimest developments of Christianity, its abettors have no ear to hear what Christianity says against it. They have, in truth, as little reverence for gospel, as for law; except when some wrested portions of it may serve a turn. Yet the public mind, on which they would act, is accessible to the light and power of the gospel. And it is important to have the public mind ever well informed, as to what the gospel does teach, touching the duty of sustaining civil law; especially while that public mind is so industriously plied with mischievous incentives. All that there is of ignorance and vice in society, is so much capital for disorganizers. Ignorance and vice, are ever impatient of control, and neither can, nor wish to comprehend the reasons for submission to law. Submission to law, is a sacrifice of private to public good; and selfishness, unenlightened, pleads against it, and prompts the feeling that law is the man's natural enemy, and that the absence of law would be a paradise. Hence a disorganizing spirit, is always contagious. And the no-government lecturer finds sympathy, among the ignorant and wicked, as an incendiary would among those, who wish to see a fearful conflagration, for the chance of pillage. Hence it is an important duty of all friends of order and peace, to keep up a clear light before the public mind, on this subject.

As the no-government theory claims support from the

gospel, it may be well before exhibiting the proof of our main position, to show how little foundation it has for this claim. It is founded mainly on these words of Christ—"But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil. But whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee to the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever will compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain," &c. Matt. v. 39—42. The non-resistants assume that these words can have no other than their literal sense. And yet they themselves show that the literal sense is impracticable. For instance, a slave escapes from bondage, and comes to them for protection from his master. And what do they? Do they say—your master has come to compel you to go with him 500 miles to the south, and you must therefore go with him twain? Nay, could we find a man, who in practice fully obeyed the literal sense of this text, we would use him as the best proof of the preposterousness of that literal sense. Nay, Christ himself did not obey the literal sense. For he did not turn the other cheek to the smiter, but rather reproved him. When the high priest's officers struck him, he replied in language of reproof; but did not offer himself for a second smiting. Christ, indeed, voluntarily offered himself as the victim for sacrifice, and for the smiting connected with the expiation of our sin. But none will pretend, that he was our example in that. But aside from this consideration, if there appears a single case in which he refused a literal obedience of this rule in the course of his life, a case in which he countenanced a use of the sword, as in Luke xxii. 36; a case in which he eluded the violence of his enemies, by miraculous power, as in Luke iv. 29; or a case in which he refused to turn the other cheek to the smiter, as in John xviii. 23; it is clear, that the literal is not the true sense. For he did not teach one thing in words, and contradict it in practice. The example of Paul was similar. The High Priest commanded him to be smitten; and he replied, God shall smite thee thou whited wall. Here, while he acknowledges in the context, that reverence was due from him to the High Priest, as a ruler of the people, he reproves him for ordering to smite him contrary to the law, while sitting to judge according to law. So in two respects he violated the non-resistant sense of the passage—acknowledging the magistracy, and refusing to turn the other cheek.

So manifestly were these examples of Christ and Paul

against the literal sense, that the enemies of Christianity, assuming the literal sense, have made the seeming contradiction a favourite point of attack. The heathen in early times, and particularly Celsus, poured ridicule upon this. This too was the favourite point of attack for Jews. Wagenséil, a Jew, in a work against Christianity makes the most of this objection. The deists, too, have pursued the deceptive advantage of this seeming contradiction. Such is the testimony of enemies, that there was a contradiction here, in case the literal sense were taken.

But why should the literal sense be taken? The verse next above very clearly indicates another sense, i. e. that Christ is speaking against retaliation and revenge. "Ye have heard that it hath been said an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." But I say unto you that ye resist not evil;" i. e. that ye resist not evil according to the principle of retaliation and revenge, "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." Revenge and retaliation, and not self defence, are here the things forbidden. The ancient law, "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," had been drawn into a justification of private persons taking revenge. And to give his hearers to understand that this is unwarrantable, he uses these proverbial hyperboles.

A sketch of the history of opinions on this subject, may aid our inquiries. The Romish church taught that the literal sense, was the true sense; and that this was given as *consilium*, a matter advised, but not required. And so as it was not best, that all should follow the good advice of Christ himself; they allowed the practices which the literal sense condemns. The reformers interpreting scripture by scripture, gave to this text a sense in accordance with the main drift of scripture, and with the present prevailing view. In opposition to the reformers, the Anabaptists soon came up, denouncing the magistracy and the use of arms, on the authority of this text. And yet, in practice, their no-government principle was found, as it ever will be, any thing but pacific. After them the Socinians adopted non-resistance; but they were not sufficiently numerous in any place, to show what their principles would have been in practice. From them the inheritance descended to the Quakers, with whom it took a modification, better consisting with the peace of the world. But one of the most remarkable developments of the principle, was with the fifth monarchy men of England, in the days of Cromwell. Like our Mil-

lerites, these men were expecting a sudden appearance of Christ, to establish a personal reign upon earth. And they held, as non-resistants do, that all existing governments were opposed to the reign of Christ; and that they must be put down; and they raised an army to put them down. And after a few had lost their lives in the attempt, the rest dispersed and gave it up.

Among the primitive Christians, the literal interpretation of these words found little favour. Justin Martyr refers to the text, and upon it says, (Apol. i. c. 16,) in general, that Christ inculcated the duty of overcoming the world, by patience and meekness. With this the teaching of most of the primitive fathers substantially agrees. They pursue a middle course, somewhat like that of Paul, when he says—Why do ye not rather take wrong. Augustine (De Mendacio c. 27) says—"These precepts pertain rather to the regulation of the heart, than of the outward conduct—requiring the exercise of benevolence and patience, in the mind; and then the regulation of our behaviour towards others, by what our benevolence would prompt as the most profitable." This is clearly shown by what Christ himself did, John xviii. 13. Luther on this passage makes a distinction between what becomes a Christian as a Christian, bound to the exercise of a meek and patient spirit, and what becomes him, as a magistrate, or a subject, bound to use his influence to restrain the wicked, and protect himself and others against violence. Calvin says—"We must specially notice the scope of Christ's remarks, which was confined to forbidding the seeking of revenge; and so far as violence may be resisted, without the spirit and purpose of revenge, the wicked who offer it are to be resisted by force." With him also Bucer and Zwingle agreed. Turretin says—"Christ when he commanded to extend the left cheek to him who smote the right, and to give also the coat to him who would take the cloak, did not change the law of nature, which instinctively prompts to resist injury, and repel force by force. But he condemns only the principle of retaliation, which adds to self defence also the purpose of revenge, that is the infliction of an equal or greater injury. These words are to be understood proverbially and hyperbolically, and not literally. For neither did Paul nor Christ himself, turn the other cheek to the smiter. So that the sense is, that they should be rather prepared to bear a new injury, than to return an equal injury; even under the pretext of a di-

vine law of retaliation." Glassius on this passage concurs with Turretin, in saying that "the negative adverb is sometimes used for a comparative particle." This sketch of opinions shows, that the ground, which has ever been taken by the leading minds in the Christian church, is the now prevailing view. And it shows a sense better corresponding with the main drift of scripture, with the special intent of the context, and with the practice of Christ and the first Christians, than is the literal sense. There is then neither necessity nor occasion, for imputing to the scriptures the absurdity, and many contradictions, which the literal sense involves.

We come next to a view of the direct warrant, which the Christian scriptures give to the civil magistracy. This is given first in form of the duty of paying tribute for the support of government. If civil government be in itself, that essence of abominations which is pretended, Christ and his apostles could not advise Christians to pay tribute, and support such a wicked usurpation. But Christ in answer to the question, whether in his view it were lawful to pay tribute to Cesar, gave a full affirmative answer, involving in its own terms an ocular proof to sustain the affirmative. And he followed up this, by an express command—"Render therefore to Cesar the things which are Cesars."

Should it be suggested, that he advised to pay tribute, as a pacific measure, and not because it was right in principle, it will be said without reason. In one case Christ advised his disciples to pay a tax, lest they should offend. But it was a tax to support the temple worship; as any one who reads the passage in Greek may see. And the word σκανδαλισωμεν, we should offend, means, we should give occasion for reproach, i. e. in seeming to despise the temple worship. And that the first Christians were not advised to pay tribute, merely to avoid collisions with government, appears in the fact, that Paul required them to pay tribute "for this cause," that government officers earned their money, and rendered an equivalent. He says, render to all "their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due." He advises them to be subject, not only for wrath but for conscience sake; and for this cause also, i. e. for conscience sake to pay tribute.

We are also required to pray for rulers as such. Paul says (1 Tim. ii. 2,) that he will have prayers, supplications, intercessions, and thanksgivings, made for kings, and for all in

authority, that we may lead peaceable and quiet lives, in all godliness and honesty. Now if the magistracy be such an abomination in the sight of God, it is strange, that he will have us put up thanksgiving for it, and pray for it, that it may answer its end in the peaceableness, godliness and honesty of the people. But if it be true, as we believe, that the worst form of civil government is better than none, and that even the colossal tyranny of ancient Rome, was to be considered a blessing, in comparison with a state of anarchy, then there was full occasion for Christianity to utter so loyal a sentiment, even while smarting under the tyrant's rod.

The actual treatment of government officers and agents, by Christ and others, throws some light on the subject. When the publicans, i. e. Cesar's tax-gatherers, came to John's baptism, and asked, what shall we do? he did not tell them to cease gathering taxes; but he said, "Exact no more than is appointed you;" and when the soldiers came, he did not tell them to cease to be soldiers. But in case these government agents were sinning in being such, here was the place of all others to put forth the testimony against those employments. Christ, too, found the sublimest specimen of faith, which Israel afforded, in a centurion, i. e. a military captain, having soldiers then under him. And while he commends the captain's faith, he hints nothing of his resigning his commission. The case of Cornelius is similar. The same stroke of the pen records both, that he was a devout man, abounding in such prayers and alms as were approved of God, and also, that he was captain of the Italian Band. Peter had been sent for to tell him "what he ought to do;" and Cornelius, in opening the interview, made this remarkable preface—"Now, therefore, we are all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God." And we have a record of the heads of Peter's discourse, and the whole story leaves us to believe, that under at least the negative sanction of the Holy Ghost, Cornelius continued to hold his military office; and that this circumstance no more obstructed his prayers and alms, than it did before this event. The case of Zaccheus was similar; and we need not rehearse it. The fact that while the New Testament records relate the reception of Christianity, by many government officers or agents, it gives not a hint that one of them was required to abandon the employment because it was sinful, deserves serious consideration. One indeed did leave the office of publican, for that of an apostle.

But even then, no more condemnation is thrown back upon the office, than upon that of fisherman, which Peter exchanged for the apostleship.

Christian ministers furthermore were instructed to enjoin obedience to magistrates. Paul says to Titus—"Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates." And the way in which Paul himself enjoined this duty, "not only for wrath, but for conscience sake," shows that he meant not to be understood, to enjoin submission to it as a thing unlawful, merely to escape the wrath of the magistrate.

But we have proofs more direct. Suppose the New Testament had contained not a hint on this important subject, and Paul should be sent from the dead to supply the omission, and we should ask him, what the Spirit would teach on this subject, and he should open a scroll and read as in Romans xiii, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour." Should not such a response, from the mouth of Paul, put every doubt to rest. It appears by this, that the ruler is not a terror to good works, as the non-resistant theory makes him —but that he bears the sword, the symbol of office, because it is the instrument of justice; that he is a revenger to execute wrath, which men may not execute for themselves, in a private capacity—that he is a minister of God for good; and that he justly claims to be paid for his valuable services.

To the same point also come the words of Peter—"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto go-

vernors as unto them which are sent by him, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." It would puzzle an expert philologist, to make these passages harmonize with the non-resistant theory. And surely a document embodying these sentiments, never issued from a non-resistant convention. And still more to the point, if possible, are the words of Christ—"Render to Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and to God the things which are God's"—and also these words of his respecting the scribes and pharisees, who exercised both a civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, under the Mosaic code—"The scribes and pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do." In fine, let any one name if he can, a doctrine or duty, which the gospel teaches more fully and explicitly, than that of submission to magistrates.

How is it then, that a plausible show of the contrary is made out. We answer, by rejecting as uninspired the parts of scripture which teach this principle. For all sects, who have embraced non-resistant views, have denied at the same time, the plenary inspiration or paramount authority of the scripture. The Anabaptists were non-resistants in theory, as well as men of violence in practice. The early Socinians were non-resistants. And both these believed in but a partial inspiration of the Bible; allowing of course any one to say of any part, this cannot be inspired; because it is contrary to my notion of things. The Quakers believed in an inward light, superior to the scriptures, more than they believed in non-resistance. The Illuminati of France and Germany, were infidels and atheists, and got neither the principle of no-governmentism nor its opposite, from the Bible; but from that so much lauded natural philanthropy, which is now placed above Christianity; which is in truth also the source of that among us. And our new sect of non-resistants, are, as a body, more decided against plenary inspiration, than any of their predecessors, with one exception.

This shows how the gospel can be so clear in favour of a duty, and this sect pretending to draw from the gospel, at the same time so decided against it. To deny the inspiration of Paul, or the correctness of the reporter of Christ's words, is a short way of disposing of a difficulty, that presents itself to any favourite theory. It ought to satisfy every one, against even the suspicion of the soundness of

that theory, that it stands by a mutilation or discrediting of the sacred records; that it has infidel principles for its foundation, and never has consisted with the reception of the whole scriptures, and it never can.

But as a last resort, the difficulty of telling how far we ought to submit to unjust acts and requirements of rulers, is urged. As to this, we remark, that in case we could not tell, that would not show that we ought not to submit at all, to just acts or to unjust. Should you ask, how far the child ought to submit to the unjust exercise of the authority of his parent, and should we decline to define the proper limits to the child's submission, would that annul the command—"Children obey your parents in all things." But this difficulty is hardly a practical one. When a case actually occurs, when authority is exercised so unjustly, that our manifest duty to God forbids our obedience—or a case where the evils of rebellion would be manifestly less than of submission, it is usually easy to know it.

But the greatest vantage ground of the non-resistants lies in the fact, that all human governments are tolerating some abuses—some statutes or provisions which are manifest violations of natural right. As to such we say, that the endurance of them, till their repeal can be secured in a lawful way, is a part of the price which we pay for the protection of law; and that human government could not exist, but upon such a principle of compensation. Here the non-resistant replies, that if this be so, government should not exist. The following resolution recently went forth from a convention of such persons, assembled to express resentment of some of the doings of our courts—"Resolved, That the rights of man are paramount to all constitutions, compacts, and alliances, and are to be asserted and maintained, as essential to the preservation of liberty, at whatever cost or hazard." Now if this has any pertinent meaning, it means that, when our courts find a law in conflict with human rights, it is their duty to give sentence contrary to it, that is to be both judges and legislators at once. And in case the judges fail to abrogate in this way, both the law and the constitution which they are sworn to sustain, it is the duty of the people, alias mobs, to see that it is done. This principle of course invests courts with an omnipotent and terrific prerogative. Open the way for them to depart from the law, as often as they take a notion that the law is not what it should be, i. e. is not in harmony with human rights, and

you have just quietly installed your judges, into the office of supreme dictators, and laid aside all your laws, as so much useless lumber. Your judges' will or caprice, is then the supreme law of the land.

To test this matter in the light of a strong case, we will say, a fugitive slave is overtaken by his master, and brought before our courts. Suppose the judges by law can avoid deciding on the question, whether he shall be compelled to return to slavery. Now comes the conflict between law and right. The council for the slave insists, that the court shall disregard law and constitution, and decide according to abstract right. But if the judge may do that in one case, he may in another, and in all. And then he has only to say of any law, it does not well consist with human rights, and so must be set aside. And then, instead of a government by laws, you have the simple independent edicts of a single man, or a bench of judges, enthroned above every law. The truth then is, that all this noisy importunity, demanding our courts to disregard established law, and decide according to abstract rights, is nothing more nor less, than an abuse of the courts, because they will not appoint themselves dictators, and become themselves our law. And in the case supposed, it is tantamount to a demand, that they shall release one slave, in a way which shall make us all their own slaves, and subject to their wills. So easy is it to see that the principle contended for, instead of opening the way to a purer freedom, prostrates all liberty.

But it will be asked, is there no remedy for these conflicts between law and right? Yes, there is a remedy, when the legislative power can be induced to repeal unjust statutes. And if both the governed and the governors were as pure as angels, all such evils would be soon removed. But laws, made in a community of wicked, selfish men, when countless abuses, having the force of prescription, have swayed the law makers, and where law erects itself on usages, and in these usages right and wrong are in some instances inextricably blended, government by law, can be at best, but an approximation toward perfect justice. If this seem hard to any, they may console themselves in the thought, that such an inconvenience comes of their own and their neighbours' wickedness. And that it is not wise to throw away a good government, because like all human things, it has some defects; since we must have an imperfect government or none—must have a government by law with all its im-

perfections, or take our chance among hordes of savages, irresponsible and unrestrained.

There are three reasons, which subject us to the liability of having now and then a case occur, in which right must yield to law; 1. Because legislators, and not subjects, must ultimately decide in a given case of conduct. There will be cases, where the opinion of some of the ruled, will be different from that of the ruler, as to what is right, all things considered. In such cases the judgment of the ruler, i. e. the delegated judgment of the many, that is the—"Be it enacted"—of the legislature, must prevail over the veto of the individual. It must be so, or law is but wind.

2. Then in the second place, all legislators are liable to mistake what is right, and to decide wrong from sinister motives, and so no code of human laws can be expected to be clear of all cases of conflict, with natural justice.

3. And in the third place, if God himself, with all his wisdom and impartial justice, were to frame a code of civil laws for us, he would not exclude from it all forms of legal injustice. For a code of civil law must of necessity engraft itself upon existing usages, and take the shape of a provision for the existing exigencies of the people. It must be shaped with reference to corrupt usages, some of which cannot be at once displaced, without a greater evil, than would be involved in their continuance. This statement we know will be questioned by many. But we have only to appeal to a matter of fact. God did once exercise his wisdom and justice, in framing a civil code for a nation, to wit, the Hebrews. He took that people as they were, and while he gave them a moral law which condemned every human wrong, he also gave them a civil law, that at best was silent as to some human wrongs; and at least negatively tolerated them. Not that He in any case commanded an unjust act. But that He in certain cases, for wise reasons, forbore to level civil penalties against existing usages, though those usages stood condemned in the light of moral and eternal law. Here of course, he left a gap for a conflict between law and right. Instances of such corrupt usages being tolerated, were had in the case of Hebrew slavery, divorce, polygamy and others. It must either be contended that slavery was no infringement of human rights, or else that that code tolerated existing wrongs; and we leave our opponents their choice in the dilemma. As to divorce for any but a single cause, Christ himself gave

this very reason for the allowance—for the hardness of their hearts he suffered it.

Suppose a Hebrew wife, divorced, thrust out upon the world, mortified in feelings, discredited in character, and ruined in prospects, merely because her husband had taken a capricious dislike to her, should bring her complaint before the judges of the land. Her appeal on the ground of natural justice would go deep and strong. She could use the very words which Christ afterwards used, and show that from the beginning of the world it was not so. But here would be the same conflict between law and right, which now furnishes many a popular theme for declamation, and yet the judges must either set aside the law, under whose authority they acted, and so remove all power to decide at all, or they must decide against natural right. The question is simply this, whether government by law, liable to abuses, as it is, will not secure a better distribution of justice, and fewer instances of natural rights taken away, than the total absence of government, allowing individuals and mobs to cut and carve for themselves—yea, whether even the slave would improve his condition, by annihilating the whole system of laws, under which he experiences oppression. The apostles, when they enjoined obedience to laws, spoke in reference to one of the most oppressive forms of government; and yet they seemed to assume, that it was better to obey, and have the protection of that government than none. And were there no violations of human rights, by that government? none in the appalling system of Roman slavery? none in so freely spilling Christian blood? none in gladiatorial entertainments, and in compelling innocent men to kill each other for the amusement of the amphitheatre? Now if those abuses could not cut off the government's claim to obedience, we surely ought to pause and consider, before we resolve to carry naked principles of human rights, over all laws and constitutions.

A fair inference from the foregoing is, that popular assemblies and combinations, for arraigning and condemning the proceedings of courts of justice, are unwarrantable in the light of the law of God, and hostile to the very existence of a government by law. If courts are guilty of misdemeanors, against which the law provides, there are lawful remedies without a resort to the unlawful. If, however, they commit wrongs against which the law does not provide, what shall we do? Shall we submit to the wrong?

or shall we take up the stereotyped excuse for mobs, and say here is a case for which the law does not provide? It must not be forgotten, that these assemblies, are of the nature of appeals to the people against judicial proceedings, and the design is to create in the public mind, an obstruction to the execution of a particular sentence of the law, and this design as really involves the principle of mob-action, as that of one collected to hinder a sheriff by force from executing the sentence of a court. And they who preach that civil laws are a usurpation and not to be obeyed, have no right to complain, if their neighbours refuse to obey the law. They who preach that the magistracy is a curse to earth, and an offence to God, might be expected to rejoice rather than complain, when a mob palsies the arm of the magistrate, and just carries into practice the no-government principle. They who assert that magistrates have no more right to rule than mobs, ought not to have a choice between the powers that be; whether they speak and act in the name of a commonwealth, or in their own name. The difference between a lecturer against law, and the mob which breaks in upon his discourse, is, that the one propounds the doctrine in words and syllogisms, and the other puts it in practice. The lecturer announces the principles, and the rioters thundering at the doors, give the experimental illustrations.

Why are mobs so dreaded? What element of danger and odiousness involved, invests them with such terror? It is not that the thing which they do is always necessarily wrong. The immediate result of a riotous act may be a good result; while the act itself is detestable. The mob is dreaded because it tramples government by law, under foot —because it carries individual will over social rights—because it puts power into irresponsible hands, and gives to the mad passions of a multitude, an uncontrollable sway—in one word, because it puts in practice the no-government theory. True, the practical inference which the mob draws from this theory is different. The theorist reasons thus—All law is a usurpation and an invasion of individual rights, and we must therefore non-resist it! The other reasons thus—The law which would hinder our acting thus and so, is a usurpation and a wrong, and therefore we must resist it! The principle of both is the same; the difference is only in an inference. And as to this, the non-resistant may or may not be the more logical and self-consistent. But his

logic is of a kind, which the common sense of the world cannot penetrate. Yes, and it is of a kind which its originators cannot sustain in practice. For a practice has of late commenced, and found support from the accredited organs of non-resistants, which fully obeys the mob-inference. The idea of being merely passive under the restraints of law, has proved insufficient for all purposes of agitation. Some practical illustrations of the superiority of an individual's rights over the rights of many were wanted. And for the last year, the attention, especially of the quiet people of New England, has been called to a new development of the no-goverment theory.

There came forth, (evidently by previous arrangement of the party,) a class of apostles, who felt themselves especially called of God, to disturb and break up assemblies for religious worship. The design appeared to be, to present to a Christian public this dilemma—you shall relinquish your Sabbath privileges, either by abandoning your places of worship, or opening them for purposes secular and foreign, and for preachers forced upon you—or by quitting your attendance—or you shall put in force on us your laws, which defend your rights, and thus give us the chance for agitation, which the infliction of penalties will afford. Now this is precisely the alternative which rioters present, when they come in to put down an abolition meeting. They virtually say—You shall cease these exercises, or you shall use the arm of law to put us down. In both cases, an irresponsible power of individuals, arrays itself against law. In both cases there is a combination and concert of individuals, to execute individual will, in defiance of public law. For usually the person deputed to commence the harangue and disturbance, comes in company with sympathizers, whose organ he is, and who stand ready to abet him, when opportunity offers. Now these things have been done repeatedly, and systematically, in several states of New England, and with such evidences of the secret concert, and open approbation of the no-government fraternity, as such, that they all are made responsible for them. Attacks have been made upon the rights and peace of several religious congregations at once, by clubs acting in concert. In some instances one has commenced the interruption, and another followed, till such confusion ensued, that the worshippers have been compelled to retire. In such a way, the no-government principle has been pro-

pounded, and its beauties set forth. The doctrine has been avowed in justification of these proceedings, that any individual who takes it upon him to be a reformer, on any subject, has rights that may properly override and tread down the rights of any people, to worship God in their own way and at their own expense. Placing the interests and rights of the one in hostility to those of the many, they claim that one may at any time interrupt the business or worship, of any number of people; that he may for instance go into any family, shop, factory, church, or legislature, and interrupt the proceedings, and command a hearing; and an attempt to silence him, or put him out, would stand in the same category with the violence done to Christ by the Jews. Indeed some of the school go even further, and pretend to a right to live at their neighbour's expense, whether their neighbour will it or will it not—that they may enter any house, or hotel, and partake without cost or permission, of any provisions which they can find.

Here, indeed, extremes have met. The ultra abolitionist and the ultra slaveholder are riding the same hobby. The one claims to eat his bread by the sweat of another's brow, without compensation or consent, and the other only makes another's brow to sweat without compensation or consent. And the same principle, fundamental to the system of slavery, is involved in the claim, which these men set up to occupy churches without consent; churches built and sustained by other's means. With other elements of injustice, it involves the wresting away by violence the use of another's property, and (so far as the existing time and purpose of worship is concerned,) another's liberty. But abstract theories, never to be put in practice, are very tame and harmless things; so after the doctrine was concocted and promulgated, it wanted to be tested by experiment. And select martyrs, male and female, volunteered to personate the newly evolved and glorious principle, and went forth, doubtless, with imaginations glowing in visions of the wondrous results, which it was to achieve. Their prophetic ken, it may be, saw the lever applied, which was to bring down with a mighty crash around them, all the social, religious, and political institutions of the country. Country! did we say? Nay, their views so large, scorned all boundaries of country or continent. They had already laid the line and plummet, which indicated in their visions, the beauteous proportions of the new edifice to be erected

on the ruins of the demolished fabric, and spread its ample canopy over the whole world. And the lever must now be worked, and the wondrous power of the revolutionizing principle be tested. The chosen martyrs arm their minds for the shock. Men, women, and children, assembled for Sabbath worship, seemed the most suitable subjects for the first experiments. Upon them the reformer's valour, and the sublime energy of his new principles might best be displayed. Though they offered less of danger than the windmill of romance, they afforded the advantage of a greater number of spectators, to witness both the daring and the martyrdom. And the sacredness attached to the day, the place, and the employment, would naturally make the intrusion less welcome to the assembly, and so give the reformer a keener relish for his work, and a higher lustre to his fame. The onset commences. First, in the mountains of New Hampshire, some skirmishing is tried to prepare for graver action. Here and there a congregation is surprised, by the intrusions of a stranger, insisting on his right to fill the preacher's place; and are compelled to eject him. Next an abolition meeting in the city of Boston, suffers the same inconvenience, and call in the police, and carry the supposed lunatic to prison. Next a well known prophetess of the school, for her repeated and troublesome offers of services in meetings, having no occasion for them, is brought before the court on a complaint of lunacy. To convince his honour that she is no lunatic, she pleads in her own defence, and for her defence she reads into the patient ear of the court, chapter after chapter of "Pilgrim's Progress," till "what was urged, main reason to persuade, did but dissuade the more," and she is kindly sent to the hospital for the insane. This, however, being the charity and not the vengeance of the law, awoke no indignation, and was an utter failure, as to procuring a capital of sympathy. And greater diligence was required of the other labourers left in the field. With new energy they took up the work of breaking up Satan's synagogues. Clusters of them alighted here and there, upon a given town, declaring their intent to drive the ploughshare of reform through the foundations of every church. They industriously spend the Sabbath in commencing speeches, and being carried out as a nuisance, from every church, as often as the brief time allows. The Sabbath evening is improved in meetings of sympathizers, and in counting the scars, and displaying the capital of previous abuse received, and treasured for future operations.

This work advances for some weeks, but before half the churches in the country are broken up by these means, a new term is given to the movement. A leader of the van of the reforming legion, is furnished with other employment, to which these movements were but preliminary. Being by some process entangled in the meshes of the law, he is brought before a court to answer for his offence against the peace and dignity of the commonwealth. This opportunity he embraces with all pleasure, since it furnished a fine opportunity for a speech, and since to defend himself and his course, is the same thing as to preach against the laws. But this was a sort of special pleading, which has little weight with learned judges, and honest jurors. And he finds his long cherished expectations realized, in a prisoner's cell—surrounded no doubt by many neighbours, well prepared to sympathise in all his hatred of civil law. He who but a few months before, had left the pulpit for the pulpit's good, had come to exercise his ministry in another congregation.

The goal is reached, the martyr is crowned. Now it is thought the tide of sympathy must flow in with impetuous currents, and tear away the foundations of all law, and carry adrift these hated courts and prisons and all this apparatus of slave power. If the law can stand a month after such a shock, it is thought a wonder. But days and nights continue their course, as if they knew not what had happened in this great world of reform. No earthquakes occur; no explosions rend the air; no frightful comets glare across the heavens; no crash of falling fabrics sends up its cloud of dust; no gathering of horrified thousands are seen rushing to demolish the citadel of law. A chill of disappointment visits the unhappy man. He inquires what mean these tardy elements of popular wrath and confusion, that they slumber so, after such a one as I have suffered this indignity? What means the great liberator himself, that he preserves this ominous silence? A letter is despatched, chiding the tameness of that organ, and uttering wonder, that the very lion of the party, at such a crisis, should do its roaring in such gentle whispers. The Liberator confesses and amends. The trumpet call goes forth for "the people," the dear people, the mighty people, to rise in the majesty of their wrath and frown out of existence such shocking judicial proceedings; and vindicate the sacred rights of the one, against those of the many. The people obey the call,

eloquence rolls from well nigh blistered tongues; resolutions indignation-mad are let forth, like so many streaming rockets, and give the world to know at least, what would be done if it could.

Well, what would they if they could? Here is a grave question. Such assemblies called to arraign judicial proceedings, are an anomaly, a rebellious element in a community governed by laws. They may be puerile and ridiculous in themselves; but they have broached a principle, which is destructive of all order. And for that reason, the subject deserves to be treated gravely. And it will be asked—Where is the harm, in the people meeting and discussing public affairs? Where is the difference, between meetings of this nature, reviewing decisions of courts—and common political caucuses? The two are as distant as the poles. They, who place all law and its administration in one category of abominations, will of course see no difference; but they who wish to see the laws preserved, may know that they cannot be, if such an element comes successfully into operation against them. As law relies on public sentiment for its execution, even a division of public sentiment against it, tends to frustrate its execution. And measures taken to intimidate courts and juries, by the thunders of popular indignation, are just the opposites of those legal modes of choosing and influencing the law-makers, which are pursued in common political assemblies. In the latter case we have the will of the people, uttered, it may be, with Babel-like discord, yet coming up through its appointed channels, it blends in a voice, clear and commanding, as the music of the spheres. Agitating and searching as this process may be, it is all in harmony with the design of government, and contributes to its stability and force. In the other case, it is the voice of faction against law, demanding that the law be put down. The one assembly seeks to correct the mistakes of legislation, by lawful means; and the other strikes a blow at your courts, in order to palsy the arm of the law—it knocks at the doors of your temples of justice, demanding that the presiding divinity be dethroned. Let none, then, confound popular assemblies, acting against law and its ministers, with assemblies, either appointing or influencing legislators. The truth is, many have formed a habit of making the popular assembly the ultimate arbiter of all disputes, remedy of all evils, and substitute for all courts.

The question then returns, what mean these popular assemblies, arraigning the proceedings of our courts? Listen awhile to their speeches and resolves. The sufferings of their incarcerated brother are eloquently set forth, enforced by the presence and exhibition of his weeping wife, and children, to provoke public sympathy. It needs to be seen, that not only has the poor injured man been arrested in his course of usefulness in Sabbath congregations, but that he also has a wife and children to share in his martyrdom. This must be pleaded, as a material element of justice in the case. Now comes a mighty labouring, by every expedient of mental friction, to accumulate a tremendous discharge of artificial lightning, to be sent in some direction. And whither? What remedial violence do these doctors of a disjointed commonwealth purpose to apply? Would they, if they could, march a band of lawless desperadoes up to the prison doors, and by such a gospel proclaim deliverance to the captive, and the opening of the prison to him that is bound? Nay, their solemn protestations of a horror of mobs forbid it. And when to point a moral and adorn a tale, their orators, after winding the passions up in a discourse of the wrongs heaped upon their companion in prison, and having seemed to show that the prison ought to be levelled, are heard to say—"Now I am a non-resistant, but I know what I should do if I had your principles, and liberty to act, and I know what you ought to do, with the weapons God has put into your hands." When we hear such inflammatory missiles sent into such magazines of explosive elements, we will try to attribute it all to an inadvertence of impassioned eloquence, and hope against hope, that it comes from a heart full of love and non-resistance, anxious as with the whisper of a zephyr, and the oil of consolation, to smooth down every wave and ripple of lawless feeling. And so we ask again—What would they if they could? Would they frighten the court to undo its own work; and issue a virtual confession, that they dare not stand by their own mandate? However much they might desire that result, they cannot be so sanguine as to expect it. Would they then raise around the court house and prison, a storm which shall cast back its lowering and ominous shade, upon the hall of legislation, and frighten its occupants to repeal the law, under which their companion suffers, and thus open all congregations to the benevolent intrusions of these reformers, and also to the

violent visits of ruder fellows, of a baser sort? Nay, this cannot be it. They would care not a farthing for the privilege of disturbing public worship, if there were no law to break. Nay it is a cardinal principle of their own theory, that the law makes all the transgression, and is the prime occasion of violence, and so far as they, and this single item is concerned, the principle is correct. Remove the law which interdicts their violent intrusion, and they would hardly thank you for the privilege of disturbing your Sabbaths.

What then will they have? Why do they invite "the people," to enter so into the sympathies of a convicted criminal, and make common cause with him? Plainly because, that in so far, as the people become one in feeling with this man, they have taken an attitude of hatred to the law—for

> "None can feel the halter draw
> With good opinion of the law."

A whirlwind of passion, that blinds the judgment, and that, engendered by glowing descriptions of the suffering of a criminal, as of an injured man, while his ill deserts are kept out of view, is the best instrument of producing hatred to wholesome laws. No laudable and lawful tendency of such proceedings can be alleged. And the fact that they are conducted by those who have proclaimed a determination to work an abolition, which consists in dissolving all compacts and organizations of society, shows that not the abrogation of one particular law, but the destruction of all law, is the real object. Who then does not see in these proceedings, ridiculous as they are, a principle which is the very germ of anarchy.

Of the ultimate purpose of these disorganizers, we will positively affirm nothing, any further than it is indicated by their public acts. But they should be the last to shrink from a public scrutiny of their intents. Having so earnestly called upon us to surrender the protection of law, the advantages of civilization—yea, our religion, our Sabbaths, our quiet homes, the safety of our lives and families, to promote their views, and having liberally denounced us for not doing it sooner, they have at least entitled us to make some inquiry, as to what their views and motives are. And having so liberally imputed hypocrisy to the whole world, excepting themselves, they have brought their own sincerity under suspicion. For none is so ready to charge others

with hypocrisy, as he whose heart knows not a purer principle. And they who make themselves so free with the motives, of others must not assume, that their own will be taken on trust, to be as pure as Gabriel's. We know of nothing in the non-resistance profession, that excludes inquiry, and is tantamount to a certificate from some infallible searcher of spirits, testifying that such a one is an honest man. We take it as a thing at least barely possible, that these professed reformers may have some ulterior design, not yet divulged. If we saw a class of men anxiously desiring to inflame, or see inflamed, the goodly palaces of a city, we should think it barely possible that they might be wishing for an opportunity for plunder—and that too, even though they should solemnly protest that they had no motive, but to rid the ground of these unnatural incumbrances, in order to restore it to its natural use of agriculture. So when we see these men, so anxious to rid us of the incumbrance of fabrics, more valuable and costly than those of brick and marble, out of the pure benevolence of making us much happier without them, we think it no discourtesy to suggest that it is possible, that they are not so simple as they would seem—that they are really designing to snatch some personal advantage from the ruin, which they are so benevolently plotting. And when we compare their present attitude, with their past professions; when we reflect that they commenced this movement solemnly disclaiming the very designs which they now avow—indignantly repelling the charge of designing to interfere with the Christian ministry, the Christian Sabbath, the separate interests of different sects; and now that they openly avow, and labour for these designs—that once they repelled the charge of making their organization a means of propagating infidelity, and now do that very thing without a blush—that once the abolition of slavery was declared to be the single and exclusive end of the movement; and now there is hardly any thing valuable in society, which they do not declare a purpose to abolish with it. Yea, when we reflect on these revelations of purposes, first concealed under most solemn protestations, what else can we expect, than that other concealed purposes are yet to come out, in the face of present professions. Who can tell, but that the profession of non-resistance itself, will be the next to glide away? Who can tell that these captains in the strife of tongues, will not, ere long, assume other weapons, and become captains of hundreds, and cap-

tains of fifties, leading forth their adherents to works of blood. In that case, there would be no greater dereliction of principle and profession, than there has been.

The suggestion that men whose tongues fight so valiantly for non-resistance and the prostration of governments, should ever take the sword, may excite a smile. But we answer in the words of the wise man—"The thing that hath been, is that which shall be, and there is no new thing under the sun." This very thing was done, by the Anabaptists of Germany, in the days of the Reformation. And their achievements of blood were no less real or shocking, for having originated in these superlatively pacific principles. And these principles, as blended with others in another development, had a like issue in France. There was not only a concealment of principles really held, but a concealment of operations by secret societies. And the sect were characterized by all the same professions, and the same real disregard of profession. They adopted essentially the same principles and measures, so far as the different habits of the two countries would allow. And at length THE END which they sought was revealed. And what was it? That which only fiends could have coveted —a fraction of hell, flaming out upon earth.* Now what

* Of the heretics which troubled the primitive church, some of the most prominent were thorough no-government men. The Manichees condemned the magistracy, as proceeding from the evil god of their theory. Hence they pronounced war unlawful, and condemned Moses for engaging in it. See Magdeburg Centuries. The Donatists carried their non-resistance to such lengths, that in some cases they actually threatened others with violence, who refused to inflict violence upon them. We translate from "Osiander's Epitomes" the following passage respecting them.

"The violent deaths which they willingly procured, without necessity, they called martyrdom. And those of them who aspired to such a martyrdom, announced it long before the time to their friends, who rendered them every kind of assistance, and brought all kinds of dainties to fatten the victims for slaughter. And after they had lived so deliciously a long time, their manner was to sally forth and compel some person whom they casually met to kill them with the sword. And if by threats they could not procure such a favour, they cast themselves from a precipice." The same historian tells us that on one occasion, when a company of these fattened non-resistants were out, in quest of martyrdom, they met a young man, and presented him a drawn sword, commanding him to take it and kill them; and threatening him with instant death if he refused. He told them that he was afraid that when he had killed a part of them, the rest would turn and take vengeance on him. He therefore desired them all to be bound before he commenced. They acquiesced in so reasonable a proposal; and having bound them all fast, left them to their own reflections.

Yet these non-resistants, like most others in later times, changed their course

those philanthropists accomplished, these may be designing. We say not that they really are. But their influence, so far as it goes, is really tending to it. And the future chances of success may determine their course. But were their designs as pure as those of angels, that fact would not render harmless a destructive principle in their hands; a principle which in all history has been associated with evil, and that continually. A good design cannot insure a good result. It would be small relief to the houseless inhabitants of a burnt city, to be told, that the fire was set with kind and benevolent intentions.

For the proofs that our no-governmentism is essentially similar to that in France and Germany, alluded to, we refer to Robinson's "Proofs of conspiracy, against all religions and governments"—a work published at the time of the French Revolution, and which then went through four editions. In one respect that movement differed from this. That commenced and advanced by secret societies, while for aught we know, all the transactions of our reformers are open. And there was a good reason for this difference. Their despotic governments would not have tolerated for a day, such action as our no-government people have. And to do the same thing there, the societies must be secret. But, without specifying all the differences, we will notice some points of resemblance.

In the first place, pantheism or transcendentalism was the form which their sentiments took, as to God and religion. Mr. Robinson, p. 41, quotes from the standard system of theology, these sentences, among others to the same point —"The soul of man is separated from the general mass of intelligence, by some of the operations of nature, which we shall never understand; just as water is raised from the ground by evaporation"—"and is at last re-united in its original form, to the great mass of waters, ready to run over the same circle again." Here is the gist of pantheism, which pervades their writings. And if we may gather from

of action, after their number had increased, so as to give them power for mischief. They committed robberies, and took violent possession of several towns, committed murder upon orthodox Christians, when they could; burnt the sacred books, threw to dogs the bread used in the Lord's Supper, broke the sacred vessels, besmeared the walls of temples, and tore down the altars. Indeed they bore a close alliance to our present non-resistants, in all hatred of what others regard as sacred. They became dissolute and debauched; scrupling not to use the sword in all violence and disorder, till they were put down by the arm of civil power.

casual announcements of the theory of religion held by leading non-resistants, as well as from here and there a more full statement, we are irresistibly led to the conclusion, that this same pantheism is the animating spirit of the sect.

2. In the second place, these originators of the French revolution were equal to our revolutionizers in professions of philanthropy and benevolence. They say, (page 92 of Robinson,) "What is this general object? The happiness of the human race."

3. In the third place, the freedom of all men, coupled with the abolishing of all power of one over another, and of all distinctions in society, was also their professed object. They, like our philanthropists, regarded all obligations of one man to another, to be but a species of slavery. And the high priest of their system, says, (p. 92,) "I have contrived an explanation, which has every advantage; is inviting to Christians of every communion, gradually frees them from all religious prejudices, animates them with the speedy prospect of universal happiness, in a state of liberty and moral equality, freed from the obstacles which subordination, rank and riches continually throw in our way. Our secret association works in a way, that nothing can withstand, and man shall soon be free and happy."

4. While infidelity was the real and leading purpose of the conspiracy, the pretence was held out that their system, was the real perfection of Christianity; they say, (p. 98,) "Such a religion is contained in the order, is the perfection of Christianity, and will be imparted to him in due time."

5. Their great complaint was, that the Christian ministry stood in their way of liberating the world from bondage. On page 108, they say—"We have to struggle with pedantry, with intolerance, with divines and statesmen, and above all, princes and priests are in our way." This quotation from a book printed in another century, reads much like a veritable extract from the Liberator.

6. Their entireness of devotion to the work of universal reform, was also similar. On page 110, they say—"No man is fit for our order, who is not a Brutus or a Cataline, willing to go all lengths."

7. They made also a prominent use of the discussion of woman's rights. The publication of Mary Woolstoncraft, advocating the theory of woman's rights, now held by non-resistants, was the work of a mind that took its impulse

and sympathies from the French Revolution. The decree of the French convention of June 6, 1794, declares, that there is nothing criminal in the promiscuous commerce of the sexes. And woman's rights had an affecting illustration, when a woman was brought forth and actually worshipped in the church, as the goddess of reason. Further, on page 152—"There is no way of influencing men so powerfully, as by means of women. These should, therefore, be our chief study; we should insinuate ourselves into their good opinion; give them hints of emancipation from the tyranny of public opinion, and of standing up for themselves; it will be of immense relief to their enslaved minds to be freed from any one bond of restraint, and it will cause them to work for us with zeal,—for they will only be indulging their own desire of personal admiration." Of the similarity of this policy to a later one, any one can judge.

8. The remarkable blending of Christian professions with unchristian principles and practices, is, though in different form, characteristic of both sects of no-government men. The former sect called "Jesus Christ the grand master" of their order, and insisted that their theory made every thing in the New Testament comprehensible; but that it taught them "to be full grown men, and out of the leading strings of priests and princes." See page 128. And yet with all their piety and pious abhorrence of the priesthood, they had in the arcana of their order, several receipts for procuring abortion—a composition which kills and blinds, when spurted in the face—a method for filling a bed-chamber with pestilential vapours—how to take off impressions of seals so as to use them as seals—a collection of some hundreds of such impressions, with a list of their owners—a receipt, *ad excitandum furorem uterinum*, and a manuscript, containing a bitter satire on all religions, also a dissertation in favour of suicide. This gives a clue to their morality and philanthropy.

9. It was a matter of principle with them when admitting, and carrying through the first stages, the pupil of their order, to pretend great veneration for Christianity, and as soon as they found his mind prepared for it, to contradict the whole. They even went so far as to establish a separate order for ministers, called the priests' order. And one of their writers chuckles over its success thus—"you can't imagine what respect and curiosity my priest's degree has

raised; and a famous protestant divine, who is now of the order, is persuaded that the religion contained in it is the true sense of Christianity. O man, man! to what mayest thou not be persuaded! Who would have thought that I was to be a founder of a new religion." Now it would not be amiss, if some of our protestant divines should make some inquiries, whether their non-resistant coadjutors are not chuckling in like manner.

These are but some out of the many points of resemblance, between the two sects. That there should be so many is hardly accidental. So many like causes must produce somewhat like results.

There is springing up, through these and like operations, a new element of power, which cannot co-exist with a government by law. One or the other must give place. And this nation must choose whom it will obey—whether a settled and responsible government, or the irresponsible power of mobs, shifting as the wind, and devastating as the whirlwind. Sooner or later this practical issue must be met. If popular assemblies for reviewing the proceedings of courts, find general encouragement, the laws will be soon obsolete; and we shall be where France was, when her no-government men had their day. For the real artificers of her memorable revolution, the Illuminati of that day, had, as we have before said, the same theory which these our Illuminati have. They too claimed a monopoly of philanthropy; and of opposition to slavery; they aspired to be the famed instruments of breaking every yoke, of dethroning every king and ruler—of vacating even the government of families, and of releasing man from all obligations to man. The infatuated nation drank the honied words. The fearful experiment was tried. Civil power retired from the parliament and the throne; law had its utterance, only in the voice of the impassioned declaimer, and its enforcement in the whirlwind of popular phrenzy. The earth trembled, the stars fell, and the powers of heaven were shaken. And the nation expiated her folly, by rivers of richest blood; till anarchy found its usual remedy, in the yoke of despotism. Yet, strange to tell, before all the eye and ear witnesses of those events, have passed from the scenes, the same sect has arisen under a new name, in the freest nation on earth, pleading for the privilege of repeating that experiment here, and conferring on us, the unspeakable blessing of a "reign of Terror."

The principles, which we have exhibited, as fully condemn some other practices, of other classes of people prompted by a blind sympathy for criminals. We often witness, and have recently witnessed, attempts to shield offenders from the just penalty of the law, by combined and unjustifiable efforts to secure an abuse of the pardoning power, or to sway our judges by force of public opinion, to recede from their decisions. The case of Colt, so memorable in the annals of criminal proceedings, is in point. A more persevering effort to stay the course of manifest justice, was rarely made. The criminal's previous standing and talents, the intercessions of influential friends, and the pleadings of parental affection, were very naturally, but very improperly, thrown into the scale—the most frivolous exceptions were taken to the legal proceedings, and insisted on till the last minute. But what was especially reprehensible in the case, was the attempt of a combination of lawyers, prompted by inconsiderate sympathy, to arraign and render unpopular and ineffective, the solemn decisions of the courts. Here was a measure, which if it should become common and effectual, when it might be with better reason, would put an end to law. The fact, that men learned in the law, have drunk so deeply into the disorganizing spirit of the times, as not to be aware of the dangerous, the revolutionizing tendency of such proceedings, is ominous.

It may be thought, that we are looking at the disorganizing elements through a magnifying glass, and that we have really not so much occasion, to watch and strengthen the things that remain. True, the professed abettors of the no-government theory are few, and their comparative influence small. Yet they are only a sort of symptom of a wide-spread disease, an unseemly and inflamed eruption on the body politic, indicating morbid action within—a mere exponent of the disease, and not the disease itself. True, the professed labourers in the cause of disorganization, are comparatively few ; and yet it is vastly easier to do harm than good ; to pull down than to build up ; to burn a city than to restore its goodly mansions, after a burning. A dozen incendiaries in a city, armed with nothing more terrible than lucifer matches, bear but a small proportion to the aggregate population ; yet having free access to all combustible materials, they may give employment to the whole force of the city, to save it from ruins. We dispute not the intrinsic insignificance of the no-government declaimers, nor

do we see any fearful elements in their combinations, in themselves considered. But they having the whole mass of human depravity, and of the moral corruption of the people on their side, may in connexion with, and as an exponent of that, be justly dreaded. It betrays no want of manly courage, to stand in awe of an element so vast, as the aggregate depravity of the human race. Aside from the irritation and incitement of any disorganizing theories, the operation of wholesome law is ill endured by multitudes. The sympathy felt for criminals, under penalty, is not the only passion that a skilful Anthony might stir up to mutiny; nor are our mock-philanthropists the only tools for a Cataline. Thousands are inwardly sighing for changes, they know not what, are jealous of the prosperity of others, impatient of the providential inequalities of society, willing to advance themselves on others' ruins, and hostile to the law that prevents them. Some are disappointed, and embittered towards the whole human race, and others are inconsiderate, and hardly know that the law that opposes their lawless wishes, does the kindly office of defending them and their families, from the thief and the assassin. Add to this, that every system of civil law, has vulnerable points; and that even in ours glaring abuses exist. Our government with all its advantages, is not in all points accordant with natural and moral right. Though it has many points, at which law and right conflict, it doubtless has less, than almost any other. And yet every instance of legalized wrong, puts a weapon into the hands of disorganizers. It is easier to point out such legal or constitutional abuses, than to procure their remedy. For selfishness and tyranny are inherent in fallen man. There is the tyranny of despotisms, and the tyranny of democracies, and the greatest of all tyranny where there is no government. And so long as selfishness and tyranny exist, there will be powerful interests to plead for the perpetuation of abuses, and a great difficulty to reform. Yet this principle is kept out of view, by agitators and the agitated. Existing legalized wrongs are fixed on, and used as proofs positive that the governments that allow them, ought not to stand for a day. Destruction, and not reform of legislation, is held forth as the natural inference.

And they, who seek such arguments against government, have an abundant supply, even in our institutions. All the legalized wrongs connected with slavery, and all the diffi-

culties attending its removal, are so much stock in trade for disorganizers. Indeed the very progress of reform and improvement in the moral world, and in the arts of civilization, and the rapidity with which change after change occurs, are forming, as it were, a habit of change, and a thirst for change, and predisposing indiscriminating minds, to welcome the most destructive projects for a change, under the conceit that innovations are of course improvements. Added to all this, a false religion has introduced a new element of danger to the commonwealth. We speak not now of the importations from the old world of the offsets of a religion, which is the quintessence of despotism, and therefore an element foreign and dangerous to our institutions; but of the relaxing influence of infidel, or semi-infidel creeds with Christian names, which are indigenous to the soil of this country. Let one example out of many suffice. It is a principle common to all these creeds, that all punishments under God's government are reformatory—that none are punished for any other purpose, than their own reformation that none are punished for example, to deter others from sin; in other words none are punished, except for their own good. This false principle has begot, as a very natural offspring, the principle that murderers should not be punished with death, because it can do a man no sort of good to hang him. And from this source has arisen an earnest effort to erase this penalty from our statute books. The enterprise is seemingly political, but really to establish a false principle in religion. And to promote it, every occasion is seized to awake an improper sympathy for criminals, and turn it to the purpose of making it appear that they ought not to render life for life. Scarce a conviction or execution occurs which is not made the text of a discourse, in favour of murderers, not perhaps as innocent, but as greatly injured men. Scarce a legislature convenes, that is not beset with petitions and arguments, to make the way of murder more easy and smooth. According to the old order of things, the way of transgressors was hard; and it is now designed to bring the improvements of the age to bear, to make it more easy. The mischievous effects of this sort of effort on the public heart and conscience, are immense, in relaxing the force of law—in alienating the public mind from the just administration of law, and in the consequent multiplication of crime. For this reason, all the no-government sect are heartily in the measure; to them any thing is welcome,

that will fritter away the hated laws. And this one instance is a specimen of many ways, in which a latitudinarian religion is unnerving the arm of civil power, and throwing unperceived elements of danger into our social institutions. But we cannot begin to name all the facilities which now tempt the action of disorganizers.

While so many causes exist, hostile to the public peace, it is no part of a patriot or philanthropist, to scatter the seeds of sedition. Some appear to have fallen into the habit of feeling that they have the most love of country, who are loudest in defaming their country's institutions, and most skilful in exciting popular disaffection, by detecting, and using as arguments against all law, the vulnerable points of our institutions, those unhappy instances in which our laws conflict with right. Thus the depositing of the germs of rebellion, and the sowing of dragon's teeth, has come to be held as a meritorious service to one's country. That such abuses should be faithfully held up for the sake of correction is no matter of complaint. But to make a business and profession for life of holding them forth, in popular declamation, to stimulate the blind passions of men, and generate movements to obstruct the peaceful operation of laws, both good and bad, is the fruit of great ignorance, or else of great malignity. It is an abuse of that civil liberty that heaven has kindly vouchsafed to us—that freedom of speech which these so much abused laws so well guaranty to us. It is an abuse of the public ear and heart, to fill it with such sedition. From such vague and impassioned denunciations, of this and that legal abuse, unreflecting minds draw the inference—not that they should seek lawful and peaceable modes of redress; and not when immediate redress cannot be had, that they should patiently submit, to avoid a greater evil—not that some instances of legal wrong are to be expected in the most perfect systems of civil law, and are to be endured, till they can be reformed in a lawful way; but that law itself, in all its parts and influences, is one monstrous concatenation of abuses. They are not invited to reflect on what would be their condition, if this so much abused system of human government, should give place to anarchy and confusion. But this and that wound, scar, or excrescence on the body politic, is exposed, magnified, and presented through all the hues and shapes of a rhetorical phantasmagoria, and then the abused mind is left to draw its own inference. Now, when it is remembered how easy it is to work wholesale mischief

with such playthings as popular ignorance and passion—what frightful explosions and devastations, imprudent tampering with them has occasioned in other times and places—when it is remembered that the history of the world shows that more of the human race have been destroyed by explosions and convulsions of human passion, than by all the violence of the elements of nature; and that now, popular violence, set loose from the restraints of law, is more to be dreaded than tempests or earthquakes, what estimate must we form of those who seek their bread and their fame, in efforts to turn away the heart of this great nation from the support of wholesome law? We should as soon expect, (if there were as much chance of success,) that they would attempt, by dwelling on the inconveniences of the seasons, the extremes of heat and cold, the chilling damps, the pestilential miasma, the fevers, the consumption, and the deaths which they occasion, to raise an argument against the ordinances of heaven, and go for a dissolution of this imperfect system of things, in order to rid it of abuses. We might expect to see them denouncing day and night, heat and cold, and raising a mob to sweep the stars from heaven, and pluck the sun from his chariot. Yea, instruments of cruelty are in their habitations. O, my soul! come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour be not thou united.

ART. VIII.—1. *Visit to Northern Europe: or Sketches Descriptive, Historical, Political and Moral of Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland, and the free Cities of Hamburg and Lubeck, containing notices of the Manners and Customs, Commerce, Manufactures, Arts and Sciences, Education, Literature and Religion of those Countries and Cities.* By Robert Baird. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 347–350. John S. Taylor & Co., New York.

2. *A Tour in Sweden in* 1838: *Comprising the Moral, Political and Economical state of the Swedish Nation.* By Samuel Laing, Esq. London, 1839. 8vo. pp. 431.

3. *Recueil des Exposes de l'administration du Royaume de Suède presentes aux etats generaux depuis* 1809 *jusqu'a* 1840 *traduit du Suedois.* Par J. F. DeLundblad, ancien counseiller de legation, &c. Paris, 1840. 8vo. pp. 366.

4. *The Poor Laws, and their Bearing on Society, a series of Political and Historical Essays.* By Eric Gustaf Gieger, Professor of History at the University of Upsala. Translated from the Swedish, by E. B. Hale Lewin. Stockholm and London, 1842. 8vo. pp. 184.

The Swedish nation owing, to her achievements in war, and the eminence of some of her sovereigns, has enjoyed for many centuries a larger share of public attention than her magnitude as an European power seemed to justify. It is so even at the present time, after a quarter of a century of peace; the affairs and condition of that people are the objects of much inquiry and animated discussion. Availing ourselves of the ample materials before us, we shall attempt to bring to the view of our readers some of the prominent features in the policy of the government and in the condition of the people, and trust we may succeed sufficiently to send many to a full examination of the subject, in the volumes from which our statements are chiefly drawn.

From the period when the Scandinavian peninsula poured forth its hordes of warriors to humble the power of Rome, and to lay waste the fairest portions of Europe, war has been the trade of Sweden. The country produced soldiers and employed them in their appropriate work. In the last three centuries nearly one half of her time has been spent in war.

The legislation of the country and the condition of its people, were doubtless shaped and determined by this state of things. The people have had their full share of the horrors of war abroad, but have never undergone the horrors of a conquered country: "for Swedish soil was never won by conquest." (Gieger p. 69.) The feudal system in its proper acceptation was never established in Sweden; the people were never precipitated by conquest into slavery, and their lands parcelled out among the conquerors. It is worth while to examine into the condition of a people who by a prowess which enabled them always to be the aggressors in war, saved themselves from the iron bondage of that system which robbed and crushed almost every other European nation. The Swedish nobility were of course military in their character and pursuits: they have always held the high offices in the state and in the army. They derived neither their lands nor their titles of nobility from

the king, who was himself only the chief noble. In the act of hereditary succession to the throne, drawn up at Orebro, on the 13th of January, 1544, on the part of all the orders, the nobility are styled the "Co-member of Sweden's Crown." Gustavus Vasa caused his hereditary crown to be tendered to him by the nobility. It could not be otherwise than that there should be continual struggling between such powerful and independent nobles and the monarchs of Sweden; of this her history furnishes ample testimony. These struggles of power, of address, and of legislation, settled in their progress and results the condition of the Swedish people. It is plain that both sovereigns and nobles from the beginning regarded the land as theirs: they could not acknowledge themselves worse off than the feudal lords in other countries, and they divided the soil of their country among them. But though the land was seized by king and nobles, abundant cause of contention remained: the power which must rest in the people remained to be appropriated. The king needed an army, and the nobles needed retainers, servants and farmers; the king needed revenue and the nobles needed income. The king imposed taxes, and the nobles extorted exemption and privileges. There was scarce a commodity of importance produced or imported in which the crown did not speculate,—from corn, copper, iron, timber, tar—to salt and tobacco. By means of ship companies and commercial companies, the government took possession of the internal and foreign trade. There was no other mode of obtaining the sinews of war. The whole effort of the nobility was to secure themselves from the burden of taxation, and to secure the services of as many people as they needed. Having possession of the land, the great mass of the population fell under their power. At various times they extorted from the crown exemption for their tenants and servants from military services, and for their lands from taxes. These exemptions were made part of their estate, attached to the lands and passed with them. They were of endless variety and extent, and produced great confusion, furnishing constantly fresh cause of struggle with the crown. Ordinances were passed limiting the personal protection extended by nobles to the people. This excluded multitudes from the benefits of protection, and rendered them liable to be called into military service by the king. Many peasants enjoying their inherited protection, became in time, and by favouring circumstances,

possessed of the lands on which they resided, by titles more or less absolute, and with this possession they took many of the privileges to which the land was entitled in the hands of the nobles. The crown could not monopolize the trade and industry of the kingdom, without employing many agents in its multifarious operations, nor could it by any possibility escape the fate of all governments in being occasionally fleeced by its fiscal functionaries. A new order rose gradually under these favourable opportunities afforded by the crown. Hosts of commissaries, contractors, agents of monopolies and holders of privileges accumulated wealth, and either passed into the ranks of the nobility or combined to form the great middle class of the burghers, who now form one of the four estates of the kingdom. The burghers, having acquired wealth enough to purchase landed estates, acquired with them some of the appended exemptions and privileges. After the year 1809, they were permitted to purchase the most favoured estates, and step into the shoes of the nobility, with all the advantages which former power had secured to the land.

This slight sketch may prepare the way for the account which is furnished by Mr. Baird and Mr. Laing, of the present state of things in Sweden.

The arable land of Sweden is divided into 65,596 estates, called in the language of the country hemmans, which are of great variety in size and value. This division is chiefly fiscal, and is used to facilitate the apportionment of taxes. They are divided into a great number of classes, according to the nature and extent of the exemptions which their original owners obtained for them. There are four kinds which we need not distinguish, lying originally within the pale of the nobleman's estate of old, and which are held of it for a certain sum of money, or for corn, or services, and which are exempt from taxes and local burdens in certain proportions to the rights of the parent domain. Another sort are exempt in part. The crown hemmans, the tenants of which hold directly from the king, pay the heaviest burdens, and enjoy no privilege nor exemption of any kind. With the feudal system, those who held directly of the crown enjoyed the greatest advantages, as every subsequent demise or lease imposed new duties or burdens. The privileges enjoyed by different estates in various localities, became a matter of science, called in Sweden, Kammervidenskap, on which lectures are yet delivered in the universities, treating

of the various classifications, exemptions and laws affecting estates, and which have grown out of the various personal rights of the former proprietors. To furnish some idea of the value of these exemptions, we are informed that the estates of the first class pay nearly 225 per cent. less of taxes and local burdens: the second from 54 to 62 per cent. less than the third or unprivileged estates. The noble estates enjoying the highest exemption, number 3462; those in the next degree less favoured, number 17,929, and the estates subject to all taxes and burdens, 44,205. In fact, the latter bear all the burdens and taxes which would otherwise fall upon the other two classes; and there are few of these who do not pay more than half their whole crop in taxes and local assessments. The whole produce of the land in an average of five years, taken by Mr. Laing, was $18,000,000, and in those years the agricultural class paid $6,400,000 in taxes to the state, and this falls in the unequal proportions above stated upon the proprietors of land. Besides this, they had to meet the local assessments, of which some conjecture may be formed from the following enumeration. The above sum of $6,400,000 includes the state tax and crown tithe; in addition there was to be paid the assessment for the clergyman; repair of church and other parish buildings; the poor rate; road tax; posting or furnishing horses; salary for midwife; do. for vaccinator; do. for district doctor: do. for parish secretary; seventeen items more, of less importance, besides the support of a prison and pay of the member of diet. These are not voluntary subscriptions, but are drawn by functionaries of the government settled in the parish, in payment of their salaries. Sweden is not burdened by a national debt; yet the people bear the heaviest load of taxes, in proportion to the capital and income of the country, of any in Europe. This taxation, unlike that of most other countries, is made to bear with great severity upon the poorer portions of the agricultural population. In England and France, meat and drink and most articles of domestic consumption, are taxed in another way to the mouth, and starvation or payment are the only alternatives. In Sweden the unprivileged farmers, by far the greatest number, are taxed with a severity which sweeps away the avails of their labour, and places them in the condition of tenants, paying a heavy rent to an exacting landlord. The effect is to throw the expense of government upon the unprotected land, which is thus virtually converted into a na-

tional domain, worked by those residing upon it for public benefit. The class thus affected, being least able to guard its own interests, has fallen a victim to the policy, power and selfishness of other classes. This mode of adjusting the burdens of taxation, ministers to the benefit of other classes indirectly as well as immediately. When taxes are laid directly upon articles which all consume, as in England, all must pay, for the prices of the articles taxed generally rise in proportion to the weight of the tax. In Sweden the nobility and others holding exempted lands are for the most part the officeholders and pensioners of government, and their interest demands that the prices of articles consumed by them should not rise. The chief burden of taxation is therefore laid upon land, the tenants of which cannot charge the amount on the products of the soil, because these come in contact with the products of the protected land, and also with foreign agricultural products, on many of which only a light duty is imposed. For example: imported oats pay only $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per bushel; wheat, 8; barley, 4; rye, 6; peas, 6; potatoes, $3\frac{1}{2}$. Living is cheap in Sweden. The public functionaries who enjoy fixed salaries number:

Clerical, and those connected with Education,	7,709
Civil, ...	9,485
Military, ...	48,930
	66,124

These with their wives and children make a vast multitude to support at public expense, and to these must be added a great many individuals to whom pensions permanent and temporary are granted. It is estimated that the aggregate of these, exceeds in number the whole living by trade and manufactures. To show how little these favoured dependants on the public purse are taxed, it need only to be stated that the ordinary gross revenue amounts to $8,000,000, of which $6.500,000 are levied upon the land; the remaining $1,-500,000 are collected by customs, a portion of which therefore falls upon the consumption of those who live upon salaries. If the land were relieved from its burden and the same amount raised by duties, or a tax on consumption, prices in Sweden would rise from 20 to 50 per cent. and the salaries would suffer in that proportion. But this adjustment of taxation and prices is firmly fixed as a part of the social system of the country; it had its rise in the power of the nobles and it cannot be altered without their consent as well

as that of the clergy, both of which orders are interested in maintaining the existing policy. Each constitute a separate house in the Swedish legislature, and either could defeat any attempt to effect a change.

Having thus seen one of the results of the power of the nobles, we may next select some features in the system which have their origin in the acts of the crown.

It required all the power and all the ingenuity of a king and his acutest advisers to raise a revenue, when powerful nobles possessed a large portion of the land and other property, in a country like Sweden. We have above adverted to the monopolies and sale of privileges, and the incorporation of companies, by which the crown levied a revenue upon the trade and industry of the kingdom. In pursuance of this policy, the crown laid its hand upon every trade, business and kind of manufacture, and either held it as a monopoly, or sold out the privilege of carrying it on, or demanded an annual sum of money by way of license. This policy, which prevailed more or less throughout Europe, has left strong indications of its former universality and vigour. Some monopolies have been discontinued, and some privileges withdrawn, and many companies abolished, but to this day in Sweden there is scarcely an imaginable employment which is not followed under a license from the government. The great outline of the mighty mining monopoly remains. There is a college of mines, having charge of all mines, woods, fossils, waters, weights, furnaces, foundries, and all operations connected with the production of metals; and having civil and criminal jurisdiction of life and property over all matters within their district. There is a president, two counsellors, four assessors, a secretary, a prothonotary, an actuary, a chancellor, two clerks, a fiscal advocate, five treasurers and metal assayers, five officers to the chemical, and three to the mechanical, laboratory. At each mine there is another host of officials. Annexed to each mine is a district of country, consisting of many parishes, the wood of which can only be used for charcoal, which the peasantry within the district must make and deliver at the work at a price fixed by the mining officers. This wood belongs to the owners of the lands, whether rich or poor, but they can only sell it to the mines at a price which they have no voice in fixing. The mines too may be private property, but it is delivered over to public management. This is so depressing to industry and enterprize, that all the science of the

mining department cannot save mining operations from the evil effects of this cumbrous system. Sweden with its boasted iron mines makes 60,000 tons of iron ; a quantity much less than is made by Crawshay & Co., and Guest, Jackson, & Co., in South Wales. The whole quantity made in that district of Wales in 1839, was 532,000 tons : all without the aid of a college of mines. In Sweden each furnace is licensed for a particular quantity, which must not be exceeded on pain of the surplus being confiscated. All iron must on its way to market pass through the hands of the agents of the mining department ; it is impossible therefore for the manufacturer to exceed the limit of his license. In order to save this mode of manufacturing, the import of almost every description of iron into Sweden is prohibited ; and that which is admitted is subject to a heavy duty of from $10 to $50 per ton. In many cases the Swedish peasants have a privilege of carrying their charcoal to a particular furnace, where, when their turn comes, they can manufacture as much iron as their coal will make. Others have the privilege of purchasing the raw iron and converting it into bars, &c.

Other departments of industry are not quite so much incumbered with the paternal care of the government, but none escape. Every trade is carried on under special license, and peculiar regulations. There is much similarity throughout the continent in this respect ; but we shall speak of Sweden only. Every tradesman pays a tax to government for leave to follow his business ; in consideration of which tax the government protects him against that active competition which might diminish the avails of his industry. The public functionaries determine how many of a trade may be licensed in any particular place. Before a man can set up as master in any business, he must serve an apprenticeship of five, seven, or ten years according to the nature of the trade. Each master can take only a limited number of apprentices, and these must serve as journeymen from four to six years, and must then travel as journeymen for four or more years, working from place to place at their trade. The travelling journeyman carries his passport and certificate with him, and is allowed by the corporation of the trade, in each town he enters, to seek employment there. If he finds no work he is maintained by the corporation during his stay, and money furnished to help him to the next town. There is of course, all the time a great number

of travelling journeymen, fitting themselves to become masters in their trades. Whether this forced pilgrimage does not bring forth more evil than good, can only be determined by those who have opportunity of long and close examination. It appears to us to be fraught with a variety of mischiefs, and as likely to make vagabonds, as industrious and skilful workmen. These privileges are so strict, that there can be no blending of trades. The copper-smith who makes a copper vessel, cannot make the brass cock to be inserted in it. The chief benefit derived from the system is said to be the protection and ease it gives the trades-people, who cannot be reduced to starvation by competition, and it is alleged that it acts as a powerful check upon population. It must be remembered, however, if it preserve the protected tradesman in a state of comfort, it excludes a much larger number from these privileges, who are left without any prospect before them but crime or pauperism. Thus, between the system of protection introduced by the nobles, and the system of monopolies, privileged companies, and close trade corporations, enforced by the crown, a large number of the people were jostled out of the social pale and remain to this hour in the position of outlaws. They have been excluded from the family at home, and are without any place or protection in Sweden, except the jail and the hospital. They are never wanted, except on the field of battle; so they meet a warm reception from their enemies, and a cold reception from their friends. It is the increase of this class which now swells the number of the poor in Sweden. A long peace of twenty-five years has doubtless greatly increased this population, and pressed upon the public authorities the question of the support and management of the poor.

"The poverty endured by the greater part of the Swedish nation with their ancient glory," says Geiger, (page 81,) "exceeds alike the conceptions and faculties of those who now-a-days complain and write of poverty." In those glorious days the poor were the children of the catholic church. It must be admitted that the mother church generally assumed the care of the poor. In Sweden one-fifth of the tithes was set apart for their benefit, and many of the monasteries were endowed with special funds for the aid of the poor. This was always a very expensive mode of relieving poverty; because after supporting the monks, as administrators of the charity, very little could be spared for extensive or efficient plans of relief. The poor were not re-

ceived and permanently kept at the monasteries, but they were never turned away without a morsel to eat and a blessing to accompany their departure. As the civil power seized the ecclesiastical revenues, for the most part, at the reformation, the care of the poor devolved upon the civil authorities of the parishes. In Sweden the church did not wholly give up the care of the poor; collections were taken in the churches for their benefit; and *begging letters*, authorizing the bearer to ask alms, were issued. At first these were general, but after 1636, they restricted the bearer to his own parish. In 1642, the issuing these letters was restricted to the clerical inspector of several parishes; to the bishop for his diocese, and to the governor for foreigners. Gustavus Adolphus finding mendicancy on the increase, passed an "Ordinance against beggars and time-thieves." He reformed the hospitals, equivalent to our modern almshouses, and established one in each county; he provided *child-houses* for the reception and care of children under eight years of age; he abolished the *old-women-houses*, which had been abused, as receptacles for the idle and dissolute; he ordered a regular survey of the poor, that those able to support themselves might be put to service—the children into the child-houses, and the disabled sent to the hospitals; and finally he ordered that all who should thereafter be found begging, who were able to maintain themselves by labour, should be arrested and carried to the house of correction, there to labour for a living. The mildness of these provisions, contrasted with contemporaneous enactments of the English poor laws, is worthy of remark. (See page 101, &c. of vol. xiii. of this Review.) Another *Beggar Ordinance* was passed in 1698, in the reign of Charles XII. which changed the hitherto voluntary contribution of the parishes into a compulsory payment. The parishes became then each responsible for their own poor; and then commenced the system of *pauper-relief quarrels*, which so much distinguish the management of the poor in England, and the tendency of which is to hold up the poor as a hateful and burdensome nuisance, to be got rid of, if possible, by any trick or chance of law, and never to be relieved or aided upon any other principle than that of legal necessity.

The evil increased until it provoked the Diet of 1809 to call for a general revision and examination of the poor law. A report and project was completed in 1821, and submitted to the States, at the Diet of 1823. The four States or houses

of the Swedish Diet divided on the plan, two against two —the clergy and peasants, against the nobles and burghers. The people, specially represented by the former, having under existing regulations, the chief care of the poor, their representatives desired, by a general poor law, to divide this responsibility; but the nobles and burghers declared their confidence in the people and clergy to be such that the existing order of things could not be safely disturbed. So the Swedish poor laws remain unchanged, with all their defects and inequalities. The management of the poor remains with the communes or parishes, and the administration is wholly different, in different parts of the country. It is not assumed by the government, as such; it no longer belongs to the church, as such, but to the civil communal authorities; and the experience of both England and Sweden show that these unwatched parish officers are guilty of the greatest known abuses of the poor law system. It comes in contact with the government only in its criminal legislation; for unhappily every state finds an important connection between pauperism and crime. The Swedish criminal code has of late years been somewhat ameliorated; but Geiger laments that "charity became more stern as justice became more merciful."

From the year 1822 to 1834, the nobles of Sweden have diminished their estates, by sales of land, above three millions of dollars; that class of the rich who enjoy no titles have increased theirs, by the purchase of land, nearly two millions of dollars, whilst the class below, or mere common people, have purchased lands to nearly the value of a million and a half dollars. During this period the number of those destitute of means and labour to obtain subsistence, and, therefore, inevitably depending on the parishes has rather diminished. The poor law commissioners, in their last report, after noticing this fact, add—"So much the more cause for anxiety is involved in the tottering independence of that class whose living depends on the wages of daily labour. The increase of this class has recently been with such rapid strides, as cannot fail to excite serious attention. This increase between 1815 and 1836 was 40 per cent., or in a two-fold proportion to the general increase of population in the same period." (Geiger, 104.)

The general wealth and prosperity in every department of industry has increased rapidly under the favouring auspices of peace, while the order of distribution was undergo-

ing the change just mentioned. In 1777 Sweden imported for home consumption, 2,560,000 bushels of grain; in 1810 this quantity was reduced to 932,000; before 1832, exportation had commenced, and reached in that year 710,356 bushels of grain, and a considerable quantity of flour. In the latter year seven-ninths of the population were engaged in agriculture. There were gathered in 1805, 19,696,000 bushels of potatoes and grain; in 1822, 33,181,172 bushels. In the 23 years, ending 1828, the population had, increased 18 per cent., and the produce of grain 42 per cent. The crop of potatoes alone, in 1805 was 1,440,000 bushels, and in 1832 it yielded 15,034,704. These facts sufficiently attest the progress of agriculture: the following statement will show as clearly the advances of manufactures and commerce. The whole value of manufactured articles in the year 1831 was $3,513,200; in 1839 the total was $5,439,100. The entire imports of 1831 were valued at $4,921,000; those of 1839 at $7,745,200. The exports of the former year were valued at $5,425,800, and those of the latter at $8,407,300. The revenue of the country, by customs, increased in a like proportion.

Sweden then furnishes another example of increasing wealth in a country where the ranks of poverty are rapidly extending. This problem has met no solution in the administration of any nation. We have had poured upon us floods of discussion by political theorists, dabblers in political economy, and writers upon population, to whom the world as yet confesses little obligation. In one point most appear to agree; the increased riches are deemed a blessing, while the increasing numbers of poor people, viewed as an incumbrance upon the wealth, is regarded as an appalling evil.

But this kingdom affords another paradox worthy of the notice of those who are students of legislation and administrative economy. In no country are the primary elements of education more diffused than in Sweden. Mr. Baird and Mr. Laing concur in this testimony. Mr. Laing states that not one person in a thousand can be found not able to read and write; Mr. Baird thinks this statement may be a little strong, but he adds, "there is no doubt there are very few, comparatively, who do not know how to read, and almost all know how to write." Mr. Laing mentions one province, Wexio-lan, in which, among 40,000, only one person was found who could not read. (Laing, p. 189—Baird, vol. ii.

234.) Compare this with the state of primary education in those states at home, in which the most boasted progress has been made. According to the last census, Massachusetts furnished one person in every 165, over 21 years of age, who could neither read nor write; Connecticut one in 589; and Kentucky, which furnishes in this respect, the most unfavourable return, one in 11⅕* The result in the whole United States is one in 31. The mode in which this education in Sweden is accomplished is even more remarkable than its universality. It is chiefly the result of family teaching. In the province of Wexio-lan, which contains 86 congregations, there are only 29 schools for teaching the first elements. "The common people of Sweden, alone of all European nations, have the honour of having outstripped the schoolmaster;—parents in the lowest circumstances, have no more occasion for a schoolmaster to teach their children these elementary, branches of education, and also the church catechism than they have for a baker to bake their bread, or a seamstress to mend their clothes." (Laing, 186.) Their ability thus to teach, seems far less remarkable than their willingness. It may be spoken, to the shame of civilized people, that no other example can be found of such parental care. Can we point out among us what parents have supplied in the education of their children which schools did not furnish?

Some in this country have been prone to imagine that we had outstripped the rest of the world in our appreciation of the advantages of early education. Sweden has not only taken the lead, but claims besides whatever benefit may arise in domestic education over that of public schools. Many among us regard it as an evil that children are herded together in masses, the bad and good, at a public school, and these theorists regard family education in the primary departments as of the first importance. They may find their views realized in Sweden now, and for more than two centuries past. The zeal for education is attributed to Gustavus Vasa, John III. and Charles XI. It commenced in Sweden, when almost unthought of, by rulers and people, in other countries, and

* It deserves notice that Kentucky, which is so lamentably behind in primary education, yet send to her colleges almost two students, for one sent by Massachusetts to her colleges.

	Population.	Students in College.
Kentucky,	779,828	1,419
Massachusetts,	737,699	769

has been persevered in by a people whose trade has been war, in which their rulers did not stint them of full occupation.

In the higher departments of learning the same superiority is not shown; though Sweden furnishes, from her whole population, more students to her universities than many of our states. The proportion of students to the whole people there, is stated by Mr. Baird to be one in 1400. In Connecticut, it is one in 372; in Massachusetts, one in 959; in Tennessee, one in 1673; in Indiana, one in 2130; in South Carolina, one in 3538; in Alabama, one in 3886; in North Carolina, one in 4768; and in the United States, one in 1113. So that we cannot greatly boast over Sweden, even in this respect; and if we regard the advantages enjoyed by the Swedish student, at the Universities of Upsala and Lund, we may well doubt, whether on the whole, sound learning and science are not as likely to advance there as here. Mr. Baird furnishes, among other interesting and useful details respecting the state of literature in Sweden, the following account of its Universities. "That of Upsala is the larger, and better endowed. The number of professors is forty-seven, together with an undefined number of adjuncts and teachers. Of the forty-seven professors, twenty-five are ordinary, of whom four give instruction in theology, two in law, five in medicine, and fourteen in philosophy, in which is embraced mathematics, chemistry, Greek, physics, natural history, logic, &c. . . . . Ten years ago the library contained sixty thousand volumes; it is now much larger." "The University of Lund has twenty-four professors; viz., four in the theological faculty, four in the legal, four in the medical, and twelve in the philosophical. There are besides eleven adjunct professors. The library contains about seventy thousand volumes." Sweden has concentrated her collegiate teaching upon two institutions, and two thousand students attend upon the teaching of seventy-one regular professors, besides a host of adjuncts and tutors. Many of these professors, it is known, are men of great ability and learning, and all are spoken of as highly respectable in their various departments.

Whatever advantage belongs to the Protestant religion, established by law, must be enjoyed to the full in Sweden. Nowhere has the civil and religious power been more thoroughly and happily blended. Nowhere is religious order more fully established. The external duties of religion

are nowhere more scrupulously and generally fulfilled. The submission to the politico-religious arm is complete. The whole machine has for ages worked with wonderful regularity. To the stringency of its requirements, is owing no doubt, that family instruction which distinguishes the country. Foreigners, residing in Sweden, are tolerated in the observance of their own worship, but the Swedes are not permitted on any pretence to desert their own church. There are few Swedish dissenters, and none avowedly such; of course there are none of the mischiefs of dissent and sectarianism. The clergy, as a body, is respectable and learned; it consists of one archbishop, eleven bishops, and three thousand one hundred and ninety-three clergymen. There are two thousand four hundred and ninety congregations. The sum of $712,157 is contributed by the people in the way of tithes, towards the support of pastors and their assistants. Besides their regular salaries, the pastors claim certain perquisites, which are never withheld although very oppressive. Mr. Baird tells us that many families give $100 on occasion of a funeral service; others $50, and the poor peasant, who has no other mode of payment, gives a cow; but there are many occasions on which presents are required besides funerals. "According to old laws," says Mr. Baird, "the pastor of a parish may compel every member of his parish to attend public worship. No man can give testimony in a court, or accept any important office, without showing that he has taken the sacrament of the Lord's Supper within a year. A boy is required to commune, before a master will take him as an apprentice." (Vol. ii. 203.) "A law of Charles XI., 1684, still in force, required the clergy to see that every individual in their parish should be taught to read. He also enacted, that no marriage should be celebrated unless the parties had previously partaken of the Lord's Supper, and that none should partake of that ordinance, who could not read, and who was not instructed in religion. The law requires every person to present himself to the pastor of his parish, and receive the necessary instruction for making this first communion. If he neglects it, the civil authorities, on complaint of the pastor, will send a constable to bring him!" (Vol. ii. 225.) If any man openly abandons the established church he loses his civil rights.

The king at his coronation is sworn to maintain inviolate the Lutheran church. In the criminal code of Sweden,

blasphemy stands first in order of crimes punishable with death; and disturbance of public worship or ridiculing the same, stands first in order of crimes punishable with imprisonment. Offences against religion are therefore the highest known to their law; thus the church is guarded by the whole power of the government. It has the advantage of a body of clergy, "who," as Mr. Laing avers, "are unquestionably more highly educated than the Scotch, or perhaps any other body of clergy in Europe." (Laing, 249.)

In the Swedish government there is a statistical department fully organized and in efficient operation. It has existed since 1748, and has now attained a superiority to any similar institution. Tables of population, property, crops, capital, embracing in short every matter of statistical interest to government or to political economists, are made out in each parish by the clergyman and secretary of the parish. A commision at the capital is constantly employed in generalizing and reducing to tables these local returns. It is to the labours of this department that the world is indebted, through Mr. Laing, Mr. Baird, and other late travellers, for an exposition of the moral state of Sweden which has recently excited so much surprise and provoked so much discussion. Mr. Laing, who preceded our countryman, drew upon himself a torrent of indignation from various authors and public functionaries in Sweden, for his unreserved disclosures. Good results have followed: his statements have had a wider circulation, and the Swedish authorities and politicians have been compelled to look at the picture, black and forbidding as it appears. The conclusions of Mr. Laing are to be received with some qualifications; but the more they have been investigated, even in Sweden, the more they are compelled to admit their substantial correctness. Some of the works in reply, transcend all bounds of truth and moderation, such as that of the Swedish ambassador at St. James, General Count Bjornstjerna. Not a few of the best authorities in Sweden, however, while they lament the fact, admit there is too much truth in the charges brought against the morals of the nation. Mr. Baird, after special inquiry, confirms the statements of Mr. Laing. The Rev. George Scott, who has resided ten years in Stockholm, and who recently visited the United States, assured us that a careful examination of Swedish statistics made by public officers had mainly justified the assertions of Mr. Laing. The worthy Professor Geiger, ("Poor Laws," p. 106,) ad-

mits "that the criminal statistics of Sweden have assumed so dark a shade, as to impress every true friend of his country with deep solicitude." Again, in a journal edited by him, at the close of an article published in September, 1839, on this subject, he sums up by declaring, that after all the subtractions made by him from Mr. Laing's calculations, "we are painfully compelled to acknowledge that the number of gross crimes among us, in proportion to our population, is, and has been, uncommonly great." One objection urged against Mr. Laing was, that he had included in his estimates a great many minor offences, which the minuteness of Swedish returns included, but which were not classed with the criminal offences in other countries, but treated under the head of police. But those who will look into his book will see that he was fully aware of this, and made allowances on that account. We cannot bring ourselves to copy the dreadful details to be found in the volumes of Mr. Laing and Mr. Baird, and in the Edinburgh and London Quarterly Reviews, but will merely state that they establish clearly the population of Sweden to be, in comparison with other European States, greatly pre-eminent in immorality and crime. Such is the fact, which, after much examination and discussion, only stands out more distinctly as a national characteristic. It is plain enough, that a good primary education, and a long and well established Protestant church, with all the power of a nation, to enforce its precepts, have not salt enough to save a people from the taint of extreme moral defilement.

Mr. Laing furnishes statements showing the contrast in the state of morals between Sweden and some other countries. In the year 1835, one person in Norway in every 1402, was convicted of a criminal offence; in the same year, in Denmark, one in every 943; in 1836, in Scotland, one in every 1099; in 1831, in England and Wales, one in every 1005; in London, 1834, one in every 540; in 1834, in Ireland, one in every 557; in 1835 and 1836, in Sweden, one in every 140 in the former, and one in 134 of the latter year, Mr. Baird informs us, that according to the returns of 1837, upwards of 16,300 persons were imprisoned in Sweden, and the general result of that year is even more unfavourable than in the year taken by Mr. Laing. This is the exhibit of the morals of a people, who were, till lately, held up as a pattern population! So much for getting at the truth.

The causes which bring about such results, are generally

much complicated: but it is not difficult to specify some which must have had a strong influence in producing the present deplorable state of morals in Sweden.

1. The inequality of taxation, which throws the chief burden of public expenditure upon those who are least able to bear it, thereby impoverishing a large class, causing much individual distress, and many cases of extreme hardship; all which excites hatred towards rulers and contempt of all laws.

2. The system of protection, which requires every man to be under the patronage of some nobleman or other wealthy person; or to find some one who will be responsible for his conduct. As vast numbers, partly through their own fault and partly through unfavourable circumstances, are unable to find such patrons, they remain degraded, hold no rank in society, and are subject at any moment to be imprisoned as vagabonds. Men who are liable, from no fault but poverty, to be imprisoned with rogues, will be ready enough to fit themselves for such company. Having no character to lose, there is scarcely a motive to save them from the commission of any crime offering strong temptation. In some of the states of our country, there are laws requiring free coloured persons to find security for their good behaviour on pain of imprisonment or leaving the state: but these enactments have generally been deemed so odious as to be seldom enforced. In Sweden, however, a very large proportion of commitments are for the want of protection. No better system could be devised to place the poor at the mercy of the rich; nor for the promotion of pauperism and crime.

3. Mr. Baird brings forward a formidable element in producing the evils now prevailing in Sweden. Recent examination has shown that 40,000,000 gallons of whiskey are consumed annually in that country; and this by a population very little over 3,000,000. Previous travellers had underrated the influence and extent of this evil practice. Mr. Baird was fortunate enough, on being admitted to a free communication with the king and his ministers, to draw their attention strongly to the subject. Having stated the mischiefs of intemperance in the United States, and the voluntary, extensive, and thorough reform which had commenced there, the king, who with his son Oscar, the crown prince, appeared deeply interested, expressed a desire that Mr. Baird should draw up in a volume the substance of his

statements, which he promised to have translated into Swedish, and that a printed copy should be placed in the hands of every clergyman in the kingdom. Mr. Baird performed his part, and the king having faithfully fulfilled his engagement, a history of the progress of the temperance reformation was extensively published in Sweden, with manifestly good results among all classes, as its author was gratified in observing in a late visit. He also addressed the House of Peasants on this subject with good effect. This was the more needful, because almost every large farmer in Sweden is a distiller.

Soon after a temperance society, the first in Sweden, was formed, in which some of the highest and most distinguished nobles and officers of the kingdom united. This first effort was favourably noticed in the address of the king to the Diet of 1840. "A temperance society has been formed in the capital, and its laws have been approved. Similar societies have been organized in the provinces. Difference of opinion may exist as to the mode of accomplishment, but none can dispute the importance of the object to which the efforts of these societies are directed. The public must do justice to that zeal which with kindness and prudence, teaches by example. Public opinion has undergone a happy change on the subject of temperance. It may now be hoped that a diffusion of knowledge in the true spirit of Christianity, will repress the evil of intemperance, and diminish the numberless miseries, vices, and crimes which follow in its train; endanger the fortunes and health of families, and cast a blot upon the morals of the Swedish people." (Lundblad, 295.) But the most gratifying event which has followed Mr. Baird's labours in the cause of temperance is a recent act of the Storthing, or Legislature of Norway, a country in which the manufacture and consumption of spirits had been carried to a fearful excess. The Storthing has determined, that after ten years from the date of the enactment, no more spirits shall be manufactured in that kingdom. If persevered in, this will be one of the boldest and most praiseworthy legislative acts of modern times.*

* It would give us pleasure, at another time with full materials, to signalize Mr. Baird's success in drawing the attention of the crowned heads to a subject so vital to the morals and well-being of their subjects. The emperor of Russia, the kings of France, Prussia, Denmark, Belgium, &c., have lent a willing and attentive ear to his representations, and there is ground for expecting favourable results.

4. Another cause of the declension of morals in Sweden is the decline of evangelical Christianity. The union of church and state is so close, and the embraces of government so strict, that it has produced a political religion, not a religious government; the form appears robust and imposing, but the *spirit* is departed. Whatever shackles the mind may wear, upon topics connected with this world, it must be free in the homage which it pays to Him who is over all things, spiritual and material. We should not judge hastily on such subjects, but we are constrained to the belief that the power of vital piety is supplanted by the power of the state, and that religion has lost in vitality, all it has gained in authority. Mr. Laing, whose notions of true godliness do not appear to have been very clearly defined, seems impelled to remark on the subject. "No spirit truly religious has ever been kindled in this country; the reformation, so far as regards the moral condition of the Swedish people, has done harm, rather than good, having merely substituted one ceremonial church for another." (Laing, 125.) It is well known that the Swedish reformation was wholly by authority. There was no distinguished reformer, no special preaching, no awakening of the public mind, no violent ferment, no persecution; the change from papal to Swedish rule in religion was the result of an ordinance, which created a new body, but could not infuse the needful *spirit*. Mr. Baird concurs in this, and being better fitted to judge in such matters, has given his views at length, but with that delicacy which his peculiar position, in regard to the temperance reform, made proper. (Vol. ii. 181.)

We supposed we could render more ample justice to the works before us, as well as to our readers, by condensing a portion of the information they furnish, than by multiplying extracts. We could not indeed do justice to Mr. Baird by extracts from his work; we must be excused this time from repeating the old blunder of handing forth a few bricks as a sample of the house. His volumes present a variety of facts and details in regard to the countries he visited, at once important and instructive. Few travellers, in truth, have enjoyed greater advantages. His long residence in Paris, and the extensive continental acquaintance which this favourable position enabled him to make, opened to Mr. Baird the best sources of information, and access to the most intelligent society wherever he went.

We regret to notice many marks of haste in the prepara-

tion of these volumes; we happen to know however that the haste was fully equal to the marks it has left. They were prepared and committed to the press, during a visit paid to this country last year, amid many other engrossing duties and pressing cares. But a few weeks were given to a labour which deserved months to effect. We trust that our author in publishing the further result of his residence and inquiries in Europe, will take the time necessary to give the full impress of his mind to the work. Mr. Baird's long residence in Europe has given him peculiar advantages to obtain information as to its moral and religious condition. It is generally known that he was sent out to aid the Protestants, especially of France, in the work of promoting evangelical religion. His arrival was warmly welcomed, and his residence there has more than realized the most sanguine anticipations. He was soon recognized on all hands as the representative of American Protestants, and as the herald of our religion and of our benevolence on those shores. His mission was so prudently, kindly and successfully managed as to secure for himself the highest personal respect, and a most favourable reputation, founded on various desert.*

But we must return to Sweden, and before closing this article, bring to more special notice the work of J. F. De Lundblad, the title of which is given above. It is a collection of the messages of the last and the present kings of Sweden, to the Diet of that kingdom. The object is similar to the annual message of our presidents, which they more resemble in length than royal addresses usually do.

Amidst recommendations relating to the various interests of the people, are mingled ample, intelligent, and well-considered discussion, on a very great variety of topics, of national importance, touching the course of legislation, and the whole administration of the government. Among these, ecclesiastical affairs and schools in every department of learning, the encouragement of science and the fine arts hold a conspicuous place. The necessity of still further amendments to the present excellent statistical institution is

* A French Protestant clergyman, and regular correspondent of the New York Observer, has recently borne most emphatic testimony to the high character and standing of Mr. Baird abroad, and to the value of his services to the cause of religion and temperance. He expresses a strong desire that Mr. Baird may be continued in that varied and opportune field of labour.—[New York Observer, Dec. 10, 1842.]

frequently urged. The interests of every branch of industry, but especially those of agriculture, manufactures, navigation, commerce, and the fisheries are earnestly sought, and the light of science and practical knowledge invoked from every quarter. Large space is given to the consideration of tariffs, taxes, pauperism, prison discipline, boards of health, a combined system of which is recommended; hospitals, an increase and reform of which are strongly urged; army, navy, and public defence; topography, internal improvements, roads, canals; draining marshes, reclaiming barrens, and planting forests. Many of these discussions will compare advantageously with any state papers we have ever seen. The impression left by this survey is strongly favourable to the present government.

We doubt whether any other nation has enjoyed for the last twenty years a government more alive to all its vital interests; Prussia may be put in comparison. The present state of morals in Sweden cannot be attributable to such an administration; but rather to the canker of a long peace; the effects of plenty and a full habit upon a system long inured to the hardships and attenuation of war. We entertain lively hopes that the present king and his enlightened advisers will not be long in the adoption of measures which will correct the morals of the country. The king has been accused of arbitrary measures, and of relying for support upon the army; it is not improbable that a military man called to rule over a military people fretting with inaction has erred on that side. It is clear, however, that he has used the army not to carry on war but to secure and maintain peace. If he be spared to the nation some years longer, and if his son Oscar* inherit his talents for governing, it will be very safe to predict for Sweden as brilliant a career in the arts of peace and in the paths of science and literature, as she has ever displayed on her route to conquest in her days of military glory.

* We have it from many sources, that the present crown prince of Sweden is a man of estimable character and great intelligence. He has shown himself repeatedly to be the warm friend of true religion and of moral reform. He is an ardent advocate of temperance, and set the example in Stockholm of discarding brandy from the table. He is about forty years of age; and is the author of an excellent work on prison discipline, in which he advocates the system of solitary labour.

ART. IX.—*Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Leviticus, designed as a general help to biblical reading and instruction.* By George Bush, Prof. of Heb. and Orient. Lit., N. Y. City University. New York: Dayton and Newman. 1843. 12mo. pp. 282.

THIS volume strikes us, on a cursory perusal, as equal to any of its predecessors, in learning, ingenuity; and force of style, while it is certainly superior to some of them in conciseness of style and soundness of judgment. A good popular exposition of Leviticus has long been needed, for the twofold purpose of calling attention to a part of scripture which has few attractions for the ordinary reader, and of giving a right direction to the views of those who do study it, and who, without such direction, are but too apt to fall into serious error. Both these ends, we think, will be promoted by the circulation of the volume before us, which is full of solid matter, on the one hand, and of lively illustration on the other. We are accustomed to ascribe much of the spurious theology now prevalent to neglect or ignorance of the ceremonial law, and its connexion with the New Testament. We are glad to see, therefore, that Professor Bush explains the legislation of this book on sound Christian principles, equally distant from the visionary mysticism of some early writers, and the ill-masked infidelity of many later ones. We are glad, too, that the work is likely to gain more attention than it might otherwise enjoy at first, from the fact of its containing an elaborate discussion of the marriage question, now so interesting to the public, in which he does justice to the argument on both sides, but decidedly maintains the ground assumed in the decision of our General Assembly. We hope that many who consult the volume for the sake of this part, will be led to make use of its help in studying the whole book of Leviticus. We know not whether the author will agree with us in thinking it a high praise of his work, that it contains very little that is new and paradoxical. The most striking novelty is the interpretation of Azazel, in which we think there is nothing to justify the forebodings of violent opposition and severe censure, with which the exposition of the passage opens. Those who are convinced by it will expect no apology for telling them the truth, and those who are not will be apt to smile at the author's apologies for doing that which, in their opinion, he has failed to do at last. A particular

merit of the work is the attention paid to archaeological illustration from the latest and best sources. As in the other works of the same series, the interpretation is interspersed with doctrinal and devout reflections, which serve to elevate its tone and spirit, while they add not a little to its practical utility. The typographical execution is neat, and for the most part, we believe correct. We have observed, however, some appearances of negligence and haste both in the Hebrew and the Hebrew-English (or whatever else it may be called) with which the notes are, in our opinion, needlessly encumbered. On the whole, we are much gratified with this addition to our scanty stock of popular, but learned, exposition, and with the proof which it affords of the author's indefatigable diligence, unabated, devoted to his chosen work, and increasing qualifications for it.

The Old Faith and the Good Way. An Expose of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church, explaining the difference between the doctrines of the Old and New School. By a Committee of the late Caledonia Presbytery, now constituting the Presbyteries of Steuben and Wyoming. Buffalo: 1842. pp. 24.

Few men in our church more deserve the respect and confidence of their brethren, than the members of the late Presbytery of Caledonia. Under circumstances of peculiar trial they remained faithful to our doctrines and discipline; and instead of allowing themselves to be carried away in the general schism and defection, which prevailed around them, they adhered under reproach and varied opposition, to the church of their fathers. Such men have a right to the sympathy and support of their brethren; and if in their peculiar circumstances, they have been led into the use of language, which, to those sitting in security and unannoyed, may appear too severe, they are not on that account to be too harshly judged. The pamphlet before us does not inform its readers, of the special occasion which called for this exposition of the difference between the doctrines of the Old and New School. It is to be presumed that the separation of that presbytery from the great body of the churches around them, would lead to frequent demands for the reason of their peculiar position, and render expedient a full exhibition of the grounds of their refusal to join the New School ranks. These grounds are found principally in the fact that the New School either adopt or tolerate doctrines inconsistent with

the standards of the Presbyterian Church, a fact which this pamphlet renders abundantly evident. There is one danger to which those members of our church, who have borne the brunt of the battle, are peculiarly exposed, and against which the interests of religion require they should be on their guard. Having seen so much of the evils of new doctrines and new measures, they are naturally disposed to be on the watch for any indication of the approach of these evils to their own bounds; and this exposes them to the danger of going to an extreme in their opposition to erroneous doctrine. They are, therefore, liable to be led into a degree of strictness unknown in other parts of the church, and unauthorized by our constitution. We are not aware that such has been the case in the present instance; but the danger is so obvious, and in the present state of the church, the evils resulting from such unauthorized strictness are so great, that it is right the attention of our brethren should be called to the subject. It is universally admitted that there are many ministers and churches now connected with the New School body, who, in all points necessary to a cordial union, are of one heart and one mind with us. It is of great importance, not merely or chiefly for our denominational interest, but for the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom, that no unnecessary bar should be thrown in the way of such union. No mere question as to the mode of reunion, or as to the door by which they are to enter, should be allowed to retard so desirable a result. Let such brethren and churches take their own course. Let them either join some existing presbytery, or constitute themselves into separate presbyteries, agreeably to the directions of the Assembly, and report to the nearest synod. Separation among sincere Presbyterians is a sin and an evil, and the sooner it is removed the better.

What makes a Church a Bethel. A Sermon delivered to the Presbyterian Congregation at Kingston, Penn., at the Dedication of their new House of Worship, Nov. 13, 1842. By Nicholas Murray, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Elizabethtown, N. J. Published by Request. Elizabethtown: 1842.

To make a church really a Bethel, the author says, that it is necessary, 1. That the order and worship of God's house should be therein maintained in their purity. 2. That the doctrines of God's word be preached in their purity.

3. That it be a place of edification to the Lord's people. 4. That it be blessed with the reviving influences of God's Spirit. All these points are illustrated and enforced with the vigour and vivacity characteristic of Mr. Murray's writings.

The Priesthood in the Church, set forth in Two Discourses. By William Rollinson Whittingham, Bishop of Maryland. Baltimore: 1844. pp. 30.

The essential point of difference between the gospel of the grace of God as revealed in the scriptures, and that great delusion which constitutes the Romish apostacy is, that in the former, the soul has immediate access to the great High Priest, Jesus, the Son of God, and by faith in Him, is justified, sanctified and saved. In the latter, man interposes between the soul and Christ, and claims to be the medium of communication, the channel through which the blessings which flow from Christ's obedience and death are conveyed to the soul. It is the assertion of the necessity of this ministerial intervention for the forgiveness of sins, that constitutes, as we believe, the mystery of iniquity. It is this usurped prerogative which enables the priesthood, "the man of sin," to exalt themselves above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that they, as God, sit in the temple of God, showing themselves that they are God. That is, it enables them to arrogate an authority which belongs only to God, and to claim a reverence and obedience which belong to Him alone. True, they say that this power is not inherent in them, and that this reverence does not terminate on them. So, too, those who ascribe miraculous power to images, and bow down and worship them, say that the power does not inhere in the image, and that the reverence does not terminate on the mere wood and stone. Yet it is not the less idolatry. The Romish priests do not pretend to forgive sin, in virtue of any power or merit of their own; they claim merely to be the authorized dispensers of the merits of Christ. They stand between the soul and the Saviour; and teach that it is only by their ministerial intervention, the sinner can be made a partaker of the benefits of the Redeemer's death. This, if we understand them, is the precise doctrine of these discourses. Bishop Whittingham teaches that "ministerial intervention that sins may be forgiven is the essence of priesthood," and that "much more, because much more

simply, is the priestly office had and exercised in the New Covenant than in the Old." The Christian ministry is a priesthood in a higher sense than the Jewish priests, who were appointed to offer sacrifices and make atonement for the sins of the people. "Christ," he says, "asserted his claim to power, as a man sent of the Father, to forgive sins. Now, what He so claimed, we find that He afterwards conveyed in the most explicit manner, to those whom He left on earth to represent him in his church and minister in his behalf, to the end of time." A higher claim than this, it is impossible for a deluded mortal to make. The claim is, that priests have the same power to forgive sins that Christ himself had. It is to be remembered that the human nature of Christ never subsisted as a person. His divine and human nature constituted but one person; and consequently whatever power and authority belonged to him belonged not to his human nature, but to him as a person. Authority is an attribute of a person. The bishop blinds himself to the awful character of his assumption, by speaking of our Lord "as a man sent by the Father." He was not a man, in the only sense the word can bear in such a connexion; that is, he was not a human person, capable as such, of personal acts and attributes. All his acts and all his prerogatives were the acts and prerogatives of the incarnate God. To speak of the authority of Christ as a man, is as though one should speak of the authority of a king's body in distinction from his soul. The power claimed, therefore, in these discourses, is the power which belonged to Him that is God as well as man, two natures in one person, and to that one person the power to forgive sins, to raise the dead and to judge the world, is attributed in the scriptures.

Bishop Whittingham thinks also that he secures his doctrine from the charge of presumption, and from liability to abuse, by making faith the indispensable condition of pardon. But then, he says, (with reverence) "Not even God himself can forgive the impenitent and unbelieving." "Forgiveness of sins, declared or conveyed by whomsoever or howsoever it may be, *can* be the boon only of the repentant believer." The limitation, therefore, to which even God and Christ are subject in exercising the prerogative of pardon, may well be admitted by mortal men who claim "to be sent to remit sins." The Romanists themselves, although they do not demand the conscious exercise of faith, in the case of infants, and we presume Bishop Whittingham does

not, as the condition of the efficacy of their ministrations; and although they do not, even in the case of adults, refer that efficacy to the state of mind of the recipient of the sacraments, yet they do demand that such recipients should not oppose the obstacles of infidelity or impenitence. We cannot see, therefore, the difference between the doctrine of these discourses, and that of the Romish apostacy. The grand difference between this doctrine and that of the Bible and of Protestant Christendom, is this: according to the gospel, the soul that repents and believes in Christ, is thereby united to the Saviour, and made a partaker of his benefits; he goes to the sacrament in obedience to the divine command to profess his faith, to have his pardon and acceptance sealed to him, and for his spiritual nourishment, and growth in grace. According to the other doctrine, however penitent and believing the soul may be, the way of immediate access to Christ is debarred to him; he must go to the priest, and by his ministerial intervention receive forgiveness. The one doctrine teaches salvation by Christ; the other, in effect, salvation by man.

The Protestant Episcopal Pastor, teaching the People committed to his charge, &c. Baltimore: 1842. pp. 28.

The latter of the two discourses delivered by Dr. Whittingham, noticed above, was delivered on the occasion of the institution of the Rev. Henry Van Dyke Johns to the rectorship of Christ Church, Baltimore. The sermon now to be noticed was delivered by Mr. Johns soon after his induction; and teaches that the Lord's Supper is not a sacrifice, the Lord's table is not an altar, and that the Christian minister is not a priest, in the proper sense of those terms. These doctrines are presented clearly and fervently, and the sermon ends with this solemn declaration. "These, my brethren, are believed to be the doctrines of our Church. I hold that they are vitally important to her peace and welfare. They embrace those principles for which our Protestant forefathers shed their blood, and none other shall you ever hear from me in this sacred desk, 'so help me God.'"

The influence belonging to the office of bishop in the Episcopal church is so great, that Mr. Johns would act under very great disadvantage in thus directly opposing the doctrine of his diocesan. He has, therefore, we think, judged wisely in publishing, in connexion with his own sermon, a lecture of the late venerable bishop White, designed to re-

fute the error that "the Eucharist involves the being therein a real or material sacrifice, an altar, and a priest in the sense of an offerer of a sacrifice." His people now see that this is not a controversy between their bishop and their rector, but between their bishop and bishop White, as the representative of the primitive church and of all protestant communions. This, therefore, is not a sectarian controversy; it is a question in which all denominations of Christians have a common interest.

Anniversary Address before the Philo and Franklin Societies of Jefferson College, at the Annual Commencement, Sept. 29th, 1842. By Lewis W. Green, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Western Theological Seminary. Pittsburgh: 1842.

THE theme of this address is contained in the opening sentence, "Progress and development are God's universal law." This great truth is first illustrated in reference to the material universe, and then to human society. The author gives a survey of the progress of civilization and knowledge since the introduction of Christianity, and of the causes now in operation to produce changes still more momentous than any which have hitherto been effected, a survey such as none but a comprehensive and vigorous mind could take or present. There is a great and important truth at the basis of all his representations, and yet it could hardly fail that a discourse devoted to such a subject, should be free from exaggeration and overstatement. At least it has struck us, that a great many of the positions assumed in this address, need to be somewhat modified to bring them down to the soberness of truth. We do not find in history any evidence of the progress of our race apart from the influence of revealed religion. It may well be questioned whether the civilization of any heathen nation, at the present day, is as advanced as that of the nations before the flood. Asia is far below the point she attained three thousand years ago. The civilization of Egypt in the time of Moses, was as advanced as that of the Greeks, who received and modified the impulse from the land of the Pharaohs. Greece was far more refined and elevated than her successor, Rome, in her proudest days of violence and triumph. Human society seems to move in a circle, not in a straight line. One nation rises, reaches its culmination and declines. Another gathers life from her ashes, and runs the same

round; making however no perceptible advance. It is only when Christianity enters into the number of causes which determine the course of the race, that progress becomes the obvious and settled law of its development. And such is the state of man since the fall, that even with the gospel, there would be no security for the advancement and melioration of society, were it not for the revealed purpose of God, that righteousness shall ultimately cover the whole earth.

The New Test of Christian Character Tested, or the Bible Doctrine of Temperance: Being a calm appeal to the sober and candid judgment of enlightened and upright men, in an humble plea for truth and reason, and an honest effort to prove that the doctrine of the universal moral obligation of "total abstinence" derives no countenance from the word of God, and is not permanently or truly promotive of the "cause of temperance" —but basing its efforts on false principles, is really an enemy to the cause. By W. L. Breckinridge, Frankfort, Ky.: A. G. Hodges, State Printer, 1842. pp. 44.

The views presented by the writer are worthy of serious consideration, and in our judgment he has rendered an important service to the cause of truth by giving them to the public.

In the course of his argument, one conducted with great ability, he discusses the following questions.

1. Does the Bible, our only rule on such subjects, represent the personal habit of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks as a Christian duty?

2. Does it represent associated effort, with a view to render that personal habit universal, as a Christian duty?

3. Do the total abstinence societies offer such a form of associated effort, as, according to the Bible, makes it every one's duty to take their pledge?

Mr. Breckinridge maintains the negative of these propositions, and for aught that we can see, he has shown that they are not true, at least not so far true as to involve the "universal moral obligation of total abstinence." On the other hand, we do not think that it follows, as a necessary inference, from the truths established by Mr. B., that there cannot exist in a community, a state of things in which it may not be duty to abstain, for the time being, from all use of wine and other lawful things, abstinence from which, in ordinary cases, is not required by the word of God, nor do

we understand Mr. B. as deducing any such inference; and we make the remark simply to prevent a possible misapprehension of our own views. Of the obligation to waive the exercise of his liberty every individual must judge for himself, and any attempt to coerce a compliance with the rules of the total abstinence societies, should be regarded as an infringement of our Christian liberty and ought to be firmly resisted, as has been done by the author of "The New Test Tested." In regard to what is duty in this matter, let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind, and let there be neither despising on the one part nor judging on the other.

There can be no doubt, that while the efforts of the total abstinence societies have done much good, they have also, as shown by Mr. B., done harm: and it is a problem of no easy solution to determine, whether on the whole they have not done as much injury as good. Yet we are by no means prepared to oppose all associated effort, by means of temperance societies, to check the progress of intemperance, or to exclude from the means proper to be employed the pledge of total abstinence, at least for specified terms.

Mr. Breckinridge seems to concur fully in the views advanced by the Rev. Dr. McCarell in his able discourses on this subject. While we agree with both these gentlemen, in many of their views, we are not prepared to adopt as our own all their forms of expression, yet we can with freedom commend their appeals "to the sober and candid judgment of enlightened and upright men."

The German Language. An Address delivered before the Goethean Literary Society of Marshall College. By John W. Nevin, D. D., Chambersburg: 1842. pp. 24.

We are glad to hear Professor Nevin say, that if called to speak of Goethe, "faithfulness to his own view of the subject would require the dark shades of his character to be brought forward with an unsparing hand." Of the genius of a man who was the idol of his nation solely on account of his literary productions, it would be idle to speak with disparagement. But no variety or force of talent can invest with permanent interest, a man, whose leading characteristic was a godless indifference to virtue and vice, to the happiness or misery of his race, to every thing in short, except self and beauty. In eulogizing the German language, Dr. Nevin found a far more important, and no doubt, far more congenial subject; one which we could

wish his discriminating and just eulogium may contribute to commend to a wider and more assiduous cultivation.

History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy, in the Sixteenth Century. By Thomas McCrie, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1842. pp. 412.

History of the Reformation in Spain, &c. By Thomas McCrie, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1842.

The Soul's Conflict and Victory over Itself by Faith. By Richard Sibbes, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1842. pp. 294.

The Nature, Power, Deceit, and Prevalency of Indwelling Sin in Believers. By John Swan, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1842. pp. 276.

These are among the more recent publications of our Board, and we content ourselves with merely giving their titles, for two reasons. The one is that they are works of established reputation and need no commendation; and the other is that we hope, in a future number to give a general survey of the operations of the Board, and to have a better opportunity than the present to speak of the various works which they have already issued. In the mean time we can only express our conviction that they are laying the church and the country under great obligations, by the wisdom and diligence with which they conduct the important work committed to their charge.

The Eloquence of the Pulpit, with Illustrations from St. Paul: An Oration before the Porter Rhetorical Society of the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass., 1842. By George W. Bethune, Minister of the Third Reformed Dutch Church, Philadelphia. Phila. pp. 63.

Every part of this discourse bears the characteristic impress of the author's hand. It is full of matter, and abounds in bold, and, we think, in most instances, just rebukes of prevalent faults in preachers. The multitude of allusions to ancient learning evinces scholarship, sometimes *ex abundanti;* for Dr. Bethune often quotes, where authority is needless, and where we could more willingly hear himself. His style is always easy, vivacious, and sometimes very strong: it is never tiresome. The rhetorical advices of the oration are in good taste, and here and there masterly. In

so diversified a discourse, to approve every thing, would savour of affectation; but we consider it a work which will make a strong impression; and there are none who need its pointed and witty animadversions more than the class of persons to whom it was delivered.

A Mother's Tribute to a beloved Daughter; or Memoir of Malvina Forman Smith. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1842.

MISS SMITH, grand-daughter of the late Rev. Dr. Griffin, was born Dec. 8, 1824, and died in the early part of the present year. She appears to have been one of those favoured children of God, distinguished by personal loveliness, mental superiority and sweetness of temper, sanctified and adorned by the graces of the Spirit. As the world contains nothing more lovely than such Christians, we know nothing more touching than the history of their patient suffering and early death. The reader of this memoir can hardly fail to mingle his tears with those of the immediate friends of the deceased, and to feel anew the power of that gospel which could make death attractive to one whom life seemed to promise all that this life can give.

Life and Writings of Ebenezer Porter Mason; interspersed with hints to parents and instructors on the training and education of a child of genius. By Denison Olmsted, Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy, in Yale College. New York: Dayton & Newman, 199 Broadway. 1842. pp. 252.

THIS work, by Professor Olmsted is a just tribute of respect to the memory of a favourite and most promising pupil, whose too eager pursuit of his favourite branch of study, brought to a premature end both his life and labours. Mr. Mason was but twenty-one years of age, at the time of his death, yet he had made great proficiency in practical and descriptive Astronomy, and gave abundant evidence of his possessing all the qualities required in an accurate observer. His drawing of telescopic appearances of four remarkable nebulæ, two of them in part or altogether his own discoveries, are, it is said, the most complete works of the kind extant. Just before his death he completed a work on Practical Astronomy. When but a little more than sixteen years of age he made observations on the solar spots of

1837, which were recorded and delineated in a manner that reflects the highest honour on this youthful observer. Mr. Mason also prepared a paper, with the title, "Telescopic Observations on the meteors of August, 1839," which has been published, since his decease, in the American Philosophical Transactions.

Among his other achievements, he constructed, while a member of the Sophomore class in Yale College, in connexion with two of his fellow-students, two reflecting telescopes, which appear to have realized the most sanguine expectations of these young votaries of science.

His attainments in the Mathematical science are represented by his friend and biographer as extraordinary; and in proof of his taste for poetry, and of his ability to shine in this department of literature, several of the productions of his muse are interspersed in the course of the narrative of his life, and they certainly possess sufficient merit to warrant the belief confidently expressed by his friends, that as a poet, too, he might have excelled. His moral qualities bore a fair proportion to his intellectual, and there is good reason to hope that he died a Christian.

Professor Olmsted, we think, has rendered a service to the cause of letters and science in our country, by the publication of this memorial of his pupil and friend, and we trust that a perusal of the Life and Writings of young Mason, will stimulate many a youth, in our different seminaries of learning, to emulate the untiring assiduity of this prematurely ripe scholar, and yet teach them, that it is paying too dear even for knowledge, to purchase it at the sacrifice of health and life.

Some Difficulties in the late Charge of the Lord Bishop of Oxford, respectfully pointed out in a letter to his Lordship. By William Goode, M. A., Trinity College, Cambridge, Rector of St. Antholin, London. First American from the second London edition. Philadelphia: Herman Hooker, 178 Chestnut street. 1842. pp. 31.

Those who have read the great work of Mr. Goode, reviewed in our last volume, or that admirable and unanswerable syllabus of his, entitled 'The Case Stated,' for both of which the public must thank Mr. Hooker, will know what to expect in this pamphlet; and they will not be disappointed.

Lectures in Divinity, by the late George Hill, D.D., Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. Edited from his manuscript, by his son, the Rev. Alexander Hill, minister of Dailly. Philadelphia: published by Herman Hooker. 1842.

FOR a number of years, Dr. Hill's Lectures in Divinity, have been in the hands of a few theologians in this country, and the estimation in which they were held was such, that a desire for their re-publication from the American press, has frequently been expressed, by one and another. This desideratum has now been supplied by Mr. Hooker, who has included the whole in one large, handsome octavo volume; so that this valuable work may be obtained by American theologians, at a very moderate price.

This work, though it still retains the title of "Lectures," is not published in that form, but has been reduced to books, and chapters. It was not published by Dr. Hill himself, and therefore labours under the disadvantage of being a posthumous work; yet it appears that he had intended to prepare it for the press, and a considerable part of it had been re-written, with that view.

As to the intrinsic value of these "Lectures," we are of opinion, that nothing of the kind has ever been published in the English language, superior to them. They are characterized by a depth and vigour of thought, and by an extent of erudition which may rightfully claim for them a high place among standard works of orthodox theology. Candour and impartiality are also manifest in every part of the discussion. In stating the opinions and arguments of opponents, there is exhibited no unfairness, but they are presented in their full strength, and under the most favourable aspect. The work is both didactic and controversial; but the controversy is free from every tincture of asperity; and is a model of thorough and dignified discussion of the most important points in theology.

The work is systematic; but does not comprehend a complete system of divinity. The author had objections to all the forms of systematic theology which are in use, and therefore struck out a plan for himself. This we regret, as we believe these lectures would have been more useful had he adopted the plan in which systems of theology are most commonly written; as in that case he would have furnished —what is still a desideratum in English—a compend of theology, suitable to be put into the hands of students. We

have, however, one advantage from the plan adopted by the author; important points are more extensively and thoroughly discussed, than they could have been in a complete system of divinity.

After giving his reasons for not adopting either the common systematic form, or what he calls the *scientific* form, he says, "For these reasons, I resolved neither to follow the ordinary systems of theology, nor to adopt the more scientific mode of classing the opinions that distinguish different sects of Christians. The plan of my course is this: Out of the mass of matter that is found in the system, I select the great subjects which have agitated and divided the minds of those who profess to build their faith on the same scriptures. I consider every one of these subjects separately: I present the whole train and progress of opinions that have been held concerning it; and I state the grounds upon which they rest, passing slightly over those opinions which are now forgotten, or whose extravagance prevents any danger of their being revived; dwelling upon those whose plausibility gave them, at any time, a general possession of the minds of men, or which still retain their influence among some denominations of Christians."

A better idea of the work, however, will be derived from a brief analysis of the contents of the six books, into which it is divided. The first book is occupied with the Evidences of Christianity. The second book treats of Inspiration,—of the peculiar doctrines of Christianity,—of the infinite importance of Christianity,—of the difficulties in the scripture system,—of the use of reason in religion,—of controversies,—and, of the arrangement of the course. The third book treats of the Trinity. The fourth book treats of the nature, extent, and application of the remedy brought by the gospel. The fifth book contains "an Index of particular questions arising out of opinions concerning the gospel remedy, and of many of the technical terms of theology. The sixth gives a view of the different systems of church government.

The Guilt and Consequences of Duelling. A Sermon, delivered October 30, 1842. By Shepard K. Kollock, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Burlington, N. J.

We learn, by an advertisement prefixed to this discourse, the occasion on which it was delivered, and the reason of its publication. It appears that two young men, attached to the Navy of the United States, together with their sec-

onds, came from another State, into New Jersey, to settle a private quarrel, according to the usages and laws of the code of honour, (falsely so called,) and that they selected the precincts of the city of Burlington as the scene of their barbarous combat. A more unsuitable place for such iniquitous proceedings could not have been found in the United States; for a more pacific and orderly population nowhere exists. It is not wonderful, therefore, that the spirit of this peaceful city should have been stirred within them to an unusual degree of excitement, when they understood that a duel had been fought within the very precincts of their city; and that by a couple of youngsters, who are supported by the funds of the country, whose sentiments and laws they set at defiance. A public meeting was therefore called, on the 4th day of November, 1842, when a committee of four was appointed to prepare resolutions, to be laid before the meeting, who brought in the following report: "Whereas, the peace of the city of Burlington has recently been disturbed, and the laws of the State of New Jersey set at defiance, by certain persons engaged in a duel within our limits, we esteem it our right and duty, as good citizens, in public meeting convened, to testify against this outrage," which they did in a number of spirited resolutions. From the seventh of the resolutions, it appears that the Rev. Shepard K. Kollock had already preached a sermon on the subject of duelling, the publication of which was requested by this public meeting.

The sermon itself was most seasonable, and contains a forcible and impressive view of the sin and folly of this detestable practice, which is still upheld in this civilized country, by the sentiments and practice of a certain class of men, who are not contented with the protection of the laws of the country; but when their pride is wounded, or when they suppose they have received an insult for which blood is the only atonement, in defiance of all laws human and divine, challenge their antagonist to mortal combat, with deadly weapons. If those men who countenance duelling were only found among the more contemptible classes of society, the evil would not be so great; but they are mostly of the higher and more respectable classes; and very often in our army or navy; or, what is more lamentable still, in our legislative halls. The very men whom we select to make our laws, and to provide punishments for the guilty, often set the example of the most deliberate and wicked transgression of the laws of the country.

We are gratified, that Mr. Kollock comes out boldly, and denounces the practice of duelling with a proper spirit of indignation; and we cordially recommend the perusal of his discourse to our readers.

It is pretended, by the advocates of this practice, that public sentiment is in favour of it; so that a gentleman, whatever may be his private opinion, must fight under certain circumstances, or be forever disgraced. Now this is a calumny against the public. The truth is, that there are ninety-nine out of a hundred, in the community, who are utterly opposed to the practice.

One thing may and ought to be done, to put a stop to this diabolical custom. LET EVERY MAN WHO CONSIDERS IT INIMICAL TO THE PEACE OF SOCIETY, RESOLVE NEVER TO GIVE HIS VOTE TO PUT ANY CANDIDATE INTO ANY CIVIL OFFICE, WHO IS KNOWN TO COUNTENANCE DUELLING.

The Sinner's Friend. From the eighty-seventh London Edition, completing upwards of half a million. New York: Robert Carter, 58 Canal street. 1843. pp. 96.

WE extract the following from the title page: "The Sinner's Friend, is now printed in SIXTEEN different languages: English, Welsh, Irish, Manx, Gaelic, French, German, Russian, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Malay, Arabic, Hebrew, Bengalee and Tahitian." We deem it unnecessary to say more.

A Treatise on the Incarnation of the Eternal Word. Newburgh: David L. Proudfit. New York: Robert Carter, 58 Canal St. 1842.

THIS Treatise originally appeared as a review in an Edinburgh periodical, and has been re-written for separate publication. It is an able and forcibly written vindication of the necessity of the Incarnation, and of the perfect freedom from sin of the human nature of our Lord, derived from the nature of his offices, as Prophet, Priest and King.

Mary Lundie Duncan; being recollections of a daughter by her mother. From the second Edinburgh edition. New York: R. Carter, 58 Canal St. 1842.

To the lovers of religious biography, this little work will prove a rich treat. It is very rarely that we are so happy as to see such endowments of person, of intellect, and of heart,

as were combined in the remarkable subject of this memoir. She was one of those gifted beings, whose rapid and beautiful development, and early departure, we regard with indescribable emotions—almost as if it were a transient visitor, from a higher and purer world. The style of the memoir, is admirably in keeping with the character of its subject. It is written by the mother, whose piety and intellectual endowments seem scarcely inferior to those of her daughter. Altogether we have been charmed with the book; and cordially recommend it to our readers.

The Assembly's Shorter Catechism, illustrated by appropriate anecdotes, &c. By John Whitecross, Teacher, Edinburgh. New York: Robert Carter, 58 Canal St. 1842. pp. 180.

THIS is a book interesting from its very singularity. The idea of illustrating the doctrines of creation, providence, and redemption by anecdotes, is surely an original one. To children, and the lovers of anecdotes it will doubtless prove attractive.

Christ our Law. By Caroline Fry. New York: Robert Carter, 58 Canal St. 1842. pp. 272.

THE title of this book led us to expect an exhibition of the precepts and example of Christ, as the rule of Christian obedience. It is however a treatise, in successive chapters, on the Sovereignty of God; the Incarnation and Substitution of the Son of God; on his Justifying righteousness; on Responsibility; on Regeneration; on Saving Faith; on the Obedience of Faith; on Repentance unto life; on Sanctifying grace: on Holy ordinances; on Union and Communion with Christ. It is piously written, in a vivacious style, and in the main orthodox. We think few men would undertake to write a book on all the leading doctrines of Law or Medicine, who had not made those doctrines the objects of professional study, and we do not see why Theology should not have the benefit of the same respect. Though Miss Fry is a woman of talents, and her book we hope will be useful, yet we could not help feeling, while reading it, the wisdom of the apostle's canon, "I suffer not a woman to teach."

A Pictorial History of France. By S. G. Goodrich, author of Peter Parley's Tales. Philadelphia: published by Samuel Agnew. 1842.

Peter Parley needs no introduction to our readers. We proceed, therefore, to say that this is likely to be one of the most useful of all his books. We concur in the opinion which we see expressed by many experienced teachers, that this is the best compend of French history we have for the use of schools, and juvenile readers generally. It is comprehensive, accurate, remarkably simple, and enlivened by anecdotes. The pictorial feature of the work consists in profile heads of the French monarchs, and other celebrated characters who figure in the text, in cuts showing the costume of the several ages, both of which are interesting, and in some fancy sketches of battles and other scenes, which may perhaps amuse children. In the mechanical execution of the book Mr. Agnew has shown both taste and skill. It is, in this respect, a good specimen of what school books ought to be.

Travels in North India: containing Notices of the Hindus; Journals of a Voyage on the Ganges and a Tour in Lahor; Notes on the Himalaya Mountains and the Hill Tribes. Including a Sketch of Missionary undertakings. By the Rev. John C. Lowrie, Assistant Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1842. 18mo. pp. 256.

The respected author of this volume, once a missionary abroad, and now equally useful in the same work at home, has here given us an account of that interesting country, which has been opened to our knowledge by our beloved brethren who have gone thither with the gospel. The reader will find in it abundance of interesting fact, fitted to awaken new zeal and affection in regard to the operations of our Mission-Board; and a cause which should be dear to every Christian heart in this connexion.

Campbell's Foreign Monthly Magazine, or Select Miscellany of the Periodical Literature of Great Britain. Philadelphia: James M. Campbell, 98 Chestnut St.

The periodicals of the present day, form so important a feature of our current literature, that it is very desirable to

have a general acquaintance with the best portion of them. We suppose, therefore, that we are doing a favour to our readers, in apprizing them of the existence and character of the above named magazine. From the ample issues of the British Periodical Press, Mr. Campbell presents to his readers a selection, which will amount to more than twelve hundred large octavo pages a year,—in double columns, and in a close, but clear and distinct type. His selections from the leading reviews, we think very judicious; while lighter articles will be found as entertaining, instructive and harmless, as such reading can well be. It is surely a great favour, to have a gentleman of education and taste, to examine for us the whole mass of periodical literature, select that portion which is most worthy of our perusal, and then furnish it to us, at a price greatly less than the original cost of its production.

Miscellanies. By Stephen Collins, M. D. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart. 1842. 12mo. pp. 308.

THIS modest volume is not a religious work, but bears on every part of it the characters of a religious mind. In addition to the refinement of literary habits which everywhere reveals itself, in these short essays, there is a Christian benignity which is very winning, and which, we doubt not a moment, belongs to the author. It is to be regretted that so many of the papers are too short to allow the essayist to rise on the wing; their average length being only eleven pages. There is much for special commendation in the sketches of Cowper, Brainard, Summerfield, Physick, Newbold, and the Deaf Elder. And from beginning to end, while there is too little of sparkling point to please the reigning taste, there is not a period which could offend the chastest mind.

The Marriage Question: or the lawfulness of Marrying the Sister of a deceased wife considered. By Parsons Cooke. Boston: 1842.

MR. COOKE, as one of the Editors of the New England Puritan, published in that paper a series of articles, in which he endeavoured to prove the lawfulness of the marriage of a man to the sister of his deceased wife. These articles he has been induced to revise and publish in a pamphlet, together with some other pieces on the same subject, by other writers.

We had the purpose to review this pamphlet, but circumstances prevented the execution of that purpose, which was never very strong. We could not persuade ourselves that any body could be convinced by it. We can understand how a man can doubt whether the Levitical law of marriage is binding upon us; we can understand how, admitting the obligation of the law, he may doubt whether this particular marriage is forbidden, but we cannot understand how any man can deny that the eighteenth and twentieth chapters of Leviticus relate to marriage, or even include it. There have been cases in which one man is right and all the world wrong. But in such cases the one man had either means of knowledge not accessible to the others; or he was free from the judicial blindness by which all the rest were smitten. It is not to be presumed that Mr. Cooke has more knowledge on this subject than all other men; nor can we suppose that the whole Jewish and Christian church have, in relation to this point, been given up to strong delusion, to believe a lie. The attempt, therefore, to prove, in opposition to the unanimous judgment of the Jewish and Christian church, that these chapters have no reference to marriage is Quixotic, and the execution is what might be expected from the attempt.

This pamphlet contains the article published a few months since in the New York Observer, signed Omicron. As this article is the ablest, and has proved the most effective argument in favour of the lawfulness of the marriage in question, it deserves a much more extended examination than we can now give it. After a few preliminary remarks the writer confines his attention to two points. The first is the meaning of the general prohibition contained in Lev. xviii. 6. "No man shall approach to any that is near of kin to him to uncover their nakedness;" or as Omicron translates it literally, "No man shall approach to any flesh of his flesh, to uncover their nakedness."—The question is what does this mean?

It is plain that much depends on the decision of this question. If the phrase "flesh of his flesh," means blood-kin only, then the law merely prohibits the marriage of blood-relations; but if the phrase includes affinity, or relationship by marriage; then the law forbids the intermarriage of those nearly related to each other, whether by consanguity or affinity. Omicron arrives at the conclusion that "philology confines the prohibition to blood-kindred."

The correctness of this conclusion we more than doubt. The word flesh is used, as might be expected, in various senses, literal and figurative. It is enough for our purpose to notice the following. It is on all hands admitted that it designates the near blood-relationship of parents and children, brothers and sisters, who are of one blood, and of one flesh. Thus Judah said of Joseph, "He is our brother, and our flesh." Gen. xxxvii. 27. It is then used for more distant blood relations, as in Lev. xx. 19; and in Gen. xxix. 14, Laban said to Jacob, "Thou art my bone and my flesh." It was used for any blood relation to which the inheritance of a man in default of sons and brothers, was to go, Num. xxvii. 11, and who had the right of redemption, Lev. xxv. 49. In a still wider sense it expresses the relationship of those who were of the same tribe. Thus, David said to the elders of Judah, Ye are my bones and my flesh, 2 Sam. xix. 12. And in a sense yet wider, as when "All the tribes of Israel said to David, Behold, we are thy bone and thy flesh." And finally it expresses the relationship in which any one man stands to any other man, as in Is. lviii. 7, where *thy flesh* means *thy fellow-man.*

The word, therefore, though properly expressive of consanguinity, is in fact used for the wide range of relationships, from the nearest blood-kindred to the general relationship of men, as having a common nature and common origin. A word thus comprehensive cannot be tied down to indicate exclusively the near connexion between blood-relations, in our sense of the term. To say the least, it may include any relationship in which one man can stand to another. What it does mean in any particular case, must be decided by the context. The question then is, what is meant when it is said, a man shall not approach to any that is flesh of his flesh? A man is forbidden to marry any that is of his own flesh or kin, that is, he is forbidden to marry the relations specified in the following verses. Omicron admits, that all that follows this general prohibition in v. 6, "is the amplification and application of this general rule, showing what degrees of nearness of kin constitute a bar to marriage." The following verses are therefore the inspired authoritative explanation of the meaning of the words *flesh of his flesh*, or *near of kin.* Let us then look at these verses. In v. 7 it is said a man shall not marry his own mother; v. 8, he shall not marry his step-mother. There is no blood connexion between a man and his step-mother. It

is a relationship arising out of marriage, and therefore a relationship by affinity. In v. 9, a sister; in v. 10, a granddaughter; v. 11, a half-sister; v. 12, paternal aunt; v. 13, maternal aunt, are prohibited. These are all blood relations. But in the following verses, 14, 15, 16, 17, an uncle's wife, a son's wife, brother's wife, wife's mother, daughter and grand-daughter, are forbidden; and these are all cases of mere affinity. We have then no less than seven cases of relationship by affinity specified in this list, viz. step-mother, uncle's wife, daughter-in-law, sister-in-law, (brother's wife,) and wife's mother, daughter and grand-daughter. If then, as is admitted, these verses are intended to explain and amplify the general prohibition that a man shall not approach any who is of his flesh, then it is undeniable, that the words "flesh of his flesh," are here used to include affinity as well as consanguinity. In accounting for the fact that "one's own daughter" is not specified, Omicron says, "no one could doubt that my own daughter is 'flesh of my flesh,' yet it might be a question whether my step-daughter is to be so regarded." The latter, therefore, is mentioned, v. 17, though the former is omitted. According to his own showing, therefore, the phrase in question includes affinity as well as consanguinity.

There seems to us to be an obvious inconsistency in Omicron's statements on this subject. He first says, the word *flesh* is used only of blood-kindred. He then says, that the verses following the 6th, are intended to show what is meant by flesh of his flesh, or near of kin. And finally that a man's step-mother, step-daughter, uncle's wife, brother's wife, &c., are all regarded as "flesh of his flesh." Yet not one of these is a blood-relation. It is true, he makes a distinction between affinity by blood, and affinity by marriage. On this distinction we would make two remarks. The first is, that, as far as regards the point in hand, the distinction is not only arbitrary, but unmeaning. Relationships are divided into two classes, those arising from common descent, and those arising from marriage; the former are by blood, the latter by affinity. What is not of the one, belongs to the latter. The only relation between a man and his step-mother, or his brother's wife, or his uncle's wife, is by marriage; it is a relation by affinity and nothing else. And if these relationships are, as is admitted, included in the general prohibition in v. 6, then, by Omicron's own showing, the phrase "flesh of his flesh," does

not designate blood-kindred only, but includes "affinity, or relationship by marriage," which is the very thing which we understand him to deny.

The second remark we would make on this distinction is, that if admitted, it does not serve his purpose. That is it cannot serve the purpose of showing that the word flesh is used only of blood kindred. For not only women married to my blood-relations, but blood-relations of my own wife, are included in the prohibition, and therefore, according to the principles admitted by Omicron, the latter, no less than the former, are in scriptural language flesh of my flesh. Yet the latter are connected to me only by affinity, in the strictest sense of the word.

If, therefore, verses 7—17 are the explanation of verse 6, there can be no doubt that relations by affinity are near kindred in the sense in which the word is there used. And as in v. 17 it is declared to be wicked for a man to marry the near kindred of his wife, the only question is, what degree of nearness is, by divine appointment, a bar to marriage.

The 18th verse, it is said, admits the lawfulness of the marriage of a man with the sister of a deceased wife, and therefore that particular relationship cannot be included in the general prohibition. The meaning of that verse is the second point to which Omicron directs his attention. The passage he reads thus; "And a wife to her sister thou shalt not take to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides her, in her life time." According to one interpretation of this verse, it means, "Thou shalt not take one wife to another, during her lifetime." Thus understood, it is a direct prohibition of polygamy. To this interpretation Omicron suggests two objections, the one historical, the other philological. The historical objection is, that polygamy, to a certain extent, continued to prevail among the Jews; and that Moses himself made laws to regulate it. This objection is undoubtedly a strong one; and yet not decisive, for it is certain that the Mosaic laws were in other cases often disregarded. And the regulation of polygamy as an existing custom is no more inconsistent with a general prohibition of it, than the regulation of divorce with the recorded institution of marriage by God in the beginning, as an indissoluble contract between one man and one woman. Moses, as expounded by our Saviour, tells us that God commanded a man to cleave to his wife, and not to put her away for

any cause, save one; and yet he made laws to regulate divorce. Why then might he not give a general condemnation of polygamy, and yet prescribe how the parties should act, where it in fact existed? While, therefore, we admit the force of this objection, it would not be sufficient to overthrow the plain meaning of the words.

But it is said that this is not the meaning of the words, that the philological objection to the interpretation given above is not less serious than the historical one. It is admitted that the phrase, "a woman to her sister," in all other places in which it occurs, means one to another, but it is said that in all such cases, it has a reciprocal distributive force, that it is always preceded by a plural nominative; as in Ex. xxvi. 3., the curtains one to another; and Ezek. i. 9, the wings one to another. This is true; (though Ezek. xxxviii. 21, is an apparent exception,) and if the interpretation rested exclusively upon the idiomatic use of the phrase would be a sufficient answer. But the interpretation rests not on the usage of the compound phrase alone, but on that of the detached words *brother* and *sister* in the sense of neighbour, fellow man, or woman. This usage is so common that if the sacred writer had intended to say, one woman to another, it is hard to see how he could have done it in a manner more accordant to the usage of the language, than by saying as he has here done, a woman to her sister. We are not disposed, however, to contend for this interpretation, for in our view very little depends upon it.

Omicron is greatly mistaken when he says, that if the words here used mean wife and sister, "this verse, as all agree, settles the question." So far from this being the case, we presume that two out of three of all the opposers of the lawfulness of the marriage of a man to the sister of a deceased wife, agree with him in the exposition of those words. Perhaps the most commonly received interpretation of the passage is, that it forbids taking one sister to another to vex her all her life, or as long as she lives. In other words, the clause *her lifetime*, is referred to the nearer and not to the more remote verb. It is then not a prohibition, but a restriction of polygamy; a declaration that if a man has two wives they must not be sisters; the one to make the other miserable as long as she lives. This is the view given by Calvin, Patrick, Gill, Prof. Bush and others, all of whom regard the marriage under consideration as unlawful. We cannot in this short notice go into the details of the exegesis of

this verse, which, simple as it appears in English, is singularly obscure in the Hebrew. It is enough for our purpose to show that Omicron is mistaken in supposing that all who adopt his interpretation of the words "wife to her sister," agree as to the inference to be drawn from the passage. The most common interpretation is, as just stated, that it prohibits taking one sister to another, to make her miserable as long as she lives. And in this view the passage does not contain the slightest intimation that the one sister may be married after the death of the other.

For ourselves we are prepared to go one step further. You may interpret this verse as you please. You may make it not merely imply but directly assert that the marriage of a man with the sister of his deceased wife, was lawful for the Jews, it would not, in our view, be the less unlawful for us. We speak now on the assumption of the continued obligation of the Levitical law of marriage, which ever has been, and still is, the general law of Christendom on this subject. No man, who believes in the continued obligation of that law, doubts that, although the childless widow of one brother might be lawfully married by a surviving brother, such a marriage would now be unlawful. That is, no man doubts that an exception was made, for specific reasons, in the case of the Jews, of the amplication of the general law, which reasons do not apply to our case; and, therefore, what was lawful for them, is not lawful for us. If this is so in one instance, it may be so in another.

Our view of this matter may be stated in very few words. God has expressly forbidden a man to marry any of his near kindred. This is the general rule, and the only question is as to its application. This question cannot be determined in any case by mere arbitrary inferences, or by varying views of expediency. It must be determined by the exposition and application of the law given in the word of God. He has himself taught us how it is to be applied. When we come to look at the exposition and application given by the sacred writer, of the general principle laid down in Leviticus xviii. 6, we find that the rule of application is not consanguinity, because in many cases he forbids marriage between parties related only by affinity. It is not *respectus parentelae* which forbids our placing in the relation of a wife, one whom we ought to look up to with something like parental affection; for we are forbidden not only to marry a mother-in-law or aunt, but also a step-

daughter or daughter-in-law. It is not a *horror naturalis*, for this in a great degree arises out of the prohibition, and not the prohibition out of that. It is not a regard for the animal perfection of the race, for that would confine the prohibitions to near blood-kindred, whereas they include many cases of affinity. But it is a regard for domestic purity. The law forbids marriage between the members of the same family; that is, between those who by the usages of society are allowed to associate together as members of the same household. This is acknowledged by the advocates and opponents of the lawfulness of the particular marriage under consideration. It is admitted by Michaelis, who says the usage of wearing the veil, drew the line of demarcation. No man was allowed to marry any woman who was so nearly related to him as to be allowed to appear unveiled before him. We quote a single passage from Maimonides, the highest Jewish authority, to show two things, First, that he made intimate domestic intercourse the ground of the prohibitions contained in Lev. xviii. 6–17, and secondly, that he considered affinity to be included in the phrase "of his flesh," In his More Nevochim, part iii. ch. xlix. he says, Congressuum illicitorum cum foeminis una ferè est ratio, haec videlicet; quòd propemodùm singulae utplurimùm in eadem domo commorentur cum viro illo, cui sunt prohibitea, &c. Again, Vir qui uxorem habet, ferè semper apud se habet ejus matrem, aviam, filiam, neptem, aut sororem, subindeque in illas incidit, quando exit, ingreditur, et negotia sua expedit. . . . . Et hi sunt omnes concubitus propinquorum carnis. A little after, he says, Fratres se habent ut radix et ramus; hinc quia prohibita est soror, prohibita etiam est *soror uxoris* et *uxor fratris*. The examination of the details, from verse 7 to 17, shows that the law was intended to apply to all domestic relations, that is, as just stated, to all relations who were accustomed to live together as one family. The cases expressly mentioned are, mother, step-mother, sister, grand-daughter, half-sister, father's sister, mother's sister, paternal uncle's wife, son's wife, brother's wife, wife's mother, daughter and grand-daughter. All these relations were among the Jews and other Orientals, accustomed to live together as one family, more or less extended; often in the same house or the same tents. It arose out of the patriarchal institutions that the sons clung around the father, and the daughters were given in marriage and became members of the families of their husbands. Hence the in-

tercourse of a nephew with the wife of his paternal uncle, was far more frequent and intimate than with the wife of his maternal uncle; and the intercourse of a brother was more intimate with the wife of his brother, than with the sister of his wife. We find therefore a paternal uncle's wife and a brother's wife specified in the prohibitions, while the corresponding relations are passed over in silence. We cannot, therefore, resist the conclusion that it is the law of God that a man should not marry any of his οἰκειαι, that is, the members of his own family, those who are accustomed to associate with him on the terms of domestic intimacy. The application of this law is determined not by arbitrary inference or general expediency, but turns on a matter of fact. The only question is, Whether the sister of a man's wife is his sister? Does he call her sister? does she call him brother? is their intercourse such as to give rise to brotherly and sisterly affection? is their relation such as to give her the right to a sister's place in his household? If so, it is a violation of the law of God, as we understand it, for them to intermarry.

We regard the dignified and able argument of Omicron, with so much respect, that we have waited long in hopes that some one better qualified and with more leisure, would reply to it. As no one appears disposed to do so, we have felt constrained, at the eleventh hour, and in a hurried manner, to state the reasons why we still believe the rule given in our Confession of Faith, is, as to the great principle involved, in accordance with the word of God.

Letters on the Subject and Mode of Baptism, in two parts. By J. T. Hendrick, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Millersburgh and Carlisle, Ky. Millersburgh: 1842. pp. 196.

THE letters furnish an outline of the opinions entertained in the different ages of the Church, with respect both to the subjects and mode of baptism. The work is very well suited to answer the avowed purpose of the writer, and exhibits considerable care and judgment in the selection of the materials, and in conducting the argument. Of the philological part of the work, however, we are not prepared to express an unqualified approval. Mr. Hendricks has freely availed himself of the labours of others, his obligations to whom he fully acknowledges. This work by Mr. Hendricks, may be safely recommended as a useful manual, on the subjects of which it treats.

CONTENTS OF NO. I.