





No. 525





THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

1845.

VOL. XVII.

PHILADELPHIA:

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

JOHN T. ROBINSON, PRINTER, PRINCETON.



CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVII.

NO. I.

January

<p>ART. I.—1. The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Nonconformists; from the Reformation in 1517, to the Revolution in 1698; comprising an account of their principles; their attempts for a further Reformation in the church; their sufferings; and the Lives and Characters of their most considerable Divines. By Daniel Neal, M. A., reprinted from the text of Dr. Toulmin's edition: with his life of the author and account of his writings. Revised, corrected, and enlarged, with additional notes by John O. Choules, M. A.</p> <p>2. The Prose works of John Milton; with an Introductory Review. By Robert Fletcher.</p>	1
<p>Art. II.—Religion in America; or an account of the Origin, Progress, Relation to the State, and Present Condition of the Evangelical Churches in the United States. With notices of the Unevangelical Denominations. By Robert Baird, author of "L'Union de l'Eglise avec l'Etat dans la Nouvelle Angleterre."</p>	17
<p>ART.—III.—Sacerdotal Absolution; a Sermon, preached before the Convention of the Diocese of North Carolina, 1843. By the Rev. M. A. Curtis, Rector of St. Matthew's Church, Hillsborough, N. C.</p>	43
<p>ART. IV.—India and India Missions, including Sketches of the gigantic System of Hinduism, both in Theory and Practice; also Notices of some of the principal agencies employed in conducting the Process of Indian evangelization, &c. &c. By the Rev. Alexander Duff, D. D.</p>	61
<p>ART. V.—Christ, The only Sacrifice: or the Atonement in its Relations to God and Man. By Nathan S. S. Beman, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Troy, N. Y. With an Introductory chapter by Samuel Hanson Cox, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.</p>	84
<p>ART. VI.—Anastasis; or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, Rationally and Scripturally considered. By George Bush, Professor of Hebrew in the New York City University.</p>	138
<p>ART. VII.—A Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. By Martin Luther.</p> <p>History of the Reformation in Europe.</p> <p>Rabbah Taken: or the Theological System of the Rev. Alexander Campbell, examined and refuted.</p> <p>A Sermon delivered at the Installation of the Rev. John M. P. Atkinson,</p> <p>The Claims of Religion on Medical Men.</p>	

Contents.

The First Part of Jacob's Latin Reader, adapted to Bullion's Latin Grammar.	
Practical Lessons in English Grammar and Composition; for young Beginners.	
A Treatise on International Law,	
The Poor Man's Morning Portion.	
Meditations and Contemplations.	
The Blessings yet left us.	
A History of the Siege of Londonderry, and Defence of Enniskillen in 1688, 1689.	
Barbarities of Rome in the Nineteenth Century.	
Memoirs and Remains of Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne.	
A Memoir of John Huss.	
The voice of the Church One, under all the successive forms of Christianity.	
On the Miraculous and Internal Evidences of the Christian Revelation, and the Authority of its Records.	
The Old Sea Captain. By Old Humphrey.	
Barnes's Notes on Job.	
Translation of Turretin.	182

NO. II.

APRIL

ART. I.—The Life of Isaac Milner, D. D., F. R. S., Dean of Carlisle, President of Queen's College, and Professor of Mathematics in the University of Cambridge, &c. By his niece, Mary Milner, author of the "Christian Mother."	191
ART. II.—A Treatise on the Church of Christ; designed chiefly for the use of Students in Theology. By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford. With a preface and notes, by the Rt. Rev. W. R. Wittingham, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Maryland. 215	215
ART. III.—Histoire de la Chute des Jésuites, Au xviii. Siecle (1750–1782.) Par le Cte Alexis De Saint-Priest, Pair De France. 239	239
ART. IV.—Pensées, Fragments, et Lettres de Blaise Pascal, publiés pour la première fois conformément aux manuscrits originaux en grand partie inédits, par M. Prosper Faugère.	252
ART. V.—The Arguments of Romanists from the Infallibility of the Church and Testimony of the Fathers in behalf of the Apocrypha, discussed and refuted. By James H. Thornwell, Professor of Sacred Literature and the Evidences of Christianity in the South Carolina College.	268
ART. VI.—The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., late Head-Master of Rugby School, and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, M. A., Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxford.	283
ART. VIII.—1. Principal Documents relating to the Survey of the Coast of the United States since 1816. Published by F. R. Hassler, Superintendent of the Survey.	

2. Executive Congressional Documents since 1832.
 3. First Report of Professor A. D. Bache, Superintendent of the Coast Survey, showing the Progress of the Word during the year ending November, 1844. 321

ART. IX.—The Odyssey of Homer, according to the text of Wolf; with notes.
 A Treatise on the Forces which produce the organization of Plants. By John William Draper, M. D.,
 A Commentary on the Book of Psalms, etc.
 Chemistry, as exemplifying the wisdom and beneficence of God.
 Journal of Prison Discipline and Philanthropy.
 Critical Exposition of Baptism.
 An Essay towards an Easy, Plain, Practical, and Extensive Explication of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism.
 Christian Experience as displayed in the Life and Writings of St. Paul.
 Civil Wars of Rome.
 The World's Religion, as contrasted with genuine Christianity.
 Advice to a Young Christian.
 A World without Souls.
 The Romish and Prelatical Rite of Confirmation Examined.
 The Communicant's Companion.
 The Divine Origin of Christianity.
 The House of God.
 Systematic Benevolence.
 Necessity of the Atonement. 344

NO. III. *John*

ART. I.—Sketches of Residence and Travels in Brazil, embracing historical and geographical notices of the Empire and its several provinces. By Daniel P. Kidder. In two volumes—with illustrations. 357

ART. II.—The Mysteries opened; or Scriptural views of preaching, and the Sacraments, as distinguished from certain theories concerning Baptismal Regeneration and the Real Presence. By the Rev. John Stone, D.D. Rector of Christ Church, Brooklyn, New York. 381

ART. III.—Theopnusty. By S. R. L. Gaussen, Professor of Theology at Geneva. 409

ART. IV.—The General Assembly of 1845. 428

ART. V.—1. A new and complete Concordance to the Holy Scriptures on the basis of Cruden, with an Introduction. By the Rev. David King, LL.D., Minister of Greyfriars church, Glasgow.
 2. A complete Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance to the Old Testament, comprising also a condensed Hebrew-English Lexicon, with an Introduction and Appendices. By Dr. Isaac Nordheimer, Prof. of Oriental Languages in the University of New York, assisted by Wm. Wadden Turner. Part 1st.

3. The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, being an attempt at a verbal connexion between the Original and the English translation, with Indexes, &c. &c. 471
- ART. VI.—The Life of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M., with the Life of the Rev. Charles Wesley, A. M. By John Whitehead, M. D. Christ on the Cross. An Exposition of the Twenty-Second Psalm.
- The Life and Power of True Godliness: described in a Series of Discourses.
- Discourses on Practical and Experimental Subjects.
1. Class book of Poetry: consisting of Selections from distinguished English and American Poets.
 2. Class Book of Prose: consisting of Selections from distinguished English and American Authors.
- A Practical Manual of Elocution: embracing Voice and Gesture.
- The Tenth Annual Report of the Association for the Religious instruction of the Negroes, in Liberty County, Ga.
- A Commentary on the Apocalypse.
- Plato against the Atheists.
- Some account of the Apples of Sodom, found on the shores of the Dead Sea.
1. Observations on Colour Blindness, or insensibility to the impression of certain Colours.
 2. Memoir on Daltonism, (or Colour Blindness.)
- Sketches of Protestantism in Italy, past and present, including a notice of the Origin, History, and present state of the Waldenses.
- Hart's Grammar. 477

NO. IV.

- ART. I.—The Apostles' doctrine and fellowship: Five Sermons preached in the principal churches of his diocese, during his spring visitation, 1844. By the Right Rev. L. Silliman Ives, D.D. LL.D., Bishop of North Carolina. Published by the unanimous request of his Convention. 491
- ART. II.—Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation. 505
- ART. III.—The Vaudois: Comprising observations made during a tour to the Valleys of Piedmont, in the summer of 1844: together with remarks, introductory and interspersed, respecting the origin, history, and present condition of that interesting people. By E. Henderson, D.D. 557
- ART. IV.—Calvin's Institutes. Presbyterian Board of Publication. 572
- ART. V.—Proceedings of the meeting in Charleston, S. C., May 13—15, 1845, on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes, together with the Report of the Committee and the Address to the public. Published by order of the meeting. 590
- ART. VI.—1. Des Classes Dangereuses de la Population dans les grandes villes, et moyens de les rendre meilleures. Par H. A. Frégier,

Chef de Bureau a la Prefecture de la Seine.

2. The Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of New York; with suggestions for its improvement. By John H. Griscom, M. D. Fellow of the College of Physicians and Surgeons; Physician of the New York Hospital; late Physician of the City and Eastern Dispensaries. 606

ART. VII.—Principle of Protestantism as related to the present state of the Church. By Philip Schaf, Ph. D. Professor of Church History and of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church Translated from the German with an Introduction. By John W. Nevin, D. D.

An Examination of President Edwards' Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will. By Albert Taylor Bledsoe.

The Works of the Rev. Richard Cecil.

Elements of Rhetoric and Literary Criticism.

Reasons for Repose.

The Raising of Lazarus from the Dead.

Life in Earnest. By Rev. James Hamilton.

Profession is not Principle; or the name of Christian is not Christianity.

Christian Retirement; or Spiritual Exercises of the Heart.

The Letters of the Rev. John Newton, &c., to which are prefixed, Memoirs of his Life, &c. By the Rev. Richard Cecil.

Alleine's Gospel Promises.

Spiritual Direction, and Auricular Confession. By M. Michélet.

D'Aubigné's History of the Great Reformation.

1. Papal Rome as it is; by a Roman.

2. History of the Robe of Jesus Christ, preserved in the Cathedral of Trêves. By J. Maux.

Internal Evidence of the Holy Bible. By Rev. J. J. Janeway, D. D.

Rills from the Fountain of Wisdom, or the Book of Proverbs, arranged and illustrated. By William M. Engles, D. D.

Memoirs of Mrs. Sarah Savage, Mrs. Anne Hulton, and Mrs. Eleanor Radnor, daughters of the Rev. Philip Henry.

Five discourses on the moral obligation and particular duties of the Sabbath. By A. O. Hubbard.

Practical Christianity in a Series of Essays. By John Bowdles, Jr., Esq.

The Pilgrim's Progress, new edition.

The Israel of God. By Stephen H. Tyng, D.D.

Perfect Peace.

A Universal Gazetteer.



THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1845.

No. I.

-
- ART. I.—1. *The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Nonconformists; from the Reformation in 1517, to the Revolution in 1698; comprising an account of their principles; their attempts for a further Reformation in the church; their sufferings; and the Lives and Characters of their most considerable Divines.* By Daniel Neal, M. A., reprinted from the text of Dr. Toulmin's edition: with his life of the author and account of his writings. Revised, corrected, and enlarged, with additional notes by John O. Choules, M. A. With nine portraits on steel. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 534 & pp. 564. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1843.
2. *The Prose Works of John Milton; with an Introductory Review.* By Robert Fletcher. London: William Ball. 1838. One Vol. 8vo. pp. 963.

NONE who watch closely the current of popular opinion, can have failed to remark that the sneer so long conveyed in the popular phrase, "the Reign of the Saints," has already become nearly pointless, and, if they be of like sympathies with ourselves, to have anticipated the time when, like the similar inscription on the cross, it shall come everywhere to stand for a simple expression of

the truth. One of the most gratifying signs of this change is the circulation, in a cheap and popular form, of Neal's History of the Puritans.

We have been accustomed now and then to see this book in the study of some more than ordinarily literary clergyman, embalmed in dusty boards, or reposing on the shelves of a public library in a state of fresh and unsoiled antiquity. And when on taking up a pamphlet, bound in the similitude of our popular literature, and evidently intended to be circulated, we saw, instead of the *Boz*, *Waverly*, or *Ainsworth*, that expectation had already printed on the mind's eye, *The History of the Puritans* by Daniel Neal, it was, for the moment, as if we had seen the venerable author himself, despoiled of his band, (for even the Independents wore bands) and ornamented with the black, blue, or variegated neckcloth, with fashionable tie, and other carnal adornments of a modern divine of his order. The sense of incongruity, however, was accompanied with a very different feeling from that with which we see the lucubrations of modern minds emblazoned with crosses, crosiers and mystic symbols, in the style of a former age.

We confess that it seems to us rather frightful than ludicrous, to see the dead forms and emblems that we had thought to be at quiet sleep with the bones of Becket and the wood of the true cross, and which since the days of childhood and romance, had almost passed from our minds, suddenly putting on the semblance of life, to startle us from our propriety. Ghost-like and awful indeed is this noon-day resurrection of things, not merely that have no life, but that never lived; this, literally, shadow of a shade and phantasm of a phantasm, that takes, from the grand exorcist, the name of Puseyism. It is truly affecting, and in no sense laughable, to see men in the church of Taylor, and Leighton, and Donne, in search of a higher spiritual life, open the tomb of its founders, and trick themselves out with the ghastly memorials of ancestral weakness and superstition.

Since the appearance of Hume's History of England, not only have the books on the puritanical side, shared the quiet and unbroken sleep of their authors, but even Clarendon and Rapin have given place to a historian, whom, in spite of the clear flow of his Gallicised and Gaelic-ised English, we dare to pronounce as inferior to the one, in elegance, as to the other in honesty. That Belial of letters, the skeptical Jacobite, the atheistical defender of the Divine

Right, the embodiment, at once, of the infidelity, churchism, Hobbism, and toryism of the last century, the elegant and subtle David Hume has been esteemed, even among anti-prelatists and republicans, the highest authority in matters that relate to the origin of their own political and religious sentiments. And hence, while ancestral pride leads us almost to deify the Plymouth Pilgrims, we yield their brethren, of the same character and creed, to the sentence of a historical Rhadamanthus, and leave them to pass into the shades without remonstrance.

But it is not our intention to enter on the defence of the Puritans, as a body. Of two of them at least, the worst informed know something more than that they were men of stiff necks, and stubborn knees, who with equal facility preached and fought, expounded the scriptures and handled the pike and harquebuss. The blindest believer in all that purports to be history, the stupidest jesters on Praise God Barebones Parliament, and the muster roll of Cromwell's regiment, begin to have some dim apprehension, that the names of Cromwell and Milton will vindicate the fame of the Puritans, when the Stuarts will only be remembered, like the later Cæsars and Merovingian kings, as not worthy to be held in remembrance. That Milton and Cromwell were in all respects the true representatives of their party, we do not pretend. But they were as nearly such, as from the very nature of the case, it is possible for a body to be represented by its leaders, whose very superiority is, for the most part, their difference. They were, for instance, as nearly the type of their faction as were Laud and Strafford of theirs. This, by most, will be readily enough granted in the case of Cromwell and as generally denied in that of Milton; or admitted of him, only in his character of controversialist. In its place, albeit, we shall attempt to show that Milton, the Poet, was as truly a birth of Puritanism, and as properly represented it, as Milton the Polemic.

It is evident that between Cromwell and Milton, although their outward development was so different, there existed a striking internal resemblance. The friendship of the men, and the high and even passionate regard which Milton's frequent and splendid eulogies testify for his patron, are not the only or highest proof of this. What else but that inward similitude, and the secret sympathies of greatness and virtue could have led the jealous and incorruptible guardian of popular rights to exercise equal faith in the

humble servant of Parliament, and the Lord Protector of England. The very contrast between them, externally, seems to have created the necessity that led to the exhibition of their internal likeness. Cromwell was forced to act the speeches that he could not utter, and Milton spoke the battles that he did not fight. This is something more than hyperbole; for the controversies of Milton bear the same relation to ordinary logical warfare, as that of a real battle to its scientific plan and mathematical demonstration of victory. They have all the pomp and circumstance of war. The movement of his argument is like that of an armed host; with the highest sense of power, we never lose a consciousness of the order and magnificence of its progress. The eye seems to detect in its construction the involutions and evolutions of a march, while here and there it breaks forth into impassioned declamation or lyrical episode, like a sudden burst of trumpets and clarions. Milton, in his prose works, is like our conception of one of Homer's gods in human armour, cumbrous and heavy in his action, but withal exulting in his strength and confident in anticipation of victory. It is only when he clothes himself in "the radiant Urim all divinely wrought" of his inimitable verse, that he moves with equal grace and strength and, at once, with ease and stateliness. Had Milton never appeared but as a controversialist, he would have stood second only to Cromwell, in the hatred of the royalists, and those who succeed to their prejudices. But they are few, who since his time have seen him in his two-fold character of politician and poet. Dr. Johnson indeed owed him a grudge for difference of opinion; but Bishop Sprat, who ordered his name to be erased from an epitaph in Westminster Abbey, seems to have been the last tory and churchman who really recognized, in the author of *Paradise Lost*, the apologist for Smectymnus and the defender of the Regicides.

But although it would not seem that there should be such a difference between great *deeds*, and great *works*, in their power to allay political rancour, the great Protector has received no such exemption. His character indeed, till recently, has been permitted, on both sides, to rest. His enemies satisfied with general consent and the apparent verdict of history, have, for the most part, been content to imitate the conduct of that loyal publican who kept a house connected with some reminiscence of Cromwell, and when pressed to ex-

press his opinion of Old Noll, was wont, with a mysterious air to take his guests into a private recess, and opening a door point out on the back of it, a pictorial attempt at his Satanic Majesty. While his few friends hopeless to vindicate his fame, and almost proud of the contempt poured upon their hero-saint, by those whose praise would confer no honour, have acted like the dining sectaries of Crabbe, who on turning the "pleasing pictures of the pencilled ware" beheld in silence,

"His stern, strong features, whom they all revered ;
 For there, in lofty air, was seen to stand
 The bold protector of the conquered land ;
 Drawn in that look with which he wept and swore,
 Turned out the members, and made fast the door,
 Ridding the house of every knave and drone,
 Forced, though it grieved his soul, to rule alone.
 The stern still smile each friend approving gave,
 Then turn'd the view, and all again were grave."

There can be no better instance than the popular opinion of Cromwell, to prove, that historical truths often become, practically, the greatest lies. The public acts of the man were confessedly great and illustrious, justifiable, if not necessary, under the circumstances, and proved to be beneficial by the result. But has not history given in its verdict? and men who could as easily read the obelisks of Luxor as, by a larger historical knowledge, verify a particular historical conclusion, will smile to hear it questioned, like a country schoolmaster to hear an impugment of the theory of Newton. His private life is open to us. We can look into his bosom. We have his correspondence with his family, letters to his children, that none but a hypocrite could believe a hypocrite to have written. But it avails nothing. Is it not written in the acts of the kings of Israel and Judah? Is it not recorded in the acts of the kings of England and Scotland?

Mr. Hume and others have not the gift to comprehend a man like Cromwell. They lack that sympathetic insight into his character possessed by Milton. They cannot understand his tears, his groans, and supplications; the hidden life of God in the heart; the outcry of a human soul, in the breast of a sagacious leader and statesman; his struggles of conscience between the conviction that he was raised up like Phineas to avenge the people of God, and the temptation to doubt his commission. As little can they understand his pathetic and

passionate protestations that he would rather have been a simple shepherd or a menial servant, if it had been thus appointed him, than to have the care and trust of these kingdoms, which, before God, was a grievous burden to him. The very earnestness and truthfulness of the man puts them at fault. They have no confidence in him, because they have no confidence in themselves, no faith in human nature. Besides, they have political prejudices, which it is convenient to express in a theory of their great antagonist, that makes him a murderer, usurper and tyrant. The enigma that they present by this means, may without exaggeration be stated thus. An ambitious and selfish usurper, who with the spoils of a nation at his feet, neither enriched his family, enlarged his patrimonial estate, nor took any pains to secure the succession in his line. A gross hypocrite and dissembler, on whom his enemies have not been able to fasten a single lie, or so much as an unquestionable act of dissimulation for a selfish end. A tyrant who placed his avowed enemies in the highest places of trust and honour, apparently, with a simple view to the good of the realm and the impartial execution of justice. An illiterate buffoon who patronised letters with the liberality of the Medicis. A besotted fanatic, who in an age of bigotry and persecution steadily supported religious toleration, and even bestowed pensions on the prelates of a church against whose usurpations he had taken up arms. But let us not despair. History does not propose this sphinx's riddle without entrusting us with the key; a key that will unlock, not only, the intricacies of this character, but for aught that we can see, of any other with equal facility and similar result. It lies in one charmed word, a word of such wondrous efficacy, that with that alone, we would undertake against Church and Schools, to prove that Plato was a Satyr, and the Apostle to the Gentiles, Antichrist. That word is *hypocrisy!* How admirable is the wit of man! admirable, yea, never sufficiently to be admired, the ingenuity of those, who in their pious solicitude lest the devil should be cheated of a saint, can, by a word, bring his virtues to the bar against him, and make his charities plead for his condemnation! Tried by this magical touchstone, the character of an individual sinks in an inverse ratio to his apparent merits. If his conduct has a show of perfect sincerity, the greater his dissimulation. If he seems wholly irreproachable, the greater his guilt. If it is impossible in all this to

detect his hypocrisy, the deeper his cunning. In short the charges against him may be summed up, in one, which in its weightiest and completest form, is that preferred by the indignant Dogberry. "Thou villain, thou art full of *all piety*, as shall be proved upon thee by good witnesses." If, by chance, Cromwell's *approved* historians yield him the possession of any virtue, it seems always to be by a kind of compromise at the expense of his party. Even Hume in his half-eulogy, at closing his account of the protectorate, is so charitable, as to hint to posterity of some little allowance to be made for the cloud of republican and fanatical delusions, which enveloped in their blinding mists, the guilty but magnanimous usurper. Hallam has the faculty to perceive that the great deeds of men are to partizan and distorted views of their motives, as the pyramids of Egypt, to the perishable record of their origin. Yet in a comparison of Cromwell with Napoleon, on the whole favourable to the former, he suggests that there can be "no adequate parallel between one who had sucked only the dregs of a besotted fanaticism, and one to whom the stores of reason and philosophy were open." And one of his reviewers who has become somewhat celebrated as a champion of the puritans, seems to admit the implication and makes it serve as a foil, still more highly to illustrate the greatness of his favourite.

That a plain obscure man whose head was grey before he took up the sword, should in opposition to the united strength of the most powerful priesthood and nobility in the world, seat himself in an uninherited throne, and eclipse by the splendour of his reign, the united glories of his predecessors—that the same man while surrounded at home by every element of discord, and maintaining his power by the control of struggling factions, should inspire such respect for himself abroad, that the word of his mouth in behalf of a handful of oppressed Vaudois, in the heart of Europe, was like the going forth of an army to their succour—that he should have found leisure in the meantime, to meditate great designs for the good of Christendom and the world, all this, indeed, is enough to prove him to have been in advance not only of his own party, but of the great body of any party in any age.

Yet when we remember that his youth was wild, and of no great promise, till his brain was touched with this *fanatical zeal*,—when we see the same puritanical element, producing a Conde and D'Aubigne in France, and a

Winthrop in New England; when we see armies under its influence, instead of being a pest and terror to the helpless, a defence and blessing, and when their work is done "retiring quietly into the body of the people"—we presume it safe to conclude, that the same agent had something to do in the formation of that character for temperance, justice and magnanimity, that distinguished the first soldier and statesman of his age. But there is no need to fear this detraction of a party, in favour of its leaders, in its effect on posterity. Parties with the progress of time become more and more identified with their great men, till at length these come to be their sole representatives; as to outward bound mariners, after the shore has sunk below the line of sight, the mountain peaks are still visible.

The share of Cromwell in the death of Charles I. gives his English vindicators their greatest difficulty. This with Americans will hardly need vindication. The people who for a slight taxation by parliament hewed down the statue of George II. and gibbeted Andre, and their descendants who approve their acts, would not have hesitated, under the tyranny of the star-chamber, to whet the axe of justice against Strafford, or even to stretch forth their hands against the sacred life of a king. In their eyes, it will be much more difficult to justify him in his assumption of the sovereign authority. And here happily his enemies themselves admit the necessity of the deed, however that necessity might have been created.

The miserable remnant of the old parliament, which had come by frequent changes to represent neither that nor the people, among other destructive measures, were bent on disbanding the army; a measure that would inevitably have resulted in an instant restoration of the Stuarts. The daring and sagacious providence of Cromwell, though the death of his own fame was the salvation of English liberty. For who can doubt that if Charles the Second had entered England over the necks of the people, instead of beneath their feet, he would have amply fulfilled the threat of the Hebrew prince and made his little finger heavier than his father's loins.

But the people like Israel would have a king. And as God gave Saul to Israel to punish their sin, in that they desired him, he gave Charles Stuart to the English people. Another of the race accursed of God, seated himself on the throne, and the reign of the saints was ended. White-

hall was no longer filled with men of thoughtful and serious aspect. Grinning courtiers and fawning parasites thronged the presence chamber of a prince, the avenues to whose favour none might tread without defilement. Proud old Cavaliers who scorned to pay court to royal harlots, and play the buffoon to please a prince for whose father they had played the man, stood aloof, and thought, with swelling hearts, of Marston Moor and Naseby. The outwitted Presbyterians retired gloomily from the field, bitterly repenting the folly that led them to put their trust in princes. The best blood in the land flowed to appease the shade of the royal martyr. Even the dead were not sacred from a revenge as despicable as ferocious. The remains of the gallant Blake were thrown into a pit, and the body of Cromwell was hanged at Tyburn. But there was one man who had rendered himself peculiarly obnoxious to both Church and State. The antagonist of the prelates, the defender of the regicides, he whose very name, as Gregory tells us, was esteemed a pollution,—what was to be expected but that the hand, which crushed Scrope and Vane, should be laid upon him? Is there then such a divine prerogative in poesy, that his enemies exasperated by old defeats and flushed with recent triumph, spared the most bitter and successful disputant of his age, because in *L'Allegro* and the *Mask of Comus*, they had seen him with “his wand and singing robes about him?” Or shall we suppose that in the very blindness and intoxication of newly recovered power, they had some prescience that if they touched a hair of that old, blind man’s head, they would bring upon themselves the curse of posterity?

Wonderful, and still wonderful, sublime beyond the power of schoolboy and *dilletante* exclamation to make it less than sublime, is the sight of old, poor, and blind, and defeated Milton, weighed down by private griefs, and broken by the storms of state, rising from the ruins of his own and the public fortunes and achieving a work, that disposes us not so much to be proud that he was of our own tongue and lineage, as to join with the human race in exultation that he was a man. Under any circumstances it must have been deemed the height of the marvellous, that one living three thousand years after Homer, should go as far back of him for the materials of his story, and build up a structure as it were in the sunset of Time, which should throw back a shadow, to eclipse the *Iliad*. His own

description of the "Palace of Lucifer in the sides of the North," is the only adequate expression for the perfect wealth of imagination exhibited in the *Paradise Lost*.

"High on a hill, far blazing as a mount,
Raised on a mount, with pyramids, and towers,
From diamond quarries hewn, and rocks of gold."

It is a notion altogether too common, that Milton was a poet in spite of the puritan. In Milton, says the Rev. Mr. Mitford, in his otherwise liberal and ingenuous life of the Poet, were united, for the first, and perhaps for the last time, the imagination of the poet and the belief of the puritan. It is readily conceded, that puritanism is not favorable to the growth of poetasters. China-asters and dandelions, do not grow, that we know, among the glaciers of the Alps; although we are told of flowers of more than tropical beauty that bloom on the verge of the avalanche and skirt the eternal frost. The severity of its creed and forms gives but little scope to what we may call the lower faculties of poetry. Wit and fancy find but little nutriment in a faith whose chief characteristics are its earnestness and truth. Had Cowley and Dryden been puritans, they would either have kept a but little to be deprecated silence, or appeared but as worthy rivals of Sternhold and Hopkins. The very limitation of the mind, from the outward and more common expression of poetical impulse and emotion, shuts it back, as it were, upon itself, and forces it into a deeper region of feeling and imagination. If the puritanical faith throws a gloom upon the soul, it is as Milton said of his blindness, an obscuration from the wings of the Almighty, to shut out the common and visible and bring it into nearer communion with himself; or, if we may dare, after this, to attempt another expression of it, it is like the night, that obscures the face of the earth, to show the magnificence of the heavens—that hides the world, to reveal the universe. Nor, severe as were the forms of his faith, did the imaginative nature of the puritan lack food, such food as gave Milton strength to rise above the height of greatest attempts. If it was not fed by statues and pictures, and intoxicated with melodious sounds; if it was not ravished in extatic visions of saints and angels, it had free access to the living oracles, and was strengthened and purified by converse with ancient prophets and martyrs, enriched with the history of the most extraordinary characters and events, and elevated by frequent and lofty communion with God

himself. The fire, indeed, thus kindled and nourished in his breast was sacred. He neither dared nor might exhibit it to dazzle the eyes of profane beholders; but hidden within, it burned with intense, because concentrated, radiance.

Many a one of those stern iconoclasts who shattered the storied panes of Cathedral windows, and passed their rapiers through pictures of more worth than a human life, lived inwardly a more truly imaginative and poetical life than any miscalled poet among the sonneteers and satirists of his time, or our modern romanticists and sentimentalists, whose apotheosis is made by the approving nod of a reviewer, and the acquiescent knee of the public, deluded like a reverential but most simple Caliban, into a base idolatry.

To Milton and Bunyan alone was given the power to develop under the conditions of the imagination, what was, in a greater or less degree, common to all. It was Bunyan's office to illustrate the Christian life, as they theoretically viewed and really practised it. Like Pilgrim's path running, with its walls on either side, over the Hill Difficulty, through sad and dark valleys, and across enchanted plains, even with such marvellous distinctness did the Christian life lie, in chequered darkness and light, before the eye of the puritan. There is more than reason to doubt whether it lies with the same distinctness before those who inherit his faith; whether Hypocrisy and Formality cannot come tumbling over the walls without notice; whether they can perceive so plainly the precise spot where Byends and his companions leave the way.

Pilgrimage with the puritan was not an attempt to gain both this world and the next, but an abandonment of the one in search of the other. It was a flight from the City of Destruction, a desertion of home and kindred. He might not even rest, except in a house built for pilgrims by the Lord of the way. His course was through an enemy's country, a region of snares and enchantments, a land of darkness and shadows. But the beautiful land, the land of promise lay before him, bathed in purple and golden light, like a sunset that never left the sky. His eye was on the distant shore where the band in shining garments were to meet him, with songs and sweet welcomings, and angels would receive him on their wings, and as they bore him through the gates of pearl, sound forth with uplifted trumpets, a shout of victory.

Bunyan's own view of this double warfare and pilgrimage, is expressed by Christian in a few words that for quiet grandeur and unboastful valour, cannot be matched from the mouth of one of Homer's or Plutarch's heroes.

"But what have you seen?" said Christian.

"*Men.* Seen? Why the valley itself, which is as dark as pitch: we also saw there the hobgoblins, satyrs, and dragons of the pit: we heard also in the valley a continual howling and yelling, as of people in unutterable misery, who there sat bound in afflictions and irons; *and over that valley hang the discouraging clouds of confusion:* death also does always spread her wings over it. In a word, it is every whit dreadful, being utterly without order.

"Then said Christian, *I perceive not yet, by what you have said, but that this is my way to the desired haven.*"

Was Milton then the only puritan, and at once poet? Cannot rather the blindest idolater of Moore and Byron, see that religion, the religion of Milton and Bunyan, is the winnowed grain, the fine gold, and consummate flower of poesy.

It was for Bunyan, the parliament's soldier, the Elstow tinker, and finally independent preacher, to shadow forth the hidden walk, and daily life of the puritans; but for Milton, the scholar and theologian, to attempt the height of that great argument, which was the constant theme of their speculation and discourse, and

——— "assert Eternal Providence,
And vindicate the ways of God to man."

It is a common mistake, to suppose that the *Paradise Lost* was a growth from a few vague hints, that its author received from the Bible, of a war in Heaven, the fall of a race of spirits, and the employment of their chief, as an evil agent in the temptation and fall of Adam. But all this, glorious as is the use he makes of it, is in reality but the machinery of the poem. The true meaning of the *Paradise Lost*, is to be found, if we may trust our own judgment, or the author, in the great Christian problem, Original Sin.

"Of Man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all its woe,
With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
Sing, heavenly Muse."

The infernal council, the voyage of the arch-fiend through chaos, and the battle of the gods, are all secondary in the design of the poem to the warfare between good and evil in the bosom of the first man. Milton is as truly the poet of protestantism, as Dante of catholicism. Both *Paradise Lost* and the *Divina Commedia* are strictly theological poems. The theology of the latter is that of the middle ages, and of the former, that of the Reformation.* After Dante has followed the serene but mournful Shade through the sickening horrors of the infernal circles, among fiendish *Carnalities*, ghosts that are yet bodies, and Demons of flesh and blood; and ascended from height to height the Hill of Pain, that shakes throughout when a purified soul awakes from the torpor of anguish, into which, by a refinement on the doctrine of penance, it had entered with as eager propension to suffer

“The allotted torments as erewhile to sin,”

Beatrice, in the *Paradise*, takes up the web of his entangled doubts, and reasons of will absolute and conditional, of vows and works, and in that sublime canto, the seventh of the book, attempts the high argument of Christian redemption. In the plan of Milton after Raphael has shown to Adam, in the fall of the angels, the nature and consequences of sin, and warned him, in vain, of his danger in an estate that stood in his free-will, whether to stand or fall, Michael descends and opens to the repentant apostate the knowledge of recovery by Christ, and of that righteousness,

“To them by faith imputed
Justification towards God, and peace
Of conscience; which the law by ceremonies
Cannot appease; nor man, the mortal part
Perform; and not performing, cannot live.”

There have been no theological professorships endowed, as was the case with Dante's works, to explain Milton; but no one in any degree familiar with him, or who will even cast his eye along the margin of his treatise on Christian

* We regret that we cannot say as much of Milton's treatise on *Christian Doctrine*: but after theologians, for something like two hundred years, have read the *Paradise Lost*, and discovered in it no greater latitude of expression with regard to the secondary character of Christ than is used in scripture; it is really marvellous to hear a man like Mr. Babington Macauley affect surprise that any one could read the book without suspecting its author of Arianism.

Doctrine and notice the references made by his editor, will doubt that the *Paradise Lost* contains a body of divinity.

The religious forms amongst which Dante lived, were sufficiently poetical for the development of his design. His genius was not forced to a flight above the popular notions, and it has taken none. But the severity of the protestant faith compelled Milton to seek that within which was not given to him from without, and hence the very forms under which he presents his design, are those of the imagination.

In accordance with this we find every thing in Dante distinctly and sharply drawn. His descriptions are to his conceptions what the pictures in a Catholic church are to the religious ideas they symbolize. While those of Milton are like the necessarily more vague, but loftier, and more etherealized forms, under which the unassisted imagination conceives the same subjects. It is a curious illustration of the anthropomorphism, if we may use the word in this relation, shown by the Catholics in the worship of the Saints and Virgin, that Dante's Beatrice, who represents theology, was a deceased maiden, that in her life he loved. While Milton with the chaste feeling of a more spiritual faith, dares scarcely name the muse of his inspiration.

“Descend from heaven Urania, by that name
If rightly thou art called.”

Had Milton been the intellectual butterfly which with too many is their only conception of a poet, he must have been attracted to the side of royalty as inevitably as a moth to the blaze. On that side was all that we can suppose of power to move the fancy and excite romantic sympathy in the passionate and reverential soul of a poet. The venerable name and authority of king. An ancient church whose external pomp was the apparent type of an inward and spiritual glory. A martial and splendid nobility, rallying to support the standard of a hundred victories, the never veiled gonfalon of their patron saint, before which the orriflamme of France had kissed the dust at Cressy and Agincourt, and the crescent of the Infidel had paled at Acre and Ascalon. Add to this that the sunset of the heroic age in Europe, threw its last beams upon the faded, but to him, not less attractive form of Chivalry, as she sat with nodding plumes and lance in rest to defend the heir of a long line of kings from the rude assault of rebellion; and how could a youthful poet have room for choice between these, and the sombre crowd

of patriots, that stood in arms against the gorgeous pageant.

Making due allowance for the exaggerations of wit, and the natural distaste of their enemies for their habits and manners, and we may still concede that, externally, the puritans were somewhat repulsive. Viewed from without, they may have seemed the errant saints of Butler or the sour and fanatical sectaries of Hume. But Milton was himself a puritan. He stood among them; and from his point of view, they were men in arms for the truth, the true Israel, the living church, the commissioned servants of Heaven.

Nor did he fail, with the true instincts of a poet, to see his relation to them in an imaginative light.

“For since from my youth,” he says in his second Defence of the people of England, “I was devoted to the pursuits of literature, and my mind had always been stronger than my body, I did not court the labours of a camp, in which any common person would have been of more service than myself, but resorted to that employment in which my exertions were likely to be of most avail. Thus with the better part of my frame, I contributed as much as possible to the success of the glorious cause in which we were engaged; and I thought, that if God willed the success of such glorious achievements, it was equally agreeable to his will, that there should be others by whom those achievements should be recorded with dignity and elegance; and that the truth, which had been defended by arms, should also be defended by reason; which is the best and only legitimate means of defending it. Hence while I applaud those who were victorious in the field, I will not complain of the province which was assigned me. I am far from wishing to make any vain or arrogant comparisons, or to speak ostentatiously of myself, but in a cause so great and glorious, and particularly on an occasion, when I am called by the general suffrage to defend the very defenders of that cause, I can hardly refrain from assuming a more lofty and swelling tone than the simplicity of an exordium may seem to justify, and though I may want the eloquence, and copiousness of diction possessed by the illustrious orators of antiquity; yet the subject of which I treat was never surpassed in any age in dignity and interest.”

Couple this with his account of the office of a poet, in *The Reason of Church Government* urged against Prelaty

and we think it will be sufficiently evident, that the puritanism of Milton was not a clog upon the heel of a feathered Mercury, but the divinely tempered armour of Achilles, the consecrated locks, and irresistible strength of Sampson.

“These abilities, wheresoever they be found, are the inspired gift of God rarely bestowed, but yet to some (though most abuse) in every nation: and are of power beside the office of the pulpit, to imbreed and cherish in a great people the seeds of public virtue and civility; to celebrate in glorious and lofty hymns, the throne and equipage of God’s almightiness, and what he works and what he suffers to be done with high providence in his church; to sing victorious agonies of martyrs and saints, the deeds and triumphs of just and pious nations, doing valiantly through faith against the enemies of Christ; to deplore the general relapses of kingdoms and states from justice and God’s true worship. Lastly, whatsoever in religion is holy and sublime, in virtue amiable and grave, whatever hath passion or admiration in all the changes of that which is called fortune from without, or the wily subtleties and reflexes of man’s thoughts from within; all these things, with a solid and treatable smoothness, to paint out and describe.”

Cromwell and Milton both drank of Siloa’s brook; both felt that to be the servant of the truth, was the largest honour and the highest glory to which man could attain. And the first, though his fame rests under nearly two centuries of ridicule and detraction, stands among the princes and statesmen of his age, revealed, like the elect Benjamite among the people, by a natural stature and bulk of greatness, that detraction cannot hide nor praise illustrate. And from the other, his twin-star of fame, the angelic Milton, whose soul was strengthened by the heavenly draught to achieve whatever of loftiest enterprise “his soul in the spacious circuit of its musings had liberty to propose to itself,” instead of courts and cathedrals, heraldic blazoury, and the august parle of priests and monarchs, we have the order of the heavenly hierarchies, the pomp and equipage of God’s almightiness, and the dread counsels of the Godhead deciding the fate of worlds; instead of bowers of Acrasia and islands of enchantment, we have paradise with its walls of living verdure, and that secret bower, whose flowery roof showered roses on the sleep of primeval innocence; pandemonium with its skiey roof, stretched above the thrones of a thousand demi-gods, and lighted with innumerable

cressets, each like a sun, yet all but a dim glimmer of light, in that vast sea of fire whose sulphurous waves burned, not with light, but darkness; instead of battles and tournaments, the slaughter at Fontarabia and the knightly flower of Trebisond and Aspramont, we have the fallen chivalry of heaven,

———God-like shapes, and forms
Excelling human;

the kingly phantom, the shapeless terror that with the snaky sorceress, his mother, guarded the infernal doors, the youthful angels that under Uriel kept watch over the imparadised lovers, and the embattled Seraphim, that mingled in Titanic warfare on the plains of heaven.

One of the most striking characteristics of Milton was his perfect and equal development in all directions. As a man of letters, a public servant, and private citizen, he was a model on which manhood might shape itself. His greatness did not lie in the exercise of a special power, but in the power to be all that was great. In the highest station he would have been superior to his fortunes, and in the lowest, would have given dignity to the station. If there is any virtuous deed not recorded of him, he still seems to us to have done it; if any great thing not attempted by him, he still seems to have been equal to it. He is the only man who ever eclipsed his own fame by a higher and brighter noon; who after winning an immortality for his youth, gave it back to oblivion by the achievements of his age. If Milton had not been the author of *Paradise Lost*, he would be better known as a lyrical and dramatic poet. If he had not been a poet, he would still have had whatever fame belongs to the first political writer of his age. If he had been neither poet nor politician, he would yet have held no contemptible rank as a theological writer and historian. And if he had written nothing at all, we should not have lacked in the story of the times, some account of one John Milton, a devout and worthy person, and a man of singular boldness in the good old cause.

Geo. W. Alford

ART. II.—*Religion in America; or an account of the Origin, Progress, Relation to the State, and Present Condition of the Evangelical Churches in the United*

States. With notices of the Unevangelical Denominations. By Robert Baird, author of "L'Union de l'Eglise avec l'Etat dans la Nouvelle Angleterre." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1844. 8vo. pp. 343.

THE subject of this work calls to it the attention of the religious patriot, and the eurrency which it is likely to have in Europe should eause us to examine with care into the faithfulness of its representations. The origin of the labour may be briefly stated. Being inquired of, in regard to our country and its religious institutions, by the late Duehess de Broglie, the author prepared a small book on the Origin and Progress of Unitarianism in the United States, of which the title is appended to his name, as given at the head of our article. The effect of this treatise was to stimulate inquiry, and he acceded to the request of some distinguished friends on the Continent, to furnish the information which is now presented in this volume. The work was written at Geneva.

In its British form the publication is more elegant and costly. The cheap edition before us is however sightly and suffieient. As the author observes, it bears marks on every page of having been composed with a view to European readers. From this peculiarity, we doubt not, many have overlooked it, as supposing themselves fully acquainted with their own institutions. Yet, after a careful examination, we think that there is no American however well informed who may not read it with instruction, and refer to it as a syllabus of important facts, not elsewhere extant in connexion. However we may know the state of things at home, we gain new views of their relations, when we compare them with kindred things abroad; and this volume derives value from a perpetual tacit comparison of this sort, inseparable from its plan and destination. Again, it is undeniable, that the members of each Christian denomination, in America, live in some degree apart, look at their respective cantons, and are ignorant of what other religious bodies are doing; except on those unhappy occasions when controversy brings them face to face. In such a work as this, there is every thing to profit persons whose views have been thus contraeted. And we admit with pleasure that many of the statistical representations here made, have interested, instructed, and even astonished us.

All these remarks presuppose fulness and accuracy in the account rendered. Without pledging ourselves for the

absolute correctness of a figure in the book, we have read it with a conviction that it answers these conditions. Dr. Baird is both capable and trustworthy, We are glad the enterprise has fallen into his hands. How different would have been the result, if such a review of our whole religious field had been laboriously made by a partisan or a fanatic. In this view of the matter, we are not sorry that the author has maintained a temperate impartiality, which to some, on various sides, may savour of indifferentism. It is the very point of view which it was incumbent on him to assume, in order at once to escape the charge of sectarian bias, and to gain access to the European mind. And the result is a book which may serve as the expositor of the American Christian, be he Episcopalian, Methodist, Lutheran or Calvinist. At the same time, the truth is fairly told with regard to those sects, which, in the very title, are classed as *unevangelical*, to wit, Papists, Socinians, Jews, Universalists, and the like.

In the Preface, Dr. Baird expressly disavows all intention to construct a theory in regard to the organization of the Church, or its relation to the State; and declares it as his sole object to give a faithful delineation of facts. Accordingly he has produced a plain, comprehensive, elaborate and useful historical treatise; such as will be of service to every intelligent American, who would refer to a convenient epitome; such as nothing short of arduous, self-denying labour could have effected; and such as fills a niche in our literature altogether unoccupied. For the minute accuracy of every statement, we do not vouch; not from distrust of the author's care or fidelity, but simply because the verification of his details would demand a toil equal to his own. But our estimate both of the justice and the value of his memoirs has increased as we have gone on in the examination; and we respect his charity and moderation, as well as his diligence. While the work is not professedly or characteristically apologetic, it is fitted in a high degree to vindicate our country and its religious institutions from the misrepresentations and calumnies of those who envy them in the old world; and having obtained a circulation in Europe such as no American book on the same subject has had, or is likely to have, it ought, even by those who may quarrel with some of its contents, to be regarded as a tribute to our national reputation. We desire to say, in as marked a manner as we can, that such efforts should not be disregarded by our people. The unexampled assaults upon our good

name, which increase with every year, are plainly due to the unexampled development of power and wealth in our national progress. Whether this transatlantic hate will ever embody itself in the form of open war against the free principles which are the origin of all our progress, is yet unrevealed. If it do not, it will be from no lack of determined hostility. And if pacification once ensue, in regard to the antagonist creeds of the two hemispheres, it will be effected by the commerce of good offices, under the banner of Christianity. Every thing therefore which tends to display to Europe the genuineness and extent of religion among us; to exhibit the identity of grace here and there; or to clear us of the charges of fraud, violence, irreligion, oppression, and anarchy, is just so much towards this desirable consummation. The author early showed his zeal in this work, by his letter to Lord Brougham, on the subject of slavery; and in the volume before us he has manifested no feeling more constantly or in higher degree, than that of intense patriotism; a patriotism increased, we are sure, by his extraordinary opportunities of knowing the people and the courts of the old nations. And we heartily adopt the judgment of the Reverend Doctors Welsh, Cunningham and Buchanan, though perhaps with very different examples in our thoughts, when they say: "We do not agree in all the opinions which the esteemed author has expressed; but we admire the judicious, benevolent, candid and catholic spirit by which the work is pervaded."

It is very far from our intention to give the analysis of a work, the merit of which lies in its condensation. The plan is easy and natural. It is divided into eight books, which are subdivided, rather beyond necessity, so as to make in all one hundred and thirty chapters. The first three books, being not quite a third of the volume, treat of our national history. Over these we pass lightly. They are obviously intended for European readers, and convey information which many of these readers will get in no other shape.

The part which discusses the *Voluntary Principle* in America, is not only the longest and most elaborate, but the most important portion; being that which will beyond all others give the work its value in the eyes of those for whom it was principally composed. It is a discussion which fills the earlier portion of the volume, and reappears occasionally in all that follows. The thirteenth chapter of the First Book is of much interest, as showing con-

clusively, that the opinion common in Europe, respecting the origin of the voluntary method in America, is unfounded; and that almost every plantation on our shores was at first, and for a long period, an acting out of the opposite principle. The people of the ancient kingdoms need to be taught that our forefathers brought with them the old-world notions; and that the prevailing mode of supporting religion was the fruit of wise delay. In another place, Book iii. c. 2, the same matter is discussed with equal ability, and the views there opened will be new even to many among ourselves. Such will read with surprise that the "Old Colony and Dominion of Virginia," (to use the style of the ancient writs) was the foremost to dissolve the tie of Church and State; and that it was the power of evangelical truth, accompanying the books of Luther, Flavel and Boston, and the preaching of Robinson and Davies, which occasioned the change completed by the act of December 6th, 1776. They will further be instructed in facts essential to our argument against foreign opponents, that Voluntaryism was not the unavoidable vice of our colonial state; but that the yoke of State lay heavily on our necks, until the era of freedom; that it was broken and cast off, knowingly, deliberately, and joyfully, by solemn acts of legislation, in New York, South Carolina, and all the colonies where hierarchy existed; and that its force was most stubborn, and longest endured, in the Puritan State of Massachusetts. The same hidden but unconquerable energies which by God's ordinance worked in the mass and broke out into political resistance and independence, burst forth in the rending of the church bonds. The two things go together, not merely in cabinet-hypotheses, but in historical events. According to our author, or rather according to Dr. Hawks, more than two-thirds of the Episcopal clergy in Virginia were opposed to the Revolution, and most of these returned to England. And we believe we may safely say, that the comparison of ancient and modern Virginia, with an Establishment, and without it, affords one of the most striking examples in church-history, of the deadening influence of one system and the quickening power of the other. For on the very ground where the mass of the stipendiary rectors were unworthy of the sacred office, there is now a body of clergy, who for diligence, piety, and repugnance to Oxford ritualism, stand unequalled among Episcopalians.

We are obliged to Dr. Baird for bringing into prominent relief the early labours of Robert Hunt, the first who ever preached the gospel in English on the shores of this continent. The facts connected with this ministry go a certain length in freeing the Virginian emigration from the charge of absolute heathenism. We would that they had enjoyed a purer and more cordial Christianity; but let us not deny that their enterprise was sanctified by the word of God and prayer.

It would be strange indeed if we were not somewhat gratified with the paragraph which we subjoin, respecting our own little State.

“After about twelve years of embarrassment, commencing with the Revolution of 1688 in England, the Proprietaries of both East and West New Jersey surrendered “their pretended right of government” to the British Crown, and in 1702, both provinces united into one, were placed for a time under the Governor of New York, retaining, however, their own Legislature. The population, notwithstanding the difficulties and irritation caused by political disputes intimately affecting their interests, steadily increased. Taken as a whole, few parts of America have been colonized by a people more decidedly religious in principle, or more intelligent and virtuous; and such, in the main, are their descendants at the present day. Nowhere in the United States have the churches been supplied with a more faithful or an abler ministry. New Jersey was the scene of the excellent David Brainerd’s labours among the Indians, during the latter years of his short but useful life. There, too, laboured the celebrated William Tennent, and those other faithful servants of God in whose society Whitefield found so much enjoyment, and whose ministrations were so much blessed. There, and particularly in the eastern section of the province, many have been witnesses of those outpourings of the Holy Spirit, which we shall have occasion in another place to speak of. And, lastly, in New Jersey was planted the fourth, in point of date, of the American colleges, commonly called Nassau Hall, but more properly the College of New Jersey. That college has had for its presidents some of the greatest divines that have ever lived in America, Dickinson, Burr, the elder Edwards, Finley, Witherspoon, Smith, Green, &c., and it is still as flourishing as ever, although a sister institution has arisen at New Brunswick, to co-operate in diffusing blessings throughout the State. I may add, that no State in the American Union has more decidedly proved the importance of having a good original population, nor has any state done more, in proportion to its population and resources, to sustain the honour and promote the best interests of the American nation.” p. 67.

Justice is done, in this historical part, to the happy influence derived from the Presbyterian emigration to this country. It is a point which will justly attract increasing attention, as the spirit of our people is aroused by the

counter-influence of ten thousands of Papists. In another connexion, Dr. Baird would, no doubt, take pleasure in recurring to the excellencies of a race from which he derives his own lineage, we mean that of Presbyterian Scotland. In this comprehensive title we reckon all the Irish Protestants; for they are of Scotch blood, and when driven by the persecuting hand of prelacy from their native seats, retained in its freshness the doctrine, and what we consider quite as important, the domestic discipline of their fathers. Wherever they are found in America they approve themselves worthy descendants of reformers and martyrs. Not from them are drawn the devotees, who fill the tents of Miller or the temple of Mormon. They are Calvinists, not merely in the sense of believing unconditional election, which seems to be the sole criterion with many who bear the name, and who with the doctrine of sovereignty, go over to Arminius or Pelagius, in respect to grace; but in the sense also that they believe, maintain and live on those cheering, purifying doctrines of the old reformation, which make Christ the sum and substance of the scriptures; which represent his imputed righteousness as the sole ground of acceptance; and which, now as of old, are stigmatized as Antinomian by the framers of new species of conversion and new conditions of pardon. Under all the stiffness, one-sidedness, narrowness, and in some circumstances, downright bigotry of Scotch and Irish Presbyterianism we are constrained to say that it affords the best material for a church structure which is known in our land. Other materials may be more ductile, but none are more permanent. And we have no hesitation in declaring that the alleged improvements in theological definition which have been known as 'American theology,' are so far from adding a step of progress to the work of the Reformers, that they have merely backslidden to the ground occupied by the latitudinarian schemers of the sixteenth century. This we can say, in perfect consistency with our admiration of the noble Nonconformists who planted the New England churches, and our prompt recognition of acuteness, versatility, enterprise and accomplishment in their descendants; who, nevertheless, have, as we believe, departed, in a direction entirely towards error, from the line of theology marked out by the earlier race. Without the restless activity of the New England mind, our country would never have made its great advances in commerce, manufactures, and diffusive

beneficence. But the very boldness, which is life to those things that demand motion, may be death to those which ask repose; and the speculative zeal which engenders invention and upholds industry, may propel the soul into hazardous mutations in the things which God has fixed. If the conservative element is demanded any where in the universe, it is demanded where positive revelation has defined the landmarks. And for this restraining force, we look to the tenets and especially to the mode of training, which characterized the old Presbyterians. These remarks ascribe due honour to those whom we are nevertheless bound to examine, before we follow their guidance in religious affairs.

The evils resulting from the union of Church and State are set in a clear light in this work. There is no country in the world where the double experiment of religion with and without an establishment, has been so fully made as in the United States: and Dr. Baird has made good use of the results. It is the very lesson which needs to be inculcated on our brethren abroad, who are singularly inattentive to the true history of the case; and who, from sometimes seeing godliness in close connexion with State patronage, and ungodliness opposed to it, are too ready to take coincidence for causality, and to regard our more thorough trial of the two methods, as a base submission to one of them from ignorance or necessity. Scotland, to which we look with peculiar regard, as the country which has been most thoroughly leavened with the gospel, and in which, as we believe, the greatest revival of religion since the Reformation is this moment in progress, is also the country where the just apprehension of this subject is most likely to produce great effects. The measure of true principles embodied in the proceedings of the Free Church, and the issue which we think inevitable in the very direction which that Church now pursues, are precisely what the more enlightened Dissenters, and all American Christians have contended for. Most gladly therefore would we forget the intemperate censures, and the wresting of facts, in regard to America, which were called forth in profusion, while the Voluntary question was agitated. Bonds are already drawn between the two bodies, always united as to gospel truth and order, which promise to hold them in indissoluble harmony. No foreign survey of American affairs, so far as our knowledge goes, bears any comparison, for comity and justice, with the

recent article in the North British Review. For such good offices, our whole Christian community should be thankful; and while we have a natural complacency in the good-will of these honoured brethren, we shall be all the readier to accept the 'excellent oil' of their rebuke.

To such minds, we do not wonder that the work before us was welcome. To others, in less enlightened portions of European Christendom, it will be equally useful. It will show them, not by abstract reasoning alone, but, by a copious induction of all the facts in the case, what the exact operation of the Voluntary principle is. It will set before them, in a palpable and undeniable exhibition, such startling truths as these; that under this method, funds are raised for church building, for the support of pastors, and extending the same blessings to destitute places; that organized and efficient agencies are founded, for the prevention of intemperance, sabbath-breaking, pauperism, and oppression; and that, considering the age of the country, it may compare with any other in respect to its charitable and philanthropic institutions.

Dr. Baird's fifth book treats of the Church and the Pulpit in America. Under this head, several important questions are discussed, concerning the nature of church-discipline, a term which has no corresponding reality, under the Anglican establishment; concerning admission to sealing ordinances, in regard to which such laxity has prevailed in foreign churches; and concerning the kind of preaching which may be considered characteristic of the United States. The following statement deserves to be extracted:

"Among the American preachers whose visits are still remembered with interest in Great Britain (and some of them on the Continent also), but who are no longer with us, may be mentioned the Rev. Drs. Mason, Romeyn, Bruen, Henry, Hobart, Emory, Fisk, and Clark, who were certainly no mean men. Of those who have visited Europe within the last few years, and who are still permitted to prosecute their work among us, the Rev. Drs. Spring, Humphrey, Cox, M'Auley, Codman, Sprague, Breckinridge, Patton, and Rev. Mr. Kirk, of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches; the Rev. Drs. Bethune and Ferris, of the Reformed Dutch; the Rev. Drs. Milnor, M'Ilvaine (bishop of Ohio), Meade (bishop of Virginia), Hawks, and Tyng, of the Episcopal; the Rev. Drs. Olin, Capers, President Durbin, and Bishop Soule, of the Methodist; the Rev. Drs. Wayland, Stowe, Sears, and M'Murray, of the Baptist; and the Rev. Dr. Kurtz and the Rev. Mr. Riley of the Lutheran and German Reformed Churches, are widely known in Great Britain, and some of them on the Continent. The last-named two were kindly received in Germany, and heard with attention, both when they spoke of the infant seminaries for

which they pleaded, as well as when they proclaimed "that Name which is above every name," and which is "like ointment poured forth." p. 190.

To this we may add, that the Rev. Dr. Kurtz, above named, one of the few native Americans who ever preached in Germany, in the language of the country, was followed by thousands of hearers, so as to require a military guard to keep order; that many expected to see, in the 'American preacher,' a black man or an Indian; and that one of his discourses was printed and well received, in the land of his forefathers, by evangelical persons. The statements of the author, respecting written and unwritten sermons, are just, so far as the fact is concerned: we are not so sure that he does not go further than is just, when he says that unwritten sermons "can hardly have the same order, clearness, and freedom from repetition," as those which are written. All the vices of *extempore* preaching are exhibited at times by those who write. The use of the pen does not necessitate method, perspicuity or conciseness. Nor does the simple absence of writing produce carelessness or prolixity. We have, on a former occasion, expressed our judgment of those who would prescribe either as the unalterable method. We now suggest, in addition, that no man need doubt the advantages of the more free delivery of truth, who is familiar with the labours of Hall, Fuller, Spencer and Jay, in England; or with those of Mason, Wilson, and Rice, in our own churches. A man may write, as well as preach, *extempore*; and we condemn the method, if it imply utterance of unpremeditated thoughts: no man can conscientiously rise in the pulpit and speak *quicquid in buccam venerit*. Nor do we believe, that the American churches have ever heard more scriptural instruction, more logical argument, or more ornate diction, than from some of the departed worthies, who spake without a line of manuscript. The practice of reading sermons is going more and more out of use in the Free Church of Scotland. It never was in use, among the Reformed churches of the continent. It is considered less binding, than formerly, even in New England. It is not prevalent among the British Dissenters. Even Episcopalians, in both countries, under the warming influence of gospel zeal, forsake their paper. And this will cause little surprise to such as are familiar with the history of the British Pulpit. While some in England have argued against it as an innovation, the following mandate of Charles II. to the University of Cambridge suffices for a reply.

“VICE CHANCELLOR AND GENTLEMEN,

“Whereas his Majesty is informed, that the practice of reading sermons is generally taken up by the preachers before the University, and therefore continues even before himself; his Majesty hath commanded me to signify to you his pleasure, that the said practice which took its beginning from the disorders of the late times, be wholly laid aside; and that the said preachers deliver their sermons, both in Latin and English, by memory, without book; as being a way of preaching which his Majesty judgeth most agreeable to the use of foreign churches, *to the custom of the University heretofore*, and to the nature of that holy exercise. And that his Majesty's command in these premises may be duly regarded and observed, his further pleasure is, that the names of all such ecclesiastical persons as shall continue the present supine and slothful way of preaching, be from time to time, signified to me, by the Vice Chancellor for the time being, on pain of his Majesty's displeasure.*

MONMOUTH.

“Oct. 8, 1674.”

We have no reverence indeed for Charles the Second, in matters of religion, and should be unwilling to see such an injunction emanating from any authority. We remember the names of Edwards and Davies and Smith and Chalmers. But we claim equal liberty for those who, after due preparation, choose to exercise their gifts after that way, which is not deemed unfavourable either to logic or rhetoric, in the great performances of a Chatham, a Burke, a Marshall, a Hayne, a Calhoun, and a Clay. These remarks, though occasioned by a passing observation of Dr. Baird, are not intended to represent him as proscribing a mode of public address which, we have reason to believe, he often employs himself.

The *matter* of American preaching is far more important. The author, on this topic, does justice to our national pulpit. We have sometimes doubted, however, whether unnecessary pains were not taken to predicate of American sermonizing a type altogether its own; and whether equal excellence, in respect to all the alleged peculiarities, were not easily to be found in all the evangelical preaching of the non-conformist and Scottish divines. Our preachers, it may be said, are *simple*: we wish we could say as much of certain metaphysical teachers who are not rare. Our preachers are *earnest*: so were Bunyan, Flavel, Livingstone, Andrew Gray, and Willison. They dwell on *immediate reconciliation with God*; so did all who ever preached the law and the gospel with converting power,

* See Statute Book of the University of Cambridge, p. 301. Car. II. Rex.

from Luther down to McCheyne. They are *highly doctrinal*; but not more so than Calvin, Owen, Charnock, the Erskines, and Boston. They are *systematic*; so were the fathers of our evangelical churches, perhaps to a fault, dwelling oftener and longer on theological topics in their order, and on scriptural books in their connexion, than most in America have been wont to do. They are *philosophical*; on which we confess judgment. They are *direct*; but not more so than Baxter, Alleine, Whitefield, and Hill. They are *faithful* and *practical*; these are the attributes of all preaching, where the gospel rules in the mind and heart. American pastors, and we tell it with thankfulness, have in numerous instances combined all the good traits of this enumeration. But we may err by claiming an excellency too exclusive, for what we love. There may be qualities which predominate in minds of another class, and which we might borrow with advantage. Understanding Dr. Baird to compare our pulpit with that of the Lutheran and Reformed churches of the Continent, we find no fault with his delineation: but we should scruple to assert that what is commonly understood as the theology of the American pulpit is superior to that of the evangelical churches of Great Britain. It is a point, however, on which we write with unfeigned diffidence, as willing to defer to the author's greater opportunities for comparison.

There is perhaps no part of this volume which is more worthy of remark than the seventh chapter of the fifth book, upon 'Revivals of Religion.' It is introduced by the author as 'invaluable;' and it proceeds from a gentleman who, in Dr. Baird's judgment, 'is better qualified by his position and by his experience, to write such an article, than any other man' known by him in the United States. To say that it is able, is no more than must be admitted of any thing which proceeds from the pen of Dr. Goodrich. But, since comparisons are odious, we may be allowed to say that we perceive in it nothing which surpasses the wise and copious instructions of Dr. Sprague. We shall also, with we trust, a deep sense of our responsibility, offer some remarks on this essay. We assent in full to all the commendation of the Puritans: they were men of whom the world was not worthy, and they gloried in a system of truth which no efforts of their sons have improved. We agree in what is said with respect to the prominence given in New England to *preaching*, and the

strong faith and expectation of *special* answers to prayer. We join in rejoicing over those early fruits of grace among the first plantations, and at a later day those "harvests" under the preaching of Stoddard. They teach us how little such blessings are connected with the modern changes of opinion, sometimes vaunted as the only means of revival. We admire the felicitous history of the blessed work in the eighteenth century, and of the labours of Edwards and Brainerd. And indeed there is scarcely a sentence in the concise and satisfactory notice of revivals, to which we can object, so far as it is historical. But when the writer proceeds to define more nicely the instrumental causes of these effects, we find him outrunning our convictions, and substituting for the common belief of American Calvinists, the peculiar tenets of his own country and school. And against this, as testimony sent across the ocean, to our brethren of the Reformed Churches, we do most solemnly protest. It is not to the value of doctrinal or frequent or fervent presentation of truth, that we object; surely not. But we complain of injustice done to the system of some of the soundest, most faithful, and most successful ministers the world ever saw, in the views here given of obligation, in respect to the sinner's conversion, and in the implications of the statement which purports to depict our adverse schemes. We desire to use candour; we would not make any man an offender for a word; we abjure, as much as he, the tenet that repentance is not a matter of duty; but we dare not assign, as a cause of true conversion, any doctrine or system which renders the sinner's recourse to God in regeneration *a mere item in a series of duties*. The preaching of Whitefield and the preaching of the Tennents are justly cited as instruments of unexampled awakening; but they would be most untruly and injuriously cited as specimens of a doctrinal system which they repudiated. It is clear as day, being matter of uncontrolled testimony, that the burden of their preaching was Calvinism, old Calvinism, and that in the very sense in which the phrase is often contumeliously employed. They preached obligation, it is true; for they preached the *law*. But who that has read the tomes of the seventeenth century, with all their varied and lengthened anatomy of the "law-work" in the soul, needs to be referred to this branch of gospel-labour as new or peculiar or American? The disposition "to comfort too soon" is mentioned with disapproval. It is a form of speech which may

mean more than meets the eye. And the writer's censure of it may betray a plan of teaching, which represents the great work as a bare legal *submission* to God's rectoral justice, and which excludes the promulgation of Christ's priestly work until such time as the convicted sinner shall have been sufficiently humbled, in the judgment of his spiritual guide. This scheme needs no further designation to those familiar with New England theology; it is one which, in our view, modifies the gospel, if it does not place the law in its stead, so exalting obligation that "grace is no more grace."

The advice to "wait God's time," that man of straw against which so many eastern divines have evinced their prowess, is not our advice; nor have we ever known it to be given. But when the teacher (even though it be the lamented Nettleton) adds, in regard to a distressed soul, "You should *keep him down*, and tell him he must submit to God," we reject the recipe. It wants all scripture warrant. It enjoins an act which, in any valid sense, is impossible without faith; and which, as understood, has nothing evangelical. It hangs a thick curtain before the great object, the sacrifice of Christ, and refuses to raise it, till when? Till the moment when the spiritual guide shall declare the humbling process to be complete. Awful is the responsibility of that man, who shall undertake to determine, when that last drop of consummating anguish has been distilled into the cup of bitterness, or when the instant has arrived when a sinner may behold the Lamb of God without injury! How simple, how plain, how safe, how glorious, in comparison, the scriptural advice to an awakened man! *Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.* Such was the method of Whitefield, as it had been the method of Livingstone, of Knox, of Luther, and of Paul and Silas.

Again, we complain that a metaphysical dogma, unacknowledged, we say not in our common Christianity, but in our common Calvinism, is here crected into a pillar of faith, and held up to the view of transatlantic brethren as a principal means of revival. We mean the New England doctrine of *human ability*. By the New England doctrine we mean what is expressed on page 204, by Dr. Goodrich's language to the sinner: "Your *cannot* therefore is only *will not.*" If the point be simply that such doctrine was, in fact, preached in the late awakenings of New England,

we of course give it up. But if it be intended that such doctrine tends in any the least degree to facilitate the conversion of sinners, we exclaim against the allegation; for the doctrine being new, contrary to the essence of the Reformed faith, savouring of Pelagian error, and diametrically opposite to the plain obvious letter of the word of God, has never produced, and can never produce, any consequences but those which are evil. And among its consequences is that lamentable degeneracy of New England theology, in some of its branches, into a scheme of seeming Pelagianism, which has awakened fear and lamentation among many even in the land of its origin. We do not charge the learned and distinguished writer of these remarks with having penned them with any polemical intention, or with any view to propagate his own avowed opinions; we are not even sure that he consciously gives any representation that is partial. But we lift our hands against this, when recorded as the exponent of American theology. New England is not the world. It is not even America. Great, enlightened, refined and influential as it is, we may nevertheless demand of its able writers, not to forget these minor tracts which lie south of its border, nor to emulate the Chinese exclusiveness of ultra-nationality. There have been revivals beyond their pale. Souls have been converted who never heard the great *catholicon* of ability. Saints are in heaven who maintained beyond a doubt that the carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. And if Chalmers or Merle d'Aubigne or Krummacher should avert their faces from such a portent as the Calvinism herein displayed, we should long for access to them in order to assure them that there are thousands of Christians in America, who admit the doctrines of depravity and of grace even as themselves.

In justice to Dr. Baird, we add the remark, that what he says in his own person concerning religious revivals, is not open to any similar objections. Indeed we assent with our utmost cordiality, when he gives us his cautions on this point:

“Experience has also taught us the necessity of maintaining order at meetings held during revivals—occasions on which, in consequence of the strong excitement of the most powerful feelings of the human heart, there is a special call for watchfulness in this respect. It is a sad mistake to multiply meetings unnecessarily during revivals,

or to prolong them to unseasonable hours at night, to the exhaustion of strength, the loss of needed repose, and the unnatural and dangerous irritation of the nervous system. Yet these are the points in which the inexperienced are most liable to err. They begin a meeting, say at seven o'clock in the evening. The preacher feels deeply, and the people are much interested. Instead of preaching for an hour, he is tempted, by the manifest attention of his hearers, to go on for an hour and a half or two hours, and instead of sending them home at half past eight o'clock, or at nine at the farthest, so that they may have time for meditation and secret prayer, in which, after all, the sinner is most likely to give his heart unto God, he dismisses them at ten or eleven o'clock, fatigued, yet excited, and altogether unfit for the exercises of the closet. This is sometimes done under the idea that the people would lose their serious impressions were the service to be short. But here there is often a temptation of the Adversary. No revival ever suffered by evening meetings being confined to a moderate length. Let the people be almost compelled to leave the house rather than unduly protract such meetings.

“One of the most important and difficult duties of a minister in a revival, is rightly to direct awakened souls. Alas! how often are even good men found to fail in this. Many ministers, whom I have known, seem to me to excel in addressing unawakened sinners, and yet to fail when called to give clear, intelligible, and scriptural directions to those who are awakened. Many, too, fail in judging of the evidences of conversion, and ‘heal the hurt of the people softly.’

“But on no point, I am convinced, from what I have seen in America, is there a greater call for the exercise of a sound prudence than in receiving into the Church persons who entertain the belief that they have ‘passed from death unto life.’ While they may possibly be kept back too long, the great error lies on the other side. The new convert naturally desires to join himself to those whom he now considers to be the children of God. He thinks that it is his duty to do so, and he may possibly be right. But the office-bearers in the Church, whose duty it is to see to the admission of none but proper persons into it, are no less clearly bound to see that the candidate for membership gives such evidences of piety as, on scriptural grounds, shall be deemed satisfactory. The one may be perfectly right in desiring to enter, and in coming to them for admission; the others may be no less justified in refusing until they have had satisfactory evidence of the applicant’s piety. No harm can result from this temporary conflict of duty, if I may call it so. Both seek to do what is right, and both will soon find their way clear.

“I consider hasty admissions to our churches to be the greatest of all the evils connected with revivals in some parts of the country, and among some denominations in particular. But this evil is not peculiar to revivals. It is quite as likely to occur when there is no revival as when there is. With all possible care it is difficult to keep a church pure, in a reasonable sense of that word. How absurd, then, to expect it when the doors are thrown wide open to admit hastily all that profess to be converted! Experience shows the necessity of decided views on this subject, and of firmness in enforcing them. On this point, as well as on all others relating to the discipline and government of the Church, too much care cannot be taken to avoid latitudi-

narian practices. The Church must be kept a living body of believers—a company of persons who have come out from the world, and are determined to adorn the profession which they have made. In their organization and action, order, which is said to be ‘heaven’s first law,’ must be maintained. In this opinion, I am sure, Christians of all denominations in the United States sincerely and entirely concur.” p. 218.

No reader of our pages can be so unreasonable as to expect that we should follow the author in his laborious survey of the churches of America. With great patience, he goes through the entire list, giving compendious notices of the sects; Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, in all their variety, Quakers, Papists, Unitarians, Universalists, Swedenborgians, Tunkers, and several others. Much of this detail will be new to many, as it was new to us. Taken by itself, it renders the book one of the most convenient and satisfactory manuals, in regard to American church-history and statistics. Our eye naturally turns to the account given of ourselves. In this, the author has had to contend with unusual difficulties. From the catholic post of observation which the plan of his work constrained him to occupy, he could not be expected to see the divisions among us, exactly as we view them. The facts, in regard to the separation of the two bodies of Presbyterians are given with candour. At the same time, he expresses it as his own opinion, on the one hand, that time should have been allowed for the Western churches to adopt the Presbyterian polity, if they had a mind to do so, before so stringent an act as that of 1838; and, on the other, that the plan of union was decidedly contrary to the constitution of the Church. To the argument for tolerance in respect to the diversities existing from the first in the elements of our body, we attribute no validity; and to the statement which would seem to make the theological differences mere variations in philosophical exposition of common tenets, we object with strong dissent. But it is far from our wish to stir up these embers, and we heartily desire that all parties may be brought nearer together by being brought nearer to the infallible standard. And we applaud the spirit evinced by such words as these, respecting the great body of Evangelical Christians:

“Taking all the professed Christians, amounting, it has been seen, to more than 2,500,000, in our evangelical churches, I hesitate not to say that far more mutual respect and brotherly love prevail among them than would were they all coerced into one denomination. The world has already seen what sort of union and brotherhood can be

produced by all being brought into one immense Church, that admits of no deviation from the decrees of its councils and conclaves. There may, indeed, be external agreement, yet beneath this apparent unanimity there may be internal divisions and heartburnings in abundance. There may be union against all who may dare to impugn her dogmas, but who can tell the almost infernal hatred with which her Religious Orders have been found to regard each other? Compared with this, all the temporary *attritions*, together with all the controversies and exacerbations of feeling that accompany them, that take place in our evangelical Protestant denominations, are as nothing.

“Common civility, on the contrary, concurs with Christian charity to make the enlightened members of one denomination respect and esteem those of another, and to appreciate the beautiful sentiment recently attributed by the chancellor of the exchequer, in the British Parliament, to the late Mr. Wilberforce: ‘I experience,’ said that distinguished philanthropist, ‘a feeling of triumph when I can get the better of these little distinctions which keep Christians asunder. I would not that any one should sacrifice his principles; but, exercising the Protestant right of private judgment, leave each to his own conclusions. It is delightful to see that in this way men of different sects can unite together for the prosecution of their projects for the amelioration of human society. When I thus unite with persons of a different persuasion from myself, it affords me an augmented degree of pleasure; I rise into a higher nature, into a purer air; I feel that fetters which before bound me are dissolved, and I delight in that blessed liberty of love which carries all other blessings with it.’” p. 269.

The sketch of Massachusetts Unitarianism, in the seventh book, is full of instruction. It should be pondered by all who would understand the process by which damnable heresies are privily brought in, or who would learn how the fine gold becomes dim and the wine mingled with water. To one section of this history, we ask particular attention.

“A few years since, German Transcendentalism made its appearance among the Unitarian clergy, and has spread rapidly. Its adherents, generally, are not very profound thinkers, nor very well acquainted with the philosophy which they have embraced, or with the evidence on which it rests. It promises to relieve its disciples from the necessity of building their religious faith and hopes on probabilities, however strong, and to give them an intuitive and infallible knowledge of all that is essential in religion; and it affords an unlimited range for the play of the imagination. It has charms, therefore, for the contemplative and for the enthusiastic.

“The controversy on this subject became public in 1836. It was brought out by an article in the *Christian Examiner*, maintaining that our faith in Christianity does not rest on the evidence of miracles; that a record of miracles, however attested, can prove nothing in favour of a religion not previously seen to be true; and that, therefore, we need to see and admit the reasonableness and truth of the doctrines of Christianity, before we can believe that miracles were wrought to commend it to mankind. The ‘Old School’ Unitarians, as they called themselves, pronounced this theory infidelity, for it struck at the

foundation of the only reasoning by which they proved the truth of Christianity. The controversy was protracted, and somewhat bitter; but no attempt was made by the 'Old School' to separate themselves from those whom they denounced as infidels.

"The charge of Pantheism is brought against the Transcendentalists generally, by their Unitarian opponents; and, in fact, some of their publications are evidently Pantheistic, while others are ambiguous in that respect. Some of them have borrowed largely from Benjamin Constant, and maintain that all religions, from Fetichism to the most perfect form of Christianity, are essentially of the same nature, being only developments, more or less perfect, of the religious sentiment which is common to all men. According to them, all men who have any religious thoughts or feelings are so far inspired; Moses, Minos, and Numa, and a few others, had an unusual degree of inspiration; and Jesus of Nazareth most of all. They do not believe, however, that even Jesus was so inspired as to be in all cases an infallible teacher; and they declare themselves by no means sure that we shall not see his superior. They reject Christ as a mediator in every sense of the term, and declare that, in order to be true Christians, we must hold intercourse with God as Christ himself did, without a mediator.

"These impious doctrines have been promulgated in periodicals and otherwise, from time to time, with increasing boldness. In the spring of the year 1841, they were put forth without disguise and without reserve in a sermon at an ordination at South Boston. Several of the leading Unitarian clergy of the 'Old School' were present, and took part in the services. It is said that some of them, in performing their parts, uttered sentiments at variance with those of the preacher, from which attentive hearers might infer that the sermon did not meet their approbation; but there was no explicit condemnation of the sermon either then or afterward, till public attention was called to the subject by three evangelical clergymen who attended the ordination as hearers, and took notes of the discourse. These three witnesses, some weeks after the ordination, published extracts from the sermon in several religious newspapers, and called on the members of the Ordaining Council to say whether they recognised the preacher as a Christian minister. Public attention was roused. Several intelligent Unitarian laymen united in the demand. Continued silence became impracticable. A number of articles appeared in newspapers and magazines, in which individual Unitarian ministers denounced the sermon, and pronounced its doctrines deistical; but they carefully avoided the question, whether its author was recognised by them as a Christian minister. Others of them preached and wrote in his defence. His ecclesiastical relations still remain undisturbed. Some of his Unitarian neighbours have recognised his ministerial character by exchanging pulpits with him on the Sabbath; and he has, in his turn, preached the weekly lecture maintained by the Unitarian clergy of the Boston Association. It is understood, therefore, that the public avowal of doctrines like his, forms no obstacle to a regular standing in the Unitarian ministry." pp. 278, 279.

But he who would descry all the breadth of this influence from abroad, must take a wider field of observation than

that which is afforded by the Socinian domain. Transcendental philosophy, as the term is used in common parlance, has sent its vapours over other fields. The miasma has penetrated New England schools and colleges; not to the infection of great numbers, but to the great corruption of a few. The term is sufficiently vague. So far from meaning what Kant understood when he employed it, the disciples of this newest school use it as an honourable cloke for whatever is undefined, whatever is unproved, whatever is more allied to poesy than to reasoning, whatever is paradoxical and mystical. It bewitches the young, because it makes them sages without study. It exalts the fanciful, because it invests their dreams with the golden cloud of philosophic diction. It invites the errorist to veil his false opinions under the garb of unwouted and indeterminate formulas. It makes religion easy to the carnal mind by presenting, as spiritualism, schemes of belief which are independent of the Holy Spirit. Wherever we meet with it, whether in the groves and high places of prelacy, or the mines of profound metaphysics, we find a species of religion which harmonizes the most discordant creeds, embraces, as in good part true, the revelation of the Bramin and the Academic; undervalues all the vulgar modes of gracious experience; and either discards the old-time phraseology of scripture, or attaches to it a meaning altogether new. Nowhere have we seen it adding strength to the arguments of natural religion, the admitted proofs of God's existence, or the historical evidences of Christianity. Nowhere has it been employed to brighten the ordinary manifestations of private, domestic and social piety, or stimulate to extraordinary efforts for the conversion of souls. Whether Coleridge or Cousin be the hierophant, the initiated novice has alike been led away from the faith of his childhood and of the church. There are many dangerous steps which may be taken, before a man reaches the godless chasm of pantheism. And we earnestly exhort our younger brethren—since among them the chief conversions are made—to postpone their adventures into these shadowy tracts, until they shall have disciplined themselves by a more than usual regimen of stern, hard, dialectical exercise; such as will not weaken them in the conflict with error; such as made the great scholastic minds originate systems that, far from perishing like waves, have subsisted as mountains; such as brought out the sinew and sharpened the sagacity of Calvin, Zanchius, Twisse, and

Edwards. Especially let them distrust all overtures, from whatever quarter, which must have for their certain result, to reduce to a dead letter all the written theology of past ages, and all the experimental records of the church; to engender a sickly hankering after every eccentric and obscure heresy, from the Gnostics and Montanus down to Swedenborg and Behmen; and which under the pretext of destroying rationalism will destroy reason itself. Better by far, in our judgment, the stiffest scholasticism of a Voetius or a De Moor, if conjoined with reverence for scripture and devotion to Christ, than the most Platonic flights of a Schleiermacher, if destitute of the catholic experience of grace in the heart.

It was no part of Dr. Baird's intention to direct public notice to the new metaphysics; but we regard the matter as having such relations to the state of religion in America, as will justify us in spending some time on it. Many even among our readers will probably think our labour ill-bestowed, in chasing an ignis-fatuus. Let such reflect, however, that it is not superfluous to warn men against the false-light which seduces from the path of orthodoxy. If it were a scientific arrangement of dogmas, in any method whatever, the danger would be less. But after careful, long-continued, and for a time not suspicious quest, we are unable to produce any series of clear propositions which our new philosophy offers to maintain. It avoids categorical assertion. It deals in vague, intangible, rhapsodical, circumlocution. To join issue, on definite points, after the manner of the schools, is against its policy. Its followers are therefore of every creed, from Popery down to Socinianism, Deism, and Atheism. Proud complacency in an alleged insight, penetrating beyond the ken of common minds, almost precludes the usual trials of logical conflict. Some are ready, therefore, to say, 'what need is there of any alarm? Why should we give ourselves any care about schemes so visionary and fantastic? Why not let them float away, as successive clouds of the same sort have floated away in Germany?'—To this the answer is easy. We fully expect these baseless visions to be dissipated, without the breath of opposition. But while they are passing over us, they are leaving behind an influence of which the evil is positive. If they were only high sounding assumptions of reason in its loftier functions, of spiritualism, and of converse with universal beauty and truth, we might

leave the dreamers to complete their dream. But they have this unfailing characteristic—*they unsettle the foundations*. Professing the research of elementary, fundamental, nay eternal truth, they deny the validity of all the popular conclusions, on which are built the evidences of our faith. Hence it is almost distinctive of all the discordant members of this school, to disparage and decry the systematic theology of the reformation; the methods of Newton, Locke, Reid and Stewart; the philosophical efforts of Edwards. Hence, also, if any credit is to be given to them, we are brought to the necessity of settling on a new basis the whole fabric of Apologetical Theology. For we must, according to them, abandon as untenable the entire teleological argument for the Being of God, and the entire historical evidence of Christianity. What this imports, we need not pause to explain to those who prize the results of theological inquiry during past ages. But we re-affirm, that independently of any positive dogmas of philosophy by those who call themselves Transcendentalists, there is in their teaching a tendency to unsettle the basis of our common belief, a tendency so determinate and universal, as to justify us in uttering the strongest *caveat*. And we are held to nothing more, until more definite and appreciable results of their system shall be evolved, in the shape of propositions to be disproved.

It is very common to hear even good people, in and about Boston, express the opinion, that this visionary scheme is useful, as leading men from Rationalistic and Deistical tenets to evangelical religion. They will not indeed call it daylight, but the twilight between night and day. They cite instances, in which Unitarians have become transcendental, as a first step towards becoming Christian. They further tell us cases like that of Tholuck, in Germany, where such opinions have led to evangelical truth. To this we shall not reply by denying the fact of such transitions: but we have a different solution for the problem. The great constitutional vice of Unitarian religion is its coldness. It gives no play to the higher and warmer emotions. It is this which thins their assemblies and petrifies their worship, which leads an Emerson to confess, that all the more enthusiastic kinds of religion, even in Calvinism and Methodism, “are varying forms of that shudder of awe and delight with which the individual soul always mingles with the universal soul.” It is this which

causes Unitarian pulpits to resound with harangues on Slavery, Spirituous liquors, Capital punishment, Texas, Aesthetics, any thing but Christ; and which drives their noblest minds from theology to politics, as in the cases of Everett, Sparks, Bancroft, and Palfrey. It is this which portends and will accomplish the death of Unitarianism in its present form. This being the case, it is not wonderful that minds which feel it, and which long for something to enkindle the affections, should seize on error rather than truth. From believing too little, they turn straightway to believing too much; from Deism to mysticism; from Socinus to Swedenborg; and, as a type of the process, Mr. Brownson has verified the predictions of his opponents, and leaped outright into the arms of Popery. To eyes just opening upon something more glorious than the ghosts which traverse the cold fields of 'liberal Christianity,' there is certainly a charm in the mystical phase of German philosophy, to which they often yield themselves. Nay more, out of this number, some, finding that they have made Ixion's mistake, grow dissatisfied with the phantom, and embrace the gospel reality. But shall we therefore use the phantom as a decoy? Shall we be accessory to a falsehood, because it has in numerous instances been the last of a train of falsehoods, previous to admitting the truth? To do so would shock every maxim of philosophical honesty. Let us proclaim the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. And let us remember, that if this newer infidelity has been the stepping-stone, upwards, to the gospel, it may be, for the same reason, the stepping-stone, downwards, to infidelity. Instead, therefore, of holding up to the gaze of a mind which is becoming less incredulous and more intent on the venerable and lovely, a 'counterfeit presentment,' in the shape of any philosophy, we would hold up to it, what is far more venerable, and far more lovely, the genuine portion of the soul, Christ crucified, and we would hold it up, not with philosophic euphemisms, or the circumlocutions of doubt, but in the clear, categorical, established formulas of Reformed Theology. This directness in preaching the gospel, even to the most fastidious, tasteful, and sentimental, is the neglected but infallible method. We take it to be the very wand to disenchant the victims of philosophical sorcery: yea, the sword of the Spirit, to hew down all imaginations. The day of judgment is impending too nearly for us to make circuits, and wait for Harvard to

lay aside its contempt for evangelical cant. So to wait, is to make the cross of Christ 'of none effect.' The Greeks will 'seek after wisdom,' and call the cross 'foolishness;' but our best hope of turning their minds is in determining to know nothing among them but Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

Dr. Baird has a chapter on 'the state of Theological Opinion in America.' Most of his remarks on this subject appear to be just. But we fail, in some degree, to apprehend the following passage, if it is not partial and open to objection.

"The great achievement of the American theology is, that it has placed the doctrine of the atonement for sin in the clearest light, by illustrations drawn from the nature of a moral government. Nowhere is the distinction between the work of Christ as the propitiation for the sins of men, and that of the Holy Spirit in renewing and sanctifying the sinner, more clearly drawn—nowhere is the necessity of each to the salvation of the soul more constantly and forcibly exhibited. The tendency of our theology, under the impulse of the Edwardean exposition of the doctrine of atonement, is to avoid the habit—so common to philosophers and philosophizing theologians—of contemplating God exclusively as the First Cause of all beings and all events, and to fix attention upon him as a moral governor of beings made for responsible action. Here it is that the God of the Bible differs from the God of philosophy. The latter is simply a first cause—a reason why things are—sometimes, if not always, a mere hypothesis to account for the existence of the universe, another name for nature or for fate. The former is a moral governor, that is, a lawgiver, a judge, a dispenser of rewards and penalties. God's law is given to the universe of moral beings for the one great end of promoting the happiness of that vast empire. As a law, it is a true and earnest expression of the will of the lawgiver respecting the actions of his creatures. As a law, it must be sanctioned by penalties adequate to express God's estimation of the value of the interests trampled on by disobedience. As the law is not arbitrary, but the necessary means of accomplishing the greatest good, it may not be arbitrarily set aside. Therefore, when man had become apostate, and the whole human race was under condemnation, God sent his Son into the world, in human nature, 'to be made a sin-offering for us;' and thus by his voluntary sufferings magnifying the law, 'to declare the righteousness of God, that God may be just, and the justifier of him who believeth.' Thus it is that God, as a moral governor, is glorified in the forgiveness of sinners; that He calls upon all men to repent, with a true and intense desire for their salvation; that He sends into a world of rebellion the infinite gift of his Spirit, to impart life to those who are dead in sin; that in a world of sinners, who, if left to themselves, would all reject the offered pardon, He saves those whom he has chosen out of the world; and he uses the co-operation of redeemed and renewed men in advancing the work of saving their fellow-men. Men are saved from

sin and condemnation, not by mere power, but by means that harmonize with the nature and conduce to the ends of God's moral government. This method of illustrating the Gospel carries the preacher and the theologian back from the Platonic dreams and dry dogmatizing of the schools, to the Bible. It sets the theologian upon studying, and the preacher upon imitating, the freedom, simplicity, and directness, with which the Apostles addressed the understandings and sensibilities of men. And thus it may be regarded as coinciding with other indications of the tendency of religious opinion in the various evangelical bodies of America." pp. 291, 292.

Upon this statement we offer one or two strictures; promising that we have no reason to rank the esteemed author in any school of theological opinion other than our own. And first, we are unable to assert of any theology, which can be distinguished as *American*, any addition of clearness to the doctrine of *Atonement*. Several incompatible doctrines are taught in America, by churches called evangelical. We have, for instance, the doctrine of John Calvin and John Owen, which is taught, in the very terms of the Reformed Confessions, by Presbyterians of all the stricter sorts. We have the doctrine of John Wesley, a modified Arminianism, taught in every iota prescribed by the founder, throughout the immense body of Methodists. We have the doctrine of Murdock, Fitch, Taylor, and Finney; for, omitting minor differences, it is the same; taught more or less extensively in and out of New England. These have no common trait so prominent, as to justify us in asserting of them, that they, or their common tenets, open a clearer view of this august subject than had previously been attained.

But if, as seems to result from what has been said, this achievement of American theology has been effected by a particular school, it must be that of New England. This is more likely to be the meaning, when we re-peruse the sentences alluding to Edwards. Of Edwards himself, we cannot write but with profound reverence. But we are unable to call to mind in his works, any new mode of presenting this specific doctrine, which has in the least degree freed it from difficulty. His treatment of this point agrees with that of the old divines. This great philosopher did indeed offer new and imperishable argument and illustration, on some topics; such as the nature of holiness and of sin, human freedom, the nature of inability, the ultimate end of creation, and the millennium; but in regard to the nature of the Atonement (and we are restricted to this by the references in the passage cited) Edwards founded no school

and made no special communications which were new.

Even though the New England view of the Atonement should be attributed to an Edwardean exposition of truth, we regard the statement above as liable to misapprehension. For it assumes that the mode which preceded of representing the Atonement, was unhappy and obscure, and even that it contemplated "God exclusively as the First Cause of all beings and events." Now, the European reader will naturally ask, 'What system of teaching is here censured?' And we are forced to reply that we know of no system which can be intended except that which is exhibited by the Dordrecht divines, by Owen, Charnock, and Flavel, by Dick, Symington, and Hill, by Witherspoon, Mason, and Romeyn. Plain readers will think of this as the system on which improvement has been made. It is not only our own creed, but it is one which is far from lying open to any charge of undervaluing or cloaking the moral government of God. Beyond all other creeds it exalts the divine Justice, even his vindicatory Justice; beyond all others, it establishes the truth (as expressed by the author) that the law "must be sanctioned by penalties adequate to express God's estimation of the value of the interests trampled on by disobedience."

The paragraph which we have extracted purports to set forth the great achievement of American Theology. The propositions which it contains may be regarded therefore as exhibiting, briefly, the conclusions of this theology, on this point. Now it is remarkable, that excepting an implied censure of some foregoing systems, there is not a proposition here which does not command our assent, nay, which would not command the assent of the most rigid Scotch Calvinist of the seventeenth century.

If, however, the view of the Atonement indicated above is the view presented by the 'New Theology,' we do not merely reject it as erroneous, but we protest against its being held forth as *American*: and if, on the other hand, it is the evangelical view, as proposed by the Reformers and their successors, down to the days of Merle, Krummacher, Cunningham, Welsh, and Stevenson, we cannot consider it an achievement of our preachers, or of our own day.

Nothing could have induced us to express even this moderate dissatisfaction with Dr. Baird's eulogium of 'American Theology,' but our knowledge that the phrase is widely used by transatlantic writers to denote a scheme

which we reject, as a retrocession from reformed doctrine; and our full persuasion, that nothing is so much needed to correct the bias of our own preachers, as a hearty return to the cordial, gracious truths maintained by our forefathers in Great Britain and ancient Massachusetts. After all, we thank Dr. Baird for his work. Our exceptions might indicate something like disapproval of the book. On the contrary, the passages on which we have remarked occupy a very small space, and are scarcely connected with the main scope. We are so far from scrupling to recommend the whole, that there is no one chapter which we would not recommend. We are enlightened and warmed by the patriotic and filial vindication of our country, and especially by the closing chapters. And where we think the author has conveyed a wrong impression, in regard to doctrinal statements, we ascribe it to an impulse not ungenerous, which would exalt the opinions of a large portion of our clergy beyond their proper place.

In style, the work is much superior to any which have before proceeded from the author. And we repeat our judgment, that it occupies a place which no other book has attempted to fill, and that it merits a permanent place in our libraries.

Chas. Fodge & G. A. Spinks.

ART. III.—*Sacerdotal Absolution: a Sermon, preached before the Convention of the Diocese of North Carolina, 1843.* By the Rev. M. A. Curtis, Rector of St. Matthew's Church, Hillsborough, N. C. Published by request. New York: James A. Sparks. 1844. 8vo. pp. 33.

By absolution is meant the authoritative forgiveness of sins; by sacerdotal absolution, the exercise of this official power by the Christian ministry, considered as a priesthood. The doctrine of sacerdotal absolution, therefore, comprehends two dogmas; first, that Christian ministers are priests, and then, that as priests, they possess this power of forgiving sins. Now these two propositions are not only distinguishable, but distinct; they do not involve each other; the truth of the one does not necessarily imply the truth of the other. It is perfectly conceivable that the ministry might have the power claimed without being priests; and on the other hand,

that they might be priests without having the power. This will be seen more clearly in the sequel. For the present it will be sufficient to observe, that the two doctrines, though distinct, are near of kin and congenial, that they are commonly held by the same persons, that they are usually discussed together, and in particular that they are so discussed in the pamphlet now before us.

This publication has just come into our hands, and of its author we know nothing; nor should we consider any notice of it needful or expedient, if we did not wish to make it the occasion of expressing our own views upon the subject, a wish arising from our view of its importance, with respect not only to its comprehensive nature, and its many points of contact with the entire system of opinion in relation to the Church, but also to its practical bearing on the method of redemption, and the answer to the question, What shall I do to be saved? To make Mr. Curtis's discourse the occasion for considering this subject, and to let his argument give shape and colour to our own, we are the more disposed, because it seems to be a fair and not discreditable exhibition of the high episcopalian doctrine now in vogue, and because it is a thing which can be handled without tongs, or even gloves, being not ill-written nor devoid of talent, and as moderate in tone and temper as it is extravagant in its conclusions and assumptions. We shall, of course, not confine ourselves throughout to the reasonings and statements of this writer, but shall pay him the compliment of making his discourse the text and starting-point of ours, first presenting the subject as it appears in his pages, and then as it appears to us, beginning with his argument and ending with our own.

In executing the former part of this plan, we shall try first to ascertain distinctly what the preacher's doctrine is, and then show how he attempts to prove it and to repel objections. It will be necessary to state his doctrine negatively as well as positively, in justice to him, that he may not be supposed to hold opinions which he expressly disavows, and in justice to ourselves, that we may not be supposed to combat doctrines which we heartily believe.

We begin, then, by negatively stating that the absolution which the author claims is not a mere ecclesiastical absolution, having reference to ecclesiastical offences and ecclesiastical penalties, and affecting only the ecclesiastical relations of the subject, or his standing before the church; but an absolution having reference to sin in general, to the sinner's

standing in the sight of God, his spiritual condition, and his ultimate salvation. Again, the absolution which the author argues for, is not a mere declarative absolution, setting forth the conditions on which God will forgive sin; nor a hypothetical absolution, declaring sin forgiven, on the supposition of the sinner's repentance; nor an optative or intercessory absolution, expressing a desire that his sins may be forgiven; but an authoritative efficacious absolution, as effective of its purpose as if administered by the independent and supreme power, without any intermediate human agency. With respect to the 'formal character of the act of absolution,' the author does indeed adopt, or at least quote, a classification of the learned Bingham, which establishes the fourfold distinction of sacramental absolution, declaratory absolution, peccatory absolution, and judicial absolution. It is clear, however, that the first and last of these, except so far as the outward form and circumstances are concerned, are one and the same thing, and that the other two are no absolution at all, according to the author's judgment, that is to say, no such absolution as would satisfy the conditions of his argument, or be considered by him worthy of the ministry. The whole drift of his reasoning is to show that an efficacious absolution, as described above, is a necessary function of the Christian ministry, not indeed in virtue of any intrinsic, independent power, but of a special delegated power, just as real and effective, as it could be if inherent or original.

In proof of this doctrine the author appeals briefly to tradition, and at more length to the scriptures. His traditional argument is drawn from the alleged fact, that the doctrine has been uniformly held by the Holy Catholic Church, and as a distinct fact, or included in the first, that the Reformers held it and the first Reformed Churches, while, on the other hand, it has been rejected only by latitudinarians, who are bent on reducing the ministry to the lowest point of inefficiency, and are utterly unable to agree as to the meaning of the scriptures on this subject.

Having, by this historical presumption, created a prejudice in favour of his doctrine, which we admit to be fair enough, so far as the alleged facts are substantiated, he adduces his argument from scripture, founded on the following three passages:

'Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.' John xx. 23.

‘Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.’ Matt. xviii. 18.

‘And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.’ Matt. xvi. 19.

With respect to the interpretation of these passages, it will only be necessary here to state, that the author denies the second and third to be exegetical of the first, and contends that it is exegetical of them. In other words, instead of arguing that because the figurative terms in Matthew *may* be descriptive of a mere ecclesiastical absolution, therefore the literal terms in John must be limited and understood accordingly, he argues that because the passage in John contains a literal grant of power to forgive sins, the metaphors in Matthew must be interpreted to signify the same thing. As to the metaphors themselves, he adopts the opinion of Calixtus, that the shutting and opening of heaven, implied in the grant of the keys, and the binding and loosing expressly mentioned in both cases, have reference alike to the bondage of sin, and convey the same idea that is literally expressed in John, viz. the remission or non-remission of sin, in the uniform sense of that phrase in the New Testament, which could not be departed from without the risk of dangerous errors.

Besides this argument derived from the express declarations of our Saviour, there is another, upon which the author seems to lay great stress, drawn from the nature of the ministerial office. The argument, in its most general form, is this, that the ministry without this power, is worthless, or at least without ‘special and positive value,’ and productive only of ‘incidental benefit, such as might ensue from the sober action of any man whatever, and not of an appointed and certain efficacy.’ To teach the truth, to preach Christ, to invite men to him, to administer the ordinances, to exercise discipline, to feed the sheep and lambs of Christ’s flock, seem to go for nothing with the author, unless accompanied by the power of life and death, salvation and perdition, to give dignity and efficacy to the office.

This view of the ministry is so remote from that contained in the New Testament, and so far from naturally springing out of the idea of a ministry, that it might well appear inexplicable, were it not clear that the author, in thus judging, has constantly before him a standard of comparison afforded

by another ministry, that of the Old Testament, the Levitical priesthood. It is not only implied but expressed in his reasonings, that such a power of absolution as he claims is needed to put the Christian ministry upon a level with the Jewish. Hence his argument may be more specifically stated in this form, that the Christian ministry is a priesthood, and must therefore have this power, without which it cannot be a priesthood, nor compete in point of dignity and efficacy with that of the Mosaic law. The premises in this ratiocination are invariably assumed, as too unquestionable to require or admit of proof. Combining this argument, founded on the nature of the ministerial office, with that derived from the express declarations of the scripture, we may thus reduce them to a single proposition: the scriptures (in the passages already quoted) recognise the power of efficacious absolution as a sacerdotal function of the Christian ministry.

Having thus established his main doctrine by an appeal both to tradition and to scripture, and in the latter both directly from express declarations, and indirectly from the nature of the ministerial office, he proceeds to consider the objections which may be alleged against the doctrine. Of these he enumerates three, which he is pleased to call ‘popular objections.’ The first is, that the doctrine is unscriptural; the second, that it is dishonouring to God, as an encroachment upon his prerogative; the third, that it is practically incompatible with human fallibility and weakness.

The first objection he disposes of by saying that it cannot be discussed apart from the other two; such is their mutual dependence that they must stand or fall together; if the doctrine is scriptural it cannot be either unworthy of God or impossible to man; if on the other hand either of these allegations is well founded, it cannot be scriptural. It is no doubt true that the inconsistency of this opinion of the word of God cannot be urged as a specific objection against it, simply because it involves the whole matter in dispute, and either includes all other objections, or renders them unnecessary. To say that it is contrary to scripture is to say that it is false, which cannot of course be urged as a separate argument to prove it false. It was not however altogether fair in Mr. Curtis to present this as a sample of the objections urged against his doctrine, and of the ease with which he can dispose of them. We may let him try his hand upon some others by and by; but in the mean time we are will-

ing to make this stipulation, that if the doctrine can be proved from scripture, the other two objections shall go for nothing, but if not, its interference with the divine prerogative and its incompatibility with human weakness, shall be held to aggravate its false pretensions and to give it a character of moral as well as intellectual obliquity.

The author's answer to the second and third of these 'popular objections' is, that they are founded on a misconception of his doctrine, as asserting an original, inherent, power, in the ministry, whereas it asserts only a derivative and delegated power or a special human agency and mediation, constituted by divine appointment, in accordance with the general analogy of God's dispensations, which the author illustrates by a great variety of scripture instances. Among these are the communication of the Holy Ghost to Joshua by the imposition of the hands of Moses; the necessity of circumcision and sacrifices under the Old Testament; the mission of Peter and John to 'confirm' the Samaritan converts after Philip had baptised them; the washing away of Paul's sins by his baptism at the hands of Ananias; the cure of Naaman the Syrian by washing in the Jordan; the forgiveness of sins at the intercession of Abraham and Hezekiah; Christ's promise to be present whenever two or three of his apostles were assembled; and the promise of healing to sick, as an effect of prayer and unction by the elders of the church.

These cases are adduced to prove not merely that God uses human agency in cases where he might dispense with it, but also that he thus employs a special 'mediation,' as the preacher calls it, where we should least expect it, and where reason can afford no explanation of it. This proposition there was no need of proving, since nobody disputes it. What the author ought to have established is not the general fact that God does specially appoint certain media or channels for the communication of his grace, but the specific fact, that the ministry is so appointed for the purpose of communicating pardon to sinners. He seems to have been conscious of his inability to do this, and has consequently confused the subject by recurring to Bingham's fourfold division, and arranging the scriptural examples just referred to, under those heads, a course which answers very well until he comes to judicial absolution, where, instead of citing even one case, he contents himself with telling what the power is, and asserting that it must be in the minis-

try, and showing its tremendous consequences. This we regard as a tacit but significant concession of the fact that there is no recorded instance of the actual exercise of the power which the author claims for Christian ministers.

We believe we have now noticed all the author's arguments, except those by which he undertakes to show that the power of remission granted by our Saviour was not an extraordinary or temporary one. These it will be sufficient to have named, as we have no intention to assume that ground of opposition to the doctrine. We may say, however, that to us the author's account of the miraculous powers of the first Christian ministers does not appear consistent with itself, since he sometimes speaks of them as being merely higher degrees of the same power which the ministry now exercises, and sometimes as so totally distinct that their coincidence was wholly fortuitous.

Having seen how triumphantly the author disposes of the 'popular objections' to his doctrine, we are sorry to be under the necessity of bringing forward a few others, which he has overlooked, either because he never heard of them, or because he regarded them as too unpopular. In doing this we waive entirely the three objections which he has discussed, until the others are disposed of, and agree that if the latter are untenable the former may be thrown away, provided always, that in case of a contrary result, our argument shall have the benefit of these subsidiary reasons to corroborate and perfect it.

In order to preclude misapprehension, let us state again the doctrine which we understand the author to maintain, viz. that the scriptures recognise a power of authoritative efficacious absolution or forgiveness of sins, as an essential function of the Christian priesthood.

I. Our first objection to this doctrine is, that *the power contended for is not a sacerdotal power at all.* We prove it, first, by the scriptural definition of a priest, as one 'ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sin.' (Heb. v. 1.) This includes mediation and atonement, but not absolution or forgiveness. We prove it, next, from the Levitical practice. The Old Testament priests did not forgive sin; they simply made atonement for it. We prove it, thirdly, from the priesthood of Christ, who is nowhere represented as forgiving sin in his sacerdotal character. We prove it, lastly, from the nature of the case. The two functions of atone-

ment and forgiveness are not only distinct, but, in a certain sense, incompatible. Christ himself acts as Lord when he forgives. Pardon is always an exercise of sovereignty, inherent or derivative. Upon these four reasons, drawn from the definition of a priest, the Levitical practice, the priesthood of Christ, and the very nature of the power claimed, we rest our first objection to the doctrine of 'sacerdotal absolution,' viz. that it is not a sacerdotal function.

II. Our second objection to the doctrine is, that *the Christian ministry is not a priesthood.*

1. They are not priests, first, because they are never so described in scripture, as they must have been if this were their true character, the rather as the writers of the New Testament had never known a religion, true or false, without a priesthood, were perfectly familiar with the names and functions of the Jewish hierarchy, and had the most exalted notions of the Christian ministry, as the most honourable office in the world, for which no man is sufficient, and of which no man is worthy. That the name should never be applied is wholly inexplicable on the supposition of a Christian priesthood. The solitary figurative phrase which is alleged in opposition to this statement,* and in which the official title is not used, but only a derivative or cognate verb, can no more prove that Paul was a literal priest than it can prove that the gentiles were a literal sacrifice, or than the parallel passages in Philippians and Timothy† can prove that Paul was a literal libation.

2. They are not priests, secondly, because no priestly function is ascribed to them. The essential functions of a priesthood, as appears from the inspired definition above quoted, from the Levitical practice, and from the analogy of Christ's sacerdotal office, are mediation and atonement, exclusive mediation between parties who are otherwise mutually inaccessible, and real atonement by the presentation of an expiatory sacrifice. Such mediation and such atonement the New Testament never ascribes to Christian ministers. To assert that the essential function of a priesthood is 'ministerial

* 'That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the gentiles, ministering (ἰερωουργοῦντα) the gospel of God, that the offering up (προσφορά) of the gentiles might be acceptable, etc.' Rom. xv. 16.

† 'Yea and if I be offered (σπένδομαι) upon the sacrifice and service of your faith.' Phil. ii. 17.—'For I am now ready to be offered (ἤδη σπένδομαι.)' 2 Tim. iv. 6.

intervention for the pardon of sin,' is either saying nothing that is definite and to the purpose; or saying too much, to wit, that women and laymen who baptise for the remission of sins, and all who teach men how to obtain pardon, are, by reason of this ministerial intervention, *ipso facto* priests; or it is saying in ambiguous and doubtful terms, what we have just said plainly, to wit, that the very idea of a priest involves that of exclusive and necessary mediation, a kind of 'ministerial intervention' of which the New Testament knows nothing.

3. They are not priests, thirdly, because the scriptures represent Christ as the only priest of his people, who by the one offering up of himself has perfectly and forever answered all the ends of the old priesthood. Having then such a High Priest, Jesus the Son of God, we may come with boldness to the throne of grace. And he not only has performed the work of a priest, but he is ever present in that character. There were many priests of old, because they could not continue by reason of death; but Christ is a perpetual priest because he ever lives. They had successors because they were mortal men. He has no successor, because he is partaker of an endless life. The apostle argues that if Christ were on earth he could not be a priest, that is, a priest of the old covenant, because the office was preoccupied by others, whose priesthood must either supersede his, or be superseded by it. If, then, there could not be two priesthoods under the old covenant, neither can there be two priesthoods under the new. If his priesthood then was incompatible with that of others, that of others must now be incompatible with his. It follows, therefore, either that the Christian ministry is not a priesthood, or that Christ is not the great High Priest of our profession.

4. They are not priests *under* Christ, and in a sense compatible with his high-priesthood, as the priests of old were, because these were types of Christ, as a high-priest yet to come, and only partially revealed, whereas now the revelation is complete, and Christ is not only come but is still present, so that the supposition of a continued priesthood now, confounds the old with the new covenant, the future with the past, and makes the type as necessary after as before the appearance of the antitype, which is absurd. It might as well be said that there must still be John the Baptists to be Christ's forerunners, or that the dawn of

day can be continued after the rising of the sun. It is no reply, then, to the foregoing argument derived from Christ's exclusive priesthood, to allege that there can just as well be priests now as before his advent, since his advent is the very thing which has removed the necessity or rather destroyed the possibility of any priesthood but the highest. For the very reason that before Christ came there was a priesthood to prefigure him and represent him, it follows that there cannot be a priesthood now, when there is nothing to prefigure, and when the object represented is and forever will be personally present.

5. They are not priests, in the sense contended for, and as successors to the ancient priests, because the functions claimed for Christian ministers are wholly different from those of the Levitical priesthood, whose sacerdotal acts were not designed to secure the pardon of sin in the sight of God, it being impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin, but had relation to the external theocracy, and were intended to secure the remission of its penalties and the restoration of the offender to its privileges, so that they might have their full effect, and yet leave the relation of the offerer to God entirely unchanged. The way in which these ends were answered was indeed designed to typify the method of atonement, but so was the lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness, the slaying of the passover, and other rites which had not the nature of sin-offerings. If then Christian ministers are indeed the successors of the ancient priesthood, they should claim no more than the power to secure ecclesiastical remissions and advantages, whereas the advocates of this succession claim to do, not what the ancient priests did, but the very thing which Christ does, and are therefore, at the same time, perverters of the priesthood of Aaron and usurpers of the priesthood of Christ.

6. They are not priests in the sense of human mediators specially appointed to bring men to Christ, as Christ brings men to God, because the scriptures, while they constantly and clearly teach that we must come to God through the mediation of Christ, teach no less constantly and clearly that we may come to Christ without any mediation at all. This distinction cannot be unmeaning or fortuitous, and is itself decisive of the question. The argument, however, is not merely negative but positive. Not only are the scriptures silent as to the necessity of any such 'ministerial intervention,' as a

means of access to the benefits of Christ's death, but they hold forth the freeness of immediate access to the Saviour, without any intervention, as one of the great distinctive doctrines of the gospel. To cite the proofs of this position in detail, would be to quote all those scriptures in which Christ is represented as having died for the very purpose of bringing us to God, and as being the only mediator between God and man. That another mediation is required to make this mediation available, is *a priori* so improbable, and so destructive of the very end for which the greater mediation is expressly said to be intended, namely, direct and free access to God, that it cannot be rendered even credible, much less proved true, by any thing short of explicit declarations of the word of God, which are not only altogether wanting, but in place of which we have innumerable invitations and commands to come at once to Christ. In the face of all this to assert, as a point of gospel doctrine, that no one comes to Christ but through his ministers, seems as extravagant as it would be to assert, as a fact of gospel history, that Christ never wrought a miracle of healing until his followers had wrought one first. Alas, how many who have tried the effect of 'ministerial intervention,' for themselves or others, might say with the father of the lunatic, 'I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure him!' And the terms, if not the meaning, of our Lord's reproving answer would be equally appropriate, 'O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? **BRING HIM HITHER TO ME.**' The parallel must not indeed be carried further; for the reason why the Christian priesthood cannot forgive sin is not the want of faith, but of authority and power. Let the illustration serve, however, to throw light upon the contrast between pardon as obtained by 'ministerial intervention,' and pardon as immediately bestowed by Christ. Unless the offers of the gospel are entirely unmeaning, the Christian ministry is not, in this or any other sense, a priesthood.

7. They are not priests, finally, because the scriptures declare them to be something altogether different. The simple fact, that they are not described as priests, would be sufficient of itself, even if no description had been given of their true official character; but the conclusion is immeasurably strengthened by the frequent and uniform representation of the ministry as messengers, heralds of salvation, teachers, watchmen, rulers, overseers, shepherds. 'Simon, son of

Jonas, lovest thou me? Feed my sheep.' 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Feed my lambs.' 'Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.' 'Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers, by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?' 'So then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase.' 'Let a man so account of us as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God, (i. e. dispensers of divine truth).' 'We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake.' Not only is all this no description of a priesthood; but that an office thus described, again and again, and in every variety of metaphorical and literal expression, should be after all a priesthood, is, if not impossible, beyond belief. And we are not surprised that most of those who hold the doctrine, found it not on scripture but tradition, or, in other words, believe that Christian ministers are priests, because they say so.

On all these grounds, then, that the scriptures nowhere give the name of priest, or ascribe any sacerdotal function, to the ministry; that Christ is represented as the one only priest of the new covenant, of whom the ancient priests were types, no longer needed or admissible; that the functions of these ancient priests were wholly different from those now exercised or claimed by Christian ministers; that any mediation between Christ and sinners is not only unknown but directly contradictory to scripture; and that the ministry is there represented under characters the most remote from that of priests, if not wholly inconsistent with it; we are justified in urging, as a second objection to the doctrine of Sacerdotal Absolution, that the Christian ministry is not a priesthood.

III. Our third objection is, that the grant of the power of remission was not made to the ministry. We find the grant in the same three passages to which Mr. Curtis has appealed, and we agree with him in thinking that they all express the same idea under different forms. But we differ from him as to the persons to whom the grant of power is addressed. This is often a difficult question to determine in our Lord's addresses, as the word *disciples*, which is generally used, has both a narrower and a wider meaning, sometimes denoting all Christ's followers, and sometimes the Apostles only, so that the objects of address can often be determined only by the context and the analogy of scripture. In the case before

us, the parallel passages must of course be suffered to explain each other, not only in relation to the nature of the grant, but also to the persons upon whom it was bestowed. The one recorded in the sixteenth of Matthew, taken by itself, would seem to show, that the power in question was conferred on Peter and his personal successors; but this conclusion is rejected equally by Mr. Curtis and ourselves, not only on the ground that such pre-eminence is nowhere else ascribed to Peter, and that no such peculiar power was ever claimed or exercised by him; but also on the ground that in the eighteenth of Matthew, a like grant is made to the 'disciples' generally. And that this does not mean the apostles merely, we infer from a comparison of John xx. 23 with Luke xxiv. 33, which shows that our Lord's words, recorded in the former place, were addressed to 'the eleven and them that were with them.' This is our first reason for believing that the power of remission granted by our Saviour was not granted to the apostles or to ministers exclusively, but to disciples or believers generally.

2. A second reason for this same conclusion may be drawn from the connexion in which the words appealed to stand in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, which contains one continuous discourse, all the parts of which are intimately connected. Our Lord first teaches the necessity of conversion in order to enter the kingdom of heaven; then the sin of offending those who believe on him; then the method of dealing with offenders, first in private, then before two or three witnesses, and then before the church; which is followed directly by the assurance that their decisions would be ratified in heaven, an assurance founded on the promise, that where two or three are gathered together in the Saviour's name, he is in the midst of them. Peter then asked how often they were to forgive private and personal offences, to which Christ replies that there can be no limit to the duty of forgiveness, and then shows by a parable the obligation resting upon those whom God had forgiven to forgive their brethren. Now to make any one part of this conversation have respect to the apostles, while the rest relates to Christians generally, is altogether arbitrary, and may as easily be denied as affirmed. Unless the necessity of conversion, the duty of avoiding offences, and of private dealing with offenders, are all peculiar to the apostles, why should the promise of Christ's presence, and of ratification to the judgment passed, be limited to them? The command is to 'tell it to the church,'

and the promise must be likewise to the church. That the formal exercise of the power granted is to be by officers, may be true enough ; but this much is plain, that whatever power is here bestowed, is not bestowed upon the ministry, but on the church.

3. A third reason for denying, that the power of remission is granted to the ministry exclusively, may be derived from the connexion which the scriptures recognise, and which all interpreters indeed admit, between this power and the gifts of the Holy Ghost. We learn from the New Testament that to every man was given the manifestation of the Spirit, to one the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another faith, to another the gifts of healing, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another the discerning of spirits, to another the gift of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues. All these wrought the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he would. The Spirit descended not only on Apostles, not only on Jews, but on Gentiles, as when Peter preached in the house of Cornelius. Even the power to confer miraculous gifts was not peculiar to the Apostles, as we learn from the case of Ananias, by whose agency such gifts were bestowed on Paul himself. Still less reason is there for assuming that the ordinary and abiding presence of the Holy Ghost is confined to the rulers of the church. They who claim it must either adduce a special promise, or show that a general promise is fulfilled in them alone, by proving their exclusive possession of those 'fruits of the Spirit' by which alone the presence of the Spirit can be known. If the power of remission now in question, is connected with the gift of the Spirit and arises from his presence, then the power must belong to all those in whom the Spirit dwells, or in other words, it does not belong to the ministry, as such, but to the church at large.

4. The same thing may be argued from the practice of the apostolic age, so far as it is left on record. On the one hand, we find no case where a power of remission is said to have been exercised by the apostles, or by other ministers, *suo jure*. We never read of men confessing their sins to them and receiving absolution or forgiveness at their hands. On the other hand, there are unambiguous traces of a power residing in the church collectively to judge its members and to try the spirits even of those who taught and governed it.

These negative and positive considerations, though they may not be sufficient to establish a disputed fact, strongly corroborate the inference already drawn from the terms and context of the passages in which the power is granted, and from its connexion with the gift and promise of the Holy Spirit, that the power of remitting sins, whatever it may be, is not a peculiar function of the Christian ministry.

IV. Our fourth objection to the doctrine is, that the power of absolute effectual forgiveness is not bestowed at all. 1. The admitted fact, that pardon is an act of sovereignty, and that none can, in the strict sense of the word, forgive, except the person against whom the offence is committed, cannot, as we have already conceded, be alleged in opposition to an express delegation of the power, or a special designation of the ministry as the only medium through which it will be exercised. But does it not create a strong presumption against the fact of such delegation and appointment, and enhance the necessity of positive explicit proof, in order to establish it? In this sense only do we here adduce one of Mr. Curtis's three 'popular objections,' not to disprove his doctrine, but to show how indispensable and yet how hard it is for him to prove it. And this presumption, far from being weakened, is corroborated by the analogies of other special agencies or mediations, which he cites, but which, as we have seen, including instances of every other 'mediation' but the one in question, raise the presumption almost to a certainty, that this awful prerogative of the divine sovereignty, if not incommunicable in its nature, has at least never been communicated to mere creatures.

2. Even supposing that our Saviour's words apparently admitted of no other explanation than the one assumed in the adverse argument, the consideration just presented would require us to seek another sense before we acquiesced in one so much at variance with all our preconceptions of the nature of the pardoning power and its relation to the sovereignty of God. In point of fact, however, this is not the only sense which our Lord's expressions naturally bear. It is only by insulating this one declaration that such an exposition of it seems to become necessary. That the power to remit sins *may* mean something less than the power absolutely and authoritatively to pardon them, is conceded by Mr. Curtis and 'the learned Bingham,' when they speak of declarative and precatory absolution as included in this grant. If a declaration of the terms of pardon, and if prayer for pardon,

are a *part* of the meaning of 'remission,' there is no absurdity, although there may be error, in assuming these to be the *whole*. If our Saviour's declaration conveys to those whom he addressed the power of absolution, and if absolution means (as Bingham says it means) declarative and precatory absolution, and if we are satisfied with this sense and refuse to look for any other, how does Mr. Curtis convince us of our error? By adducing arguments from other quarters, from the nature of the ministry, the Jewish priesthood, and the analogy of God's dispensations, not by insisting that the words themselves can only mean authoritative efficacious absolution, which would be directly contradictory to what he says about the other and inferior kinds. What we allege is not, that the words *cannot* mean forgiveness in the highest sense, but that they *need* not be so understood, if any good cause can be shown for giving them another explanation.

3. It is plain from the connexion in which these words of Christ are found, that the power bestowed is twofold, that of authoritative teaching and that of authoritative judgment. By virtue of the former, the church was to act as a witness of the truth, that is, simply to proclaim the doctrines which she had received from Christ; by virtue of the latter, to apply these doctrines to the case of individuals, to bind and loose, to open and shut, to receive into the church and to exclude from it. In the discharge of both these functions she was to be under the control and guidance of the Holy Spirit, as well as regulated by the written word, so that nothing at variance with this standard should be received even upon her authority. This intimate connexion between the powers of teaching and of judgment, and the common dependence of both upon the Spirit and the word of God, make it the more improbable that the one was designed to be more authoritative or effectual than the other, and furnish a strong reason for believing that the power of remission which Christ gave to his disciples was power to declare the conditions on which God would pardon sin, and, in accordance with this declaration, to receive or exclude men from communion.

4. This conclusion is confirmed by the actual practice of the apostolic church. The sense in which Christ's words were understood by his disciples, is determined by the way in which they acted on them. If they believed themselves to be invested, either individually or collectively, with power absolutely to forgive sins, as the only appointed channels of communication between the souls of sinners and the

mercy of God or the merits of Christ, we might expect to find them claiming this authority in words, or at least exerting it in act. Instead of this we find them simply preaching the doctrine of repentance for the remission of sins. The constant burden of their preaching is that faith in Christ is of itself sufficient to secure forgiveness, not at the hands of men, as 'mediating agents' or in any other character, but at the hands of God, to whom the power and the act of pardon are always and immediately ascribed. That a power, which is now claimed as essential to the dignity and value of a ministry, as well as one expressly granted by the Saviour, should be thus omitted, both in word and deed, by those who first received it, or at least by the inspired historians of the acts of the apostles, is to us inexplicable, nay incredible, and added to the previous considerations, seems to show that Christ's words, in the passages appealed to, not only may but must refer to something very different. On these grounds, therefore, we would rest our fourth objection to the doctrine of Sacerdotal Absolution, viz. that no such power as the one contended for has ever been conferred by Christ at all.

V. Our fifth objection to the doctrine is that, as a theory, it is part and parcel of a system of falsehood, from which it cannot be detached without gross inconsistency and arbitrary violence. Among the unscriptural and dangerous doctrines, which it presupposes, or to which it leads, is the doctrine that the apostles were the original recipients of the Holy Ghost, whom they alone had the power to communicate by the imposition of hands; that they transmitted this power to their episcopal successors; that in every ordination by a bishop, sanctifying grace and supernatural power are imparted; that all who are thus ordained priests have power to make the sacraments effectual means of communicating the benefits of redemption, the power, as even Protestants express it, of making the body and blood of Christ; that in the eucharist the sacrifice of Christ is really repeated, or at least so commemorated as to secure the pardon of sin; that it is only by participation in the sacraments, thus administered, that men can be sanctified or saved. With the priestly power to forgive sins is connected, on the one hand, the necessity of specific confession, and on the other, the infallibility of the church; with that, the denial of the right of private judgment; and with that, the necessity of persecution. To one who goes the whole length of these errors,

their connexion and agreement can but serve to strengthen his convictions ; but to those who shrink from any of them, it ought to be a serious consideration, that they stand in the closest logical relation to the plausible and cherished dogma of Sacerdotal Absolution.

VI. Our sixth objection to the doctrine is, that it is practically a subversion of the gospel, a substitution of human mediation for the mediation of Christ, and an exaltation of the priest into the place of God. It is easily said that the power arrogated by the clergy is derivative and delegated, that it is God who pardons and Christ who makes the throne of grace accessible, just as it may be said and is said, that the Papist who adores an image uses it only as a help to his devotion while he worships God. The profession may in either case be honest, but in neither case can it avail to change the practical result, to wit, that God is neglected or forgotten in the idol or the priest. Instead of that dependence on the Spirit and the Word, which form an indispensable condition of Christ's promise to his people, the clergy are invested with authority, first, to decide what is scripture ; then, to determine what the scripture means ; and then, what is to be believed as matter of faith, though not contained in scripture ; while at the same time they alone have power to forgive the sins of men. This practical restriction of the power to determine what is sin and to forgive sin, in the hands of a certain class of ministers, as such, without regard to their character and standing before God, is the sum, essence, and soul of Antichrist ; the constituent principle of that very power which has debauched and enslaved the world ; of the power which sits in the temple of God, claiming to be God ; the mystery of iniquity, sustained by the working of Satan with all power, the power of the sword, the power of learning, the power of superstition, the power of an evil conscience, the power of lying wonders, a power which has held and will hold the world in subjection, till the Lord shall consume it with the Spirit of his mouth, and destroy it by the brightness of his coming. The gospel thus preached is 'another gospel,' and the doctrine, which tends to such a practical result, is and must be false.

To such of our readers as are satisfied, by these or any other arguments, that forgiveness of sins is not a sacerdotal function, that the Christian ministry is not a priesthood, that the power of remission was not given to the ministry, that the power of absolute effectual remission was not given at

all, that the contrary hypothesis is one link in a chain of fearful errors, and practically tends to the subversion of the gospel, we may now say what we waved our right to say before, to wit, that the doctrine of Sacerdotal Absolution is unscriptural, dishonouring to God, and incompatible with human fallibility and weakness.

In the course of our argument, and at its close, the question naturally presents itself, what is the Church to which the power of remission has been granted, how does it act, how can it be consulted, what relation has it to the Christian ministry? These are inquiries of the highest moment, and the answer to them is really involved in the preceding argument; but a direct and full solution is not necessary to the negative conclusions which we have endeavoured to establish, and may be better given in another place.

ART. IV.—*India and India Missions, including Sketches of the gigantic System of Hinduism, both in Theory and Practice; also Notices of some of the principal agencies employed in conducting the Process of Indian evangelization, &c. &c.* By the Rev. Alexander Duff, D. D. Church of Scotland Mission, Calcutta. Edinburgh, 1839.

DR. DUFF, having been obliged on account of his health, to leave for a season his station in Calcutta, returned home to Scotland; and during the four years which he spent there he travelled extensively through the country, and delivered many instructive and eloquent addresses to the people, on the subject of Eastern missions; and exercised a powerful influence in stirring up the minds of both clergy and laity, to take a livelier interest in this important work, than they had before done. His health being so far restored as to admit of his return to his station in India, but having a few months to dispose of before he sailed, he deliberated with himself, and consulted judicious friends, whether it would be more promotive of the good cause, to employ this time in travelling from place to place, and delivering addresses, or in committing to writing and publishing a volume, which should contain the substance of his addresses already prepared, with such other matter relating to the India Mission,

as might appear to be interesting. The result was, that the latter was judged to be the more expedient course; and hence, the public are in possession of this highly valuable, and deeply interesting volume; that is, the British public; for while our presses have been teeming with all sorts of matters and things, much of which is absolutely valueless, no bookseller has thought proper to give an edition of this book to the American public.

The contents of the volume are thus described by the author, "The first chapter mainly consists of *historic fact*, gleaned from Mill, Maurice, M'Pherson, and other authorities."

"The second chapter proposes to unfold the grand theory of Hinduism.

"The third chapter is devoted to an account of some of the leading superstitions and idolatries of eastern India.

"In the fourth, there is a consideration of the general agency to be employed, in evangelizing India.

"In the fifth chapter, miscellaneous objections to the missionary enterprise, are considered.

"The sixth chapter, can only be considered as a *fragment*. The original intention of the author was to enter at large into the history of the Church of Scotland's Foreign Missions, from their rise to the present time. But the unexpected length, to which the preceding chapters extended, left him no other alternative, than to limit himself to the briefest period which could furnish an intelligible conception of the principles, working, and design of these missions. On this account, he has confined himself exclusively to the station first selected—Calcutta. And in the educational department, to the operations of the first twelve months there—merely glancing at the present and anticipated results."

But as this chapter, brief as it is, contains that information which will be most acceptable to our readers, we will pass over all the rest, and endeavour to give a condensed view of the author's account of the principles adopted, and carried into effect, for conducting this very important mission.

About the year 1823, several memorials were presented to the General Asssembly of the Church of Scotland, on the subject of foreign missions; but none of them deserves so particular a notice as one sent forward by the Rev. Dr. Bryce, then senior clergyman of the Church of Scotland, at Fort

William, in the East Indies, tending powerfully to attract attention to that benighted land as a peculiarly promising sphere for missionary operation. The people of Scotland appeared to be ripe for an enterprise of this kind; and that which was especially needed was, that some individual of sufficient weight of character, authority, and influence should step forward, and take the lead in prosecuting the work. Such an organ it pleased Providence to raise up in the person of the Rev. Dr. Inglis, a man of high moral integrity, of commanding intellect, and of unrivalled business habits—a man who, in a remarkable degree, possessed the confidence of all parties in the church; and to crown all, a man “whose unobtrusive, growing piety, threw a halo over his latter days, irradiated his passage through the dark valley, and ceased not to brighten onwards till eclipsed by the more glorious sunshine of Jehovah’s presence.” It was in the session of 1824, that this eminent man brought forward a resolution embracing both domestic and foreign missions, which was adopted by the Assembly. And to carry this resolution into effect, two separate executive committees were appointed, to whom the whole business of conducting missions, in their respective fields, was committed; but who were directed to report annually their proceedings to the Assembly. Of the committee on foreign missions, Dr. Inglis was appointed the convener; and an earnest and affectionate address was sent out by the Assembly, “to all ministers and parishes, to use their best exertions to promote the sacred cause in which the church had resolved to engage, for the benefit of their fellow men at home and abroad.”

At the meeting of the General Assembly in May, 1825, Dr. Inglis presented an important report from the committee on foreign missions. Many considerations induced them to select India, as the country possessing the greatest advantages, and affording the greatest facilities for commencing a mission. And one feature of the plan recommended, and which in practice has become prominent was, the erection of a collegiate institution, for the communication of knowledge to the natives, in the higher branches of literature, science, and Christian Theology. The Assembly entered very cordially into the plans of the committee, both as respected the country where the missionary operations should be begun, and the plan of a high school or collegiate institution. And in conformity with the recommendation of the committee, it was resolved, that this central seminary should

be placed under the charge of a superintendent, who should be an ordained minister of the Church of Scotland; and not less than two assistant teachers, to be sent out from Scotland. It was made the duty of the principal or superintendent, to instruct the pupils on the subject of the Christian religion; and also, as he might have opportunity, to preach the gospel to others. The scheme was somewhat novel; yet it is simple, and, as experience has proved, founded in wisdom, and eminently adapted to the condition of the higher classes of the Hindus. For they, being an intellectual people, and accustomed to subtle reasonings, the same methods of promoting the adoption of Christianity among uncultivated savages, would not be suitable to them. Besides, one object proposed by this plan was, to raise up well qualified, native teachers; and all must admit, that in whatever state of civilization the people may be to whom the gospel is preached, it is all important that the teachers of religion should be men of cultivated minds, and well furnished with various knowledge. The whole credit of the conception of this plan, undoubtedly belongs to Dr. Inglis; for as early as the year 1824, he brought out the rudiments of the scheme, in a sermon preached before the "Society for Promoting Christian knowledge."

In the year 1826, Dr. Inglis wrote and widely circulated, in the name of the committee, his celebrated "Pastoral Address," to the people of Scotland, in which, after answering objections, and stating the encouragements which they had for the prosecution of the plan, he thus concludes, "In taking leave of the subject and of you, we feel that there are motives and encouragements arising out of the work itself, to which we exhort you, that will have a more powerful effect on your minds, than any words or arguments which can be employed. It seems impossible, that, in this case, we should not have one common feeling: for it is a feeling which has its origin in the law of our nature. Having our own hope in Christ and His salvation, it would be altogether unnatural that we should not have a desire to communicate this blessed hope to those, who, with ourselves, have one common Father—whom one God hath created. Is it possible, we can rely on the merits of Christ as a Saviour for the exercise of that mercy and grace by which alone we can be delivered from everlasting misery, and made partakers of everlasting happiness, without an earnest desire to make known the way of salvation through Him to others, who partake of our

common nature? Or is it possible that this benevolent desire should be promoted and strengthened by the precious hope of advancing, at the same time, the honour of Him who redeemed us? Is it possible that the promise of the Spirit of all grace to strengthen and prosper us in every righteous undertaking, and the most special promise imparted to us by our heavenly Master, in reference to this most blessed work, that He will be with us always even to the end of the world—should not effectually encourage us in such a labour of love? Or is it possible that the assurance which is given us of the ultimate and universal prevalence of the Redeemer's kingdom, should not establish our minds in the use of all wise and righteous means for hastening the happy time when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth?"

In the year 1827, Dr. Inglis informed the Assembly, that the committee had been vigorously employed in promoting subscriptions and parochial collections, to accomplish the object which the Assembly had in view; and that among other measures, a correspondence had been opened with every presbytery of Scotland; and it is due to the memory of Dr. Inglis to say, that this laborious correspondence was conducted by him alone. And what was the result of these benevolent exertions? Out of nine hundred parish churches and fifty-five Chapels of Ease, collections, at the end of the year, had been made in no more than fifty-nine parish churches, and sixteen chapels, the aggregate of which did not amount to one thousand pounds! the special donations, and annual subscriptions, to about three hundred and ninety pounds! Notwithstanding this very unfavourable result of these incipient measures, Dr. Inglis was not discouraged. He found a growing interest in the cause among the ministers; and at the meeting of the General Assembly, in the following year, he was enabled to report, that the state of the funds had become so favourable, as to encourage the committee to look out for and select a proper person to be sent to India, to lay the foundation of such a seminary as the Assembly, from the beginning had projected: and sensible how much depended on the person first engaged in executing this plan, the committee earnestly solicited the aid of the members of the Assembly, to enable them to make a wise and judicious choice.

Early in the year 1829, was appointed the first missionary, ever employed by the national Church of Scotland. This

was no other than the Rev. Dr. Duff, the author of the book now under review. When the proposal was first made to him, he was on his trials before the presbytery of St. Andrews, and under a consciousness of his insufficiency for so great a work, on account of his youth and inexperience, he declined the appointment. He was perfectly willing to leave his friends and native country, and make any sacrifice of personal ease and worldly prospects, if he could only be persuaded that he was called in Providence to the work. By frequent, tender conversations with the Rev. Dr. Ferrie, who had been requested to make the proposal to him, most of his difficulties were by degrees removed. But still he declared, that he could not accept the appointment, unless he could be assured of two things; first, that he should be in no respect made amenable to any body of men in India, civil or ecclesiastical; and that he should not be controlled in carrying into execution any measures which appeared to him to be conducive to the propagation of the gospel among the natives. On both these points he received full satisfaction; but was informed, that one essential part of the plan was, the institution of a school of a high order; yet all the minor details of instituting a Seminary would be left to the missionary.

In May, of the same year, the appointment was formally ratified by the General Assembly. And on the 12th of August, Mr. Duff was ordained to the evangelistic and ministerial office, by the Presbytery of Edinburgh; Dr. Chalmers having presided and officiated with his wonted power and eloquence. About the middle of October, the missionary set sail in the *Lady Holland*, East Indiaman, from Portsmouth; and never did the first agent of any Society leave his native country more entirely unfettered, untrammelled, and unembarrassed. During the period which intervened, between the first proposal of this enterprise, and the sailing of the missionary, every thing had happened so auspiciously, that he began to be solicitous lest God was not dealing with him as a son, as he had been required to endure no chastening. "Prosperity had accompanied every movement, like the perpetual sunshine of a cloudless sky." This led him, after his embarkation, to deep, and searching inquiries, in regard to his call to the important work on which he was sent, and to a rigid scrutiny into the purity of his motives. "Was the glory of God the chief object? the love of Christ the actuating

principle? the regeneration of sinners, the travail of his soul; and their final redemption, his richest recompense of reward? Was he with his whole heart prepared to give up every idol, relinquish every darling pursuit, and for the sake of Christ, joyously submit to be accounted, "the off-seouring of all things? Was he really so fortified by faith and prayer, that amid scorn, and reproach, and perils; and living deaths, he would cheerfully serve an apprenticeship to martyrdom?"

The servants of God have seldom occasion to perplex themselves long on account of their freedom from ehaustisement. This, our missionary soon found verified in his sad experience. Seldom has there been a voyage, from first to last, so fraught with disaster and discipline. After many vicissitudes, and troubles, on the 15th of February, the vessel violently struck on the rocks of an uninhabited, barren island, about thirty miles north of Cape Town. With the utmost difficulty, the passengers and crew escaped with their lives. The noble vessel soon went to pieces, and almost every thing on board perished. The detriment of the missionary was such as could not easily be recovered. He had to regret the loss of about eight hundred volumes of books, selected in almost every department of science. Of his whole library, only a few damaged volumes were picked up on the beach. But a loss which he felt still more sensibly was, the whole of his manuscripts, containing his journals, notes, essays, &c.; all that for years he had for his own use committed to writing. The only book which escaped without damage, was a copy of Bagster's Comprehensive Bible and Psalm book, the cherished gift of a few friends, just before he left his native shores. But though thus deprived of all his property, his books, and manuscripts, he was not forsaken of his God. At the time, he wrote "They are gone—they are gone, and blessed be God, I can say, *gone*, without a murmur. So perish all earthly things, the treasure that is laid up in heaven, is alone inaccessible. God has been to me a God full of merey; and not the least of His mereies do I find in the cheerful resignation which he now enables me to feel, and to say, 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord.'"

After all his heart-searchings, in the commencement of the voyage, with a view of detecting every lurking idol of the deceitful heart, one escaped his notice which was now

made manifest. He had fixed his affections too strongly on his books and manuscripts, and God had graciously wrested them from him—sinking them all to the bottom of the sea, or scattering them in useless fragments on the desolate shore: but there was one volume saved, uninjured, and that was the blessed Book of Life. “Here,” said he to himself,” is the Bible for you, grasp it as the richest treasure of infinite wisdom, and infinite love—a treasure, which in the balance of heaven, would outweigh all the books and papers in the universe. Go, and prayerfully consult that unerring chart, that infallible directory, humbly trust to it, and to your God, and never, never will you have cause to regret that you have been severed from your idols, as thereby you become more firmly linked by the golden chain of grace to the throne of the Eternal.”

A letter to Dr. Inglis, the convener of the committee, breathes the noble spirit of a devoted missionary, an extract from which we here give: “Thus unexpectedly has perished part of the fruits of the Church of Scotland, in the great cause of Christian philanthropy: but the cause of Christ has not perished. The former, like the leaves of autumn, may be tossed about by every tempest; the latter, more stable than nature, ever reviving with the bloom of youth, will flourish, when nature herself is no more. The cause of Christ is a heavenly thing, and shrinks from the touch of earth. Often has its high origin been gloriously vindicated. Often has it cast mockery on the mightiest efforts of human power. Often has it gathered strength amid weakness; become rich amid losses; rejoiced amid dangers; and triumphed amid tortures and fires of hell-enkindled men. And shall the church of Scotland dishonour such a cause, by exhibiting symptoms of coldness or despondency, in consequence of the recent catastrophe? God forbid! let her rather rouse herself to new energy, let her shake off every earthly alliance with the cause of Christ, as a retarding, polluting alliance; let her confide less in human resources, and more in the arm of Him who saith, ‘Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit.’ From her faithful appeals, let the flame of devotedness circulate through every family, and prayers to the Lord of the harvest, from every dwelling:—and then, may we expect her fountains to overflow, for the watering and fertilizing of many a dry and parched heathen land. For my own part, recent events have made me feel more strongly than ever, the vanity of

all earthly things, the hollowness of earthly hopes. They have taught me the necessity of being ‘instant [in season, out of season;]’ of spending and being spent in the cause of Christ. My prayer is, though at a humble distance, to breathe the spirit, and emulate the conduct of those devoted men, who have gone before me; and if like them,³ I am destined to perish in a foreign land, my prayer is, to be enabled cheerfully to perish with the song of faith on my lips,—‘O death, where is thy sting, O grave, where is thy victory.’”

This disastrous shipwreck was only the beginning of sorrows, for having embarked in another vessel on the 7th of March, a tremendous gale was encountered off Mauritius, in which the vessel well nigh foundered. And at the mouth of the Gauges, she was overtaken by a hurricane, and violently dashed on shore; so that all the horrors of a second shipwreck were experienced. But on Wednesday the 27th of May, after nearly an eight months voyage, Mr. Duff and his partner reached Calcutta, more dead than alive, through fatigue and exhaustion. The feelings of the missionary were thus expressed on the day of his arrival. “Thus have we at length reached our destination, after a voyage at once protracted and disastrous. But if, in respect to the things of earth, it pained and impoverished, the experience of my dear partner and myself leads us solemnly to declare, that in respect of spiritual things, it greatly revived and enriched us; for the loss of earthly comfort and possession is a rich gain indeed, when accompanied by the increase of that treasure which nothing can diminish or impair. Through God’s blessing, we were enabled to view the whole as the apparently severe, but unspeakably kind discipline of a Father ‘who afflicteth not willingly, nor grieveth the children of men.’ How base then were it to fret; how ignorant to complain; how cowardly to despond? For where is faith without a victory? Where is the victory without a struggle? And can there be a struggle without enduring trials, and encountering difficulties? To the feeble and dastardly soldier of the cross, be all the ease of indolently lagging in the rear, and all the security that can result from being the last to engage, and the foremost to escape from approaching danger. To us, we would pray, be the toil, and the hardship, and the danger, and the crown of victory for our reward—or death, when maintaining ‘our Master’s cause, for an eternal glory.’”

In Calcutta, our missionary and his partner experienced the kindest sympathy from the missionary brethren, and from private Christians; and from none more kindness and assiduous attention than from Bishop Corrie, then Arch-deacon of Calcutta. The Rev. Dr. Bryce also, of the Scotch Church, treated them in a manner which calls for their lasting gratitude. And although the scheme adopted by the Assembly was entirely different from that sketched in the memorial of Dr. Bryce; yet that gentleman did not, on that account, manifest any disappointment or coldness to the missionary enterprise, or to the missionary. The wisdom of the committee on the India mission, or rather of their convener—for the whole weight of the business devolved on him—was manifest in two particulars, first in the selection of such a man as Mr. Duff—zealous, devoted to the work, and perfectly independent in his judgment, and at the same time, kind and conciliatory in his disposition, and bold in his spirit of enterprise. In the hands of a common man, the mission must have utterly failed—indeed, it would never have been commenced. The second particular in which wisdom was discovered, was in the commission given to Mr. Duff, that all the details of the method of conducting the mission, and especially the plan to be pursued in the projected seminary, were left to the judgment of the missionary. Had he been trammelled with particular and minute instructions, he never could have commenced operations; or at any rate, he could never have been successful in the enterprise. Indeed, the only suggestion made respecting the location of the school, that it should be out of the city of Calcutta but not far off, was found to be altogether unsuitable; it was soon perceived that no other situation but the city would at all answer.

The most difficult problem, however, for the missionary to solve, was, what the method of instruction in the seminary should be. The great difficulty was, to obtain scholars prepared to enter on such studies as belong to a course of liberal education. The missionaries of all denominations in Calcutta, had paid attention to schools, but these were of the common elementary kind; and the pupils instructed in them, were not at all prepared to enter on the branches taught in a college, or high school. It is true, there were many young men taught in the schools supported by government; but it being a fundamental principle in these schools, to give no religious instruction whatever; those educated in them,

though prepared for higher instruction, had no disposition to enter a seminary where Christianity was taught as a part of the regular course. Some persuaded Mr. Duff to erect a fine building, which might serve to attract public attention, and thus induce scholars to enter the school; but he saw that this experiment had been fully tried, and at a great expense; but that no favourable result had been realized. He, therefore, in opposition to the opinion of most of the friends of the enterprise, determined to commence by forming a preparatory institution in which youth might be trained, with a view to their entering on the higher branches in due time. Of his purpose, he informed the committee at home, "For the present," says he, "the idea of founding a collegiate institution, must be relinquished—and we must direct, all our educational energies towards establishing and extending those elementary seminaries, that must act as the permanent and ever-teeming nurseries of an institution of a higher order."

This point being settled, the next inquiry—and a very baffling one it was—respected the instruction which should be given in these elementary schools. Bengali being the vernacular tongue of the country, was of course the language used in all the common schools; but it was observed, that the scholars remained but a short time in school, and were but little improved when they left it. Besides, there was a poor prospect of obtaining scholars; for the Brahmans and higher classes, teach their own children at home; the middle classes would prefer the government schools, in which no mention was made of Christianity, and where the fees were very moderate; and thus the schools instituted by the missionary would be likely to receive only the children of the poorer people, and the outcasts. It was, moreover, to be decided, whether it would be most expedient to extend patronage to schools already in existence, or to establish new schools, to be regulated and instructed according to the judgment of the superintendent. This last seemed to be the wisest course; but still the difficulty was, to obtain scholars; which seemed to be insuperable. Therefore, after weighing impartially all circumstances it appeared, that common Bengali schools would by no means answer the purpose of preparing youth for the collegiate institution; and that there existed no prospect of obtaining scholars to attend such schools.

But there was another question, not less important than

any which had been decided, ‘what language ought to be used in communicating instruction to the scholars, when admitted into the high school?’ The choice lay between the Sanskrit, the learned language of the natives, and English, the language of the rulers. This question appeared of vast moment to Mr. Duff, and it was not determined without earnest prayer for direction to the Father of lights. All the weight of authority, and all the most plausible arguments were in favour of the Sanskrit. The supreme government had determined in its favour. Every system of liberal education proceeded on the supposition, that this language was the best. All orientals were enthusiastically in its favour. And what seemed of more weight than all the rest, some of the oldest and most experienced missionaries in Bengal, were decidedly in its favour. Yet in the face of all this array of high authorities, and in opposition to the opinion of nearly all who possessed the best opportunity of forming a correct judgment, Mr. Duff, boldly and independently, resolved to repudiate the Sanskrit, and other learned languages of India, and openly and fearlessly to declare the English language to be “the most effective medium of Indian illumination—the best and amplest channel for letting in the full stream of European knowledge on the minds of those who, by their station in society, their character and attainments, their professional occupation as teachers and preachers, were destined to influence and direct the national intellect and heart of India.”

He determined therefore to assume the responsibility, and proceed. A house was obtained in the central part of the Old Town, and notice was given to a few leading men among the natives that it would be open to receive scholars on the next Tuesday. Through the influence of a native of high character, who was friendly to the institution, four young men made their appearance, with whom Mr. Duff held, principally through an interpreter, a long and interesting conversation. They went away expressing themselves highly gratified. On the next day, induced by the report of those who had attended, twenty more appeared. Most of these also retired, with very favourable impressions. On the third day, the number of additional attendants amounted to eighty. So that without any extraordinary exertion the room, which would hold no more than one hundred and twenty, was entirely filled, in the space of three days. On the fourth day, when the mis-

sionary was about to reduce the scholars to order, no less than two hundred new applicants made their appearance, and were clamorous for admission. It was now announced, that it would be impossible to receive all who had applied, but that a selection would be made; and that proper decorum and order might be preserved, it was determined, that every application should be in writing, and accompanied by a recommendation from some respectable native, or European gentleman. It was, however, with the utmost difficulty that the crowd of young men could be persuaded to withdraw. The principal part of the ensuing week was occupied in receiving applications and examining candidates. The anxiety for admission continued without abatement, and as it was a disagreeable thing to reject young persons so desirous of getting an English education, it was resolved to meet different classes, at different times in the day, the first going out when they had received their lesson, and giving place to others to occupy the room in their turn. This was only a temporary arrangement, until more ample accommodations could be procured. The ardent thirst for English learning now manifested, was much greater than had been conceived by any one; but the desire of possessing new books, which had commonly been distributed gratuitously, at the opening of schools, no doubt, had its influence. And it had been common for many, when they had received their books, to forsake the school in a very short time. To prevent this practice, two regulations were adopted; the one, that every pupil should pay for his books; and the other, that parents or guardians should sign an obligation that the youths should be regular in their attendance, and should remain a reasonable time in the school. This had the effect of causing many of the idle and frivolous immediately to disappear; while the more sober and industrious complied with the prescribed conditions. Two hundred and fifty was the highest number which could possibly be admitted with the present accommodations.

On the 2d of April, the actual instruction commenced. Some were found able to spell and read words of two syllables, which however they did not understand. A second class could make out to spell and read words of one syllable. A third class merely knew the alphabet; but the greater number had to begin with their A, B, C. This unexpected success in getting scholars was very encouraging; if it had been predicted a month before, no one would have believed it.

Much time was necessarily spent in reducing the scholars to order, of which they appeared not to have the smallest idea ; and in this work the native assistants were not of the least service, as they had as little knowledge of regularity as the pupils.

The want of mental culture in the most advanced of these Hindu youths, was most remarkable, at first. "If I," says Mr. Duff, "distinctly pronounced such a sentence as this, 'The sun shines,' and the next moment asked the pupil, 'What shines?' the answer would be a vacant stare." For, although these young men had read something, they had never been accustomed to think on the subject, or to any degree of reflection. Care was taken that there should be no upbraiding of the pupils for their stupidity and defect of apprehension. It was treated as a state of mind necessarily arising out of their former education ; or rather the want of all mental culture. The hope was entertained, that by proper instruction and discipline, a great change would soon be apparent, and this was realized in the space of a few weeks.

As it was an essential feature of the plan of education intended to be introduced, to teach the evidences and leading doctrines of Christianity, the best method of introducing the study of the Bible, so as not to give a shock to the prejudices of these young Hindus, became a matter of intense interest with the superintendent. Some advised, that the truth of Christianity should at once be made the subject of discussion, and that the falsehood of the Brahminical religion should be denounced. Mr. Duff, though sufficiently bold and independent, was at the same time prudent and cautious. He foresaw that such a course would have the effect of driving every pupil from the school ; and thus all the promising and auspicious circumstances attending the commencement of the enterprise would be entirely lost. The subject was surrounded with difficulties, to overcome which, all the wisdom of the serpent was required. For, not only were these sons of the Brahmins devoutly attached to their own religion, and to the sacred books in which it was taught ; but by some means, they had received a most unfavourable impression of the character of the Bible ; produced, it is believed, by the sentiments, conversation, and conduct of irreligious and infidel Europeans. "And this untoward impression, if not originally suggested, had been at least rivetted and confirmed by the policy and example of their Christian govern-

ors, in the course of a century of absolute dominion." The very opposite course had been pursued by the Mohammedan conquerors of India. They, from the beginning, made their religion prominent; and every public document was prefaced by the summary creed of the grand impostor, "There is one God, and Mohammed is his prophet." But the conduct of Christian rulers was the reverse. They kept their religion entirely out of view; and what was the result? A conviction in the native mind, that the Bible was so hateful a book, that even its professed adherents were ashamed of it, in the presence of strangers. Not only was the Christian religion cautiously kept out of view in all the transactions of the government, but from every school and seminary established or patronised by government, the Bible was systematically excluded. Thus every heathen prejudice against the Bible, as an odious book, was doubly fenced; and every feeling of aversion exacerbated in the greatest degree.

Under these very inauspicious circumstances, Mr. Duff pursued a course of consummate wisdom, calculated at once to obviate prejudice, and to excite curiosity to become acquainted with the contents of the Bible. After the instructions had proceeded about a week or fortnight, he addressed his pupils, "and observed to them, that in every good system of education, those principles should be inculcated which had a tendency to improve the heart and regulate the conduct, as well as that knowledge which tends to improve the judgment, and enlighten the understanding; and that, therefore, it seemed reasonable to commence their literary pursuits, by imploring a blessing from that Being from whom they had received their existence and all their faculties and enjoyments. My young friends," said he, "one great object of my coming hither, is to convey to you *all* the European knowledge I possess myself—*literary, scientific, and religious*. You, too, have stores of knowledge, such as it is, and I cannot but confess the humiliating fact, that your ancestors were comparatively learned and civilized, when mine were nothing better than ignorant painted barbarians. . . . But times are changed now, and we are changed with them. We have now become civilized, and possess vast treasures of learning which we reckon worthy of being communicated to others. Of this, you yourselves prove that you are not ignorant, by the desire which you have manifested to acquire our language, and through it our learning. As there is a book, the Vedas, which you

reckon the fountain head of all your best knowledge; so, there is a book, the Bible, which we esteem the fountain head of all our best knowledge. But I cannot disguise from you the fact—neither could I if I would, as ye yourselves must have been told—that between every department of your learning and ours, whether literary, scientific, or religious, there do exist the greatest, the most irreconcilable differences. Many of you, I know, have heard that much of our knowledge, particularly on the subject of religion, is mischievous and dangerous. How, then, in the case of such reported differences, ought wise men to act? Ought we to look with open eyes at our own, and turn with bandaged eyes towards yours? And ought you to deal in like manner by us? Surely not. This is not the determination of enlightened, wise men, but of blinded fools. Accordingly, how are wise men to act in this matter? Many of us do study your language and your books. In this way are we not able coolly and deliberately to compare your knowledge with our own and to judge for ourselves which is best? Most assuredly. Well, what we at present wish and expect is, that you, acting the part of wise men, should in like manner study our language and our books. And having done so, will not you be able to institute a comparison between all your knowledge of every kind and ours, and thus determine for yourselves what is best? Undoubtedly, you may. Determine, therefore, to persevere in your present resolution, and you will, ere long, acquire the means of arriving, through the guidance of the great God, at a true and wise decision. In the mean time, will it not be wisdom on your part, to suspend all judgment on debatable points, till, by accession of knowledge, ye be able to judge for yourselves.”

This address had a very happy effect in removing prejudices, and paving the way for the introduction of religious instruction. The young men were not to be forced into the adoption of any thing, which, after an impartial examination did not commend itself to their own understanding: they were pleased to find that they were constituted judges of all which should be taught, as soon as they were capable of forming an intelligent judgment on the subject.

As it was determined to introduce prayer and the reading of the scriptures into the school, it was judged to be advisable not to commence with an extempore prayer, but to make use of the Lord's prayer. A number of Testaments having been obtained from the Bible Society of Calcutta,

they were put into the hands of the pupils, and they were directed to the page where this prayer was found. Immediately, however, some of the more advanced scholars turned to the title page, and saw that the book was the New Testament. On which one of them arose and said, "Sir I not want read any thing against my own religion; and I not want read any thing of your; and I not want to be forced to become Christian." In answer, they were assured, that there was no intention to force any one to be a Christian; neither was it intended to cause any thing to be read against their religion, or in favour of Christianity which would not commend itself to their own understanding. After the Lord's prayer was read, and the import of every petition explained, the missionary read the parable of the prodigal son, with a brief exposition of its meaning. The next passage of scripture read was, the xiii. chap. of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. "Perhaps," says Mr. Duff, "in the whole Bible, within so narrow a compass, there could not be found a passage which brought out so many points of contrast with the genius of Hinduism as the first seven verses of that chapter; and yet as there was no direct attack made, nor even any allusion to their false system, they not only took no offence, but expressed admiration of the passage. The next passage read was the sermon on the mount. There is scarcely a statement in this discourse which is not as applicable to the Hindus, as to those to whom it was originally addressed. Yet being directed against Judaism and the Jews, it could be no matter of offence. And yet it was better suited to produce conviction in the mind of a Hindu than any direct attack on his own religion, by which, at once, all his prejudices would have been immediately awakened. Although the precepts of Christianity were in direct opposition to the principles and predominant spirit of the Hindus; yet such is the power of truth and so congenial is it to the human mind, that such precepts as that which enjoins love to enemies, extorted from some of them the highest encomiums. One could not restrain himself from speaking out his feelings, saying, 'O how beautiful, how divine! Surely this is the truth, this is the truth!' Such an idea as that of loving an enemy and praying for him, had never entered their minds; and yet when presented to them, the truth commended itself powerfully to their reason; just as the light is so adapted to the human eye, that if it had never been seen before, yet the first ray

entering the eye would give unspeakable delight. The young Hindu who made the forementioned exclamation, for days and weeks, could not cease repeating the exclamation, 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you. How beautiful! Surely this is the truth!'"

In this way, an hour was spent daily, in reading and commenting on select portions of the Bible, in all the higher classes. At first, from their imperfect knowledge of English, their progress was slow, but the slowness of their progress was more than compensated by the opportunity afforded, of dwelling long on particular points, and exhibiting the truth in all points of view best calculated to remove prejudice, and open the way to its reception. Though the Bible was thus fully introduced as a class-book; yet it was from the beginning used in connexion with the devotional exercises of the school, "with the view," as says Dr. Duff, of bringing all the faculties of the soul into contact with the life and spirit and quickening influence of Jehovah's holy oracles—and never, never for the parsing, syntactical, and sundry other grammatical exercises of lingual acquisition. Than this practice, which we fear is too common, we know of none more likely to lower the Bible from its unapproachable eminence of sacredness, as THE BOOK—THE BOOK OF BOOKS. And we have," says he, "never ceased, and through God's blessing never will cease, to lift up our solemn protest against it." "If the Bible is to be made a school and class book—and rather, infinitely rather, let us decide on the banishment of grammars, and geographies, and popularized excerpts, consecrated exclusively to science and the muses, from our schools, than suffer it to be dislodged by the great antichristian confederacy from its throne of rightful supremacy, in wielding the sceptre over the entire educational realm. If the Bible, we say, is to be made a school and class-book, let it not be evacuated of its divine significance, by being turned into common use, for testing the rules and laws of every self-elected dictator, in the ancient domain of speech. Let it ever be maintained in the right ascension of its sacredness—the meridian altitude of its spiritual power. Let it be gratefully studied as the Book of Life. Let it be joyfully consulted as the chart of heaven; let its holy oracles be listened to with profoundest awe; let its cheering revelations be received and hailed, as the brightest rays from the 'ancient glory;' let its statutes, testimonies, and righteous judgments be submitted

to, as the unchanging ordinances of the King of kings. And then, and then only, will that best of books—the Bible—be allowed to promote the grand design for which it was by heaven bestowed. Then and then only, will it be duly revered; the God who gave it duly honoured; the myriads of young immortals trained in educational seminaries, duly quickened and edified—fortified for the vicissitudes of time, and ripened for hosannahs of eternity.”

The greatest difficulty experienced, was the want of proper elementary books. None, suited to the condition of the pupils and to the end contemplated by the institution of the seminary, could be procured. For, from those used in the government schools, every allusion to religion was cautiously excluded. To obviate this difficulty, three elementary books were prepared, each consisting of two parts, the first *common*, the second religious. The intention of the second part was, simply to bring before the minds of the pupils such truths as would have a tendency to enlighten the understanding, or awaken the conscience. And when the pupils had read these elementary books, which were made to contain as many striking and interesting facts as possible, their acquaintance with English was such, that they could read the Bible understandingly; and it was accordingly put into their hands.

For a considerable time, the instructions of the seminary went on without any interruption, or disturbance. At ten o'clock, the bell was regularly rung, and none were admitted, who came after this hour. One morning, when the teachers entered the room, to their surprise, they found that the school was nearly deserted. Upon inquiring, of those present, the reason of the absence of their companions, no answer was given, but one of them drew out the newspaper, entitled *Chundrika*, of that morning, and pointed to a particular paragraph. There, the Institution was condemned in no measured terms; the mode of study was represented as tending to subvert Hinduism, and the entire system was anathematized. The parents who permitted their sons to attend this school, were threatened with the loss of caste, by the sentence of the *Dharma Shabha*, or holy assembly, of which the editor of the paper was the secretary. This hostile edict produced a sudden panic among the Hindus, in consequence of which, nearly all the pupils were withdrawn in a single day. “Very well,” said the superintendent, “it cannot be helped. To us, per-

sonally, it is a matter of little moment. Those who have withdrawn are their own greatest enemies; and in the end, will find themselves the greatest losers." Those who remained were informed, that as long as half a dozen should attend, the instruction should go on as before. The parents had not acted voluntarily in withdrawing their sons, but under a panic, and in a week, nearly the whole had returned again. Similar publications were from time to time, made in this and other Hindu papers, which produced a much more inconsiderable effect, until the people became accustomed to these fulminations, and disregarded them.

At the close of the first year, it was judged expedient, to hold a public examination of the pupils, at which the Rev. Dr. Bryce presided. It was attended by a large company of ladies and gentlemen. Among the rest, Archdeacon Corrie attended, and nearly all the clergy connected with the Presidency of Calcutta. Some also of the higher classes of Hindus were present. The pupils, who were arranged into eight different classes, acquitted themselves in such a manner, on every study, as to call forth the admiration and loud praises of the whole audience. And, the next day, all the papers edited in English, and one in Hindu, came out with a most favourable account of the examination. This success of the first examination gave a mighty impulse to the Institution. Gradually, the accommodations have been so enlarged, that the average attendance, for a number of years, has been about eight hundred. These public examinations have been continued from year to year, and have invariably attracted great attention. They have been attended not only by the clergy and literary men of Calcutta, and by travellers and strangers of distinction who happened to be in the city at the time, but in some instances, by the governor general of India, and the highest officers of the state. And there has been but one opinion expressed, respecting the performances of the pupils, and the admirable mode of instruction and discipline, by which such results have been produced. It is believed, that as it relates to the more important branches of learning, a more thorough education is not acquired at any college or university in the world.

The good effects of this institution are great and various. In the first place, it has demonstrated to all impartial men, that the danger of giving religious instruction in schools intended for Hindu youth, is merely imaginary; and that the Bible may be introduced as a class book, not only without

creating any permanent disturbance, but with eminent success in forming the opinions and principles of the pupils. And secondly, this seminary has had a direct and powerful effect in undermining, and accelerating the downfall of the monstrous system of idolatry which has for ages prevailed in India. And this effect is not only to be attributed to the study of the Bible; but every science taught in the school, reveals truths in diametrical opposition to the tenets of the Hindu religion. "There is not," says Dr. Duff, "a branch of true literature or science which does not furnish weapons to demolish Hinduism." Just sentiments are now held and expressed by hundreds who have imbibed them here, in families to which missionaries or their books can have no access; and this operation is going on gradually, and silently, increasing in extent, every year.

The instructions received in this seminary will also have a powerful effect in weakening the attachment to *caste*; one of the greatest hindrances to the gospel, and to all useful schemes of improvement and reformation, which exists.

Another actual effect of the success of this school has been, the institution of similar schools, upon a smaller scale, in other places. Mr. Trevelyan, one of the greatest friends and promoters of Hindu education, in an address on the subject of education, says, "How numerous are the instances in which the visitors of the General Assembly's celebrated academy have caught the spirit of the plan, and been induced on their return to their respective districts, to form the nucleus of similar institutions. Besides, there are now several branch institutions in immediate connexion with the central school. And as soon as the success of the first important enterprise was evident, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland sent out suitable men, who laid the foundation of institutions upon precisely the same plan, and instructed in the same manner, at Bombay, and Madras, which though not so numerously attended, have flourished in an equal degree, and have been under the superintendence of teachers of the same character as Dr. Duff.

But this is not enough. You say, we wish to hear of the conversion of souls to God. This is the grand end to which all missionary labours should tend. To its furtherance and accomplishment all educational plans and expedients must ever be rendered subservient. On this subject, Dr. Duff speaks beautifully. "By the vigorous prosecution

of the means, now described, it is in our power, in humble dependence on God's ordinary providence, to root out the monstrous errors of Hinduism, and substitute for them true literature and true science. Yea more; it is in our power to build up the evidence of Christian knowledge and doctrine, in the minds of hundreds; so that they become firmly persuaded of the truth of both. In a word, become *intellectually* Christianized. Beyond this, the use of ordinary means will not carry us. But beyond this, there must be a progress, else our prayers must remain unanswered, our primary design unrealized. We want to behold, not merely *intellectual* but *heart Christians*;—not merely individuals intelligently convinced of the truth of Christianity, but vitally awakened to discern and experience its special suitableness and adaptation to their own case, as guilty and polluted transgressors of God's holy law. Now, all the necessary knowledge we can, and are bound by every lawful means to communicate to the intellect. But we cannot render it efficaciously operative in impressing and renewing the heart. No: as soon might we strive to roll back the great rivers to their spring-heads in the lofty mountains, or force the tides of ocean to retire within the caverns of earth, or command the sun to retrace his course in the firmament of heaven. Savingly to change the heart, is wholly beyond the power of all human, of all created capacity. To whom then does the supernatural power belong? The volume of inspiration, the testimony of God's chosen people in every age, with one concurrent voice proclaim, that such a power is *the exclusive possession, and its exercise the sole undeniable prerogative of the Almighty Spirit of all grace*. What then have we to do? Have we no duty to discharge, as *instruments*, connected with the conversion of lost sinners? No duty! we have an all-important duty to perform. It is, in the first place, our part, by every legitimate measure, to bring the knowledge of salvation into immediate juxta-position with the understandings, and the hearts of men. It is, in the second place, our part and our privilege to wrestle in prayer, that the Holy Spirit may exert its gracious influence in opening the understanding, softening the heart, and rendering the knowledge of the truth influential. It is our part, to make known the glad tidings, that for sinners of the race of Adam a Saviour hath been provided, a Surety found, the blood of the everlasting covenant shed—that the sins of the most flagitious offenders

may be pardoned, though these should be numberless as the sand on the sea-shore, and in magnitude exceed the great mountains : though the cry of them should reach unto heaven and the guilt of them point downwards to the blackness, which fills with horror the prison house of the condemned spirits. It is our duty, and our privilege, to look to the influence of omnipotent grace, as that which can secure for the joyous message, a believing reception.

Missionaries, imbued with such sentiments and breathing such a spirit, will not be left to labour in vain ; they will be permitted, though they sow in tears, to reap some fruit of their labours. Accordingly, Dr. Duff goes on to say, "Blessed be God, we have not been left to a mere assurance of *hope*, however strong, and however well founded. In the unsearchable riches of his grace, He has been pleased to refresh this weary heritage with the transporting spectacle of souls converted to the Saviour. In immediate connexion with the instructions of the seminary, individuals have been led openly to renounce their idols, openly to embrace the Lord Jesus, as their God and Saviour, under circumstances the most appalling to mere flesh and blood. It has often been alleged, that there never has been a *sincere* conversion among the heathen of India. No sincere conversion!! How can sincerity be most effectually proved to exist? How, but by the number and extent of the sacrifices to which individuals will submit in defence of their profession? It is by such a test the sincerity of apostles and martyrs, in every age, has been most triumphantly vindicated. Now we assert, that, in Calcutta, there have been conversions that will abide the application of such a test, in its most unmeasured severity. Individuals have been led to cleave to Jesus, in spite of persecution. They have been confined, chained, and cruelly beaten ; they have been driven to relinquish father and mother, and all the endearments of home ; they have been constrained to submit to the loss of substance and hereditary possession ; they have gladly submitted to the alternative of being prepared to undergo a slow death by poison, rather than abandon the cause and cross of Christ. 'Father,' exclaimed one of these youthful heroes, when threatened to be put to death secretly, without witnesses, 'Father, I am as determined as you are ; you may kill my body, but cannot kill my soul ; and this I tell you, if ever I am at liberty, nothing will prevent me from being baptized.' "

We would only add, that since this book was published,

a disruption of the Church of Scotland has taken place; and Dr. Duff, with all the other missionaries of the General Assembly, have sent in their adherence to the Free Church. In consequence of this, Dr. Duff and his associates, have been deprived of all their buildings, together with all their apparatus and books. But they are not discouraged; and God will make up to them not only this, but every other loss sustained for the sake of his truth.

ART. V.—*Christ, The only Sacrifice: or the Atonement in its Relations to God and Man.* By Nathan S. S. Beman, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Troy, N. Y. With an Introductory chapter by Samuel Hanson Cox, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. Second edition, re-written, enlarged and improved. New York: Mark H. Newman. 1844. pp. 171.

THE doctrine of which this little book treats, has always been regarded as the cardinal doctrine of the gospel. It was the burden of apostolical preaching; the rock of offence to Jews and Greeks, the corner stone of that temple in which God dwells by his Spirit. The cross is the symbol of Christianity; that in which every believer glories, as the only ground of his confidence toward God. The rejection of this doctrine, therefore, has always been regarded, and is in fact, a rejection of the gospel. It is the repudiation of the way of salvation revealed by God, and the adoption of some method not only different but irreconcilable. Whatever, therefore, affects the integrity of this doctrine, affects the whole system of religion. It lies in such immediate contact with the source of all spiritual life, that the very nature of religion depends on the manner in which it is apprehended. Though all moral and religious truths are in their nature sources of power, and never fail to influence more or less the character of those who embrace them, yet some truths are more powerful, and hence more important than others. We may speculate with comparative impunity on the nature of angels, on the origin of evil, on the purposes of God, on his relation to the world, and even on the

grounds and nature of human responsibility ; but when we come to the question ; how am I to gain access to God ? how can I secure the pardon of my sins and acceptance with Him ? what is the true ground of hope and what must I do to place myself on that ground so as to secure the assurance of God's love, peace of conscience, and joy in the Holy Ghost ? then the less we speculate the better. The nearer we keep to the simple, authoritative statements of God's word, the firmer will be our faith, the more full and free our access to God, and the more harmonious and healthful our whole religious experience. Such is the informing influence of such experience, when it is genuine, that is, when really guided by the Spirit and conformed to the revelation of God, that it effects a far nearer coincidence of views in all the children of God, than the multiplicity of sects, and conflicting systems of theology would lead us to imagine. The mass of true Christians, in all denominations, get their religion directly from the Bible, and are but little affected by the peculiarities of their creeds. And even among those who make theology a study, there is often one form of doctrine for speculation, and another simpler and truer, for the closet. Metaphysical distinctions are forgot in prayer, or under the pressure of real conviction of sin, and need of pardon and of divine assistance. Hence it is that the devotional writings of Christians agree far nearer than their creeds. It may be taken for granted that that mode of stating divine truth, which is most in accordance with the devotional language of true Christians ; which best expresses those views which the soul takes when it appropriates the doctrines of the gospel for its own spiritual emergencies, is the truest and the best.

How then does the believer regard the person and work of Christ, in his own exercises of faith, gratitude or love ? What is the language in which those exercises are expressed ? If we look to the devotional writings of the church, in all ages and countries, and of all sects and names, we shall get one clear, consistent answer. What David wrote three thousand years ago, expresses, with precision the emotions of God's people now. The hymns of the early Christians, of the Lutherans, the Reformed, of Moravians, of British and American Christians, all express the common consciousness of God's people ; they all echo the words and accents in which the truth came clothed from the mouth of God, and in which, in spite of the obstructions of theologi-

cal theories, it finds its way to every believing heart. Now one thing is very plain, Dr. Beman's theory of the atonement never could be learnt from the devotional language of the church, our's can. Every thing we believe on the subject is inwrought, not only in the language of the Bible, but in the language of God's people, whether they pray or praise, whether they mourn or rejoice. We have therefore the heart of the church on our side at least.

It lies on the very surface of the scriptures: 1. That all men are sinners. 2. That sin for its own sake, and not merely to prevent others from sinning, deserves punishment. 3. That God is just, that is, disposed from the very excellence of his nature, to treat his creatures as they deserve, to manifest his favour to the good, and his disapprobation towards the wicked. 4. That to propitiate God, to satisfy his righteous justice, the Son of God assumed our nature, was made under the law, fulfilled all righteousness, bore our sins, the chastisement or punishment of which, was laid on him. 5. That by his righteousness, those that believe, are constituted righteous; that his merit is so given, reckoned or imputed to them, that they are regarded and treated as righteous in the sight of God. These truths, which lie on the surface of the scripture, are wrought into the very soul of the church, and are in fact its life. Yet every one of them, except the first, Dr. Beman either expressly or virtually denies.

He denies that sin for its own sake deserves punishment. He every where represents the prevention of crime as the great end to be answered by punishment even in the government of God. If that end can be otherwise answered, then justice is satisfied; the necessity and propriety of punishment ceases. This is the fundamental principle of the whole system, and is avowed or implied upon almost every page. His argument in proof that repentance is not a sufficient ground for pardon, is that it has no tendency to prevent crime in others. In human governments, he says, punishment is designed to prevent a repetition of crime by the criminal, and to prevent its commission by others. The former of these ends might be answered by repentance, but not the latter. So in the case of the divine government, repentance on the part of the sinner, might, "so far as his moral feelings are concerned," render it consistent in God to forgive, but then "Where is the honour of the law? Where is the good of the universe?" p. 57. The design of "penalty is to operate as a powerful motive to obedience." p. 127.

There is, he says, the same necessity for atonement, as for the penalty of the moral law, and that necessity, he uniformly represents, as a necessity "to secure the order and prosperity of the universe." p. 128.

It is of course admitted that the prevention of crime is one of the effects, and consequently one of the ends of punishment. But to say that it is *the* end, that it is so the ground of its infliction, that all necessity for punishment ceases when that end is answered, is to deny the very nature of sin. The ideas of right and wrong are simple ideas, derived immediately from our moral nature. And it is included in those ideas that what is right deserves approbation, and what is wrong deserves disapprobation, for their own sake, and entirely irrespective of the consequences which are to flow from the expression of this moral judgment concerning them. When a man sins he feels that he deserves to suffer, or as the apostle expresses it, that he is "worthy of death." But what is this feeling? Is it that he ought to be punished to prevent others from sinning? So far from this being the whole of the feeling, it is no part of it. If the sinner were alone in the universe, if there was no possibility of others being affected by his example, or by his impunity, the sense of ill-desert would exist in all its force. For sin is that which in itself, and for itself, irrespective of all consequences, deserves ill. This is the very nature of it, and to deny this is to deny that there is really any such thing as sin. There may be acts which tend to promote happiness, and others which tend to destroy it; but there is no morality in such tendency merely, any more than there is health and sickness. The nature of moral acts may be evinced by their tendency, but that tendency does not constitute their nature. To love God, to reverence excellence, to forgive injuries, all tend to promote happiness, but no man, who has a moral sense in exercise, can say that they are right only because of such tendency. They are right, because they are right, in virtue of their own inherent nature. And the opposite dispositions or acts are in their nature evil, irrespective of their tendency to produce misery.

The theory that the end of punishment, even in the divine government, is to prevent crime, is only one expression of the more general theory, that happiness is the end of creation, and that all holiness is resolvable into benevolence. This theory is a product of the mere understanding, and does violence to the instinctive moral judgment of men.

We know that holiness is something more than a means ; that to be happy is not the end and reason for being holy ; that enjoyment is not the highest end of being. Our moral nature cannot be thus obliterated, and right and wrong, made matters of profit and loss. The command not to do evil that good may come, would on this theory, be a contradiction, since that ceases to be evil which produces good. All virtue is thus resolved into expediency, and the doctrine that the end sanctifies the means, becomes the fundamental principle of virtue. It is strange that even when the moral feelings are in abeyance, and men are engaged in spinning from the intellect, a theory that will reduce to unity, the conflicting facts of the moral world, they could adopt a view which reduces all intelligent beings to mere recipients of happiness, and degrades the higher attributes of their nature into mere instruments of enjoyment ; a theory which meets its refutation in every moral emotion, and which has proved itself false by its practical effects. We may safely appeal to the convictions of every man's breast, against this whole theory, and against the doctrine that sin is punished and deserves punishment only as a warning to others. No man when humbled under the sense of his guilt in the sight of God, can resist the conviction of the inherent ill-desert of sin. He feels that it would be right that he should be made to suffer, nay, that rectitude, justice, or moral excellence demands his suffering ; and the hardest thing for the sinner to believe, is, often, that it can be consistent with the moral excellence of God, to grant him forgiveness. Into this feeling the idea of counteracting the progress of sin, or promoting the good of the universe, does not in any measure enter. The feeling would be the same, though there were no universe. It is ill-desert and not the general good, which every man feels in his own case, is the ground of his just liability to punishment. And without this feeling there can be no conviction of sin. We may also appeal against this metaphysical theory to the universal consciousness of men. Though it is admitted that governmental reasons properly enter into the considerations which determine the nature and measure of punishment, yet it is the universal and intuitive judgment of men, that the criminal could not be rightly punished merely for the public good, if he did not deserve to be punished irrespective of that good. His suffering benefits the public because it is deserved ; it is not deserved because it benefits the public. That this is

the universal judgment of men is proved by every exhibition of their feelings on this subject. When any atrocious crime is committed, the public indignation is aroused. And when the nature of that indignation is examined, it becomes manifest that it arises from a sense of the inherent ill-desert of the crime ; that it is a sense of justice, and not a regard to the good of society which produces the demand for punishment. To allow such a criminal to escape with impunity, is felt to be an outrage against justice, and not against benevolence. If the public good was the grand end of punishment, then if the punishment of the innocent would promote that object most effectually, the innocent should suffer instead of the guilty ; consequently if murders would be most restrained by the execution of the wives and children of the assassins, it would be right and obligatory to execute them, and not the perpetrators of the crime. If this would shock every man, let him ask himself, why ? what is the reason that the execution of an innocent woman for the public good, would be an atrocity, when the execution of the guilty husband is regarded as a duty ? It is simply because the guilty deserve punishment irrespective of the good of society. And if so, then the public good is not the ground of punishment in the government of God, but the inherent ill-desert of sin. Men in all ages have evinced this deep seated sense of justice. Every sacrifice ever offered to God, to propitiate his favour, was an expression of the conviction that the sin for its own sake deserved punishment. To tell a man who brought his victim to the altar, that the real philosophy of his conduct, was to express a desire for his own reformation, or for the good of society, would be a mockery. Such an idea never entered any human heart, when in the presence of God and seeking his forgiveness.

It is not pretended that this theory is taught in the Bible. It purports to be a philosophy. The Bible contradicts it on every page, because every page contains some expression of genuine human feeling, of the conviction of the real difference between right and wrong, of a true sense of sin, or of the great truth that our responsibility is to God, and not to the universe. The doctrine therefore that sin is punished merely to preserve the order and prosperity of the universe, is an utterly false and revolting theory ; inconsistent with the intuitive moral judgments of men, subversive of all moral distinctions, irreconcilable with the experience

of every man when really convinced of sin, and contradicted by every thing the Bible teaches on the subject.

Dr. Beman again denies, and it is essential to his system that he should deny, the justice of God. He admits that God has a disposition to promote the welfare of his creatures, and so to order his moral government as to make it produce the greatest amount of happiness. This however is benevolence, and not justice. The two sentiments are perfectly distinct. This our own consciousness teaches. We know that pity is not reverence, that gratitude is not compassion, and we know just as well that justice is not benevolence. The two are perfectly harmonious, and are but different exhibitions of moral excellence. The judge of all the earth must do right. It is right to promote happiness, and it is right to punish sin; but to refer the punishment of sin to the desire to promote happiness, is to attribute but one form of moral excellence to God, and to make his excellence less comprehensive than our own. Dr. Beman speaks of commutative, distributive, and general justice. The former has relation only to the regulation of property, and has nothing to do with this subject. Distributive justice consists in the distribution of rewards and punishments, according to merit or demerit. General justice, he says, embraces the general principles of virtue or benevolence by which God governs the universe. The second kind, he correctly says, is justice in the common and appropriate sense of the word. p. 131. When we say that he denies the justice of God, we mean that he denies that justice in its common and appropriate sense, is an essential attribute of the divine nature. There is nothing in his nature that leads to the punishment of sin, but benevolence, or a regard to the happiness of the universe. If that is secured, sin and all sin may go unpunished forever. This we say is a denial of divine justice.

It is a principle of our nature, and a command of God, that we should regard him as absolutely perfect; that every moral excellence which we find in ourselves we should refer to him in an infinite degree. Why do we believe that God is merciful, but because he has so made us that we approve of mercy, and because he has in his word declared himself to be full of compassion. Our moral nature is as much a revelation of God's perfections, as the heavens are of his wisdom and power. If therefore he has implanted in us a sentiment of justice, distinct from that of benevolence, we are constrained by the very constitution of our nature to refer

that perfection to God. All men in fact do it. It enters into the sense of responsibility, into the nature of remorse, and into that fearful looking for of judgment which manifest themselves in every human breast. Men know that God is just, for they in their measure are just; and they instinctively fear the punishment of their sins. To be told that God is only benevolent, and that he punishes only when the happiness of his government requires it, is to destroy our whole allegiance to God, and to do violence to the constitution of our nature. This is a doctrine that can only be held as a theory. It is in conflict with the most intimate moral convictions of men. This, as already remarked, is evinced by the sacrificial rites of all ages and nations, which derive their whole character and import from the assumption that God is just. If justice is merged into benevolence, they cease to have any significance as propitiatory offerings. If then distributive justice, justice "in its common and appropriate sense," is by the common consciousness of men declared to be a virtue, is it thereby revealed to belong to God; and he can no more cease to be just, than he can cease to be benevolent or holy. This is only saying that if moral excellence leads us to judge that sin in itself deserves punishment, then the infinite moral excellence of God cannot but lead him to treat it as it deserves.

Again, it is included in our conception of God as absolutely independent and self-sufficient, that the reasons of his acts should be in himself. He is absolutely perfect, he acts with undeviating rectitude, and by so acting he promotes the highest good of his creatures. But the good of his creatures is not the end of his actions, for of him and through him and to him are all things. It is to subordinate God to the creature, to make the creature the end of his actions. He rewards one man and punishes another, not because he will thus make others happy, but because it is right, and by doing right the greatest good to others is the result. This is the view which both reason and scripture presents of God as infinite and self-sufficient, who is the beginning and the end of all things. It is hence plain how the justice of God necessarily flows from his holiness. He is so holy that he delights in all that is good, and hates all that is evil; and if he acts agreeable to his nature, he constantly manifests this love of excellence and hatred of sin. But what is reward and punishment but the manifestation of the approbation or disapprobation of God? If holiness is communion with him,

sin is alienation from him; if his favour goes out towards the one, his displeasure goes out towards the other; if the one is attracted, the other is repelled. The attributes of God are not so many distinct qualities, but one perfection of excellence, diversified in our conceptions, by the diversity of the objects towards which it is manifested. The justice of God is therefore nothing but the holiness of God in relation to sin. So long as he is holy, he must be just; he must repel sin, which is the highest idea we can form of punishment. To say then that God punishes only for governmental reasons, is to destroy our very conception of his nature.

That distributive justice is an essential attribute of God, is therefore revealed to us in the very constitution of our nature, in which we find a sense of justice, which is no more a form of benevolence than it is of reverence. It is revealed in all the operations of conscience; in the common consciousness of men, as expressed in all their prayers, confessions and sacrificial rites. It is revealed in the scriptures in every possible way; in all they teach of the nature of God, of his holiness, of his hatred of sin, of his determination to punish it; in the institution of sacrifices, and in the law. If the precepts of the law are an expression of the divine perfection, so is the penalty. If the one declare what it is right for God to require, the other declares what it is right for him to inflict. If God does not command us to love him, merely to make his dominions happy, neither does he punish merely for the public good. The law is a revelation of what is right, and God will require and do right for its own sake, and not for another and a lower end. God then is just, and Dr. Beman and his theory, by denying that there is any such attribute in God as justice distinct from benevolence, do equal violence to conscience, reason and the Bible.

Dr. Beman, again, denies that Christ made a true and proper satisfaction to divine justice, and thus departs from the common faith of Christendom, and seriously vitiates the whole doctrine of redemption. It is well known that at the time of the Reformation there was no controversy between Protestants and Romanists either as to the necessity or nature of the atonement. All classes of Protestants and the church of Rome itself, united in teaching, 1. That the Son of God having assumed our nature obeyed and suffered in our stead, thereby making a true, proper and complete satisfaction for our sins. And 2. That his righteousness was so given or imputed unto us as to constitute us righteous in the

sight of God. The Romanists even reproached Protestants for not coming up to their doctrine on this subject, insisting that the satisfaction of Christ was not only full and equivalent, but superabundant. "Pretium, says the Cat. Rom. i. 5, 15, quod Christus pro nobis persolvit, debitis nostris non par solum et aequale fuit, verum ea longe superavit." It is one of the standing heads of theology in the Romish systems, Satisfactio Christi fuit de rigore justitiæ, which they prove; and answer the common Socinian objections, viz. that such a satisfaction destroys the grace of salvation, that it is impossible that the temporal sufferings of Christ should have such efficacy, &c. As to their views of the second point above mentioned, it is enough to quote the following passage from Turretin, vol. 2, p. 709. "It is not questioned," he says, "whether the righteousness and merit of Christ are imputed to us; for this the Papists dare not deny. The Council of Trent, Sess. vi. c. 8, says, 'Christ by his most holy passion on the cross merited justification for us, and satisfied God the Father in our behalf, and no one can be righteous to whom the merits of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ are not communicated.' Hence Vasques in 1. 2. q. 114. disp. 222. chap. 1. says, 'We concede that not only what is within us, as sin, faith, righteousness, may be imputed to us, but also what is without us, as the merits and obedience of Christ; because not only what is within, but, also what is without, on account of which something is given to us, is said to belong to us, (ad aliquum effectum,) as though they were really our own.' Bellarmin Lib. 2. de Justif. cap. 7, acknowledges the same thing, when he says, 'If Protestants meant only that the merits of Christ are imputed to us, because God gives them to us, so that we can present them to God for our sins, he having assumed the burden of making satisfaction for us, and of reconciling us to the Father, the doctrine would be true.' This is in fact precisely what we do mean. For when he adds, 'we hold that the righteousness of Christ is so imputed to us, as by it we become formally or inherently just,' he asserts what is gratuitous and false, on account of his own perverse and proposterous theory of moral justification."*

* It is characteristic of the church of Rome that while she holds the truth, she contrives to make it of no effect by her traditions. Thus while she teaches that the merit of Christ is the ground of our justification, she makes those merits accessible only through her ministrations, and confounds justification and sanctification. And while she holds the truth as to the nature of Christ's satisfac-

The Lutheran church held the strictest form of doctrine as to the nature of Christ's satisfaction, and as to justification. That church teaches that the sufferings of Christ were strictly penal, that his obedience and death made a full and proper satisfaction to the law and justice of God, and are imputed to the believers as the sole ground of their justification. We cannot swell our article with numerous citations in proof of a well known fact. In the Apology for the Augsburg Confession, p. 93. it is said, "Christus, quia sine peccato subiit pœnam peccati, et victima pro nobis factus est, sustulit illud jus legis, ne accuset, ne damnet hos qui credunt in ipsum, quia ipse est propitiatio pro eis, propter quam justi reputantur." In the Form of Concord, it is said, "Justitia illa, quae coram Deo fidei aut credentibus et mera gratia imputatur, est obedientia, passio, et resurrectio Christi, quibus ille legi nostra causa satisfacit et peccata nostra expiavit." p. 684. Again, p. 696. "Humana natura sola, sine divinitate, aeterno omnipotenti Deo neque obedientia, neque passione pro totius mundi peccatis satisfacere valisset. Divinitas vero sola sine humanitate inter Deum et uos medatoris partes implere non potuisset. Cum autem . . . obedientia illa Christi non sit unius duntaxat naturae, sed totius personae; ideo ea est perfectissima pro humano genere satisfactio et expiatio; qua aeternæ et immutabili justitiæ divinæ . . . satis est factum."

It will not be necessary to prove that the Reformed churches held precisely the same doctrine. There was no controversy between them and the Lutherans either as to the nature of the satisfaction of Christ, or as to justification. They differed only as the design of Christ's death, whether it had respect equally to all men, or had a special reference to his own people, a point which we hope to have room to discuss in the sequel of this article. We are now concerned only about the nature of the atonement. Bretschneider states, in a few words, the common doctrine on this subject of the two great divisions of the Protestant world. After saying that God, according to that doctrine is immutably just, and therefore must punish sin, and yet being immutably benevolent, he determined to provide redemption, he pro-

tion, she chooses to confine it to original and mortal sins, that she may make room for her own doctrine of satisfaction by good works and penances. The infinite value of the Saviour's merit, she perverts as a source, whence to derive the power to grant indulgences, &c.

ceeds, "For this it was necessary, 1. that some one in the place of men, should fulfil the law which they ought to have kept, and 2. that some one should endure the punishment (Strafen) which they had incurred. This no mere man could do, for no man (since all are subject to original sin,) could perfectly keep the law, and every man must suffer for his own sin. Neither could any divine person accomplish the task, since he could not sustain suffering and punishment. He alone who is at once God and man, with a human nature free from sin, could accomplish the work."* This righteousness, he adds, "God imputes to men as though they had wrought it out themselves."

Against this doctrine of satisfaction to the divine justice the Socinians were the first to object.† Under the pressure of their objections the Remonstrants in Holland gave way, and Grotius in his work, *De Satisfactione Christi*, though defending in the main the Catholic or common doctrine, introduced the principle, that the satisfaction of Christ was rendered to the governmental justice of God. Very far below the doctrine of Grotius, in many important respects, is the theory of Dr. Beman. In some cases he falls even below Socinus. "God as the supreme governor," he says, "must so conduct all his movements, whether of justice or mercy, as to leave on the minds of dependent creatures, a deep and just impression, that the penalty of the law will be executed, and that the sinner must perish. *To fix this impression indelibly in the breast of the sinner, is the object of the atonement.*" p. 41.‡ This however is probably a lapsus, such an one however, as few men could make. He generally includes other intelligent creatures. Still, with him, the atonement is a mere method of instruction; a means to exhibit a certain truth for the moral restraint or improvement of those to whom it is made known. The gratuitous forgiveness of sin, it is said, would

* Bretschneider's *Handbuck der Dogmatik*. vol. 2, p. 266.

† In the Racovian Catechism, it is asked, "Did Christ die that he might, properly speaking, merit our salvation, or, in like manner, properly speaking, discharge the debt due for our sins? An. Although Christians generally now hold that opinion, yet the sentiment is false, erroneous and exceedingly pernicious."

‡ Socinus taught that the atonement was designed 1. To confirm the new covenant and all its promises, especially those of the pardon of sin, and of eternal life. 2. To assure us of the love of God. 3. To induce us to embrace the gospel. 4. To encourage us by his example to trust in God. 5. To abrogate the old dispensation, &c.

tend to produce the impression that God was indifferent to his law, and that sin might be committed with impunity. To counteract that impression, to teach, or declare that sin was, in the sight of God, an evil, and would be punished, and thus to open a way to exercise mercy, without weakening the motive to obedience, is the design of the death of Christ. Justice in its "common appropriate sense" he says, "was not satisfied by the atonement of Jesus Christ." p. 131. "The law, or justice, that is, distributive justice, as expressed in the law has received no satisfaction at all." p. 133. So far as the atonement secured the government of God from the evils of gratuitous forgiveness, it was a satisfaction to his benevolence, but not to justice in any other sense. p. 182. It was designed to teach a certain truth; it is "a symbolical and substantive expression of God's regard to the moral law." p. 35. "It furnishes an expression of his regard for the moral law," and "evinces his determination to punish sin." p. 91. "To fix indelibly this impression on the heart of the sinner is the object of the atonement." p. 42.

Our first remark on this subject, after showing, as we think we have done, that the whole basis of this theory is false, is that it is destitute of any semblance of support from scripture. It hardly purports to be any thing more than a hypothesis on which to reconcile what the Bible teaches with our views of moral government. It is a device to make the atonement rational, to explain away the mystery which hangs over it, and makes the whole august transaction perfectly intelligible. Dr. Beman says that the doctrine of the atonement enters "into the very texture of revelation, warp and woof." It is, he says, "the vital principle, in the very heart of the gospel." p. 62. Surely then we have a right to have it treated as "a purely biblical question," as he affirms it to be. Yet in his chapter on the nature of the atonement, as far as we can find, he refers but to one solitary text in the whole Bible! It is a theory woven warp and woof out of the understanding, not even out of the conscience. The solitary passage which Dr. Beman cites as teaching his doctrine is Rom. iii. 25, where it is said that God set forth Christ as a propitiation for our sins, to declare his righteousness. "The object of the atonement," he says, "is here stated in explicit terms. It was required and made in order to open a consistent way for the publication of pardon, or for the exercise of

grace to sinners. Its purpose was to declare the righteousness or moral rectitude and perfection of God in dispensing, in this instance, with the literal execution of the penalty of the law, and in bestowing eternal life upon those who deserved to die." p. 124, He afterwards, p. 132, says, the words just and righteousness as here used have "no direct reference to law," but express "those principles of virtue or benevolence by which we are bound to regulate our conduct, and by which God governs the universe." Then of course the passage might be rendered, 'Christ was set forth as a propitiation to declare the benevolence of God, that he might be benevolent even in remitting the sins of those that believe;' an interpretation which needs no refutation. The first remark then to be made on this passage is, that it teaches the very reverse of what it is cited to prove. Dr. Beman himself says that in their "common and appropriate sense," the words just and justice have reference to law, and express what he calls distributive justice. Then if the language of the apostle is to be taken in "common and appropriate sense," it teaches that the propitiation of Christ was designed as an exhibition of justice in its proper sense; in order to make it apparent that God was just even in remitting sin; that the demands of justice had not been sacrificed, but on the contrary fully satisfied. It is only by taking the words in a sense that is inappropriate and unusual, that any other doctrine can be got out of the passage. Besides, Dr. Beman's interpretation is not only in direct opposition to the common meaning of the words, but to the necessary sense of the context. Satisfaction to justice is the formal idea of a propitiation, and saying that Christ was a propitiation, is only saying in other words, that our sins were laid on him, that he bore the chastisement or punishment of our sins, in order that God might be just, in justifying those that believe. Again, this interpretation is agreeable to the sense in which the words just, righteous, righteousness, &c. are familiarly used by the apostle. Is God unrighteous, he asks, who taketh vengeance? Rom. iii. 5. He denounces the divine judgment, by saying, God will cut short the work in righteousness. Rom. ix. 28. See also 2 Thess. i. 5, 6. The obvious sense then of the passage in Romans iii. 25, the opposite to that which Dr. Beman gives it.*

* "We see ourselves obliged," says Tholuck, "to admit, in this place, the

But if we admit that the passage in question does teach that the atonement was designed to set forth God's regard for the good of the universe, what then? would it establish Dr. Beman's theory? Far from it. It is one of the most common fallacies of theological writers, to seize upon some one passage, and shutting their eyes on all others, assume that it teaches the whole truth on a given subject. The death of Christ was designed to answer manifold ends, more perhaps than it has yet entered into the heart of man to imagine. It would be the extreme of folly to take one of those ends, and infer that its attainment was its whole design, or let us into the full knowledge of its nature. Is it not said a hundred times that the death of Christ was designed to exhibit the love of God? does this prove that it does not display his righteousness? It is said to declare his wisdom; does that prove it does not display his love? It was designed to bring us unto God, but does that prove it was not also an atonement? It is not by taking any one view, or any one text, that we can arrive at the truth. We must have a theory which will embrace all the facts; a doctrine which includes all the revelations God has made on this subject. The objection to Dr. Beman's view of the design of Christ's death, is not that it is false, but that it is defective. It states only a part, and a subordinate part of the truth. The atonement is an exhibition of God's purpose to maintain his law and to inflict its penalty, and thus to operate as a restraint and a motive on all intelligent beings, because it involves the execution of that penalty. It is this that gives it all its power. It would be no exhibition of justice, if it were not an exercise of justice; it would not teach that the penalty of law must be inflicted, unless it was inflicted. We hold all the little truth there is in Dr. Beman's doctrine, but we hold unspeakably more.

Our immediate object, however, is to call attention to the entire absence of all scriptural support for this theory. We

idea of distributive justice (*vergeltende Gerechtigkeit.*)" He afterwards says that the loss of that idea in theology has occasioned "unspeakable evil," and that the doctrine of atonement "must remain sealed up until it is acknowledged." See his *Römerbrief* ed. 1842. He refers with approbation to Usteri's exposition of this passage in his *Paulinischer Lehrbegriff*. On turning to that author we find he says, his object is to prove "that the representation contained in Rom. iii. 24, 25, viz. that God, to declare his righteousness, laid on Christ the punishment of the sins of men, is the doctrine of Paul" And he accordingly goes on to prove it, particularly from Rom. viii. 3. Usteri is one of those writers, who do not feel called upon to believe what the scripture teach, though they make it a point of honour to state its meaning fairly.

have already shown that the only passage directly referred to does not teach what it is cited to prove, and that if it did, it would give no support to the theory built upon it. The surprising fact however should be more distinctly noticed, that while the Bible is said to be full of the doctrine of atonement, scarcely an attempt is made to prove its nature from the Bible. Christ is said to be a sacrifice, to bear our sins, to be a propitiation, a ransom, &c. &c., but no attempt is made to tell us what all this means. There is no examination of the terms, no illucidation of the meaning they bore in the age of the apostles. The writer does not even pretend to found his theory upon them. In the chapter in which he gives his own view of the nature of the atonement, they are scarcely even mentioned. The whole affair is a piece of pure Rationalistic speculation, formed on certain principles of moral philosophy which have nothing to do with the Bible. It is assumed that happiness is the end of all things; that to promote happiness is the essence of virtue; that the prevention of crime, which causes misery, is the end of punishment; that the death of Christ, as it tends to prevent crime, supercedes the necessity of punishment. There is the theory. And we can hardly avoid saying that it has more affinity with Jeremy Bentham, and "the greatest happiness" system, than it has with the Bible, or with the sympathies of Christians.

Our next remark on this theory is that it is perfectly arbitrary. The Bible teaches that Christ was a sacrifice, that he bore our sins, that the chastisement of our peace was laid upon him; that he propitiated God; was a ransom; was made sin, that he might be made righteous. These and similar statements set forth the nature of the atonement. There are many others describing some of its manifold effects. It declared the justice of God, exhibited his wisdom, set us an example, purifies his people, and in short, glorifies God and promotes the best interest of his kingdom. If you take in the former statements, there is perfect unity in all these representations. The work of Christ is a display of the justice and love of God, it leads men to repentance, and exerts this moral influence on the universe, because it is a satisfaction to divine justice, and answers the demands of his law. But if the scriptural account of its nature be rejected, then it is a matter to be arbitrarily decided, which of its effects shall be selected as determining its character. If Dr. Beman says it is an atonement because it expresses God's regard to the order and welfare of his government; Socinus

may say, it is an atonement because it assures us of the love of God. The one is just as much right as the other; for both are right as far as they go; but both are arbitrary in selecting what suits their taste, or their philosophy, and rejecting all the rest. Dr. Beman does not pretend that his doctrine is taught in those passages of scripture which really describe the nature of the atonement, neither does Socinus. Both say all that is figurative. The one says its nature is to be inferred from one of its effects, the other from another; the one considers it as designed mainly to teach God's rectoral justice, the other his love. It is perfectly plain that on this plan the citadel is surrendered. Dr. Beman can have nothing to say to the Socinian, which the Socinian cannot retort on Dr. Beman. Both admit that we are saved by the death of Christ; the one affirming that it is because it brings us to repentance and thus makes our forgiveness consistent with the character of God and the interests of his kingdom; the other, that it is because it reconciles forgiveness with the good of the universe, in a different way.

It may also on this ground be made a fair subject of debate, which view really assigns most importance to the death of Christ. Is it clear that fear is more conservative than love? that the exhibition of God's regard to law, would have a greater effect in promoting holiness than the exhibition of his mercy? We very much doubt it. And we confess ourselves very much at a loss to see, why the Socinian view of the design of the Redeemer's death, should be regarded as a rejection of the doctrine of atonement, if his death was merely designed to exert a conservative influence on the moral government of God. Certain it is that this is not the doctrine against which the early Socinians contended.

It is further plain that the principles of interpretation which Dr. Beman is obliged to adopt to reconcile his theory with the Bible, are all that is wanted to serve the purpose of Socinians. They both deny that we are to take the language of scripture according to its "common and appropriate sense," and agreeable to the mode of thinking prevalent in the age in which it was uttered. The vastly different views entertained by Dr. Beman and Socinus as to the person of Christ, make of course a corresponding difference in their whole religious system. But as to the nature of the atonement, we have always considered the ground advocated by Dr. Beman, as utterly untenable against the arguments of Socinians. It is a rejection of the scriptural account, and

after that is done, one theory has as much authority as another.

Our third remark is, that this theory besides being independent of scripture, and perfectly arbitrary, is directly opposed to the explicit teaching of the word of God. Be it remembered that the Bible is admitted to be full of the doctrine of the atonement; that it is the great central point in the religion of redeemed man. It is also admitted that God has revealed not only the fact that we are saved by the obedience and death of Christ, but also the way in which his work is efficacious to that end. The Socinian says, it is by its moral effect upon men; Dr. Beman says, it is from its tendency to prevent crime and preserve the order of the universe; the common faith of Christendom is, that Christ saves us by satisfying the demands of law and justice in our stead. As the Bible is full of this doctrine it must enable us to decide which of these views is right, for the Bible was intended to teach us the way of salvation. We are taught then first, that *Christ bore our sins*. Heb. ix. 28, 1 Pet. ii. 24, Is. liii. 12, &c. It cannot be disputed that the usual scriptural meaning of the expression, *to bear sin*, is to bear the punishment due to sin. Lev. xxii. 9. If they keep not my ordinance "they shall bear sin for it." Num. xviii. 22, xiv. 33, Lev. v. 1, 17. "He is guilty, and shall bear his iniquity." Ez. xviii. 20. "The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son." No one doubts that this means, the son shall not be punished for the sins of the father, nor the father for the sins of the son. When therefore the scriptures say that Christ bore our sins, they say in express terms, that he bore the punishment of our sins. This is rendered the more certain, because he bore them by suffering, or by dying; and because the scriptures express this same idea in so many other ways. This account of the nature of the atonement is found not only in poetical descriptions of Christ's sufferings, but in the most didactic portions of the Bible. The language used had an established sense in the minds of those to whom it was addressed, who could not fail to understand it according to its obvious meaning. That meaning, therefore, we are bound, by all sound rules of interpretation, to believe the sacred writers intended to convey. How does Dr. Beman answer this? Does he attempt to show that the phrase "to bear sin" does commonly mean to bear the punishment of sin? or that it has not that mean-

ing when used in reference to Christ? As far as we have been able to find, he contents himself with some general remarks against taking figurative language in its literal sense. He subjects the passages, in which the phrase in question occurs, to no critical examination. He makes no attempt to show that figurative language may not convey a definite meaning, or that that meaning is not to be learnt from usage, and the known opinions of those to whom it is addressed. It is enough for him that he does not like the truth, which the passages in question would then teach; that he cannot see how the innocent could so take the place of the guilty as to bear their punishment; that he cannot reconcile this doctrine with the justice of God, nor with his views of other portions of scripture. In the mean time the plain meaning of the scriptures stands, and those who find all other scriptural representations consistent with that meaning, and to whom it is in fact the very ground of their hope towards God, will receive it gladly, and in all its simplicity. The theory of Dr. Beman, then, which denies that Christ suffered the penalty due to our sins, must be admitted to be in direct conflict with these express declarations of the word of God.*

Secondly, the scriptures in order to teach us the nature of atonement, says that Christ offered himself as a sacrifice unto God. What then is, according to the scriptures, a sacrifice for sins? "The essence of a propitiatory sacrifice," says Storr, "is the forgiveness of sin, through the transfer of punishment from the actual offender to another."† The moderate Bishop Burnet says, "The notion of an expiatory sacrifice which was then, when the New Testament was writ, well understood all the world over, both by Jews and gentiles, was this, that the sin of one person was transferred on a man or beast, who upon that was devoted or offered to God, and suffered in the room of the offending

* Prof. Stuart, in his commentary and Excursus on Heb. ix. 28, says, "*To bear the sins of others*, is to bear or endure the penalty due to them." Having proved this, he adds, "The sentiment of the clause then clearly is, that Jesus by his death, (which could take place but once), endured the penalty that our sins deserved or bore the sorrows due to us." What he further says, that the sufferings of Christ were not in *all respects* and considered in every point of view, an exact and specific *quid pro quo*, as it regards the penalty threatened against sin, that the Saviour did not suffer a guilty conscience, or despair, would be pertinent, had he first proved that any respectable body of Christians held any such doctrine, or that a guilty conscience, or despair is an essential part of the penalty of the law.

† Zweck des Todes Jesu. § 8.

person; and by this oblation, the punishment of the sin being laid on the sacrifice, an expiation was made for sin, and the sinner was believed to be reconciled to God.”* That this is the correct view of the scriptural doctrine concerning sacrifices, may be inferred, 1. From its being confessedly the light in which they were generally regarded by the Jews and by the whole ancient world, and from its being a simple and natural explanation of the service. On this hypothesis, every thing is significant and intelligible. 2. From the express didactic statements of the Bible. The life is said to be in the blood, and “I have given it to you as an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul (life.) Lev. xvii. 11. The very nature of the service then was the substitution of life for life. The life forfeited was redeemed by the life paid. 3. From all the rites connected with the service and all the expressions employed concerning it. There was to be confession of sin, imposition of hands (as expressing the idea of transfer and substitution,) the sins were said to be laid on the head of the victim, which was then put to death, or, as in the case of the scape-goat, dismissed into the wilderness and another goat sacrificed in its place. All these directions plainly teach that the nature of expiatory offerings consisted in the substitution of the victim for the offender, and in the infliction of the penalty of death incurred by the one, upon the other. 4. That this is the scriptural doctrine on this subject, is made still plainer by the fact, that all that is taught by saying, that the Messiah bore our sins, that our iniquities were laid upon him, that he bore our sorrows, that the chastisement of our peace was laid on him, is expressed by the prophet by saying, He made “his soul an offering for sin.” Then an offering for sin, is one on whom sin is laid, who bears sins, i. e., as has been shown, the penalty due to sin. 5. This view of the subject is further confirmed by a consideration of the effects ascribed to these sacrifices. They made atonement; they propitiated God; they secured the remission of the penalty incurred. When an Israelite had committed any offence by which he forfeited his standing in the theocracy, (that is, the favour of God as his theocratical ruler,) he brought to the priest the appointed sacrifice, made confession of his sin, the victim was slain in his place, and he was restored to his standing,

* Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles. Article 2.

and saved from being cut off from his people. These sacrifices always produced these effects; they always secured the remission of the theocratical penalty for which they were offered and accepted. Whether they secured the forgiveness of the soul before God, depended on the state of mind of the offerer. Of themselves they had no such efficacy, since it was impossible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sin. But nothing is plainer from scripture, than that the way in which the Israelites obtained the remission of the civil or theocratical penalties which they had incurred, was intended to teach us how sin is pardoned in the sight of God through Jesus Christ.

If then the Bible, according to the almost unanimous judgment of Christians, teach that the idea of an expiatory sacrifice, is, that by vicarious punishment justice is satisfied and sin forgiven; if this was the view taken of them by Jews and Gentiles, then does the Bible, in so constantly representing Christ as a propitiation, as a lamb, as a sacrifice for sin, expressly teach that he bore the penalty due to our sins, that he satisfied divine justice, and secured for all in whose behalf that sacrifice is accepted, the pardon of sin and restoration to the divine favour. To talk of figure here is out of the question. Admit that the language is figurative, the question is what idea was it intended to convey? beyond doubt that which the sacred writers knew with certainty would be attached to it, by their immediate readers, and which in fact has been attached to it in all ages of the church.* To tell a conscience-stricken Israelite that a sacrifice was designed either to impress his own mind, or the minds of others with the truth that God is just or benevolent, would have been a mockery. It was to him an atonement, a propitiation, a vicarious punishment, or it was nothing. And it is no less a mockery to tell a convinced sinner, that the death of Christ was designed to lead him to repentance, or to preserve the good order of the universe. Unless the Redeemer was a sacrifice, on whom our sins were laid, who bore the penalty we had incurred, it is, to

* "It is not possible for us to preserve" says Bishop Burnet, "any reverence for the New Testament, or the writers of it, so far as to think them even honest men, not to say inspired men, if we can imagine, that in so sacred and important a matter they could exceed so much as to represent that a sacrifice which is not truly so. This is a subject which will not bear figures and amplifications; it must be treated strictly, and with a just exactness of expression." Burnet on the Thirty-Nine Articles, the same page quoted above.

such a sinner, no atonement, and no adequate ground of confidence toward God.*

Again, it is a part of the common faith of the church, that Jesus Christ, is a true and proper priest; that what was symbolical and figurative, with regard to other priests, is real as it regards him. He is called a priest; it is proved that he has all the qualifications for the office, that he was divinely appointed, that he performed all its duties, secures all its benefits, and that his priesthood supercedes all others. We are accordingly commanded to come to him in the character of a priest, to commit our souls into his hands, that he may reconcile us to God, and make intercession for us. This is the scriptural method of representing the manner in which Christ saves us, and the nature of his work. Dr. Beman in his chapter on the "Fact of the Atonement," which is directed against Socinians, avails himself of all the usual sources of scriptural proof, and in the course of the chapter is forced to speak of Christ as a sacrifice and a Priest. But when he comes to the exposition of his views of the nature of the atonement, he finds it expedient and even necessary, to leave that mode of representation entirely out of view. We hear no more of propitiating God, of Christ as a sacrifice, of his character as a Priest. It is now all moral government, the order and interest of the universe, symbolical teaching, exhibition of truth and mo-

* "The innate sense of divine justice, which all men possess, demands that the sinner should receive his due, that the stroke he has given to the law, should recoil upon himself. The deeper his sense of guilt, the less can he be satisfied with mere pardon, and the more does he demand punishment, for by punishment he is JUSTIFIED. Whence do we derive his intimate persuasion of God's justice? Not from without; because men, as empirically guided, regard freedom from suffering as the highest good; it must therefore be implanted in our nature by God himself. The holiness of God, which reveals itself to the sinner by the connexion between suffering and transgression, has therefore, a witness for itself in every human breast. Hence, on the one hand, the proclamation of pardon and reconciliation, could not satisfy the conscience of the sinner, unless his guilt had been atoned for by punishment; and on the other hand, divine love could not offer its blessings to the sinner, unless holiness was revealed together with love. It was therefore necessary that suffering commensurate with the apostacy of man should be endured, which men would impute to themselves as their own. Such was the suffering, inward and outward, of the Redeemer. Two things were necessary, 1. That those sufferings should correspond to (entsprechen) the greatness of the sin of mankind, 2. That the sinner could rightfully impute them to himself." THOLUCK, Beilage II. zum Hebraerbrieff p. 104. There is more real and precious truth, according to our judgment, in that short paragraph, than in all Dr. Beman's book.

tives. Why is all this? Why does not Dr. Beman's doctrine admit of being thrown into the scriptural form? Why must the terms sacrifice, priest, propitiation, be discarded, when teaching the nature of the atonement? For the very obvious reason that there is an entire incongruity between his views and the word of God. What has a sacrifice and priest to do with governmental display? This fact alone works the condemnation of Dr. Beman's whole theory. His plan of salvation, his method of access to God, is irreconcilable with that presented in the scriptures. There we are taught that as the Israelite who had offended, came to the priest, who made an atonement for him in the appointed way, and thus reconciled him to God; so the penitent sinner, must come to Christ as his High Priest, who satisfies the divine justice by presenting his own merits before God, and who ever lives to make intercession for him. Would this representation ever lead a human being to imagine, that Christ merely makes pardon possible, that his death was a symbolical lesson to the universe? According to Dr. Beman's theory, Christ is not a Priest. We are under no necessity of recognising him as such, nor of committing ourselves into his hands, nor of relying on his merits and intercession. A mere possibility of salvation for all men is all that Christ has accomplished. But does this make him a High Priest, in the scriptural and universally received sense, of the term?

A third method by which the scriptures teach us the nature of the atonement, is by express declarations concerning the nature of his sufferings, or the immediate design of his death. It is expressly taught that his sufferings were penal, that he endured the penalty of the law, and that he thus suffered not for himself but for us. This is a point about which there is so much strange misconception, that it is necessary to explain the meaning of the terms here used. The sufferings of rational beings are either calamities, having no reference to sin; or chastisement designed for the improvement of the sufferer; or penal when designed for the satisfaction of justice. Now what is meant by the language above used is, that the sufferings of Christ were not mere calamities; neither were they chastisements, (in the sense just stated), nor were they simply exemplary, nor merely symbolical, designed to teach this or that truth, but that they were penal, i. e. designed to satisfy divine justice. This is the distinctive character assigned to

them in scripture. Again, by the penalty of the law is meant, that suffering which the law demands as a satisfaction to justice. It is not any specific kind or degree of suffering, for it varies both as to degree and kind, in every supposable case of its infliction. The sufferings of no two men that ever lived, are precisely alike, in this world or the next, unless their constitution, temperament, sins, feelings, and circumstances were precisely alike, which is absolutely incredible. The objection therefore started by Socinians, that Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law, because he did not suffer remorse, despair, or eternal banishment from God, was answered, by cotemporary theologians, by denying that those things entered essentially into the penalty of the law. That penalty is in scripture called death, which includes every kind of evil inflicted by divine justice in punishment of sin; and inasmuch as Christ suffered such evil, and to such a degree as fully satisfied divine justice, he suffered what the scriptures call the penalty of the law. It is not the nature, but the relation of sufferings to the law, which give them their distinctive character. What degree of suffering the law demands, as it varies in every specific case, God only can determine. The sufferings of Christ were unutterably great; still with one voice, Papists, Lutherans and Reformed, rebutted the objection of Socinus, that the transient sufferings of one man could not be equivalent to the sufferings due to the sins of men, by referring, not to the degree of the Saviour's anguish, as equal to the misery due to all for whom he died, but to the infinite dignity of his person. It was the Lord of glory who was crucified. As the bodily sufferings of a man are referred to his whole person, so the scriptures refer the sufferings of Christ's human nature to his whole person. And he was a divine, and not a human person; but a divine person with a human nature. This is an awful subject, on which all irreverent speculation must be very offensive to God. Let it be enough to say with the scriptures that Christ suffered the penalty of the law in our stead, and that the penalty of the law was that kind and amount of suffering, which from such a Person, was a full satisfaction to the divine justice. All that our standards say on this point, they say wisely, viz. that the Saviour endured the miseries of this life, the wrath of God, the accursed death of the cross, and continued under the power of death for a time. This was the penalty of the law; for the

wrath of God however expressed, constitutes that penalty, in its strictest and highest sense.

That the scriptures do teach that Christ's sufferings were penal, has already been proved from those passages in which he is said to bear our sins, that our iniquities were laid upon him, that he suffered the chastisement of our peace, and that as a sacrifice he endured the death which we had incurred. The same truth is expressed still more explicitly in Gal. iii. 13. The apostle thus argues. The law pronounces accursed all who do not obey every command; no man has ever rendered this perfect obedience, therefore all men are under the curse; but Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for us. There can be no doubt what the apostle means, when he says, that all men are under the curse; nor when he says, cursed is every one who continueth not in all things written in the law to do them, neither can it be doubted what he means when he says, Christ was made a curse. The three expressions, under the curse, accursed, and made a curse, cannot mean essential different things. If the former mean that we were exposed to the penalty, the latter must mean that Christ endured the penalty. He hath redeemed us from the curse by bearing it in our stead.*

To the same effect the apostle speaks in Rom. viii. 3. What the law could not do (i. e. effect the justification of men) in that it was weak through the flesh, that God did, having sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, or as a sin-offering, he condemned, i. e. punished sin, in the flesh, i. e. in him, who was clothed in our nature. This passage, agrees, as to the principal point, with the one cited from Galatians. The sentence which we had incurred was carried into effect upon the Redeemer, in order that we might be delivered from the law under which we were justly condemned. In 2 Cor. v. 21, the apostle in urging men to be reconciled to God, presents the nature, and mode of the atonement, as the ground of his exhortation. "For

* In this interpretation every modern commentator of whom we have any knowledge concurs, as for example Koppe, Flatt, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Rückert, De Wette. What the apostle adds in the next verse, "For it is written cursed is every one that is hung upon a tree," is evidently intended to justify from scripture the use of the word *curse*. Those publicly exposed as suffering the sentence of the law, are called *cursed*, hence since Christ, though perfectly holy, did bear the sentence of the law, the word may be properly applied to him.

he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might become the righteousness of God in him." The only sense in which Christ, who was free from all sin, could be made sin, was by having our sins laid upon him, and the only way in which our sins could be laid upon him, was by his so assuming our place as to endure, in our stead, the penalty we had incurred. "God made him to be sin," says De Wette, "in that he laid on him the punishment of sin." Here again we have precisely the same doctrine, taught under all the other forms of expression already considered. Christ was made sin, as we in him are made righteousness; we are justified, he was condemned; we are freed from the penalty, he endured it; he was treated as justice required the sinner to be treated; we are treated according to his merits and not our own deserts.

Fourthly, there are various other forms under which the scriptures set forth the nature of Christ's death which the limits of a review forbid our considering. He has redeemed us; he has purchased us; he gave himself as a ransom, &c. It is readily admitted that all these terms are often used in a wide sense, to express the general idea of deliverance without reference to the mode by which that deliverance is effected. It cannot however be denied that they properly express deliverance by purchase, i. e., by the payment of what is considered equivalent to the person or thing redeemed. In the Bible it is not simply said that Christ has delivered us; nor is it said he delivered us by power, nor by teaching, but by his death, by his own precious blood, by giving himself, by being made a curse for us. Such representations cannot fail to convey the idea of a redemption in the proper sense of the term, and therefore teach the true nature of the atonement. We are redeemed; that which was given for us was of infinite value.

If the scriptures thus teach that Christ saves us by bearing our sins, or being made a sin-offering in our place, then the more general expressions, such as he died for us, he gave himself for us, we are saved by his death, his blood, his cross, and others of a similar kind, are all to be understood in accordance with those more explicit statements. To the pious reader of the New Testament, therefore, the precious truth that Christ died as our substitute, enduring in his own person, the death which we had incurred, redeeming us from the curse by being made a curse for us, meets him upon almost every page, and confirms his

confidence in the truth and exalts his estimate of its value, by this frequency of repetition and variety of statement.

Fifth, there is still another consideration in proof of the unscriptural character of Dr. Beman's theory, which is too important to be overlooked. The apostle in unfolding the plan of redemption proceeds on the assumption that men are under a law or covenant which demands perfect obedience, and which threatens death in case of transgression. He then shows that no man, whether Jew or Gentile, can fulfil the conditions of that covenant, or so obey the law as to claim justification on the ground of his own righteousness. Still as this law is perfectly righteous, it cannot be arbitrarily set aside. What then was to be done? What hope can there be for the salvation of sinners? The apostle answers by saying, that what the law could not do, (that is, save men,) God has accomplished by the mission of his Son. But how does the Son save us? This is the very question before us. It relates to the nature of the work of Christ, which Dr. Beman has undertaken to discuss. Paul's answer to that question is, that Christ saves us by being made under the law and fulfilling all its demands. He fulfilled all righteousness, he knew no sin, he was holy, harmless and separate of sinners. He bore our sins in his own body on the tree, and thus endured the death which the law threatened against sin. He has thus redeemed us from the law; that is, we are no longer under obligation to satisfy, in our own person, its demands, in order to our justification. The perfect righteousness of Christ is offered as as the ground of justification, and all who accept of that righteousness by faith, have it so imputed to them, that they can plead it as their own, and God has promised to accept it to their salvation. We can hardly persuade ourselves that any ordinary reader of the Bible, can deny that this is a correct representation of the manner in which Paul preached the gospel. It is the burden of all his writings, it is the gospel itself as it lay in his mind, and as he presented it to others. It is the whole subject of the first eight chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, and of all the doctrinal part of his Epistle to the Galatians. In the former of these epistles, he shows that there are but two methods of justification, the one by our own righteousness and the other by the righteousness of God. Having shown that no man has or can have an adequate righteousness, of his own, he shows that the gospel reveals the righteousness of God, that is, the

righteousness which is by faith in Jesus Christ, and which is upon all them that believe. This righteousness is so complete, that God is just in justifying those who have the faith by which it is received and appropriated. He afterwards illustrates this great doctrine of imputed righteousness, by a reference to the case of Adam, and shows that as on the account of the offence of one man, a sentence of condemnation passed on all men, so on account of the righteousness of one man, the free gift of justification has come upon all. As by the disobedience of one the many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one, the many are made righteous. It is involved in all this, that we are no longer under the law, no longer subject to its demand of a perfect personal righteousness but justified by a righteousness, which satisfies its widest claims. Hence the apostle so frequently asserts, ye are not under the law; ye are free from the law. But how? not by abrogating the law, or by dispensing with its righteous claims, but legally as a woman is free from her husband, not by deserting him, not by repudiating his authority, but by his ceasing to have any claim to her, which continues only so long as he lives. So we are freed from the law by the body of Christ, i. e., by his death. He was made under the law that he might redeem them who were under the law; he hath redeemed us from its curse by being made a curse for us, he has taken away the hand writing which was against us, nailing it to the cross. There is, therefore, now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, because we are by this gospel freed from the law and its condemnation. Hence Paul teaches that if righteousness, (that is, what satisfies the demands of the law) could have come in any other way, Christ is dead in vain. How exclusively this righteousness of Christ was the ground of the apostle's personal confidence, is plain from his pregnant declaration to the Phillippians, that he counted all things but dung, that he might win Christ, and be found in him, not having his own righteousness, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.

With this representation of the plan of salvation, Dr. Beman's theory is utterly irreconcilable. According to his theory, the demands of the law have not been satisfied. "The relation of the sinner to the curse which this law pronounces against the transgressor, is legally—not evangelically—just the same that it was without an atonement." "The law has the same demand upon him, and utters the

same denunciation of wrath against him. The law, or justice, that is distributive justice, as expressed in the law, has received no satisfaction at all." p. 133. What then has Christ's atonement done for us? He has simply opened the way for pardon. "All that the atonement has done for the sinner," says Dr. Beman, "is to place him within the reach of pardon." p. 137. "The way is now open. Mercy can now operate. The door is open." p. 106. The atonement "was required and made in order to open a consistent way for the publication of pardon, or for the exercise of grace to sinners." p. 124.

This theory directly contradicts the apostle's doctrine, 1. Because he teaches that Christ was made under the law for the purpose of redeeming them that are under the law, and that he was made a curse for us. We are therefore delivered from the law, as a covenant of works, and are not subject to its demands and its curse when united to him. 2. Because it virtually denies that Christ wrought out any righteousness which is the ground of our justification. He merely makes pardon possible, whereas Paul says that by his obedience we are made righteous, that we become the righteousness of God in him. On this new theory, the language of the apostle, when he speaks of not having his own righteousness, but the righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ, is unintelligible. 3. It destroys the very nature of justification, which is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight only for the righteousness of Christ, imputed unto us, and received by faith alone." But according to this theory there is no such thing as justification: we are merely pardoned. In scripture, however, and in all languages, the ideas of pardon and justification are distinct and in a measure opposite.* If we are justified, we are declared righteous. That is, it is declared that, as concerns us, on some ground or for some reason, the law is satisfied; and that reason Paul says must either be our own righteousness, or the righteousness of Christ. Dr. Beman's theory admits of no such idea of justification. The sinner is merely forgiven, because the death of Christ, prevents such forgiveness doing any harm. This is not what the Bible teaches, when it speaks of our being made the righteousness of God

* "The word *δικαιοῦν*," says De Wette, "means not merely negatively to pardon; but also affirmatively to declare righteous."

in Christ ; or of his imputing righteousness to us ; or of our receiving the gift of righteousness. This is not what the convinced sinner needs, to whom, not mere pardon, but justification on the ground of a righteousness, which though not his own, is his, as wrought out for him and bestowed by the free gift of God, is necessary to peace with God. Rom. v. 1.

4. It destroys the nature of justifying faith and deranges the whole plan of salvation. In accordance with the scriptures, faith in Jesus Christ, is, in our standards, declared to be a saving grace, whereby we receive and rest upon him alone for salvation, as he is offered to us in the gospel. This is perfectly natural and intelligible, if Christ is our righteousness. If his work of obedience and death is the sole ground of justification before God, then we understand what the Bible means by believing upon Christ, putting our trust in him, being found in him ; then the phrase, faith of Christ, which so often occurs as expressing the idea of a faith of which he is the object, has its appropriate meaning. Then too we understand what is meant by coming to Christ, receiving Christ, putting on Christ, being in Christ. Upon Dr. Beman's theory however all this is well nigh unintelligible. We admit that a vague sense may be put on these expressions on any theory of the atonement, even that of the Socinians. If the death of Christ is necessary to salvation, either, as they say, by revealing the love of God, or as Dr. Beman says, by revealing his regard for law, then to believe in Christ, or to receive Christ, might be said to mean, to believe the truth that without the revelation made by his death, God would not forgive sin. But how far is this from being the full and natural import of the terms ! Who would ever express mere acquiescence in the fact that Christ has made salvation possible, by saying, ' I would be found in him not having mine own righteousness, but the righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ ? ' The fact is the Socinian view is in some respects much easier reconciled with scripture than that of Dr. Beman. The passage just quoted, for example, might have this meaning, viz. we must have, not the moral excellence which the law can give, but that inward righteousness of which faith in Christ is the source. This would have some plausibility, but what ' the righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ ' can mean, as opposed to our own righteousness, on Dr. Beman's ground, it is hard to conceive.

Again, according to the Bible and the common doctrine of the church, when a sinner is convinced of his sin and misery, of his entire unworthiness in the sight of God, he is to be directed to renounce all dependence upon himself and to believe in Christ, that is, to place all his confidence in him. But if Christ has only made salvation possible, if he has merely brought the sinner within the reach of mercy, this is a most unnatural direction. What has the sinner to come to Christ for? Why should he be directed to receive or submit to the righteousness of God? Christ has nothing to do for him. He has made salvation possible, and his work is done; what the sinner has to do is to submit to God. The way is open, let him lay aside his rebellion, and begin to love and serve his maker. Such are the directions, which this theory would lead its advocates to give to those who are convinced of their sin and danger. This is not a mere imagination, such are the directions, commonly and characteristically given by those who adopt Dr. Beman's view of the atonement. Christ disappears in a great measure from his own gospel. You may take up volume after volume of their sermons, and you will find excellent discourses upon sin, obligation, moral government, regeneration, divine sovereignty, &c., but the cross is comparatively kept out of view. Christ has no immediate work in the sinner's salvation; and accordingly the common directions to those who ask, what they must do to be saved, is, submit to God, choose him and his service, or something of similar import. To such an extreme has this been carried, by some whose logical consistency has overcome the influence of scriptural language and traditionary instruction, that they have not hesitated to say that the command, Believe in Christ, is obsolete. It was the proper test of submission in the apostolic age, but in our day, when all men recognise Christ as the Messiah, it is altogether inappropriate. We doubt not that thousands who agree substantially with Dr. Beman, would be shocked at this language; nevertheless it is the legitimate consequence of his theory. If the atonement is a mere governmental display, a mere symbolical method of instruction, then the command to believe in Christ, to come to him, to trust in him and his righteousness, is not the language in which sinners should be addressed. It does not inform them of the specific thing which they must do in order to be saved. Christ has opened the door, their business is now immediately with God.

Again, can any reader of the Bible, can any Christian at least, doubt that union with Christ, was to the apostles one of the most important and dearest of all the doctrines of the gospel; a doctrine which lay at the root of all the other doctrines of redemption, the foundation of their hopes, the source of their spiritual life. But according to the theory that Christ's death is a mere symbolical method of instruction, an expression of a great truth, that it merely opens the way for mercy, what can union with Christ mean? In what sense are we in him? how are we his members? How is it that we die, that we live, that we are to rise from the dead in virtue of that union? What is meant by living by faith of which he is the object? The fact is this theory changes the whole nature of the gospel; every thing is altered; the nature of faith, the nature of justification, the mode of access to God, our relation to Christ, the inward exercises of communion with him, so that the Christian feels disposed to say with Mary, They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.

We do not believe there is truth enough in this theory to sustain the life of religion in any man's heart. We have no idea that Dr. Beman, Dr. Cox, or any good man really lives by it. The truth, as it is practically embraced and appropriated by the soul under the influence of the Holy Spirit, is the truth in the form in which it is presented in the Bible, and not as expressed in abstract propositions. It is therefore very possible for a man, to adopt theoretically such an abstract statement of a scriptural doctrine, as really denies its nature and destroys its power, and yet that same man may receive the truth for his own salvation as it is revealed in the Bible. We see daily instances of this in the case of Arminians, who professedly reject doctrines, which are really included in every prayer they utter. In like manner we believe that many who profess to adopt the theory, that the death of Christ merely opens the way for mercy, that it is only the symbolical expression of a moral truth, deny that theory in every act of faith they exercise in Jesus Christ. Still the theory is none the less false and dangerous. It has its effect, and just so far as it operates, it tends to destroy all true religion. Its tendency, especially in private Christians, is counteracted by reading the scriptures and by the teaching of the Spirit. But the evil of the constant inculcation of error and misrepresentation of truth, cannot easily be exaggerated. The particular error concerning the na-

ture of the atonement inculcated in this book, has, we believe, done more to corrupt religion, and to promote Socinianism, than any other of the vaunted improvements of American theology, which, after all, are but feeble reproductions of the rejected errors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The doctrine of atonement for which we contend as the distinguishing and essential doctrine of the gospel, is, 1. That sin for its own sake deserves the wrath and curse of God. 2. That God is just, immutably determined, from the excellence of his nature to punish sin. 3. That out of his sovereign and infinite love, in order to redeem us from the law, that is, from its demands and curse, he sent his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, who in his own person fulfilled those demands, and endured that curse in our stead. That his righteousness, or merit, thus wrought out, is imputed to every one that believes, to his justification before God. This is the doctrine of the church catholic, overlaid, corrupted and made of none effect, in the church of Rome; disembarrassed, reproduced, and exhibited as *the* doctrine of the Reformation; in manifold forms since opposed or rejected, but ever virtually embraced and trusted in by every sincere child of God.

What then are the objections to this great doctrine? The first objection urged by Dr. Beman is, that it involves "a transfer of moral character between Christ and those for whom he died. Christ could not be punished on legal principles, until he was guilty in the eye of the law; and his people could not be justified on legal principles, till its penalty was literally inflicted. This transfer of character so as to render Jesus Christ the sinner, and the soul for whom he died, innocent, appears to us without foundation in reason and scripture." The objection then is, that the doctrine that Christ endured the punishment of our sins, and that we are justified by the imputation of his righteousness, involves such a transfer of moral character as to render Jesus Christ a sinner, and those for whom he died innocent. This objection is directed not against this or that individual writer, but against whole bodies and classes of men, for Dr. Beman over and over asserts that there are but two views of the atonement, the one against which he brings this and other objections, and his own governmental theory. We have already shown that the former is the common doctrine of all the churches of the Reformation. It is against them therefore,

this objection is brought. Our first remark on it is, that it is the old, often repeated, and often refuted slander of Socinians and Papists, the latter corrupting and denying the doctrine of their own church. Our second remark is, that it is a gross, shocking, and, we are constrained in conscience to add, wicked misrepresentation. Dr. Beman betrays his want of faith in the truth of the accusation, though he makes it against hundreds and thousands of his brethren, by saying that a doctrine which represents Jesus Christ as a sinner, “appears to us without foundation in reason and scripture.”! Shocking blasphemy *appears to us without foundation!* What man who believed what he said could utter such language? Is this the way in which a doctrine which represents the Son of God a sinner, is to be spoken of? No, Dr. Beman knew full well, that the doctrine he writes against, includes no such blasphemy. He cannot be so grossly ignorant as not to know that the distinction between the imputation and the infusion of sin and righteousness, is one for which the churches of the Reformation contended as for their life; and that the distinction is plain, intelligible, scriptural, and unavoidable. One which he and all other men do make, and must make. When the prophet says, “The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father,” does Dr. Beman pretend to believe, that he means that the moral character of the father shall not be transferred to the son? that the sin of the one shall not be infused into the other? why then does he pretend to believe (for we hope it is mere pretence) that when we say, our sins were laid on Christ, we teach that our moral character was so transferred to him as to render him a sinner? Our third remark is, that the objection is glaringly unjust. We say in the very language of scriptures that Christ bore our sins. We tell in what sense we understand that language, viz. that it means, not that Christ was rendered in moral character a sinner, which is blasphemy, but that he bore the punishment of our sins, which is the universally admitted meaning of the scriptural phrase. We say farther, that by punishment we mean sufferings judicially inflicted as a satisfaction to justice. These things are so plain, they have been so often repeated, they so evidently do not involve the shocking doctrine charged on those who use this language, that we can have little respect for the man, who can gravely, and tamely repeat the charge, to the prejudice of the truth, and to the wounding of his brethren.

Dr. Beman's second objection is, that the system he opposes destroys "all mercy in God the Father, in the salvation of sinners, because it represents God as totally disinclined to the exercise of compassion, till every jot and tittle of the legal curse was inflicted. On the same principle grace or pardon in the release of the sinner from future punishment, would be out of the question; for what grace or pardon, or favour, can there be in the discharge of debtor whose demand (debt?) has been cancelled to the uttermost farthing?" p. 122. This objection is the staple of his book. On p. 100 he represents us as teaching that "the Son of God endured the exact amount of suffering due on legal principles, to sinners." On p. 107 he says, "The amount of Christ's sufferings must consequently be the same as the aggregate sufferings included in the eternal condemnation of all those who are saved by his merit. . . . The agonies which he suffered were equal to the endless misery of all those who will be saved by his interposition in their behalf." On p. 146, he says, "If *one* soul were to be saved by the atonement, Christ must sustain an amount of suffering equal to that involved in the eternal condemnation of that one soul; and if a *thousand* were to be saved a thousand times that amount, and in the same proportion for any greater number who are to be rescued from perdition and exalted to glory. To this scheme there are insurmountable objections." True enough, but who hold that scheme? Dr. Beman attributes it to all who believe in the atonement, and do not adopt his scheme, for he says there are but two. This doctrine that the sufferings of Christ amounted to the aggregate sufferings of those who are to be saved, that he endured just so much for so many, is not found in any confession of the Protestant churches, nor in the writings of any standard theologian, nor in the recognised authorities of any church of which we have any knowledge. The whole objection is a gross and inexcusable misrepresentation.* In a more moderate form it was brought forward by the Socinans, and repelled by the writers of that and subsequent ages. De Moor is generally recognised as the theologian of most authority among the

* There was a little anonymous work called *Gethsemane*, republished some years ago in this country, which taught this *quid pro quo* system of the atonement. But we do not know a single man, now of our church who adopted the sentiments of that work.

churches of Holland, and Turretin is admitted to be one of the strictest of the Geneva school, and they both answer this calumny, by denying that according to their doctrine, there is any necessity for the assumption that Christ's sufferings were equal to the sufferings of all his people. Thus Turretin, after quoting at length the objection from Socinus, answers it, first, by showing that the scriptures teach that the one death of Christ was a satisfaction for all; that as by the one sin of Adam, many were made sinners, so by the righteousness of Christ, many are made righteous. 2. By insisting on the distinction between precuniary and penal satisfaction. A piece of money in the hand of a king is of no more value, than in the hands of a peasant, but the life of a king is of more value than that of a peasant, and one commander is often exchanged for many soldiers. 3. He says the adversaries forget that Christ is God, and therefore, though his sufferings could not be infinite as they were endured by his finite nature, they were of infinite value in virtue of the infinite dignity of his person. Sin, he says, is an infinite evil, because committed against an infinite God, through the act of a finite nature. So the sufferings of Christ, though endured in his human nature, are of infinite value from the dignity of his person.*

Dr. Beman, under this head, frequently objects that we degrade the atonement into a mere commercial transaction, a payment of a debt, which, from the nature of the case excludes the idea of free remission. Our first remark on this objection is, that the scriptures use this same figure, and therefore it is right it should be used. When it is said, Christ purchased the church with his own blood, that we are redeemed not with corruptible things as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, such language means something. In every metaphor there is a point of comparison; the essential idea involved in the figure, must be found in subject to be illustrated. To purchase is to acquire, and to acquire, by giving or doing something which secures a title to the thing acquired. When it is said that Christ purchased the church, it is certainly meant that he acquired it, that it is his, and that by his death he has secured a title to it, founded in the justice and promise of God. This does

* See in the fourth vol. of his works, the treatise *De Satisfactione Christi*, p. 289. The same answer to the same objection may be seen in *De Moor*, vol. iii. p. 1030.

not make redemption a commercial transaction, nor imply that there are not essential points of diversity between acquiring by money, and acquiring by blood. Hence our second remark is, that if Dr. Beman will take up any elementary work on theology, he will find the distinction between pecuniary and penal satisfaction clearly pointed out, and the satisfaction of Christ shown to be of the latter, and not of the former kind. 1. In the one, the demand is upon the thing due, in the other case it is upon the person of the criminal. Hence, 2. The creditor is bound to accept the payment of the debt no matter when or by whom offered; whereas in the case of a crime or sin, the sovereign is bound neither to provide a substitute nor to accept of one when offered. If he does either, it is a matter of grace. 3. Hence penal satisfaction does not *ipso facto* liberate, the acceptance is a matter of arrangement or covenant, and the terms of that covenant must depend on the will of the parties. Dr. Beman lapsed into an important truth, when he said "Christ suffered by covenant," p. 98. What that covenant is, we learn from scripture, and from the manner in which it is executed. The Bible teaches that, agreeably to that covenant, the merits of Christ do not avail to the benefit of his people immediately; his children remain under condemnation as well as others until they believe; and when they do believe, they receive but the first fruits of their inheritance, they are but imperfectly sanctified, and are still subject to many evils, but being in a justified state, their sufferings are chastisements and not punishments, that is, they are designed for their own improvement, and not to satisfy justice.

The satisfaction of Christ therefore being for sin and by suffering, is expressly and formally declared not to be of the nature of pecuniary satisfaction. The grace of the gospel is thereby not obscured but rendered the more conspicuous. God is not rendered merciful by the atonement, (as we be slanderously reported, as some affirm that we say); on the contrary, the atonement flows from his infinite love. Dr. Beman writes as a Tritheist, or as against Tritheists, when he speaks of the work of the Son rendering the Father gracious, and attributes that representation to us. The Lord our God is one God. It was his infinite love devised the plan of redemption, and it was so devised, that the exercise of love should be perfectly consistent with holiness, in order that God might be just in justifying sinners. Sure-

ly then our doctrine does not obscure the grace of the gospel, at least as to the origin of the plan of mercy. But it is further objected that if Christ rendered a complete satisfaction to divine justice, then pardon becomes a matter of justice and not of grace. Justice to whom? certainly not to the ungodly, the unrighteous, the utterly undeserving, and hell-deserving sinner. If Christ suffered by covenant, and fulfilled all the conditions of that covenant, then he acquired a right to its promises. If he purchased his Church he has a right to it. If it was promised that for his obedience to death, he should see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied, then he, having done all that was required of him, has a right to the promised reward. But what right have we? None in the world; we are poor, and blind, and miserable, having nothing, meriting nothing, our only hope is that we shall be treated, not according to our deserts, but according to the merits of another.

The objection sounds strange to our ears, coming from such a quarter, that we destroy the grace of the gospel. What is salvation by grace, if it is not that God of his mere good pleasure provided redemption, that he determines of his own will who shall be partakers of its benefits; that those who are brought to repentance and faith, are not only justified avowedly on the ground of a righteousness which is not their own, but who are made to feel and acknowledge, as the very condition of their acceptance, their own ill-desert and misery, and who not only owe every thing to Christ, but possess every thing simply in virtue of their union with him, which union is kept up only by a self-renouncing, self-emptying faith. The feeblest infant resting on its mother's bosom, a new born lamb carried in the shepherd's arms, might with as much plausibility be suspected of doubting the love that sustains them, as the believer in Christ's having purchased the church with his own blood, of doubting the entire gratuitousness of his own salvation.

It would be easy to retort, and show that it is Dr. Beman's doctrine that destroys the grace of salvation. If Christ only makes pardon possible, if the possibility of forgiveness is all we owe to him, to whom or what do we owe heaven? Is it to ourselves as some of the advocates of his doctrine teach? This is the natural answer. Christ having made pardon possible, then God deals with men according to their works. Whatever answer Dr. Beman

himself would give to the above question, it must from the nature of his system, be tame compared with the answer, which flows from the doctrine that we owe the blessed Redeemer, not the possibility of pardon merely, but justification, adoption, sanctification, the resurrection of the body and life everlasting. These things, and all the blessedness they include or suppose, are not merely rendered possible, but actually secured and given for Christ's sake alone; and hence the spirits of the just made perfect, whose robes have been washed and made white in the blood of the lamb, would drown in their thanksgiving to Him that has cleansed them from all sin, the whispered acknowledgments of those who have nothing for which to give thanks but the possibility of pardon.

These objections which Dr. Beman urges in various forms throughout his book, are all old, and have been answered a hundred times. There is indeed one objection which is certainly American. It seems there was no economy in the atonement. It saved nothing, and gained nothing. The atonement it is said is "the grand device of heaven for preventing misery and promoting happiness." p. 108. And it is triumphantly urged, (through some eight pages,) that if Christ suffered as much as the redeemed would have endured there is no gain of happiness. It is "a mere *quid-pro-quo* transaction." p. 111. We have already shown that no church, or class of men hold that the blessed Redeemer endured as much suffering as the redeemed would have endured. It is a mere misrepresentation. But dismissing that point, the objection itself is unworthy of a being gifted with a moral sense. Would it be nothing that unnumbered millions are saved from sin and made perfect in holiness? Supposing there was no absolute gain as to the amount of misery prevented, that Christ had in a few years suffered all that finite beings through eternity could endure, still would the vast accession to the holy inhabitants of heaven be nothing? Does not the Bible say that he gave himself for his church, to purify and cleanse it? that the promotion of the holiness was the design of his death? Has it come to this, that the theory which makes happiness the end of the creation, must represent holiness as nothing, not worth giving thanks for, if gained at the least expense of happiness? This gross, epicurean view of the sublime and awful mystery of redemption, is a disgrace to the age and country that gave it birth.

We have thus endeavoured to show that the theory of atonement advocated by Dr. Beman, is founded on the false assumption that the punishment of sin is for the prevention of crime, and not on account of its own intrinsic ill-desert; that it of necessity involves a denial of the justice of God, and makes mere happiness the end of creation; that it is destitute of any semblance or pretence of support from the scriptures; that it is just as arbitrary, and as much a philosophical speculation as the Socinian theory, the latter asserting that the design of Christ's death was to display the love of God, and thus lead men to repentance; and the former, that it was intended to express his regard for his law, and thus act as a motive to obedience. We further endeavoured to prove that the theory is in direct conflict with the Bible. The scriptures teach in every possible way, that as man was under a law or covenant which requires perfect obedience and threatens death in case of transgression, the Son of God was born of a woman and made under that law, fulfilling its conditions of perfect obedience and sustaining its curse for man's redemption. And that his righteousness is freely imputed to all those who receive and rest upon it by faith. In denying this doctrine, which is the common faith of Christendom, Dr. Beman's theory involves the denial of justification, reducing it to mere pardon; destroys the true doctrine of justifying faith; overlooks the union between Christ and his people; tends to banish Christ from view, and to vitiate the very source of all evangelical religion.

We showed that his objections to this doctrine, with one melancholy exception, were the oft repeated and oft refuted calumnies of Socinians; that the common doctrine does not involve the transfer of moral character or represent Christ as a sinner; that so far from obscuring the grace of the gospel, or teaching that the atonement is the cause of the love of God, it represents it as flowing from that love, and presents in the clearest possible light the gratuitous nature of salvation. It is of grace that a Saviour was provided; of grace that the benefits of his death are conferred on one rather than another. And though we rejoice to know that he has acquired a right to his church, having bought it with his own blood, yet his people know, feel, and acknowledge that to them every thing is of grace, their vocation, justification, and final salvation. This is Christianity, a religion, of which Christ is the Alpha and Omega, the

first and the last, the author and the finisher, not the mere cause of the possibility of pardon.

Our discussion of the all-important question respecting the nature of the atonement, has run out to so great a length, that we cannot claim much room for the consideration of its extent. Dr. Beman writes on this whole [subject, very much as a man might be expected to write against Calvinism, who got his views of that system, from the furious harangues of itinerant Methodist preachers. He quotes no authorities, establishes no assertions, but coolly goes on attributing just what opinions come into his head to those against whom he writes. Had he taken up any one author, or class of authors, cited from their writings their own exhibitions of doctrine, and proceeded to examine them, his readers would know what credit to give to his statements. He however has preferred to state in general terms that there are but two views of the atonement, his own and another. That other he then most grievously misrepresents. He attributes to all who reject his doctrine, opinions which not one in a million of them ever entertained. As far as relates to the nature of the atonement, these misrepresentations have already been pointed out. He commences and continues his discussion concerning its extent on the same plan. He assumes that the question relates to the limitation in the very nature of the work of Christ. "If," he says, "the atonement is to be considered as a literal payment of a debt, or, in other words, if it consisted in suffering the exact penalty of the law, in the room of those who will be saved, it is manifest, that it must be limited in its extent. In this case it would be a provision which must be regulated according to the principles of commutative justice. If *one* soul were to be saved "then Christ must suffer so much, if a thousand then a thousand times as much," &c. p. 145. The opposite doctrine, which he adopts, necessarily leads to the conclusion "that an atonement sufficient for one, is sufficient for all," of course those who reject his view, are made to hold an insufficient atonement, p. 147. So Dr. Cox, in his introductory chapter, speaks of "the limitation of the nature" of the atonement, and represents those whom he opposes as holding that it is as "limited in its nature as in its application," p. 16, 17. If these gentlemen would take the trouble to read a little on this subject they would find that this is all a mistake. They are merely beating the air. Those who deny that Christ died for Judas as much as

for Paul, for the non-elect as much as for the elect, and who maintain that he died strictly and properly only for his own people, do not hold that there is any limitation in the nature of the atonement. They teach as fully as any men, that "an atonement sufficient for one is sufficient for all." It is a simple question relating to the design, and not to the nature of Christ's work. That work as far as we know or believe, would have been the same, had God purposed to save but one soul, or the souls of all mankind. We hold that the atonement as to its value is infinite, and as to its nature as much adapted to one man as to another, to all as to one. The whole question is, for what purpose did he die? What was the design which God intended to accomplish by his mission and death? That this is the true state of the question, is obvious from the fact, that the Reformed and Lutherans do not differ at all as to the nature of Christ's satisfaction, though they do differ as to its design. Lutherans, as they deny the doctrine of election, deny that the satisfaction of Christ had special reference to the elect, though they are even more strict than the Reformed, in their views of the vicarious nature of the atonement, i. e. of the imputation of our sins to Christ, and of his obedience to us. Accordingly in all the early defenses of Calvinists, their arguments on the necessity, and on the truth or nature of the atonement, are directed against Socinians, and not against either Romanists or Lutherans. But when the question is discussed, "For whom did Christ die?" they address their arguments against the latter. Turretin, for example, in the statement of this question, says, "It is not a question concerning the value and sufficiency of Christ's death, whether it is not, in itself, sufficient for the salvation of all men. That is, on both sides, admitted. His death being of infinite value, would have been most amply sufficient for the redemption of all men, if God had seen fit to extend it to all. Hence the common distinction made by the fathers, and retained by many theologians, *Christ died sufficiently for all, efficaciously for the elect*, is perfectly true if understood of the worth of Christ's death, but not so accurate if understood of his purpose and design in dying. The question, therefore, properly relates to the purpose of the Father in giving his Son, and the intention of the Son in laying down his life. Did the Father destine his Son for all and every man, and did the Son deliver himself to death with the intention of substituting himself in the place of all and

every one, in order to make satisfaction and procure salvation for them? Or, did Christ give himself for the elect alone, who were given to him by the Father, and whose head he was to be? The heart of the question, therefore, comes to this, not what is *the nature or efficacy* of the death of Christ, but what was the design of the Father in giving him up, and the intention of Christ in dying.”*

The simple statement of our doctrine, therefore, answers two thirds of Dr. Beman’s objections against it. This is not a statement got up for the occasion, but made a century and a half before he was born. There is one view in which the question concerning the extent of the atonement is indeed intimately connected with its nature. If any man holds the doctrine that the atonement was nothing more than a symbolical expression of a truth, and “merely opened the door of mercy,” there is of course an end to all question as to its design. If that be its nature, it can have no more reference to the saved than to the lost. And it is probably in order to get rid of all difficulty as to the extent of the atonement, that many have been led to adopt the above mentioned most unscriptural and dangerous view of its nature. But if the true doctrine concerning the nature of the satisfaction is retained, as it was by the Lutherans, and even in a great measure by the early Remonstrants, at least by Grotius, the question as to its extent, resolves itself into a question concerning the purposes of God. It might seem as if this were an entirely useless question. The purposes of God are not the rule of our duty, and whatever God may design to do, we are to act in accordance with his preceptive will. Still there is a right and a wrong in every question, and what is wrong in relation to one point, must tend to produce erroneous views with regard to others.

Dr. Cox intimates with some truth that the difference of opinion on this point, has its origin, or at least implies a difference of view as to the order of the divine purposes. p. 18. As in fact, however, there is no order of succession in the purposes of God, but simply in our mode of conceiving them, all his decrees being comprehended in one eternal purpose, any question about the order of those decrees, must be a question relating to our own thoughts. Those thoughts, however, may be confused, contradictory, or lead to conclusions in conflict with revealed facts. Even this question,

* Turretin, vol. ii. p. 498.

therefore, is not without its importance. If the purposes of God are all one, any mode of conceiving them which prevents their being reduced to unity; which supposes either a change, or uncertainty in the divine plan, must be erroneous. As it is involved in our idea of God as the intelligent ruler of the universe, that he had a design in the creation and redemption of man, all classes of theologians form some theory (if that word may be used) of the plan adopted for the accomplishment of that design. According to one system, God purposed to create man, to permit the fall, to provide salvation for all, to give all sufficient grace, to elect to life those who improve this grace. This is the scheme of the Remonstrants, and of those generally who reject the doctrines of election and efficacious grace. According to another system, God purposed to create man, to permit the fall, to provide for the salvation of all, but foreseeing that none would accept of that salvation, he chose some to everlasting life, and determined by his effectual grace, to give them faith and repentance. This is the scheme proposed by Amyraud, Testard, Camero, and other French theologians of the seventeenth century. According to others, God purposed to create man, to permit the fall, to choose from the mass of fallen men an innumerable multitude as vessels of mercy, to send his Son for their redemption, and with him to give them every thing necessary for their salvation. This was the common doctrine of all the Reformed churches, from which the two former systems were departures. The common New School system, adopted in this country, lies between the Arminian and the French scheme, containing more truth than the former, and less than the latter.

The question which of these views of the whole plan of God's dealings with men, is the most correct, must be determined, 1. By ascertaining which is most consistent with itself; which best admits of being reduced to one simple purpose. It would not be difficult to show that the two former include contradictions, and involve the ascription of conflicting purposes to God. 2. By ascertaining which is most in harmony with the admitted character of God, as infinite, independent, and self-sufficient, of whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things. 3. By ascertaining which is most consistent with revealed facts. The first, or Arminian scheme, breaks down entirely by coming in conflict with the clearly revealed truth of God's sovereignty in election, and of conversion by his mighty power, and not by

an influence common to all men. Our present business, however, is with the two latter schemes, so far as they relate to the design of Christ's death. Was the Son of God sent into the world, as Dr. Beman says, merely to make the salvation of all men possible, or actually to save all whom God had given him?

Before attempting to answer this question, it is proper to remark that Dr. Beman and those who adopt his theory, seem constantly disposed to forget that SALVATION IS BY GRACE. If it is of grace, then it is a matter of grace that God provided salvation at all for guilty men. If this is not so, the gift of Christ, the influences of the Holy Spirit, and every other gift requisite for our salvation, are mere matters of justice, which it would have been unrighteous to withhold. No man can believe that, however, without contradicting every page of the Bible, and the testimony of every true Christian. 2. But if God was not bound to save any, he is at liberty to save whom he pleases. If he need not provide salvation for any, there could be no injustice in providing it for some and not for others. If salvation is of grace, it is of grace that one and not another is saved. And to complain that the mission of Christ was not designed to save all, or even that it did not open the door of mercy for all, if such were actually the case, would be to complain of the gratuitous nature of salvation. And 3. If salvation is by grace, then those who are saved, are freely called, justified and glorified. The ground of their acceptance, is not to be found in them, but in the good pleasure of God. This is the plain doctrine of the Bible, to which we must submit; and it is so clearly revealed, and so essential to the very nature of the gospel, that those who are not willing to be saved by grace, cannot be saved at all.

There is therefore no preliminary presumption against the doctrine that the death of Christ had not an equal reference to all men, but had a special relation to his own people. The presumption is all the other way. As the whole plan of salvation is, according to the apostle, arranged with a view "to show the exceeding riches of the grace of God, by his kindness towards us," that view of the economy of redemption, which renders the grace of God the most conspicuous, is the most in harmony with its grand design. What God's actual purpose was in the mission of his Son, we can only learn from his own declarations. He reveals his designs to us, partly by their execution, and partly by the an-

nunciation of them in his word. What God does, is the clearest revelation of what he intended to do. Hence if the satisfaction of Christ actually saves all men, it was certainly designed to save all men; but if it saves only a part of the human race, it was certainly designed only for a part. It cannot be questioned that Christ came to save men from their sins, and if we ask, Who he intended to save? we can get no better answer than by learning whom he does in fact save. If the end of Christ's mission was salvation, it is not conceivable that he died equally for all, unless he purposed to save all. Dr. Beman, however, denies that the design of his mission was salvation, it was merely to make salvation possible.

In assuming this ground, he is guilty of the same one-sidedness, the same contracted view, which he exhibits in his doctrine concerning the nature of the atonement. It is conceded that the work of Christ does lay the foundation for the offer of salvation to all men. Dr. Beman hence concludes that this was its only end; that it merely opens the way for the general offer of pardon. His theory is designed to account for one fact, and leaves all the other revealed facts out of view, and unexplained. The Bible teaches, however, a great deal more, in relation to this subject, than that one fact. It teaches, 1. That Christ came in execution of a purpose; that he suffered as Dr. Beman expresses it, by covenant, and ratified that covenant with his own blood. 2. That his mission was the result and expression of the highest conceivable love. 3. That, it not merely removes obstacles out of the way, but actually secures the salvation of his people. 4. That it lays the foundation for a free, full, and unrestrained offer of salvation to all men. 5. That it renders just the condemnation of those who reject him as their Saviour; that rejection being rightly the special ground of their condemnation.

Dr. Beman's theory accords only with the last two facts just mentioned. It will account for the general offer of the gospel, and for the condemnation of those who reject it, but it is inconsistent with all the other facts above stated, which are not less clearly revealed, and not less important. It overlooks in the first place, the fact that Christ came into the world and accomplished the work of redemption, in execution of the covenant of grace. The use of such words as *covenant*, are often convenient, and sometimes unavoidable, as a concise method of expressing several

related truths. Wherever there is a promise by one person to another, suspended upon the performance of a condition, there is a covenant. As therefore, the scriptures expressly speak of a promise made to the Son, suspended upon the condition of his incarnation, obedience, and death, they teach that there was a covenant of grace. The promise made to the Redeemer, was that he should see the travail of his soul; that he should have the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; that those whom the Father had given him should come unto him; that they should all be taught of God, receive the Spirit, and be raised up the last day; that He should be the first-born among many brethren, and be highly exalted as the head of his people, and far above all principalities and powers. It is further expressly taught that he secured all these inestimable blessings, by his obedience unto death. Because he thus humbled himself, God has highly exalted him; on account of the suffering of death, he was crowned with glory and honour; because he made his soul an offering for sin, therefore God hath divided to him his portion. If these things are so, if Christ had the attainment of these blessings, which involve the salvation of his people in view, in coming into the world; if the accomplishment of this work was the object of his mission, then it is a contradiction in terms, to say that, as far as the purpose of God and his own intention are concerned, he had not a special reference to his own people and to their salvation in his death. Their salvation was the reward promised, when it was said "he shall see his seed," and it was for that recompense he died. Dr. Beman's theory denies all this. It assumes that his death, his whole work, had no reference to one class of men more than to another, to the saved more than to the lost. It simply made the pardon of all men possible. This is of course a denial, of what Dr. Beman himself, in an unguarded hour, admitted, viz. that Christ suffered by covenant. What covenant? The scriptures make mention of no other covenant, in connection with the Redeemer's death, than that which included the promise of his people to him as a reward, and which was ratified in his blood. Here then is one plain, important, revealed fact, which Dr. Beman's theory overlooks and contradicts. If Christ in his death had regard to the recompense of reward, and if that reward included the holiness and salvation of his people, then beyond contradiction, his satisfaction had a special reference to them.

In the second place, his theory contradicts the plainly revealed fact, that the mission and death of Christ are the expressions of the highest conceivable love. According to Dr. Beman, they are the expression of mere general benevolence. It is admitted that love was the motive which led to the gift of the Son of God. If that love was general benevolence to all men, then he died for all; if it was special love to his own people, then he died for them. That there is such special love in God, is involved in the doctrine of election. According to that doctrine, God of his mere good pleasure, before the foundation of the world, chose some to everlasting life, and for infinitely wise and holy reasons, left others to perish in their sins. To say that the infinite love which led to the mission of Christ, was a benevolence which had equal regard to these two classes, is to deny the doctrine of election. That doctrine, in its very nature supposes a difference in the regard had for the vessels of mercy, and the vessels of wrath; for those in whom God purposed to display the riches of his grace, and those on whom he designed to show his wrath, and make his power known. In teaching this doctrine, therefore, the scriptures teach, that besides the benevolence with which God regards all men, there is a higher, special, mysterious, unspeakable love which he has to his own children. And to this love they refer the incarnation and death of the Son of God. The scriptures are too explicit and too full on this latter point to allow of its being questioned. Greater love, said Christ himself, hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Paul prays that the Ephesians might be strengthened by the Holy Spirit, to be able to comprehend what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ which passes knowledge. Hereby perceive we the love of *God*, because he laid down his life for us. In this we perceive the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him freely give us all things. In these and in various similar passages, it is distinctly asserted that the love which led to the gift of Christ, was not general benevolence, consistent with the eternal reprobation of its objects, but the highest conceivable love, that would spare nothing to secure the salvation of those on whom it rested.

Again, it is, with equal explicitness and frequency, asserted,

love to his people was the motive of the Son of God, in laying down his life. "For their sakes, said the Redeemer, I sanctify myself." "I am the good shepherd, the good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep." "I lay down my life for my sheep." "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it." Do not these passages assert that love for his church, his friends, his sheep, was the motive of Christ in dying? When the scriptures divide men into classes, the sheep and the goats, the church and those who are not the church, and say that love to his sheep, love to his church led the Saviour to lay down his life, they expressly assert that it was a peculiar love for them, and not a general benevolence including them and all others alike, that was the motive of Christ in laying down his life. Let it be remembered that this whole question relates, not to the incidental effects of Christ's death, but to his intention in dying. The passages above quoted, and the scriptures generally, do then teach that besides his general benevolence for men, God has a special love for his own people, and that that special love, for his own, for his friends, for his sheep, led the Saviour to give himself up to death. If this is so, it overturns Dr. Beman's theory, which is in direct conflict with this plain and precious truth. It is not that benevolence which consists with eternal reprobation, i. e. with the eternal purpose to leave men to suffer the just recompense of their sins, that led the Father to give up the Son, and the Son to assume our nature and die upon the cross. Those who admit this, admit all the limitation of the atonement for which we contend; a limitation not as to its nature or value, but as to the purpose of God and intention of Christ. Besides, does it not involve a contradiction, to say that love to those whom God purposed, for wise reasons, not to save, was his motive in providing salvation? Our Saviour teaches that the knowledge of the gospel aggravates the guilt and consequently the misery of those who reject it; then certainly, love to them was not the motive which led either to the adoption or the proclamation of the scheme of redemption. The fact is, this doctrine that Christ died as much for Judas as for Paul, is inconsistent with the doctrine of election; and the two have never for any length of time been held together. Those theologians in the church of Rome, who remained faithful to the doctrine of election, also held that the death of Christ had special reference to his own people. The Lutherans, when they rejected the one doctrine, rejected

also the other. So did the Arminians. A few French divines endeavoured, by reversing the natural order of the decrees, for a time to unite the two; but the attempt failed. Both doctrines were soon rejected. The sovereignty of God, election, special love as the motive of redemption, and consequently a special reference to the elect, in the death of Christ, are joined together in the scriptures, and they cannot long be separated in the faith of God's people.

Another revealed fact which Dr. Beman's theory overlooks and contradicts, is that Christ's death, not only removes obstacles out of the way of the exercise of mercy, but actually secures the salvation of his people. It has been repeatedly shown that Dr. Beman constantly asserts that the only effect of the atonement is to bring the sinner within the reach of mercy, it merely makes pardon possible. This is the only effect claimed for it, and all that can be attributed to it on his theory. This however is in direct conflict with the scriptures, because they teach that the death of Christ renders the salvation of his own people certain. This follows from what has already been said. If Christ suffered by covenant; if that covenant promised to him his people as his reward and inheritance, on condition of his obedience and death, then assuredly when he performed that condition, the salvation of all whom the Father had given to him, was rendered absolutely certain. Hence, it is said, that he purchased his church, that is, acquired a right to it. He gave himself for his church, that he might purify and cleanse it. He came into the world to save his people from their sins. He gave himself for our sins that he might redeem us from this present evil world; or, as elsewhere said, to purify a peculiar people unto himself. These and similar declarations teach that the design of Christ's death, was actually to save his people. They are, therefore, so many direct contradictions of the doctrine, that he merely opened the door of mercy. To make salvation possible, is not to save; to make holiness possible, is not to purify; to open the door, is not to bring us near to God.

The scriptures also ascribe effects to the death of Christ, irreconcilable with the idea that it is a mere governmental display. We are justified by his blood, we thereby obtain remission of sins, we have peace with God, we are delivered from the wrath to come, and obtain eternal redemption. It is contrary to all scriptural usage, to bring down all these and similar declarations, to mean nothing more than that these

blessings are rendered attainable by the work of Christ. This is not what the words mean. To say that we are justified, or reconciled, or cleansed, is not to say that the obstacles in the way of obtaining the blessings mentioned, are merely removed. It is to say that his blood secures those blessings; and secures them in the time and way that God has appointed. No instance can be produced in which a sacrifice, offered and accepted, is said to propitiate God, and be the ground of pardon, when nothing more is meant than that the sacrifice renders pardon possible. The meaning uniformly is, that it secures and renders it certain. The very acceptance of it, is the established way of promising forgiveness to those in whose behalf the sacrifice was offered. Dr. Beman's theory, therefore, in attributing so little to the death of Christ, contradicts the established meaning of scriptural phrases; and is inconsistent with the clearly revealed fact that His death makes salvation not only possible, but certain.

It is further revealed that there is an intimate connection between the death of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit was promised to Christ, to be given to his people. The apostle Peter says, He having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath shed forth this, which ye both see and hear. Acts ii. 33. In Tit. iii. 5, 6, God is said to shed on us abundantly the Holy Ghost, through Jesus Christ our Lord. All spiritual blessings are said to be given to us in Christ Jesus, Ep. i. 3; that is, on account of our union with him, a union eternal in the purpose of God, and actual when we believe. This union existing in the divine purpose, this covenant union, is represented as the ground of the gift of regeneration. In Ep. ii. 5, 6, we are said to be quickened with Christ, to be raised up in him. This can only mean that there is a union between Christ and his people, which secures to them that influence by which they are raised from spiritual death. If so, then in the covenant to ratify which Christ died, it was promised that the Holy Spirit should be given to his people, and to secure that promise was one design of his death. And consequently all for whom he died must receive that Spirit, whose influences were secured by his death. He is, therefore, said to have redeemed us from the curse of the law, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit, Gal. iii. 13, 14. It obviously contradicts this important truth, to teach that Christ's death had as much reference to one man as another, or that it merely renders mercy possible. If Christ suffered by covenant, and if that

covenant included the promise of the Holy Spirit, to teach, renew, and sanctify his people, then it cannot be denied that those thus taught, renewed and sanctified are those for whom he died.

Dr. Beman's theory, therefore, which denies that the death of Christ had a special reference to his own people, is inconsistent with the plainly revealed facts, 1. That he died in execution of a covenant in which his people were promised to him as his reward, to secure which reward is declared to be his specific and immediate design in laying down his life. 2. That the motive which led to the gift of the Son, and of the Son in dying, was not general benevolence, but the highest conceivable love, love for his sheep and for his friends. 3. That the design of his death was not simply to remove obstacles out of the way of mercy, but actually to secure the salvation of those given to him by the Father; and that it does in fact secure for them the gift of the Holy Ghost, and consequently justification and eternal life. In other words, God having out of his mere good pleasure, elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation, by a Redeemer. The only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who being the eternal Son of God, became man, was made under the law, satisfied, by his obedience and death, all its demands, and thus fulfilled the conditions of that covenant on which the salvation of his people was suspended, and thereby acquired a right to them as his stipulated reward. Such was the specific design and certain effect of his death. This is the plain doctrine of our standards, and as we fully believe, of the word of God.

It will however, doubtless be asked, admitting that our doctrine of the atonement does accord with the facts above mentioned, can it be reconciled with the no less certain facts that the gospel is to be freely offered to all men, and that those who reject it, are justly condemned for their unbelief? If it cannot, it must be defective. On this score, however, we feel no difficulty.

Our doctrine is, that the Lord Jesus Christ, in order to secure the salvation of his people, and with a specific view to that end, fulfilled the conditions of the law or covenant under which they, and all mankind were placed. Those conditions were, perfect obedience, and satisfaction to divine justice, by bearing the penalty threatened against sin.

Christ's righteousness, therefore, consists in his obedience and death. That righteousness is precisely what the law demands of every sinner, in order to his justification before God. It is, therefore, in its nature, adapted to all sinners who are under that law. Its nature is not altered by the fact that it was wrought out for a portion only of such sinners, or that it is secured to them by the covenant between the Father and the Son. What is necessary for the salvation of one man, is necessary for the salvation of another, and of all. The righteousness of Christ, therefore, consisting in the obedience and death demanded by the law under which all men are placed, is adapted to all men. It is also of infinite value, being the righteousness of the eternal Son of God, and therefore sufficient for all. On these two grounds, its adaptation to all and its sufficiency for all, rests the offer made in the gospel to all. With this its design has nothing to do; who are to be saved by it we do not know. It is of such a nature and value, that whosoever accepts of it, shall be saved. If one of the non-elect should believe (though the hypothesis is on various accounts unreasonable) to him that righteousness would be imputed to his salvation. And if one of the elect should not believe, or having believed, should apostatize, he would certainly perish. These suppositions, are made, simply to show that according to our doctrine, the reason why any man perishes, is not that there is no righteousness provided suitable and adequate to his case, or that it is not freely offered to all that hear the gospel, but simply because he wilfully rejects the proffered salvation. Our doctrine, therefore, provides for the universal offer of the gospel and for the righteous condemnation of unbelievers, as thoroughly as Dr. Beman's. It opens the door for mercy, as far as legal obstructions are concerned, as fully as his; while it meets all the other revealed facts of the case. It is not a theory for one fact. It includes them all; the fact that Christ died by covenant for his own people; that love for his own sheep led him to lay down his life; that his death renders their salvation absolutely certain; that it opens the way for the offer of salvation to all men, and shows the justice of the condemnation of unbelief. **NO MAN PERISHES FOR THE WANT OF AN ATONEMENT**, is the doctrine of the Synod of Dort; it is also our doctrine.

Dr. Cox is pleased to call us "restrictionists." A most inappropriate designation. There is more saving truth in the

parings of our doctrine, than in his whole theory. Our doctrine contains all the modicum of truth there is in his, and it contains unspeakably more. His own theory is the most restricted, jejune, meagre, and lifeless, that has ever been propounded. It provides for but one fact; it teaches a possible salvation, while it leaves out the very soul of the doctrine. It vitiates the essential nature of the atonement, makes it a mere governmental display, a symbolical method of instruction, in order to do what was better done without any such corruption. While we teach that Christ, by really obeying the law, and really bearing its penalty, in the place of his people, and according to the stipulations of the covenant of grace, secured the salvation of all whom the Father had given him; and at the same time throws open the door of mercy to all who choose to enter it. We retain the life-giving doctrine of Christ's union with his own people, his obeying and dying in their stead, of his bearing our sins, and of our becoming the righteousness of God in him; of the necessity of entire self-renunciation and of simple reliance on his righteousness, on the indwelling of his Spirit, and on his strength for our salvation; while we impose no restriction on the glorious gospel of the grace of God.

Long as this discussion has become, we have touched only what appeared to us, the most important points of the controversy, and must leave others unnoticed. We trust we have said enough, to show that there is no necessity for surrendering the common faith of Christendom, as to the nature of the atonement, for the miserable theory propounded by Dr. Beman. We cannot close this article without a single remark concerning his book itself. It is a small volumè; sold at a moderate price, and intended for general circulation. It is written in a calm and confident spirit, but without force, discrimination, or learning. It is the very book to do harm. It presents its readers the choice between two doctrines, the one no man can adopt, the other is hardly worth accepting. So far as this book is concerned, the atonement must be rejected either as incredible or as worthless. He represents the one doctrine, as teaching that Christ became personally and morally a sinner, that he suffered just what in kind and degree, all his people throughout eternity, would have endured, and that they by his righteousness became morally innocent. This view of the atonement, no man can believe and be a Christian. His

own doctrine makes the atonement a mere symbolical method of instruction, and reduces the whole work of Christ in this matter, to making pardon possible. This again is a doctrine, which we see not how any man can practically believe, and be a Christian. The book in itself is of little consequence. But from its gross and yet confident misrepresentation of the truth, it has more of the power due to falsehood, than any book of the kind we know. That Dr. Cox, in his Introduction, should applaud such a book, neither surprises nor pains us. We are well aware that he knows no better. We say this with no feeling of disrespect. God gives his gifts, to every one severally as he will. To Dr. Cox, he has given many amiable, and some shining ones, but it is notorious that neither *Σοφία* nor *Γνωσις*, is of the number. As to the author of the book himself, we have no disposition to sit in judgment on his motives. He has most grievously misrepresented the truth, whether ignorantly or otherwise, it is not for us to say.

ART. VI.—*Anastasis ; or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, Rationally and Scripturally considered.* By George Bush, Professor of Hebrew in the New York City University. New York and London. Wiley and Putnam. 1845. pp. 396.

WHILE we regard the doctrine of the resurrection as a vital article of religious faith, we are happy in believing that its vitality does not reside in any physical theory of the resurrection itself. With a very indistinct idea, or no idea at all, of the nature of the process, we may believe the revealed *doctrine* of the resurrection with all assurance, and secure, in full, its practical effects. We may believe that men live in another world, though we know not how they live. We may even believe the doctrine as firmly without a knowledge of the physical nature of the fact, as with it. Such is our actual experience. With no certain knowledge of the physical conditions of the life to come, men hold as firm a conviction of the doctrine of their future existence, as of the existence of God, or of their own spiritual nature. The revelation of the doctrine, therefore, gains its end. It gives us the impression that *we* personally, with the clear

consciousness of identity, and the indelible conviction of an unbroken continuance of being, are to live forever.

It is this abiding faith of immortality which sustains our lively interest in all that can be known of the physical conditions of our future life. With an unwavering belief that we shall be hereafter, we desire to have it appear "*what* we shall be." And hence, few inquiries, so hopeless of conclusive answers, are pursued with more assiduity, than those relating to the time and manner of the resurrection of the dead. Nor are we jealous of such inquiries, as tending, of necessity, towards a corruption of faith, or savouring of unwarrantable meddling with things unrevealed. We rather view them as perfectly legitimate; conducive to wholesome mental activity, favourable to salutary impressions from the deep and inscrutable mysteries of the universe, and fruitful, often, of the incidental confirmations of faith in doctrines already received and understood.

If the volume of Professor Bush gives us little hope of advantage to the moral influence of the doctrine of the resurrection, it gives us less fear of any extensive and injurious disturbance of the popular faith on that subject. His call on public attention, manly and emphatic as it is, and sufficiently formal, is producing its effect. But we should not be surprised if many of his more intelligent readers should lay down the book with some disappointment of the expectations with which they took it up. As sincere friends of the author, and admirers of his talents and learning, we are glad that his reputation and usefulness as a writer, a reasoner, and an expounder of the Holy Scriptures, do not depend on this book; and that it is not by this production that the Christian public are to graduate their expectations of valuable service from his pen. His erudition and industry need no commendation; but if there has been heretofore any distrust of his opinions, and of the manner and results of some of his exegetical inquiries, it will, we apprehend, find no relief in this performance.

While we presume that the argument of Professor Bush will change the views of very few believers in the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, we take the very fair occasion afforded us by the appearance of his book, to state the principles on which that and all similar arguments on this subject have been and are still liable to be resisted.

Whether his preliminary vindication a priori, on the broad principle that "the knowledge of revelation is progressive,"

will prepare his way to popular favour, must be determined by a very obvious law of human nature. In regard to both the volumes by which God instructs mankind, the Professor entertains (p. 14) the irresistible conviction that the same great law "of gradual developement" prevails. "Natural science has achieved its triumphs by slow and toilsome steps. The arcana of creation have hitherto been laid open fact by fact, and principle by principle. Ages elapsed before even the true *method* of prosecuting physical inquiries was fixed by the genius of the immortal author of the *Organon*. And at the present day, Geology, for instance, is but just beginning to unwrap the bandages which have swathed, for countless centuries, the mummy globe which we inhabit. And so in every other field of the naturalist's investigations the process of discovery has been alike tardy and gradational. Who can question that the most advanced outposts of the territory conquered by the science of this generation will have dwindled and become scarcely perceptible to the retroverted eye of the philosopher of 1944?"

Again, on page 17: "Our knowledge of the contents of revelation is destined to be *progressive*; and in support of this position we certainly have the advantage of the argument drawn from the general analogy of Nature and of Providence. Throughout the whole range of creation we recognise the perpetual presence and operation of this great law. The principle of progressive advance from the imperfect to the finished,—from the rude to the refined,—from the infantile to the mature,—from primordial elements to elaborate formations,—from tender germs to ripened fruits,—from initial workings to ultimate consummations, is every where apparent; and why should it not hold here also? If progress is heaven's law in every other sphere of observation, the *presumption* certainly is, that there is no exception here; and we are at liberty to affirm the fact, unless some adequate reason can be previously assigned for questioning or denying it."

Now this sort of argument for the progressive development of the truth of revelation, will suggest to the reflecting reader the possibility of pushing presumptions from analogy too far. We may reason by analogy from facts to a presumption. But to make that presumption the analogical ground of another is to build upon sand. The analogy of the inhabited earth is ground of fair presumption that the other planets of the solar system are inhabited. But with

what force could we hence presume that the geography of this globe will agree with all the other globes of the system? It may be a fair presumption from analogy that the knowledge of religious truth is progressive, while the presumptive probability that the conditions of its progress will provide for the validity of the particular argument of Professor Bush, may be indefinitely feeble. Conceding the doctrine of progress, in any sense in which a man of our author's intelligence can hold it, an opponent will still demand to know whether he must look for indefinite progress in the knowledge of an ancient tongue, the usages of which are matters of history. Are the terms of language such surds that the ideas they express are to be sought only by an endless approximation?

The knowledge of religious truth in individual minds is indeed progressive; and this is the progress which the Professor's analogy of advance from the infantile to the mature, from the germ to the ripened fruit, &c. fairly suggests. Doubtless, also, in ages and countries of superior intellectual culture, individuals have clearer and more intelligent views of religious doctrine, are able to discern more of the relations of divine truth, and to set it forth in more ample and brilliant illustration. But it is not so certain that the line of advancement in biblical knowledge is continuous through successive generations. That we know more than the ancients about the meaning of the Bible is more easily asserted than proved. The modern critic derives no doubtful advantage in public estimation from being able to fortify his opinions by antiquity; and Professor Bush himself appears to value his doctrine none the less for its age, or its agreement with the views of Locke and Swedenborg and Manasseh Ben Israel. Few interpretations of obscure passages of scripture are given which have not the authority of some early writers for their support; a fact which might somewhat diminish our expectations of any great discoveries in the department of biblical exegesis. That there will be a general and continuous progress in mental culture, we rejoice to believe. But that this advancement is to effect important changes in the understanding of the scriptures, it will suffice to believe when the changes themselves shall take place. Advancing science will doubtless multiply illustrations of religious doctrine, and assist the reason of man in discerning the laws by which some spiritual operations are conducted; it may increase the use of analogy in

religious instruction, and enlarge and enliven our views of the uniformity of the works of God; but the supposition that the language of revelation is to undergo continuous modifications of its apparent meaning has no literary analogy for its support.

The science of *Hermeneutics*, quoted as a proof of "signal advances made, in latter times, in the principles of biblical interpretation," and represented as "rapidly elevating itself to a high place in the circle of positive sciences," is doubtless worthy the high place to which it aspires. But what is that science, what can it be, more than a formal and systematic statement of the principles, which have, from early time, been applied by common sense in the interpretation of the scriptures? Does this science present discoveries? Its discoveries must relate to principles, not before recognised, perhaps, in form and under specific names, yet doing their silent work in every sound mind, by teaching one man how to ascertain the sentiments of another through the medium of language? Is this science destined to an endless progression? Are the principles on which we are now interpreting the word of God to be lost in the brilliancy of rules, yet in the progress of science to be revealed; and are they to "dwindle and become scarcely perceptible to the retroverted eye" of the future interpreter?

It is probable, as our author implies, that the present age is slow to receive new doctrine, or even new theory relating to old doctrine. But whether or not it is more so than any other age, the fact of its being so at all is evidently the result of some useful property of human nature, which acts with greatest effect in the most pressing exigencies for its useful offices. When we hear it said that the present age is peculiarly "slow of heart" to believe new doctrine, we look back through the years of our remembrance to see what wind of doctrine has been entirely withstood, and what sleight of men and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive, has not taken its full proportion of captives. It probably does not occur to all the readers of the various productions of our author that stability of opinion is an unusual characteristic of this generation; nor would it be found a hindrance to the real progress and final triumph of truth, if some should suffer their theories to lag a little behind the age until the zeal of discovery shall prove to them that its trans-ultima Thule is indeed terra firma. It will prove little to the damage or discredit of our theologi-

cal opinions, that they should be numbered awhile amongst the dingy structures of antiquity, till the modern erections shall put off the glare of novelty, and reveal their superior conformity to the absolute and unchangeable beauty.

As "*positive proof*" that "heaven's law" of progress shall hold in the interpretation of the scriptures, Professor Bush adduces the two facts that many obscurities now exist in the Bible, and that the languages of the Bible are to us foreign and dead. The *probability* that these obscurities will not always "remain to cloud the lustre of the word of God," is a part of his *positive proof* of the progressive development of scriptural truth. The four pages, however, in which our respected author serves up this fallacy in luxuriant style to the reason of his readers, we notice merely as one among "some errors in reasoning" for which he bespeaks indulgence in his preface.

As to the fact that the languages of the Bible are to us foreign and dead, it suggests indeed the probability of an improved understanding of the scriptures by the increase of oriental learning. Yet the modern student cannot forget that these stores of oriental learning, now so rare and valuable and rapidly accumulating, were the familiar possessions of the ancients; and that those very forms and usages of life, now so precious for the light they shed upon the sacred record, gave all their light to minds as capable of discerning and appreciating truth as any of the present day. There were minds who loved the truth, and had the promised special aid in learning it; and although the early expositors wrote less than the moderns, and published fewer opinions, yet their writings sufficiently show that many views of the meaning of scripture now taken by the most learned of our critics, received due attention from them, and were retained or dismissed according to their apparent value. Now if, to the most serious and candid readers of this class, the scriptures shall be found to have conveyed the impression that the bodies of the dead will be raised to life, similar readers in any age of the world may be expected to receive the like impression; and such will continue to be the faith of such readers, until the article shall be shown to be absurd. When that absurdity shall be actually shown, we doubt not that the laws of belief which have produced the existing faith, will allow, with all desirable promptness, the old opinion to give place to the new. It seems reasonable and cheering to anticipate such improvement in sacred learning as will

enable us to recover what has been lost to us by the death of the languages of the Bible ; but reason will hardly presume that this improvement can result in more than a conformity of our exposition to that of the learned and pious interpreters to whom the languages and the customs of the scripture times were more familiar. Few hold the presumption that no new knowledge is to be expected ; yet it seems quite improbable that the general theory of progress, in its discernible bearings on the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, will go far to conciliate intelligent and reflecting minds to the reasonings and exegesis of our author.

On the principle that knowledge of the doctrines of revelation is to be progressive, Professor Bush proceeds in his attempt to show that the present advanced state of knowledge enables us to see that the resurrection of the body is not taught in the Bible. It is the first step of his course to "state the inevitable deductions of reason" with which men will "compare the averments" of scripture, and by which they will determine beforehand what God might be expected to teach on the subject of the resurrection. He expects that the discoveries of science, which "have enabled us to put a more correct interpretation upon many points of scripture," "will give us a clew to conduct us somewhat nearer the truth on the great theme" before us. As the formation of the caterpillar might suggest to the naturalist a probable transformation into something like a butterfly, so "a more intimate knowledge of the interior elements and functions of our physical and psychical constitution may finally enable us to educe the permanent laws of our future being, and bring us to a true 'Physical Theory of another Life.'"

His argument from reason respecting the doctrine of the resurrection takes its departure from the trodden path of common thought, at the point where reason loses sight of the elemental particles of the body that died. It is impossible to follow the mortal body through any *natural* transformation into the body immortal. "The common view of the resurrection labours fatally on the score of a conceivable connexion between the present and the future body." "The original, putrefied, decomposed and dissipated body" presents to the eye of reason no elements out of which the "sublimated, glorious, incorruptible fabric" may, even by the power of God, be built. "The *letter* of the inspired record announces a fact apparently at variance with other facts which carry with them an authority no less imperative

to our rational understanding. How can a body come out of the grave that is not there?" Millions of human bodies have been burned; millions have been buried in the sea; millions have been devoured by ravenous birds and beasts; and all have been decomposed and distributed into countless animal and vegetable formations; and how are these bodies to be restored? In Paul's illustration from the seed and the plant springing therefrom, there is the manifest preservation of life in the vital germ. If that germ dies there is no production of life to be expected from it. In the case of insect transformations there is a discernible connexion between the primitive and the ultimate organism. If the caterpillar dies and is dissolved, we lose sight of a vital connection between it and any other organization whatever. And since the body of man does thus die, and the elements pass into other combinations, the conclusion is that the prevailing notion of the resurrection of the same body is irrational, and that such a doctrine cannot be taught in the scriptures.

As the scriptures do, however, suggest the resurrection of something that may be called the same with that which lived before, it becomes desirable for the author to adopt the distinction between personal and bodily identity. The body is not the same at different times, yet the consciousness of *personal* identity remains unimpaired. He quotes Newnham's assertion that "the consciousness of personal identity does not depend on the body but on the mind; that it has nothing to do with the material particles, but rests on the immaterial spirit, and upon the sense of its continued existence." The inference is that a spiritual body not containing any of the elements of the material organization and inseparable from the vital principle in the man, may, without violence to the known conditions of the consciousness of personal identity, constitute the body of the future life. "If we could find in the human being, some thing that continues to live in spite of the constant process of decay and dissolution, something of which we could predicate an immoveable identity in the midst of perpetual transition, should we not feel that we had obtained a clew to the true resurrection body?" "The resurrection body is a part of our present being to which the essential life of the man pertains." "It is called a body for the want of a more fitting term by which to express it." "There is no greater error (p. 72) than to suppose that at death the soul goes forth from the body as a *bare power of thought*,—bodi-

less and formless *mens.*” “While our reason assures us that the power of thought does not pertain to the gross physical fabric which remains when the inhabiting spirit has taken its flight, we are still unable to resist the impression that it does inhere in something which goes forth at the same time with the vital principle; and that something we believe to be the ψυχή, the seat and substance of *nervous sensibility.*” “We lack evidence (p. 77) that the *vital* principle adheres to any ethereal relics of the inhumed body, as this unquestionably pertains to that part of our nature which we term the *soul*, and which we deem capable of assuming a spiritual corporeity without reference to the body which it forsakes at death.” “It would seem, then, on the whole, (p. 78) from a collation of all the grounds on which an opinion can be formed, that the judgment of reason would be, that *a spiritual body is developed at death.* By *spiritual* in this connexion we mean refined, subtle, ethereal, sublimated. By the developement of a spiritual body we mean the disengagement, the extrication of that physical part of our nature with which the vital and animal functions are in the present life intimately connected; and which differs from the pure spirit, the intellectual principle, as the Greek ψυχή or *sensitive principle* differs from the νοῦς the *self-conscious intelligence.*” “As this view completely disembarasses the subject of difficulties which are insurmountable on any other, we must hold its claims on our credence to be imperative.”

We cannot doubt that most unbiassed readers will feel a strong repugnance against this parade of “the inevitable deductions of reason,” on the very account of their dictatorial bearing upon the interpretation of the holy scriptures. The very attitude of this “argument from reason” awakens jealousy. The argument seems boldly to assume the prerogative of deciding what is and what is not truth, on a subject which no man can understand except by revelation from God. The axiom with which the argument begins, no reader will dispute. We may safely assume that revelation will not contradict reason. But what has that to do with a question about which reason knows nothing, and which revelation alone must decide? Reason is liable on such a question, to assume the most preposterous and perilous position. John Wesley repudiated the doctrine of predestination, not because he found it to be contradicted in the scriptures, but because it disagreed with his precon-

ceptions of human freedom, and of the justice of God. Then every passage of scripture which savoured of divine decrees must be wrested into conformity to the "inevitable deductions" of his reason. Socinus formed a rational theory of the unity of God; and whenever he met in the scriptures, an explicit or implied suggestion of a divine Trinity, or of the Deity of Christ, he did not hesitate "to compare the averments of revelation with what he knew of its author from other sources;" a process which finds great favour with an exceedingly rational portion of each generation of biblical interpreters. The Pelagian theory of sin and of regeneration suffers no lack of scientific defenders, whose philosophy, being to them unquestionably the "true philosophy, can never be in conflict with true faith." And even Baron Swedenborg, whose reveries in theology were the natural flesh upon the bones of his psychological system, perceived no discord between the voice of his inward oracle, and the accommodating tenor of the word of God. Few if any are the heresies which have not originated in the pretence of throwing the light of rational deductions upon the pages of scripture.

Still Professor Bush is right in his assertion that "all truth must of necessity be eternally consistent with itself. No man is required to hold views of revelation to which a sound and enlightened science or philosophy can solidly object." In admitting this, however, we cannot forget the infirmity of reason in its present state, especially when handling the things of God. What if ancient science, in its difficulty with the scriptural prediction of the final conflagration, had accommodated the prediction to its want of a chemical theory, on which the literal event might be explained? Even the present discoveries of science may be only incipient; and if we propose to give a scientific version of the Bible, let us wait till our science gets its growth, and we can feel assured that what now seems truth to us will not turn out to be falsehood. The discoveries of science and the deductions of reason may now present apparent inconsistencies with scripture which future discoveries and deductions will completely remove. It may be premature, for instance, to assert that the mortal bodies of men are *not* subject to a natural law of resurrection inherent in their elements, and destined under the hand of Omnipotence, to regulate their re-formation. Let him deny who knows.

As we enter on the more particular examination of "the

argument from reason," we will venture to remark that in relation to the prevalent theory of the resurrection, our author assumes a position unnecessarily belligerent. A great part of his conflict seems to us to be with a man of straw. The views of the mass of Christian people on this subject are unquestionably very vague. Few persons have ever thought of any physical theory of the resurrection as an article of faith. Most of our Christian readers, if requested to state their views, would probably say they believed in the resurrection of the same body that died; but as to the identity of the particles, or any of the physical conditions of conscious identity, they have scarcely ever raised a question, and never made a serious attempt to settle one. These persons, we presume, if Professor Bush would give them some plausible account of the disposal of the flesh-body in the case of those who do not die, would doubtless feel little difficulty in adopting his spirit-body. The only question of his which would embarrass them, relates to the *time* of the resurrection. The great body of Christians hold no opinion respecting the resurrection more clearly than that of a future and simultaneous rising of the dead. On this point, therefore, they would look with interest for the proof of his position. The more intelligent and studious, whose attention has been drawn to the subject for the purpose of deciding for themselves upon the nature of the resurrection, have generally rested in the obvious sense of the scriptures, understood literally only so far as they might be without glaring absurdity. This class of readers have always felt the philosophical difficulty of the literal resurrection, and would gratefully receive help in solving the problem. Divines who were invited by their vocation to explain the doctrine, have rarely done more than to follow out the leading suggestions of the scripture as far as any natural conditions of the resurrection could be consistent with the spiritual, and there to stop. Even the majority of *writers* have scarcely thought of adopting and upholding any physical theory of the resurrection; but have rested in the views they had until they might correct them in clearer light; hardly expecting, however, that science and the deductions of reason would so soon "completely disembarass the subject of difficulties." None of these classes could properly be said to have any system to be overthrown; but all would doubtless receive with due deference, any suggestions which might help their reason to see through the process of a scriptural resurrection.

The first step in "the argument from reason" is to state and illustrate the insurmountable difficulty of conceiving a resurrection of the same material body, viz. the want of a connexion between the former and the latter body. The thought of some connexion between the two bodily states has come into the minds of men from the scriptures; and it has come by these means: The terms describing and signifying the final resurrection are used with reference to bodies known to have been dead and made alive again and are not used with reference to the reception of a spiritual body by persons who, as Enoch and Elijah, "did not see death." The resurrection is represented by Christ as the coming forth of those that are in their graves; and Christ also speaks of raising up men at the last day. This is the natural language for expressing a relation between the mortal and immortal body. And we presume, no one has ever read 1 Cor. xv. without receiving a suggestion of some connexion between the body that dies and that which is to live. In this way the notion is accounted for, and its origin will therefore appear quite legitimate.

Now by what is this suggestion contradicted? Not by the scriptures. The immediate entrance of souls into Paradise after death does not oppose it; for we know nothing of the soul to warrant a presumption that it may not live and act, and enjoy, and suffer without a body. To pronounce it one of "the greatest errors to suppose that the soul goes forth at death as a *bare power of thought*—a bodiless and formless *mens*," Professor Bush knows as well as we do, is to assert what neither of us can prove. What do we know of the manner of the soul's existence out of the body? Such conjectures of ours have no weight against the language of the Bible. The literal and obvious sense of the inspired passages referred to, is contradicted by nothing but the alleged impossibility "of *conceiving* a connexion between the present and the future body.

The difficulty is not suggested by any established principle of natural philosophy. Science would demonstrate no more of a natural connexion between the body of Lazarus raised to life and the body which had been four days dead, than between the body of Abel supposed to be raised to life at the end of the world, and the body which was mangled by violence and perhaps devoured by beasts six thousand years ago. The difference between the dead body of Lazarus and that of Abel, is not a difference of natural ten-

dencies, of mechanical or chemical laws, ordained to be unto life or promotive of resurrection. That is to say, had Christ stood where Abel was murdered, and said, Abel, come forth, the effect had been as much promoted by the predispositions of matter, as was the effect of his call on the body of Lazarus. The dry bones of the valley of vision were, in the eye of the philosopher, no nearer being living bodies after bone had come to its bone, and all were covered with flesh, than when they were scattered promiscuously through the valley and were very dry. The difficulty raised here is therefore only sensible. The connexion of the former body with the latter is rendered inconceivable in the view of Professor Bush, by the entire dissipation and the untraceable re-combinations of the sensible corporeal particles. Parts of the body of Goliath have crept into Alexander's horse, and thence into "some dancing dervish of an eastern city," and thence no mortal knows where! Still every mortal takes for granted they are somewhere; and the question now before us relates to the *possibility* of some sort of latent vitality naturally pre-determinant towards resurrection, or to the *positive proof* that no such vitality remains.

The reasonings of Professor Bush demand that the resurrection of the body, if wrought at all, shall be wrought in analogical conformity to other operations of God. He sees between the caterpillar and the butterfly "an unbroken thread of life." He discerns in the caterpillar the corporeal rudiments of the butterfly. And he requires this "vital continuity" and this provisional organization or something analogous to them, as the natural prerequisites of resurrection in the human body. It being only as a philosopher that the Professor makes this demand, he will expect that from particular facts we shall determine the notion of vitality in general, together with the general conditions of vital activity.

The life of the oak is associated with the notion of seminal vitality in the acorn; the life of the eagle with the notion of life in the egg; the life of the fawn with the life of a certain seminal secretion in the parent deer. The existence of this vitality in particular cases is known by one of these two methods only: experiment or inspection. We know the acorn to be alive when it germinates; the egg when it hatches; and it either is the fact, or may be, that by diligent and skilful observation upon the conditions of experimental

phenomena, we may establish optical, tactile or olfactory tests of vitality, which may supersede experiment and diminish practical inconvenience. But one or the other of these evidences of life is indispensable to our conception of the existence of life, or of a connexion between the acorn and the oak.

Now it here demands attention, that in these elementary bodies the sensible tests of vitality can be established only by satisfactory experiment. Every body seems sure that wheat sown in whole kernel and in proper circumstances will grow; and that flour sown will not grow; but either the experiment has in some form been tried, or it is not now certainly known whether the grinding of wheat destroys its seminal vitality or not. The *nature* also of this principle of life is known to us only by its effects. That the fig tree will produce figs and not grapes we know not until we see that figs and not grapes grow on it. It is only by satisfactory experiment that men have learned that the acorn will produce an oak, and not a bramble. Nothing but experiment upon the bodies in question can determine, in the first instances, the presence and the nature of life; and our only definition of vitality in general seems to be: that principle in one body which tends in given circumstances to the production of a like body. We should not attribute complete vitality to the kernel nor to the egg unless we saw satisfactory proof of its tendency in given circumstances to the production of its like. It is then by the use of these principles that the question of a resurrection vitality in the substance of the human body must be decided.

The terms of our proposed resurrection require a pre-resident vitality of a peculiar sort. The life of the acorn is its tendency in given circumstances to produce its like. But the supposed resurrection vitality of the substance of the human body is its tendency, in given circumstances, to *resume the like form in connexion with the same person*. Now supposing the vitality in question to be *similar* to that of the kernel or the egg, then the known fact that the crushing or boiling of the kernel and the egg destroys their life, affords presumption that the mechanical or chemical dissolution of the human body annihilates its resurrection property. It affords presumption only, not proof. And this presumption is indefinitely weakened by the extreme dissimilitude of the supposed vitalities in the two cases. Who will not admit, that though we knew certainly that the disintegration

or the decomposition of the human body will destroy its tendency in *any* circumstances, to produce its like in *another person*, we do *not* know certainly, and have only the slightest ground of presumption that either will destroy a tendency, which, for aught we know, is *totally* different from the other, viz. a tendency in given circumstances to resume its like *form* in connexion with the *same* person? He who would not admit this, would argue that since ground wheat will not grow and boiled eggs will not hatch, therefore, alum in solution will not crystallize on thread.

To us, this indefinitely feeble presumption against the existence of a vital resurrection principle in the decomposed materials of the mortal body, is something quite different from "the clearest evidence of facts and the soundest process of reasoning," which, as Professor Bush would have it, (p. 81) "demand the reconciliation of scripture" to their conclusions. The positive proof that no such principle is possible thus dwindles into the weakest presumption that such principle does not in fact exist. This is all the objection suggested by analogy against the hypothesis of a natural connexion between the mortal body and the body of the resurrection. It will be readily seen that this objection can weigh little against a declaration of the scriptures that "they that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of man, and shall come forth."

To try further the conceivableness of a relation between one body and the other, let it be considered how a connexion is rendered conceivable between an acorn and an oak. From some language used on this subject it would almost seem that the connexion between the seed and the plant was thought to be a matter of intuitive perception. But how does this connexion become discernible to our minds? How come we by the notion of a vital continuity, an unbroken thread of life, bridging the chasm between the caterpillar and the butterfly, the seed now ripening, and its future germination, the egg now deposited and the eaglet hereafter to spring from it? A fact of the greatest importance at this point of our inquiry must here be carefully noted: That we come to the knowledge of the vital connexion of these phenomena only by witnessing the occurrence of the phenomena themselves. The suggestion of a connexion between facts comes in the first instance from observation of the facts themselves. The naturalist sees the scion with the acorn at its root; and here springs his first thought of vitality in the

acorn. He then dissects the seed, not to find the principle of life, but to ascertain what he can of the organic and sensible conditions of the life; and he finds in the seed the rudiments of the vegetable product. By the aid of his optical devices, and still more by the aid of an imagination occupied with the tree, he discerns in the acorn the miniature of the oak. But before his observation upon the germination of the seed and the growth of the tree, the seminal configuration, even had it been distinguished at all by his inspection as a vegetable likeness, would have suggested to him any thing but vitality; still less would it have suggested the peculiar vitality of the oak. Before any observation of the growth of the tree, let the philosopher examine the section of an acorn in which he shall discern all that exists of the outline of the embryo tree; then let him inspect a fragment of granite with a sprig of fossil fern imprinted on its surface, and he shall not know whether the one possesses more vegetable vitality than the other. We insist on this remark here, not because any one is likely to deny it, nor because it did not probably occur to the philosophical mind of our author, but because it appears not to have impressed his mind with what we deem its real bearing and force in relation to this point of his argument from reason. It is only the observation of the actual phenomena of life that renders conceivable to us the vital connexion between them.

When will the true philosopher feel himself competent to pronounce upon the vital continuity of the body of man, from death to the resurrection? Plainly when he has witnessed the events in their order, and not till then. Will he who cannot tell *à priori* whether a grain of wheat falling into the ground will die or live, venture to pass judgment *à priori* upon the animal vitality of the human body, and its susceptibility of resurrection by some natural laws? Professor Bush calls for a relation between body and body, to be made conceivable, without submitting his mind to the only process by which relations of phenomena are made conceivable in any case.

We present, then, to the imagination of our philosopher the dispersed corporeal elements of a man, and invite him to show us proof by inspection, by experiment, or by analogy, that the vitality of those elements *is* annihilated by their dispersion. We invite him to present just ground of strong probability that it is so. And while he shrinks from this, we challenge him to offer the basis of a fair presumption

of such annihilation. And since we do not expect him to do so much as that to his own satisfaction, we will assume against him on this subject the principle which Butler applies to the soul, and say, that the existence of vitality at all in the particles of a human body is ground of presumption in favour of its continued existence, in the absence of positive proof to the contrary. We then ask whether the fact of such vital organization of these particles in certain circumstances is not presumptive evidence of an inherent tendency in those particles to a similar vital organization in similar circumstances; a tendency which must be presumed to remain in existence till positive proof is given of its annihilation. Thus sound reason can hardly evade the conclusion that the continued existence of vitality in the dispersed particles of the human body is, in the present lack of all positive evidence to the contrary, a matter of fair presumption. If, as the reasonings of Professor Bush presuppose, the particles of the human body possess at any time that which may be called vitality, we have no positive proof that they lose that vitality by a mere dispersion or decomposition; and we therefore have a clear presumption that they retain their vital quality latent, and awaiting the proper circumstances of its destined developement.

But what particles? "What body?" Every human body that dies at seventy years of age has had ten different sets of particles. Which set of these particles retains the supposed vitality? All of them, we reply; and for this reason, that we know not certainly that any which have had it lose it, and we know no reason why one set should retain it rather than another. And then, asks the objector, are all the particles which have ever been in a human body to be resumed at the resurrection? We answer, the supposition that they *are*, is by no means absurd; for they may all be wanted to furnish the rising multitudes of all mankind. Nor would it be absurd if they should not be thus resumed though all should have the properties which, by our supposed law of nature, would fit them for resumption. But how are these particles, by their blind tendencies, respectively to know their places, and with their uniform prepensions, to regulate amongst themselves, their due distribution and appropriate collocations? A most interesting question indeed! And we have thousands like it, suggested by every department of the works of God. How came the particles of all the bodies of all mankind to know their places in the

corporeal systems they have successively formed? What causes the sun to know his place? What keeps the comet in his erratic path? What determines the floating particles of the impregnated fluid to their respective places in the crystal, as if each knew the precise number, the shapes, the areas, and the mutual relations of the surfaces and angles of the diamond which all were to form? Let our objector walk with us through that mountain of anthracite, and tell us whether his reason is satisfied to insist that there *is not* a pervading crystalline vitality (we will presently vindicate this use of the word vitality) inherent in select particles of the mass, ready to act when due time and circumstances shall disengage it from its present antagonists, and invite it to its natural regular and brilliant concretions? And let him tell us whether this latent tendency to crystallization does not suggest a conceivable connexion between the blackness and darkness of the mountain of coal, and the rich splendours of ten thousand diamonds. With such facts before him he must show that there is absurdity in the supposition of a resurrection vitality, pervading all the particles which are to constitute the immortal bodies of men, and suited to sustain a conceivable relation between the mortal and the immortal body.

Whatever difficulties relating to the identity of the former with the latter body, should arise from the above remarks, may be disposed of thus: It is on all hands admitted, from Mr. Locke, nay, from Plato to Professor Bush, that personal identity does not depend on identity of corporeal particles. Our author indeed supposes that complete personal identity does not demand the appendage of a material body at all. He argues on the tacit presumption, that without the earthly concomitant, the person may retain undisturbed his sense of identical completeness, and even feel that in his disembodied enlargement, there is more of himself than there was before. Whether this be so or otherwise we shall not now stop to inquire. But, assuredly, it will not be taking greater liberty than this with the doctrine of identity, to assert that identity of particles enters not at all into the common view of identity of body. If the consciousness of bodily identity be one of the principles to which the resurrection of the body must conform, it will suffice for our theory to impose only those conditions of bodily identity which have prevailed in the present life.

It is a fact that in this life *personal* identity is never dis-

sociated from *bodily*. We carry through all the changes of the body as clear a conviction of bodily identity as of mental. Sameness of body is here involved in sameness of person, and is, in this life, never separated from it. Through all the processes of abstraction and accretion incessant in our mortal frame; no man ever yet conceived himself to have another body. And this sameness of body has nothing to do with sameness of particles. It is not a conclusion of reason, but a fact of consciousness. On this principle it will, therefore, be readily perceived that the doctrine of bodily identity suffers no violence from any remarks above presented, respecting the promiscuous distribution of corporeal particles among the resurrection bodies of men.

It ought, however, on this point to be added that whatever of identity the scriptures may be understood to imply *must* be the identity mentioned above. When it is asked, how can the same body be raised from the grave while the same matter is not there, the objector overlooks the nature of bodily identity. He does not consider that the soul makes no demand for the same particles as a condition of recovering the same body. It does not even demand identity of substance to satisfy its consciousness of bodily identity. Let it be remembered, what modifications the body may undergo, and still report itself to the soul as the same body. Not only may you remove its particles and put others in their place, but change its stature, as from infancy to manhood; change its form, proportions and complexion, as from those of the child to those of the man; change its strength, as from health to sickness and from sickness to health; change the sensations it awakens in the mind; and when all this is done, it would surely seem that the sense of bodily sameness, if it could be destroyed at all, would be destroyed. But when all this is done, the same body, in the judgment of the soul, is yet there. We say the same body in the judgment of the soul; for in this matter, the soul is to be the only judge. Indeed, all that we have here supposed is actually done, in the case of every person who passes through the common course of human life, while the bodily subject of all these changes remains the same. The conviction of its sameness is immovable in the mind. If, therefore, the scriptures be understood to assert the resurrection of *the* body, they assert an event which in the eye of reason is sufficiently provided for by the visible course of the material nature, and the known bodily conditions of conscious identity in the soul.

To form *the same* body in the resurrection, there is nothing demanded but what is at hand on the spot where the mortal body fell. The only identity of body which the soul has ever recognised here, is recoverable from materials abounding at the place of the previous dissolution. How then can a mind in due submission to reason satisfy itself with an objection against the resurrection of the body, from any supposed want of identical particles in its new constitution?

To return to the subject of continued vitality. We promised, in a previous parenthesis, to vindicate our use of the word vitality in so broad a sense. To the demand for proof of a connecting vitality between death and the resurrection, we reply, first, that the demand is absurd; inasmuch as it calls for the proof of what could not be proved though it were true. Then we suggest the *possibility* of a vitality residing in the dispersed materials of the mortal body. And we farther suggest the commendation which this *possibility* receives from reason, on account of the broad sense in which the word "vitality" may be legitimately used. Let vitality in general be defined as the tendency of a substance in given circumstances towards the result appropriate to its nature. Now all life is not the same life. There is one life of animals, another of plants, and another of minerals, and so on. There is a life of the human body; and who is competent to say that there is *not* one life of bodies which are to have a resurrection, and another life of bodies which are not to have a resurrection? Assuming, then, that the scriptures teach a resurrection of the human body, we are led by the analogies of that Providence which makes things tend towards their proper results, to presume that somewhat inheres in the destined material of the immortal frame, which renders a resurrection of the body possible, by the power of God, in conformity with natural laws. If this somewhat be not as worthy of the name "vitality" as is the principle of life in a seed or in the particles of the soil into which the seed is cast, let us be taught the reason why. And no reason being given, we have precisely the same proof of vital continuity from the death to the resurrection of the body as we have of a vital continuity from the ripening of a corn of wheat to its germination when cast into the earth.

But these hints of a possible vitality inherent in the scattered relics of the mortal body, although as consistent with reason, to say the least, as any objection that can be urged

against them, embrace only a small part of the strength of this argument. In the case of vegetable and animal transformations, the living principle of the creature continues with the body through all the bodily changes. The same life is continued from the larva through the chrysalis into the butterfly. In the intermediate state the life has not departed from the body. It is considered as inseparable from the body, and as having no existence without it. The vital property of the seed is considered as a property of the material body; perhaps developed by means of the seminal organization; perhaps being itself the cause of that organization. In these instances of life, the vital principle has a bodily representation. When the body is placed in the circumstances required for its germination, the property of life reveals itself by means of the organic changes; and establishes, on the part of the seed, a material medium of communication between the vitality of the seed, and the vitality of the elements without. Through this medium the seminal virtue acts on the circumambient vitality, and is acted upon by it.

Now it is this material medium which the argument of Professor Bush demands to render vital continuity conceivable. It avails nothing, in his view, that the life of the creature cannot be proved to have been destroyed; nor that it be proved to exist; so long as no organized material body is observed in which this life may be conceived to reside. His reasonings require that the life of the seed should have a material representation to give us a conception of its presence and power. And were it only the life of a seed which we are investigating, we should, perhaps, be compelled to assent to that requisition. For we have no knowledge of the existence of vegetable life apart from the vegetable body. We have no evidence of the existence of such a thing as the disembodied vitality of a plant or an animal.

Still reason does not countenance the notion of the materiality of either vegetable or animal life. On the same principle, it denies the materiality of the life of man, and the materiality of the life of a plant. And it is at least as conceivable *à priori* that the life of a plant should exist apart from the body, as that the life of a man should thus exist. Now let it once be announced, on competent authority, that the life of plants does *not* perish with the body, but exists in a disembodied state; and let

reason adapt to that fact her theories of vital operation. Suppose that by the law of vegetable change, the living principle goes forth from the body of the seed at the instant of maturity, enters a separate state of existence, and so continues until the time when a new product is to be formed by its agency. During this interval, let the body of the seed be dissolved, and, as a grain of wheat, cease to exist, and let its particles disappear from the most discriminating eye of a human observer. At the appointed time and after due preparation of the soil, let the disembodied and departed vitality of the grain be recalled to the spot of its previous departure, to apply its vital agency in beginning and conducting the process of the new formation. The body arising from the operation is precisely the body proper to that species, and of the same kind as the body that died; for God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body. Let this become the familiar process of the husbandman in replenishing his granaries. It will be seen that the only change of the common phrasology on this subject, required in describing the operation, would be in the words denoting the act of sowing. The process would be called as now, the *raising* of wheat, not the *creating* of it; the life of the article having previously existed. Taking the whole process into view from the maturity of the seed to the maturity of the new product, it would be the dying and rising again of wheat. This would be its appropriate designation; the language being, of course, understood of the body of the grain, and not of the vital principle. But since in this case the product is supposed to be many grains from one, and therefore the result is stated in the terms of the species, wheat from wheat; let it be supposed, that the new product was a single grain only, for each grain that died. The true description then is, the dying and rising again of *the* wheat; grain from grain being undistinguishable. Let it further be supposed that each grain which died had its peculiarities; some corporeal dimension, proportion, complexion, or mark, distinguishing it from every other; and let each grain of the new product correspond in all particulars with the parent grain which died. The process would now be called the dying and rising again of *a grain* of wheat. Let it still be added, that the living principle is conscious of life, and of the changes which affect it; that it recognises in the new production, the body it had previously relinquished, and feels the re-investiture as a

recovery of its personal completeness. Then how can the process be otherwise faithfully described than as the dying and rising again of *the grain* of wheat?

In this series of suppositions our departure from the facts of the vegetable nature is less than at first sight might be presumed. That the life of the seed is something different from the body, none will deny. We supposed the life to be separated from the body; and we now observe that this supposition does not, in the least, impair the conceivableness of the connexion between the seed and the plant. Abstract from the seed the vital principle, and take the seminal organization by itself. What discernible connexion remains between that lifeless and diminutive coil of rudimental vegetation, and the beautiful, vigorous and stately plant? Restore the vitality, and witness its workings; and what can we know of the help it receives from what seems to us the provisional arrangement of particles in the seed? It is the appointment of nature indeed that the life of such a plant shall act through such organic matter; yet the fact of this appointment we learn not from the perception of any necessity for it inherent in the principle of vegetable life, but by observing the process of nature. So far as we can see, the organization of the seed is no less debtor to the vitality, than the vitality to the organization. Hence, to assert the peculiar dependence of the vital principle on the structure of the seed, is to speak without reason. The life made the seed what it is, and, when circumstances permit, will repeat the operation; while between any one stage of the process and another, the "vital continuity" is preserved in the principle of life, and not in the mere form of the matter. No conformation of the matter can, of itself, help us to a conception of the *vital* connexion between one form of the vegetable organization and another.

It is therefore plain that even in the dying and rising again of a grain of wheat, the connecting vitality between the body that is and the body that shall be, is not the material organization. By our observation of the uniform relation between the form of the seed and the life of the seed, the organized body of the grain becomes to us the *sign* of life. It is not the life, but stands to bear witness of the life. When the seed falls into the ground and dies, it loses even the form of its seminal vitality. All its particles, so far as human eye can see, undergo a local transmutation as complete as that which takes place in the particles of the soil

composing the enlarged bulk of the plant. No two portions of the original grain can be presumed to retain, through the process of germination and growth, their former mutual relations. Every pin and joint in the fabric is loosened. The whole mass is dissolved and reorganized. Foreign matter is introduced which seizes and absorbs the primitive elements; and builds up, under the direction of the invisible principle of life, a structure truly and properly new.

What then is that circumstance which is made by our author's philosophy essential to "vital continuity." It comes to be the mere interval of time between the dislocation of organic materials in the old body, and their subsequent collocation in the new. In the actual course of vegetable nature, the particles, upon leaving their former mutual relations in the seed, *immediately* assume their new mutual relations in the plant. In the case described above, the particles are supposed to continue longer separate, and to come together through a protracted and circuitous transition; the identity of the particles, however, being no more certainly lost in the longer transition than in the shorter.

To show now the decisive bearing of this extended and minute discussion upon the subject in hand: We have seen that the organized body of a living thing is a *sign* only, and not the *essence* of vitality; and although Professor Bush rests (inadvertently, as we charitably presume,) his *conception* of the vital relation between body and body on this material sign, yet even he will not insist that the bodily organism *constitutes* the relation. The human vitality unlike that of the caterpillar or the acorn, has a known and acknowledged capability of existence apart from the material body. The organized but breathless body of a man, is not to us even a *sign* of the presence and power of life. Put that body in what circumstances you will; place it erect, clothe it, warm it, apply your philosophic devices for extorting its muscular activity, command all your chemical artifices to stay its dissolution—and you have not awakened in the mind of the observer the conception of a vital relation between that body of death and a body of life. The absent spirit carried with it every ligament which was wont to unite, in any conceivable relation, the body of one stage of human life with the body of another. The form lies lifeless there, not because the blood was exhausted from it, nor because the bones were broken, nor because the nervous sensibility was benumbed, nor because the

muscular fibres were mangled or dissolved; but because the spirit is gone out of it. After the departure of the spirit, the continuance of the form and organization of the body is nothing to any purposes of life. Were the spirit about to resume an earthly abode, who shall tell us whether it were easier for it to form the walls of its new tenement out of the collapsed remains of the old habitation, or to rear them from fresh materials? To insist, then, upon a preserved bodily organization as the only legitimate sign of a vital relation between the body of death and the body of the resurrection seems to us to be walking rather by sense than by reason. This is the fundamental error of Professor Bush; and his entire theory "labours fatally" under it. While the acorn has no conceivable relation to the oak except through the life abiding in it, and while the vital principle in rearing the oak, makes use of the acorn only by taking it in pieces and joining its particles in new relations, he insists that a human body, known to be lifeless, shall be the sign of a conceivable relation between life and life. And because he cannot find that body he denies that there is any resurrection. Let the body only lie whole in the grave, though ever so dead, nay, let only a thimbleful of its ashes stay collected there till the hour cometh, then might he acknowledge some connexion between the dying of the body and its rising again.

Our author re-asserts the old distinction between the $\psi\chi\eta$ and the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\epsilon$, the vital principle in man, and the intellectual. Without admitting the truth of the distinction, we feel no repugnance against its bearings on the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. His theory requires in the $\psi\chi\eta$ properties which will account not only for the phenomena of life, but also for the development of a spiritual body. For the conception of this latter property, he is indebted to his hypothesis of the spiritual body. Unless some property of the $\psi\chi\eta$ be discovered or supposed, adapted to produce this psychical investiture, the result cannot, of course, be expected. Now it is most true that to suppose a spiritual body, and then assert, on the foundation of that supposition, an adequate provision for such a body in the vital part of the soul, "completely disembarasses the subject of difficulties insuperable by any other" process. The exceeding convenience of this circle in the very foundation of his "Anastasis," the Professor cannot too highly prize. Without it he could not have laid a stone in his logical edifice; but with it he has reared a gorgeous structure. He presents us at the instant

of death with ‘a spiritual body in full developement; refined, subtle, ethereal, sublimated; disengaged,—extricated from that psychical part of our nature with which the vital and animal functions are, in the present life, intimately connected, and which differs from the pure spirit,—the intellectual principle, as the Greek ψυχῆ or *sensitive principle* differs from the νοῦς, the *self-conscious intelligence*. It is a *tertium quid*,—an intermediate something between the cogitative faculty and the gross body.’ A most valuable something it is, and the proof of its existence is its casual relation to the ‘refined, subtle, ethereal, sublimated body *supposed* to be disengaged or extricated from it.’ As a mere theory, professedly hypothetical, offering some plausible solution of known phenomena, it would be liable to no objection, and might pass for what it is worth. But coming forward with confident pretensions of certainty, asserting a resurrection body which ‘we are to know to exist because we know that we ourselves exist,’ (p. 70) and claiming for itself to be the only view in which *the* reason is well pleased, it provokes resistance against its arrogance, and scrutiny into the ground of its claims.

This psychical part of our nature, whether essentially distinct from the intellectual or not, is altogether apposite to what we are endeavouring to present as the scriptural theory of a bodily resurrection. It supplies the requisite link of vital continuity. As to its being a body or having a body “which has nothing to do with the gross material particles which enter into the composition of our present earthly tenements,” we have nothing to say, because we know nothing. But this we know, that this principle of life has once held a vital connexion with a material body; that it held control over the bodily conformations, and that, by laws common to itself and the matter of the body, it conducted the corporeal system through its allotted course of vicissitude. We see no reason why this connexion with matter may not be resumed; and since the scriptures *seem* to say it shall be so, we think it reasonable that the return of this departed principle of life into vital connexion with a material organization should be expected. As it before produced a physical structure from materials which fell in its way, it may do it again. But whereas it before carried on a gradual process of conformation corresponding to the demands of a changing body, now it *may*, by an instantaneous act, raise for itself a fabric which shall remain unchanged forever.

We wish to state distinctly the grounds on which we suggest this capability of the vital principle in man. The scriptures speak of an event which in the course of the vital operation, puts such a property in requisition, if that event shall take place by natural laws. That such a property should exist, is by no means absurd or inconceivable; and a ground of presumption in its favour is found in analogous operations actually carried on in the present life. If we judge that, by means of the vital energy of the soul, the divine power *may* raise a material body at the last day, it is because, by that means, it has already raised a material body, and sustained it through its appointed course. If the promised work should be instantaneous, instead of being, as now, continued through a gradual and protracted course, it will only present a difference in time; and of such a difference we have a faint analogical shadow in the diverse times in which individuals, in diverse climes and other diverse circumstances, arrive at bodily maturity; showing that, as circumstances vary, the vital principle *may* vary the periods of its operation. If the body thus raised from the dust should assume a peculiar property of permanency and power and glory, according to the scriptures, there will then be presented a diversity in the *kind* of operation. For this we may observe a slight analogy in the various degrees of corporeal beauty and vigour, in different persons and in different ages of the same person; in the diverse *kinds* of working exemplified by the vital principle, in maintaining the sound body and in overcoming a leprosy or healing a wound; where the same vitality presents known operations of obvious diversity in kind; and teaches that the glorious and immortal life *may* be wrought into the material fabric without such hostility to the present diversified laws of the vital principle, as will, of necessity, exclude their agency.

In conformity with the views above suggested, the following may be stated as a rational and scriptural process of bodily resurrection. At the appointed time and signal, the soul, with its psychical affinity for a material organization, and its unimpaired capacity for holding and enjoying a corporeal investment, is present, and ready to submit its vital energy to the direction of Omnipotence in the work of raising the dead. The end of the present order of nature in this world of perishable things has come; and if some of the laws of the animal, the vegetable and the mineral kingdoms are suddenly repealed; if the instant disengagement of sub-

stance from substance, the abrupt decomposition of air, earth and sea, and all that is therein, takes place, to supply material for the rising millions, it provides also, as the chemist will testify, for the universal burning. Through the vital agency of the living spirit of man, now resuming one of its intermitted offices, the dissolved and dissipated relics of human mortality hear the voice of the Son of man, and every depository of death becomes a scene of returning life. Where any bodies remain entire from recent death, or any portion of the dust into which a mortal body was reduced is recognised in a collected state, it would be a natural conformity of the sensible process with the scriptural intimations, if each spirit should select the material mass which was its own before; and thus in literal fulfilment of scripture, they that are in their graves shall come forth. What proportion of the buried generations can be said in any sense to be in their graves, those may judge best who best know how long the traces of an animal deposit in a grave or a tomb can, either by the organs of sense or by the tests of science, be discerned; and how long those traces may be discernible by the psychical vision, after the eyes of our bodily sense and of our purblind science have lost sight of them. To a reflecting mind it would not, perhaps, awaken surprise, if some local indications of a bodily presence should thus be found for a large majority of all the dead. As for those that are not in their graves, a portion are expressly accommodated by the words of scripture, which represent the sea as giving up the dead that are in it; and when Death and Hades are said to deliver up the dead that are in them, we are taught in a figure, that wherever the materials of man's corporeal frame may be hidden, they will be summoned forth by the piercing and awakening voice of the Son of man, to take their places in the incorruptible bodies of the resurrection. Each spirit retains its law of individual conformation, by which it governed the corporeal development before, and by which it now produces, with only such exceptions in the bodies of the righteous, as the absence of all disorder will account for, an exact bodily resemblance of the man to his former self. Each person takes to himself those peculiar powers and modes of sensible representation by which he was distinguished in the mortal body. If local associations can contribute to enliven the triumphant joy of the rising saint, or aggravate the horror of the rising reprobate, they may be provided for by circumstantial adaptations, not per-

haps minute, yet sufficiently effectual, to the local recollections of individuals. If the soul should require, as we grant it may, that the conditions of conscious identity should be complied with in the new body, it may be done; for from whatever quarter the particles may be collected, or however few of the particles which ever had place in the old body may enter into the new, the consciousness of identity is satisfied on the very grounds on which it rested during the earthly life. Should the rising body conform in some perceptible measure to the one that died, in its individual peculiarities, especially in those which distinguished its period of greatest vigour and beauty, the notion of an exterior sameness will be among the natural cognitions of the mind upon the recovery of its material complement. Thus far then, at least, we are assisted by the analogies of nature in conceiving a physical process of resurrection, corresponding with the common interpretation of the sacred writers.

We have been led to discuss thus minutely the subject of a vital connexion between the dying and the rising body, by the important place which that subject holds in the theory of Professor Bush. It is upon the alleged absurdity of supposing such a connexion that he rests his main objection against the doctrine of a material resurrection. If such a connexion has been shown to be as conceivable as the connexion between the seed and the plant, the objection fails. The necessity for any other than the common theory is precluded. Our argument from reason coincides with the more obvious and literal sense of the scriptures, and is, in the language of geometry, the argument from scripture produced.

A point of acknowledged difficulty still remains;—the change which takes place in the material body at or after its rising from the dead. It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. We shall all be changed. Some great change is here suggested as an indispensable preparation of the body for the heavenly state. Analogy suggests, as we have before observed, the *possibility* of our receiving a body more durable, vigorous, and glorious as the natural result of the vital operation in the process of resurrection. Beyond this, what kind or what degree of change must come to prepare the corporeal frame for its immortal existence we cannot, in the present life, expect to know. It doth not yet appear what we shall be. The essential dif-

ference between the spiritual body and the natural, who can define? On this point Professor Bush's theory and our own are equally at fault. Who shall tell us whether any corporeity can be evolved by nature from the physical element of the soul, to answer the conditions of the future life of man? This sort of spiritual body, of which if our space would permit we should say more, was a figment of the ancients, employed to assist their conception of a separate state of departed souls. To some of the ancients it was inconceivable that the soul should suffer without a body; and supposing all souls to pass through a purgatorial ordeal in Hades, the possession of some sort of a body after death they deemed an indispensable condition of that invisible existence. "If," says Philoponus,* "the soul be incorporeal, ψυχὴ ἀσώματος, it cannot suffer. How then is it punished? There must be joined with it some sort of a body which being inordinately distracted or constricted, by excessive cold or heat, puts the soul to pain through sympathy." This doctrine of a spiritual body was confirmed in the faith of its advocates by the phenomena of apparitions. "For how," exclaims the same writer, "do the shadowy spectres become visible among the tombs?"† The theory thus suggested, and found to correspond with many supposed, and some known conditions of the spiritual existence, was in some form adopted by most of the Grecian poets and philosophers, and by some of the most distinguished of the early Christian writers. But Irenæus, Origen, and others of the Christian fathers who adopted this notion of an immaterial corporeity, regarded it as altogether consistent with a resurrection of the material body; the soul being capable, as they expressed it, of wearing as it were, one coat over another. We lack as yet the proper authority to determine whether the material corporeity is less capable of adaptation to the exercises of the heavenly life than the immaterial. Although it would be highly entertaining to ourselves to prolong ad libitum a statement of plausible hypotheses respecting the nature and changes of matter in connexion with the physical theory of our future state, we can here only remark that we see no possible advantage arising to our conception of the life to come, from the admission of this ancient pagan theory of a spiritual

* Proœm. in Aristot. de Animâ.

† Πόθεν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τάφοις τὰ σκιοειδῆ φαίνονται φαντάσματα;

body inseparable from the soul. It seems to us far less conformed to the Apostle's idea of a spiritual body, as we gather it from some of his forms of speech; and since we have no surer guide on this subject than the hints of scripture, we think it most reasonable and safe that the minds of Christians should remain predisposed to disaffection towards a hypothesis which seems to us so groundless and so fruitless.

We have thus far confined our attention to Part I. of the "Anastasis," relating to 'The Argument from Reason,' 'The Doctrine of Identity,' and 'The true Body of the Resurrection.' Our aim has been to offer what occurred to us as some of the reasons why most considerate believers of scripture will probably be better satisfied with the common view of the resurrection, than with the theory of Professor Bush; and we have gone to some length and minuteness in trying the truth of his hypotheses. He pronounces it utterly incredible that any vital connexion should exist between the mortal and the immortal body; and his objection, if we have rightly understood the substance of it, as gathered from the different forms in which he states it on different pages, may be viewed in two parts; first, that the scattered materials of the dead body must be presumed to have no inherent vitality by which a conceivable connexion can be formed between the two bodies; second, that no property of the present body can be conceived as a natural antecedent to the ethereal and glorious body of the future state. To the former part of the objection we reply, first, that, supposing the same material substances which shall have composed human bodies to be wrought into human bodies again at the resurrection, we are incompetent to decide whether all the matter shall not have a vital preparation for that purpose. Second, that the fact of its having had some sort of adaptation to constitute a human body, is ground of presumption in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the vital adaptation continues, and in the proper circumstances will reveal itself in the appropriate functions of life; and although this property be no other than that which is supposed to belong to all similar substances, it yet destroys the presumption that a bodily resurrection in conformity with any material laws conceivable by natural reason, is impossible. But not pressed to rely on the supposition of this form of preserved vitality, we present another which may be joined with it, or may, if so preferred, be taken as an alternative. We observe that

the body of the seed is not the life ; and that in the view of reason the life, as something conceivably distinct from the body, would be, if conceived to exist after the dissolution of the body, a proper vehicle of vital continuity between grain and grain. The vital spirit of man may therefore be regarded as the proper ground of a rational connexion between the dying and the rising body, and the conception of this connexion is not at all affected by the question whether each body embrace the same particles or not. Although no identity of particles be preserved, yet since the vital principle is known to have pre-existed, the process will be properly called the *dying and rising again* of the human body, and not the *creating* of it as at first. We also observe particularly that the fundamental importance given by Professor Bush to the mere preserved but lifeless organization of the body,* is utterly unphilosophical. To the second part of the objection we reply, that a natural relation between the gross material body of the present life, and that glorious spiritual body of the heavenly state, cannot be pronounced absurd, until the essential difference of the two is certainly known ; and until we are more capable than now of conceiving all the forms of manifestation which matter may assume consistently with substantial identity. Our profound ignorance of the very nature of matter and of the spiritual body is a conclusive answer to all objections against the possibility of the one arising by some natural laws out of the other. We, then, venture to suggest the outline of a process of resurrection which seems to us agreeable with the statements of the scriptures and with sundry analogical facts of the present life.

Of 'The Argument from Scripture' we have room for but few words. If the true argument from reason overthrows the objections against a resurrection according to the more literal sense of scripture, there arises from this subject no necessity of departing from the more obvious meaning of the sacred writers. We are sure that a rational relief from such necessity is gratifying to most of the devout readers of the word of God. It cannot but cause great disquietude in minds of pious reflection, to have the page of revelation darkened by speculations into which they cannot enter, and the value of which they cannot appreciate ; especially when their reason finds comfortable exercise in those views which

* See pages 40 et seq., also 52, 152, 180, et passim.

their understanding of scripture opens before them. On this account we entertain a cordial preference for that theory of the resurrection, which, while it involves no absurdity, permits the scriptures to mean what they most obviously seem to say.

The meaning of one of the terms denoting *resurrection* in the New Testament includes the idea of raising a *dead body* to life. This is unquestionable. Professor Bush would admit this, were it not that "*the sense of the term must be governed by the truth of the doctrine.*"* He quotes Mr. Locke's attempt to establish a distinction between "the dead" and "the bodies of the dead;" where the philosopher asserts, in substance, that the scriptures when speaking of the general resurrection at the last day, nowhere use language which declares the resurrection of *the dead bodies* of men. As an evidence that Paul makes such a distinction, Mr. Locke refers to 1 Cor. xv. 35, "How are the dead raised up, and with what bodies do they come?" "Which words 'dead' and 'they' if supposed to stand precisely for 'the bodies of the dead,' the question will run thus, 'How are the dead bodies raised up; and with what bodies do the dead bodies come?' which seems to have no very agreeable sense." Had we any doubt that these terms were sometimes used in different senses, we could not be convinced by such criticism as this. Is it not plain that the objector whom Paul quoted referred to a resurrection of the body, and that he intended to raise the question respecting the manner or process of a bodily resurrection and the kind of body produced? But not to enlarge on this particular passage, it is true that 'the dead' is the phrase usually applied to the final resurrection; yet it is also true that the same phrase is applied to 'the bodies of the dead.' Christ commanded his disciples to raise 'the dead,' and sent word to John in prison, that 'the dead are raised,' in the same language which Paul uses of the final resurrection. So far then as the known fact can explain the term for the unknown, it, of course, confines the language to the sense of a resurrection of the material body. As to Paul's application of the terms denoting resurrection, in 1 Cor. xv. we find ourselves entirely unable, in our most frequent and patient study of that remarkable and invaluable chapter, to resist

* Pp. 145, 146. We are then to determine the sense of the term by the truth of the doctrine, while we are trying the truth of the doctrine by the sense of term!

the conviction that, whatever else the writer had in his mind, he embraced a view of the resurrection of the dead in the sense in which Christ was raised; of the resurrection of a material body, and of some intimate connexion between the body that died and the body that is raised. Most readers probably define the apostle's language concerning the general resurrection by the fact of the Saviour's resurrection, as far as they can make such a definition apply. It becomes indispensable, therefore, to ascertain and illustrate the nature of that most important fact.

The resurrection of Christ is an auxiliary at once to our belief and to our understanding of the doctrine of the final resurrection. The readers of Professor Bush, therefore turn with curiosity to his chapter on that subject, expecting him to reconcile the history of that event with the theory of no resurrection of the body. And here he meets us with the bold denial that the material body of the Saviour was raised to life at all. He finds that fact nowhere explicitly asserted. If his readers have not before been prepared by his startling assertions, to receive almost any declaration from him without astonishment, we are sure they must be surprised at this. What can he call an explicit assertion that the dead body of Christ was made alive? We will suppose him to have been at the sepulchre with the Marys "early in the morning while it was yet dark," and before the news of the resurrection was announced; and with all the light of the present advanced period of the Christian economy, to have witnessed what then and there transpired. The stone is displaced and the sepulchre is open. The two angels meet him with their unexpected information; "ye seek *Jesus who was crucified. He* is not here; *he* is risen, come, see the place where the Lord lay." He steps forward, and while stooping and looking into the sepulchre, says to himself, "It is even so. Jesus who was crucified, and whom I seek is not here. But—what then? *He is risen.*" Now what does the witness understand by that word *He*? The living soul of the Saviour? That had not been there, but had all the time been with his penitent fellow-sufferer in Paradise. Besides, our witness went to the sepulchre inquiring not for the soul of the Lord but for the body. And the absence of the body fills him with disappointment and surprise. It is that absence which he wishes to have explained. And what does the angel mean when he says, *He* is risen, but that the body is

restored to life? Supposing the fact to have been so, what better language could have been used to assert it? Who would have thought of specifying the body in terms as if to meet some philosophical doubt which no inquirer had, in either speech or act, suggested? And can it, in the face of the announcement "He is risen," be asserted with due deliberation and candour, that the resuscitation of that body is nowhere explicitly stated? But turning round from the sepulchre, the witness sees a person whom he soon recognises as the Saviour himself; shortly afterwards, meets and recognises him again, falls down before him and worships him, *holding him by the feet*. He is present when Christ appeals to his incredulous disciples to handle him and satisfy themselves that his body is real flesh and bones; and when he bids the doubting Thomas, put his hand upon the wounds; and when the Lord eats before his disciples expressly as a test act; and thus, in the appropriate phenomena of a material body, gives and professes to give his friends the true sensible proofs of his re-incarnation. Now under all this testimony of the senses, what position does reason assume? Is that the body that was crucified or not? Is there nothing in all these acts and words, in this more than mere affirmation that he has flesh and bones, and that this body was to be known by its marks as the same that died; is there nothing in all this amounting to an explicit assertion that the body of Jesus was raised? The whole form and style of the testimony transcends mere explicitness. Compared with this vivid and emphatic strain of address, the frigid indicative would have been feeble and ineffectual. And yet says Professor Bush, "the language that is used respecting that event, is such as is capable of being consistently understood without the *implication* that his material body had any share in the resurrection."

His other reasons for denying the resurrection of the material body of Christ are, that the body which ascended was not material, and that body was the same which rose from the dead; that his different manifestations were in a body not subject to the laws of matter; that his apparel is not accounted for; and that he probably ascended to heaven in the intervals of his several manifestations. The probability of this latter supposition is derived from his saying to Mary, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father; from his assuring them they should see

him after a little while, "because I go to the Father," and that their heart should rejoice, which word was fulfilled by making "the disciples glad when they saw the Lord;" from his conversation on his way to Emmaus which implied that he had "entered into his glory;" from his saying to them in Galilee, "all power is given unto me," &c., and his breathing upon them as a token of imparting to them the Holy Ghost, which presupposes his previous ascension; from a plurality of ascensions being implied by Luke in the beginning of Acts; from the nature of the Saviour's priestly office which required that he should ascend immediately after his resurrection; and from his having finished his work. The material body of Christ is not thought necessary by Professor Bush, for the purposes of testimony in favour of his resurrection, inasmuch as all those purposes may be answered by a spiritual body; and although the disciples from "their carnal apprehensions" may have had no other view than that the body which was crucified was the body in which the Lord appeared to them, yet he thinks it reasonable to suppose that deeper instruction in the Christian mysteries taught them more correct views on this subject. It is true, concedes Professor Bush, "that an unsophisticated upon hearing or reading the evangelical narrative would inevitably receive the impression that the body raised and manifested to the disciples was the literal, material body of Christ." But "the same inspired truth which is milk for babes is at the same time strong meat for grown men." "We live at a more advanced period of the Christian economy, and have the advantage of all those ulterior developments of its essential genius which were wanting to the first age of the church; and why should we close our eyes to the brighter light that is shining around us for fear of seeing more than was seen in the earliest dawn of Christianity?" p. 166. To the very natural inquiry, what became of the body which was crucified, if it was not raised from the dead; the Professor thinks it a sufficient reply, that to suppose a miracle in disposing of it, is as reasonable as to suppose a miracle in spiritualizing and preparing it for the heavenly state, which latter miracle is required on the supposition that the material body was raised to life; and to dispose of that body was as worthy an occasion for a miracle, as was the miraculous disposal of the body of Moses to prevent the Israelites from bestowing idolatrous worship upon it.

Thus is disposed of by our author, that wonderful and instructive event in the life of our Saviour, to which believers have in every age of Christianity resorted for a triumphant attestation of the certainty of a general resurrection, and their idea of its nature. And in such views as these we are to recognise those ulterior developements of the essential genius of Christianity which were wanting to the first ages of the church. If these are the ulterior developements, we tremble to imagine the ultimate.

To bestow a moment's notice in detail upon a few things here advanced: "The evidence is certainly conclusive," says the Professor, "that it was not a material body which ascended into heaven." We suppose this conclusive evidence consists of the ascension itself of the body; that is, its independence of the law of gravity; for we presume he will not go quite the length of asserting it as certain that heaven does not admit any thing material. We presume the doctrine of no material bodies in heaven is more congenial to his views than the opposite; let him say, if he please, more probable; but will he say it is *absolutely certain*? and while he remembers that "flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God," he remembers also that there is matter which is not flesh and blood. The certainly conclusive evidence must, therefore, be the suspension of the law of gravity, or the release of that particular body from the general law of bodies *in this world*. This is just as conclusive evidence of the immateriality of the Lord's anastatic body, as his walking on the water would be of the immateriality of his body before death. But is it *certain*, in the next place, that the same body which rose from the dead ascended to heaven unchanged? Join this uncertainty with the other, and their sum is the value of this proof that the Lord's material body did not rise.

"The circumstances of his appearance to his disciples in repeated instances, subsequent to his resurrection, are far more consistent with the idea of his possessing a spiritual body than the reverse," p. 153. The reference here is to his standing in the midst of his disciples when *the doors were shut* and other like facts. No doubt these appearances were attended by circumstances more consistent with a spiritual body; but then, they were attended also by circumstances more consistent with a material body. The Professor seems to be holding as nice a balance of probabilities here as if he had not a ton weight of positive testimo-

ny in one of his scales. He was as we just now supposed, told more than "explicitly," at the sepulchre, that "Jesus *who was crucified and had lain there, was risen* ; he held that bodily person by the feet ; he handled the body and saw the wounds, and put his finger on them, and saw the body take food, in undisguised and professed testimony of its materiality ; yet against all this he is turned, by 'the superior consistency of some *circumstances* of his appearance with a spiritual body.' We speak thus because, of all the considerations here arrayed against the affirmed fact of the bodily resurrection, this one, relating to the supernatural appearance of Christ on certain occasions, is the only one which we before thought any man of sense could deliberately urge. Can the Professor expect to carry his idea of a spiritual body by the aid of its 'more consistent circumstances,' against all possible proof given to all the senses ? If he can, we are glad that *his* power of reason is not *the* reason ; for if we must present to mankind the evidences of religious truth to be weighed in such a balance, we shall despair of the progress of Christianity so far as reason has anything to do with its reception.

But one word more on the appearances and their circumstances. We are not inclined to employ an incredulous criticism on the terms which so generally convey the impression that the Saviour's entrance and exit were with closed doors. We are willing the facts should be so understood ; for we know not but they were really so. Yet with only a moiety of Professor Bush's philological dexterity, and a tithe of his temerity, we could make it appear, that 'the language used of those events, is such as to be capable of being consistently understood without the implication,' that in the cases of our Saviour's appearance, there was, on the supposition of a material body, any supernatural phenomenon at all. For instance, Jesus is said to have *stood in the midst of them*, the doors being shut. It is not said "explicitly" that the doors were shut when he came in ; and how natural the conclusion, that while the doors were open he entered and sat ; and after the doors were shut, rose and addressed his disciples. Or on the other occasion, while the two disciples were relating the occurrences on the way to Emmaus, and at the table there, and Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, it is not said even that the doors were shut, and the presumption is allowable that he entered in the natural way. And as to his evanishing at the house

in Emmaus, it was at the instant of the disciples' confusion after their sudden and overwhelming discernment of him as their Lord, while their faces, *perhaps*, were hidden with astonishment, and their hearts "burning within them" with the lingering fire of his eloquence along the road, that he abruptly and silently withdrew, *they knew not how*. Moreover since "the meaning of terms must always be governed by the truth of the doctrine so far as it is possible to ascertain it on satisfactory grounds," and we profess to have ascertained on grounds quite satisfactory, that the material body of our Lord arose from the dead; and whereas it is not according to nature that a material body should go in and out at a closed door, therefore the terms must be understood to accommodate the idea that when the Saviour entered, the door was open; and so on, for the other cases. If this brief example may be taken as a feeble hint of what the ulterior developements of the essential genius of Christianity would, in the hands of their powerful discoverer, have done on our side of this interesting question, we might have expected, *mutatis mutandis*, to see our doctrine completely disembarassed of difficulty, and the antiquated fancies of the "Anastasis" annihilated.

On the supposition of our Lord's material corporeity, the deportment he assumed towards his disciples appears consistent with truth and honesty; on the other supposition it appears disguised and guileful. If he appeared in supernatural movements at times amongst his disciples, they could see such movements accounted for in the same manner as they long before accounted for his walking on the sea. They could call his movements miraculous, and be satisfied; for they knew, from other facts, that the power of working miracles was with him. But reverse the supposition, and although the unsuspecting ignorance and simplicity of his followers might have screened him, in their esteem, from the *reproach* of falsehood, yet the *fact* of deception would be there, and would have its corresponding principle within; a consequence on which we cannot think the Professor will insist. And the reproach of deceit must follow, for the material body was expressly asserted then, and how could it be afterwards denied without reproach? It is entirely consistent with truth, not to say all that is true; to assert what is false can be justified on no pretence of useful design. Besides, "a miracle must be supposed in either case;" in the first the miracle is supposed to account for the circum-

stances of the appearance ; in the other, to account for the appearance itself. In the first case the miracle would be recognised with revived admiration often excited before, and by a cause known by previous and frequent occurrence ; in the other, it would bring up no associated recollections of the Lord in the minds of his disciples, and would leave them confounded with a new wonder. In the one case, there would be the ingenuous presentation of appearance accordant with facts ; in the other, an assumption of appearance which could not serve its purpose but by giving countenance to a lie.

If the reasonings of Professor Bush are valid against the evidences of the Saviour's material body after his resurrection, they equally avail against the evidences of his incarnation at any time. The only real proof we have that Jesus ever had a material body, is precisely that which was given of his material body after he rose from the dead. It is true, we have it said in the terms of inspiration, The Word was made flesh, and so forth. But what are words of inspiration before Professor Bush ? Most unfortunately for "the averments of scripture," these latter days are so prolific of light, that the old course of reflection is reversed. What was the sun is now the moon, and the former moon has become the sun. The scriptures cannot tell us anything conclusive on the subject of the Saviour's incarnation. But we begin now with philosophy, and settle "the truth of the doctrine," and then turn and correct the scripture. If the Lord spent forty days without food, if he was transported by the tempter from pinnacle to mountain, if he shone on the mountain and walked on the sea, such facts are far more consistent with the idea of his having a spiritual than a material body. The material phenomena are easily resolvable into "*optical acts.*"

It is commonly regarded by prudent critics, as a matter of great delicacy to disturb the general confidence of believers in the competency of the inspired writers in reference to matters which they profess to treat as with authority. The disciples of Christ were chosen witnesses of his resurrection, and are mostly supposed capable of bearing witness to *the truth* in every matter touching that event, and requiring attestation. But, says Professor Bush, while he insists that the body of Christ was really spiritual, "we may admit indeed that the disciples *supposed* that the body which they saw and handled was the veritable body of their crucified

Lord; and that in their preaching the resurrection of Jesus, they had no other idea than that of the re-animation of his body of flesh." And yet, on such a subject as this, what they supposed to be true was false! Happy was it for Origen that Celsus did not think of this sort of argumentation against the apostles. We need not accord to those men knowledge of things which they did not profess to know and to teach; but if they may not be thought competent to testify truth on this subject, and such truth as all men, in their circumstances, would have seen and believed, what could they hold an unmolested claim to know? "It is reasonable indeed to suppose that as they subsequently became more deeply instructed in the mysteries of the kingdom and were able to penetrate more fully its spiritual character, they may have come by degrees to more correct views on this subject; at any rate we know no reason why the measure of their intelligence, on this point, should be the limit of ours." On what point? Why on the question whether Jesus appeared in his 'veritable body.' We should be glad to know in what respects the Professor, with all his knowledge, could tell better than Peter, whether the body of Jesus was flesh and blood or not? And in what respects would Peter's views be improved by subsequent light? Peter had heard an angelic servant of his Master affirm that *he*, that is, his body was raised from the sepulchre "where the Lord lay." He had heard his Master himself declare that his body was flesh and bones, and to be told afterwards that this was not so, that his Lord had a sublimated, ethereal and glorious body, would elevate, a little perhaps, his views of his Saviour's corporeal glory, but how would it sink his estimation of his moral glory!

Upon the whole, for we must come to a close, it seems to us impossible that the doctrine of the "Anastasis" on the subject of our Lord's resurrection should find the least toleration amongst candid, reflecting and religious people. We may misjudge, and perhaps our prepossessions are somewhat strengthened by the "exigencies of theology." We trust they are. But for our own part, we could imagine no severer penance, than to be forced to go into all the world, preaching such a doctrine and sustaining it by such facts amongst reasonable men. We sincerely hope that our highly respected friend will not long be able to read his own book with complacency. We have done what we could to make him disrelish it; and if we shall have failed

to awaken even a stronger and more sacred emotion than is expressed by that word, though we may feel no disappointment, we shall feel sorrow. As we have advanced in the careful and candid examination of the book, our conviction has been greatly increased, not so much of the grievousness of the specific errors of the work, as of the intellectual peculiarity, may we say infirmity, apparent on its pages. Of our men of extensive and varied learning, our eloquent writers, and our devoted and successful scholars, he is certainly among those who hold the fewer qualifications for appreciating and presenting "the inevitable deductions of reason."

In this book more particularly, his extreme infelicity appears in the incessant, varied and broad flourish of propositions, which have more harmony for rhetoric than sense and truth for logic, and for the application of which he almost seems at times to have less taste and less concern than for the sound. He has, therefore, written with more satisfaction to himself than he will give to his thoughtful and serious readers. With a copious and lofty style, an active imagination, vigorous power of invention, and extensive acquisitions of learning, he is capable of assuming an enviable eminence in a most important and influential department of literature. But the power of language thus cultivated and indulged seems in his case dangerous to the power of ratiocination. There are passages in the book, evincive of no common power of description; and the concluding two or three pages are eloquent with words and thoughts and feelings which cannot fail to overwhelm an intelligent and considerate reader. While the public will continue to look with interest for the future productions of Professor Bush's able and prolific pen, they will probably feel less confidence and find less advantage in his original speculations than in his vivid illustrations and powerful enforcements of uncontroverted truth.

We have offered no particular criticisms on his examination of the passages of scripture supposed to relate to the subject of the resurrection. While we agree in several of his conclusions in reference to some of the passages examined, particularly those of the Old Testament, we discern throughout, that prevailing lack of candour which is the natural result of strong theoretic prepossession. It would appear to most readers, we think, even were those criticisms the whole of the book, that each passage was taken

up and examined with the feeling that somehow, 'peaceably if it may, forcibly if it must,' every word shall hold its peace for the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and either speak against it, or speak on some other subject. For ourselves we fear such criticism, and the more, if it is fraught with learning and skill. But the author professes no other design than that of bringing the word of God to his points. It is in keeping with his avowed intent. He draws up his argument from reason, which holds for him supreme authority in the matter of truth; and then resolves that with this oracle the scriptures, rightly understood, cannot disagree. What has he then to do, but to see that the scriptures be *so* understood as his argument from reason requires; to carry round his test among the words of revelation, and hammer and hew, until every piece works in? So preposterous a proceeding will, we doubt not, be noticed with due displeasure. Let us have arguments from reason on subjects which the scriptures leave unsettled; it would be violence to nature to disparage them, if their subjects come within their legitimate scope. If astronomy presents to us her demonstrations of the magnitude, the motions, and the relative positions of the heavenly bodies, we will adopt her theories; and such phraseology of scripture and of common conversation as is inconsistent with those theories we will either discard, or use it with the full understanding of its philosophic impropriety. We will either change our forms of speech respecting the rising and setting of the sun, or use them without countenancing the philosophical paradox they imply. But, wanting such demonstrations, we may hold the language of the scriptures as the form of sound words. If the philosopher fails to give us such a proof of his theory as would lead a prudent man to think of warping a syllable of revelation an hair's breadth for his accommodation, and then proceeds against obnoxious passages with an air of confidence and decision which could not have been exceeded, had he felt himself supported by demonstrations like those of astronomy, and far stronger than any to which geology can pretend, he presents such an example of philological adventure as we should hope would be harmless to all but himself, by appearing too rash to invite imitation. Of the doctrine of the resurrection, philosophy cannot settle a single principle. As well might she attempt to affirm or deny respecting the nature of the Trinity, or the date and manner of the creation of the uni-

verse. It is purely a doctrine of revelation. So far as it is known at all, as to either its certainty or its nature, it is known from the Bible. By any other way than through the word of God, who can hope to reach the true theory of the resurrection? While then we find delight and profit in following even the faintest lines of analogy from things known to things unknown, we may well indulge astonishment and sadness at the temerity which obtrudes a bewildered and delirious philosophy behind the written word, and asserts in the name of reason a command over mysteries which God hath kept in his own power.

That the doctrine of the resurrection, as revealed in the scriptures, is profoundly mysterious, we are sure; but no more sure, than that to mortals its mysteriousness will never be diminished. If the past progress of knowledge gives any hint on this subject, it is that for farther light upon this doctrine than is given in the scriptures, we must wait until this mortal shall put on immortality. We have here no clue to conduct us through its labyrinths. Science can give us none. Anatomy, physiology, chemistry, of late so keen-sighted and eloquent respecting our present corporeal life, are utterly blind and dumb in relation to the bodily life to come.

Yet among the uncertainties or the mysteries presented for our investigation, there is no other, pertaining to our physical condition, so entertaining and so profitable as this. Here is a point in which, according to the scriptures, we can discern a distinct and peculiar relation between the Lord Jesus Christ and a portion of our physical destiny. He is the resurrection and the life. He himself has become the first fruits of them that slept. Every one in his own order; Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. A glorious series of events in a glorious order! Resurrection is, in itself, a joyful prospect to the believer; how much more joyful in such a connexion as this! We rise, indeed, to immortality and glory; but we rise in the train of the conqueror of death. We rise under the hand of one who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body; himself the model and the builder of an incorruptible and glorified humanity.

ART. VII.—*A Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.* By Martin Luther. New York: Robert Carter. 1844. pp. 575.

THE Bishop of London in 1575, speaking of this book, says, "This work being brought unto me and to consider of, I thought it my part not only to allow it to the print, but also to commend it to the reader, as a treatise most comfortable to all afflicted consciences exercised in the school of Christ." Few of his successors, for the last two hundred years, we fear would venture on such a recommendation. The great theme of the book is: "Sin is pardoned for Christ's sake in whom thou believest, who is perfectly just; whose righteousness is thy righteousness, and thy sin is his sin." This doctrine is set forth with all the power and fervour belonging to the character of the greatest man of modern history; and with that deep sense of its value which perhaps can never be fully felt by any who have not, as Luther, been held in bondage to the law; and like him been driven almost to despair by the conviction of sin, unrelieved by a knowledge of the gospel. That a man like Luther, whose feelings were so strong, and who knew no fear, should sometimes use language which is too bold for modern ears, and liable at any time to misrepresentation, is no matter of wonder. There are things in this book which his adversaries, and the adversaries of the doctrine which he held so dear, have in all ages perverted to the injury of the truth. Yet there are few works so imbued with the spirit of the great doctrines of the gospel; few in which Christ is more completely the Alpha and Omega. "Mine eyes," says Luther, "shall behold nothing else but this inestimable price, my Lord and Saviour Christ. He ought to be such a treasure unto me, that all other things should be but as dung in comparison of him." "I believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God, whom the Father sent into the world to redeem us miserable sinners oppressed by the tyranny of the law. He gave his life and shed his blood for me. Therefore, feeling thy terrors and threatenings, O law, I plunge my conscience in the wounds, blood, death, resurrection, and victory of my Saviour Christ. Besides him I will see nothing, I will hear nothing." This was the spirit and the doctrine to which we owe the Reformation.

The History of the Reformation in Europe. With a Chronology of the Reformation. By the author of

“The Council of Trent.” London: The Religious Tract Society. New York: Robert Carter. 1844. 12mo. pp. 432.

THE circulation of such works as the one here mentioned, is one of the best means of maintaining the Protestant faith and feeling. Its small compass and comprehensive character, render it available over a wide sphere, and the high character of the London Religious Tract Society is a guarantee for its fidelity.

Rabbah Taken: or the Theological System of the Rev. Alexander Campbell, examined and refuted. By Robert W. Landis, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Bethlehem, New Jersey. New York: Mark H. Newman. 1844. 8vo. pp. 135.

MR. LANDIS published some years ago an article on Campbellism, in the American Biblical Repository. That article he has enlarged and presented to the public in a new form. He has evidently devoted great labour to the work, and executed his task ably and thoroughly. It is a seasonable and important publication, and we hope the author will find in its extensive usefulness, an ample compensation for his labour.

A Sermon delivered at the Installation of the Rev. John M. P. Atkinson, Sept. 13, 1844. By the Rev. William M. Atkinson. Winchester: 1844. pp. 24.

THIS discourse is founded upon 2 Cor. iv. 1, Therefore, seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not. The author discusses the following points, 1. The necessity of a valid authority to preach the gospel. 2. The necessity that the preacher shall himself have received mercy. 3. How he may perform his duties without fainting. Almost the whole sermon is devoted to the first. Dr. Atkinson maintains the good old Protestant doctrine that the only valid call to the ministry is from Christ himself, and that the office of the church is to judge and declare, in the way He has appointed, who are the recipients of this divine call. In a very condensed form, the writer presents very stringent arguments against the Popish doctrine of apostolical succession, and makes good use of his stores of historical learning in exhibiting the novelty and futility of that doctrine as held by nominal Protestants.

The Claims of Religion on Medical Men. A Discourse delivered in the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Nov. 24, 1844. By H. A. Boardman, Pastor of the Church. Second edition. Philadelphia: 1844. pp. 24.

IT is very gratifying that Dr. Boardman should be called upon to print this discourse by the members of the two great medical schools of Philadelphia. We consider this a good omen. It is not many years since, when a sermon so replete with evangelical sentiments, so faithful and pointed, would probably have met with little favour from the majority of the young men in attendance on such institutions. That it is now otherwise is a matter for sincere thankfulness, and the rapid circulation of the discourse, proves that its merits, and the importance of the subject of which it treats, have been in some good measure, properly appreciated.

The First Part of Jacob's Latin Reader, adapted to Bullions's Latin Grammar; with an Introduction on the Idioms of the Latin Language; an important Vocabulary; and Exercises in Latin Prose composition on a New Plan. By Rev. Peter Bullions, D. D., Professor in the Albany Academy. New York: Pratt, Woodford & Co. 1845. pp. 336.

DR. BULLIONS'S long and successful experience as a teacher, and the reputation of his Greek, Latin and English Grammars, are better recommendations of any new production of his pen, than the commendations of the periodical press. We need only say that the work before us is handsomely got up, and is a substantial book, well adapted to the use of learners.

Practical Lessons in English Grammar and Composition; for young Beginners. By Rev. Peter Bullions, D. D. New York: Pratt & Woodford. 1844. 12mo.

THIS work is intended for children under twelve years of age, and designed as introductory to the use of the larger work by the same author. Those whose minds at the age of fourteen or sixteen, have been but little cultivated, or whose circumstances preclude the hope of a thorough education, will find in this small book, all they need in learning the principles of our language.

A Treatise on International Law, and a Short Explanation of the Jurisdiction and Duty of the Government

of the Republic of the United States. By Daniel Gardner, Esq. Counsellor at Law. Troy, N. Y. pp. 315. 12mo.

THE author of this work has attempted to place the duties of nations to each other, upon the high ground of moral obligation. He shows that the aggregation of men together, and their combination in a state cannot render it right for them to do conjointly that which no one of them could rightfully do individually; and that, in short, the great duties of mercy, truth, righteousness and peace, are no less binding upon nations, than upon the individuals composing them. These duties he urges with simplicity and force. He aims especially to show that the practice of capturing or plundering the merchant ships of an enemy is a barbarous and unchristian mode of warfare. If private property on land, and even public edifices other than those devoted to warlike purposes, are deemed free from belligerent capture, as they now are by all civilized nations, why should not the same immunity be extended to private property at sea? Let this principle be admitted, and the right of blockade of an enemy's ports except against vessels carrying munitions of war, be disowned, and war would become so unprofitable that it would be difficult to make it the interest of any nation to engage in it. The author contends with much earnestness and force for the recognition of these principles as part of the code of international law. In the second part of his work he gives a brief but lucid exposition of the internal jurisdiction and duties of the American Republic. The whole work is pervaded by a high moral and religious tone, which gives an authoritative character to its teachings. The only part of it to which we feel disposed to take exception, is the preliminary chapter, in which the author discusses the laws, morals, ethics and international law of antiquity. The disparagement which he puts upon the labours of such men as Plato, Aristotle and Cicero, will be felt by the student of antiquity to be too unqualified. The advocate of Christianity, in the conscious fulness of his blessings, can afford to concede more than the author seems willing to do, to those who studied man in his relations to his fellows, without the aid of inspired teaching.

The Poor Man's Morning Portion, being a Selection of a verse of Scripture, with Short Observations for every Day in the Year; intended for the use of the Poor in
VOL. XVII.—NO. I. 24

Spirit, who are rich in Faith, and heirs of the Kingdom. By Robert Hawkes, D. D., late Vicar of Charles, Plymouth. New York. Robert Carter. 1845. pp. 315. 12mo.

THIS collection of meditations is characterized by sound doctrinal truth, and an elevated spirit of devotion.

Meditations and Contemplations, by the Rev. James Herve, A. M., containing his Meditations among the Tombs, Reflections on a Flower-garden, &c. Two volumes in one. New York. Robert Carter. 1845. pp. 245. 24mo.

OF this well known work we need say nothing more than to announce its publication, in a very neat form. Notwithstanding the excessive glitter and other faults of style, it is evidently one of the works which the world is not willing to let die.

The Blessings yet left us. A Sermon delivered before the First Church and Society, in Nashua, N. H., Nov. 15, 1844. By M. Hale Smith, Pastor. Boston: S. N. Dickson. 1844.

THIS is a thanksgiving sermon. The particular grounds of thankfulness insisted upon, are, the possession of the Bible, general education, and the prevalence of a conservative spirit in the community. The evidences of the influence of that spirit to which the writer adverts, are the defence of the Sabbath, and of the ministry; opposition to the abolition of capital punishment for the crime of murder, and to the machinations of Popery. All these topics are well handled, and their obvious bearing on questions of present public interest, give the discourse more than ordinary claims to attention.

A History of the Siege of Londonderry, and Defence of Enniskillen, in 1688, 1689, by the Rev. John Graham, Rector of Tamlaghtard in the Diocese of Derry. Philadelphia: James M. Campbell. New York: Saxton & Miles. 1844. pp. 247.

ONE of the good effects of the renewed interest in the Popish controversy, is the revival of sympathy with our Protestant ancestors. Any work which narrates their sufferings, may now count on a cordial reception from the Christian public. And there are few more effective means

of enlightening the people as to the true nature of Popery, and of awakening a proper Protestant feeling, than works which record the struggles of our forefathers for their liberties, and which exhibit the usual persecuting spirit of the Church of Rome. On this ground we are glad to see the republication of this account of the siege of Derry, written by a descendant of one of the heroic defenders of that city.

Barbarities of Rome in the Nineteenth Century. By Raffaele Ciocci, formerly a Benedictine and Cistercian Monk. First American from the Second London edition. Philadelphia : James M. Campbell. New York: Saxton & Miles. 1844.

THIS is an interesting narrative of the sufferings of the author; who, a native of Rome, was ensnared into the assumption of the monastic vows; but enlightened by reading the Bible, after many trials effected his escape to England, where he now resides in safety.

Memoirs and Remains of Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne, Minister of St. Peter's Church, Dundee. By Rev. Andrew A. Bonar. With an Introductory Letter, by Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D. Philadelphia : Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1844. pp. 386.

THE memoirs of Henry Martyn and other works of the kind, have been in a high degree useful in diffusing and deepening a missionary spirit both in England and America. And such memoirs as that of this eminently devoted and highly gifted man, cut down in the very morning of life, we hope may be equally effective in promoting a right spirit in the rising generation of ministers. It may be safely recommended as one of the most interesting and useful biographies published for many years.

A Memoir of John Huss. Translated from the German. New York : Robert Carter. 1841. pp. 106. 2mo.

THIS little work gives a distinct and highly interesting account of the chief incidents in the life of the Bohemian Reformer, a life that ought to be familiar to all who are capable of admiring the highest attributes of humanity. Luther himself is not more distinguished for his simple and hearty love of the truth, and his fearless reliance upon it than his great precursor John Huss. The whole compass of history

furnishes us with no higher instance of heroism than was exhibited through the closing scenes of his life, when assailed by threats and bribes, by cruelty and kindness, he held fast his integrity, with a firmness too great to be vehement, and moved onward with quiet dignity until his sufferings were consummated in the fire which lighted the path of the reformation.

The voice of the Church One, under all the successive forms of Christianity; a Discourse pronounced at the opening of the Theological School at Geneva. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, D. D. Translated by Rev. R. Smith, Waterford, N. Y. New York: John S. Taylor & Co. 1844. pp. 63. 18mo.

THE popularity of Dr. Merle, well earned by his History of the Reformation, will be sufficient to bespeak a favourable reception for any thing from his pen. This discourse discloses in a less degree that same talent for scizing remarkable points of view and presenting them in a simple and earnest style, which so singularly distinguishes his great work. He finds four great epochs in the history of Christianity, when its mode of presentation, or form, was modified by the necessities of the period. The first of these forms, which he designates as the *vital*, prevailed from the time of the Apostles to that of Arius. During this period, Christianity was not so much a system of doctrines as a mode of life. It was presented as a remedy for the moral maladies of men, and the exhortation was not to reason about it, but to try it. When the Arian and Pelagian heresies arose, it became necessary to state and defend the Christian doctrine with more precision, and hence arose the second form which Dr. Merle terms the *dogmatic*. The impulse given to all modes of human activity by the great intellectual awakening of the eleventh century, necessarily affected theology, and hence we have the third, or *scholastic* form. This was the period of the systematic reduction of the doctrines of Christianity to the forms of the human understanding, when logic claimed to be the handmaid of religion, and systems were multiplied without end. To this period succeeded the fourth, that of the *Reformation*, which was nothing else than the re-establishment of that which had been suffered to decay. The Reformation takes the form of system, carries that back to dogma, and crowns all with the characteristic of life. Such are the several forms which

Christianity has, in different ages assumed, and the author aims to show that under these different forms the church has always taught substantially the same great truths respecting God and man, and the relation subsisting between them under the scheme of redemption. And he certainly makes it apparent that the doctrines of the Trinity, the total depravity of man, his helplessness and consequent salvation through grace by the blood of Christ, however, they may have been obscured or counteracted by prevailing errors, were distinctly taught through each of these successive periods.

On the Miraculous and Internal Evidences of the Christian Revelation, and the Authority of its Records. By Thomas Chalmers, D. D., LL. D. In two volumes. New York: Robert Carter. pp. 395, 455. 18mo.

WE are glad to see a neat and cheap reprint of this work of Dr. Chalmers. Though it is a symptom of an unhealthy state of the public mind when the multiplication of defences of Christianity is demanded, yet as there will always be more or less of scepticism in the world, the contribution of a standard work, upon this subject is never untimely. The treatise of Dr. Chalmers has long been known as one of the ablest arguments in defence of Christianity. It is distinguished more than his recent works, by his well known peculiarities of style, and redundant variations of thought, but these defects are more than compensated by the fulness and massive strength of the argument.

The Old Sea Captain. By Old Humphrey. New York: Robert Carter. 1844. pp. 252. 24mo.

THE Old Sea Captain cannot fail to be a great favourite with all the young folks who make his acquaintance. The heartiness of youth lives with him in his old age, and imparts a genial charm to his tales and instructions, which will take the hearts of all, as it did the boys of Cape Academy, to whom they were originally addressed.

Notes, Critical, Illustrative, and Practical, on the Book of Job: with a New Translation, and an Introductory Dissertation. By Albert Barnes. 2 vols. 12mo. New York. 1844.

ALTHOUGH we have not yet given to this book that de-

tailed examination which it merits and requires, in order to a fair appreciation of its value, we are unwilling to forego the opportunity of saying that it strikes us, on a cursory inspection, as superior, at least in some respects, to any of the author's previous publications. On his *Isaiah* it is certainly a very great improvement, both in matter and manner. Far more concise, correct, and vigorous in style, it exhibits, at the same time, more extensive scholarship and more familiar knowledge of the labours of his predecessors. Indeed, as to this last point, it leaves little, if any thing, to be desired. This expression of opinion must of course be subject to the subsequent results of a more critical inspection. That it is not likely to be modified essentially, a strong presumption is afforded by the literary qualities of the performance, which appear at first sight even to a superficial reader. Besides those which have been already mentioned, we may say that the arrangement is convenient, and the typography not only handsome but comparatively accurate, so far as we have had occasion to observe. These minor circumstances, added to the extent of Mr. Barnes's reading on the subject, the time which we understand has been devoted to it, his proverbial industry and now mature experience in the work of exegesis, all encourage us to hope that this will prove to be the most creditable if not the most useful addition which he has yet made to the biblical literature of his church and country.

Translation of Turretin.

We understand that a gentleman in Princeton is engaged in a translation of Turretin, with a view to its publication. Of the scholarship of the gentleman alluded to, we can speak with entire confidence; and the importance of the work in which he is engaged, we think cannot be questioned. We consider Turretin as, on the whole, the best systematic theological writer with whom we are acquainted; and notwithstanding the tincture of scholasticism which pervades his work, it is remarkably adapted to the present state of theology in this country.

CONTENTS OF NO. I.

ART. I.—1. The History of the Puritans, or Protestant Nonconformists ; from the Reformation in 1517, to the Revolution in 1693 ; comprising an account of their principles ; their attempts for a further Reformation in the church ; their sufferings ; and the Lives and Characters of their most considerable Divines. By Daniel Neal, M. A., reprinted from the text of Dr. Toulmin's edition : with his life of the author and account of his writings. Revised, corrected, and enlarged, with additional notes by John O. Choules, M. A. 2. The Prose works of John Milton ; with an Introductory Review. By Robert Fletcher.	1
Art. II.— Religion in America ; or an account of the Origin, Progress, Relation to the State, and Present Condition of the Evangelical Churches in the United States. With notices of the Unevangelical Denominations. By Robert Baird, author of "L'Union de l'Eglise avec l'Etat dans la Nouvelle Angleterre."	17
ART.—III.— Sacerdotal Absolution ; a Sermon, preached before the Convention of the Diocese of North Carolina, 1843. By the Rev. M. A. Curtis, Rector of St. Matthew's Church, Hillsborough, N. C.	43
ART. IV.— India and India Missions, including Sketches of the gigantic System of Hinduism, both in Theory and Practice ; also Notices of some of the principal agencies employed in conducting the Process of Indian evangelization, &c. &c. By the Rev. Alexander Duff, D. D.	61
ART. V.— Christ, The only Sacrifice : or the Atonement in its Relations to God and Man. By Nathan S. S. Beman, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Troy, N. Y. With an Introductory chapter by Samuel Hanson Cox, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.	84
ART. VI.— Anastasis ; or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, Rationally and Scripturally considered. By George Bush, Professor of Hebrew in the New York City University.	138
ART. VII.— A Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. By Martin Luther. History of the Reformation in Europe. Rabbah Taken : or the Theological System of the Rev. Alexander Campbell, examined and refuted. A Sermon delivered at the Installation of the Rev. John M. P. Atkinson, The Claims of Religion on Medical Men. The First Part of Jacob's Latin Reader, adapted to Bullion's Latin Grammar.	

Practical Lessons in English Grammar and Composition ; for young Beginners.	
A Treatise on International Law,	
The Poor Man's Morning Portion.	
Meditations and Contemplations.	
The Blessings yet left us.	
A History of the Siege of Londonderry, and Defence of Enniskillen in 1688, 1689.	
Barbarities of Rome in the Nineteenth Century.	
Memoirs and Remains of Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne.	
A Memoir of John Huss.	
The voice of the Church One, under all the successive forms of Christianity.	
On the Miraculous and Internal Evidences of the Christian Revelation, and the Authority of its Records.	
The Old Sea Captain. By Old Humphrey.	
Barnes's Notes on Job.	
Translation of Turretin.	182

