





THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1845.

No. III.

Gas. H. Alexander.

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. Philadelphia: Sorin & Ball. London: Wiley & Putnam. 1845. 2 vols. post 8vo.

WHILE we show great avidity for information concerning regions in the old world, we are often ignorant of countries in our own hemisphere. How few of our readers could, on examination, give any intelligent view of the great empire of Brazil! We can answer for ourselves, that the work now on our table has communicated as much that is new and awakening, as any similar volumes we ever opened. Hitherto our sources have been few and imperfect: this is the first work exclusively on Brazil, which has proceeded from the American press. Even the English volumes on the subject are not recent; nor is there any one, the writer of which personally visited more than two or three of the eighteen provinces. Southey's quartos are very much confined to great libraries, and seldom perused; and the continuation by Armitage is still less known.

The very works to which we should naturally turn for information are full of errors. Mr. Kidder has shown this in regard to two of these; and we follow his strictures. In McCulloch's Universal Gazetteer, the blunders are such

as the following: Three Provinces are enumerated, which have no existence in the empire, to wit, Rio Negro, Minas Novas, and Fernando: two are omitted, which actually exist, to wit, Santa Catharina and Rio Grande do Sul. "All its principal rivers," we are gravely told, "are on the coast. Its harbours are among the finest in the world, and are connected with the interior by numerous large rivers, most of which are navigable for a considerable way inland." Whereas, though the harbours of Rio de Janeiro and Bahia deserve this commendation, neither of them is connected with the interior by any great navigable river; nor is the coast intersected by any such river, except the Amazon. The same authority mentions the fanatical Sebastianists, as one of the *chief* religious sects at Rio: they have been nowhere numerous in the present century. The converted Indians, according to McCulloch, amount to three hundred thousand; a sum thirty times as great as any intelligent Brazilian would name. The independent Indians are set down at one hundred and fifty thousand; whereas, according to the safer information of our author, there is at least this number in the single province of Pará.

Nor do we arrive at more authentic statements, in the sumptuous and truly valuable narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition. San Salvador is there said to be "better known as Rio de Janeiro." San Salvador is six hundred miles from Rio, being the old name of Bahia. In the same notices of Brazil, the orthography of not less than six names of provinces is incorrect.

Yet this ignorance, and these errors, relate to a country, with which our commercial relations are extensive and intimate. During twenty-one years, the importations from Brazil have increased, from the value of \$605,126 to \$5,948,814 per annum; and our exports from \$1,381,760 to \$2,601,502.

Brazil is not a country which we should any longer allow ourselves to overlook. Let us be reminded, that it embraces nearly half of all South America, covering an area equal to six-sevenths of Europe, and larger than that of the United States with all our territories. Its vegetable wealth is enormous. "Embracing the whole latitude of the southern torrid, and ten degrees of the southern temperate zone, and stretching its longitude from Cape St. Augustine, the easternmost point of the continent, across the

mountains of its own interior to the very feet of the Andes, its soil and its climate offer an asylum to almost every valuable plant." Its scenery is magnificent, its climate is salubrious, and it is exempt from the earthquakes of Chili and Peru.

These physical attractions of Brazil have led to most of the researches which have hitherto been made known to the public. The only considerable portion of the coast which has been subjected to scientific investigations is that which was traversed by Prince Maximilian. The names of Eschowege, Rodriguez, Ferreira, Spix, Martius, Natterer, St. Hilaire, and Von Langsdorff, as Mr. Kidder truly remarks, are familiar to science. A high value is set on the works of St. Hilaire, who became well acquainted with the interior. Natterer, a German, spent seven years in Brazil. Spix and Martius were sent out by the King of Bavaria: they passed from Rio through S. Paulo, Minas Geraes, and Goyaz, to the city of Maranham; thence by sea to Pará; thence up the Amazon to the limit of the empire. They made numerous lateral excursions on the rivers, returning to embark at Pará. The Baron Von Langsdorff, at the head of a numerous body of Russian savans, proceeded from Rio through S. Paulo and Matto Grosso: at the sources of the Madeira they divided their forces, and after wide surveys met again at Pará. But Langsdorff returned to Europe in a state of mental alienation; and the invaluable stores of the commissioners are still inedited. M. Riedel, one of the number, has remained at Rio, where he pursues his inquiries: he is supposed to be better acquainted with the Brazilian Flora than any other person living. It is to be hoped that the day will come, when Christian enterprise shall penetrate regions which even the hardy naturalist has left unexplored.

In a religious aspect, Brazil is not less interesting. Mr. Kidder is probably the only Protestant minister who ever preached on the waters of the mighty Amazon; and yet as he testifies, there is no Popish country in the world, more open to the gospel and the word of God. The work before us abounds in most encouraging proofs of this, as connected with the personal labours of the benevolent and enterprising author. The popery of the empire is almost effete. On few subjects, says Mr. Kidder, do Brazilian writers of all classes, express themselves with greater unanimity of opinion, than respecting the state of religion in

the country: people and ecclesiastics, officers of state, men of business and politicians, all agree in representing the condition and prospects of religion as low and unpromising. Monasticism is wearing out. The secular priests are on the decrease. Churches are going to ruin. Parishes, in great numbers, are lying vacant from year to year. Ecclesiastics are turning to worldly employments.

Signs are not wanting, of liberal views among the higher church functionaries. As a remarkable instance, we may mention the ex-regent Diogo Antonio Feijo; whose work on Celibacy has been translated by Mr. Kidder. He is described, by our author, who enjoyed an acquaintance with him, as a man of marked character. He was originally an ecclesiastic. On the establishment of an independent government, Feijo became a leading member of the House of Deputies. In this capacity he proposed, that the law enjoining clerical celibacy should be repealed; and this was received with great favour by both priests and the people. Notwithstanding the opposition which was called forth, he was successively appointed minister of state, regent of the empire, and senator for life; and was moreover elected by the imperial government bishop of Mariana. Feijo died in 1843. Such examples indicate a readiness to exchange popery for some other system of opinions; but it becomes us, as Christians, to see to it, that it be not exchanged for impiety and atheism. The oscillation from Romanism to infidelity is neither unnatural nor uncommon, as we are taught by the history of France. The literature of Brazil takes its tone from the French. Many Portuguese literati are at Paris. French books are in demand in South America, so that at Rio, a large proportion of the books are from Paris. The works of Voltaire, Rousseau, and especially Volney, are circulated in great numbers. As we associate religion in Brazil with the name of the Jesuits, it is proper to read what our author says concerning this once powerful order.

“The Jesuits were the only men who ever made systematic and zealous exertions for their improvement. They entered this field when their prosperity was at its meridian, and they found it sufficiently ample for their most enlarged ambition. Notwithstanding the extravagance of their fables, and the more than doubtful policy which they generally found it convenient to employ, yet they practised many real virtues; and when we compare their character with that of the other rival orders, and behold them repeatedly mobbed and persecuted on account of their opposition to vice and cruelty, we cannot withhold from them a degree of respect.

“For about two hundred years from the first establishment of their order in Brazil, they laboured zealously and with varied success in every part of the country, from the thickets of the Upper Amazon to the plains of Piratininga. They were repeatedly expelled from some of the cities and provinces, but they as often recovered favour and returned. Finally, the great effort made for their overthrow succeeded. No person had a more powerful agency in that movement than the Marquis of Pombal, the prime minister of Portugal, and nowhere were the decrees against the Jesuits executed with more rigour and even cruelty than in Brazil, under his instructions. Not only were all their possessions confiscated and the members of the order banished, but they were seized in person, and thrown into prison without ceremony or mercy. Finally, not less than four hundred and eighty of them were simultaneously transported from different ports along the coast. They were crowded into the holds of vessels, like negroes into a slave-ship. Those who succumbed to these hardships were neither allowed the common alleviations of sickness, nor, what they more desired, the sacrament in the hour of death. Those who survived the passage were immured in the dungeons of Portugal, from which many of them never emerged.”

It was altogether with a missionary object that Mr. Kidder visited Brazil. On landing at Rio de Janeiro, he was associated with the Rev. Mr. Spaulding, who was already engaged in a very interesting day-school, and in other Christian enterprises. He conducted divine service every Lord's Day, in a commodious room, preaching chiefly to English and American hearers, besides labouring for the seamen, and distributing bibles and tracts. More than half of the first volume is taken up with Rio de Janeiro; and every sentence in the narrative is interesting and valuable.

After some months' residence, the missionaries made a Christmas excursion to some of the towns and villages on the ample bay of Rio, and to some of its numerous islands. In January, 1839, Mr. Kidder went to Santos the chief port of the province of San Paulo, south-west of the capital. The remainder of the volume is occupied with an instructive and graphic view of this important province; which, so far as is known, had never received the visit of a Protestant clergyman.

The next excursion of the missionary traveller was along the northern coast of Brazil; and it was undertaken at a most favourable epoch, when the Brazilian Steam Packet Company had just been organized, under the patronage of the imperial government. Its boats, built in England, were named after the principal ports at which they were to touch, in the following order, from south to north, viz: the St. Sebastian, the Bahiana, the Pernambucana, the Maran-

hense, and the Paraense. The distance between Rio and Bahia is about eight hundred miles. There is no large city or flourishing port on the coast; nor is there a single direct or beaten road through the interior; and the only author who has ever traversed this region by land, is the Prince Maximilian, of Neuwied, between 1815 and 1818. The description of Bahia is worthy of special notice. To one approaching, the promontory, on which the city stands, seems to arise out of the ocean. The eye is presently struck with an outline of domes and towers. Soon the Antonio convent, the Victoria church, and the walls of the English cemetery, become visible. The landing is effected near the arsenal, from which the traveller enters the lower town.

“This lower town is not calculated to make a favourable impression upon the stranger. The buildings are old, although generally of a cheerful exterior. The street is very narrow, uneven and wretchedly paved. Besides, the gutter passes directly through the middle, rendering it unavoidably filthy. At the same time it is crowded with pedlers and carriers of every description. You here learn one peculiarity of the city of Bahia. Owing to the irregularities of its surface, and the steepness of the ascent which separates the upper town from the lower, it does not admit of the use of wheel carriages. Not even a cart or truck is to be seen, for the purpose of removing burdens from one place to another. Whatever requires change of place in all the commerce and ordinary business of this sea-port, and it is second in size and importance to hut one other in South America, must pass on the heads and shoulders of men. Burdens are here more frequently carried upon the shoulders, since the principal exports of the city being sugar in cases, and cotton in bales, it is impossible that they should be borne on the head like hags of coffee.

“Immense numbers of tall, athletic negroes, are seen moving in pairs or gangs of four, six, or eight, with their loads suspended between them on heavy poles. Numbers more of their fellows are seen setting upon their poles, braiding straw, or lying about the alleys and corners of the streets, asleep, reminding one of black-snakes coiled up in the sunshine. The sleepers generally have some sentinel ready to call them when they are wanted for business, and at the given signal they rouse up like the elephant to his burden. Like the coffee-carriers of Rio, they often sing and shout as they go, but their gait is necessarily slow and measured, resembling a dead march rather than the double-quick step of their Fluminensian colleagues. Another class of negroes are devoted to carrying passengers in a species of sedan chair, called cadeiras.

“It is indeed a toilsome, and often a dangerous task, for white persons to ascend on foot the bluffs on which stands the *cidade alta*, particularly when the powerful rays of the sun are pouring, without mitigation, upon their heads. No omnibus or cah, or even *sege*, can

be found to do him service. Suited to this state of things, he finds near every corner or place of public resort, a long row of curtained cadeiras, the bearers of which, with hat in hand, crowd around him with all the eagerness, though not with the impudence, of carriage-drivers in New York, saying, '*Quer cadeira, Senhor?*' 'Will you have a chair, sir?' When he has made his selection and seated himself to his liking, the bearers elevate their load and march along, apparently as much pleased with the opportunity of carrying a passenger, as he is with the chance of being carried. To keep a cadeira or two, and negroes to bear them, is as necessary for a family in Bahia, as the keeping of carriages and horses elsewhere. The livery of the carriers, and the expensiveness of the curtaining and ornaments of the cadeira, indicate the rank and style which the family maintains.

"Some of the streets, between the upper and lower towns, wind by a zig-zag course along ravines; others slant across an almost perpendicular bluff, to avoid, as much as possible, its steepness. Nor is the surface level, when you have ascended to the summit. Not even Rome can boast of so many hills as are here clustered together, forming the site of Bahia. Its extent between its extreme limits, Rio Vermelho and Montserate, is about six miles. The city is nowhere wide, and for the most part is composed of only one or two principal streets. The direction of these, changes with the various curves and angles necessary to preserve the summit of the promontory. Frequent openings, between the houses built along the summit, exhibit the most picturesque views of the bay on the one hand and of the country on the other. The aspect of the city is antique. Great sums have been expended in the construction of its pavements, but more with a view to preserve the streets from injury by rains, than to furnish roads for any kind of carriages. Here and there may be seen an ancient fountain of stone-work, placed in a valley of greater or less depth, to serve as a rendezvous for some stream that trickles down the hill above; but there is nowhere any important aqueduct."

The historical sketch of Bahia, or St. Salvador, from its discovery by Americus Vesputius, in 1503, to the present time, is brief but satisfactory. We refer the reader to several points of singular interest; such as the gipsy settlement, in 1718; and the slave-trade, of which Bahia has been a favourite emporium.

"The offensive ideas now associated with that traffic, among all enlightened nations, are strangely in contrast with the semblance of philanthropy, under which it was originally carried on. It is true, that interest was the first thing looked at then as well as now. The country was in need of cultivation, and the planters were in need of laborers. But then their condition was in no way so pitiable as that of thousands of poor negroes in Africa, who had been captured in the wars of different tribes against one another, and who might be tortured and sacrificed if they were not redeemed. What a worthy enterprise, then, to send vessels to *ransom* those poor pagan captives,

and bring them where they could be Christianized by baptism, and at the same time lend a helping hand to those who had been so kind as to purchase them out of heathen bondage, and bring them to a Christian country! Expressive of such ideas, the bland title by which the buying and selling of human beings was known, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was the *commerce for the ransom of slaves*.

"A dispatch from D. Joseph, king of Portugal, to the viceroy of Brazil, in the year 1756, lies before me, from which it appears, that he had received representations from the Camara of Bahia, together with various cultivators of sugar and tobacco in the province, informing him of a monopoly that had sprung up in the business of ransoming slaves; whereupon the august monarch, with that royal and paternal solicitude which had inclined him, repeatedly, to regulate this most important branch of the commerce of his vassals, decreed, by and with the advice of the ultra-marine counsel,

"1. 'That this commerce should thenceforward be free to every one, not only in the ports before resorted to, but in all the ports of Africa, both within and beyond the Cape of Good Hope.

"2. 'But that, in order to avoid the evil of having too large vessels employed, and a bad selection of provisions, the boards of inspection in Bahia, Pernambuco, and Parahiba, should examine, with all care, the cargo and provisions of each ship fitted out, seeing that these were suitable, and that the vessels were light, not carrying at most more than three thousand rolls of tobacco, in order that they might enter any port, and accomplish a *good ransom* at moderate prices.

"3. 'That the commander of the fort of Ajuda, on the coast, should prevent as much as possible the congregation of a number of vessels in any one port, and allow but one vessel to buy slaves at a time.'

"These regulations, ostensibly planned to mitigate the cruelty and evils of the traffic, had the effect to increase both an hundred fold. From that day to this, Bahia has been a great mart for the slave-trade."

Mr. Kidder made a second visit to Bahia on his return from the north. According to his description, it is one of the most beautiful cities in the world. The public promenade is on the boldest of its heights, looking on one side to the bay and on the other to the ocean, and surpassing in airiness the Battery of New York.

"What can be more beautiful than those extended and curving lines of whitened buildings—the one upon the heights, the other upon the water's edge—every where separated by a broad, rich belt of green, itself here and there dotted with houses. Nowhere does the uniformity of whitened walls and red-tiled roofs show to finer advantage, in contrast with the luxuriant vegetation that surrounds them. In fact, there are few cities that can present a single view of more imposing beauty than does Bahia, to a person beholding it from a suitable distance on the water. Even Rio de Janeiro can hardly be cited for such a comparison. That city excels in the endless va-

riety of its beautiful suburbs ; yet I should be at a loss to point out one which, in all respects, equals that part of Bahia known as the Victoria hill. In Rio, one section competes with another, and each offers some ground of preference ; but in Bahia, the superiorities seem all to be united in one section, leaving the foreigner no room for doubt or discussion respecting the best quarter for locating his residence. On the Victoria hill may be found the finest gardens that Bahia affords, the most enchanting walks, and the most ample shade. Here too are the best houses, the best air, the best water, and the best society. The walls of two ancient and extensive forts, also add very much to the romance and historical interest of the place. In fine, he who looks for any one spot that combines more of external beauty than does that to which I refer, will roam long and widely over the face of the earth. Yet it was here that Henry Martyn, who incidentally touched at this port on his passage to India, forty years ago, sighed and sung—

“ O'er the gloomy hills of darkness,
Sit my soul, be still and gaze.”

“ That the moral aspect of the place has since undergone any manifest change, is not to be presumed, since no causes have been at work that contemplated such a change. Facts will soon appear calculated to illustrate this subject, and to give point to the remark of Martyn: ‘ Crosses there are in abundance, but when shall the DOCTRINES of the cross be held up?’ ”

From Bahia, our author proceeded northward, in the same steamer. He was next brought along the River S. Francesco and the small province of Sergipe. Alagoas is the adjoining province, on the north, in which a landing was made at Maceió, after about forty hours from Bahia. This harbour is beautiful even beyond the beauty of Brazilian ports. The semicircular beach sweeps inward, covered with sand of snowy whiteness ; and a little back stands the line of white houses, embowered here and there in groves of majestic Coqueiros, whose fruit, cluster amidst branching leaves like jewels among the plumes of a coronet. Upon a hill-side, still further inland, appears the little city.

Pernambuco was the next city, in going northward, at which our author landed : it is but a short distance from Olinda, which is more conspicuous on the maps, and which was for two centuries the capital of the province. Of this higher city, Pernambuco is the port. It is often denominated Recife—from the reef—and is the third city in the empire.

“ Olinda, seen from this distance, must attract the attention and admiration of every one. Of this city, set upon a hill, one is at a loss whether to admire most the whitened houses and massive tem-

ples, or the luxuriant foliage interspersed amongst them, and in which those edifices on the hill-side seem to be partially buried. From this point a line of highlands sweeps inward with a tolerably regular arc, terminating at Cape St. Augustine, and forming a semi-lunar reconcave, analagous to that of Bahia. The entire summit of these highlands is crowned with green forests and foliage. Indeed, from the outermost range of vision to the very precincts of the city, throughout the extended plain, circumscribed by five-sixths of the imagined arc, scarcely an opening appears to the eye, although in fact the country overlooked is populous and cultivated. Numbers of buildings also, within the suburbs of the city, are overtowered, and wholly or partially hid by the lofty palms, mangueiras, cajueiros, and other trees. The interval between Recife and Olinda is in striking contrast to this appearance. It is a perfectly barren bank of sand, a narrow beach, upon one side of which the ocean breaks, while on the other side, only a few rods distant and nearly parallel, runs a branch of the Beberibe river."

After a residence of some weeks in Pernambuco, including excursions into the surrounding country, Mr. Kidder resolved to visit Itamaracá, a remarkable island on the northern coast of the province. The islanders are mostly watermen, and many of them are employed in the fisheries; an easy, simple hearted race, who seem to have won the kind regards of our author in a peculiar manner. Another excursion from Pernambuco was made to Parahiba; and as there was something singular in the mode of transit, we must let the traveller speak for himself; only regretting that we are unable to reproduce his striking print.

"A voyage at sea upon a *jangada* is not an incident of every day's occurrence, at least with North Americans. Nor is it easy to convey in words a perfect idea of the simple and singular structure by which the savages of Brazil were accustomed to traverse the waters of their coast hundreds of years ago. Although in constant use since the period of discovery, the *jangada* has preserved its aboriginal form and style of construction, and even in this age of improvement is not likely to undergo any change for the better. Properly speaking, it is merely a raft, composed of unhewn logs of a peculiarly light wood, called *pau de jangada*. Trunks of trees are selected, about six inches in diameter, as nearly straight and uniform as possible. These are stripped of bark, sharpened at each end so as to cut the water, and then fastened to each other by three rows of transverse pins. The number of logs used is generally six, although I have seen them composed of three, four, seven, and even twenty logs. These latter are used as lighters for unloading vessels, and are nearly square in form, while the sailing *jangada* is rectangular, and generally about five feet in width by sixteen or twenty in length.

"When about to embark from Itamaracá, I found it as necessary to secure a good *jangada*, as it would be in New York to select a choice berth for a passage to Liverpool. The *Paquete do Norte* was re-

commended to me as one of the finest craft owned on the island. When I negotiated for its use, it stood high and dry upon the beach before the house of its proprietor, ready for examination. It was of good size, and appeared to have seen no little service. It was cumbered with no appurtenances in the way of masts, sails, or rigging. There stood the form of bleached logs, having no fixtures upon them save a socket for the mast, and a seat for the steersman. Two straight sticks, about five feet high, stood in the exterior log on either side, within reach of the steersman's seat, designed for the suspension of his water gourd and bag of provisions.

"On its being chartered expressly for a passenger, the proprietor proceeded to fit it out in extra style, by putting a *girau* upon it. This term *girau* is entirely technical, being used to designate what in English it would be difficult to name, unless it were called a suspension cabin. Its construction was in this wise: Two strong poles were lashed one to each of the stancheons or sticks just mentioned, at the height of eighteen inches, and thence slanted forward till they rested upon the logs near the mast. Across these were fastened boards, making a floor. Over head sticks were bent to support a cover, not dissimilar in appearance to that of a traveling wagon; thus a space was left for the passenger about three feet in height by four in width. A thick rush mat was then spread on the bottom for a bed, and another over the top as an awning, to which, in case of rain, an oilcloth could be added, so that all might be kept dry. Thus rigged, my *paquete* was ready for sea. The only additions needed for purposes of navigation were—first, a setting-pole, to push off from shore: second, a slender mast, and a three-cornered sail to catch the breeze; and third, a long, broad oar, to serve as a rudder. Its crew consisted of two men, the *proeiro* and *patrao*, or bowsman and steersman."

"I thought them very venturesome occasionally, as they would run their *jangada* directly over the long pointed stakes of the *curraes de peixe*, which often stood bare as the waves receded before us. But they so managed, as in every instance to mount the swell and ride safely over them. The liability to get afoul of these stakes is one of the greatest dangers of this navigation, especially in the night. They often stand a long way out from shore, and might not be seen until they had impaled a *jangada*, or split it in pieces. Through the care of a kind Providence, we suffered no injury from them or any other cause. I frequently reflected during the passage, that we were not exposed to a catalogue of accidents which are very formidable to vessels of greater dimensions. Our raft would not easily capsize or go to the bottom; and as to springing aleak, there was the same chance for the water to run out as to run in. The danger, however, of falling off or being washed overboard was not so small. And since we could look directly through the bottom of our buoyant bark into the depths beneath, we could not say that there was even a plank between us and death."

We might fill some pages with a recital of Mr. Kidder's survey of the country into which he penetrated, from Pernambuco; but we must hasten with him, again by

steam, on his northward cruise. Leaving the province of Parahiba behind, they skirted along that of Rio Grande do Norte. Our readers will bear in mind the peculiar contour of the southern continent; remembering that it bulges out very boldly into the Atlantic; and that on doubling Cape St. Roque, the voyager, turning westward, finds himself rapidly approaching the third degree of south latitude. The next port was Ceará, S. lat. $3^{\circ} 42' 58''$, and W. long. $38^{\circ} 34'$. The heights near the city mark the termination of the great Serra do Mar, a mountain-chain already familiar to the traveller, in S. Paulo, sometimes inland and sometimes near the ocean, and stretching through at least twenty degrees of latitude. The province of Ceara, which looks out across the Equator, towards the North Atlantic, is large and prolific. The great mass of the people live as they list. Thousands in the interior have never seen bread: but watermelons, of great size and excellence, may be bought at the rate of twenty cents a hundred. There are multitudes of Indians, in a state of barbarism. Passing the province of Piahy, which is between Ceara and Maranh, Mr. Kidder approached the capital of the latter—S. Luis de Maranh. It is said to be better built than any city in Brazil. This river and bay were discovered in 1500, by Pinzon, one of the companions of Columbus. Our plan forbids us to offer even a sketch of the history of the province, which is worthy of perusal; and this remark applies to every one of the localities already mentioned. We can call to mind no book of travels, in which the historical portions are more wisely interspersed, so as to satisfy reasonable curiosity and yet avoid tedious annals.

The river Amazon awakens attention by its very name. In former days the voyage from Maranh to Pará, a distance of four hundred miles, used to be effected by canoes passing through the continent and coasting around not less than thirty-two bays, many of them so large that sight cannot span them, and connected by a labyrinth of waters, so that the voyage was shortened by ascending one river with the flow, crossing to another, and descending with the ebb. This circuit, of about three hundred leagues, could be accomplished in thirty days. It was, says Mr. Kidder, at that golden era, when Indian labour was plenty, and could be secured at four cents a day. Nature was amidst these wilds in her pristine loveliness. "Nothing interrupted the security of the traveller, and nothing disturbed the silence

of those sylvan retreats, save the chattering of monkeys, or the caroling of birds. The silver expanse of waters, and the magnificent foliage of tropical forests, taller than the world elsewhere contains, and so dense as almost to exclude the light of the sun, combined to impress the mind with inexpressible grandeur."

The ebb and flow of the tides in the Amazon are observed with regularity six hundred miles above the mouth, at the confluence of the river Madeira. There is much that awakens wonder, in these mighty waters. The description of Condamine, a hundred years ago, is cited :

"During three days before the new and full moons, the period of the highest tides, the sea, instead of occupying six hours to reach its flood, swells to its highest limit in one or two minutes. It might be inferred that such a phenomenon could not take place in a very tranquil manner. The noise of this terrible flood is heard five or six miles, and increases as it approaches. Presently you see a liquid promontory twelve or fifteen feet high, followed by another, and another, and sometimes by a fourth. These watery mountains spread across the whole channel, and advance with a prodigious rapidity, rending and crushing every thing in their way. Immense trees are instantly uprooted by it, and sometimes whole tracts of land are swept away."

"This phenomenon," we now use the language of Mr. Kidder, "is called, from its aboriginal name, *pororoca*, and gives character to the navigation of the Amazon, for hundreds of miles. No sailing craft can descend the river while the tide is running up. Hence both in ascending and descending, distances are measured by tides. For instance, Pará is three tides from the ocean, and a vessel entering with the flood must lie at anchor during two ebb tides before she can reach the city."

Pará is eighty miles from the ocean, 1° 21' south of the equator.

"The traveller, on entering Pará, is struck with the peculiar appearance of the people. The regularly descended Portuguese and Africans do not, indeed, differ from their brethren in other parts, but they are comparatively few here, while the Indian race predominates. The aboriginals of Brazil may here be seen both in pure blood, and in every possible degree of intermixture with both blacks and whites. They occupy every station in society, and may be seen as the merchant, the tradesman, the sailor, the soldier, the priest and the slave. In the last named condition they excited most my attention and sympathy. The thought of slavery is always revolting to an ingenuous mind, whether it be considered as forced upon the black, the white, or the red man. But there has been a fatality connected with the enslavement of the Indians, extending both to their

captors and to themselves, which invests their servitude with peculiar horrors.

“Nearly all the revolutions that have occurred at Pará are directly or indirectly traceable to the spirit of revenge with which the bloody expeditions of the early slave-hunters are associated in the minds of the natives and mixed bloods throughout the country.”

We would gladly insert, if space were allowed, the notices of the Amazonian forests, with their gigantic parasites, and strange inhabitants—of the caoutchouc or gum-elastic—of the massaranduba, the cacao, the Brazil-nut—and especially of the cruelties practised against the aboriginal savages, who were pursued and hunted down in their vast forests like beasts of prey—and of the decaying churches of this great province: but all these will be better found, in their due connexion, in the work itself.

After very full and remarkably perspicuous accounts of the region on the coast, Mr. Kidder devotes some space to the survey of three inland provinces, Matto Grosso, Goyaz, and Minas Geraes. Villa Bella, a chief town of the first mentioned, is in a right line, one thousand miles distant from Pará, and by sea twenty-five hundred. It is nearer the centre of South America than any province, being bounded on the west by Peru and Bolivia, and on the south by Paraguay and San Paulo. Sixty-six tribes of Indians still exist in Matto Grosso. It abounds also in gold and diamonds. Goyaz is the province lying east of Matto Grosso. Both these were originally settled by gold-hunters; and the most eager avarice was satiated. For the first year, every slave commonly returned three or four ounces a-day. It lay upon the very surface of the ground. Yet the time came, when a pound of gold could scarcely buy a bushel of corn, and when, in one instance, salt was purchased for its weight in gold, and a drove of cattle was sold together at the rate of an ounce and a half of gold for a pound of flesh and bone.

Minas Geraes is the third of these inland provinces, lying east of Goyaz. Its name signifies the general or universal mines, and it contains gold, silver, copper and iron, besides precious stones. One writer has remarked with emphasis, that if there be one spot in the world which might be made to surpass all others, Minas is that favoured spot. Its climate is mild and healthful; its surface is elevated and undulating; its soil is fertile, and capable of yielding the most valuable productions; its forests abound

in choice timber, balsams, drugs and dye-woods." Full details concerning this province may be found in the writings of Mawe, Walsh and others. Here ends the outward journeying and voyaging of Mr. Kidder. From Pará he made a rapid homeward voyage to Rio de Janeiro. We gladly append an extract of some length, not more for the sake of its missionary bearing, than for the pathos of its closing incident.

"On becoming again established at Rio de Janeiro, in connection with my worthy colleague, Rev. Mr. Spaulding, our attention was specially directed to the benefit of the numerous English and American seamen visiting that port. Mr. Spaulding had maintained the Bethel service with great regularity and effect during my absence.

"Nothing could exceed the order and solemnity of the assemblies which gathered together each Sabbath morning, on the deck of some noble vessel, at whose mainmast the emblem of peace and mercy was floating in the breeze. We generally found the vessel, designated for the time being as the Bethel ship, arranged and decorated in the most tasteful manner, with seats to accommodate all who might choose to come and worship God. How delightful was it to see boatload after boatload of seamen coming alongside for this noble object; men who, but for such an opportunity, would be seeking recreation on shore, exposed to all the temptations of vice, and the snares of sin! How sublime were the sentiments inspired by such a scene, especially in such a place! The brilliant sky, the lofty mountains, and the swelling tide of the ocean, could not fail, at any time, deeply to impress the thoughtful mind; but when, surrounded by all these objects, it was our privilege also to witness, in a company of seamen, the attention of the soul fixed upon eternal things, and indicated by the heaving breast, the falling tear, and the unconcealed resolve, ours was no ordinary pleasure.

"We had the satisfaction of organizing a Seamen's Temperance Society, and finding numbers interested in its worthy objects. It was also our good fortune at that period, to have these efforts seconded by the active and efficient co-operation of an officer of the United States navy, who has since died, but who will long be remembered as a philanthropist and a Christian.*

"Nor were our labours confined to merchant vessels, or to the Sabbath day. We were occasionally invited to preach on board American ships of war, and from time to time we took occasion to pass through the whole crowd of vessels upon the receiving anchorage, and visit one after another, to converse with those on board, and to leave behind us tracts and other mementoes of our Christian friendship. These labours were bread thrown upon the waters, for which we doubted not the promise was sure, that it should be found after many days. Various interesting circumstances also occurred on shore, by which new occasions of usefulness in the country at large were opened before us. We now had correspondents along the whole

* Lieutenant Mooers.

coast. During my late tour I had been enabled to put in circulation many copies of the Holy Scriptures, and about sixty thousand pages of religious tracts. Besides this, I had left Scriptures for sale, and tracts for distribution, in the principal places. Thus, by the establishment of depositories in the maritime towns, where the Scriptures could be procured by persons from every part of the interior between S. Paulo and Pará, a great step was taken toward offering the word of God to the entire nation, and inviting the inhabitants generally to receive it.

"We now began to take active measures to establish preaching in the Portuguese language at Rio. I was engaged in preparing a series of discourses, which I hoped soon to commence delivering. It was at this most interesting juncture, that my labours in Brazil were suddenly interrupted by a most painful bereavement. My beloved wife was smitten by the cruel hand of disease, and in a few days was consigned to an early grave. She was cut down in the midst of a field of usefulness, for which she had become peculiarly qualified. Her willing and faithful services in 'the work whereunto she was sent,' were suddenly and fatally checked by the unlooked-for approach of death. But she died as she had lived, an humble, devoted Christian; and in her final hour triumphed over the last enemy, by falling 'asleep in Jesus'—that Saviour,

"'For the light of whose smile in the heaven of love,'

her warm heart continually aspired. Her precious memory will be long and fondly cherished upon earth, but her 'record is on high.' Her resting-place was not found, as she had once poetically desired it might be, in the caverns of 'the deep blue sea,' but in the Protestant burial ground of Rio de Janeiro. Her remains were entombed in the Cemetery of Gamboa, a beautiful declivity in the northern suburbs of the city, bordering upon the bay.

"But for its melancholy associations, this spot would be regarded as one of the loveliest on earth. At its rocky base the tides of the ocean cease not to ebb and flow. A shaded avenue leads upward from the sea-beach to the centre of the enclosure, where memorials of the dead stand thick on every side. As the stranger lifts his eye towards the northern horizon, he beholds a magnificent bay, spotted with islands, and hemmed in by lofty mountain peaks—while all around him vegetation is smiling in fadeless verdure, and fanned by the daily breezes of the tropics. This bereavement, like the untimely winds of autumn, swept many tender blossoms of hope and promise for ever away. It imposed upon me the imperious necessity of a speedy embarkation for the United States, as a hopeful means of preserving the life of an infant son. A month elapsed, and I spent another night on board a vessel in the harbour preparatory to sailing.

"What a contrast did I experience in my feelings and condition, to the circumstances under which I had, five months previously, occupied nearly the same position on board the *Oriente*. The same star-lit heavens were over me, the same glassy waters beneath, the same giant mountains, and the same extended city before and around me. But yet how changed the scene! Before, my mind was filled with expectation and joyous hope, but now it was desolated with sad remembrances and overwhelming sorrow."

From these volumes, it would not be difficult to select specimens of brilliant description, and some episodes of stirring narrative. We might also borrow statements of the political history of the empire which would be both valuable and new: for nowhere else have we been able to attain any insight into this perplexed subject. But this would be to copy an important portion of the work, which we desire rather to place in the hands of our readers. We choose therefore to confine ourselves, in what remains, to the religious aspect of Brazil, under the two heads, of the Romish church, and the essays made towards the introduction of the Gospel. And if we shall succeed in communicating our own impressions, it will be seen and felt, that the case is not hopeless, that the juncture is favourable, and that the eyes of Christian America should be fixed with earnest inquiry upon this whitening harvest of the south.

Popery in Brazil was founded in cruelty and upheld with pomp, but seems to be dying away, from the vice of its constitution. Mr. Kidder does justice to the French Calvinists who sought an asylum at Rio, in 1555. The church of Geneva sent two ministers and fourteen students; *the first Protestant mission to our continent*. The sanguinary fanaticism of the papists prevented all that might have been hoped from such beginnings. "According to the annals of the Jesuits, Mem. de Sa stained the foundations of his city with innocent blood. 'Among the Huguenots who had been forced to fly from Villegagnon's persecution, was one John Boles, a man of considerable learning, being well versed both in Greek and Hebrew. Luiz de Gram caused him to be apprehended, with three of his comrades, one of whom feigned to become a Catholic—the others were cast into prison; and there Bales had remained eight years when he was sent for to be martyred at Rio de Janeiro, for the sake of terrifying his countrymen, if any of them should be lurking in those parts.'"

The principal city shows abundant signs of what popery has been; containing, with its suburbs, about fifty churches and chapels. The names are given in the appendix. Among these are found 'Igreja do Bom Jesus do Calvario'—'do S. Ignacio de Loyola'—'Nossa Senhora Mai dos Homens'—'da Madre de Dcos' and 'Espirito Santo de Mata Porcos.' They are generally among the most costly edifices. The chapel of the convent of St. Benedict was built in 1671. Its sides are crowded with images and

altars, and the roof and walls with pictures of the patron saint's achievements. Angels and cherubs, carved in wood and gilt, occupy every available corner. The internal construction of Brazilian churches has, of course, no reference to the hearing of the word. Preaching is not known among the weekly services of the church; though Mr. Kidder listened to sermons, on special occasions, in the Gloria church. The people faced round from the altar, to the little pulpit, and attended to a fervid harangue; during which the speaker paused, and lifting a little crucifix, fell on his knees and began praying to it as his Lord and Master. The pulpit is always on one side, and there are no seats, save the floor of marble, wood, or earth. This is sometimes strewed with leaves or covered with boards. The sound of bells at Rio de Janeiro is represented as extraordinary even for a popish city.

Among the religious orders of Brazil, the Benedictines are the most wealthy. Other fraternities exist, and as is usual contribute largely to the public charities of the country, by hospitals and various asylums. At Rio, the *Irmandades*, or Brotherhoods, are numerous: they erect churches, provide for the sick, bury the dead, and attend to the souls in purgatory. The famous *Misericordia* was founded as long ago as 1582, by the Jesuit, Jozé de Anchieta. He was one of the earliest missionaries of his order, and yet our readers may not be familiar with his merits. "Dominion was given him" says Vasconcellos, "over the elements and all that dwell therein. The earth brought forth fruit at his command, and even gave up the dead, that they might be restored to life and receive baptism from his hand."—"He could read the secrets of the heart. The knowledge of hidden things and sciences was imparted to him; and he enjoyed daily and hourly ecstasies, visions, and revelations. He was a saint, a prophet, a worker of miracles, and a vice Christ." His successor, strange to say, was an Englishman, originally named John Martin, but more glorious as the Friar Joam d'Almeida. The church has had few such ascetics. He displayed ingenuity and refinement in his self flagellations. His scourges were, some of whipcord, some of catgut, some of leather thongs, and some of wire. He had cilices of wire for his arms, thighs and legs, one of which was fastened round the body with seven chains; and another, which he called his good sack, was a shirt of the roughest horse-hair, having on the inside seven

iron crosses rough with points like a nutmeg-grater. His fastings were in due proportion, and are detailed by our author.

“Such,” says Southey, “were the extravagances to which the catholic superstition was carried in Brazil at this early day. For the self-government which divine philosophy requires, it had substituted a system of self-torture, founded upon Manicheism, and not less shocking to the feelings, or repugnant to reason, than the practices of the eastern yogues. Its notions of exaggerated purity, led to the most impure imaginations and pernicious consequences; its abhorrence of luxury was manifest by habitual filth, and in actions unutterably loathsome; and let the Romish church appeal to its canons and councils as it may, its practices were those of polytheism and idolatry.”

Bahia is the archiepiscopal see of the empire: here therefore monkery is prominent; for its convents are said to contain more friars and nuns than all the rest of Brazil. The Jesuits led the way. Others, as the Franciscans, the Benedictines, and the Carmelites, followed. At one time the Franciscans numbered nearly six hundred friars. This convent possesses the image of S. Antonio de Argoim. For a length of time this saint received regular pay as a soldier, but in 1705 he was promoted to a captaincy, on full pay: and the order to this effect, which afterwards received the royal sanction, is given at length by Mr. Kidder. He has since been made a colonel, and receives his pay as such, through the Franciscan friars. The Benedictines own in Bahia ninety-three estates, besides all their possessions in the surrounding regions. The Slipped and Barefooted Carmelites, the Barefooted Augustinians, and the Almoners of the Holy Land are enumerated. But still more interesting are the Italian Capuchins, the only ecclesiastics among thousands of seculars and regulars, who, since the days of the Jesuits, have deserved the name of missionaries. Of these some very valuable notices occur.

Monasteries seem to have been thought necessary in every part of Papal America, and at the earliest stages of colonization. Thus at Angra, with a population little above two thousand, are found establishments of the three leading orders; the Benedictines, the Slipped Carmelites, and the Franciscans of St. Anthony. These edifices were severally occupied, when Mr. Kidder visited S. Paulo, by a single friar. The Benedictine convent at Rio is a stately, sombre pile, with a library of almost six thousand volumes. The Franciscan convent at Parahiba is described

as a regular monastic edifice, after the fashion of the middle-ages; with high walls, chapel, court, rows of cells, vaulted ceilings, and anti-Dominican paintings; though the rival order is unknown in Brazil. Ceará is somewhat singular, among the cities, in being destitute of monastic buildings; and the remark applies to the whole province.

We have long entertained it as a firm opinion, that he who would behold the true working of popery, must look at it far from the rivalry and the corrective scrutiny of Protestantism; in other words, in South America. There its idolatry, fraud and fanaticism have free scope. In the church of Espirito Santo, at Pará, God the Father is represented on canvass, as a very old man, dressed in a monkish gown. In the same church is an image of the Virgin, with a writing promising forty years of indulgence to such as pray before it. At another place, Mr. Kidder observed in the hands of an aged negro an idol like a child's doll, by means of which money was collected from street-passengers, for building a church. When certain ants devoured an altar-cloth, at Maranham, we learn from Mr. Southey, that the friars proceeded against them in due form of ecclesiastical law. We are favoured also with a faithful translation from a document prepared by a Brazilian Padre in 1839, containing a roll of saints, with the diseases, vermin and other ills, against which they respectively render aid: thus St. Benedict against serpents; St. Tude against coughs; and St. Apolonia against tooth-ache. The ninth chapter is full of instruction and entertainment, in respect to the numerous festivals of the church. An instance is given in which the clergy are charged in the newspapers with omitting the festival, for lack of fees: "no pence, no paternoster." In a lively description of a procession at Pará, we have the following passage:

"On the splendid moonlight nights of the season the city would be nearly emptied of people, and multitudes, *todo o mundo*, would crowd to the Nazareth feast. How few of them all had any proper idea of the character of Him who came out of Nazareth to take away the sins of his people!

"The church on this spot was quite small, and constructed so much like a dwelling-house as to have a double veranda, above and below, on three of its sides. In the upper veranda hung the hammocks of the soldiers on guard. In front stood a species of *alpendre*, or *ranchito*, with a tiled roof. Within the mass-house were two altars—that surmounted by the image borne in the procession stood on the right, and was unusually elevated. One would have supposed that

this image came from France, for its *tout ensemble* reminded the beholder of toy-shop dolls of the largest size. Two wide ribbons, one green and the other red, extended from the dress over the altar, and hung down towards the floor. Hundreds of people crowded around to enjoy, in turn, the privilege of kneeling down and kissing these ribbons! On the opposite wall hung a collection of plaster forms, representing all manner of ulcerated limbs and diseased members, that were said to have been miraculously cured by our Lady. Near these hung a rude painting, designed to show an apparition of said Lady to a sick person, who, of course, recovered. Lest this event should not be comprehended it was explained in the vulgar tongue—*Milagre que fez Nossa Senhora de Nazare!*”

The tendency of popery to fanaticism is strikingly set forth in the notices of the Sebastianists :

“The distinguishing tenet of this sect is the belief that Don Sebastian, the king of Portugal, who, in 1577, undertook an expedition against the Moors in Africa, and who, having been defeated, never returned, is still alive, and is destined yet to make his re-appearance on earth. Numberless dreams and prophecies, together with the interpretation of marvellous portents confirming this idea, have been circulated with so much of clerical sanction, that many have believed the senseless whim. Nor have there been lacking persons, at various periods, who have undertaken to fulfil the prophecies, and to prove themselves the veritable Don Sebastian.

“Nevertheless the prime point of faith is, that he will yet come, and that too, as each believer has it, in his own lifetime. The Portuguese look for his appearance at Lisbon, but the Brazilians generally think it most likely that he will first revisit his own city, St. Sebastian.

“It appears, however, that a reckless villain, named Joao Antonio, fixed upon a remote part of the province of Pernambuco, near Píancó, in the Comarca de Flores, for the appearance of the said D. Sebastian. The place designated was a dense forest, near which were known to be two acroceraunian caverns. This spot the impostor said was an enchanted kingdom, which was about to be disenchanted, whereupon Don Sebastian would immediately appear at the head of a great army, with glory, and with power to confer wealth and happiness upon all who should anticipate his coming by associating themselves with said Joao Antonio.

“As might be expected he found followers, who, after awhile, learned that the imaginary kingdom was to be disenchanted by having its soil sprinkled with the blood of one hundred innocent children! In default of a sufficient number of children, men and women were to be immolated, but in a few days they would all rise again, and become possessed of the riches of the world. The prophet appears to have lacked the courage necessary to carry out his bloody scheme, but he delegated power to an accomplice, named Joao Ferreira, who assumed the title of ‘his Holiness,’ put a wreath of rushes upon his head, and required the proselytes to kiss his toe, on pain of instant death. After other deeds too horrible to describe, he commenced the slaughter of human beings. Each parent was required to bring forward one or two of his children to be

offered. In vain did the prattling babes shriek and beg that they might not be murdered. The unnatural parents would reply, 'No, my child, there is no remedy,' and forcibly offer them. In the course of two days he had thus, in cold blood, slain twenty-one adults and twenty children, when a brother of the prophet, becoming jealous of 'his Holiness,' thrust him through and assumed his power. At this juncture some one ran away, and apprised the civil authorities of the dreadful tragedy.

"Troops were called out who hastened to the spot, but the infatuated Sebastianists had been taught not to fear any thing, but that should an attack be made upon them it would be the signal for the restoration of the kingdom, the resurrection of the dead, and the destruction of their enemies. Wherefore on seeing the troops approach they rushed upon them, uttering cries of defiance, attacking those who had come to their rescue, and actually killing five, and wounding others, before they could be restrained. Nor did they submit until twenty-nine of their number, including three women, had actually been killed. Women, seeing their husbands dying at their feet, would not attempt to escape, but shouted 'the time is come; viva, viva, the time is come!' Of those that survived a few escaped into the woods, the rest were taken prisoners. It was found that the victims of this horrid delusion had not even buried the bodies of their murdered offspring and kinsmen, so confident were they of their immediate restoration."

A thoughtful and inquiring priest of S. Paulo confessed to our author, that "Catholicism was nearly abandoned here, and all the world over;" and explained himself, by adding that there was scarcely any thing of the spirit of religion among either priests or people. He admitted the evils of celibacy, saying the clergy were almost all *de facto* more than married, to the infinite scandal of religion, and that infidelity was rapidly spreading. The provincial president of Alagoaz, in a speech to the Legislative Assembly, in 1842, says of the churches: "They are in the worst state imaginable. Many of them are either actually falling into ruins, or have no outward similitude to a temple, and are in no way calculated to inspire the respect due to the house of the Lord."

In Pernambuco, the monasteries are in small repute; and indeed, throughout Brazil, nothing is more common than to see edifices once occupied by religious fraternities appropriated to secular uses. On this subject, no testimony is so cogent as that of the minister of justice and ecclesiastical affairs, addressed in 1843 to the Imperial Legislature.

"The state of retrogression into which our clergy are falling is notorious. The necessity of adopting measures to remedy such an evil is also evident. On the 9th of September, 1842, the government addressed inquiries on this subject to the bishops and capitular vicars. Although complete answers have not been received from all of them, yet the following particulars are certified.

“The lack of priests who will dedicate themselves to the cure of souls, or who even offer themselves as candidates, is surprising. In the province of Pará there are parishes which, for twelve years and upwards, have had no pastor. The district of the river Negro, containing some fourteen settlements, has but one priest; while that of the river Solimoens is, in similar circumstances. In the three comarcas of Belem, the Upper and the Lower Amazon, there are thirty-six vacant parishes. In Maranhão twenty-five churches have, at different times, been advertised as open for applications, without securing the offer of a single candidate.

“The bishop of S. Paulo affirms the same thing respecting vacant churches in his diocese, and it is no uncommon experience elsewhere. In the diocese of Cuyabá not a single church is provided with a settled curate, and those priests who officiate as stated supplies, treat the bishop's efforts to instruct and improve them with great indifference.

“In the bishopric of Rio de Janeiro most of the churches are supplied with pastors, but a great number of them only temporarily. This diocese embraces four provinces, but during nine years past not more than five or six priests have been ordained per year.

“It may be observed, that the numerical ratio of those priests who die, or become incompetent through age and infirmity, is two to one of those who receive ordination. Even among those who are ordained, few devote themselves to pastoral work. They either turn their attention to secular pursuits, as a means of securing greater conveniences, emoluments, and respect, or they look out for chaplaincies, and other situations, which offer equal or superior inducements, without subjecting them to the *literary tests*, the trouble and the expense necessary to secure an ecclesiastical benefice.

“This is not the place to investigate the causes of such a state of things, but certain it is, that no persons of standing devote their sons to the priesthood. Most of those who seek the sacred office are indigent persons, who, by their poverty, are often prevented from pursuing the requisite studies. Without doubt a principal reason why so few devote themselves to ecclesiastical pursuits, is to be found in the small income allowed them. Moreover, the perquisites established as the remuneration of certain clerical services, have resumed the voluntary character which they had in primitive times, and the priest who attempts to coerce his parishioners into payment of them almost always renders himself odious, and gets little or nothing for his trouble.”

In the midst of decaying forms, and the degeneracy of morals, it is not surprising that propositions to make the Brazilian church independent of the Roman see, have been entertained by the legislature and favoured by the people. And the fact is worthy of note, that in 1836, the government proposed to employ *Moravian missionaries*, to catechize the Indians of the interior.

No abstract of ours can convey the impression produced by the details of these volumes, which are the more credible and weighty, because the author brings them forward incidentally, and with a remarkable absence of every thing rancorous or uncandid: If any thing is to save the millions of this empire from anarchical infidelity, it must be the infusion of a new element in the shape of genuine Christianity; and it is the attempt to effect this, by evangelical

missions, that shall now for, a little, engage our attention.

Mr. Kidder found at Rio de Janeiro his brother missionary, the Rev. Mr. Spaulding. The circulation of Bibles in the Portuguese language was a primary object of their endeavours. The Scriptures when offered for public sale, found many purchasers: when they were distributed gratuitously, there was on some occasions a rush of applicants. The notes of request, from various classes, given in the appendix, speak a volume of encouragement. Versions, in French, Portuguese and English, were sought with avidity by amateur linguists. As many as eight hundred copies were called for. Increased demand was caused by the fanatical but impotent opposition of the priesthood; and the articles which they published were found to refute themselves. In distant provinces, the missionary discovered that Bibles from the capital had gone before him. And such was the freedom enjoyed in this work, that during all his residence, Mr. Kidder never received the slightest opposition or indignity from the people; so that his conviction is firm, that there is not a Roman Catholic country on the globe, where there prevails a greater degree of toleration, or a greater liberality of feeling towards Protestants.

The same efforts were pursued in other provinces. In Pernambuco the state of things was such as to induce the belief, that there had never been a more favourable opportunity for the introduction of the gospel. A Padre lent his aid in distribution, and evinced a love for the sacred volume, which had made it his one book, for a year or two. A respectable priest in S. Paulo acknowledged that the Bible was the true instrument against the prevailing infidelity, and hoped that he might some day devote himself to the genuine work of an evangelist. A young gentleman, in the same province, received New Testaments, and reported that the demand awakened by them among his young friends was immediate and urgent. In the provincial capital, the encouragement was such, as to excite the hope of introducing the Scriptures into the schools of the whole province: nothing can more strikingly show the openness of the field. The secretary and the senior professor in the University rendered hearty assistance. The project was respectfully entertained by gentlemen of both political parties, including two priests, the bishop-elect of Rio de Janeiro, and the celebrated Andradas. Mr. Kidder's memo-

rial, of which a copy is inserted, was regularly presented, in February, 1839. Although the proposition was never acted upon, it is significant and encouraging, that it was never formally rejected.

In remote places, our traveller found single copies of the Bible, faithfully preserved. Notwithstanding some momentary panics created by the priests, many volumes were put in circulation; some of which, we trust, under God's blessing, are doing their work at this hour. These may prove a happy antidote to the corrupt teachings of the ecclesiastics, who, according to the assertion of the archbishop of Bahia, go ahead, "without any BIBLE but their BREVIARIES."

We cannot lay down these engaging volumes, without declaring our conviction, that if there is a country in the world which should awaken the missionary zeal of American Christians, it is Brazil. We own ourselves to be surprised at the facilities for evangelical labour which are revealed by this narrative.

In point of style, this work is highly meritorious. It is always unpretending, almost always correct, and very often elegant. The natural transparency of the diction presents nothing to interrupt our easy progress; and on some occasions the author rises with his subject to what we consider the best manner of simple narrative. Here and there an inaccurate expression escapes his pen; but, as a whole, the book is worthy of a place among the more elevated productions of our national literature. Of its higher and Christian qualities, we need only say, that it leaves us with the most sincere respect for the mind and heart of the learned and benevolent author.*

Geo. W. Andrews

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. Harpers & Brothers, 1844.

* We should do injustice to these beautiful volumes, if we did not allude to one of their chief attractions, namely, the engravings and cuts with which they are adorned. These amount to the number of thirty-three, and are either principally, if not wholly, from original sketches of the author.

THE progress of knowledge has ever been through conflicts of truth with error. And whoever supposes that error, if left to itself, will die of its own inherent weakness; and that the proper way to advance knowledge, is to expound truth and let error alone, has entirely misread the lessons of human history. When we look back to the past, we see that the error, which after a severe conflict, has been put down in one age, re-appears in another, and sometimes for a conflict far more severe than the first. Indeed history proves that errors, no matter how absurd, which have at any time, seized upon human belief, may come forth with all the power of falsehood over the human mind, in ages of vastly different degrees of general enlightenment. The very work at the head of this article has been written, to put down the superstitious errors of monkish theology, which though an hundred times refuted, have re-appeared in the field of protestant theological controversy, amidst all the enlightenment of the present age. We will therefore make the able work of Dr. Stone, the occasion of examining what we conceive to be the groundwork of all theological controversy, viz: *The connection between reason and revelation.*

The first problem which presents itself in the investigation of the connection between reason and revelation, is *what is meant by reason?* We shall endeavour to show, that whatever idea men may intend to convey by it in such a connection, they do in reality mean by it, *philosophy.* If this be so, then our inquiry will resolve itself into an investigation of *the connection between philosophy and revelation.*

We have heretofore in an article on Psychology, (October No. 1843) endeavored to show with Locke, that there are no innate ideas or principles by which the mind judges of truth, but that all our knowledge is acquired by experience;* and that what we call principles are nothing more

* In order to be properly appreciated or understood, this article should be viewed in connection with those, from the same pen, already published in our Journal. See Princeton Review, for July, 1840, April and October, 1843. The writer uses experience in a wide sense, as including all the facts of consciousness. In saying therefore that all knowledge is to be referred to experience or to revelation, it is not to be considered that intuitive truths, truths which the writer elsewhere calls "self luminous." are denied. In the ordinary sense of the word, we think it impossible, that the knowledge of any necessary and universal truth, should rest on experience. Such basis is altogether too narrow. That every effect within our experience, has had a cause.

than generalised facts; and that whether these facts or principles have been generalised by ourselves or by others, they are equally acquired by experience in our meaning of that term. We refer to our reasoning in that article for the truth of this doctrine.

If, then, the mind has no innate knowledge, but acquires all through experience, we must mean by *reason*, either the bare faculty of reason, or else the knowledge acquired by that faculty: for upon that theory of mental philosophy, it can have no other meaning. If then we mean by it, the bare faculty of reason, the inquiry resolves itself into this: *What is the use of reason in interpreting revelation?* and if we mean by it, the knowledge acquired by that faculty, the inquiry resolves itself into this: *What is the connection between our knowledge of nature and revelation.* And whether we use the word in the one meaning or the other, it amounts to the same thing, in the connection in which we are considering it. For the real inquiry is, *what light does our reason throw upon revelation?* If our reason has no light, but what it has acquired by experience, then this light is the light of nature, which is philosophy; and it is by this light, that it must judge of the truths of revelation, if it judge of them by any other light, than that of revelation itself. There are then, according to this analysis, only two lights to guide the mind in the investigation of knowledge, the light of nature and revelation. And our inquiry obviously resolves itself into the question, what assistance does the light of nature afford us in examining the truths of revelation? Or, *what is the connection between philosophy and revelation?* And this is the question we propose to examine.

“The knowledge of man (says Bacon) is as the waters, some descending from above, and some springing up from beneath; the one informed by the light of nature, the other inspired by divine revelation. So then, according to these

is no adequate ground of the assurance that every effect *must* have a cause. There are many forms of expression used by our able contributor, throughout this, as well as the articles above referred to, which we would not have employed; and, though we presume we refer far more of our knowledge to the constitution of our nature, than he may be inclined to do, yet we are not sure that, with proper understanding, we should be found materially to differ. At any rate, our readers will thank us for presenting them the interesting discussion contained in the following pages, though some of the principles advanced, may not seem quite consistent with the views which the conductors of this Review are known to entertain.—THE CONDUCTORS.

two differing illuminations or originals, knowledge is first of all divided into divinity, and philosophy." As then, nature and revelation are the only sources of knowledge, what assistance does the light of nature or philosophy give us in interpreting divinity or revelation? This question Bacon has properly answered. "But on the other side (says he) out of the contemplation of nature or ground of human knowledge, to induce any verity or persuasion concerning the points of faith, is in my judgment not safe. *Da fidei qua fidei sunt.* We ought not attempt to draw down or submit the mysteries of God, to our reason; but contrariwise, to raise and advance our reason to the divine truth. Wherefore we conclude that theology, which in our idiom we call divinity, is grounded only upon the word and oracle of God, and not upon the light of nature." Such is the doctrine of the Baconian Philosophy, that theology is grounded only upon the word and oracle of God, and not upon the light of nature. We must look to the light of nature for philosophy, but to revelation, for theology. And as the mind has no innate knowledge, if we interpret revelation by any other light than its own, we interpret it by the light of philosophy, whether we call it interpretation according to reason, or not. For we have shown, that what we call reason, is philosophy; and not a light put into the mind by the Creator, at or before our birth, and therefore a divine standard of truth, called by the a priori philosopher, *the reason*, by which, revelation as well as nature, is to be tested as to the truth of its doctrines.

But let us not, in this inquiry, overlook the distinction between reason, as meaning *philosophy* and as meaning *the bare faculty of reason*; and thereby mistake what we say about it as meaning philosophy, as being said about it as meaning the bare faculty of reason. For it would be nonsense, to say that reason in this latter sense, is of no use in investigating the doctrines of revelation. "The use of reason (faculty of reason) in religion, (says Bacon) is of two sorts: the former, in the conception and apprehension of the mysteries of God, to us revealed; the other in inferring and deriving of doctrine and direction thereupon. The former extendeth to the mysteries themselves; but how? by way of illustration, and not by way of argument; the latter consisteth indeed of probation and argument. In the former we see God vouchsafeth to descend to our capacity in the expressing of his mysteries in sort as may be unto us; and doth graft his revelations

and holy doctrine upon the notions of our reason, and applieth his inspirations to open our understanding, as the form of the key, to the ward of the lock; for the latter, there is allowed us a use of reason and argument, secondary and respective although, not original and absolute. For after the articles and principles of religion are placed and exempted from examination of reason, it is then permitted unto us to make derivations and inferences from and *according to analogy of them*, for our better direction. In nature this holdeth not; for both the principles are examined by induction, though not by a medium or syllogism; and besides, those principles or first positions have no discordance with that reason which draweth down and deduceth the inferior positions. Such therefore is the secondary reason which hath place in divinity, which is grounded upon the placets of God." Bacon here shows that reason enables us to apprehend the mysteries of God, such as the doctrine of the atonement, or the resurrection, not by way of argument or proof, but by way of illustration; for God doth graft these mysteries, as well as his holy doctrine, *love your enemies*, and other such doctrines, upon the notions of our reason, and applieth his inspirations to open our understanding as the form of the key to the ward of the lock, in order that we may fully understand them. But we will show in a subsequent part of this article, that much of what we, in considering at this day the connection between philosophy and revelation, are apt to call the notions of reason, and probably of what Bacon in the passage quoted, has called the notions of reason, is not derived exclusively from the light of nature, but also from revelation. Because our first parents were taught by revelation, at the very moment of their creation, or rather, as soon as their internal consciousness was awakened into knowledge. The light of nature had no sooner fallen on their minds, than God spoke to them and instructed them in all knowledge proper for them. And the mode of instruction by revelation was continued through prophets and inspired men till the completion of that mode of instruction in Christianity. So that the light of nature and the light of revelation are so mixed up in our knowledge, that the teachings of each cannot be separated, and the latter had become so corrupted before Christianity was promulgated, that we are apt in the ardour of investigation, to call all our knowledge anterior to Chris-

tianity the notions of our reason. So that, in strictness, the bare faculty of reason is not now, and never has been, employed in examining revelation, but is employed with a knowledge already furnished from both nature and prior revelations. But this use of our prior knowledge is not by way of proof of the doctrines of revelation at this day, but merely by way of comprehending them; because every portion of our prior knowledge has lost its authority as revelation, from the fact, that the revealed cannot be distinguished from the natural, and therefore cannot be made a test in examining what is known to be revelation. Bacon also shows that reason is of use in inferring and deriving doctrine and direction from revelation, and that this consisteth indeed in probation and argument: but still, that this use of reason and argument is secondary, not original and absolute; for, that all our inferences and derivations must be made according to the analogy of the articles and principles of religion, or as the Apostle expresseth it, by "comparing spiritual things with spiritual;" and not as in nature, where principles themselves are ascertained by induction.

We do not, therefore, in revelation ascertain first-principles, such as love your neighbour as yourself, or the ten commandments, by induction in the wide domain of reason or philosophy, and then try the scriptures by these principles; nor do we look out into the domain of philosophy for still higher and more absolute truths, as the transcendental philosophers do, and deduce from them the great doctrines of revelation, according to certain fancies about *the unity of truth*. But we get all our knowledge of the truths of revelation from a sound interpretation of the scriptures. "For the obtaining the information (says Bacon) it resteth upon the true and sound interpretation of the scriptures, which are the fountains of the waters of life." Because the fundamental doctrines taught in revelation are the generalizations, if we may so speak, of a wider experience than that which lies within the province of philosophy. They embrace eternity, with all the facts in that boundless field of experience. It is only then by a mind which has swept over that vast field of vision, that the truths which belong to it can be generalised. A finite mind cannot do so; and of course it must receive such truths from the mind that can; or rather, must receive them from the mind whose manner of knowing is different from man's

manner of knowing—who knows intuitively, what man knows inductively; and to whom all truths are objects of intellectual perception. And this is the reason that induction has a secondary office in ascertaining the truths of revelation: they belong to a wider field of experience than that in which induction can be used.

The proper mode, then, of interpreting the scriptures, is not by making its doctrines square with our reason, which is nothing more than our philosophy, but by a sound interpretation of their language by the rules of grammar and logic; and by collecting all the passages on the same subject matter, and from the induction of the whole, draw the meaning of each; and not from the meaning of one which we may fancy to be a leading one, to infer the meaning of all the rest, thus violating the fundamental principles of induction, which in this secondary way holds good in investigations of this kind, as well as in nature. In some cases, however, where the meaning of a text is so obvious that no two opinions can be entertained about it, like what Bacon calls “glaring instances” in nature, where one single instance is so significant, that you can by it alone determine upon the nature of the whole class, you may use it as a key to the meaning of less obvious passages upon the same subject matter. In a word, we must make scripture the infallible rule of interpreting scripture; just as we make nature the infallible rule of interpreting nature. Neither must we interpret the scriptures altogether as we would a mere human writing. For though in most things they are like human writings, yet they differ in some essential particulars; as is well shown by the following remarks of Bacon. “But the two latter points known to God and unknown to men, touching the secrets of the heart and the successions of time, do make a just and sound difference between the manner of the exposition of the scriptures and all other books. For, it is an excellent observation which hath been made upon the answers of our Saviour Christ to many of the questions which were propounded to him, how that they are impertinent to the state of the question demanded: the reason whereof is, because not being like man, which knows man’s thoughts by his words, but knowing man’s thoughts immediately, he never answered their words, but their thoughts: much in the like manner it is with the scriptures, which being written to the thoughts of men, and to the succession of ages, with a foresight of

all heresies, contradiction, differing estates of the church, yea and particularly of the elect, are not to be interpreted only according to the latitude of the proper sense of the place, and respectively towards that present occasion whereupon the words were uttered, or in precise congruity or contexture with the words, before or after, or in contemplation of the principal scope of the place; but have in themselves not only totally or collectively, but distributively in clauses and words, infinite springs and streams of doctrine to water the church in every part. And therefore the literal sense is as it were the main stream or river; so the moral sense chiefly, and sometimes the allegorical or typical, are they whereof the church hath the most use: not that I wish men to be bold in allegories, or indulgent or light in allusions: but that I do so much condemn that interpretation of scripture which is only after the manner as men use to interpret a profane book." These sagacious remarks of Bacon need no comment. They point out with great precision, the difference to be observed in interpreting the scriptures and a mere human writing—a difference founded upon the omniscience of the Author of the scriptures.

It may perhaps be asked, whether philosophy is of no use at all, in the interpretation of the scriptures? as our remarks thus far, may appear to lead to the conclusion that it is not. We answer, yes! For it must be borne in mind, that the scriptures contain something besides revelation, that though they brought life and immortality to light, yet the greater part of them are rehearsals of historical facts and citations of natural phenomena, and remarks upon the nature of man, all of which lie within the province of philosophy. Of course then, all natural phenomena, whether physical or psychological, are to be explained by philosophy, with the limitation as to the psychological phenomena which will be explained hereafter; and not to be judged according to the words of scripture, as these convey the notions current amongst men at the time the scriptures were written, and not absolute truth, as do their teachings of revelation proper. The Papal Church, for instance, followed the letter of scripture, when it condemned Galileo. But this was a matter in which it ought to have followed the light of nature or philosophy. For the scriptures do not teach philosophy, but theology. They were intended to light up that dark abyss which lies beyond the present

state of existence—to bring life and immortality to light. This is the province of revelation, and over it philosophy throws no light. For much of what we now call philosophy, as we have already indicated, is in reality the light of revelation, which has become so mixed up with the light of nature in our knowledge, that we cannot separate them, and it has therefore lost all its authority as the light of revelation in interpreting the scriptures. Indeed, it is doubtful whether all the the the theological notions in the world are not fragments of revelations more or less corrupted, made in the early ages of human history. For it is certain that the theology of our first parents, was a direct revelation, and not inferences from the indications of nature. And this was also the case with our second great progenitor, Noah. And therefore it may be, that all the theology in the world, in all the varying forms of monotheism, polytheism, and pantheism, is derived more or less from these original divine revelations, but kept alive in these corrupt forms by the indications of nature, ever since they were revealed. And as the light of nature, with the assistance of all the fragments of divine revelations which had been handed down to them, was not sufficient to enable the wisest philosophers before the Christian dispensation, to form a correct idea of God; and as the light of nature has not been sufficient to prevent the idea of God from being entirely obliterated from the minds of some tribes of men in the south of Africa, who have for centuries been entirely removed from the influence of the amount, of revealed truth which is always acting through the general agencies of civilization, it may be doubted whether the light of nature in itself is sufficient to *originate* in the human mind the idea of God; though they are certainly sufficient to prove the existence of a God, after the idea of God is once in the mind,—is once grafted upon the notions of causation and contrivance developed in consciousness; and the mind is thereby enabled to perceive and generalise the analogies pertaining to the subjects which are presented in the psychological and physical world. And the Creator has certainly not left the human race to the teachings of the light of nature alone: but has made revelation even of his own existence, a part of his educational economy. It is true, that the Apostle to the gentiles has said:—"For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made,

even his eternal power and Godhead: so that they are without excuse." But this, we apprehend, does not controvert our view. Because the Apostle says this of men, who had the idea of God, as he well knew, given them by divine revelation, either immediately, or by remote means. And what the Apostle says further seems to confirm our view: "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened," &c. The words, "when they knew God," evidently refer to other knowledge than that derived from nature—from "the things that are made." All then, the Apostle appears to teach, was, that even the light of nature was sufficient to keep alive in the mind the idea of God, which had been communicated by divine revelation, if man had not apostatised, and thereby suffered his mind to be darkened. And a kindred thought is expressed in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen, were not made of things which do appear." The meaning here is, that it is by faith, by the teachings of revelation and not by the light of nature, that we know that all things are made by God, and not developed out of capabilities of nature by agencies which we can ascertain by the light of nature; as philosophy would seem to teach. So that there may be a doubt, whether all the evidences of natural theology are not seen by a light imparted at some stage of man's history, by direct revelation.

And this does not detract from the proper force of the evidence of natural theology. For though we might not be able to read the planetary system in the indications of the heavens, as Newton did, still after he has taught us, we can there see its evidences in all their force, and they are just as incontrovertible as if we had discovered them ourselves. So in regard to the evidences of natural theology, we might not be able to see these evidences in nature, without an instructor, but when once instructed, we may be able to see them in all their fulness. And it is no objection to the parallel, that we require a supernatural instructor in the one case and only a human instructor in the other. For we utterly repudiate the shallow sophism, that "nothing can be made intrinsically evident to reason, whose intrinsic truth transcends reason; or, what is the same thing, is not naturally knowable by reason." The intrin-

sic truth or internal reasonableness of many of the doctrines of revelation which are not naturally knowable by reason, is now evident to the mind enlightened by revelation. For example, the precept "love your enemies," and the other sublime instructions of the sermon on the mount, were not naturally knowable by reason : but we apprehend, their internal reasonableness or intrinsic truth, is clearly discovered by the Christian. Else, the doctrine of spiritual discernment taught in the scriptures is a cunningly devised fable. We admit there are some mysteries in revelation, as for instance, the trinity, whose internal reasonableness is inevident to the mind of man : but none of them contradict what is known. They are merely above our knowledge ; and therefore do not support the sophism which we repudiate. Therefore, though the evidences of natural theology may not be naturally discernable, yet they may be seen by the light of revelation shed abroad on the mind, increasing its spiritual discernment.

We see then how little the light of nature or philosophy has to do with theology or the teachings of revelation. Philosophy is nothing but the result of the observation and analysis of phenomena, either in the physical or psychological world : and our knowledge of the infinite and the absolute, or in other words, our general conceptions, are nothing but inductive inferences, and not the result, of direct cognition, as is our knowledge of particulars. Every conclusion therefore, which transcendeth the sphere of phenomena, is mere conjecture. What light then, does philosophy throw upon the doctrine of the trinity, or of the origin of sin, or the atonement, or even upon the immortality of the soul ? Where are the phenomena or analogies in nature, from which these great doctrines are to be inductively inferred ? They are without any but the very vaguest analogies in nature, and certainly without any prototype in existence. The little light which philosophy amongst the ancients seemed to throw even upon the immortality of the soul, was perhaps but the faded light of ancient revelation which had passed down commingled with the light of nature in human teachings. This truth has often forced itself upon us when reading the *Phaedon* of Plato. The rambling speculations, the flimsy hypothetical reasonings that prove nothing, the vulgar illusions, which neither explain nor enforce anything, but need to be explained themselves, all overwhelm us with the conviction, that the writer is

striving after something beyond the compass of the human faculties unaided by revelation. And even the analogies of nature which are often employed in illustrating the doctrines of revelation, and defending them from the cavils of infidels, are but a secondary knowledge. They have been seen by the light of revelation, and not by the light of nature. *They* do not lead to the truths of revelation, but the *light of revelation* leads to them, and enables us to see them as the foot-prints of the God of revelation upon the domain of nature. It is by a spiritual discernment, which the truths of revelation beget in the mind, that we perceive them; just as we have already shown, is the case with the evidences of natural theology.

We have said that all natural phenomena whether physical or psychological, are to be explained by philosophy, and not by the words of scripture. But it is important to observe, that there is a difference between physical and psychological truths in the certainty of which they can be made to bear upon the interpretation of scripture. There is generally more certainty in our knowledge of physical than of psychological truth. For instance, we know with absolute certainty, that the earth moves round the sun, and that the bread and wine in the eucharist are bread and wine; and of course, scripture must be interpreted accordingly; for God never contradicts in revelation, what he has said in nature; and it must be borne in mind that in physics all reasoning must end in submission to the senses. For the illusions of sense can only be corrected by evidence of the same sort, where one sense is brought to testify against another or the same sense against itself. And Revelation throws no light over physical truth, except as to the origin of the world, and the order of its creation, and perhaps also as to the time in which it was created, and also, that things were created mature, the vegetables bearing seed after their kinds, and the animals, young after their kinds; if these truths can properly be said to lie within the range of physics. And therefore physical truth must be seen exclusively by its own light, or the light of philosophy. But this is not the case with psychology. For over the moral branch of this subject, though lying within the province of philosophy, revelation throws much light. For even though it should be maintained that we are not enabled by the light of revelation to discover any psychological truth, which is not to some extent made known to us by the light of

nature, yet it must be admitted, that we are enabled by it, to see the great truths of the moral branch of psychology in much greater distinctness. For example; the great fundamental truth of our moral nature, that which constitutes the basis of the moral branch of psychology, *that the heart of man is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, and that man is born in sin*, is made much more manifest to our reason by the light of revelation, than it is by the light of nature. Our spiritual discernment is quickened and invigorated by the doctrines of revelation, through the agency of the Spirit of God; and we are thus enabled to discern much more clearly, the great truths which lie within the moral branch of psychology. The remark of the Apostle: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned," has much pertinence to the topics of which we are treating, but was spoken more particularly of the great truths of the plan of salvation through Jesus Christ, over which the light of nature throws no light whatever. Notwithstanding though, that the light of revelation illumines the truths of the moral branch of psychology, still after we have searched the scriptures about any doctrine relative to man, it is legitimate, with the light thus obtained to look into the nature of man or psychology, and to the intellectual branch as well as to the moral, for though it throws no light over the purely intellectual branch, yet it assumes the truths of that branch, to see whether we can derive from thence any evidence confirmatory of our interpretation, in the adaptation of the doctrine to the nature so discerned, or in the conformity of the doctrine to ascertained psychological laws. Indeed the adaptation of the doctrines of revelation to the nature of man in regenerating it, and satisfying its most earnest cravings, and its most perplexing doubts, is one of the strongest evidences of its divine character; because it evinces a knowledge of man, on the part of the teacher of such doctrines, far more accurate than any man can by possibility possess; for one of the most important of these doctrines, is *that man cannot possibly know, such doctrines*. In order to discover this adaptation, we must understand, both revelation and man: but in the enquiry, it ought to be constantly borne in mind, that revelation is the light, and man the subject to be illumined, and not the reason of man the light, and revelation the subject to be

illuminated. "For God doth graft his revelations and holy doctrine upon the notions of our reason, and applieth his inspirations to open our understanding as the form of the key to the ward of the lock." It is true however, that the truths of scripture do nevertheless appear more manifest after we have seen the excellence of their application to our natures, than before; and thus more completely satisfy our skepticism.

With these views then, we should never make revelation subordinate to philosophy. For of any of the proper truths of revelation, philosophy knows but little, and of many of them nothing at all. And this truth cannot be too much urged upon our attention. The neglect of it, has been the great source of heresy in every age of Christianity. And that it has lost none of its importance is made manifest by many publications of the present day, and by none more clearly than the recent work of Prof. Bush on the resurrection. The Professor has signally violated this fundamental principle of scriptural interpretation. He has made his argument from reason, or the light of nature, the first step in the investigation of the teachings of revelation on the subject of the resurrection; instead of first examining revelation and ascertaining its doctrines from its own teachings on a subject lying so emphatically within its province, and then examining nature, to see whether it said anything upon the subject. And as might be expected by any one acquainted with the fallacy of such a method of interpretation, we see in the whole investigation, a constant effort to bring the truths of revelation within the laws of nature, which if successful, would at once destroy the supernatural character of revelation and cast the inquirer down upon the broad platform of infidelity. In his very preface, he says "the resurrection is effected by the operation of natural laws." And he more than intimates, that the spiritual body is developed immediately after death by the magical agencies of Mesmerism; and declares that "the intimate connection between electrical phenomena and *light* goes undoubtedly to favour the idea that the spiritual body will be essentially luminous." And thus the great leviathan doctrine of the resurrection which had been swimming about in the boundless ocean of metaphysical conjecture, for a period long before the Sadducees disputed about it, and had escaped the angling of the most skillful philosopher, has been caught by Prof. Bush upon the cunning hook of reason, with almost

as much ease, as a boy catches a trout. But scriptural commentators should know that the line of philosophy cannot fathom the mysteries of revelation; nor its light illumine their darkness. Philosophy stands by the dying man, feels his pulse ebb and flow, sees the pallid hues gather over the brow, sees the fire of the eye bedimmed, and hears the last gasp of life; and all then is lost in shadow, clouds and darkness. True, philosophy may then cast a longing hope and a probable conjecture into a future state, which imagination can create. But is this sound philosophy? Is this such a light as can gild the dark clouds which hang over the future, with a bow of promise sufficiently bright to animate the hopes of the dying man? Let the dying infidel answer the question! For philosophy then, to tell us in what body the soul is to rise, when it does not tell us that it will rise at all, is to our minds, something like a double *petitio principii*.

And to show to what extravagant lengths Prof. Bush has been carried by his endeavour to make it appear that "the resurrection is effected by the operation of natural laws," he says that, the body of the resurrection is a *psychical*, and not a *spiritual* body. He does this for no other reason, as his whole argument shows, than, because the *psyche* according to the distinctions of ancient philosophy has more of affinity with the agencies of nature, than the *pneuma*, and is therefore more likely to constitute the body which is to be under the operation of natural laws according to his favourite theory. And yet the Apostle Paul says explicitly that the body of the resurrection is not to be a psychical body, but a spiritual body, "it is raised a spiritual body," (*soma pneumatikon*.) And stranger still! Prof. Bush has made this declaration of the Apostle, the motto to his book; and a great part of his argument assumes the doctrine. And yet when he comes to make an explicit statement of his doctrine, he reverses the declaration of the Apostle, in order to carry out his favourite theory, "that the resurrection is to be effected by the operation of natural laws." Such are the straits into which an incautious speculator is placed by a false logic.

This *a priori* mode of interpreting scripture.—of forcing one's philosophy upon its teachings,—has been the great source of theological error in all ages of Christianity. At the present day, we need but look to New-England theology, where the attempt to bring down the mysteries of

revelation, to the principles of reason, at first reduced Christianity to Unitarianism, and has now completely frozen all light out of it, that as a retreat from open infidelity this theology has ascended the high walks of the transcendental philosophy, to see whether it cannot descry in its reveries something to bridge over the yawning chasm which separates the mystery of revelation from the teachings of philosophy. And in all countries where the a priori philosophy prevails, at the present day, especially in Germany, it is corrupting revelation by subordinating its teachings more or less to its transcendental conceptions, upon the ground that Christianity is a system of accommodation undergoing a gradual development through the agency of philosophy. And Cousin the French philosopher openly takes the ground, in his Introduction to the history of philosophy, that revelation is to be developed and perfected by philosophy. We do not wonder at this in a professed philosopher. But even he is often driven by his reasonings from this principle, into such infidel positions, that in order to prevent his reader, from considering him an infidel, he frequently amidst the difficulties of reconciling his religion with his philosophy, exclaims in his very loudest accents, that he is a *Christian* philosopher. We can smile at the philosopher who thus rolls his stone to the top of the hill, and is then carried down by its weight back again to the bottom. But very different are our feelings, towards those rational theologians who with lusty, though unavailing efforts are striving to clamber up the lofty, but cloud-capped summits of the transcendental philosophy, to see whether they cannot descry from the lofty peaks, by the light of reason, the objects of that distant region, where only the light of revelation penetrates, while the higher they ascend the thicker is the darkness; and who at last become so habituated to the darkness, that they mistake the figments of their own imaginations for the objects of that distant region. And we know that some, who are so firmly convinced by its external evidences, that Christianity is a divine revelation, as to be unable to throw off the belief, after becoming captivated by the eclectic philosophy of Cousin, and following it with enthusiasm, in its vain endeavours to subordinate Christianity to philosophy, have at last become so well aware of its infidel tendencies, that in a moment of despondency, they have precipitated themselves down into the broad abyss of Roman Catholic credulity,

exclaiming as they fall "that nothing can be made intrinsically evident to reason, whose intrinsic truth transcends reason, or, what is the same thing, is not naturally knowable by reason"! and maddened by this sophism, strive to believe, that bread and wine are flesh and blood, as taught by the infallible church, which sees not with its eyes, but with an inward grace.

In the earliest ages of Christianity also, the various sects of philosophers of that day, the Judaizing sects who maintained a sensuous philosophy of the lowest grade, as well as those sects who maintained a speculative idealistic system, resting upon an a priori foundation, perverted Christianity, by making its doctrines conform to their respective preconceived philosophical notions. These interpreters set out with these notions, and searching through the scriptures for something to support them, seized upon individual passages, and dis severing them from their historical and logical context, made them mean what suited their preconceived notions, because the words taken by themselves were capable of such signification. They could not bring themselves to limit their speculations by the definite facts of revelation. The Platonists, for instance, instead of conceiving God, as the scriptures represent him, as a personal God who created all things from nothing, and who upholds and controls all things, and has a care for every individual as well as the whole, brought into Christianity the God of their speculative conceptions, their *ὄν*, from whence all existence eternally flows by a necessity, under the guidance of the reason. That Judaizing sect, the Ebionites, also brought their carnal Jewish notions into the interpretation of scripture; and made the whole Christian scheme conform to them. They considered the Messiah, according to the Jewish representation of him, as a man who had been chosen Messiah by a decree of God's council, and furnished with the requisite divine powers, for the accomplishment of his office. And though this sect maintained a sensuous philosophy of the lowest grade, and not a speculative one, yet they made an a priori application of it to the interpretation of scripture; and thus perverted scripture in the same way that the idealistic philosophers did.

But the most extravagant example of perverting scripture by forcing upon it the speculative opinions of a spurious a priori philosophy, is that of the Gnostics. These specu-

lators gave themselves up, in the interpretation of scripture, to the most unbridled license, despising the letter, idealising every thing, and striving to look by the light of reason beyond scripture and the natural world, and dive into the mysteries of those things which lie beyond the ken of man, and properly belong to the things which rest upon that faith which reposes upon the authority of God. This gnosticism, not even content with the wide range of Platonic speculation, gave itself up to still wilder fancies. They introduced the notions of the oriental theosophy into the interpretation of Christianity, and made a theosophical Christianity. They found in Christianity what they thought resemblances to their theosophical doctrines, and seizing upon these resemblances, they forced them according to their spurious method of interpretation, into full harmony with their preconceived notions. And thus while they thought they were interpreting scripture, for they were firm believers in Christianity, they were in reality developing their own theosophical notions. Christianity did not soar enough into supernatural regions for them. It dwelt too much among men—was too practical. They wished to prove all things—to comprehend the incomprehensible. “The inquiries which chiefly occupied them,” says Neander, “were these: How is the transition from infinite to finite? How can man imagine to himself the beginning of creation? How can he think of God as the original projector of a material world, so foreign to his own nature? Whence come those wide differences of nature among men, from the man of truly goodly disposition, down to those who appear to be given up entirely to blind desire, in whom no trace of the rational and the moral creature can be found?”

“Now it was exactly here,” continues Neander, “that Christianity made religious faith independent of speculation, and cut off at once all that would lead to those speculative cosmogonies by which the element of pure religious faith was only troubled, and the confusion between the ideas of God and nature furthered, inasmuch as it (Christianity) directed the eye of the spirit beyond the whole extent of the visible world, where in the chain of cause and effect, one thing is constantly unfolding itself out of another, to an almighty work of creation performed by God, by which worlds were produced, and in virtue of which the visible did not spring out of that which appears, Heb. xi. 3.

Creation is received here as an incomprehensible fact under the constraint of a faith that raises itself above the position occupied by the understanding, which wished constantly to deduce one thing from another, and to explain every thing, while it denies everything that is immediate. Gnosis would not acknowledge any such limits to speculation; she wished to explain and represent to the mind how God is the fountain and the source of all existence." And the Gnostics, in their attempts to explain these problems, built up the most fanciful system imaginable; because their speculations were not limited by facts either in nature or revelation: but in the licentious spirit of an a priori philosophy, they roamed at large over the boundless regions of fancy, and filled Christianity with the doctrinal phantasmagora of their theosophy.

But Platonism holds the most prominent place of any philosophy in the history of Christian theology. For it has been from the first ages of Christianity, and is even now, proclaimed as the philosophy peculiarly akin to Christianity. And some have declared, and do still declare, that Platonism was a forerunner of Christianity; and some going still further, maintain that Jesus was inspired in no other sense than Plato was. Now all this we conceive to be most pernicious error—from the first proposition that Platonism is akin to Christianity, to the legitimate deduction from it, that Jesus was inspired in no other sense than Plato was. The Platonic philosophy with its a priori method, and its transcendental conceptions, never did, and never can exercise wholesome influence upon Christian doctrine. It dwells too much on empyrean heights, ever to affiliate with Christianity in its humble walk in the strait and narrow way of life. It claims to have a mystic ladder, by which it can ascend to the region of absolute truth, and have a clear intellectual perception of the real essence of things—to have in fact, as great an abundance of revelations, as the apostle Paul had, when he was caught up to the third heaven. It professes to have a knowledge which transcends the bounds of those truths which are received from external impressions and internal suggestions—in fact, to know after God's manner of knowing. It thus, like every other a priori philosophy, poisons knowledge at its very source, by teaching that general truths are objects of direct cognition, and that particulars are known by reasoning from these general truths. With these high assump-

tions, Platonism has made, and cannot but make Christianity a system of doctrine to be tested and explained by its own principles, and to be moulded in accordance with its own knowledge of absolute truth. When carried to its ultimate deductions, it cannot but maintain that Jesus was inspired in no other sense than Plato was: because Plato knew absolute truth by direct cognition—"by employing the naked thought (says he) alone, without any mixture, and so endeavouring to trace the pure and general essence of things without the ministry of the eyes or ears; the soul being, if I may so speak, entirely disengaged from the whole mass of the body, which only encumbers the soul and cramps it in the quest of wisdom and truth, as often as it is admitted to any the least correspondence with it." According to this doctrine, the reason of Plato was equal to the inspiration of Christ. What then is to be done with the declaration of the Apostle:—"For other foundations can no man lay than is laid, which is Jesus Christ?"

It is true, that at an early period of Christianity, Christian doctrine took a wider range and more discursive flights in the theology of the Platonic schools of Alexandria, than in that of the cotemporary schools, where different modes of thought prevailed; and in looking back over that period of history, we are apt to be captivated by the false show of Alexandrian theology. But we apprehend, that it is at least doubtful, whether the impulse which proceeded from the Alexandrian schools had a tendency to advance sound scriptural interpretation, and pure Christian doctrine. For no fact in church history is more certain, than that the fathers of the first centuries perverted Christian doctrine by calling into their aid the Platonic philosophy in the interpretation of scripture. And that many of them believed and endeavoured to make others believe, that most if not all the mysteries of their religion had been set forth in the writings of Plato. Chrysostom declaimed against these efforts; and the unsophisticated Tertullian declared that the seeds of heresies were scattered in Plato's doctrine of ideas. And it was Platonism culled from the writings of the fathers, that furnished the schoolmen with the extravagance of the matter of their theology, as the logic of Aristotle did the subtilty of its form. So that at every period of the progress of Christianity, Platonism has been one of the chief sources of its corruption.

And it is manifest that the great Apostle to the gentiles,

who was so eminently qualified for his high mission, by his gentile as well as Hebrew learning, did not think that the Platonic philosophy was in any way kindred to Christianity. For in his first epistle to the Corinthians, he denounces the Greek philosophy as foolishness, and takes great pains to place Christianity in open hostility to it. And throughout this whole epistle, he never once attempts to elucidate any doctrine of Christianity by the teachings of the Greek philosophy, though the epistle was addressed to Greeks. And yet, it is one of the most striking features of the mode of instruction used by Christ and his Apostles to graft their doctrines upon those notions of their hearers which have any affinity whatever, with the doctrines which they taught. This we see strikingly exemplified by the Apostle Paul when he was writing to his own countrymen the Jews, in the epistle to the Hebrews. In the very opening of the epistle he shows that Christianity is the continuation of the system of instruction, which God had employed towards their fathers, by the prophets. And in the eleventh chapter, he shows at great length, and with deep earnestness, that faith was the vital principle of religion under the old dispensation as well as under the new: thus showing that the great central doctrine of Christianity, "*the just shall live by faith*", was also the central doctrine of the religion of their fathers. But never once in all his epistles to the Gentiles, though we find him saying that *certain of their poets* had said what he was then teaching, do we find him saying that Greek philosophy, whether Platonism or any other form of it, taught similar doctrines with those of Christianity. But on the contrary, his whole drift is to show that this philosophy was antagonist to Christianity. And indeed, we do not recollect any instance in all his writings where the Apostle ever attempts to liken the great doctrines of revelation to any thing in the natural world—to any doctrine of philosophy—except when he speaks, in the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians, of the resurrection of the dead. But even there, he does not attempt to *prove* the doctrine of the resurrection, by analogies from nature which he adduces; but merely to illustrate what he taught. For the analogies, are not philosophical analogies from which an inductive inference can be drawn as to the truth of the great doctrine discussed, but merely rhetorical analogies illustrative of his meaning. And it is contrary to the fundamental idea proclaimed in Christianity, to prove

its doctrines by the light of nature—to search in the analogies of nature for a key to its mysteries. For as the doctrines taught do not lie within the range of experience—within the province of nature—the mode of proof was by *miracle*; thereby bringing supernatural things, though not within the province of nature, yet within that of experience; by making, for instance, the supernatural fact of the resurrection a fact in experience, by the resurrection of Christ. And when Paul stood upon Mars Hill, which overlooks the proud city of Athens, prouder perhaps of her philosophy, than any thing else, he did not enlogize that philosophy, and say that it was kindred to the great doctrines which he taught, and thereby gain a favourable hearing; but proclaimed that he had come to declare unto them the God whom they *ignorantly* worshipped. How differently does the Apostle act from the fathers of the first centuries of the Christian church, who were continually endeavouring to show that Platonism contained almost all Christian doctrine.

With these facts forcing themselves upon any but the most superficial student of the scriptures, how can it be pretended, that Platonism has any affinity with Christianity. For the Apostle does not except Platonism from his censures of the Greek philosophy; as he undoubtedly would have done, if he had not intended to include it in his denunciations. And it will not be pretended that the Apostle was not acquainted with the Platonic philosophy; when he was familiar with all Greek literature.

We have now, we submit, shown that Platonism, with every form of the a priori philosophy, is utterly at war in its very fundamental conceptions, in its whole view of the capacity of the human mind, with the genius of Christianity as a revelation from God lying beyond the province of reason, and to be found only in his word contained in the Holy Scriptures. For every system of a priori philosophy when carried out to its legitimate deductions, must like Platonism, virtually supersede revelation, in its assumption that man by virtue of his natural union with the Divinity, is able to apprehend intuitively all the spiritual truths which concern him; and thus confounding all distinction between the natural and supernatural orders of things—between philosophy and revelation.

We now propose to show, that there is a philosophy which is consistent both in its method of investigation, and

its principles with Christianity—a philosophy, which, humbling itself before Christianity, acknowledges it to be a revelation of a knowledge that lies beyond and above its province. This is the Inductive or Baconian philosophy.

That there is a philosophy, or rather psychology, which accords with Christianity—is assumed in it—is very obvious. We say *psychology*, because we have heretofore shown that revelation throws no light upon physics—teaches nothing in regard to them—but is confined to the spiritual part of nature—the nature and destiny of man, which lies properly within the province of psychology. There is, therefore, a psychology which is in accordance with Christianity, and which is assumed in it, because there must be a correspondence between man and revelation. Man must be such as revelation represents him to be—else revelation is false. And revelation must be adapted to man—must assume a correct view of his nature. The laws of his mind, must be such as revelation assumes. If his mind were like that of the beasts of the field, for example, revelation would be altogether unfitted to it. Because, such is the constitution of the mind (if we may use the word in such an application) of a beast, that moral truth cannot operate upon it. There are no notions in his mind, no perceptions in his instincts, upon which the doctrines of revelation can be grafted, and the inspirations of God applied as the ward of the key to the form of the lock, to open his understanding so as to comprehend them. The process of enlightenment and regeneration set forth in the scriptures would be unfitted to such a nature; because they could not operate upon it—its very laws forbid it. For how could moral truth, which is the great and only instrument by which the Spirit of God operates upon the mind of man in bringing it from a state of sin to one of holiness, operate upon the mind of a beast which has no moral perceptions? There would have to be a *new creation*—the beast would have to be changed, or rather created into a man—would have to be endowed with all the capabilities of an intellectual, moral being—before the doctrines of revelation could operate upon it. But such is the nature of man that the doctrines of revelation can operate upon his mind; because it is founded upon a correct view of the laws of his mental constitution—it assumes a correct theory of his mind. The theory of mind is a legitimate object of philosophical inquiry—is a branch of philosophy which we call

psychology. There must be then, according to this analysis, a theory of mind, a psychology, assumed in Christianity; and this theory of mind, whether it be possible to ascertain it or not, is just as true as Christianity itself, which assumes its truth as its own foundation as a scheme of salvation for man.

It is therefore legitimate, in the interpretation of scripture, as we have before shown when we had this topic in hand in another part of this article, after we have carefully examined the doctrines of revelation, to search in psychology to see whether we can find any thing there confirmatory of our conclusions, or any thing which clearly forbids them. But it cannot be too constantly and too carefully borne in mind, that we must not force our psychology upon scripture. For there is much danger of doing it, even when we make the psychological inquiry the last in the process of interpretation; but not the hundredth part as much, as when we carry our preconceived psychological notions into the inquiry according to the a priori method; thus making the psychological inquiry the first in the process of interpretation. For let it not be supposed, that we imagine that any one would in the interpretation of scripture, first look into psychology and then into scripture; for all that we mean, by making the psychological inquiry the first in the order of the investigation, is, that they will carry their preconceived psychological notions into the interpretation; which is the same thing in effect, as first examining into psychology for the doctrine to be found in scripture. For so clearly is it contrary to all sound canons of interpretation to force our preconceived notions upon scripture, that we cannot even take the abstract meaning of a word and force it upon that word in a passage contrary to the import of the context; as is strikingly exemplified in 1st. Cor. iv. 3, where the word *ἡμέρα* (day) is used in the metonymical sense of judgment, contrary to its universal signification.

What then is the psychology, or theory of mind assumed in Christianity? We have heretofore, in the article (October No., 1843) before referred to, shown that it is the theory, that all our knowledge is founded upon experience; and is acquired through the light of nature, or the light of revelation. This is the psychology with all its doctrines developed in that article, which is assumed in Christianity. We refer to our reasoning in that article for the truth of the doctrine. We have there shown, that the theory of mind,

that all our knowledge is founded on experience, is true according to the light of nature or psychological phenomena, and we have also there shown, that it is assumed in Christianity as a scheme of instruction. When, therefore, there are more than one view of the genius and cardinal doctrines of Christianity, derived from different interpretations of scripture, it will be legitimate according to the principle developed in this article, to enquire which view accords best with the established principles of psychology. And we think, that it will appear in the sequel, that the evangelical theology will accord best with these principles.

According to the theory of mind which we maintain as the true one, revelation teaches a knowledge which nature does not : and all our knowledge is derived from one or the other of these two sources. If this be so, then of course we must look to the scriptures which are the records of that revelation for the doctrines which it teaches ; just as we look to nature for philosophy. And it is manifest that such perversion of scripture could never result from this method of interpretation, as from the a priori method which we have shown to have been so great a source of error. Because this method of interpretation is limited in all its speculations by the definite facts of revelation, and does not pretend to see beyond. And this inductive method of interpretation corresponds with the nature of Christianity. For Christianity is given to us not in the form of a system demonstrated in all its parts ; but it is presented in facts and doctrines which are to be generalized, and the unity of its doctrines to be ascertained and developed by an examination of all their various representations and applications set forth in the scriptures. This constitutes the glory of Christianity. This makes it that practical, popular system adapted to the wants of every grade of intelligence, just as the light of nature, or rather its phenomena, are adapted to every grade of intelligence, from the peasant to the philosopher, from the child to the man. If Christianity had been promulgated as a dogmatic system developed in all its logical concatenations, the ignorant could never have profited by its teachings, except through the instructions of the learned. And it would have been an esoteric, priestly system, known only to a priesthood whose divine right it would have been to monopolise the oracles of God ; and thus to hold the keys of heaven. But it is presented in such a form that every man can appropriate it to himself

in his own way—can understand its doctrines set forth in a practical mode, in so many various applications to the conduct of individuals of every grade and character, and condition. Its very form teaches the great Protestant doctrine of private judgment.

For the first time then in the history of man, the esoteric and the exoteric are united and harmonised. The philosopher and the multitude have the same religious doctrines. Faith and knowledge have become reconciled—knowledge has confessed its ignorance, and admitted it must build upon faith as its only sure foundation in theology as well as in philosophy. The Greek has renounced his wisdom, and espoused the foolishness of the Jew. And thus is realised, what appeared to the ancients an impossibility, a religion that unites all men with one another: “A man must be very weak,” says Celsus, “to imagine that Greeks and barbarians in Asia, Europe and Lybia, can ever unite under one religion.”

How distinctly at every step in the foregoing analysis do we see that the psychological doctrines which are developed in the inductive philosophy, are those which harmonise with the nature of Christianity, as a mode of instruction to mankind. It is seen that Christianity makes faith occupy a position higher than reasoning. That reasoning must set out from faith, just as in nature we must set out from simple belief. And the facts which are the legitimate objects of faith must be ascertained, by induction employed in the secondary way we have before mentioned, in the examination of scripture under the guide of the rules of grammatical and logical interpretation. Neander, in speaking of Apelles, an oriental theosophist, who embraced Christianity, says: “Apelles, finding no satisfactory conclusion in his speculations upon the incomprehensible, took refuge in the faith which obeys an inward necessity without being able to solve every difficulty to itself (difficulties which in his case met him even in that which he could not choose but to recognise), he could do no other, he said; he felt himself obliged *to believe* in one eternal God, as the original cause of all existence, but he could not scientifically prove how all existence was necessarily to be traced back to the one original principle. The church-teacher, Rhodon, to whom he made these communications in confidence, laughed at him as one who pretended to be a teacher, but only *believed* what he taught;

and *acknowledged* that he could not prove it; but one is inclined to ask, whether the laughter in this case was wiser than the man whom he laughed at, and whether Rhodon himself, in the strict sense of the word, could prove that which Apelles avowed that he only believed. What Neander says of Apelles, "he took refuge in the faith which obeys an inward necessity, without being able to solve every difficulty," is the true psychological doctrine developed by Reid, as is shown in the article before referred to. Here then is shown the doctrinal identity of the true psychological doctrine that we believe by an inward necessity independent of ratiocination, and the psychology which is assumed in Christianity. And thus is shown that the faith of Christianity is adapted to the nature of man—is in conformity to the laws of his mind.

But as faith is the great central doctrine of Christianity, we will develop its psychological foundation still further. It is a psychological fact, that the knowledge of every philosophical truth increases the ability of the mind to apprehend still more recondite truths. The more of philosophy we learn, the greater is our ability to learn other truths; and the knowledge of truth invigorates the mind—quickens and enlightens the mental eye: gives it a wider view and a deeper penetration. And it is another psychological fact, that there is an intimate connection between the feelings and the intellect—that it is a law of our own mental constitution, that every emotion is allied to some object of perception, or memory or imagination, and is dependent upon it as its antecedent or cause; and the emotion can never be excited in the mind except by its appropriate object being in the view of the mind; and can never cease to exist in the mind until the object is forgotten or removed from its view. We see then, how it is that philosophical truth operates upon the moral and aesthetical part of our natures, quickening and improving both the sensibility to the moral and beautiful. We will now show that we have here developed the psychological foundation of religious faith; and that the doctrine that we are saved by faith, is one adapted to the nature of man.

Through faith we are saved; and that not of ourselves. As it is the truth which is the proper object of faith; it is the truth which, by the agency of the Spirit of God, operates upon man, enlightening his mind, and quickening and purifying his moral sensibility, according to the psy-

chological laws above indicated, by which truth operates upon our moral and aesthetical nature. The truth is given to us by God, and by an inward necessity, we believe, when it is discerned by us. True faith is accompanied with a spiritual communion between the heart and the doctrine believed, according to the psychological law of the connection between the feelings and the intellect; and hence there is generated in the heart a condition kindred to the truth believed. The truth enters into the spiritual life, and becomes its forming and fashioning principle, by which the whole inward man is changed according to the psychological law, into conformity with it. By true faith we enter into communion with divine things; and this is different from that faith which rests merely upon authority, and clings only to outward things. This last is not a belief in the truth by its own impression upon the mind, but a belief in the authority; and is therefore a mere logical inference that the doctrine to which the authority is given is true. It is not a perception of the truth by its own light. It is not spiritual discernment—a perception of the truth accompanied by its correspondent holy emotion. Believing the miracles of the gospel is nothing in itself, the devils believe and tremble—but the belief of its truths is every thing.

We see then, that according to psychological laws, it is through faith, having truth for its object, that we are changed from wickedness to holiness—that the love of sin is turned into the love of holiness; and it is the truth by the agency of the Spirit of God, which changes us, and not we of ourselves. Faith works by love; because the truth which produces faith, converts our hatred of holy things into the love of them; and love becomes the condition of faith—the impulse of the soul generated or quickened into life by faith, is love; and of course the heart then works by love. And thus is shown, according to psychological laws, the nature of the doctrine that faith works by love.

We see, then, by this analysis, how the evangelical view of Christianity, which makes faith and truth the great paramount matters in the scheme of redemption, is explained and supported by those psychological laws which have been established by a rigid induction of phenomena, and this is strong confirmation, that this is the correct view of Christianity.

ART. III.—*Theopnusty*. By S. R. L. Gaussen, Professor of Theology at Geneva. New York: John S. Taylor.

THOUGH God is not the father of truth, it being as eternal and necessary as Himself, still His mouth is the only oracle, and His mind is its perfect guage. Pretended truth, not gotten in some way from Him, is no truth; but gotten in any way from Him, it stands good, past all possibility of mistake or wrong, and is imperative at once upon His creatures. The opinions, therefore, that divide mankind, all defer to the question, what would God have us believe? and conflict between them, however wide the interest it involves, and however keen the interest it excites, has no colour of excuse for lasting beyond the time when it shall have been shown, either that no truth has come from God on the subject in dispute, or precisely what truth has come from Him. So that the grand end in studying any question is, to bring the mind of God, whether by reason, which is His voice, or by nature, which is His work, or by the Bible, which is His word, in contact with our own minds.

By whichever of the three, however, this contact may be formed, it is of prime importance to settle the office of reason, for it has work to do, no matter how God may open Himself to man.

This work has been obscured and thrown into doubt by a favourite mutiny of reason—a desertion of its proper office and a usurpation of another. Its proper office is to stand and weigh evidence for the truth, and to give sanction to faith as soon as that evidence reaches a sufficient height. Its mutiny has been in insisting that it shall see through a truth as well as see its evidence, in intruding its own power to understand into the list of necessary proofs, and so in refusing to believe what it cannot comprehend. Or, a little differently, for error has never only a single phase, it is a withholding of belief from every thing that reason cannot argue out from common principles. How grossly it is bred of prejudice may be seen in the fact that it is not for a moment tolerated any where else than in religion. Natural science does not wait to record her acquisitions till she has robbed them of all mystery. Reason does not comprehend the union of soul and body; yet believes it. Reason cannot argue out the attraction of the earth and sun from any principle not gathered from the fact itself. Indeed the only principle that seems to touch the

case, "nothing can act where it is not," seems all against it; yet reason submissively believes. Let it get within the circle of religious truth however, and its tone changes. Men's feelings, then, are with it in its errors. We like it to doubt and cavil. The trinity we do not believe, and the incarnation we do not believe, and miracles we do not believe, because reason, not acting as she always does, but instructed by our prejudices, revolts at the method by which they are reached and at the mystery in which they are wrapped. This error of the mind has gotten the name of Rationalism.

Winning a pretext from it, but still for an interested end, i. e., to shield false doctrine from the scrutiny of reason another school of religionists have passed over to the opposite extreme, and held, that in all questions of faith, reason must be silent, for that "where faith begins reason ends."

This is no escape from Rationalism, except as from one folly into a worse. The curse of Rationalism lies not in the use of reason in religion, nor even in the too great use of reason, a thing impossible, as much so as for an eye to gaze at a distant object too keenly to see it, or for a judge to look into a cause too closely to decide it. It lies in a total misdirection of reason. The man who denies the force of gravity, because he cannot understand it, is not bowing to reason, but making reason bow to prejudice. Let him reason farther, and his faith will return to him. So of the Rationalist. He does not reason enough, or else not well enough; for in admitting evidence for mysteries he would stand on a far higher level even of intellect, than in suffering his faith to go no farther than his sight. Indeed his principle carried out would strip us of all knowledge; for where is the truth that does not trace its root deeper than our eye can follow it? Simply then because what is Rationalistic is not rational, does it brand it itself as error.

Let it be remembered that reason in common and popular discourse denotes that power by which we distinguish truth from falsehood and right from wrong,* or striking out the last words, inasmuch as wrong and right are but different modes of truth, that power by which we distinguish truth from falsehood. Now who dare say, that contact may be formed between the divine mind and ours, and truth pass from one into the other, without the use of

* Stewart's Philosophy, Vol. II. p. 10.

this power? Must we not “know of the doctrine whether it be of God?”* God’s being the oracle cannot discharge reason from being the judge; for let any one attempt to conceive, how thought of any kind could get into his soul without passing the tribunal of reason. It may be received superstitiously on the sole authority of the church, or reverently on the sole authority of God, but authority itself in either case offers itself as a reason. So that, to say nothing of our duty to “prove all things and hold fast that which is good,” there is a mental necessity upon us. Faith cannot be so implicit, or authority so supreme, as neither to give, or be, or seem a reason for itself. The fact is, credulity is never so servile as to cast from it all private judgment. It may degrade the judgment of reason, but cannot resign it; for dismiss reason from its office, and man has nothing more to do with truth, nor actively with God.

* Under no circumstances of divine communication does reason seem to have less to do than where truth is imprinted on the mind by direct inspiration. Then there seems to be nothing needed, but to listen,—“I will hear what God the Lord will speak.” Better reflection, however, will convince us that reason has an office here, much the same as in any other mode of learning. First of all it is cast upon us to judge whether God is speaking. All truth that enters the mind is not inspired truth. We must “try the spirits whether they are of God.”† Then close upon this follows another work, of telling the meaning of what he speaks. If the inspiration has been one of words alone as was probably the case with Balaam, then the prophet has the same labour with his hearers to decypher and explain. If it has been an imprinting of the thought itself, as it was perhaps with holier men than Balaam, still a sanctified reason must again come in to unfold and connect and apply the thought.

Inspiration, however, is rare. Only one mortal among millions has enjoyed it, and he for the benefit of the rest. To us truth out of the mind of God must come at second hand, through those few favoured men, and though God guides them in receiving it, and makes them infallible in delivering it to us, still we get it not in the shape it came to them. Poor forms of matter, when most refined, but a rough way of conveying thought, are the only media of communion between man and man, and therefore the only

* John vii. 17.

† John iv. 1.

way which inspired men have had to hand down their oracles to us.

Obscured, divided, and broken up as truth necessarily must be in descending from God's mind into no better vehicle than dull material signs, language as we call them, it may readily be imagined how greatly the labour of reason must be enhanced when it descends from the simple work of receiving an inspiration from the mind of God, to the less honourable but more complex work of interpreting it from out of the lips, or from under the pen of man. This last is our work. Thought which going forth from its infinite source, has poured itself into rude signs, we must gather back and identify and store away for our spiritual uses. Our creed, in this age of the world must be got by reading; and reading must necessarily task all the faculties of the mind. It implies at each step a judgment of evidence and of meaning; and what other power have we for this than the sanctified power of reason?

The doctrine that sways all private judgment to the authority of the church, and that would withdraw the written word from the people, would not, should we grant it, vitiate our conclusion. Some one must read. If not the people for themselves; then the Church for the people: and the minds that make up "the Church," no matter who they are, if we trust them to get for us the sense of scripture, must get it by interpretation, and by that only conceivable mode of right interpretation—the exercise of an enlightened and divinely directed reason in the work of judging.

This is no easy work. Preparation for it came by our earliest and longest studies; and though the Bible, now that education has furnished us with a knowledge of its grammatical signs, seems to give up its meaning to us with little trouble, yet how much it still withholds! The Bible still grows with all of us in size and riches by the careful sifting of its language. It admits and rewards all degrees of toil and exactness; and he must rest content to starve his faith with but half a revelation who does not put all his powers under task for interpretation. Those translations of the sacred text in which so many make it an act of piety to confide, at the very time when they would depose reason from any office in religion and even ridicule its claims, are the fruits of long years of closest and most various exercise of reason. The fact is, call reasoning Ration-

alism, and brand it as an evil, and the Bible is at once shut up and sealed. Make trust in the mind's decision heresy, and you shut up the only faith to trust in God; you have set your name to the most thorough skepticism. That corrupt reason breeds error infallibly, calls not that it be renounced, but that it be renewed; not at all that we seek some other avenue to truth; there is no other; but that we call down the Spirit to open and widen and straighten that which God Himself has appointed.

These remarks will bring the mind of the reader to the right point for introducing the principle above alluded to.

The mere recognition of grammatical signs, is not the whole of reading. Were language an exact picture of thought, then the will of God would suffer nothing in clearness and fulness from being committed to such a medium, but could be gathered by an act of mind as near to simple apprehension as the act by which ancient prophets saw what "the spirit within them did signify." Absolute precision, however, is no attribute of language. Signs, whatever their mode are essentially ambiguous. The shades of thought are so much finer, and more endlessly varied than the modes of matter that one can never find a true impression in the other.

This is most true, of course, of the ruder signs—forms of motion, or, as we call them, gestures; a method of making matter the utterer of mind, the vagueness of which is extreme. If the principle we are about to notice, did not furnish us a key, it would be a mystery how men impart to them or see in them, so much significancy. Still, though in these lower modes the obscurity is greatest, we do not wholly get out of it in reaching the very highest level of artificial refinement, and in adopting signs most narrow in meaning and best defined. Language, though by far the most transparent medium of thought, of which we have any conception is thoroughly ambiguous. Not only so, but in a thousand cases, read as it stands, each word in its strictest definition, it is worse than ambiguous, false. It is the necessary habit of writers, trusting to a principle, distinct from mere grammar, for finding this sense, to compose sentences whose natural downright meaning, is palpably untrue. The Bible is full of such sentences. Nay, we know not that it would be going too far to say, that if nothing could come in as a basis of hermeneutics but bald definition, scarcely any part of scripture but would be so far ambiguous as to teach less truth than error.

Let some remarkable instances illustrate what is meant. The tenth commandment is, "Thou shalt not covet." Take these words as they stand in their simple sense, and they bring discord into the whole moral law. The mad faith of the Stoic might be built upon them, or any system absurd enough to forbid the exercise of one of man's inborn and necessary emotions; but true religion would contradict them at every point. Desire, (and the same word in the original has elsewhere this translation) the strongest desire is a Christian duty and a grace of the Holy Spirit. "Covet earnestly the best gifts." There can be no love of God without it. It is plain there must be some clue in the mind of the plain unlettered reader to a sense much narrower than the word self-interpreted would justify.

So with another of the decalogue: "Thou shalt not kill." Definition alone is not all that must interpret it. Appeal to nothing else, and you would have a precept that would meet well enough the conscience of a Brahmin, but would contradict the duty no less than the practice of every Christian.

"It repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him at His heart."* Shall we take this as it stands; just as our dictionaries would define it? Could there be better evidence that in reading, the mind is called to an office beyond mere telling the common force of words, and the current use of sentences; and must be furnished beforehand with some governing principle on the strength of which it may feel authorized to depart from that force and use? We have quoted marked instances to make the truth more prominent, but deeper examination of any written book would show it to be general; inasmuch as all language, in its strictness, either falls short of the shade of thought committed to it, or else wanders from it.

Revelation, then, is worth nothing to us without the aid of what we shall call, THE PRINCIPLE OF DESIGN. The humblest reader of the Bible uses it; if unwittingly, still, of course, and constantly.

As we have seen, the only end of the reader is, to bring himself in contact with the mind of the writer—to discover his will, or his intention in the language he has chosen. We assume the hypothesis, that that intention harmonizes in all its parts. Especially in reading the Bible, each leaf

* Gen. vi.: 6.

is turned with faith in the oneness of its Author's will. This harmonized will is his design.

Now what was it in respect to the passages just quoted, that convinced us they would not bear the strict meaning of their own words? Plainly, previous knowledge, on our part, of what God would have us believe. The sense was at once swayed to its proper bearing, by the discord any other would occasion with the truth already in the mind. The manifest design changed and fixed the sense.

So it must in each step of interpretation. The words alone do not give the meaning to us, but the words corrected and modified by light from other quarters. Our former knowledge must digest our new acquisitions; just as the food of the body can be assimilated to it only by the warmth and strength of its previous nourishment.

To brand this as "philosophy and vain deceit," is idle. There is a deep and radical necessity in such a course. It is not a license; it is not a privilege; it is the very life and soul of reading, in its simplest forms—that which each mind adapts at once, without choice or doubt. The Bible was never meant to work its ends without it. It would have been no more impossible for Galileo to read the sentence, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon,"* in its directed sense, or, *ex animo*, to recant before it on the charge of vain philosophy, than for the least sophisticated reader to go counter to his own sense of design in reading the plainest scriptures.

That principle is much the same to which, in the legal profession, there is such constant appeal, and in neglect of which such endless injustice has been done: we mean intention, a principle not safely or even sanely lost sight of in any kind of writing; for, indeed, insanity could hardly bring together such strange and incoherent thoughts as any book would present without it. As examples, take Matt. vi. 16.; ii. 5.; ix. 3; x. 12. All figurative passages are more or less in point.

What would naked grammatical interpretation do for such sentences as these? "If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."† "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot

* Josh. x. 12.

† Luke xiv. 14.

sin, because because he is born of God.”* “Pray without ceasing.”† “It pleaseth God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.”‡ Let any reader ask himself what such sentences would be worth to him as forms of truth, if he were forbidden to task his already acquired store of kindred truth to render them intelligible. Let him go deeper, and by watching his own mind in all reading, and the poverty and waywardness of language in all writing, see if he can read at all, without shaping and limiting and enlarging the ideas that words offered to him. The line of the intended thought, and the line of simple definition often and widely diverge, but seldom strictly coincide.

The fact is, we have spoken of natural grammatical interpretation, but the idea is a mere figment. Language was never given for such self-limitation. The principle of design is essentially a part of grammar; for until it can be shown that without a miracle words can point with perfect singleness of indication to one shade of meaning, this principle must determine our choice between many shades. Call grammar that which gives the intention and rules of language, and we read grammatically only when we feel free to depart, as occasion asks it, from the common sense of words.

How on any other principle are we to give faith to the exact verbal contradictions of the Bible? “Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.”§ Compare also (Rom. iii. 28., and iv. 2.), “A man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” “If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory;” with (James ii. 21, 24), “Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac,” &c. “Ye see then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.” And yet these passages, in strict letter so opposite, are, in the intention of their writers, simply and beautifully consistent, a little previous knowledge brought to the reading of them being enough to bring the utmost logical harmony out of the utmost verbal discord.

Again, what clue but that of which we are speaking, can help to fix in their proper places the various means by which men are said to be saved, so as not to contradict the

* 1 John. iii. 9. † 1 Thess. v. 17. ‡ 1 Cor. i. 21. § Prov. xxvi. 45.

fact of one salvation. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we can be saved."* "If by any means I (Paul) might save some of them."† "In doing this, thou shalt save thyself."‡ "Baptism doth now save us,"§ &c. "We are saved by hope."§ "Receive the engrafted word which is able to save your souls."¶ It is cast upon the mind in each case to shape the meaning, that the unity of God's saving work may not be broken.

Our Lord's discourses are somewhat remarkable for the degree in which he takes for granted in those who listen to this prompt perception of design. "Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance."*** "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father,"†† &c. "Take no thought for your life,"‡‡ &c. "The maid is not dead,"§§ &c. He questions the people as to its possession. "What think ye of Christ? How doth David in spirit call Him Lord?" &c. He rebukes them for the want of it. "O ye of little faith; why reason ye among yourselves because ye have brought no bread?" "How is it that ye do not understand, that I spake not to you concerning bread?" &c.

His disciples, too, and other inspired writers, have left on record hundreds of such mistakes in which we see the mischief of losing sight of the principle of design, and by which therefore that principle is set in the clearest and most striking light. We beg the reader to notice, as we mention some of them, how uniformly the persons who make the mistake, fail to get hold of the design by carnal, external views of what the writer or speaker means—in one word, by a tendency to literalism—that wide and general form of literalism, which is the offspring of a mind devoted to externals.

From what source but this, came that interpretation of the scribes, which made all the Old Testament prophecies of the Messiah point to an earthly king, who, in a long personal reign should restore the kingdom to Jerusalem? "We trusted that it had been he, which should have redeemed Israel."§§

* Acts iv. 12.

† Romans ii. 14.

‡ 1 Tim. iv. 16.

§ 1 Peter iii. 21.

§ Rom. viii. 24.

¶ James i. 21.

*** Luke xv. 7.

†† Matt. x. 34.

‡‡ Matt. vi. 25.

§§ Matt. ix. 24.

§§ Luke xxiv. 21.

By taking narrower cases, they may be multiplied to almost any extent. "If thou knowest the gift of God, thou wouldst have asked (of me) living water. Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep," &c.* "I have meat to eat that ye know not of. Hath any man brought him ought to eat?"† It is wonderful how these mistakes, in every way so unique, cluster together in some chapters. "Whither I go ye cannot come. Will he kill himself? The truth shall make you free. We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man; how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free? Ye do that which ye have seen with your father. Abraham is our father. If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death. Now we know that thou hast a devil. Art thou greater than our father Abraham, which is dead; and the prophets? &c. Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad. Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Before Abraham was, I am. Then took they up stones,"‡ &c. Could there be more signal proof of the emptiness of mere words to minds unfurnished with the key to their design?

A similar train of misconceptions occur in John vi., in many points more interesting to us, because, notwithstanding Christ's repeated explanations,—“It is the Spirit that quickeneth the flesh profiteth nothing,”—the very same misconceptions are persevered in till the present day. The reader will mark that the error is still literalism—a refusal to see a figure, where the speaker meant one. “The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Lord, evermore give us this bread. I am the bread of life. The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven. Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph? &c. He that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am the living bread that came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. This is an hard saying, who can hear it. It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh

* John iv. 10, 11.

† John iv. 32, 33.

‡ John viii.

profiteth nothing ; the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life." The whole (and it should be read together, for many of the tokens of a spiritual meaning which Christ held out to render the mistake of his hearers inexcusable, are seen in the sentences we have omitted ;) may stand as a type of the many superstitious interpretations to which the words of Christ and his apostles are still subjected, helping carnal men to exalt the externals of the church at the expense of what is spiritual.

Let us be satisfied now, however, with this inference from other quotations. There is a partial knowledge of design which is an essential element of reading. Each sentence, as it stands by itself, presupposes in the mind of its reader light to define its meaning, which the bare language does not in all cases furnish.

Strong objection, we know, will at once array itself. The principle in question is open to the most dangerous abuse. Give up reliance on the self-defining power of language, and let each man's reason set its limit, and what unity or safety will be left in revelation? Where is the office of grammar, what is the end of words, where is the good of scripture, if nothing precise or definite is given to the mind?

The difficulty might be met by casting upon those who urge it, the responsibility of its solution. Our argument was from experience, supporting itself at each point on fact—the fact that men actually do, and that involuntarily, call in to their help in reading, more than mere definition of words. First explain away the fact, and then you have a right to the objection. Look into any commentary, or hear any plain Christian expound the scripture, and tell us why appeal is so often made to "what makes good sense," or "what would be consistent for the inspired man to say," or "what would meet his purpose." We stand on the safest of all grounds, fact and necessity.

Waiving this right however : does not the weight of the difficulty bear only upon the extravagant use of design. While the argument had in view the folly of trusting in mere grammar to the neglect of design ; does not the objection meet only the opposite extreme—trust to a knowledge of design to the neglect of grammar? The fact is in arguing this whole question men have falsified both sides of it by choosing either of two equally wrong positions. The so called philosophical method of interpretation and the

grammatical method have been held up as essentially distinct, and as able, either, as chosen, to stand alone. There never was a greater misconception. There never was a more sure result than the fastening of error on both antagonist parties. The philosophical method is well enough as the name of the extreme on that side, and the grammatical method of the extreme there ; but no amount of practical error can divorce them wholly. Each must include the elements of either, however wrongfully one may predominate. The true method moreover lies between them, and is true only in proportion as it blends both in harmony.

You say, this license as to design will destroy all certainty of language. But have we not seen (in case of the Jews) the license of language destroy all justness of design? There must be some accommodation between the two; and it lies in this: We have no right to depart from a common or possible usage of words. There is our limit on that side. Language is certain up to that degree of precision which its known usage gives it. If its usage could in the nature of things be single, as was said early in this paper, no consideration of design would be needed. But to meet its ambiguities and its shaded and varied meanings, direct and metonymical, exact and exaggerated, literal and figurative, something else is loudly called for; and the principle of design, if it but restrict itself to the limit of this variety, makes interpretation actually more sure and safe. One is a check upon the other. Language limits the design; this defines the language.

It is time, however, now to ask whence this previous acquaintance with design, is gathered; for it must be got legitimately, or we have no right to use it. What has been pronounced a real, necessary and instructive act of the mind in reading, must be only a perversion and a prejudice, unless it traces itself back to a foothold in the truth. The moment, too, it does trace itself back, it becomes available orally to defend, as it was mentally to discover the meaning of the passage, in the reading of which it has been enlisted, it becoming possible, as it does with all instructive acts of the mind, to dissect and set it down step by step in writing, and then to use it, as we wish to do hereafter, as a link in logical argument.

Now for that general acquaintance with design with which we come to the reading of a text in scripture, three

sources may be given. The list might be lengthened. Experience and testimony, might be added to it; indeed, any source of certain knowledge. 1. The intuitive truths of the mind. 2. Other scripture. 3. Deductions from other scripture.

1. As to the intuitive truths of the mind, no fear need be had of giving in to the idea that they sway the sense in reading, however cautious men ought to be in doing homage to the human mind by setting it as judge over revelation. For to intuitive truths everything must bow. It is on intuitive truth that all faith in a Bible, or even in God's being is pillared. The mind's intuition is the first and highest voice of God to man; so that it is but a light honour to put upon it to say that it helps men to honour God's design in sentences of scripture, when all scripture and all faith must in the nature of things acknowledge it as their last appeal.

If a text should appear in the Bible in letter commanding us to blaspheme God, the intuitive principle would just as promptly revolt against a literal meaning, and force the mind to recognise some other design, as it would revolt against the Deists' renunciation of a Bible altogether, or the Atheists denial of a God. So when a text does appear saying, that, "the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger,"* or that "God hardened Pharaoh's heart"† or, that "this cup is the New Testament in my blood,"‡ the same inward voice cries out against the blasphemous or absurd rendering in either sentence, and turns the mind in search after another. Some previous acquaintance with design, then, is had by intuition.

2. Much more is had by scripture previously read. A clear revelation on any page, the mind at once seizes as a standard for every other. These standards multiply and gather in the mind as we read on, that we cannot be reading long without forming something like a system in our minds, God's harmonized will as it has appeared to us, and this goes with us in after reading, a test, as it grows of all additions to itself.

3 This would be quite enough to meet the ambiguities of language, if they were its only imperfection. But language lacks in fulness, as well as in precision. The Bible reveals all truth that it is necessary for us to know, virtually, but

* Isaiah xiii. 9.

† Exodus x. 20.

‡ Luke xxii. 20.

not verbally. Thought is a plane; language touches its surface only at scattered points; and all the intermediate spaces, where it fails in contact, the mind must supply. The world itself could not contain the books that should be written if every shade of necessary truth were formally expressed in revelation. The lack of this is no evil, if the mind be set to the work for which God made it: by legitimate deduction to fill up the chasms of scripture. Revelation, in effect, includes all doctrines, that by sound reasoning are drawn from it; they were in the mind of God when He gave the parent truth from which they are deduced. The exact thought of revelation is but the frame work of our faith—the seeds of things intended for growth and increase in the soil of the mind.

If this be not so, why do men resort to homilies and expositions to fill out and enlarge upon the word? Let its letter be enough, if study can gain from it no additional instruction. It is unquestionably, a perfect rule of faith, but only so, when viewed in that office for which it was given, as a guide and basis of evidence to intelligent and reasoning minds. God meant it to bring into act every faculty of the soul, in weighing, discriminating, enlarging, balancing, in all intellectual exercise by which one truth sinks into another.

As illustration we quote again, “Thou shalt not kill.” It is not a little remarkable what varied action of the mind this little text requires.

First, other scripture occurs to narrow down its meaning. It cannot be God’s design to say, clear of all reserve,—“Thou shalt not kill,” or else he would not have enjoined animal sacrifices upon Abel, or have granted animal food to Noah. Nor, imagining human life to be alone referred to, could it yet be his design to say positively, “Thou shalt not kill;” for cases of sanctioned war* and the law of capital punishment† prove the contrary.

Then when direct scripture, has gone so far, fair deduction must go still farther. A thousand minor cases require settlement. When may life be sacrificed for great national ends? When, in the various instances that may occur, may one life go for the rescue of many? How far may life be jeopardized, and for what ends? We meet all such questions virtually by appeal to scripture, yet not to the letter of

* Joshua viii. 1.

† Genesis ix. 6.

scripture, but to the design ; and the task, to gather this, is thrown upon the judgment of the reader.

But now still another step : the command is one of the decalogue, and must have its wide and spiritual meaning ; for it has its place to fill in that moral law which is exceeding broad. Here opens an illimitable field on which the bare command, "Thou shalt do no murder," is but the starting point. All the language ever spoken cannot cover it, we mean specifically and in every minute application. The mind taking with it such examples of interpretation as that in Matt. v. 22, where Christ brings causeless anger under this commandment, must by just inference fill out the spiritual sense, letting this command like the rest of the ten grow wide and long before its eye till together they embody the whole of morals, engrossing in their comprehensiveness, that all engrossing law—the Law of Love.

Thus our view is finished of that system of ways and means, by which God's mind is opened to his creatures. Now the whole meets a beautiful analogy in nature. God's mind is the sun of the spiritual world. Man's mind is the eye, without which the light is wasted. It has no where else to impress itself. Man's reason is the judge to discriminate the shape and colour of what is seen and to divide between the light and the darkness ; misused, if it judge farther than its judgment lies, as much so as if an eye should labour to discern the centre instead of the surface of surrounding objects, or refuse to own them to be there unless it could see through them ; but totally abused, if it imagine that it has not some judgment on every truth that the mind receives, as certainly as sensation has on every shade or shape that the eye takes in. Language is the medium that conveys the light, dark in itself, bright only as the carrier of those transmitted rays. But where is the analogy for what we have claimed in design.

Philosophers tell us that if the diffusion of light depended solely upon the direct rays of the sun, every thing would be in darkness, that did not stand in those rays. The sun would have to shine immediately upon an object to render it visible at all, and even then we could see it only on its illuminated side. That light which is now poured over all nature, which penetrates the forest, which bathes the mountain, which goes down into the cavern, which visits us in our houses, awakening us before the sun and cheering us after its going down, all diffused light, would vanish. Day

and night would be alike anywhere but under direct solar power.

What principle is that, beyond direct illumination, that orders the system as it is? Reflection. One subject, when illuminated, lights up the rest. The air, the clouds, the earth throw back the rays and scatter them, and thus fill the spaces which otherwise they could not reach. A thousand objects that have never seen the sun borrow his light from those right under his beams.

The analogy could scarcely be more complete. Reflection does not create light. It only scatters it. It makes one illumination do the work of many; carrying the ray shed on one point, and diffusing it over a thousand others. Mark too, it not only extends, but corrects our vision. Objects, of which, without it, but one side would be revealed, and which hence, in many positions, would send us a distorted outline, horned or cusped, this would unfold in their true form and colouring, giving us the advantage in our judgment of their perspective and their shade.

But we hasten on from mere illustration to reach again a point of absorbing interest, which from the first has been kept anxiously in view. Is there not danger in this whole matter? Can any man be safe in the use of such a key to revelation.

We need not hesitate. Certainly there is the utmost danger. So long as the human mind is not only fallible, but prone to falsehood, how could we dream of safety in its judgments. Nay, give it up to itself, and we might be sure that it would judge wrong, nor gather one spiritual truth from the whole of revelation.*

But then, while this is sober fact, it is wild argument. Each step in thought that the unconverted mind takes is perilous; shall it take none? All uses of the mind in inquiry after God are fraught with danger; are they therefore false or vain uses? The fact is the objection lies as much against the whole of reading as against this part of it. Mind must be appealed too; if not for design, then for grammar itself. Who knows not how words are warped and changed under the pretence of strict philosophy; how the dearest articles of our faith are taken from us sentence by sentence, under the sanction of alleged usage? Germany, where the varieties of language have been most

* 1 Corinthians ii. 14.

deeply studied, is witness enough, that if danger must condemn, then all interpretation must be given up.

Even inspiration asks for mind, and therefore, argues danger. Those visions of Balaam, the sceptre rising out of Israel and the star out of Jacob, did not so write their truth on the heart of the seer that he could not pervert them. Is, therefore, the use or worth of inspiration nothing? Prove that man can deal with truth, without help from mind, or prove that apostate mind can walk in any path to truth, and be infallible, or else confess that danger alone proves nothing in the matter.

But let us not dismiss this fact. There is danger. The position which it cannot overthrow, it may favour and confirm. Set over against it another fact, for which we have appealed to consciousness and accumulated proof, that no man can read a sentence without the help of preconceived notions of design, be they true or false, and we have, first of all, the explanation of a noted problem in religion. How is so brief a book as the Bible made to speak so many languages, in becoming the basis as it has of so manifold, nay and opposite systems of belief? The truth is notorious that all forms of obliquity in faith or morals profess their own warrant in this single volume, a truth pointing plainly on the one hand to the slenderness of the self-limiting power of language, and on the other, to the potency of that mental instinct, if we may call it so, which brings the preconceived ideas of the mind to mingle in the work of reading. A scrupulous man, possessed with a corresponding notion of God's design, opens the book only to find the spirit of his own bondage copied there. "Resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also"* "Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn thou not away."† - The Universalist strengthens himself there in his doctrine. "Who (God) will have all men to be saved," &c. "Who gave himself a ransom for all," &c.‡ "Not willing that any should perish," &c.§ So the Perfectionist: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; he cannot sin, because he is born of God."|| "Be ye, therefore, perfect as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."¶ And the Antinomian: "Now we are delivered

* Matt. v. 39.

† Matt. v. 42.

‡ 1 Tim. ii. 4, 6.

§ 2 Peter iii. 9.

|| 1 John iii. 9.

¶ Matt. v. 48.

from the law,"* &c. And lastly the superstitious man, pleading for all literal senses and exalting everything external. "This is my body, which is broken for you."† "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."‡

Now, it will not do to say, the very fault is, that these preconceived notions should be allowed any voice; so it is, if you refer to their error, but by no means, if you refer to the whole fact of preconception. It is necessary—they will enter; if not falsely coloured, they would be vital to the discovery of truth. If an eye be jaundiced, the way to provide against false judgments is to cure it, not to put it out. Then here; until you prove that you can digest fresh truth with no help from what has been taken into the mind before, that empty of everything but the mere machinery of words, you are fit for the work of reading—that thought asks nothing from former thought, but increases wisdom by accumulation and not by growth, you must rest contented in making safe and sure, what you cannot abandon.

Can it be made sure? Certainly: just as any other act of the mind. How can it be made sure? To the extent of speculative soundness, just as any other act of the mind may be made so—by a sound and wise preconception, resting on a sober previous study of the truth. It is the "unlearned and unstable that wrest the scriptures to their own destruction."§ To the extent of spiritual soundness, however, and a saving apprehension of the truth, and, indeed, we may say, to the point of entire safety, either speculatively or spiritually, it can be made sure only by the special guidance of the Holy Ghost. For "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God,"§ &c.

The analogy of faith, as framed in the mind of an unconverted man, is valuable in proportion as it is rationally well considered; but, since it can be only an intellectual system, it must fail to introduce him to any saving truth, and may shape itself in the grossest speculative error. What can make us sure? A sense of design framed under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

To establish this Principle of Design as a test in controversy, is that for which this article has been written. We need it specially in studying the nature of the

* Romans vii. 6.
‡ 2 Pet. iii. 16.

† 1 Cor. xi. 24.

‡ John iii. 5.
§ 1 Cor. ii. 14.

visible church. Who is not tired of hearing controversy on this head turning endlessly on one or two narrow ambiguous scriptures, which God never meant as our chief light in shaping the order of His church, which may be proved to be susceptible of debate indefinitely, and therefore, over which men may battle till the end of time, and still read them each in their own tongue wherein they were born. A patterning after nature, by a simple watching of the instincts, or native impulses of the mind, would totally cure men of such waste discussion. How does the mind in its earliest and most unbiassed movement, meet such a text as this, "I have said, ye are gods."* Not by long inward contention over the words themselves, but by instantly and briefly referring them back, for limitation, to the general truth, there are no more Gods than one. So of the church and all externals. We cannot help framing ourselves wide gospel principles in regard to them, and on them the mind instinctively falls back when any language jars with them. "This is my body," for example. It is artificial and opposed to nature for the mind to debate over mere grammar, in a case like this, when it has once appeared, that it can mean something else than its baldest, briefest sense. That moment the mere verbal controversy has pronounced itself interminable, and the mind is longing to cast herself back upon broader principles, and the grander and better witnessed doctrine of the gospel, thereby to digest and decide the passage. This is nature—the instinct of the mind, and as with all natural instinct, it is logical and true. The mind fresh and not yet touched by prejudice, will follow it; and we have but to observe our minds, and copy their working, to get upon our paper the briefest and strongest mode of settling Bible questions, the most certain to convince, because the mind intuitively resorts to it to convince herself, and the least open to a challenge, because appealing back at once out of the reach of lesser and more entangled questions to the broad and high ground of the gospel. The fact is, we talk about it as wise to bring out orally and in writing, that method to which the mind secretly and of herself resorts; but it is more than wise. It is necessary and universal. Most arguments virtually use it. And only because it is not more distinctly recognized and stated, does it so seldom do what,

* Ps. lxxxii. 6.

in many a private mind it has often done, *i. e.*, seal and settle controversy.

Our only choice is, whether to use it unwittingly and with but half effect, for even in canvassing one verse, we must use it—or to give it such depth and prominence, that we may mould whole arguments upon it.

Wm. Dodge.

ART. IV.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church met in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, May 15th, 1845, and was opened with a sermon, by the Rev. Dr. Junkin, moderator of the last Assembly, from John viii. 33—"The truth shall make you free." The Rev. John M. Krebs, of New York, was elected moderator; the Rev. M. B. Hope, of Philadelphia, temporary clerk; and Dr. Krebs having resigned his office as permanent clerk, the Rev. Robert Davidson, of New Brunswick, was elected in his place.

The house proceeded to appoint a place for the next meeting of the Assembly. Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Charleston and Alleghany city were nominated. The roll was called, and Philadelphia received 122 votes, Alleghany 33, Charleston 20, Cincinnati 1. The next place of meeting, therefore, will be at Philadelphia, in the tenth Presbyterian church.

The several boards of the church made their annual reports, the first being

The Report of the Board of Education.

This is the twenty-fifth year of the existence of the board. In 1831, one of the members said, the society was dead, and the Philadelphia brethren might bury it; but since then they have raised \$400,000, and educated 1500 students. The number of candidates during the past year has been 11; of these there have been in their Theological course, 137; in their Collegiate course, 162; Academical course, 68, under the immediate care of Presbyteries, and the stages of their studies unknown, 13; teaching to procure funds, 13. Of these 4 have died during the year; 1 has been dropped for not reporting; 3 have withdrawn on account of ill health; 11 have gone into other means of support,

and 54 have finished their studies and gone into the field of labour. Thirteen have been discontinued from the funds—not because they were destitute of piety or talents—but simply because they fell short of an elevated standard of education. The report contained an able argument in favour of the beneficiary system of education, and an answer to the various objections urged against it, in which it was stated that of the 250 ministers in the church without charge, only nine had been educated on this plan.

In reference to this report, the Assembly adopted a series of resolutions, commending “the fidelity with which its arduous, delicate and peculiarly embarrassing duties” had been performed; urging peculiar caution on presbyteries in the selection of beneficiaries, and upon teachers fidelity in reporting on their progress in knowledge; protesting against allowing a candidate under the care of the Board to slight his pledge, by entering the ministry, without a thorough course of preparatory study, or without devoting three years to a theological course; and commending the institution to the increasing confidence of the churches.

It must be admitted, that this Board has peculiar difficulties with which to contend. When the subject of Domestic or Foreign Missions is presented, it commends itself at once to the judgment and conscience, but when a call is made to assist young men in gaining an education, the question is started, is it best to assist them? would it not be better to let them struggle on by themselves? And if the conclusion is arrived at, that assistance should be given, still there are a great many objections presented as to the way in which it is done, or as to the judgment exercised in the selection or guidance of the candidates. The agents of this Board, therefore, have a perpetual conflict to maintain; and when they are successful in one place, they have to renew the struggle in another. It is highly desirable that the church generally, would calmly consider this whole subject, and come to a settled conviction as to what ought to be done, and not leave the brethren who have to bear this burden, under the necessity of continually arguing the matter anew. Is then the object of the Board a good one? Is it desirable that young men who need it, should be assisted in preparing for the work of the ministry? One of the most common objections to the affirmative, is, that it is derogatory and injurious to the character of young men to receive such assistance. Is it derogatory to a man to re-

ceive a salary? On what ground is a salary paid, but the scriptural and obviously righteous principle, that a man who devotes his time and labour to the service of any body, should be sustained by that body? If these young men devote themselves to the service of the church, they come within the operation of that principle. A pastor is supported while he is studying, and for his studying, as much as when he is preaching. A missionary is as much entitled to support during the year or two which he must devote to acquiring the language of the heathen, as when he is able to instruct them. And so the man who devotes himself to the service of the church, which is commonly a very self-denying service, is as much entitled to a support, if he needs it, when preparing for the ministry, as when engaged in the active discharge of its duties. The church in all ages has recognised the justice of this principle. What are religious foundations in the universities, the colleges, and the various educational establishments in all Christian countries, but so many provisions for the gratuitous or cheap education. Every enlightened civil government acts on the same principle. If the state needs men for any special service, she does not hesitate to prepare them for it, whenever the necessity exists. It is hard to see why a youth educated at the Polytechnic school at Paris, the military academy at Berlin, or at our own West Point, should be regarded as a high-minded man, and a candidate for the ministry, if educated by the church, should be stigmatised as a charity student. And if he is unjustly so stigmatised, it will do him good, if he bear the reproach with humility and meekness. It is, however, unjust, and there would be nothing either derogatory or injurious in thus educating men at the expense of the church, if the matter were viewed in a proper light.

Another objection, however, is that there is no necessity for such a Board; we have ministers enough; the supply is more than equal to the demand. We have no doubt that this is the most formidable objection with which the friends of the Board have to contend. It must be conceded that in some parts of the country there does seem to be a superabundance of ministers. If a vacancy occurs in a desirable position, there is often a crowd of candidates for the post. This, however, is true only of a few parts of the country. And it is unavoidable, that some men from their age, some from the state of their health, others, it may be for the want of zeal, are prevented from going to the more difficult

fields, and thus produce an undue accumulation at particular points. This, however, does not prove there is no need of more ministers. Look at the single fact, that our population doubles itself every twenty-five years. Take into consideration, that this population is so scattered, that instead of one minister being sufficient for every two thousand people, he cannot, in many places, adequately serve as many hundred. There are at the present time at least five hundred vacant congregations in our church; and the Board of Missions have stated that there are from five hundred to one thousand places where congregations could be advantageously organized, if we only had the men. There are but four Presbyterian ministers in Texas, where one man now is worth as much as ten may be a few years hence. There are whole districts of our country containing forty or fifty thousand people, with scarcely a single settled religious instructor among them.

If, then, it is right that young men who need aid should be assisted in preparing for the ministry, and if there is a demand for more labourers, we may be certain that if our church does not educate her own young men, other churches will do it for us. We shall lose them. They will go where other and juster views of this matter prevail. We do not doubt that the most effectual method that could be taken by any denomination of Christians, in this country, to cut the nerves of their own strength, would be to resolve to do nothing in this business, but let their young men shift for themselves.

Admitting the propriety and even the necessity of having such a Board, is the course pursued by our Board a wise one, does it educate the right kind of men? In answer to this question it may be admitted that mistakes may and must occur; that it is impossible to see into the hearts of men, or always to form a just estimate of their abilities. But let it be considered, first, that all due care, as far as general arrangements are concerned, are taken to secure a wise selection of candidates. The executive officers of the Board, cannot be personally acquainted with every part of the church and all the young men in it. The selection and recommendation rest, where they ought to do, with the presbyteries within whose bounds the young men live. They have the best opportunities of judging of their fitness, and on them must rest the responsibility of the choice. Then again, look at the result. The Board, we are told, have

aided nearly fifteen hundred young men, and of these, the secretary informs us, he can find "only nine who are not labouring faithfully in the field; and of these nine some are in all human probability disabled." Again, of all the presbyterian ministers "who are labouring in frontier and destitute regions and among the heathen, two-thirds have been" educated by the Board. Has then the money of the church been hitherto thrown away? Has not the Board been wonderfully guided in selecting the right kind of men, men who are enduring more hardness in the service of Christ, than any other class of men in the church?

It is further objected that the Board are educating "a class ministry," introducing into the sacred office a set of men deficient in cultivation and good manners. To this it may be remarked, first, that in this country refinement depends very little upon birth, but mainly on education and subsequent intercourse with society. If you take a young man and give him a liberal education and place him among educated men, he becomes in every respect their equal. And, secondly, the objection is not founded in fact. Since the institution of the Theological Seminary in this place, about one half of its students have received aid from the church, we are persuaded that the moiety thus aided have, as to piety, as to talents, scholarship, and manners, been quite equal to those who have needed no assistance. In a multitude of cases they have been the sons of clergymen, or of widows, or of educated men in restricted circumstances. And even when taken from the uneducated classes of society, the refining influence of piety, knowledge and social intercourse, has in most instances, placed them on a par with their fellows. The records of the Board will show that the least useful class of our ministers, has not been that which has passed through their hands. We therefore fully believe that both the object of the Board, and the manner in which they have discharged their duties, are worthy of the approbation and support of the church.

Board of Foreign Missions.

The Assembly met on the evening of May 19th, for the purpose of celebrating the Anniversary of the Board of Foreign Missions. Walter Lowrie, Esq. the Corresponding Secretary, read extracts from the Annual Report, of which the following is a brief abstract:

Receipts, \$82,672 84. Expenditures, \$81,469 71.

Publications.—The Missionary Chronicle, in newspaper and pamphlet form; The Foreign Missionary; Annual Report of 1844; The Duty of Christians in relation to the Conversion of the World, &c.

New Missionaries.—To China, five clergymen were sent during the year; to Western Africa, one; to the Indian tribes, two; to Texas, one.

Missions.—In Texas, four clergymen at as many places. Among the Iowa, Creek and Chippewa Indians, five clergymen, two teachers, one farmer; an important manual labour boarding school commenced among the Iowas, supported partly by their own funds; a similar institution commenced among the Creeks; 150 scholars at schools previously formed among these tribes; a church organized among the Creeks; about twenty members in the church among the Chippewas. In Western Africa, two coloured clergymen among the colonists in Liberia; schools at Monrovia and Sinoe, with 130 scholars; church at Monrovia of 35 members; two clergymen (one of them coloured) at two stations among the Kroos, between Monrovia and Cape Palmas; one American and two native teachers; boarding school of 40 scholars at Settra Kroo. In North India, three separate missions, the Lodianna, Allahabad, and Furrukhabad; with six stations; sixteen American clergymen and one native clergyman, ordained by the presbytery of Furrukhabad in November last; one printer, one teacher, one female teacher, one native licentiate preacher, ten native Christian teachers and catechists, besides other native teachers and assistants; four printing presses, from which nearly 8,000,000 pages of the Sacred Scriptures and other religious works were issued in four languages; schools at all the stations, viz: thirteen common schools with 300 scholars; four boarding schools with about 200 pupils, mostly orphans, and all supported by the missions; four high schools, with about 300 scholars; churches at four stations, to which a number of converts were added during the year. In China, three separate missions, with stations for the present at Macao, Amoy, and Ningpo; seven clergymen, two physicians, one printer; printing press at Macao, with metallic types, in successful operation. In Papal Europe, efforts are made to spread the Gospel, by means of a correspondence opened during the year with the Evangelical Societies of France and Geneva, and moneys have been re-

mitted for that purpose. Among the Jews, a mission proposed.

Summary.—Missions in six general fields, viz: Texas, the Indian tribes, Africa, India, China, and Europe; stations, 22; clergymen, or ordained ministers, 37; physicians, 2; printers, 2; teachers, 5; native Christian licentiate, catechists, and teachers, 11; numerous native teachers and assistants; numerous schools; twelve churches; the statistics of European missions not included.

Mr. Lowrie accompanied his report with a statement, that since he had reached Cincinnati, he had received the painful intelligence of the destruction of the printing establishment in Lodianna by fire. The loss is estimated at \$10,000. He had also received another letter containing the gratifying intelligence that one friend of the Board had forwarded to them a letter containing five \$1,000 notes, to re-establish the press in Lodianna.

Addresses were delivered by Mr. Lowrie, Drs. McGill and Edgar, and Mr. Graves.

The Report was committed to a committee, and the Assembly adjourned.

This committee specially recommend that immediate efforts be made to repair the loss experienced by the destructive fire in the missionary premises at Lodianna, and renew the ordinary expressions of confidence in the Board and zeal for the cause.

Report of the Board of Domestic Missions.

The Report was read by Dr. McDowell, the Corresponding Secretary, from which it appears that the whole number of Missionaries in commission during the year has been 346. Of this number 198 were in commission at the commencement of the year, and 148 new appointments have been made. This is an advance upon the number of any previous year. Of the whole number, 203 are located west of the mountains, and 143 east of the mountains including the Northern and Middle States, and the whole of the South. Of the new appointments 89 have been in the West, and 59 in the East and South. The whole number of churches and stations supplied during the year were over 1000. The Missionaries are stationed in 24 states and territories, and the whole amount of labour performed is 280 years. The additions to the churches on certificate were

1300, on examination 2500, total 3800. The receipts into the treasury have been \$50,522 05.

Sabbath schools have been greatly multiplied. Temperance is now on the advance although in the first part of the year it was on the retrograde. A few of the missionaries have been the instruments of interesting revivals. The number of missionaries and the amount of funds collected during the year have been greater than during any preceding year.

The committee to whom this report, together with the report of the committee on church extension, and sundry memorials on the removal of the Board were referred, recommended the adoption of several resolutions. The portion of their report relating to the removal of the Board, is as follows :

“The very great extent of the field of operation of the Board, extending from the New England states to the extreme boundary of civilization in the West, and from the Northern Lakes to Florida, embracing every variety of habits, feelings and interests, and an equal diversity in the nature of the feeble churches and destitutions to be supplied, renders it next to impossible for any body of men located at any given point within the territory, however wise and energetic they may be, to manage to the best advantage in all the cases that arise. The present is also a great crisis in the affairs of the Protestant churches of our land, owing to the rapid increase of Popery and other heresies, many of which are entirely local in their character, and require to be promptly met by suitable men. The Valley of the Mississippi has especially been selected as the great field in which Popery has declared her design to fight the battle for empire in this Republic. With these considerations in view, together with the fact that the churches are by no means awake to the dangers which environ them, and the necessity of not suffering themselves to be outdone by the other Protestant denominations, while the General Assembly deem it altogether inexpedient to change the location of the Board, they adopt the following plan for giving increased activity and efficiency to its operations :

“1. That a Committee be appointed by the Board with similar powers to that already located at Philadelphia, to hold its meetings at Louisville, Kentucky, and to report monthly to the Board.

“2. That a Secretary and General Agent be appointed

by the Board, to labour in connection with the above Western Committee, with a Treasurer and other necessary officers.

“3. That the supervision of the Western and South-Western fields, the boundaries of which are to be designated by the Board, be committed to the above Committee, so far as procuring and locating missionaries and obtaining funds are concerned. But neither the Eastern nor Western Committee shall locate a missionary, for whose support they have not in their respective Treasuries the necessary means, without the consent of the Board.

“4. That the Board at its monthly meetings, shall, upon the reports of these committees, make such transfers of funds as shall be found most expedient for furthering the best interests of the work, and shall assign the particular fields in which the agents shall labour.”

There were three plans suggested to the Assembly. First, to allow the Board and its executive committee to remain as at present in Philadelphia; second, to remove the whole concern to the West; third, to allow the Board and one committee to remain in Philadelphia, and to appoint a co-ordinate committee for the West. As often happens in cases of compromise, the plan which apparently is least eligible and least satisfactory to all parties, the third above mentioned, was adopted. We do not pretend to be competent judges, in this matter, but we think we can see strong reasons for having the centre of operations in the East, and also very plausible ones for having it in the West, but we confess we cannot see how it can well be both East and West, at the same time. In such matters, however, it is best to do what brethren wish to have done; and since it is very plain that the Western brethren were bent on a change, and considered, as Dr. Potts expressed it, the question to be “whether Western men were fit to be managers of an executive committee of one of the Boards of the church,” we do not see how the Assembly could fail to concede the point. They plausibly urged that Western men would have a better knowledge of the field; feel a deeper interest in it; be able to present its claims more forcibly, and to rouse the church more effectually to the work of meeting its demands; that much less was done than the case required, less by far than Romanists were doing, less even than other denominations were effecting; and that Eastern men could not fail to give a rather too willing

ear to the calls for help from Eastern churches. On the other hand, it was contended that it was a principle, sustained by reason and experience, that your head quarters should be near your resources; that so long as the funds for the support of domestic missions came principally from the East, it was expedient and proper that the centre of management should be there; that unity and efficiency required one central body; that the Board was doing more than ever hitherto had been done in this work, and as much as other denominations, if any fair standard of comparison be adopted; that the interests of the West had not been postponed to those of the East; that the Board was the creature of the presbyteries, and must do their bidding; that all the facilities for carrying on its operations were greater eastward than westward of the mountains.

It may be presumed that both parties were influenced by a sincere desire to promote the best interests of the church, and whether the plan adopted be in itself wise or not, all will doubtless endeavor to give it a fair trial.

Board of Publication.

There have been 28 new books published, and 53,000 copies; 18 of these Sabbath school books; 71,500 copies have been printed from stereotype plates. The financial department is in a flourishing condition. The expenses of the year were \$37,527 71. The report asked the attention and the prayers of the church.

In the report of the committee to which this subject was referred, we find the opinion expressed, that the affairs of the Board have been managed with great prudence and fidelity; that the Assembly approve of a rigid adherence to the terms of sale originally adopted, and discountenance the establishment of depositories at the risk of the Board, or on doubtful credit; that it is recommended to employ colporteurs in every part of the country, who will purchase the books of the Board, and dispose of them "for the profits arising from the sales;" and that the preparation and publication of a new digest of the important decisions of the Assembly, is advised.

Slavery Question.

Several memorials on the subject of slavery having been presented to the Assembly, they were referred to Messrs. Rice, Lord, McGill, Lacy, N. N. Hall, Leavitt, and Dunlap.

This committee subsequently made the following report, which was adopted, as follows :

“The memorials may be divided into three classes, viz.

“1. Those which represent the system of Slavery as it exists in these United States, as a great evil, and pray this General Assembly to adopt measures for the amelioration of the condition of the slaves.

“2. Those which ask the Assembly to receive memorials on the subject of slavery, to allow a full discussion of it, and to enjoin upon the members of our church, residing in states whose laws forbid the slaves being taught to read, to seek by all lawful means the repeal of those laws.

“3. Those which represent slavery as a moral evil, a heinous sin in the sight of God, calculated to bring upon the church the curse of God, and calling for the exercise of discipline in the case of those who persist in maintaining or justifying the relation of master to slaves.

“The question which is now unhappily agitating and dividing other branches of the church, and which is pressed upon the attention of the Assembly by the three classes of memorialists just named, is whether the holding of slaves is under all circumstances a heinous sin, calling for the discipline of the church.

“The church of Christ is a spiritual body, whose jurisdiction extends only to the religious faith, and moral conduct of her members. She cannot legislate where Christ has not legislated, nor make terms of membership which he has not made.—The question, therefore, which this Assembly is called upon to decide, is this:—Do the Scriptures teach that the holding of slaves, without regard to circumstances, is a sin, the renunciation of which, should be made a condition of membership in the church of Christ?

“It is impossible to answer this question in the affirmative, without contradicting some of the plainest declarations in the Word of God. That slavery existed in the days of Christ and his Apostles, is an admitted fact. That they did not denounce the relation itself as sinful, as inconsistent with Christianity; that slaveholders were admitted to membership in the churches organized by the Apostles; that whilst they were required to treat their slaves with kindness, and as rational, accountable, immortal beings, and if Christians, as brethren in the Lord, they were not commanded to emancipate them; that slaves were obliged to be “obedient to their masters according to the flesh, with

fear and trembling, with singleness of heart as unto Christ," are facts which meet the eye of every reader of the New Testament. This Assembly cannot, therefore, denounce the holding of slaves as necessarily a heinous and scandalous sin, calculated to bring upon the Church the curse of God, without charging the Apostles of Christ with conniving at such sin, introducing into the church such sinners, and thus bringing upon them the curse of the Almighty.

"In so saying, however, the Assembly are not to be understood, as denying that there is evil connected with slavery. Much less do they approve those defective and oppressive laws by which, in some of the states, it is regulated. Nor would they by any means countenance the traffic of slaves for the sake of gain; the separation of husbands and wives, parents and children, for the sake of "filthy lucre," or for the convenience of the master, or cruel treatment of slaves in any respect. Every Christian and philanthropist certainly should seek by all peaceable and lawful means the repeal of unjust and oppressive laws, and the amendment of such as are defective, so as to protect the slaves from cruel treatment by wicked men and secure to them the right to receive religious instruction.

"Nor is the Assembly to be understood as countenancing the idea that masters may regard their servants as *mere property*, not as human beings, rational, accountable, immortal. The scriptures prescribe not only the duties of servants, but of masters also, warning the latter to discharge those duties, "knowing that their master is in heaven, neither is there respect of persons with him."

"The Assembly intend simply to say, that since Christ and his inspired Apostles did not make the holding of slaves a bar of communion, we, as a court of Christ, have no authority to do so; since they did not attempt to remove it from the church by legislation, we have no authority to legislate on the subject. We feel constrained further to say that however desirable it may be to ameliorate the condition of the slaves in the Southern and Western States, or to remove slavery from our country, these objects we are fully persuaded, can never be secured by ecclesiastical legislation. Much less can they be attained by those indiscriminate denunciations against the slaveholders, without regard to their character or circumstances, which have, to so great an extent, characterized the movements of

modern abolitionists, which, so far from removing the evils complained of, tend only to perpetuate and aggravate them.

“The Apostles of Christ sought to ameliorate the condition of slaves, not by denouncing and excommunicating their masters, but by teaching both masters and slaves the glorious doctrines of the gospel, and enjoining upon such the discharge of their relative duties. Thus only can the church of Christ, as such, now improve the condition of the slaves in our country.

“As to the extent of the evils involved in slavery, and the best methods of removing them, various opinions prevail, and neither the scriptures nor our constitution authorize this body to present any particular course to be pursued by the churches under our care. The assembly cannot but rejoice, however, to learn that the ministers and churches in the slave holding states, are awakening to a deeper sense of their obligation, to extend to the slave population generally, the means of grace, and that many slaveholders not professedly religious, favour this object. We earnestly exhort them to abound more and more in this good work. We would exhort every believing master to remember that his master is also in heaven, and in view of all the circumstances in which he is placed, to act in the spirit of the golden rule, ‘Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even the same to them.’

“In view of the above stated principles and facts,

“Resolved, First, That the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States was originally organised, and has since continued the bond of union in the church upon the conceded principle that the existence of domestic slavery, under the circumstances in which it is found in the southern portion of the country, is no bar to Christian communion.

“Second, That the petitions that ask the Assembly to make the holding of slaves a matter of discipline, do virtually require this judicatory to dissolve itself, and abandon the organization under which, by the Divine blessing, it has so long prospered. The tendency is evidently to separate the northern from the southern portion of the church; a result which every good citizen must deplore, as tending to the dissolution of the union of our beloved country, and which every enlightened Christian will oppose as bringing about a ruinous and unnecessary schism between brethren who maintain a common faith.”

The yeas and nays being called on the adoption of this report, the vote stood, affirmative 164, negative 12, non-liquet 3, excused 1. Mr. Robinson and six other members presented their dissent from this decision in the following words: "The undersigned ask leave to dissent from the action on the report on slavery, because they think it does in some important parts contravene former action on this subject, particularly the testimony of the Assembly in 1818."

Such a harmonious decision of a question, so difficult so delicate and so exciting, is matter for sincere thankfulness to God. Our Church we trust is thus saved from the excitement which has rent asunder other denominations, and which threatens to weaken, if not to destroy, the bonds of our national union. We have long entertained the opinion that there is no serious difference of opinion on this subject, between the great majority of good men at the north and south. The danger was that they would not understand each other, that the one party would be extreme in their denunciations of evils all admitted, and the other so sensitive as to allow nothing to be said on the subject. Providence has kindly ordered it so that the fears of his people have been disappointed, and instead of weeping over a ruptured church, we are called upon to rejoice over its more cordial union.

The Marriage Question.

The vexed question concerning the lawfulness of marriage between parties nearly related by affinity, was again brought before the Assembly and discussed at great length. The question came up on the report of a committee appointed two years ago, whose report was printed in the appendix of the minutes of the Assembly of last year. Mr. Goldsmith moved the indefinite postponement of the report, with a view to send down an overture to the presbyteries for the alteration of the book. This motion was opposed by Dr. N. Rice and Dr. Junkin, and advocated by the mover and Mr. Lacey. The motion prevailed; whereupon Mr. Goldsmith moved, "That the Assembly send down to the presbyteries the following question, viz. Shall the last sentence of the 4th section of the 24th chapter of the Confession of Faith, the words, 'The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred, nearer in blood than he may of his own,' &c., be stricken out? And that

they be required to answer it at the next Assembly." This motion gave rise to a long debate, interrupted by various motions for indefinite postponement, and substitutes. The question however was urged to a decision, and the vote stood, Ayes 79, Nays 98. So the motion was lost. In the course of the discussion, Dr. N. Rice moved to postpone Mr. Goldsmith's resolution, with a view of introducing the following: "Resolved, That it is not expedient to overture the Presbyteries on this subject. Resolved, That it be, and it hereby is solemnly enjoined upon all our ministers henceforth to abstain entirely from solemnizing or encouraging such marriages, as are declared in our Confession of Faith to be forbidden in the word of God; and that it be, and hereby is, enjoined upon all our sessions and presbyteries to apply the discipline of the church to all members of our church who may hereafter contract such marriages, and that they refuse to receive into the church any person so related." This motion was lost by a vote of 84 to 80. A committee consisting of Messrs. Edgar, Lord, McMaster, and Leavitt, was subsequently appointed to bring in a minute expressing the views of the Assembly on this subject. This committee made a report in substance the same as the resolutions proposed by Dr. N. Rice, "leaving all former cases of violations of this law to be disposed of by the lower judicatories as their wisdom and prudence may direct," but enjoining the observance and enforcing the rule in future. This report was ultimately disposed of by being indefinitely postponed.

The subject was also brought up judicially by a complaint of Mr. McQueen, against the Presbytery of Fayetteville for having refused to restore him to the functions of the ministry, from which he had been for some years suspended, for having married the sister of his deceased wife. After the parties had been heard, Dr. Hamilton offered the following resolution, viz. "Resolved, That the prayer of the memorialist be granted so far as that this General Assembly recommend to the Presbytery of Fayetteville to reconsider their action in the case of Archibald McQueen, and if in their judgment it should appear conducive to the peace of the church, and to the promotion of religion in the region around them, to restore Mr. McQueen to the communion of the church, and to the exercise of the functions of the gospel ministry, on the ground that in his case, the ends of discipline are attained by the operation of the sen-

tence under which McQueen has been lying for a period of three years." This resolution was adopted, ayes 96, noes 62.

It is obvious that there are three different opinions prevailing in our church in reference to these marriages. First, there are many who consider them as unlawful, but not invalid; who regard them as violations of a general rule laid down in scripture for the preservation of domestic purity and peace; but though, thus censurable, not necessarily invalid. Just as a Christian's marrying a Pagan is unlawful, inasmuch as it is a violation of the general rule laid down in scripture, for the preservation of domestic religion, yet such a marriage is not invalid. To this class must belong all who voted for the resolution proposed by Dr. N. Rice, or for that proposed by the committee, or for the restoration of Mr. McQueen. On no other ground could such votes be given. All those resolutions imply that the parties thus married, though they did wrong in marrying, are not living in sin. Dr. Rice would hardly have ventured to propose, or eighty members of the Assembly to sustain a resolution, that all drunkards now in the church should be let alone in their intemperance, but that sessions and presbyteries must be careful not to admit any more. All the above resolutions, therefore, are virtual declarations that the marriages in question, though unlawful are still valid.

A second class take the ground that they are both unlawful and invalid, and of course that persons living in such connexion, cannot properly be either admitted to the church, or retained in it. A third class, and one which appears to be rapidly increasing, hold that the marriages in question are neither unlawful nor invalid. It is certainly a matter of regret, that such diversity of opinion exists; but it must be remembered that it is a difference of judgment, as to what the law of God allows or forbids, and therefore is one in which one class cannot be called to concede to the others. The only question is, what in such circumstances ought to be done? Shall we submit to the anomalous state in which the church has so long continued? or shall we divide? We believe there is not in the world so large a body of ministers, who more thoroughly adhere to their standard of faith than the clergy of our church; yet on this point, it is plain they differ among themselves, and from the Confession of Faith. For more than a hundred years this differ-

ence has existed ; and the several sessions and presbyteries have been allowed to act on their own views on this subject, and the church has during all this period, exhibited the irregularity of men being disciplined in one place, and left uncensured in another, though they have done the same thing. The Assembly (as formerly the old Synod,) has almost always acted upon the principle of neither restoring a man condemned by his session or presbytery for such a marriage, nor coercing the lower courts to make it a matter of discipline. This state of things must be allowed to continue, or we must divide. If the Assembly either forces a lower court to restore, or to sentence a man, contrary to its own judgment, for such a marriage, in other words, if this matter is made a term of communion, then the church must divide. We do not believe that either party would be willing to push the matter to such an issue.

Romish Baptism.

The question as to the validity of baptism as administered by a Roman Catholic priest was brought before the Assembly, by an overture from the presbytery of Ohio, which gave rise to a long and interesting debate. Drs. Junkin and N. Rice, Professor Thornwell, Dr. McGill, and others advocated the negative of the question, Dr. Lord, Mr. Aitken, and a few others the affirmative. In favour of returning a negative answer to the question, the votes were 169, against 8, non liquet 6. We feel almost overwhelmed by such a vote. Any decision of the General Assembly is entitled to great respect, but a decision sustained by such a majority, almost imposes silence on all dissentients. And yet we believe it will take the church by surprise. Men will be disposed to ask what new light has been discovered? What stern necessity has induced the Assembly to pronounce Calvin, Luther, and all the men of that generation, as well as thousands who with no other than Romish baptism have since been received into the Protestant churches, to have lived and died unbaptized? The suddenness with which this decision has been made will add not a little to the surprise and regret with which it will be received. The judgment has come before the argument. We do not doubt that the brethren who urged the course adopted by the Assembly, have examined the subject, but we are very sure the church has not. We question whether one in twenty of our ministers have ever

given it more than a passing consideration. Yet as the Assembly professes to speak in the name of the whole church, it would seem proper that no decision so important and so deeply affecting the character of the whole body in the eyes of Christendom, should be pronounced, until means had been taken to ascertain the views of the church generally. The Assembly has indeed the right to resolve all questions of casuistry, regularly presented, and to give advice to the lower courts when requested. We do not question the right. We only venture to question the wisdom of giving an answer suddenly, in opposition to all previous practice, and to the principles of every other protestant church. The fact that the answer is new, creates a reason for being slow to pronounce it. Had a judicial case been presented involving such a question, the Assembly would have been bound to give judgment according to its conscience. But we conceive the cases to be rare, in which it can be right to take up a question *in thesi*, and to enunciate a dictum at variance with all previously adopted principles and usage. We are very sure the United States court would be very slow to enunciate, without necessity, a principle of law in opposition to all precedent in that and all similar courts.

We shall very briefly and respectfully state the reasons, which constrain us to dissent from the decision that Romish baptism is invalid. We could do this, to our own satisfaction at least, by simply asking, What is baptism? "It is a sacrament, wherein the washing of water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, doth signify and seal our engrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagements to be the Lord's." There are three essential points included in this definition.

1st. Baptism is a washing with water. Hence a washing with sand, wine, oil, or milk is not baptism. Instances are recorded in which men baptized in the desert with sand, have been rebaptized; and great surprise was expressed at Beza's declaration; *Ego quovis alio liquore non minus rite, quam aqua baptizarem*, Epist. II. ad Tillium. Water, however, by common consent is essential to the ordinance, because it is commanded, and because it belongs to the significancy of the rite.

2d. But not every washing with water is the Christian ordinance of baptism, it must be a washing in the name of

the Trinity. Hence washing with water by an anti-trinitarian, is not baptism. When the controversy first arose in the church about the baptism of heretics, there were two extreme opinions. Cyprian, and those African bishops who were under his influence, took the ground that the baptism of all those who separated from the outward communion of the Catholic church, whether for heresy or schism, was null and void. In this view the bishops of Asia Minor generally coincided; a fact easily accounted for as all the heretics with whom they were in conflict denied the very essentials of the gospel. Stephen, bishop of Rome, went to the opposite extreme, admitting the baptism of all kinds of heretics to be valid. Both parties soon settled down upon middle ground. In the council of Arles, A. D. 314, when nearly two hundred bishops were present, it was determined; "If any one return from his heresy to the church, let the Catholic priest question him about the creed; and if they perceive that he was baptized in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, only the imposition of hands shall be given him, that he may receive the Holy Ghost. But if upon examination, he answers not the Trinity, (that is, that he was not baptized in the name of the Trinity,) let him be rebaptized." To the same effect was the decision of the great council of Nice, which directed that the Novatians should be received without baptism, but required a repetition of the rite in the case of the disciples of Paul of Samosata. There was subsequently a dispute whether baptism by those Arians who retained the orthodox formula was valid or not. "The more general and prevailing interpretation of the Nicene canon was, that the baptism of all heretics and schismatics, who did not reject the Catholic form of baptizing in the name of the Trinity, was to be received, however they might be heterodox in their faith and opinions. This was certainly the sense of the council of Laodicea, of the second general council of Constantinople, and the second council of Arles and Trullo; as also of St. Austin, St. Jerome, Gennadius, Ursinus Afer, Siricius, Leo, Innocentius, the author under the name of Justin Martyr, and the generality of the ancients."*

Protestants have not gone to this length, as they require a professed faith in the doctrine of the Trinity, in order

* See Bingham's *Scholastic History of Lay baptism*. c. I. in his *Origines Ecclesiæ*, and Neander's *History*, vol. I. pp. 565—577, German edition.

to the validity of baptism, because it is from its nature an act of worship of the Triune God. With one accord, however, they have acquiesced in the judgment of the ancient church, that the baptism of heretics is not void on account of heresy, provided they retain the doctrine of the Trinity, and baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit. This is the doctrine of the Lutheran church, see Gerhard's *Loci Communes*, vol. 9. L. 21. c. 4., where he sustains the practice of his church, by quoting the words of Anselm: "Baptisma a quocunque datum fuerit, sive a bono sive a malo, sive a Catholico, sive ab haeretico juxta morem ecclesiae in nomine Patris, Filii et Spiritus sancti, tantundem valet."

The same doctrine as to baptism by heretics was held by the French and Geneva churches. See Turrittin, vol. iii. p. 442. "Some heretics," he says, "corrupt the very substance of baptism, as the ancient Arians, modern Socinians, rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity; others, retaining the essentials of the ordinance and the true doctrine of the Trinity, err as to other doctrines, as formerly the Novatians and Donatists, and now the Papists and Arminians. The baptisms of the former class are to be rejected; those of the latter are retained, although they err as to many doctrines, and their baptisms, in circumstantialia, are polluted by various ceremonies." See also Pictet, *La Theologie Chretienne*, Lib. xv. c. 13. The church of Holland adopted the same view; see Morus, *Commentarius Perpetuus*, &c., vol. v. p. 448. *Docetur esse distinguendam haeresin; a. abditam et professione externa expressam; b. retinentem essentialia baptismi, et evertentem eadem: adeo ut Baptismus administratur in nomen Dei Triunius veri agniti; vel fiat luto, quo perit analogia inter signum et rem signatam; aut non fiat in nomine Dei Triunius, sed in coetu antitrinitario. In posteriori casu baptismus repetendus censetur, non in priori.* No one questions this being the doctrine of the church of England, since her practice on the subject has been uniform, and sustained by the highest judicial decisions. It is, therefore; the doctrine of the universal church, that baptism administered in the name of the Trinity, by one professing faith in that doctrine, is not void on account of heresy. Such is the doctrine of our standards which declares baptism to be a washing with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The ground of this universally received view of the subject is obvious. The validity of

baptism depends upon the appointment of God, and not upon the character or faith of the administrator; and therefore, any baptism which is administered according to His appointment, the church has felt constrained to admit to be baptism.

3. There is, however, a third particular included in this definition of baptism; it must be with the design "to signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagements to be the Lord's." There are two things included in this statement; participation of the benefits of the covenant, and the avowal of our purpose to be the Lord's. No washing with water, even if in the name of the Trinity, is Christian baptism, unless administered with the ostensible design of signifying, sealing and applying the benefits of the covenant of grace. This is what the ancient church meant by "intention" as essential to this ordinance; and which the papists have characteristically perverted. By intention, they mean the secret purpose of the priest; against which view of the doctrine, all Protestants protested, as one of the devices of the man of sin, to make the people dependent on the priesthood. The ancient and true doctrine is that intention refers to the ostensible and professed design of the administration. No washing with water, in the name of the Trinity, therefore, is baptism, if done in sport, or mockery, or with the professed design of healing the sick, or raising the dead. It must be with the professed, ostensible intention of complying with the command of Christ, and of doing what he requires to be done, by those who accept the covenant of grace. From this it follows, that no baptism administered by a Jew, a pagan, a child, or an idiot, can be valid, because in all such cases, the requisite design must be absent. A Jew cannot, being such, join in an act of Christian worship, for he would thereby cease to be a Jew. As baptism includes the invocation of the Trinity, as a religious act, no man who does not profess to believe in the Trinity, can profess to join in such act.

The doctrine of our standards, therefore, is the precise doctrine of the ancient church, viz., that there are three things essential to baptism; the matter, form, and intention. The matter, is the washing with water; the form, washing in the name of the Trinity; the intention, not the popish notion of the secret purpose of the priest, but the professed, ostensible design of the act. When these three things are

found, there, according to our standards, and the common doctrine of the church, is baptism.

Such being the formal and authoritative definition of the rite, in order to determine in any given case, whether any [particular baptism is valid, all we have to do is, to ask whether it has these essential characteristics. Is it a washing with water? Is it administered in the name of the Trinity? Is the professed design of the rite to signify, seal and apply the benefits of the new covenant? If so, then, by our standards, it is baptism. To determine the question before us, we must, therefore, ascertain whether,

1st. Romish baptism is a washing with water? The Romish catechism defines baptism to be "The sacrament of regeneration by water with the word." In answer to the question, What is the matter of baptism? the Romish theologians answer; *Est omnis et sola aqua naturalis, seu elementaris, "any and only natural water."* One of their favourite *dicta* is the saying of Augustine: *Quid est Baptismus? Lavacrum aquae in verbo: tolle aquam, non est baptismus; tolle verbum, non est baptismus.* Water, therefore is, according to the Romish church, essential to baptism, and as far as "the matter" is concerned, nothing else is. The water may be marine, or rain, or river, or from a spring, or mineral; it may be clear or turbid, warm or cold, but it must be water. Baptism with mud, wine, milk, oil, saliva, tears, &c., the Romish theologians pronounce invalid.* Their doctrine on this point is identical with our own.

We were therefore greatly surprised to see that it was stated on the floor of the Assembly that Romanists did not baptize with water, but with water mixed with oil. Suppose this to be true, water with oil thrown on it is still water. How many things are mixed with the wine we use at the Lord's supper? Is wine adulterated with water no longer wine? Did not our Saviour call the paschal cup wine, though mixed with water? This objection is trivial. So long as the element used is water, and so long as the significancy of the rite is made to consist in washing with water, the matter of the ordinance is retained. But,

* In answer to the question, what kind of water may be used in Baptism, "R. Talis est aqua marina, pluvialis, fontana, fluvialis, mineralis; sive turbida sit sive clara, frigida vel calida; sive benedicta sive non. . . . E contra invalidus est Baptismus collatus in luto, vino, pingui cerevisia, laete, oleo, saliva, sudore, lacrymis," &c.—Den's Theology; tom. v. p. 158.

as far as we know, the objection is unfounded in fact. There are various ceremonies which precede, attend and follow the rite as administered in the Romish church; among which is Chrism; or anointing with oil, but these ceremonies are not represented as entering into the nature of the ordinance, or making any part of it.* They are treated of and explained separately. First, Baptism is declared to be a washing with water; and then the ceremonies accompanying this washing are stated and explained. In treating of the "matter of baptism," not one word is said of oil or anything else, but water *vera et naturalis* is declared to be necessary and sufficient. As far therefore as the first point is concerned, Romish baptism, is baptism. It is a washing with water.

2. Is it then correct as to the form? Is it administered in the name of the Trinity? The form prescribed by the council of Trent, is in these words, "Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti." The form therefore is identical with our own. It is not in words, merely, that this form is scriptural, the avowed sense in which they are used is correct. There is not a Church on earth which teaches the doctrine of the Trinity more accurately, thoroughly or minutely, according to the orthodoxy of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, than the church of Rome. The personal and official relations of the adorable Trinity, are also preserved. The Father is represented as the author of the new covenant, the Son as redeemer, the Spirit as sanctifier. There is no such thing as baptism in the name of the Trinity in any church, if Romish baptism is not.

3. Then as to the third essential part of the ordinance, the design, in this also their baptism agrees with that of Protestants. According to our standards the design of the Sacrament is to signify, seal and apply to believers the benefits of the new covenant. This is the precise doctrine of the Romanists, so far as this. 1. They say it is essential to a sacrament that it should be a sensible sign of spiritual blessings. 2. That it should be instituted by Christ. 3. That it should have a promise of grace.† Hence the sacraments

* The preceding ceremonies are, exorcismus, signum crucis, salis gustus, et linitio salivæ; Concomitantes, abrenunciatio, unctio baptizandi oleo catechumenorum, catechismus, et inquisitio voluntatis suscipiendi Baptismum; Subsequentes, unctio baptizati per chrisma, vestis candidæ donatio, et cerei ardentis traditio. Dens. Vol. V. p. 205.

† Cardinal Tonnerre, Institutiones Theologicae Vol. III. p. 276.

signify, seal, and apply the benefits of redemption. According to both parties, by baptism we are formally constituted members of the visible church, and partakers of its benefits. The great difference relates not to the design of the ordinance, but to the mode and certainty with which that design is accomplished, and the conditions attached to it. In other words, the difference relates to the efficacy, and not to the design of the ordinance. The design on either side is stated to be to initiate into the visible church and secure its blessings. But how and to what extent, and under what conditions these blessings are secured by baptism, there is a great difference of opinion. As to the efficacy of the sacraments there are these three general views. First, That of the Zuinglians who make them mere naked signs. Secondly, that of those who teach that they certainly convey to all infants the blessings signified, and to adults if rightly disposed; and Third, the middle doctrine maintained by our church, and the Reformed generally. Speaking of baptism, our Confession of Faith says: "By the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited (i. e. conveyed) and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such as (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the council of God's own will, and in his own appointed time." According to our doctrine then, baptism does not uniformly convey the benefits which it signifies, and secondly its efficacy is not limited to the time of its administration.* With regard to adults, the difference between us and Romanists is much less. According to our standards the sacraments are made effectual as means of grace to believers, or "to worthy receivers;" and Romanists say, that in adults

* In the old Scots Confession it is said, "And thus we utterlie damne the vanities of they that affirm Sacramentes to be nothing ellis bot naked and baire signes. No, wee assuredlie beleevc, that be Baptisme we ar ingrafted into Christ Jesus, to be made partakers of his justice, be quhilk our sinnes ar covered and remitted." In the Book of Common order, "approved by that famous man John Calvin, and received and used by the Reformed Kirk of Scotland," this idea is expressed with some limitation. "The venomous dreags" of sin, it is said, remain in the flesh, "yet by the merites of his death (they) are not imputed to us, because the justice of Jesus Christ is made ours by Baptisme; not that we think any such virtuc or power to be included in the visible water, or outward action, for many have been baptized, and yet were never inwardly purged; but our Saviour Christ, who commanded baptism to be administered, will, by the power of the Holie Spirit, effectuallie worke in the hearts of his elect, in time convenient, all that is meant and signified by the same."

to the profitable use of baptism, there are requisite, the influence of divine grace, the act of faith, of hope, of love, and of penitence or contrition.*

The error of the Romanists concerning the absolute necessity and uniform efficacy (in the case of infants) of baptism, is very great, but it cannot invalidate the nature of the ordinance. It is out of all reason to say that the rite is valid, if it is supposed to be effectual to some and at an indefinite time, and invalid, if supposed to be always effectual when there is no opposition. Besides, if baptism is null and void when administered by those who hold the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, what shall we say to the baptism in the church of England, in the strict Lutheran churches, and in all the churches of the East? On this plan, we shall have to unchurch almost the whole Christian world; and Presbyterians, instead of being the most catholic of churches, and admitting the being of a church, wherever we see the fruits of the Spirit, would become one of the narrowest and most bigoted of sects. Indeed we cannot but regard this sudden denunciation of Romish baptism, as a momentary outbreak of the spirit of Popery; a disposition to contract the limits of the church, and to make that essential to its being and sacraments, which God has never declared to be necessary.

We have now shown that Romish baptism fulfills all the conditions of valid baptism, as given in our standards. It is a washing with water in the name of the Trinity, with the ostensible and professed design of making the recipient a member of the visible church, and a partaker of its benefits. On what grounds then is it declared to be null and void? The grounds are two. First, it is not administered by ordained ministers of Christ; second, the church of Rome is not a true church, and therefore its ordinances are not Christian sacraments. The former of these arguments stands thus: No baptism is valid unless administered by a duly ordained minister of Christ. Romish priests are not such ministers. Therefore Romish baptism is invalid.

It may be proper, before considering his argument, to ascertain the precise point to be proved, or what is meant by the words valid and invalid in this connexion. They

* *Quaenam (dispositio) requiritur ad fructuosam hujus Sacramenti susceptionem? R. Illam late describit Conc. Trid. sess. 6. c. 6. ut videre est: Summatim dicimus ex eo requiri motum divinae gratiae, actum fidei, spei et amoris ac poenitentiae seu contritionis. Dens. Vol. .V p. 187.*

seem often to be used in the sense of regular and irregular. Christ has appointed a certain class of men to preach the gospel and administer the sacraments. For any one not belonging to this class, to perform either service, is irregular, and in that sense invalid. Valid, however, properly means available, (able to effect). A thing is valid when it avails to its appropriate end. Thus a deed is valid, which avails to convey a title to property; a marriage is valid, which avails to constitute the conjugal relation. Sometimes the validity of a thing depends upon its regularity; as a deed if not regular, if not made according to law, does not avail for the end for which it was made. Very often, however, the validity of a thing does not depend upon the rules made to regulate the mode of doing it. Many marriages are valid, which violate the rules of decorum, order, and even civil society. When Romish baptism is pronounced invalid, it is not declared simply irregular, in the sense in which lay-preaching is unauthorized; but it is said not to avail to the end for which baptism was instituted; it does not avail to make the recipient a professing Christian. Though a sincere believer should be baptized by a Romanist, such baptism would not signify or seal to him the benefits of the new covenant, nor express his purpose to obey Christ. Such is the declaration. The first argument in support of this position is founded on the assumption that no baptism is valid, in the sense just explained, unless administered by a duly ordained minister of Christ. We do not mean to contest this proposition, and must not be understood as denying it, but we say its truth ought to have been proved and not taken for granted. Our standards do not affirm it. They say indeed that "neither sacrament may be dispensed by any, but by a minister of the word lawfully ordained." *Con. of Faith*, c. 27, § 4. But they say the same thing of preaching. *Larger Cat.* ques. 158. Both are irregular; but irregular and invalid are very different things. Again, this proposition is not contained in the definition of baptism. That ordinance is declared to be a washing with water, in the name of the Trinity, to signify our ingrafting into Christ. To say, It is a washing with water, *by a minister duly ordained*, in the name, &c. is to give a new definition, essentially different from the old one. The insertion of this clause may be authorized, but the authority ought to be given. Again, the principle in question, cannot be inferred from the nature and design of baptism.

Baptism was instituted to constitute or declare the recipient a disciple of Christ, and to signify and seal to him the benefits of the new covenant. It does not necessarily follow from this statement, that it does not avail to this end, unless administered by an ordained man. If ordination did, as Puseyites say, convey grace and impart supernatural power, it would be more apparent, why baptism by unconsecrated hands should fail to have any efficacy. Puseyites, therefore, are very consistently anabaptists, both here and in England. Again, the principle assumed is contrary to the belief and practice of the great body of the people of God in all ages. The common doctrine of the church has been, that baptism and teaching belong properly to ministers of the word; in cases of necessity, however, baptism by unordained persons, was regarded as not only valid, but proper; in all other cases, as irregular and censurable, but still as baptism and not to be repeated. At the time of the Reformation this doctrine was retained by the whole Lutheran church, and by the church of England. Calvin, Beza, the French church, and the church of Holland rejected it, and so we presume did the church of Scotland. Though, therefore, the Reformed or Calvinistic churches have generally maintained the position assumed by the Assembly, as to the invalidity of lay-baptism, yet, as it is not asserted in our book, and has been denied by so great a majority of Christians, it ought not to be made the ground of an argument, without some exhibition of the grounds on which it rests. This is a subject to which we presume less attention has been paid in our church, than it merits. We repeat the remark, that we are not to be understood as denying that baptism must be administered by an ordained man, in order to its validity; we are willing to concede that point in the argument, the conclusion however utterly fails, unless the minor proposition above stated can be proved. Admitting that baptism must be administered by ordained ministers of Christ, it must be proved that Romish priests are not such ministers, before it can be shown that their baptisms are invalid.

Let us inquire then what is an ordained minister, and then see whether the Romish priests come within the definition.

According to the common doctrine of Protestants, an ordained minister is a man appointed to perform the sacred functions of teaching and administering the sacraments in

any community professing Christianity. There is a right and a wrong way of doing this; there is a way agreeable to scriptural precedent, and there are many ways which have no such sanction. Still whether it be done by a prelate, a presbytery, by the people, or by the magistrate with the consent of the people, if a man is recognised by a Christian community as a minister, he is to be regarded as having due authority to act as such. It does not follow from this that we are bound to receive him into ministerial communion, or to allow him to act as a minister in our churches. That depends upon his having the qualifications which we deem requisite for the sacred office. Should a prelate or presbytery ordain an ignorant or heretical man, we should be under no obligation to receive him to the sacred office among ourselves. And if the people should elect a man to that office, we are not bound to receive him on the ground of that election, since we believe that ordination by the presbytery ought to be required. Since, however, Christ has not made the ministry essential to the church, much less any particular method of inducting men into that office, we have no right to say that a body of Christians are no church, and have no valid sacraments, because they differ from us as to the mode of ordaining ministers. It is one of the Popish principles which have slid into the minds of some Protestants, and which was openly avowed upon the floor of the Assembly, that the ministry is essential to the church. Such a sentiment is directly opposed to our standards, and to the word of God. According to the scriptures, a church is a congregation of believers, or of those who profess to be believers; according to the hierarchical system, it is "a congregation of believers *subject to lawful pastors.*" An intrusive element, which is the germ of the whole hierarchical system, is thus introduced into the idea of the church, which changes and vitiates the whole thing. Bellarmine has the credit of being the first writer who thus corrupted the definition of the church. The being of a church does not depend upon the ministry, nor the being of the ministry on the rite of ordination. Any man is a minister in the sense of the proposition under consideration, who is recognised as such by a Christian community.

The soundness of this principle appears, 1. From the consideration already referred to, that we have no authority in this matter to go beyond the scriptures. If Christ or his

apostles had said that no man should be recognised as a minister, nor his official acts accounted valid, unless ordained in a specified manner, we should be bound by such rule. But the scriptures contain no such rule, and we have no right to make it. All that the Bible does, is to make known the fact, that ministers were examined and authenticated as teachers by other teachers, but that it must be so, they nowhere assert.

2. This doctrine flows from what is one of the distinguishing principles of the evangelical, as opposed to the hierarchical system, viz.: that all church power belongs originally to the church as such. The original commission, the promises and prerogatives were given, not to the church officers as their peculium, but to the people; and they may exercise those prerogatives not regularly, not orderly, or wisely, it may be, but still validly under any form they see fit. They ought, indeed, to follow scriptural examples, as to the mode of making ministers, but still as the power to make them was involved in the original commission granted to the church, we cannot deny it.

3. To reject the principle in question is to involve ourselves in all the difficulties, absurdities and assumptions of the doctrine of apostolical succession. Every church would have to prove that its ministry had been regularly ordained in a specific manner from the apostles to the present time. This, from the nature of the case, can no more be done, than a man can prove that all his ancestors were regularly married from the time of Adam. It may be assumed, but it cannot by possibility be proved. And since there is in scripture no promise of any such unbroken succession of ordinations, to assume it, is gratuitous; and to make such assumption the basis of ecclesiastical claims, or of religious hopes, is absurd and ruinous.

4. We all act upon this principle. What Presbyterian feels called upon to trace up historically to the apostles, the ecclesiastical genealogy of every minister whose act he is called upon to recognise? Or who ever thinks of inquiring whether every candidate for the admission to the Lord's supper, if from among the Methodists or Baptists, was baptized by a man ordained in a particular way? It is always considered enough if the applicant was baptized by one having public authority in the body whence he came, to administer the sacraments.

5. All Protestant churches have recognised the same

principle. The language of the twenty-third Article of the Church of England may be taken as expressing the general sense of the age of the Reformation on this subject. That article says: "Those ought to be judged lawfully called and sent, who are chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them, in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." This asserts the necessity of a call, without prescribing any particular mode as essential to its validity. Accordingly, the validity of the orders which many of the reformers received in the Romish church, was universally admitted; while at the same time, no objection was made to the vocation of those who had received nothing more than election by the people. It was held, indeed, that under ordinary circumstances, no one should assume the sacred office to himself, and that besides election by the people, there should, in a regular state of the church, be an examination and imposition of hands by the presbytery. But it was denied that these things were essential.

Do, then, the Romish priests come within this wide definition of ordained ministers? Are they appointed by public authority to teach the Christian religion, and to administer its ordinances? The question is not whether they are good men, or whether they do not assume sacerdotal and other powers to which they have no claim? or whether they are correct in doctrine? but simply, whether in a body professing to hold saving doctrine, they are appointed and recognised as presbyters? If so, then they are ministers within the sense of the received Protestant definition of the term.* The only ground on which this can be denied is, that they do not in any sense profess the Christian religion any more than Jews or Pagans, and therefore this argument, though presented first and separately in the minute adopted by Assembly, really resolves itself in the second presented in that document, viz.: That the Church of Rome is in no sense a Christian church. Without anticipating that point, however, we maintain that as the Romish priests are appointed and recognised as presbyters in a community

* This is the ground on which the Reformed churches defended the validity of the orders received from the Church of Rome. "Talis autem est," says Turretin, "episcoporum et presbyterorum vocatio in ecclesia Romana, quae quoad institutionem Dei bona fuit, sed quoad abusum hominum mala facta est. Unde rescissio errorum et corruptelarum ab hominibus invecularum, non potuit esse vocationis abrogatio, sed correctio et restitutio.—Vol. iii. p. 265.

professing to believe the scriptures, the early creeds, and the decisions of the first four general councils, they are ordained ministers in the sense above stated; and consequently baptism administered by them is valid. It has accordingly been received as valid by all Protestant churches from the Reformation to the present day.

Calvin, in his Institutes, Lib. iv. c. 15 and 16, after saying that baptism does not owe its value to the character of the administrator, adds: "By this consideration, the error of the Donatists is effectually refuted, who made the force and value of the sacrament commensurate with the worth of the minister. Such are our modern Katabaptists, who strenuously deny that we were properly baptized, because we received the rite from impious idolators in the papacy; and they are therefore ferocious for re-baptism. We shall, however, be sufficiently guarded against their nonsense, if we remember we were baptized not in the name of any man, but in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and therefore baptism is not of man, but of God, no matter by whom it was administered."

The first canon of the chapter on baptism, in the book of discipline of the French church, declares, "Baptism administered by an unordained person is wholly void and null;" yet the twenty-eighth article of their Confession of Faith declares Romish baptism to be valid. In the national synod of 1563, John Calvin presented, in the name of the pastors and professors at Geneva, a letter in reply to reasons pronounced by them "very feeble and impertinent," in behalf of lay-baptism, one of which was derived from the assumption that Romish priests were not true ministers, and yet their baptisms are valid. To this the reply made was: "Popish baptism is grounded upon the institution of Christ; because the priests as perverse as they are, and utterly corrupt, are *yet the ordinary ministers of that church* in which they so tyrannically demean themselves."* To this view the French church steadily adhered long after the council of Trent, whose decisions were assumed by some of the members of the Assembly, to have wrought such a change in the character of Romanism. The illustration used by Calvin, derived from the fact that those circumcised by apostate priests under the old dispensation, were never recircumcised, or treated as not having received

* Quick's Synodicon, vol. i. p. 48.

that rite by the inspired prophets, we find repeated by all subsequent writers.

The church of Holland agreed with the French church in regarding the Romish priests as authorized to administer baptism.* Such, too, has been the constant doctrine of the Lutheran church,† and of the church of England. Indeed, we know of no church that has ever taken different ground. The Assembly, therefore, has taken a position on this subject in opposition to the principles of the whole Protestant world. A fact which of itself creates a presumption almost overwhelming against their doctrine.

The second great argument in favour of the decision of the Assembly, which indeed includes and supercedes the one just considered, is: The church of Rome is not a true church of Christ, and therefore its sacraments are not Christian ordinances. This is a very plausible argument, and has the advantage of being short and syllogistic. To its influence we doubt not is principally to be referred the decision in question. To us however it appears to be only another of the innumerable instances of fallacy and false reasoning founded upon the ambiguity of the word church. We know of no subject in theology on which it is more difficult to attain and preserve distinctness of thought, and precision of language than this. The word church has meanings so allied and yet so different, so well authorized and yet so indefinite, that it is almost impossible to avoid using the term in one sense in the premises of an argument, and another in the conclusion. Almost every treatise on the church, which it has been our lot to read, has been more or less a saying and unsaying, affirming and denying the same things of the same subject. This is the fault not so much of the writers, as of the vagueness of the terms. You

* Morus, Tom. v. p. 449. *Hinc passim judicant Nostrī rebaptizandos esse qui ad nos transeunt antè in coetu Soeinianorum antitrinitario baptizati. . . De baptizatis in ecclesia Romana hodierna mitius judicium Nostrī ferre solent, ob retentam illie eum elemento visibili aquae baptismatis, fidem Trinitatis et administrationem baptismi in Dei triunitus nomen.* He quotes the acts of the Synod of Dort, which forbid Romish baptism to be repeated where "the form and substance" of the rite have been retained. Doubts, it seems, were entertained as to baptisms performed by vagrant priests, as a question relating to that point was presented to the French Synod of 1581, who replied: "Since authority to baptize belongs to them according to the order of the Romish church, baptism administered by them is not to be repeated; but baptism by monks to whom no such authority belongs, is void."

† Gerhard, vol. x. p. 93.

may, with equal truth, affirm or deny that a given body is a church; you may say that the church is a congregation of saints, and yet composed in great part of sinners; that it is infallible as to matters of faith, and yet may fatally apostatize; that all its members shall be saved, and yet that many of them will be lost. The whole system of Popery and Puseyism owes its logical power to an adroit management of this word. To the church are promised in the scriptures, the continued presence of Christ and influence of his Spirit, by which it is certainly guided into the knowledge of saving truth, preserved from fatal errors, and effectually prepared for heaven. But, according to our standards, the church consists of the professors of the true religion; therefore, to professors of true religion is promised this continued presence of Christ and the saving guidance of his Spirit. This argument is just as good as that used by the Assembly; and yet, unless it is false, the whole doctrinal system of Romanism is true. It is obvious therefore that extreme caution is necessary in constructing any argument, the validity of which depends on the idea attached to the word church.

The question whether the church of Rome is a true church? cannot be intelligently answered without previously fixing the meaning of the term. The word *ἐκκλησία* in its application to Christians, is in the New Testament, a collective term for *κλητοί*. The called are the church. Any number of "the called" collectively considered are a church. The church as such, is not an organization; any more than the human race as such is a society. Men must organize and live in society; but their organizing does not make them men, nor members of the human race. In like manner the church, or the called, as such, are not an organized body, though it is their duty to organize. But organization does not make them a church, but being members of the church, i. e. *κλητοί*, they associate for certain prescribed purposes. It seems to us that a large portion of the false reasoning connected with this whole subject, arises from the erroneous assumption that organization enters into the very idea of the church. An organized body may be a church, but it is not their organization that makes them so; because any number of the called, or the whole body of them is a church, or the church, in the scriptural sense of the term. When Christ is said to love, Paul to have persecuted, or we to labour for the church, the word does not

designate an organized body. It is merely a collective term for the people of God. Since "the called" are, according to the uniform usage of the epistles of the New Testament, the effectually called, or true believers, it follows that the church is a collective term for true believers. We therefore find that whatever is affirmed of believers is affirmed of the church, and whatever is promised to believers is promised to the church. If the Christians of Rome, Corinth, or Ephesus are addressed as the church in those cities, they are at the same time addressed as believers, as saints, as those who are in Christ, as led by the Spirit, and as heirs of eternal life. As however no man can look upon the heart, we do not know who is a true believer; and therefore we cannot tell who is a member of the church or body of Christ. We are therefore bound to do as the sacred writers did, that is, to regard and treat every man as a believer who makes a credible profession of faith in Christ; and of course we are bound to regard and treat any body of such men as a church. If a man makes no profession of faith, we cannot regard him as a believer; nor can we so regard him if he makes any profession inconsistent with the existence of saving faith. And consequently if a body of men make no profession of faith, they cannot be a church; nor can they be so regarded, if they make a profession which is incompatible with saving faith in Christ. Every man therefore who has true faith is a member of Christ's body, which is the church; and every man who professes such faith is a visible or professed member of his church; and any number of such men collectively considered is a branch of the church. If therefore we deny to any man the character of a Christian, on account of the profession which he makes, we must be prepared to show, that such faith is incompatible with salvation. For if professing such doctrines, (or professing nothing more than certain doctrines) he may be saved, he may be a true believer and of a course a member of the church. And in like manner, if we deny to any body of men the character of a church, on account of its creed, we thereby assert that no man holding that creed can be saved. To determine therefore whether a man or a church is to be denied the Christian character, we must ascertain, what is the minimum of truth that can save the soul. For to deny that a man is a Christian on account of his ignorance or errors, and yet admit he may be saved, is to contradict ourselves. And to say that a body of such

men is no church, is no less a contradiction. It is therefore evident that the question, What is a true church? resolves itself into this: How little truth may avail to salvation? This is a question we are hardly competent to answer, and there is no need of answering it. We can tell what is a pure church; and with that standard we can compare our own and all others, and regulate our intercourse with them accordingly. The course however commonly pursued is to give a definition of a pure church, and then to declare that any community not embraced in that definition, to be no church. Thus it is said, a church is a congregation of believers in which the pure word of God is preached; the pure word of God is not preached in Rome, therefore Rome is not a church. By the same argument the whole world may be unchurch, save our own particular sect, no matter how narrow that sect may be. This method of reasoning is just as unreasonable as it would be to say, a Christian is one who believes the doctrines and obeys the precepts of Christ, therefore no man who is erroneous in doctrine or practice can be a Christian; which would be to go beyond even Perfectionists, for they do not make a perfect faith essential to the character of a Christian. We cannot take a definition of a perfect Christian as the rule of decision whether any particular man is to be treated as a brother; nor can we take the definition of a pure church, as the criterion of the being of a church. Any man who professes truth enough to save his soul, is not to be denounced as no Christian, simply for his faith's sake. And any body of men that professes truth enough to save men, cannot on the ground of heresy be denied the character of a church.

The correctness of this exposition of what is necessary to the being of a church, is plain, 1. From the express declarations of scripture. The Bible teaches that whosoever is a true worshipper of Christ, no matter how ignorant or how erroneous he may be, is a true Christian. "Whosoever believes that Jesus is the Son of God, is born of God." Such is the explicit declaration of the Bible. Whoever, therefore, professes to be a worshipper of Christ, i. e., to love, reverence and serve him as God, does thereby profess to be a Christian; and any body consisting of those who profess to worship Christ, is a body of professed Christians, that is, a church. Paul, in his epistle to the Corinthians, addresses himself to the church of God in that city, i. e., to those "who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ."

Any body of men, therefore, that retains the doctrine of the incarnation, or that Jesus is the Son of God, that sets him forth as the object of religious worship and confidence, retains the vital principle of Christianity. Nothing can prevent the saving power of that truth, when it is really embraced. 2. Again, according to our standards, there is no salvation out of the visible church. It is a common saying of Protestant theologians, "No man has God for his father, who has not the church for his mother." This is only saying, with the scriptures, that there is no salvation out of Christ. But if these premises are correct, the conclusion necessarily follows, that any religious body in communion with which men may be saved, is a part of the visible church; otherwise men are saved out of that church. The visible church, therefore, according to our standards, consists of all those who profess saving truth. 3. This point is so plain, that it was repeatedly conceded on the floor of the Assembly. The question, whether the Romish Church is a true church, was admitted to turn on the previous question: Does she retain truth enough to save the soul? One of the speakers did, indeed, say that although there were true believers in the church of Rome, they were not members of the visible church; which is a contradiction in terms, since the visible church consists of *all* who profess the true religion, or saving doctrine. The mere fact of their having faith and avowing it in their conversation and deportment, makes them members of the visible church, in the true, scriptural, and Presbyterian, though not in the Puseyite, sense of the term.

If these principles are correct, we have only to apply them to the case in hand, and ask, does the church of Rome retain truth enough to save the soul? We do not understand how it is possible for any Christian man to answer this question in the negative. They retain the doctrine of the Incarnation, which we know from the infallible word of God, is a life-giving doctrine. They retain the whole doctrine of the Trinity. They teach the doctrine of atonement far more fully and accurately than multitudes of professedly orthodox Protestants. They hold a much higher doctrine as to the necessity of divine influence, than prevails among many whom we recognise as Christians. They believe in the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and in eternal life and judgment. These doctrines are in their creeds, and however they may be perverted

and overlaid, still as general propositions they are affirmed. And it must be remembered, that it is truth presented in general propositions, and not with subtle distinctions, that saves the soul. Protestants, says Bossuet, cannot deny that we admit the fundamentals of religion. "If they will have them to consist in believing that we must adore one only God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and that we must put our trust in God alone through his Son, who became man, was crucified, and rose again for us, they know in their conscience, that we profess this doctrine; and if they add those other doctrines which are contained in the apostles' creed, they do not doubt that we receive them all without exception." Having quoted an admission to this effect, from Daille, he adds: "But though M. Daille had not granted thus much, the thing is manifest in itself; and all the world knows that we profess all those doctrines which Protestants call fundamental."*

* An Exposition of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church, by the Right Rev. J. B. Bossuet, London, 1685, p. 2. On Justification, Bossuet says: "We believe, in the first place, that our sins are freely forgiven us by the divine mercy, for Christ's sake. These are the express words of the council of Trent. . . . Seeing the scriptures explain the remission of sins, by sometimes telling us that God covers them, and sometimes that he takes them away and blots them out by the grace of his Holy Spirit, which makes us new creatures; we believe that to form a perfect idea of the justification of a sinner, we must join together both of these expressions. For which reason we believe our sins not only to be covered, but also entirely washed away by the blood of Jesus Christ, and by the grace of regeneration; which is so far from obsecuring or lessening that idea which we ought to have of the merit of his blood, on the contrary it heightens and augments it. So that the righteousness of Christ is not only imputed but actually communicated to the faithful, by the operation of his Holy Spirit, insomuch that they are not only reputed, but rendered just by his grace." p. 12. It is easy to see here the unhappy blending of justification and sanctification together; but it is a far better statement of the truth, than is to be found in multitudes of Arminian writers; and unspeakably better than that, which for a hundred years, was preached from the great majority of the pulpits in the church of England.

Romanists teach that Christ is the meritorious ground of our justification. Thus the council of Trent, sess. vi. c. 7., says: *Meritoria (causa) est dilectissimus Dei unigenitus, qui cum essemus inimici, per nimiam caritatem, qua dilexit nos, sua sanctissima passione in ligno crucis, nobis justificationem meruit.* And in c. 8., the council say: "Christum sanctissima sua passione in ligno crucis nobis justificationem meruisse, et pro nobis Deo Patri satisfecisse, et neminem posse esse justum, nisi cui merita passionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi communicantur." In like manner, Bellarmine, de Justificatione, ii. c. 2, says, "We are justified on account of the merits of Christ;" and in c. 7, he says, "If Protestants only mean that the merits of Christ are imputed to us, because they are given to us by God, so that we can present them to the Father for our sins, since Christ undertook to make satisfaction for us, and to reconcile us to God the Father, they are right." Which is precisely what we do mean.

It is further evident that the church of Rome retains truth enough to save the soul, from the fact that true believers, who have no other means of instruction than those therein afforded, are to be found in that communion. Wherever the fruits of the Spirit are, there is the Spirit; and wherever the Spirit is, there is still the church. It is one of the worst features of Puseyism, that it takes such a view of the church, as to force its advocates to deny those to be Christians who exhibit the Spirit of Christ. Instead, therefore, of loving them as brethren, they cast out their names as evil; which is not only a great sin, but a great detriment to their own souls. We shall not less sin against God and our own best interests, if we reject as reprobates any of the real followers of Christ, no matter in what external communion they may be found. We rejoice, therefore, that the Assembly freely admits, in their minute, that there are true believers in the church of Rome. Indeed, we are not sure that truth would not demand the admission that there were more of evangelical doctrine and of true religion in that church, than were to be found in the church of England, or in some of the Protestant churches of the continent of Europe, notwithstanding their orthodox creeds, during their long declension in the last century. We have heretofore had the misfortune to be held up as the friends of drunkenness, and the advocates of slavery, because we could not believe that alcohol is sin, and every slave-holder a thief; and we fear that even good men may now regard us as the apologists of Popery, because we cannot think that a community who believe that Jesus is the Son of God, who worship the Trinity, who hold that we are justified by the merits of Christ, and are sanctified by his Holy Spirit, are to be placed in the same category with Pagans and Mohammedans. And we are constrained to say, that as the cause of temperance and the interests of the slave, suffer greatly from the extravagance of their advocates, so we fear the cause of Protestantism suffers materially from the indiscriminating denunciations heaped upon the church of Rome, and from transferring the abhorrence due to her corruptions, to her whole complicated system of truth and error.

The view presented above of the church of Rome is sustained by the authority of the Reformers, and of all Protestant churches. We have already remarked, that the question whether the church of Rome is a true church, may be affirmed or denied, according to the sense attached to the

terms. Accordingly, it is both affirmed and denied, by the parties referred to. They used the strongest terms of denunciation of the whole papal system; its perversion of the truth, its false doctrines, its corruption in worship and morals; its tyranny and persecuting spirit. They declared that church to be antichristian and apostate, the mystical Babylon, from which the people of God are commanded to withdraw. All this is said not only by the Reformers, but by churches and theologians down to the present day. At the same time, and in the same breath, they said that viewed in a different light, the church of Rome is still a church, just as the apostate Israelites were still the covenant people of God. If the Israelites were denominated from the character of their rulers, or of the mass of the people, from their authoritative declarations and acts, they were apostates and idolaters. If denominated from the relation which they still sustained to God, from the truth which they continued to profess, or from the real saints who were to be found among them, they were still the church, and were so addressed by the prophets, and their circumcision regarded as the seal of God's covenant. Thus Calvin says: "If the church be considered as the body whose judgment we are bound to revere, to whose authority we must defer, whose instructions we must receive, to whose discipline we must submit, whose communion we must religiously and in all things cultivate, we cannot concede the papacy to be the church, as though the obligation to obedience still continued. Yet we willingly concede to it what the prophets conceded to the Jews and Israelites. . . . Since then we are not willing to concede the title church unconditionally to the papists, we do not thereby deny that there are churches among them, but only contend for the true and legitimate constitution of the church, with which communion is required in sacraments and doctrine." Lib. iv. c. 2. §§ 10-12. To the same effect Turretin denies that the modern church of Rome can, without qualification, be called a true church of Christ; but to explain his position he says: "The church of Rome may be viewed under a twofold aspect, as Christian in reference to the profession of Christianity, and of the evangelical truths which it retains; and as it is Papal, in reference to its subjection to the Pope, and to its corruptions, as well in manners as in doctrine, which it has mixed up with those truths and built upon them, contrary to the word of God. In the former

aspect, we do not deny that there is some truth in that church; but in the latter, under which she is contemplated when we deny her to be a true church, we deny that she is Christian and apostolical, but affirm her to be antichristian and apostate. In this view, *impropiè et secundum quid*, we admit the church of Rome to be a Christian Church in three respects. 1. In respect to the people of God, the elect, still remaining in it, who are commanded to come out. 2. In respect to the external form, in which we discover some of the elements of a church, in respect as well to the word of God and its preaching, which though corrupted, still remain, and as to the administration of the sacraments, especially baptism, which, as to the substance, still remains entire. 3. As to Christian and evangelical doctrines, as concerning the Trinity, Christ as mediator, his incarnation, death and resurrection, and others by which she is distinguished from pagans and infidels."—vol. iii. p. 135.

We admit that it is a very unfortunate method of speaking, to say a body is a church *secundum quid*, and *secundum quid* is not a church. Still this is an inconvenience we have to submit to on almost all subjects, and in the present instance, it expresses a great truth. It must be remembered that these were holy men, who trembled at the word of God. Christ had commanded his disciples to hear the church, to remain in her communion and to submit to her discipline. To admit, therefore, without qualification, that the church of Rome was a true church, seemed to include an admission of an obligation to receive her doctrines and to submit to her authority. This they could not do. They therefore denied that the church of Rome was a church in any such sense as to require communion and obedience. They thereby intended to deny that the supremacy of the Pope, the hierarchy, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, worshipping of saints, and the other numerous corruptions of popery, belong to the church of God; that they are Christian or apostolical, and as such to be received and submitted to. While they admitted that the reception of the scriptures as the word of God, the profession of saving doctrines, the sacraments, the presence of the elect, are characteristics of the church, and consequently that any body of which these things can be affirmed, cannot consistently with the truth of God, be simply and without qualification, declared to be no more a church than a company of pagans. The necessity of making these distinc-

tions, of affirming and denying the same proposition, shows the impropriety of the question. Instead of asking, What is a church? we should ask, What is a pure church? All the definitions given in our books, tell us what a pure church is. And when Protestants deny the church of Rome to be a church, they deny that she comes within their definition of a pure church, though they admit her to be a corrupt and apostate church. The whole foundation, therefore, of the argument of the Assembly, seems to us to be false. It assumes that the church of Rome is in no sense a church; which is to assume that she does not admit the scriptures to be the word of God, that she does not profess that Jesus is the Son of God and the Saviour of the world, that she does not profess saving truths, and that she does not bring forth children unto God; all which assumptions are notoriously and confessedly false, and therefore the conclusion which is derived from these assumptions, must be unsound.

Long as this article has become, there is one other view of this subject we must be permitted to present. It matters not whether the papacy as an organization is a church or no, as far as the present question is concerned. The contrary assumption is founded upon the idea that baptism is an act of a church; or that the administrator so acts in the name of the organized society to which he belongs, that those whom he baptizes thereby become members of that society. It was hence argued that the recipients of Romish baptism, are made Romanists, and are baptized into a profession of all the heresies of popery. This appears to [us an entirely wrong view of the subject, and to be founded on the Puseyite doctrine of the church as a corporation, or organized body, into which men are admitted by the ordinance of baptism. It is however the admitted doctrine of Protestants, that the church Catholic is not an organized society. It is also admitted among Protestants that baptism does not initiate the recipient into any particular church, but into the church catholic. The eunuch when baptized by the road side, Paul when baptized in his chamber, the jailor at Phillippi, and the thousands of scattered believers baptized by the apostles were not made members of any particular church, or organized body by their baptism. After they were baptized, and thus introduced into the church catholic, they associated or organized themselves into particular churches. So at the present day,

no man is made an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Methodist by his baptism, but after baptism, he joins what particular denomination he sees fit. No man therefore is made a papist by being baptized by a papist. It follows from this that the validity of baptism does not depend upon the character of the particular denomination to which the administrator belongs; because he does not act in the name of that denomination, but as a member of the church catholic. And every man who professes saving truth is a member of that church. It matters not therefore whether the Quakers as a society come within the definition of a church; individual Quakers, if they have the faith of God's elect and profess it, are members of his church. And so too it matters not whether the papacy comes within the definition of a church; individual papists, if they profess that Jesus is the Son of God, are within the pale of the church catholic, and, if they have public authority, may baptize in the name of Christ.

Baptism therefore, not being an ordinance of any particular church, but of the church catholic, and every man who professes saving truth being a member of that church, Romish baptism if administered by a man professing such truth, is Christian baptism. It is baptism administered by a member of the visible church, having public authority in that church, which is all that can be said of baptism administered by the Archbishop of Canterbury, or by the moderator of our Assembly.

We maintain therefore Romish baptism to be valid; that is, that it avails to make the recipient a member of the church catholic, because it is a washing with water, in the name of the Trinity, with the design to signify, seal and apply the benefits of the covenant of grace. It is administered by ordained ministers; for a Romish priest is a man publicly called to the office of a presbyter. It is administered by a member of the visible church; for every man who confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, is a member of that church. It is only by adopting the hierarchical or Puseyite doctrine of the church, and of orders, that the opposite conclusion can be sustained. We must restrict the church to miserably narrow limits, within which the truth and Spirit of God refuse to be confined; and we must claim an authority and virtue for specific forms of ordination, which the scriptures no where sanction. We are therefore, constrained to regard the decision of the Assembly as in

direct conflict with our standards, and with the word of God; and as incompatible with Protestant principles, as well as with the practice of the whole Protestant world. We have no scruple in saying this. For in protesting against the decision of 169 members of the Assembly, we can hide ourselves in the crowd of 169 millions of faithful men, who since the Reformation, have maintained the opposite, and more catholic doctrine.*

If the church of Rome is antichrist, a synagogue of Satan, how can its ordinances be Christian sacraments? This we doubt not is the difficulty which weighs most with those who reject Romish baptisms as invalid. We would ask such persons, whether they admit that a Roman Catholic can be a child of God? If he can, how can a man be a member of the synagogue of Satan and of the body of Christ at the same time? Is there no inconsistency here? If not, then there is no inconsistency in declaring that the Romish system, so far as it is distinguished from that of evangelical churches, is antichristian, and yet that those who are groaning under that system are in the visible church. The terms antichrist, synagogue of Satan, &c., refer not to the mass of the people, nor to the presbyters of that communion, nor the word of God, nor the saving truths which they profess, but to the Popish hierarchy and

* We have heard it repeatedly objected that this whole discussion attributes too much importance to baptism. What is the harm, it is asked, of declaring a particular kind of baptism to be invalid? or of repeating the ordinance? We have also heard brethren say, they left the matter to the decision of the applicant for admission to our communion. If he wished to be rebaptized, they rebaptized him; if he was satisfied with the baptism received in the church of Rome, they did not insist on a repetition of the ordinance. We have no superstitious feeling on this subject, but we object to such repetition.

1. Because it involves a declaration of what is not true. It declares that to be no baptism which has all the essential characteristics of that sacrament. It declares that the recipient had never before avowed himself a Christian, when the fact is not so.
2. Because we have neither scriptural authority nor example for the repetition of the rite; and such repetition is forbidden by our Confession of Faith, and is contrary to the usage of the whole Christian Church.
3. Because it is contrary to the very nature of the ordinance. *Baptismus est signum initiationis.* It is a declaration that the recipient now for the first time takes upon him the obligations, and claims the privileges of a professing Christian. If a man is installed into a particular office, it is a declaration that he was not before publicly invested with the office. If he presents himself to be married to a particular woman, it is a declaration that she is not already his wife. And if he presents himself for baptism, he declares that he has not been washed with water in the name of the Trinity, in order to his initiation into the visible church.

its corruptions. That hierarchy with its usurpations and errors, is the mystery of iniquity, the man of sin, which in the church catholic, the temple of God, exalts itself above all that is called God or that is worshipped. If Roman Catholics are no part of the visible church, then the Romish hierarchy is not "the man of sin" spoken of by the apostle, for he was to rise and rule in the church. It is, therefore, one thing to denounce the Romish system, and another to say that Romanists are no part of the church catholic. And if they are in the church, their baptism being a washing with water in the name of the Trinity, is Christian baptism; just as the word of God, when read or preached by them, is still his word, and is to be received and obeyed as such.

Wilson - H. G. 1844.

- 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. Glasgow: 1844.
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. Wad-den Turner. Part 1st. New York and London: 1842.
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.* 2 vols. London: 1843.

THE chapter and verse division of the scriptures, though it often trammels the sense, and deceives the incautious reader, is a great convenience. One would suppose that such a division had suggested a Concordance of passages, wherein these notations might be availed of for so important an end. But in truth, Cardinal Hugo had first made a Concordance of the Latin Bible, and was driven to these numerical subdivisions, for reference in that work. This was about three centuries before the first attempt toward such a key for the New Testament in English, which Thomas Gybson, the author, (London, 1535) introduces as

“most necessary to be had in the hands of all such as desire the communication of any place contained in the New Testament.” This, indeed, is the common use made of such a work among ordinary readers. Though subjects may often be traced and analyzed by means of the verbal captions and classifications, and though important help may be had towards making the scripture interpret itself, an English Concordance, we know, is usually taken up, to find some passage by some prominent word in it, which may be remembered. And all own how great a service can be rendered in this way by an adequate key to all the passages. An occasional hunt for a verse, where we have forgotten the chapter and perhaps the book, and can only rummage the Bible for a word or phrase we may recall, failing perhaps at last, has fully satisfied all of the comfort to be had from a Cruden or even a Butterworth. Yet some of the smaller works in this department have sought portableness and cheapness in abridgment, so far as only to tantalize by their disappointment. How often you may search in Brown for a passage, and taking eight in ten of the words, not find it after all! The popular and satisfactory volume of Cruden, first published more than a century ago, has been the standard of completeness and accuracy. Beyond the mere help for finding a verse, his elaborate headings are often valuable. Yet it contains more than a Concordance need, and the size and cost have doubtless contracted its circulation. The present attempt at abridgment under the auspices of Rev. David King, LL.D. has gone on the plan of erasing superfluous references—omitting explanations of words as being more appropriate to a dictionary—contracting quotations, and excluding wholly the Concordance to the Apocalypse. This edition is neatly put up—with great saving in size and one-half in expense, and is altogether safely abridged and satisfactory. An American edition (re-print) has since appeared.

A Hebrew Concordance is quite another thing. The common biblical student would resort to it, not so much for finding passages or even for examining subjects, as for analyzing words and phrases, by inspection of their particular use. The citations being in Hebrew text, without the points, it is not much that common proficients can gather of the forms, or philological structure from this source, while they are often appalled at the bare black-letter, and can at most, only tell how frequently the word occurs and

where, turning to the English Bible for examination of the use. Yet a collation of passages is spread before the eye. The general and special force of a term or idiom can be deduced—and thus, the Concordance becomes a sort of Biblical Lexicon with the great advantage of quoting every case in which the word appears.

Nordheimer's prospectus which was issued in 1840 was hailed by many as promising greatly to subserve the interests of sound biblical learning. He proposed to improve upon Fürst's which had been itself so much an improvement upon the old authors.

He added a compendious Hebrew-English Lexicon which would relieve very much the dryness of the book, and aid critical investigation—giving concisely the original form and meaning, as well as the varieties of occurrence. His appendices, such as a tabular view of all the forms of nouns with their origin and mode of formation—also a list of all the particles or pronominal roots with their compositions and formations must have been highly useful. But sadly enough this work has been arrested, after the 1st No., for lack of that patronage it so richly deserves. And we fear that the opportunity has gone by, of securing it to our American scholars. So it occurs—that the results of plodding and profound investigation are lost, for want of interest in those who are so immensely helped at so little comparative cost. The materials in the hands of Mr. Turner, the assistant of Dr. N., could be issued, we understand, so as to carry out the original plan of the author. Could not some one of literary enterprize and monetary capital be found to furnish the adequate means—assume the proprietorship, and have the work go on? The call in New York for a given number of subscribers was no fair test of the circulation which such a book, once issued, would obtain. How many, from all parts, never knew of the publisher's call, and the condition of publishing. It is worth being noticed by our literary capitalists, if such we have, that the great work before us entitled "The Englishman's Concordance"—Hebrew, 2 vols., Greek, 1 vol.—appears under no other name than that of George V. Wigram, who declares himself "neither originator, executor, nor reviser, but *proprietor* only." He candidly narrates some incidents connected with the first conception and projection of such a work—referring the idea and incipency of it, to

Rev. Wm. Burgh, a clergyman of Dublin, and tracing it through various stages to its completion.

We can only notice, in brief, the "Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance to the Old Testament." The type is clear and fair, and the page altogether neat and attractive. The chief novelty is the Hebrew-Anglic feature, the passages being cited not in the Hebrew text, but in the words of the received version. The circumstances of the original form are well exhibited, by a sufficient quotation from the English, putting in italics so much of the sentence as properly translates the term. This gives at a glance the biblical usage; and aids the student "to deduce his meaning and definition of terms from the use made of them by the Holy Ghost." In this way, it is a complete Biblical Lexicon, Hebrew and English, only without the philological analysis of roots. The Hebrew word is given at the heading in its primitive form, and designated by the part of speech; while all the regular changes that it takes, are indicated by a separate paragraph with an English notation, e. g. the conjugations in which a Hebrew verb occurs are denoted by the Kal, Niphal, &c., and the passages are carefully sorted under each, to correspond. So that without having the Hebrew forms in all their varieties before the eye, the student is fairly apprized of the grammatical changes; and for close inspection of the word itself, nothing is easier or better than to refer, at once, to the passage in the Hebrew Bible. Every Hebrew Lexicon is, to a great extent, biblical, because apart from the analysis of the root and the help of comparative philology, the main material is gathered, of course, from the scripture use. But this has the advantage of quoting *every passage*, with all the rarities and varieties, opening the whole history of the word in all its circumstances, at once to view, as it has found place in the Old Testament. It will be seen that the grammar and dictionary of the language can be studied here to some extent, with fine advantage, and with an attraction and facility not elsewhere found. The force of the respective verbal forms, or conjugations, can be noted by their use, which so far, is a relief to the dryness of formularies and rules. And thus, an extensive biblical apparatus is had, calculated to make one familiar with the language, after having mastered the rudiments.

Curiosities of translation are frequently exhibited which are most interesting to be collected so completely,

and contrasted so plainly with the ordinary use, and grammatical peculiarities are often so indicated as to provoke the closest inquiry from other sources. e. g. לָנֶפֶשׁ occurs in five instances with these varieties in the translation: 1. "therefore," 2. "wherefore," 3. "for which cause," 4. "surely," and in Zechariah xi. 7. "You!" Note. The English version takes this for a pronominal suffix. Margin, "Verily."

So the important Heb. noun כֶּבֶד, m.

Gen. vi. 14. Pitch it within and without *with pitch*.

Exod. xxi. 30. If there be laid on him *a sum of money*.

" xxx. 12. Then shall they give every man *a ransom*.

Num. xxxv. 31. Ye shall take no *satisfaction* for the life of, &c.

Num. xxxv. 32. Ye shall take no *satisfaction*, &c.

1. Sam. vi. 18. And of country *villages*.

" xii. 3. Of whose hand have I received (any) *bribe*, (mar. *ransom*.)

Job, xxxiii. 24. Found *a ransom*, (mar. or *atonement*.)

" xxxvi. 18. *A great ransom* cannot deliver thee.

Ps. xlix. 7, (8). Nor give to God *a ransom* for him.

Prov. vi. 35. He will not regard any *ransom*.

" xiii. 8. *The ransom* of a man's life (are) his riches.

" xxi. 18. The wicked (shall be) *a ransom* for the, &c.

Cant. i. 14. A cluster of *camphire*.

" iv. 13. *Camphire* with spikenard.

Isa. xliii. 3. I gave Egypt (for) *thy ransom*.

Am. v. 12. They take *a bribe*, mar. or *ransom*.

Here, the entire list of scriptural uses and circumstances of the word is given at a glance.

Great care has evidently been taken in citing the translation so fully, as to give the version of the Hebrew word, and selecting such other words for quotation as best to exhibit the sense and connection, italicizing neither more nor less than exactly answers to the Hebrew form in the text. e. g. p. 287, "*Thou shouldest make thy nest as high*." We are led at once to conclude, from this precise denoting of the English force which the form has, as it is found, that it is in the Hiphil conjugation.

There is really much that is interesting in this volume for common, cursory perusal. Though this is not looked for in a Concordance, but all the contrary, yet the light

here thrown upon the meaning of words by a comparison of all their various senses in scripture, repays the glance at any page, and makes it readable.

We are startled at the immense labour in the revisions and comparisons that must have been necessary to secure even tolerable accuracy for the work. After comparing other Concordances among themselves, and with the original, and finding them not to be relied on for fulness or correctness, a volume was made, containing a census of all the Hebrew words in the Old Testament, as "a standard of comparison," so that no omission might possibly occur. It is stated that in this volume not six words out of 400,000 were missing in the last review; and that finally as compared with Fürst it discovered not less than seven corrigenda, and at least ten omissions in the first eight pages of the work, correct as it has been considered. The most of ten years has been occupied in various and laborious revisions. The comparisons—the verifications by different editions of both Hebrew and English Bibles—the re-writing of MSS.—the counting of verses and words, and even of some letters, in true Masoretic style—with the cutting, pasting, checking, sorting, reading the words, now verbatim, now literatim, must give any one who reads the Introduction, the highest idea of accuracy in the work throughout.

The arrangement for the particles—a difficult matter in such a compilation, from the frequency with which they occur, is in the highest degree satisfactory. When the instances do not exceed twenty they are given entire, as in other words. When beyond this number, selections are furnished (from an entire list made out) of all the uses and connexions. But a crowning feature of advantage in the work, is found in the Indices.—1st. Under each Hebrew and Chaldee word is shown the variety of English *definitions* occurring in the version. This serves as a Lexicon in brief, and very concisely gives a tabular view of the senses in which the word has been used.

2nd. Is an index ranging under any *English* word the various *Hebrew terms* translating it, with reference to the page. This gives a view of Hebrew synonymes. Besides, it serves as an English Concordance. You may take a prominent word of any passage in the English version, and usually, with little trouble, you can find both the Hebrew term and the scriptural senses of it.

Cruden sureiy had enough in the dry processes of his valuable work, to make him crazy, apart from the incidental perplexities which actually had that effect. The disappointments of patronage he should have been saved; and so should any, who have waded through such an immense mass of items for the so great convenience of others. We hope that these volumes will amply repay the *investment* that has been so handsomely made. Many a mere English student of the scriptures, will find himself let into the Hebrew by a new door-way. Not a few, perhaps, who, with some smattering of the language, are none too fond of the apparatus for its mastery, or of the dull processes for its pursuit will find extra facilities and allurements here. And while the Hebraist will easily get at the Hebrew forms by consulting his Hebrew Bible, he will have, at a view, what is so important to him, all the instances in which the word occurs, with enough of the passage from the English to recall often the connection, and to intimate the position of the Hebrew term. We do not believe that any thing can ever supersede, for a minister of the word, a thorough knowledge of the respective originals; but one who would get some insight of the Hebrew language in a pleasant way, that illustrates constantly the grammatical rules, and keeps the best kind of Lexicon before him, could not do better than to study these volumes. The commonest reader can find striking entertaining points, making the book desirable, as was intended, for the mere Englishman. Many, doubtless, who have never had the least clue to the original tongues, will seek these Concordances for their libraries.

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. With an Introduction, by the Rev. Thomas H. Stockton. Two vols. in one. Second American edition. Philadelphia: 1845. pp. 308 and 312.

DR. WHITEHEAD was associated with Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore as one of the literary executors of Wesley, and was intrusted with the manuscripts of John, the private diary of Charles, and with the use of the manuscripts of the Wesley family, to assist him in the preparation of this work.

An unfortunate difference arising between Dr. Whitehead and his associate executors, led to a protracted controversy touching the fidelity of our author and the character of his work. Mr. Stockton refers this controversy to the unwillingness of Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore to allow a full and faithful history of the rise of Methodism to be given to the world, as such history would bear, in some respects, unfavourably on themselves. However this may be, the advantages of Dr. Whitehead for giving a full account of the two distinguished subjects of his memoir, were such as no other biographer has possessed; and it is not without apparent reason that Mr. Stockton pronounces this, "The original work—the foundation work on which others have built—the standard Life of John and Charles Wesley."

Christ on the Cross. An Exposition of the Twenty-Second Psalm. By Rev. John Stevenson, perpetual curate of Casy and Gunwalloe, Cornwall. First American, from the tenth London edition. New York: Robert Carter. 1845. pp. 345.

THIS is a devout practical commentary on one of the most remarkable and affecting of the Messianic portions of the Old Testament; in which our blessed Redeemer is contemplated first as suffering, and then as triumphing; Christ "on the Cross, in darkness; and Christ on the Cross, in light." The work has commended itself to the pious feelings of the followers of our Lord, by the devout spirit in which it is written, and by the important truths which it so impressively presents.

The Life and Power of True Godliness; described in a Series of Discourses. By Alexander McLeod, D. D., late Pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, in New York. Fourth edition. With an Introductory Essay. By John Mc. Leod, D. D. New York: Robert Carter. 1845. pp. 280.

THIS is a work of established reputation. Three editions were printed during the life-time of their distinguished author; and a fourth is now published, with a biographical essay. These sermons treat of the most important topics of practical religion, and are distinguished by richness of doctrinal instruction, and by the perspicuity and force with which that instruction is presented.

Discourses on Practical and Experimental Subjects.

By Jonathan Cogswell, D. D. Late a Professor in the Theological Institute of Connecticut. New Brunswick: 1845. pp. 228.

THESE Discourses are published at the expense of the author, and the whole edition generously presented to the Presbyterian Board of Domestic Missions. Dr. Cogswell, as a sermonizer, is very instructive. He presents the truth clearly, and in a form well suited to produce a practical effect; and we cannot but hope that the circulation of these discourses will be productive of great good.

1. *Class Book of Poetry: consisting of Selections from distinguished English and American Poets; arranged in chronological order, with Biographical and Critical Remarks.* By John S. Hart, A. M., Principal of the Philadelphia High School. Philadelphia: Butler & Williams. 1845. pp. 384.
2. *Class Book of Prose: consisting of Selections from distinguished English and American Authors, &c. &c.* By John S. Hart, A. M., Principal, &c. Philadelphia: Butler & Williams. 1845. pp. 384.

THESE works are intended as reading books for schools. They contain selections from more than a hundred poets and prose writers, well adapted from the chronological arrangement adopted to give some idea of the progress of the language and changes of style. The brief notices of the writers, prefixed to the selection, communicate important information to the young reader. The passages quoted, are designed not only as models of expression, but as lessons of wisdom and goodness.

A Practical Manual of Elocution: embracing Voice and Gesture. By Merritt Caldwell, A. M., Professor of Metaphysics and Political Economy, and Teacher of Elocution in Dickinson College. Philadelphia: Sorin & Ball. 1845. pp. 331.

THIS appears to be an elaborate and able work. The author acknowledges himself greatly indebted for his materials to "The Philosophy of the Human Voice, by James Rush, M. D." and to the "Chironomia of Austin." The principles contained in these standard works, are here clearly

stated and copiously illustrated. Elocution is so much an imitative art, that we do not know whether such works as the one before us, can enable a young man to make himself a good reader or speaker; but we are convinced that far too little attention is generally paid to this subject; and that it is of great importance that those who expect to spend their lives in addressing public assemblies, should learn the principles which Professor Caldwell has so well unfolded, and endeavour to gain correct habits of articulation, modulation, and emphasis. We would therefore recommend this work as an incentive and guide in this department.

The Tenth Annual Report of the Association for the Religious instruction of the Negroes, in Liberty County, Georgia. Savannah. 1845.

THIS Report contains a great deal of interesting information as to the religious instruction of the negroes in Liberty county, both before and since the organization of the existing association. This information we should be glad to transfer to our pages, did our limits permit, and did we not hope to have this whole subject presented at length, in a future number, to our readers. We will therefore only say, at present, that the present report of the tenth year of the Rev. C. C. Jones's labours in this field, furnishes abundant evidence that great good has already been accomplished; and that Southern Christians and planters generally, would consult their own interests, as well as their duty, in diffusing far and wide, the means for the regular and faithful instruction of their slaves. The association has been in active operation eleven years; it has furnished a district embracing a population of more than four thousand negroes with the regular preaching of the gospel. During the past year, it has kept in operation seven Sabbath schools, with an average attendance of five hundred and twenty seven scholars, and twenty-five teachers. It has maintained "inquiry meetings," to aid those who were in spiritual darkness or distress. It has pursued a system of plantation meetings, which have been found of great service. It secured the gratuitous and faithful service of the Rev. Samuel S. Law, for some time before his death, in preaching the gospel; and half the time of his son, the Rev. J. S. Law, has for two years and a half, been devoted to this work, in the service of the Lambert estate.

A Commentary on the Apocalypse. By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass. Two vols. 8vo. Andover: Allen, Merrill & Wardwell. New York: Mark Newman. 1845.

WE can at present only give the title of this work, which may be considered the *chef d'oeuvre* of its venerable author. He has devoted to it many years of patient labour; and has erected a durable monument to his ability for diligent research. Every question connected with the literary and exegetical history of the Apocalypse is fully examined, and we are happy to find that in almost all matters of importance, the author's views are coincident with those generally entertained by Christian commentators on this portion of scripture. We need hardly add that the work is printed with the elegance characteristic of the Andover press.

Plato against the Atheists; or, the Tenth book of the Dialogues on Laws, accompanied with critical notes, and followed by extended Dissertations on some of the main points of Platonic Philosophy and Theology.—By Taylor Lewis, LL. D. Professor of Greek Language and Literature, in the University of the city of New York. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1845. pp. 378.

PROFESSOR LEWIS has in this work given abundant evidence of a familiar acquaintance with the writings of his favorite author. As the public mind is now more awake than usual to philosophical discussions, and the Baconian and Transcendental systems are coming more and more into conflict, we are glad to see an attempt of a scholar addicted to neither school to vindicate the claims of Platonism. He can expect to satisfy neither, though he may reasonably hope to give pleasure and instruction to both.

Some account of the Apples of Sodom, found on the shores of the Dead Sea. By A. B. Lambert, Esq., F. R. S., V. P. L. S., &c. Edinburgh Philosophical Journal.

AMONG the objects of wonder described by Eastern travellers, the beautiful but deceptive apples of Sodom occupy a conspicuous place. They have been described by a suc-

cession of writers, since the time of Josephus until our own day, but their true nature was never understood until some specimens of the fruit were brought to England and submitted to Mr. Lambert, the Vice President of the Linnean Society. According to the account of our countryman Dr. Robinson, the tree on which this fruit grows is from six to eight inches in diameter, and from ten to fifteen feet high ; or nearly of the dimensions of an ordinary apple tree. It has a greyish cork-like bark, with long oval leaves, and in general appearance and character might be taken for a gigantic perennial species of the silk weed, found in the Northern parts of the United States. Its leaves and flowers are similar to those of that plant, and when broken off they in like manner discharge copiously a milky fluid. The apples, as they appear on the tree, are of a rich purple colour, and varnished over with a soft substance of the consistence of honey ; shining with a most brilliant lustre in the sun ; they appear like a delicious and tempting fruit. Though fair to the eye and soft to the touch, when pressed, or slightly struck, they explode with a puff like bladders or puff balls, leaving in the hand only the shreds of the thin rind and a few fibres. They are filled chiefly with air, like bladders, which gives them the round form, while in the centre a small slender pod runs through the body from the stem, and is connected with the rind by thin filaments. This pod contains a small quantity of fine silk with seeds, precisely like the pod of the silk weed, though much smaller. The Arabs collect the silk and twist it into matches for their guns, preferring it to the common match, because it requires no sulphur to render it combustible. They also employ the same article as a stuffing for their cushions.

The specimens submitted to Mr. Lambert were brought to England by the Hon. Robert Curzon. They were the first that had ever been seen in that country, and a scientific examination of them enabled the author to clear up the many mistakes made by travellers in reference to them. They prove to be gall apples, on a species of oak, containing an insect. Mr. Curzon having had the curiosity to taste a small quantity of the interior, found it literally "as bitter as gall." The nut is pea-shaped, with a circle of small sharp-pointed protuberances on the upper part of it, which appear to be formed by the insect for defence. In each of the galls there is an aperture through which the

insect escapes, and in the centre there is a small round hole or nidus, where it lodged. Mr. Lambert finds the leaves of the oak to be those of the *Quercus insectoria*, which is accurately figured in Oliver's Travels in the Levant. The tree is found throughout Syria. The insect has been figured by Oliver, but he does not appear to be aware that the galls found on it are the same with the apples of Sodom.

- Sodom's Apples.*
1. *Observations on Colour Blindness, or insensibility to the impression of certain Colours.* By Sir David Brewster, K. H., &c. Philosophical Magazine.
 2. *Memoir on Daltonism, (or Colour Blindness.)* By M. Elie Wartmann, Professor of Natural Philosophy in the Academy of Lausanne, &c. Scientific Memoirs.

It is an interesting fact in reference to the dependence of one class, at least of our knowledge, on sensation, that many persons are born with defective vision and yet remain for years of their lives without being conscious of the deficiency. We know a gentleman who had probably been always near sighted, but who did not discover the peculiarity of his vision until the age of twenty-five, when it was accidentally made known by looking at a distant object through a concave lens. Many persons whose eyes are sound and capable of exercising the most delicate functions, are permanently unable to distinguish certain colours. And the number of such persons is much more considerable than we would be led to imagine from the little attention this defect of vision has excited. It is often unknown to the individual himself, and indeed only becomes revealed by comparing his powers of discriminating different colours with those of other persons. The eye also under some circumstances may lose its sensibility for particular colours, or be thrown into such an unusual state as to present all objects to the mind under the appearance of a false colour. Thus if a person looks fixedly for a time at a bright red object and then turns his eye to a white wall, he will perceive a green image of the red object depicted on the white surface. A lady of our acquaintance was once thrown into an alarming but laughable paroxysm of terror by an effect of this kind. She had been for some hours attentively sewing on a bright crimson dress, when her attention was directed towards her child, who, in its sport, had thrown it-

self on the carpet; its face appeared of the most ghastly hue, and the affrighted mother screamed in agony, that her child was in convulsions—the other inmates of the house hastened to her assistance, but they were surprised to find the little one smiling in perfect health. The sanity of the mother became the natural object of solicitude, until the effect was properly referred to the impression made on her eye by the crimson cloth.

Phenomena of this kind are known by the name of accidental colours; they have long attracted the attention of the natural philosopher, but the explanation of them is still involved in considerable uncertainty. The hypothesis which has been most generally adopted is that the eye by long attention to a particular colour, becomes fatigued with this and is incapable after a time, of distinctly perceiving it; while it retains its full power of perception in reference to a fresh colour. The consequence of this is that when the eye is directed to a white surface, after having attentively regarded a red object, green must appear; because white may be considered as a compound of red and green, and when the perception of the red is destroyed, the green must become visible. This explanation, however well it may apply to some of the phenomena, is not sufficient for the whole. Accidental colours can be perceived in the eye itself in perfect darkness. This is shown by steadily regarding for a short time a brilliant lamp, and then covering the eyes with the hands so as to exclude all external light, a luminous spot will be perceived which passes in succession through all the colours of the rainbow.

Of the real cause of these appearances we are as yet almost entirely ignorant. Professor Plateau, of Ghent, has indeed referred them all to a few simple principles, but these appear to us rather expressions of the law of succession of the phenomena, than physical explanations of them. We do not however at this time intend to dwell on this class of phenomena, but to give a succinct account of those peculiarities of vision, in which abnormal perceptions of colour are permanent, and which are fully treated of in the memoirs, the titles of which stand at the head of this article.

The peculiarity of vision called *colour-blindness*, and sometimes *Daltonism*, may generally be referred to two classes. 1. Those in which all impression of colour, except white and black, are wanting. 2. Those in which

the individual can perceive certain simple colours, but is not able properly to distinguish between them. There are persons, strange as it may appear, in whom the sense of primary colour is entirely deficient, and who, in place of red, yellow and blue, see nothing but different degrees of white and black. Professor Wartmann gives a number of cases of this kind. The most ancient of those he finds described, is that by Dr. Tuberville, in 1684, of a woman, of about 32 years of age, who came to consult the Dr. about her sight, which, though excellent in other respects, gave her no impression in reference to colour, except white and black. Spurzheim mentions a family, all the members of which could only distinguish different shades of white and black. An account is given by Mr. Huddart of a shoemaker, in Cumberland, who could distinguish in different colours only a greater or less intensity of light, calling all bright tints white and all dull ones black. His peculiarity of vision was unknown to him until one day, while a boy, playing in the street, he found a stocking, and for the first time, was struck with the fact that it was called by his companions red, whereas to his mind it was capable of no farther description than that designated by the word stocking; he was thus led to conclude that there was something else besides the form and position in the leaves and fruit of a cherry tree, perceived by his playmates but not seen by himself. Two of his brothers had the same imperfection, while two other brothers, his sisters, and other relatives, had the usual condition of vision.

Of the other class, the cases are much more numerous; we shall, however, give only a few examples. Mr. Harvey, of Plymouth, mentions a tailor who could see in the rain-bow but two tints, namely, yellow and bright blue. Black appeared to him in general, green, sometimes crimson—light blue appeared like dark blue, crimson, or black—green was confounded with black and brown—carmine, red, lake, and crimson with blue.

But the most interesting case of this kind, is that of the celebrated chemical philosopher, Dr. Dalton, of England. He published an account of his own case and that of several others, in the transactions of the Manchester Society, in 1794. Of the seven colours of the rainbow, he could distinguish but two, yellow and blue; or at most, three, yellow, blue, and purple. He saw no difference between red and green; so that he thought the colour of a

laurel leaf the same as that of a stick of red sealing-wax. A story is told of his having, on one occasion, appeared at the quaker meeting, of which he was a member, in the usual drab coat and small-clothes of the sect, with a pair of flaming red-coloured stockings to match. Whatever may be the truth in reference to this story, we have the assertion of Professor Whewell, that when Dr. Dalton was asked with what he would compare the scarlet gown with which he had been invested by the university, he pointed to the trees, and declared that he perceived no difference between the colour of his robe and that of their foliage. Dr. Dalton found nearly twenty persons possessed of the same peculiarity of vision as himself; and among the number, the celebrated metaphysician, Dugald Stewart, who could not distinguish a crimson fruit, like the Siberian crab, from the leaves of the tree on which it grew, otherwise than by the difference in its form.

On account of the prominence which Mr. Dalton's publication gave this defect of vision, the continental philosophers gave it the name of *Daltonism*. To this name, however, several British writers have strongly objected. If this system of names were once allowed, say they, there is no telling where it would stop, the names of celebrated men would be connected, not with their superior gifts or achievements, but with the personal defects which distinguish them from their more favoured but less meritorious cotemporaries. Professor Whewell proposed the term *Idiopts*, signifying peculiarity of vision; but to this name Sir David Brewster properly objected, that the important consonant *p* would be very apt to be omitted in ordinary pronunciation, and so the last state of the Idiopt would be worse than the first. The name *colour-blindness*, suggested by Sir David, although not in all cases free from objection, is perhaps better than any we have seen proposed.

It has already been stated that the number of persons affected with colour-blindness, is much more considerable than is generally imagined. They are often themselves ignorant of their imperfection of vision, particularly when it is restricted to the want of power to discriminate between colours nearly related to each other. Professor Seebeck found five cases among the forty boys who composed the two upper classes of the gymnasium of Berlin. Professor Prevost, of Geneva, stated that they amounted to one in twenty; and Professor Wartmann does not think this estimate much exaggerated.

Observations on this peculiarity of vision have as yet been confined, so far as we know, to Europe, with the exception of two cases described by Dr. Hays, of Philadelphia, in the proceedings of the American Philosophical Society. It has also as yet been found only among the white race, although sufficient observations have not been made to render it probable that it is confined to this variety of the human family. The question has been asked, whether there is any external sign by which to detect, with simple inspection of the visual organ, a case of colour-blindness. Professor Wartmann remarks, that he would not venture to give an answer to this question in all cases in the negative. I have observed, says he, in the case of *Daltonians* whose eyes are brown, of the colour which the English call hazle, a golden lustre of a peculiar tint, when the eye was viewed under an incidence of some obliquity.

Colour-blindness is found much more common among men than women. Out of one hundred and fifty registered cases, there are but six of females, and one of these is doubtful. It has been conjectured that needle-work on a variety of coloured articles, might be the means of counter-acting the tendency to this defect, as well as to produce a delicacy of discrimination of different shades of colour, not possessed by those otherwise employed. But in answer to this, it has been remarked, that in the case of *Daltonians* engaged in painting, there has been found but little, if any improvement of condition of the vision; and the very employment of the females on works which require a constant comparison of colour, would daily reveal cases of blindness of this kind, did it frequently exist in the female sex. This peculiarity of vision is principally congenital. Professor W. has found but two exceptions; in one of these, colours were perceived in the usual manner, until the ninth year, when at that time the boy received a violent blow on the head, which fractured the scull, and rendered surgical operations necessary. The fact, however, that three of the brothers of this individual were affected with the same kind of vision, renders it probable that he was constitutionally predisposed to this peculiarity.

With regard to hereditary predisposition there are some persons in whom this defect of vision occurs, whose relatives have never been known to be affected with it; others appear to have inherited it from their fathers through several generations, both on the maternal and paternal side.

The boy before mentioned, as becoming blind at the age of nine years, was the eldest of eleven children, seven males and four females; these were singularly divided into two sets, one of which consisted of individuals with flaxed hair, and all the males with defective vision; the other, of those with red hair and ordinary power of vision.

Dr. Scebeck, as well as Professor Wartmann, has made a series of experiments, to determine whether a person of this peculiarity of vision possesses the power of perceiving differences in colours which appear identical to us. The result of the investigations of both these philosophers was that he does not. Another problem has also been solved by the last mentioned gentleman, in reference to the difference between a person with this defective vision, and one of ordinary conditioned sight, in the perception of complementary colours. He found that colours which we regard as complementary, or such as when mingled together produce white, do not appear as such to those affected with abnormal vision. They are not however insensible to accidental colours, but the feeling which results from the fatigue of attempting to produce these appears to be more painful in them than in us.

Various hypotheses have been advanced by different persons for the explanation of colour-blindness. Mr. Dalton supposed that his peculiarity of vision, as well as that of those whom he had examined, depended on the fact that the vitreous or principal humour of the eye, in these cases, instead of being colourless and transparent was tinged with a blue. After his death, in obedience to his own instruction, his eyes were examined by his medical attendant, Mr. Ransome, but the vitreous humour was not found to exhibit any tinge of blue, on the contrary it was of a pale yellow colour. Objects viewed through it were not changed in colour as they should have been had the hypothesis been true. Indeed, were the supposition correct, the same effect should be produced by blue spectacles, which is known not to be the case.

Stewart, Herschel and others are of the opinion that this malady of vision is attributable to a defect in the *sensorium* itself, which renders it incapable of appreciating the differences between the rays on which the sensation of colour depends. Sir David Brewster conceives that the eye in the case of colour-blindness, is insensible to the colours at one end of the spectrum, just as the ear of certain persons is

insensible to sounds at one extremity of the scale of musical notes, while it is perfectly sensible to all other sounds. He knows nothing about the *sensorium*, or its connection with, or mode of operation upon, the nerves of sensation; and from the analogy of sight and hearing, he has no hesitation in predicting that there may be found persons whose colour-blindness is confined to one eye, or at least is greater in one eye than in the other. Nor is this, says he, wholly a conjecture from analogy, for my own right eye, though not a better one than the left, which has no defect whatever, is more sensible to red light than the left eye. The case is precisely analogous with respect to his ears, for certain sounds; and no person, it is presumed, will maintain that there is a *sensorium* for each ear and each eye.

Whatever may be the cause of the inferiority, there exists a very easy means of rectifying it to a certain extent. This method, first used by Dr Seebeck, consists in viewing coloured objects through coloured media. Suppose the medium to be a piece of red glass; the impression of a red body and of a green one on the eye of a person like Dr. Dalton, would be different, although with the naked eye they would be the same. The red glass would intercept much more of the light of the green object than of the red one, and hence the two would be readily distinguishable by a difference in the intensity of the illumination of the two objects. Nothing can equal the surprise, says Professor Wartmann, of a *Daltonian* when the errors which he commits every day in the appreciation of colours are thus disclosed to him.

Sketches of Protestantism in Italy, past and present, including a notice of the Origin, History, and present State of the Waldenses, by Robert Baird. Boston: Benjamin Perkins & Co. 1845. pp. 418.

THESE sketches from the pen of Dr. Baird we have read with the liveliest interest; and we cordially recommend them as worthy the attention of all the friends of genuine religion. A portion of the sketches are given from the personal observation of the author. And the American churches, which hold the faith and order of the Waldenses, owe a debt of gratitude to the Rev. author, for the information he has given them respecting these witnesses for the truth. The whole volume will amply repay a careful perusal.

English Grammar : or an Exposition of the Principles and Usages of the English Language. By John S. Hart, A. M., Principal of the Philadelphia High School, and Member of the American Philosophical Society. Philadelphia : E. H. Butler & Co. 1845. pp. 192.

THE slight examination we have been able to give this volume, has made on us the impression that it is a work of uncommon excellence. The arrangement is clear, the definitions concise, the matter well condensed, and the whole presented to the eye in a neat and attractive form.

CONTENTS OF NO. III.

- 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, inclu-
ding a notice of the Origin, History, and present state of
the Waldenses.

Hart's Grammar. 477

