THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1847.

No. II.

ART. I.—*Horae Apocalypticae, or a Commentary on the Apocalypse, critical and historical; including, also, an examination of the chief Prophecies of Daniel, illustrated by an Apocalyptic Chart, and engravings from medals, and other extant monuments of antiquity.* By the Rev. E. B. Elliott, A. M., late vicar of Tuxford, and fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Second edition, with an Appendix, containing a sketch of the history of Apocalyptic Interpretation, &c. London: 1846.

WE have hitherto reviewed no books written in explanation of this mysterious portion of the inspired volume: deterred, chiefly, by the difficulty of the subject; and also by the vast discrepancy in the views of commentators. We feel, however, that this part of scripture ought not to be neglected; especially, as a blessing is pronounced on "him that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein." And of late, more than in former years, the attention of many learned men has been directed to the interpretation of the Apocalypse; and although, the disagreement among expositors continues as great as ever; yet, it is believed,

that some new light has been struck out by one and another; so that there is reason to hope, that in the progress of investigation, some satisfactory commentary may be obtained. And if some parts should still remain obscure, especially as relates to predictions not yet fulfilled, we may, by the aid of the labours of learned commentators, come to understand those prophecies which have found their fulfilment in the history of past events. Without committing ourselves, at present, to any theory of interpretation, we will endeavour, impartially, to set before the reader an outline of the commentary of the eminent writer, whose work we have placed at the head of this article.

As, however, the inspiration and genuineness of this book has been called in question by some learned theologians, it may be proper to mention, that we consider this point to have been fully and satisfactorily settled by the essay of Dean Woodhouse and after a thorough and learned investigation, by Professor Stuart, every objection of any weight has been answered, and both the internal and external evidences of the authenticity of this portion of the canonical volume, has been set in a light so clear, that we cannot but think that every candid person who attends to the evidence adduced, must be convinced that it rests on as solid a basis as the other books of the sacred volume.

Mr. Elliott, the erudite author of this work, has given us four schemes of Apocalyptic interpretation; which he designates by the appellations, of *the Praeterist*, the *Futurist*, the *Church-scheme*, and his own.

They who hold the *Praeterist* scheme, entertain the opinion, that all the leading predictions of the book of Revelation, were fulfilled in the early periods of the Christian church; and have relation particularly to the opposition made to the gospel by Pagans and Jews, and to the sufferings and persecutions endured by Christians, from these enemies; together with the deliverance wrought for the church, in the providence of God, by the conversion of the Roman empire to Christianity. This scheme is said to have been invented by Alcasar the Jesuit, and was adopted by Grotius and Hammond. It has, for obvious reasons, been a favourite scheme with the Romanists. Bossuet has defended it with his usual learning and eloquence. It was also adopted by Wetstein, and by nearly all the modern German critics; and in Great Britain, by Professor Lee and Dr. Davidson, and in our

own country, by Professor Stuart of Andover, in his late learned work on the Apocalypse.

The scheme of the *Futurists*, is of more modern origin than the former, and has had fewer advocates. The Jesuit Ribera, is said to have been the first who proposed it. The same reasons which recommended the Prætorist scheme to the adherents of Rome, will also apply to this: for by it, the arguments used by Protestants to show that the pope is anti-Christ, are entirely evaded. In the one case, the prophecies commonly applied to the pope, are all supposed to have been fulfilled before the power of the pope was manifested; and in the other scheme, these same predictions do not begin to be accomplished, until the reign of the pope is well nigh over. This scheme of the apocalyptic predictions has been ably refuted by Mr. Birk, and also by Mr. Elliott, in the last of his four volumes. Its principal advocates have been Mr. Maitland, and Mr. Burgh; and Mr. Newman, also, in the Oxford Tracts, has defended the same theory. The Futurists agree with the Prætorists in understanding the days and years of the apocalypse literally. They suppose anti-Christ to be an individual, a great infidel and enemy of the church, who is to tyrannize over the saints, just three and a half years. But while these two schemes agree in several particulars, in the main point, they differ, toto cœlo; the one considering the main prefigurations of the apocalyptic visions long since past, and the other referring them to events still far remote in the future. These last, however, have one advantage in defending their scheme; there are no historical facts on record, which stand in their way.

An outline of their scheme of interpretation, with a satisfactory refutation may be seen in the fourth volume of the work under review.

The third scheme is that which Mr. Elliot denominates the *church-scheme;* because its advocates apply all the *seals* to the various states of the church. This theory of interpretation was adopted by Vitringa and Paraeus; and more recently by Cunninghame, Bickersteth, and many others.

These last mentioned commentators, explain the seals to relate to the successive states of the church, in the following manner. The white horse is the symbol of the primitive church, and of her purity, symbolized by the white colour: her conquests and

triumphs, after severe conflict, by the bow and the crown; and by the rider, they understand, the ministers of the gospel, through whose agency Christianity was widely propagated. "He went forth conquering and to conquer." The period of the white horse is by them included between the years 70 and 320, when the Christian religion was fully established as the religion of the empire.

The opening of the second seal, which reveals a red horse, they interpret to represent the sad divisions of the church by the introduction and prevalence of Arianism, during which period the church was not only distracted with heresy, but suffered grievous persecution as long as the favourers of Arianism held the supreme power. The period of this seal extends from 324 to 530.

The third seal, and the black horse, symbolize, according to this scheme, a spiritual famine, the reign of superstition, and the commencement of the power of anti-Christ. The period of this seal is supposed to be included between 533 and 1073.

The pale horse, of the fourth seal, is the symbol of spiritual desolation—the papal church in the climax of corruption—bloody persecutions of the saints who refused to submit to papal domination. The period of this seal is supposed to commence about the beginning of the thirteenth century, and to extend to the beginning of the fifteenth.

The fifth seal, which opens to the view of the spectator, the souls under the altar, crying aloud for vengeance against their persecutors, is made by this theory to represent the dreadful persecutions of the papal church, now in the zenith of her power, against the Waldenses, Albigenses, &c. This loud and bitter cry of the martyrs is supposed to refer to a period about the commencement of the sixteenth century; and their being clothed with white robes, to the exaltation of the true servants of God by the glorious reformation from popery; which arrived at its highest success about the year 1552.

The opening of the sixth seal, which was accompanied with a great earthquake, is by these commentators, referred to the French revolution, which commenced about 1792. In all their interpretations of the seals, the riders are made to represent the ministers of the church, and the colour of the horses, the spiritual character of the church. Thus, the white horse signifies the primitive purity, the red horse a state of discord among profess-

ing Christians; the black horse a state of spiritual famine; and the pale horse, the spiritual desolation and corruption of the church.

This scheme, which Mr. Elliott calls the *church-scheme*, he undertakes to refute: and in our opinion, he is successful in pointing out many inconsistencies in this theory. But in general, we would remark, that in regard to apocalyptic interpretation, on every scheme, it is much easier to pull down than to build up.

Let us now take a view of the fourth scheme, which is proposed, and with great learning and plausibility defended, by Mr. Elliott, in the work under review. Before proceeding farther it may be proper to mention, that this author, as well as all who adopt the church-scheme, interpret the days, in the Apocalypse, to stand for years. And this principle, for the sake of brevity, is called, *the year-day* principle of interpretation. Our author defends this mode of interpreting the several periods mentioned in this book, by arguments of great force. And, as the sealed book was written on the outside as well as the inside, he adopts the hypothesis, that the two sides of the book contained two series of parallel events, and according to this idea, he conducts his commentary. On this point however, there is much obscurity. For although, it is said, that the book was written both on the inside and outside; yet we never read afterwards of what was written on the outside of the book: the whole which was revealed was by opening the seals, which could exhibit only the writing on the inside.

Mr. Elliott differs entirely from those who maintain the church-scheme, in regard to the symbolical meaning of the seals; for while they consider them as referring, as has been seen, to the character and condition of the visible church, he interprets them to represent, at least the four first where horses appear in the scene, to the successive states and fortunes of the Roman empire, commencing from the time at which John saw the vision, in Patmos. Much pains and profound erudition are displayed in proving that the *horse* is a symbol of the Roman empire, but never of the visible church. The period of the history of the empire represented by the white horse, on which sat a rider, armed with a bow, and adorned with a crown, who went on conquering and to conquer, was one of unexampled prosperity and glory. It extends from the death of Claudius to the accession of Commo-

dus, including the reigns of Nerva, Trajan, Adrian, and the two Antonines. It is represented by Gibbon, as "a period of intervals extraordinarily protracted of external peace; and as remarkable for the wonderful and almost uniform triumphs in war, by which the glory of the empire was illustrated, and its limits extended." "In short," says he, "If a man were called to fix a period in the history of the world, during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would undoubtedly fix on the one designated."

An objection to this application of the symbol might seem to arise, from the rider of the white horse wearing a crown on his head, and a bow in his hand; but our author with great learning and ingenuity explains this, very satisfactorily.

The red horse of the second seal, whose rider had given to him a great sword, and power "to take peace from the earth," is explained, to refer to a period extending from the death of Commodus, in 193, to the slaughter of Philip and his army, in 249. Here, again, the infidel Gibbon is made to furnish the history by which this part of the Apocalypse was remarkably fulfilled. If the "Decline and Fall" had been written expressly for the purpose of explaining and verifying the predictions of the Apocalypse, it could not have answered the purpose better; nor so well, as it now does when we know that nothing could be further from the mind of this learned historian. Indeed, we may be sure, that few things would have caused deeper mortification to one so inimical to Christianity, than to have foreseen that his history would be put to such a use. But Providence orders all these things, and makes "the wrath of man to praise him;" and overrules the minds of infidels, so that their writings are often made to subserve the cause of truth. Thus, Volney, in his "Travels in Syria," is found to furnish some of the best illustrations of scripture facts.

At the opening of the third seal, a man on a black horse was seen with a pair of balances in his hand, and immediately upon the exhibition of the symbol, a voice was heard from the midst of the four living creatures, saying, "a measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny, and see thou hurt not the oil and the wine." Almost all commentators have interpreted this as referring to a time of famine; but this application is attended with insuperable difficulties, both as it relates

to the price of grain here mentioned, which is not indicative of a great scarcity, and also because the historical facts of this period do not answer to such an interpretation.* Our author, therefore, seeks another interpretation, which was suggested by a careful perusal of Gibbon; which is, that the symbols here exhibited, do not refer to famine, but to *oppression.* The author of the "Decline and Fall" gives it as one principal reason of the decline of the empire, that the people were every where oppressed by a system of taxation introduced by Caracalla. By him the taxes imposed on the citizens of Rome were extended to the whole empire; and in the collection of those taxes, the greatest extortion was practised; so that repeated laws *de repetundis* were enacted. It is a remarkable coincidence, that the very kinds of produce here specified, were those on which taxes were laid. To prevent extortion, it was customary to name the price at which grain of different kinds should be estimated. It might seem at first view, that this species of oppression is scarcely of sufficient importance to be made so prominently the object of prophecy; but our author shows from Gibbon, that no other cause operated more efficiently in causing the decline of the Roman empire, than oppressive taxation, as has been just said.

The pale horse, under the fourth seal, accompanied by death, *hades,* or the grave, and having power to destroy men by God's four great judgments, war, famine, pestilence, and wild beasts, is of easy interpretation. The only difficulty is about the *fourth part of the earth;* this is by our author made to mean, that each of these destructive judgments would destroy its part of the inhabitants of the Roman empire. But how does the history of this period correspond with this prefiguration? The answer is easy. Within twelve years after the death of Alexander Severus, such a scene of death and desolation commenced, that all commentators, nearly, are united in referring the prediction to the same events. Mede, Daubuz, Lowman, and Newton, cite the facts from contemporary historians; but our author, as usual, chooses to make Gibbon give testimony in the case. The period under consideration, may be considered as commencing from the year 248 and extending to 298; about twenty years;

* Cunninghame refers this prefiguration to a spiritual famine, which is very unnatural.

which Gibbons calls "the twenty years of shame and misfortune, of confusion and calamity." And it is remarkable, how exactly the instruments of destruction, mentioned in the text, correspond with those given by the historian. First, the *sword*. "Every instant of time was marked, every province of the Roman empire was afflicted by barbarous invaders and military tyrants. The *sword* from without, and the *sword* from within." Next, *famine* and *pestilence* which generally go together, or rather, as expressed by the historian, "Famine is almost always followed by epidemical disease, the effect of scanty and unwholesome food." Such a pestilence as now ravaged the Roman empire, has scarcely a parallel in the history of the world. It extended through every province, and lasted from 250 to 265—fifteen years. In the city of Rome alone, 5000 persons died daily, and many towns were completely depopulated. It has been computed, that by the four judgments mentioned, at least one-half of the inhabitants of the Roman empire perished. For when the human race were so greatly diminished, the wild beasts of the forest increased in like proportion, and became very destructive, as appears from Arnobius, who wrote about the year 300, and speaks of the destruction occasioned in the preceding age, "by lions, serpents, and other monsters."

We are now done with the seals the opening of which exhibited horses of different colours, and accompanied with various significant symbols, which represented the Roman emperors, and the scenes which took place during the successive periods of their reign. We come now to the fifth seal, on the opening of which the apostle had a vision under the altar, of "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, how long O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth". No doubt this vision is intended to represent a severe persecution of the Christian church, in which many martyrs should be slain. And in accordance with this, we have in history just such a scene as is here prefigured. Diocletian and his colleague Galerius formed the purpose of extirpating Christianity from the earth. Hence arose the most bloody and extensive persecution with which the church was ever visited. This period, therefore, received the appellation of the "Era of Martyrs." It is plainly declared in the

edicts of Diocletian, that it was his fixed purpose to abolish the Christian name. And such was the desolation caused by nine or ten years of this cruel persecution, that the emperors were persuaded that they had accomplished their object; for pillars were erected commemorative of the event; some of the inscriptions on which are still extant. And to prevent this religion from ever rising again, the attempt was made utterly to destroy the Christian Scriptures. But vain is the counsel of men against the purpose of God. The investiture of these martyrs with white robes, is supposed to signify, that in a short time they would not only be released, but would enjoy a signal triumph; for they were seen with palms in their hands. This view of the meaning is fully sustained by the events of history. Immediately after this bloody persecution, Constantine the Great, overthrew the power of the persecutors, and publicly avowed his conversion to Christianity; when all persecution of the Christians, not only ceased, but the church and its ministers were exalted to a condition of security and honour. In fact, Christianity, henceforward, became the religion of the empire.

The earthquake, at the opening of the sixth seal, with its awful consequences, must refer to some extraordinary revolution; which should greatly affect the condition of men of all classes. The revolution under Constantine, referred to already, is believed confidently to be the "great earthquake" which spread terror through the whole heathen world. According to the decisive testimony of both Eusebius and Lactantius, Constantine, before encountering his enemies in Italy, had adopted the Cross as his distinctive military ensign. That object of abomination to the Romans they now saw glittering on the helmets, engraven on the shields, and interwoven with the banners of the soldier. The emperor's own person was adorned with it, wrought out of the richest materials, with the finest workmanship. Above all, on his principal banner, or the LABARUM, this once accursed emblem was displayed at the summit, with a crown of gold above it, and a monogram of the name of Him, who after bearing the cross now wears the crown. Why the emperor adopted this ensign and made it the most conspicuous of all others, cannot easily be accounted for, without supposing the reality of the vision, which he declared he saw in the heavens, at mid-day; when he beheld a cross with this inscription in

Greek, "By this thou shalt conquer." But although the emperor by a solemn oath affirmed to Eusebius, the truth of this remarkable vision; yet, as to many learned men it has appeared improbable, we shall enter into no discussion, and express no opinion respecting it.

The consternation of the reigning emperors, as well as of all other classes among the heathen, must have been most astounding. There are now extant, medals struck by Diocletian and Maximin, in which the one assumes the name of Jupiter, and the other of Hercules, and in which they are represented as destroying the hydra, Christianity. When Maxentius went forth to battle, he was encouraged by the heathen oracles, as being the champion of heathenism against the champion of the cross. And when Maximin was about to engage with Licinius, he made a vow to Jupiter, that if successful, he would extirpate Christianity. And when Licinius turned against Constantine, being about to engage in battle with him, in a public harangue to his soldiers, he ridiculed the cross, and staked the falsehood of Christianity on his success. But, wherever the banner of the cross was displayed, there victory followed. Gibbon says, that Licinius greatly dreaded the power of the consecrated banner, which animated the soldiers of Constantine with such enthusiastic bravery, and spread terror and dismay through the ranks of the adverse legions.

In this great earthquake which agitated and changed the condition of the whole Roman empire, the sun is represented as becoming black, and the moon as turned to blood; the stars as fallen, and the heavens rolled together as a scroll. The whole face of nature was changed. At first, Constantine gave liberty to all to worship as they chose; but he constantly favoured the Christians in making appointments to office; and in the latter part of his reign, he prohibited the heathen sacrifices; so that, before the end of the century, Paganism was in a great measure abolished, in all the populous cities of the Roman empire. The stars had now fallen.

The sealing of the servants of God, of which an account is given in the 7th chapter of Revelation, our author supposes to represent the spiritual part of the churches selected from the mass of professing Christians, as the 144,000 were taken from all the tribes of Israel. He is of opinion, and it accords with the fact,

that soon after the triumph of Christianity, by the victories and edicts of Constantine, vital religion began to decline; so that, out of the whole mass of professing Christians, there was only a remnant, according to the election of grace. He maintains, that one principal cause of this declension of spiritual religion, was ascribing an undue efficacy to the sacraments of the church,—the identical error which has been revived in the English church, in our day. One of the errors then prevalent respecting the efficacy of baptism, led many persons, and Constantine among the rest, to delay the reception of this initiatory rite, until near the time of their death. The emperor Valentinian pursued the same course, but alas! death overtook him, before Ambrose arrived to administer the sacrament.

We cannot say, that our author's interpretation of this part of the Apocalyptic vision, is as satisfactory to our minds, as some of the preceding. He takes much pains to prove, that these 144,000 are the same as the white-robed and palm-bearing multitude, before seen in the vision; but we are not convinced that he has fully succeeded in his attempt.

Our learned author takes every opportunity of coming out explicitly in favour of the doctrines of distinguishing grace. Indeed, he is of opinion, that the sealing a select number out of the tribes was, among other things, intended to teach the doctrine of particular election, or discriminating grace; and to show historically, that in the period of the church to which this sealing refers, this doctrine would be clearly brought to view, and ably inculcated. "On the whole," says he, "the main doctrinal truth prefigured in the palm-bearing vision, seems to have been that of the assured final blessedness and salvation of those who then, and ever afterwards, should answer to the sealed ones—in other words, of the election of grace. Also, that of these there would be a number numberless, gathered out of every clime and nation, as well as out of every succeeding age; but that they should be brought to the fruition of their heavenly joys, not till after the lapse of a great—perhaps, long tribulation, and would feel themselves saved by redeeming grace."

The historical application is to the era of Augustine. The influence of his doctrinal opinions has extended down through all the dark ages, even to the reformation and below it, upon such members of the Romish church, as the Jansenists. And he

shows, that the ministry of this great defender of the peculiar truths of the gospel, falls in precisely with the period to which this sealing of the servants of God must refer. And, as to his real doctrinal views," says our author, "they were, as all know, emphatically and pre-eminently, those of *divine, sovereign grace, predestinating, electing, preventing, quickening, illuminating, adopting, saving*—saving alike from sin's dominion, and all other real evils of this life, and saving unto the end." So copious is he on this subject, and so much is it his aim, that his name has been associated with it, in all subsequent ages. For from the time of Justin Martyn downwards, this doctrine had, by the doctors of the Christian church, been very partially propounded, and obscurely taught." He shows how Augustine was by Providence, raised up and qualified by his native powers of mind, by his conversion, and by the grace of God, clearly to propound and ably to defend this system of divine truth. And the rise and spread of the Pelagian heresy of *free-will,* drew from him argumentative and copious dissertations on the subject. And under his direction councils were induced solemnly to condemn the Pelagian errors, and to recognize the doctrines of grace as the true doctrines of scripture and of the church. It is remarkable, that Augustine himself gives an interpretation of this part of the apocalyptic vision corresponding to that of our author; for he speaks of the sealed ones, "as not only *Israelites*, but specifically, as *God's twelve tribes of election,* out of Israel's professing tribes; and, also, as of the constituency of the New Jerusalem." From the time of Augustine, our author observes, two streams of doctrine passed down through the church; the one, the *ritual, ecclesiastical* kind of religion; the other, the *Augustinian, spiritual* doctrine of saving grace. Through the middle ages down to the time of the reformation, were found scattered through the church, many, who cordially embraced these spiritual views; and some also, in the Romish church, since the reformation, as was before noticed in relation to the Jansenists, who warmly defended these doctrines.

Whether our author has given a correct interpretation of the vision of the palm-bearers or not; we cannot refrain from expressing our high satisfaction, in finding him so fully orthodox on the great doctrines of free and sovereign grace.

At the opening of the seventh seal, "There was silence in

heaven about the space of half an hour." No part of the apocalypse has perplexed and confounded commentators more than this: and the diversity of opinion among them is very great. Our author prefers the interpretation of Mede, Daubuz, and Newton, but gives some views of his own respecting the period intended by the *half-hour*; which if not entirely satisfactory, deserve the praise of ingenuity. His opinion is, that the "Lord's Day," of twenty-four hours, on which the vision was seen, designates the whole period of the events prefigured in the apocalyptic prophecy. He calculates, that from the time of John to the millenium, may be computed to be about 1800 years; then the period designated by *half an hour*, will be about 70 or 80 years. But, as this period of quietude occurred before the opening of the seventh seal, it is necessary to construe the verb here used in the pluperfect tense, *there had been silence* for half an hour; that is, a period of peace and tranquillity of about 70 years, which he calculates to extend from the victory of Constantine over Licinius, in the year 344, to the death of Theodosius, in the year 395. This period, however, he divides into two parts, by the tremendous battle of Adrianople, in which the emperor Valens was defeated and slain, in the year 378. The northern barbarians were hovering like a dark cloud over the borders of the empire, ready to burst with fury on it; but a short breathing was allowed, in consequence of a renewal by Theodosius of the treaty made by Constantine with the Goths. The angels, commissioned to hold the winds at the four cardinal points, received a command "not to hurt the land, until the servants of God were sealed in their foreheads."

The learned commentator, whose work is under consideration, seems to apprehend, that the preceding interpretation of the half hour's silence will not be entirely satisfactory to all, he therefore proposes an alternative, which is to compute the time according to the principle of the *year-day*, followed in other parts of the interpretation. And then it will refer, to a short period of peace, immediately after the opening of the seventh seal, before the tremendous convulsions commenced which are prefigured in the vision seen, under the seventh seal. Accordingly, there was a very short period of peace in the empire.

Immediately after the silence mentioned, there appeared seven angels, to whom were given seven trumpets. But before

these angels commenced sounding their trumpets, there appeared a very extraordinary scene; another angel came forth and took his station at the altar of burnt-offerings, having a golden censer, and there was given him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints, on the golden altar, which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense which came up with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand. And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire, and cast it on the earth, and there were thunderings and voices, and an earthquake."

Most commentators agree, in considering this angel to represent Jesus Christ in his sacerdotal office, officiating as the High Priest of his people. Our author thinks he sees in this representation of the saints offering their prayers through Christ the Mediator, an intimation that now commenced the erroneous notions of approaching God by other intercessors. But although this accords with the historical facts, respecting this innovation, yet we confess, that this interpretation appears to us to be forced and far-fetched; we see no such intimation in this part of the vision. But whatever may be the true reference of the scene, there is scarcely any view of the mediation of our great High Priest more animating and encouraging than this.

We come now to the interpretation of the trumpets. Most expositors of the Revelation agree in referring the four first trumpets to the violent irruption into the empire, of the Goths, Vandals, and other barbarous nations. But they have been much at a loss how to explain what is intended by the *third part* of the trees, third part of the ships, &c. Mede, who is followed by many, explains this, as signifying the Roman empire, which he says is about a third part of the then known world. Cunninghame thinks it must relate to a tripartite division of the Roman empire, but he is at a loss to know to what it refers. Our author thinks, that he has discovered this tripartite division of the empire, which was made in the time of Constantine, just before the establishment of Christianity. It was at that memorable crisis, when Galerius and Maxentius, being both removed by death, the Roman world was divided between Constantine, Licinius, and Maximin. The part which fell to Constantine, included Gaul, Spain, Italy, and Africa; to Licinius the rest of Europe; and to Maximin, Egypt and the Asiatic pro-

vinces. "This," says our author, "was the only tripartite division of the empire which was ever made. Afterwards, indeed, the empire was permanently divided into two parts, but the line of demarcation, between the eastern and western division, was never definitely drawn. It was, therefore, in prophetic reference, more proper to have respect to the older division, where the lot of each emperor was accurately determined.

Before the commencement of the sounding of the trumpets, the angel who stood at the altar, is represented as filling his censer with fire, and casting it on the earth. Upon which, there were "voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake." This was a prelude to the awful judgments signified by the trumpets. When the first angel sounded, there was a storm of "hail and fire mingled with blood; and they were cast upon the earth, and a third part of the earth was burnt up, and a third part of the trees, and all green grass was burnt up." "The storm from the north," says our author, "commenced on the Rhœtian hills, swept along the borders of Italy; and then, the cloud being divided, a part passed over the seven-hilled city, and the other into Gaul, spent its force entirely on the western division of the empire. The land before them was as the garden of the Lord, behind, as a desolate wilderness."

After a short pause, the second angel sounded, "And, as it were, a great mountain burning with fire fell into the sea, and a third part of the sea became as blood." The judgment prefigured by this burning mountain, fell on the islands and the land situated on the western part of the Mediterranean; for this sea belonged to the whole empire; and the *third part*, was that which belonged to the third division, before mentioned, which was washed by the waters of this sea.

And when the third angel sounded, there fell a burning star, on the third part of the fountains and rivers of water. The judgment here predicted, still fell on the same division of the empire as the former, but not on the sea coast, but on the interior, on the countries near the sources of the great rivers of this portion of the empire. This burning meteor, in its course, ranged along the Rhenish frontier of the western empire; thence it passed to the fountains of the rivers, in the Alps; but meeting with some check, it turned back on the Danube, blazed awhile,

and then become extinct. The name of this star was *wormwood*, and it embittered all the waters where it came.

At the sounding of the fourth trumpet, the effect was seen in the heavens instead of the earth; a third part of the sun and moon was smitten. An eclipse of the heavenly bodies spreads darkness over this same *third part* of the empire. By this it was signified, that the fourth judgment would be on the ruling powers of this division.

The historical events by which these symbolical prefigurations were verified, are given at great length by our author; but he again makes Gibbon the chief expositor.

In the year 395, the storm which had been long gathering on the nothern borders of the empire, burst forth with tremendous violence. Alaric and his Goths, in the year 396, ravaged the provinces of Thessaly, Greece, Epirus, and Peloponesus. The land trembled before them. "The deep and bloody traces of their march," says Gibbon, "could be traced by the traveller, many years afterwards." By the infatuated policy of the emperor Arcadius, "Alaric had been made master-general of all Illyricum; and having ravaged all Thessaly and Greece, he directs his course toward Italy." "Thrice, in fulfilment of his destiny, he descended from the Alps on the Italian plains, marking his course, each time, with ravage, conflagration, and blood; and he was not the only enemy who from the north invaded Italy. Rhœdagaisus, from the extreme north of Germany, came down with his Vandals, between the first and second invasion of Alaric. Blood and conflagration marked every step of these barbarians. They met with no repulse until they reached Florence, and then the check received, only turned their murderous course on Gaul and Spain." "The consuming flames of war," says Gibbon, "were spread from the banks of the Rhine over the seventeen provinces of Gaul. The scene of peace and plenty was suddenly changed into a desert, and the prospect of smoking ruins could only distinguish the desolations of man from the solitudes of nature." A similar account is given of the ravages of the Vandals in Spain; whence they never returned. These irruptions may be considered as occurring under the first trumpet, and as occupying a space of ten or twelve years; say from 400 to 410, and perhaps a few years longer.

The burning mountain of the second trumpet, is supposed to

prefigure Genseric, the Vandal. He completed the conquest of the western islands of the Mediterranean, and of the maratime provinces of Africa, to which country he crossed over, in the year 429, and spread ruin and desolation over those fertile and populous regions. If Genseric were a burning mountain, Attila, called the "scourge of God," might well be prefigured by a blazing meteor, which, carried destruction through the countries, lying on the great rivers of the empire. Having, in the year 450, entered into a treaty with Genseric, he moved against the western provinces, along the upper Danube, and then crossing the Rhine at Basle, he fell down upon Belgium, and made the valley of that river one scene of desolation and woe; burning the cities, massacreing the inhabitants, and laying the country waste. And when checked in his progress, by the tremendous battle of Chalons, he turned his course over the Alps, on the fountains of the great rivers of Italy. The fine country in the north of Italy, he utterly desolated; and from the Alps proceeded to the Appenines "where," says Sigonius, "all was flight, depopulation, slaughter, slavery and despair." And yet, his ravages were confined to that *third part* of the empire, before designated. He then returned to the Danube, where he died of apoplexy, in the year 453. Thus, this blazing meteor became extinct.

About twenty years after the death of Attila, Odoacer, with his Heruli, actually abolished the Roman government in Italy, which, under Augustalus, the last emperor, had become a mere shadow of power. And when Theoderick conquered the Heruli, he reigned as an absolute sovereign, both at Rome and Ravenna, from 493 to 526. And when Italy was conquered by Belisarius and Narses, the senate of Rome and the consular power ceased, and Rome itself became a desolation.

After the sounding of the four first trumpets, "an angel flew through the midst of heaven, and cried with a loud voice, woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth, by reason of the voices of the three angels which are yet to sound." This alarming warning preceded the rise of the Saracens, under Mohammed and his successors. All the ancients considered the destruction of the Roman government, as a remarkable era; for this was the power which they understood to be referred to by Paul, as preventing the rise of the MAN OF SIN; until it should be taken out of the way. The author expatiates at great length, on the state

of things prior to the sounding of the fifth trumpet, and gives a full account of the opinions of the fathers, of what might be expected after the extinction of the Roman government; among whom, there is a remarkable unanimity of sentiment, on the subject.

There is no part of the Apocalypse, in the interpretation of which commentators have been more agreed, than in referring this fifth trumpet to the rise and prevalence of the Saracens. The fitness * of the symbol of the locusts is dwelt upon by our author; as Arabia is the country from which, in all ages, this destructive insect has proceeded. And commentators have remarked the coincidence between the commission given to the locusts, "not to hurt any tree or green thing," with the orders given to the armies of the Saracens by their chiefs. On the first invasion of Syria, Abubeker issued orders to his troops, "not to destroy any palm trees, nor any fields of corn." Their commission to destroy, was also restricted to those who had not received the seal of the living God. From the beginning, Mohammed professed to war only against idolators; among whom, alas, the greater part of the Christian church were now to be classed. It was in the year 629, that the Mohammedans made their first attempt on Syria, which was unsuccessful; but in 636, they invaded that country, and took Jerusalem and Damascus. Next, Egypt fell into the hands of the Saracens, and a few years afterwards, the whole of the African provinces. In the east, the Moslem arms were victorious over Persia; and in the eighth century, Spain was added to their conquests. There seems to be some difficulty in the names given to the angel of the abyss, *Abaddon* and *Appollyon;* but with Mede, our author thinks, that it is meant, that Mohammed would be a great destroyer, not only of the bodies of men by the sword, but of their souls by his false doctrines.*

There is nothing more remarkable in this prophecy, than the

* Cunninghame explains the angel of the abyss, or the fallen star, to represent the declension of the Christian bishops, and particularly the fall of the bishop of Rome into grievous error, by the spreading of which the way prepared for the locusts to come forth. He observes that the smoke which arose out of the abyss and darkened the sun and the air was not produced by the locusts, but preceded them, and opened the way for their coming forth. In this he has followed several of the older commentators.

precise agreement between the time specified, and the time of the actual progress of the Saracens, upon the *year-day* principle. For commencing the calculation from 612, when Mohammed first published his pretended revelations, to the year 762, when they received the first effectual check to their victorious career, in the south of France, is a period of exactly 150 years. And then occurred another event, which had a greater effect in putting a stop to the progress of the Saracens than the victories of Charles Martel; which was a division in the caliphate. In the year 750, the family of the Abassides were supplanted by that of the Ommiades. The deposed caliph fled to Spain, and *there* was acknowledged as the true caliph; while Almanazor kept possession of the east; and in this very year, 762, laid the foundation of a city on the banks of the Tigris, which became the seat of empire in the east. From this time, the conquests of the Saracens ceased. "The locusts," as Daubuz remarks, "took their flight from Christendom." Thenceforth, instead of being agressors, they became the objects of successful aggression. By the son of Charles Martel they were expelled from France, and the provinces which they had conquered rescued from their hands. And also, in the east, the tide of war was rolled back by Copronymus, the Greek emperor; so that, from 755 to 762, the Saracen power was evidently on the decline, and never recovered itself.

After a pause, the sixth angel sounded; when a voice was heard from the four corners of the golden altar which is before God, saying, "loose the four angels which have been bound in the great river Euphrates, and the four angels were loosed." It is generally agreed among commentators, that we have here a clear prediction of the Turks, who arose in a country beyond the Euphrates, and who established the seat of their empire at Bagdad, on this river. The first Turkish army, according to Gibbon, crossed the Euphrates in the year 1063. Their force consisted almost entirely of cavalry; and this is clearly foretold, for it is said, "The number of the army of horsemen was two hundred thousand thousand." The emperor, who had collected a great army to oppose the invaders, was defeated in the battle which was fought near Malazgerd, in the year 1071; and was himself taken prisoner. By this disastrous event, all the eastern provinces were irretrievably lost. And had not Providence provided another power to hold them in check, they would have

subdued the whole empire; but it was so ordered, that the armies of the Crusaders, on their march to Jerusalem, encountered the host of the Turkmans, in Asia Minor, and for a while, stopped the onward progress of these fierce barbarians. This, however, occasioned only a temporary delay; for they still continued in the country, and selected Iconium as the seat of their government.

One horde after another crossed the Euphrates, and in several instances, subdued those who first arrived, and took their place; but all their wars and military movements, tended to the destruction of the Greek empire. By the Turks, fire arms were first used in war; and most commentators have thought, that this fact was distinctly prefigured. "Out of their mouths (of their horses) issued fire and smoke and brimstone." Our author is surprised that Woodhouse and Vitringa should have hesitated to admit this. "By these three, the fire, the smoke and the brimstone, the third part of men were killed." The description of the siege of Constantinople by the Turks, by the employment of artillery of the largest calibre, furnishes a beautiful comment on this part of the prophecy. No expositor, until Dr. Keith, however, had ever suggested any explanation of what is so particularly mentioned respecting the tails of the horses. It was the fact, that the principal ensign of these barbarians was a *horse-tail;* and to this day, the horse-tail among the Turks, is an emblem of power and dignity. Thus a Turkish pashaw, is described, as of one, two, or three horse-tails, according to the power and dignity of his station. And as to the stings with which "they do hurt," (injustice) it refers to the cruelty and tyranny of these pashaws, of which history furnishes ample testimony, and some of very recent date.

The time of the continuance of these horsemen, is given with an appearance of great accuracy. "An hour, and a day, a month and a year." Mr. Elliott, after a full discussion, determines that these portions of time should be taken in the aggregate; and supposing them to be portions of the Julian year, the period will be one of 396 years, and 106 days. Computing, therefore, from the time of the first invasion of the Turks, to the conquest of Constantinople, the period is 396 years and 130 days; the 106 days would terminate about the middle of the siege. This is a remarkable coincidence.

In the tenth chapter of the Apocalypse, the apostle John saw, "a mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud, and a rainbow on his head, and his face as it were the sun, and his feet as pillars of brass, and he had in his right hand a little book open, and he set his right foot on the sea, and his left on the earth, and cried with a loud voice, as when a lion roareth, and seven thunders uttered their voices," &c.

The majesty and insignia of this angel, naturally leads to the opinion, that it could be no other than the Son of God. The earlier protestant commentators agreed in referring this vision to the reformation, and interpreted the *open book* to mean the gospel; but Mede, whose influence on the commentators who succeeded him has been great, took up the opinion, that the little book was a book of prophecy, connected with the sealed book; and most of late have followed him in this. Our author reasons cogently against this interpretation, and thinks that the earlier opinion is correct; that by the open book should be understood a new era, in which the preaching of the gospel, which had almost ceased, would be renewed. This little book, John was commanded to take and eat. In this symbolical action, the apostle, as, in many other cases, must be considered as the representative of all gospel preachers; who must first receive and digest the truth before they begin to prophesy. By prophesying is meant, preaching the gospel.

The seven thunders which uttered something which John was forbidden to record, has greatly perplexed commentators. Mr. Elliot has a most remarkable fertility of invention, and seldom fails to bring forth something ingenious and plausible, even where other expositors have appeared utterly at a loss. He is of opinion, that these were *the thunders of the Vatican*, and that, though so long heard with servile submission, should no longer be regarded; and John in his representative character, is forbidden to record them. Luther, and his coadjutors in preaching the gospel, utterly disregarded these once formidable thunders, or papal bulls.

In regard to the TWO WITNESSES, our author adopts the opinion, which has been more commonly received, that they represented the witnesses for the truth, whom God raised up successively, through the whole period of their prophesying. It is very clear that these witnesses cannot be any impersonal thing,

as for example, the Old and New Testaments. Nor can they be individuals, for their period of prophesying extends through 1260 years, according to the principle of interpretation adopted. Their number is two, because two witnesses were required by the law to establish any fact; and they are only two, to show that during this long period, the number of witnesses, though sufficient, would be few. The most difficult thing is to explain what is said of the powers conferred on them, to prevent rain and turn the waters into blood, &c. There is here an evident allusion to the miracles of Moses and Elijah; but our author thinks, that the denunciations of divine vengeance by these witnesses on persecutors and on the wicked would certainly be accomplished, is all that is necessary to understand by the powers, said to be given to the two witnesses. Their prophesying in sackcloth imports, that during this whole period, the witnesses of the truth should be in a state of depression and affliction. They are called "the two olive trees," from which oil was conveyed to the candlesticks, that is, to the churches, for according to the inspired explanation, the candlesticks signify the churches. We may conclude, therefore, that both ministers and churches, during this period, are to be considered witnesses. The most difficult part of the exposition relates to the death and resurrection of the witnesses. Is this past? and if so, when did it occur? The beast that ascended from the abyss made war with them and slew them; and their dead bodies lay unburied in the street, or *broad place* of the great city, called Sodom and Egypt, where their lord was crucified. These last words would seem to refer us to Jerusalem, as the place where the witnesses must be slain; but our author, and others, make it sufficiently evident that by this great city, Rome must be intended. Sodom and Egypt are manifestly used here in a mystical sense. When Rome is fixed on as the place, we should not understand merely the city, but the whole hierarchy of the papacy. The witnesses were slain and their voices silenced through the whole world; so that for three and a half days, that is three and a half years, no witnesses appeared.

Mr. Elliott enters into a full view of the historical evidence of the fact, that witnesses for the truth were raised up in every age of the church; and that these witnesses were during this whole period greatly persecuted. But, that shortly before the

commencement of the reformation, the testimony of these witnesses, by means of the inquisition and other methods of persecution, had come to an end. As the death of the witnesses extended precisely through three years and a half, it becomes a matter of importance to fix accurately, if possible, the point of time, at which the two witnesses may be considered as killed. This period the author fixes with considerable confidence, at the ninth session of the Lateran Council. On which occasion, the public orator of the council, in his oration, speaking of the success of the church in extirpating heresy, used these remarkable words, "*Jam nemo reclamat nullus obsistit.*" The Bohemians had been cited to defend themselves at this council, but they failed to appear; and no other preachers and defenders of evangelical truth appeared throughout the whole church. A death like silence prevailed, the witnesses were slain, and their testimony had ceased. Now counting from this date, three years and a half, and it brings us to the very day on which Luther nailed up his theses against *indulgences*. The papal rulers now rejoiced and congratulated one another, because they who so long tormented them, were now lying dead before them. But this joy and triumph was of short duration, for after the expiration of the three years and a half, "the spirit of life from God, entered into them, and they stood upon their feet, and great fear fell upon them which saw them."

According to the interpretation of our author, the witnesses came to life and were received up to heaven, when at the beginning of the reformation, so many able evangelical ministers were raised up in almost every part of Christendom. Many, however, are of opinion, that the witnesses are still prophesying in sackcloth, and that the time when they shall be slain is still future.

We learn from the "Edinburgh Witness," that Dr. Candlish has addressed several letters to Mr. Elliot respecting his interpretation of that part of the Apocalypse which relates to the two witnesses, which are said to be written with great power. Also an animated controversy has arisen between these eminent men, on other points discussed in these volumes. But what scheme of prophecy Dr. Candlish advocates, we do not know, as his letters have not, to our knowledge, reached this country.

The author endeavors to make out two lines of successive witnesses, one in the west, the other in the east, and among the latter, he gives a prominent place to the Paulikians, (Paulicians.)

He also entertains the opinion, that as the sealed book was written on the outside as well as the inside, that there were predicted two series of events, synchronizing with each other. Therefore, in his fourth book he returns, and endeavours to trace a second line of prophecies fulfilled, which were written on the out-side of the roll. But our limited space will not permit us to follow him through this part of his commentary.

As, however, this part of the book contains a prophecy respecting the rise and prevalence of popery, under the figure of a terrible beast, which arose from the abyss, we cannot pass it over without giving the reader a summary, or mere outline, of what it contains on this point. The great *red dragon* is explained to refer to the Pagan power, by which the church was sorely persecuted. The woman represents the church, and by the man child which was born of her, he does not think that there can be any reference to the birth of our Saviour; but this he considers a strong prophetic figure of the recognition of Christianity by the laws of the empire. The rage of the Pagan powers, is represented by the effort of the dragon to devour the child. And the war in heaven between Michael and the dragon, represents the contest between Christianity and Paganism for supremacy, in which war the dragon was defeated, and cast down to the earth—dispossessed of his power; and the child was caught up to heaven; or exalted to a place of honour and power. The woman who represents the true orthodox church, was not permitted to enjoy a long season of triumph and ease; but was soon compelled to flee to the wilderness. It was but a few years after the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the empire, before the Arian heresy disturbed its peace, and after the death of Constantine, gained the ascendency, and persecuted the true church most cruelly, and drove the woman into the wilderness, where she is nourished during the prophetic period of 1260 years; by which it is predicted, that during this whole period, the true church would be in a depressed and suffering state; so that this prefiguration answers exactly to the period of the two witnesses. The two great wings of an eagle with which the woman was enabled to flee to the wilderness, represents the providential care which God exercises over his spiritual church, in providing a refuge for her, under all her persecutions.

The wild beast from the sea and from the abyss, are shown to

be the same, by a comparison of the attributes of each. It is also shown, that the chief head of the apocalyptic beast is the same as the little horn of Daniel, and answers exactly to the MAN OF SIN, described by Paul. The seven heads of the beast, are explained by the angel to mean, seven hills on which the city was built, which can refer to nothing else than the city of Rome. These seven heads, were also said by the angel to mean "seven kings; five are fallen, one is, and the other is not yet come. And the beast that was and is not, he is the eighth." The explanation of this is, that there were seven successive forms of government, five of which were past, one existed at the time of the vision, and the seventh was still to come. But whereas, this seventh received a deadly wound, by which it was, as it were annihilated; yet, as this deadly wound was afterwards healed. this beast might be considered an eighth. The seven heads appertained to the draconic form; but the seventh passed over into a new form of the beast, and is considered as the eighth. The seven forms of government were, *Kings, Consuls, Dictators, Decemvirs, Military Tribunes*, and these were past. The sixth, the *imperial*, which then was, and the seventh, which became the eighth, was still future. While, almost all commentators agree in considering these heads as representing seven successive forms of government, yet they differ exceedingly in making out the number, in the Roman state. And, especially, they seem to be at a loss what to make of this paradoxical *seventh*, which was yet the eighth. Our author. after examining all the theories which have been offered, and finding them unsatisfactory, suggests a new explanation. The first six are as stated above; but the *imperial*, the one then in existence, has commonly been considered as the same to the termination of the empire, but he thinks, that though the name continued the same, the real form of government was changed by Diocletian. When the crown was exchanged for the diadem; when the moderate power of the first emperors was exchanged for Asiatic despotic power; so that the seventh form of government commenced with this emperor; and when the pagan power was ended, there arose another power out of it, which was the papal. At the rise of this last power, the Roman state was divided into ten kingdoms, prefigured by the ten horns. This division can only refer to the western empire; and here between the years 486 and 490,

we find the following ten powers who had invaded the empire. The *Anglo Saxon, The Franks, the Allemans, Burgundians, Visigoths, Suevi, Vandals, Heruli, Ostrogoths,* and *Bavarians.* About the year 526, we find the nations a little changed, that is the *Lombards* having conquered the Heruli, took their place; but the number of kingdoms was still ten. The power of the beast arose contemporaneously with the ten horns; for they all grew out of the seventh head, which had now become an eighth. Accordingly, authentic history shows, that the papal dominion began as early as 431, and continued to rise until the time of Gregory the great, and still went on increasing till Gregory VII; and from him to Innocent VIII, and down to Leo X, when the reformation commenced. The history of this arrogant power, the impious claims, and the blasphemous speeches of the Popes is very striking; but we cannot give even a sketch of it.

One of the most difficult things in the whole book is, *the image of the beast.* Our author, after discussing other explanations and rejecting them, adopts one entirely new; which though at first view, it seems forced and unnatural, yet he contrives to make appear quite plausible. By the image of the beast, he understands the Western Councils, by which so many superstitious and unscriptural decrees were made, and to which men were bound to render obedience, at the peril of their lives. "As many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." The author thinks, that *the mark of the beast* was the sign of the cross, superstitiously used, and by the *number* of the beast, 666, he understands the word *Lateinos*, which is the earliest and most commonly received opinion. But on this subject he displays great erudition, and much ingenuity.

In this part, Mr. Elliot enters on an able vindication of what he calls the *year-day* principle; that is, counting a year for every day. And particularly examines into the commencement and termination of the period so often mentioned in this book, and several times in Daniel also. By the tenth part of the city which fell before the sounding of the seventh trumpet, our author understands the separation of Great Britain from the Papal community: and by the measuring of the temple and altar and the worshippers, the organization and discipline of the reformed churches. By the rejoicing of the 144,000 on Mount Zion, he

understands the blessed effects of the reformation which produced joy in heaven, and peace on earth.

But we must hasten to give some account of the sounding of the seventh trumpet. This, the author refers to the French revolution; which he remarks, was preceded by one of the most remarkable hail storms, ever witnessed in France. The first four vials under this trumpet are all referred to the events connected with this extraordinary and unexpected revolution. Between the four first vials and the four first trumpets, there is a striking similarity, which has been noticed by most commentators.

The pouring out the first vial produced a grievous and noisome ulcer, which our author thinks prefigures the horrible doctrines of atheism, materialism, infidelity, and licentiousness, which like a loathsome ulcer, infected the body politic. To which he adds *democratic fury*, or anarchy. The second angel poured out his vial on the sea, and the third on the rivers; but the fourth was poured on the sun, the consequence of which was, that this luminary scorched men with fire. All these are readily applied to the successive events and destructive evils of the French revolution. But the fifth vial is poured out on the seat of the beast himself. The history of the popes since the French revolution is familiar to all. Rome was taken and the pope made prisoner by Napoleon.

The sixth vial was poured out on the great river Euphrates; that is on the Turkish empire. The fulfilment has been in our own times, and as it were before our eyes. The Ottoman empire, once so formidable to all Christendom, has only existed by the sufferance of the great European powers, for some years past. This empire is doomed to fall, and that shortly. But who are *the kings of the East*, whose way is to be prepared by the drying up of the Euphrates? Most commentators say, the Jews. But why should a way be made for the Jews across the Euphrates, beyond which few of them dwell? And we can see no propriety, in calling them "the kings of the East." This interpretation our author rejects, although he is strongly confident of the return of the Jews to their own land. He interprets it to mean, the kingdoms of the east, which contain a large part of the population of the world. The Turkish empire has been a great obstacle to the propagation of the gospel in the east.

When this obstacle is removed, we may hope that a free course will be open for the gospel, to the kings of the east.

As the period of 1260 years, according to any calculation, must be drawing towards its termination, the present generation must be living near to very important events in the history of the church, and of the world. The earliest probable commencement of this period would bring it to a close in the year 1790, when the great earthquake of the French revolution shook the world. According to a second beginning, the termination will be in 1849; and according to a third, in 1864. There seems to be a designed obscurity in the commencement of prophetic periods, when a certain number of years is specified. It would not be profitable to men to know exactly *the times and seasons*, which the Father chooses to keep in his own power.

The vision of the angel flying through the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach, explains itself. Our author very naturally refers it to the rise of Bible and Missionary Societies, during the last half century. Still this angel continues his flight, and will, until the gospel is preached to all nations. "Then cometh the end."

Mr. Elliott's explanation of the vision of the three frogs, which came out of the mouth of the beast, and the false prophet, is really curious. The first frog he makes to be the spirit of atheistical democracy, which burst forth in the midst of the French revolution—a spirit of lawlessness and anarchy. The second frog is the pure spirit of popery, which, within the last twenty years has greatly revived, and is exerting an unusual vigour in attempting to make proselytes, and recover lost ground. This evidently comes out of the mouth of the beast. Our learned author seemed to be at a loss, to what the third frog should be referred, but on the whole, he settles down in the opinion, that Puseyism answers to the prediction better than any thing else. And he lays down the fundamental principle of this system to be, "That *the apostolical succession of the priesthood is essential to the validity of sacraments.*" This frog comes out of the mouth of the false prophet. He attributes the rapid progress of this system to the agency of evil spirits. These frogs go forth to all the kings of the whole world, to gather them together to the war of the great day of God Almighty—to the battle of Armageddon.

It is not our purpose to follow our author through his exposition of unfulfilled prophecy, in regard to which, we have very little confidence in the commentaries of men. But, as it may gratify the reader, to know, what his views are respecting the millenium, we will transcribe a brief summary, given by himself, of what he supposes may be the order of future events. But before citing his words, we may remark, that he does not believe in any millenium prior to the second advent; but supposes the world will be in a state of entire carelessness when this great event shall occur.

"It would seem, therefore, that in this state of things and feeling, among professing Christians, all suddenly, and unexpectedly, and conspicuous over the whole world, as the lightning that shineth from the east even to the west, THE SECOND ADVENT AND APPEARING OF CHRIST will take place. That, at the accompanying voice of the archangel of God, the departed saints of other dispensations will rise from their graves to meet Him, alike patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs and confessors—all at once, in the twinkling of an eye. That then, instantly, the souls of those alive on the earth, will also be caught up to meet Him in the air. These latter being separated out of the ungodly nations, as when a shepherd divideth his sheep from his goats; one person snatched from his company or his avocations, and another left. And all, both dead and live saints, changed at the moment, from corruption to incorruption; from dishonour to glory, though with very different degrees of glory; and all welcomed alike—the faithful receiver of a prophet, as well as a prophet—to enter on the inheritance and kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world. And so in a new and angelic nature, to take part in the judging of the world. Meanwhile, it would also appear, that with a tremendous earthquake accompanying, of violence unknown, since the revolutions of primeval chaos. An earthly earthquake under which the Roman world, at least, is to reel to and fro like a drunken man. The solid crust of this earth shall be broken, and fountains burst forth from its inner deep: not as once of water, but of liquid fire,—a fire, now pent up within its treasure house, and intended as the final habitation of devils. That this, I say, shall then burst forth, and engulf the vast territory of the papal Babylon and its godless inhabitants, thence spreading even to Palestine, and

every where, as in the case of Sodom, making the very elements melt with fervent heat. And then, the flame will consume antichrist with his confederate kings; while the sword also does its work of slaughter, the risen saints, being perhaps (as would seem from both Enoch's and the apocalyptic prophecy) the attendants of the Lord's glory, in this destruction of antichrist; and assessors in his judgment of a guilty world. And then, immediately, it would seem also, the renovation of the burnt earth is to take place; its soil being purified by fire, in all that shall remain of it for the nations of the saved; that is, the gentile remnant and the saved Israel. And the Spirit too, poured out to renew, in a better sense, the moral face of nature. And that so the millenial commencement of Christ's eternal reign with his saints, is to begin. The Shekinah, or personal glory of Christ amidst his saints, being chiefly manifested in the holy land, and at the city of Jerusalem; but the whole earth partaking of the blessedness. And thus, the regeneration of all things, and the world's redemption from the curse, according to the promises, at the manifestation of the sons of God."

The order of events given above, is in the very words of the author; and we confess, that we regret that a man so learned and ingenious, should have suffered himself to publish a view of the second advent, so confused and inconsistent, and so obviously obnoxious to insuperable objections. But we have observed, that in almost all cases, men who enter ardently into the study of prophecy, especially when they have a favourite scheme to support, acquire a peculiar kind of vision; so that they see force in arguments and analogies, in which other men of sound judgment, see nothing of weight. Something happens to them similar to what is observed in the natural sight; when persons for a long time confine their attention to minute objects, near at hand, they become by degrees near-sighted, and cannot clearly discern distant objects. In perusing this laborious and learned work, we have frequently been struck with the fact, that a very undue stress is laid on very obscure analogies; and conclusions derived with much apparent confidence, from very uncertain premises. And the same thing is still more remarkable in Mr. Cunninghame's work, on the Apocalypse.

We are advocates for no particular scheme of apocalyptic interpretation: we are waiting for further light. We are con-

scious that we have done little justice to Mr. Elliott's theory, in the outline, which we have attempted; the space allowed for our article, did not admit of a full exhibition of a scheme, the illustration of which occupies the greater part of four large octavo volumes. But as the work is not likely to be re-published in this country, we were of opinion, that even this meagre skeleton would not be unacceptable to our readers, as we find that the minds of men are more and more turned to this subject. As an evidence of this, we would observe, that just as we are concluding this review, a ponderous and learned volume, on the Apocalypse, has been put into our hands, written by Mr. David Lord, a merchant of New York, and a gentleman much devoted to theological studies. By dipping here and there into this volume, we find that it is replete with learning, and that the author differs widely from all previous commentators, both in the principles of interpretation, and in the explanation of many of the symbolical representations in the visions of the Apocalypse. But in some future number of our periodical, we hope to have it in our power, to take further notice of a work, which, whatever may be the scheme of interpretation adopted, cannot but be creditable to American literature by the extent of research manifested.

But we cannot conclude this review without expressing our concern, that the views of expositors are so exceedingly discordant; and yet every interpreter seems to be confident of the correctness of his own views; at least for the time being; for it must be confessed, that commentators on the Apocalypse not only differ from each other; but often from themselves. The Rev. Geo. Stanley Faber, is a veteran in this department of interpretation; and yet in his latest work, he repudiates almost all expositions given in his earlier prophetic writings; and some too, which other learned commentators still think were correct. No man seems to have more confidence, and at the same time more candour, than Mr. Cunninghame. His work has gone through four editions; and in every succeeding one, he frankly confesses errors into which he had fallen in the foregoing.

Amidst such wide diversities, nearly all expounders of this mysterious book agree in one thing; they are all *pre-millenarians;* that is, they confidently expect the second advent of our Lord before the millenium commences, and the continued pre-

sence of Christ on earth with his people. But as to the order of events, and the *manner* of his presence, they are again widely at variance. Mr. Elliott does not hold the extravagant doctrine, that the Son of God will be exiled from his celestial throne, for a thousand years; but supposes, that a visible glory, like the ancient Shekinah will be exhibited at Jerusalem; but what benefit will arise from it to the people on the other side of the globe, he has not explained. Most, however, of these prophetic men, believe in the actual, bodily presence of Christ on earth, during the whole millenium. And why they do not apply the *year-day* principle to these thousand years, they have not explained.

Mr. Cunninghame seems to possess a deeper insight into the future, and into the mystical meaning of the Apocalypse, than any other author, whom we have consulted. He is confident that he has discovered a mystical calendar, or system of chronology running through the whole Bible, by which the most extraordinary coincidences are discovered. To us, the whole appears more to resemble the cabalistical interpretations of the Jews, than anything else—but the truth is, we have no patience to study such matters.

It will be amusing, however, to follow this author in his views of the circumstances of the second advent. He entertains the opinion, that when the voice of the archangel and the last trumpet sounds, Christ will not immediately appear, but will take up his residence in the upper regions of the air. Immediately, however, on the sound of the trumpet, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, &c., will rise from the grave with incorruptible and glorious bodies; and the saints then living on the earth, shall be changed in the twinkling of an eye, and both the resuscitated and the changed shall be caught up to Christ, where he has erected his throne; and there they shall remain with him, during the great battle of Armageddon. (But who is to fight on the Lord's side, does not appear.) The continuance of Christ and his redeemed people in the air, will be for an unknown time—say years. And while here, the New Jerusalem church shall be constituted, and its institutes inculcated on the saints. And when every thing is prepared, and the earth is purified by fire, the New Jerusalem will come down, with our Lord at its head, when He shall reign with his saints on earth a

thousand years. He seems to be at a loss, however, to dispose of the Jews, whose return to Palestine is to occur after the saints are caught up into the air; and he is doubtful whether they will be converted to Christianity before or after their return; finally, he seems to be of opinion that a first-fruits of the nation will be converted before. There is, one pleasing trait in the character of these prophetic men; they generally appear to be truly orthodox and evangelical in their views of Christian doctrine.

The reflexions which have occurred to our minds respecting these various hypotheses, is, that it would be wiser to give less indulgence to an exuberant imagination—to leave secret things to God,—not to be wise above what is written, and to acquiesce with submission, in the declaration of the risen Saviour. "IT IS NOT FOR YOU TO KNOW THE TIMES AND THE SEASONS WHICH THE FATHER HATH PUT IN HIS OWN POWER."

ART. II.—*Discourses and Addresses at the Ordination of the Rev. Theodore Dwight Woolsey, LL. D., to the ministry of the Gospel, and his inauguration as President of Yale College, October* 21, 1846. Published by order of the corporation.

THIS is a beautifully printed pamphlet, of exactly one hundred pages. The occasion of the various discourses it contains, as well as their general nature and respective authors, will appear in the following extracts from the preface, which, after stating that President Day resigned his office, August 18, 1846, proceeds thus:

"On the following day, the Fellows made choice of Theodore D. Woolsey, LL.D., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature, to be the President, and requested him, in the event of his acceptance of the office, to unite with the Prudential committee in making the necessary arrangements for his ordination to the Christian ministry, and for his inauguration to the Presidency of the College.

"The views of the President elect were entirely coincident with those of the Corporation as to the religious and ecclesiastical nature of the office to which he was elected. Accordingly he regarded his election as a call to ministering in the word of

God; and when after due deliberation, he had accepted the call, he united with the Prudential committee in requesting the ministers of the gospel in the Board of Fellows, to act as a council of ministers for his ordination.

"The corporation having been convened on the 20th of October, this arrangement was reported by the Committee and accepted; and the ordaining council was constituted accordingly. Dr. Woolsey was then presented to the council as a candidate for the ministry of the gospel; and having been examined by them, . . . he was unanimously approved.

"On the following day, at ten o'clock, A. M. the public solemnities of the ordination were performed. . . . The sermon was preached by the Rev. Leonard Bacon, D.D. . . . The charge was given by the Rev. Noah Porter, D.D., and the right hand of fellowship by the Rev. Theophilus Smith."

In the afternoon, "the ceremony of induction was performed by the Rev. Jeremiah Day, LL.D., D.D., late President, acting as senior Fellow, in behalf of the corporation; and the inaugurating address to the President was followed with a discourse to the audience. A congratulatory address in Latin was delivered by James L. Kingsley, LL. D., Professor of the Latin Language and Literature, . . . after which the President pronounced his inaugural discourse."

We find all the above mentioned performances in the pamphlet before us, except the Latin address by Dr. Kingsley. We regret that he has not seen fit to publish what seems to us as essential to a complete portraiture of the proceedings, as it was to the academic dignity, of the occasion. In the present state of classical attainment, a Latin address is far more likely to be appreciated and enjoyed, in the reading than the delivery; and the multitude not only of graduates who have been favored with his instructions, but of other educated men to whom he is honorably known, would have been glad to see another memento of this veteran scholar, *qui nihil tetigit quod non ornavit.*

We have taken the more copious extracts from this introductory narrative, because we wish to bring distinctly before our readers, one prominent and distinctive feature in this inauguration of a President over the largest, and with a single exception, oldest College in our country. We refer to his ordination to the ministry of the gospel, which appears to have been deemed and

made an indispensable preliminary to his induction to the Presidency. The candidate whom the corporation judged in all other respects most fit, being destitute of this qualification, was elected on the condition that he acquire it preparatory to his inauguration. Of course, such a body of men would not invite any one to go through the mere form of ordination to the sacred office, who was void of the essential gifts and acquisitions, which are requisite to the due discharge of it, and without which such a ceremony would be no better than a solemn farce. Dr. Woolsey in early life chose the ministry as his profession, and richly furnished himself therefor by laborious and various study; and although these aims were mysteriously frustrated, yet, when in maturer years, God gave him a more distinct and emphatic call to the work, that call found him furnished with the amplest theological erudition, and with a piety at once chastened and confirmed by severe and protracted trial.

But notwithstanding these high qualifications, that self-distrust which in his opening manhood, led him to shrink from the vast responsibilities of the sacred office to which he had aspired, rendered him, if possible still more unwilling to assume it, when having already spent a large portion of the prime of his life in another vocation, there was added the aversion to great and unlooked for changes in our habits and pursuits, which grows with years. Owing to his scruples on this point, he was disposed to decline—and despite the most importunate entreaties, did for some time anxiously delay accepting—the office to which he was elected, inasmuch as he agreed with the corporation, "as to its religious and ecclesiastical nature." At length, being persuaded that duty required him, to accept what he calls "this undesired office,"* he became no less satisfied that his own personal scruples and preferences in regard to entering upon the work of the ministry were thereby overruled; that he, who would properly fulfil the duties pertaining to the presidency of such an institution of learning, must also have the relations and sympathies, the privileges and responsibilities of a Christian minister.

All this shows—and for this reason we thus dwelt upon it—how cardinal and indispensable it was deemed by all the parties concerned, that the President of the college should also be a

* Inaugural Address, p. 100.

minister of the gospel. But it has been contended by many, that to insist on such a prerequisite to office in an educational institution, savours of needless stiffness and gratuitous bigotry. Accordingly the ground taken and adhered to, in this instance, has been the subject of extensive criticism and censure. The question then arises, and it is one of no secondary moment; were the Trustees right in this case, in acting upon the opinion, that no one, whatever may be his other endowments, who is not a Christian minister, is qualified for the full and adequate discharge of the duties of the Presidency of the college. Ought this qualification, *ordinarily*, to be sought and insisted on in those who are called to preside over those institutions, to which our young men resort for a liberal education?

To these questions we do not hesitate to respond affirmatively. With regard to almost all our colleges, a single consideration is conclusive on this subject. They were founded, and the funds for their endowment were originally and sacredly bestowed, for the purpose of providing for the church a supply of educated and orthodox ministers. This was the great motive that led to the establishment of nearly, if not quite, all of our more ancient and prosperous colleges. This prompted by far the larger portion of the donations and sacrifices by which they were founded and built up. In a note by Dr. Bacon, (p. 35,) it is stated that the petition to the legislature for the charter of Yale College, set forth, "that from a sincere regard to, and zeal for, upholding the Protestant religion, by a succession of learned and orthodox men, they had proposed that a collegiate school should be erected in this colony, wherein youth should be instructed in all parts of learning, to qualify them for public employments in church or civil state; and that they had nominated ten ministers to be trustees, partners, or undertakers for the founding, endowing, and ordering the said school." The preamble to the charter, rehearses this representation and makes it the basis on which it rests. Similar was the origin of nearly all those great institutions planted by the wisdom and self-denying piety of our forefathers. Not only so, but the history of their subsequent growth and accumulation of funds, will show that they have drawn their main support from the benefactions of the pious, who cherished them chiefly in view of their being nurseries of young ministers. Substantially the same is true of the great mass of colleges of a

more recent origin. The grand motive which originated and has sustained them, in many cases at incredible sacrifices, was a desire to maintain and propagate the Christian religion, by rearing up an able ministry. Their benefactors, patrons, trustees, and instructors, have been for the most part Christian men. In almost all instances they are cherished and controlled by some single denomination of Christians; in some cases they owe their paternity and support to local ecclesiastical bodies. Leaving out of view that magnificent abortion of infidelity, which has sealed its own doom, by its suicidal exclusion of all Christian teachers, it may be safely said, that all the colleges in the country, would quickly expire, or preserve but a languid and sickly existence, if they were bereft of that support which they receive from the church in one form and another, on account of their agency in producing a supply of competent ministers, and otherwise promoting the cause of pure religion.

This being so, it is a plain breach of trust, a foul perversion and prostitution of the most sacred charities, if these colleges are not so administered and regulated, as to make Christianity the paramount and supreme interest, to which all their instruction and discipline are tributary. But the character of an institution is of course strongly represented by its presiding officer. If it be a primary object of it to advance the Christian religion, by imbuing the students with its doctrines and spirit, and through them, the world, over which they are destined, whatever profession they may select, to exercise a commanding influence, then he who presides over it as universal head and regulator, should be a minister of that religion. If it be a primary object for which its funds were bestowed, to train young men for the ministry, then surely he who has the universal supervision and lead of its operations, should himself exercise that ministry. Good faith with the pious founders and benefactors of these institutions forbids that they be so far secularized, that the Presidency or the ascendency in their management, be in the hands of any others than accredited ministers and friends of the gospel.

But aside from any such special obligation, viewing the question as open, and to be decided on its intrinsic merits, we reach the same conclusion. The interests of these colleges, the great ends for which they exist, their government and discipline, the cause of sound learning and education, the highest good of the

student, of the church and the world, combine to demand that the President be authorised to preach the word, and distribute to each one a portion in due season.

As we have already seen, to whatever extent it is important that religion be ascendant in the college, to the same extent is it desirable that it have in the President an official expounder of its truths, and steward of its mysteries. Now, aside from the direct claims of Christianity, which in comparison with every rival interest, are transcendent and uncompromising, its indirect bearing on science and education themselves, entitle it to a lofty pre-eminence in the University. None can deny that its truths are the most vast, sublime, and inspiring, that can engage and occupy the human mind. Nor can it be questioned, that they have a peerless eminence, a centrality in the sphere of human knowledge, so that they wholly eclipse all other departments of science, by their own overshadowing immensity, excellence and grandeur. How then can that education, or learning, or instruction, or intellectual development, be otherwise than unbalanced, distorted and morbid, if not positively effeminate and puerile, in which this "science of sciences," the knowledge of the supreme, elemental truths which revelation discloses concerning the Soul, God, Eternity, Redemption, are either obliterated, or slightly and incidentally brought forward, or lowered from that supremacy over all other teachings, which they ought as surely to maintain, as the sun its rank above the moon and stars? Leaving this fruitful topic which may be adverted to again, when we notice Dr. Bacon's discourse, we proceed to observe, that

This ministerial character of its chief officer is needed in order to bring it into proper contact and sympathy with ministers, churches and the whole Christian community. A college is no abstraction. If it have any vitality it lives in the persons of its officers. By them, and also by the students they educate, it becomes known among the people. Especially is it by the chief officer, that it is known abroad among men, and that they communicate with it. Now, in order that the ministry may have the most cordial and confiding intercourse with him, it is requisite that he be of the same office, that so he may be of one heart and soul with them. And in his ministerial character, Christian people have the strongest pledge that the concerns of the institution will be administered in strict fidelity to the paramount

claims of religion. But experience as well as reason show that, as our American colleges are situated, they cannot long thrive, when bereft of the active sympathy and confidence of the Christian community.

Moreover the successful government of an American college, requires the enthronement of religion in its just supremacy. In this country we have no police, which of itself can avail in the least to save our thousands of students from utter ruin. Nor will the democratic feeling which is among the people like a very atmosphere, suffer aught that is harsh, imperious or despotic in the management of young men. Hence college government, which for the time being takes the place of the parental, must, as President Day observes, p. 63, be chiefly "one of influence," and it becomes "essential to its preservation that there be a majority of the students on the side of good order and assiduous application." But what can be so effectual to generate and nourish this correct feeling on the part of the students, as a conscientious fear of God, a just sense of religious and Christian obligation? In other words, this feeling in favour of order and industry, will prevail in proportion to the amount of morality and religion among the students. These will be somewhat in proportion to the prominence which Christianity obtains in all its affairs and proceedings. We believe, that as a matter of fact, no colleges have been harassed with such desperate insubordination, as those which are most thoroughly divorced from religion.

But aside from these secondary and more utilitarian grounds, the great reason why Christianity should be enthroned in the college, and made its presiding genius in the person of its presiding officer, is that, on account of which it ought to reign every where, in all things, over every heart and every life, viz., its inherent, eternal, infinite excellence, its universal and absolute obligation. Here as well as elsewhere, it must be sought as a supreme good in itself, or it loses its essential character, and ceases to be itself, and thus fails to yield any of its secondary and consequential worldly benefits. It must be first, or it cannot be at all. "Seek ye *first* the kingdom of God and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." All but infidels must concede that the reception of the gospel by men, is immeasurably the greatest good which can be imparted to them. This being so, it is plain that it ought to have a com-

manding eminence in that course of liberal education, which is of such power in shaping the minds and hearts, the career and destiny of multitudes of young men, of the highest talents and promise. Moreover, it is through their influence that the minds of the people universally are moulded. With few exceptions they constitute our physicians, lawyers, clergymen, editors, authors, statesmen, in short the teachers and guides of the race. The influence of these leaders and commanders of the people must be immense, whether it be enlisted for or against true religion. How unutterably important then is it, that they be the friends and supporters of evangelical piety? How plainly should all the fundamental arrangements and regulations of our colleges be adapted to promote so blessed a consummation? What can more happily tend towards it, than that the head of the institution be a minister of this holy religion? How desirable, that his vast influence be felt upon the students, not only in exemplifying, but in formally inculcating its doctrines and precepts? that, in addition to other means of influencing his pupils, he may avail himself of the solemn and tender relation sustained by the Christian pastor and teacher to his flock, to exercise a purifying influence upon them? How important, that he be able as occasion may require, to "rebuke, reprove and exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine," by the use of the *sermon*, which, notwithstanding the hackneyed allegation of its dullness and impotence, beyond all other kinds of instruction and entertainment, widely and permanently interests and improves mankind, being God's great ordinance for saving them that believe, that he have access to the pulpit which must ever stand acknowledged,

> "The most effectual guard,
> Support and ornament of virtue's cause"?

And on the other hand how does the fit discharge of these solemn duties add to his weight and dignity, his claims to affection and reverence? While our colleges under such auspices will be likely to send forth hosts of pious young men ready to every good work, to become leaders in "the sacramental host," and blessings to the church and the world, what better than a pest and scourge of society, is that literary institution which is annually pouring out its throngs of young men equipped with that knowledge which is power, while their principles and tastes

are so depraved, that they will exert power only in polluting and ruining their fellow-men?

Such are the considerations which vindicate the practice which has been almost universal in our more reputable colleges, of choosing none but Christian ministers to their highest office. They are ordinarily conclusive, colleges in our largest cities, are indeed so peculiarly affected by their location as to escape the force of much of the foregoing reasoning. Their students are derived chiefly from the cities in which they are located. Hence they reside in their own families, are under the guardianship of their own parents, with whom they "go up to the house of God in company." Thus they rarely meet their instructors except at recitations and prayers. In these cases many of the peculiar elements and traits of ordinary college communities are wanting. Many parts of the ordinary academic regimen may here be dispensed with, since the moral and religious impressions of the students are mostly imbibed elsewhere than at the college. Nor need we refrain from adding, that one of our city universities is favoured with a chancellor, who though a layman, needs only a formal investiture with the office of the ministry to adorn it; who makes his Christian influence felt in every sphere and relation he fills, with a felicity and power seldom equalled by clergymen; who would be disqualified by ordination for various high posts in our country, and who has the rare merit of having demonstrated in his own example, that Christian piety consistently acted out by public men, sheds a lustre and dignity upon the highest offices in the state. So remarkable an exception to the general class of men to which he belongs, presents also an exception to ordinary rules and reasonings about them; and it would be as preposterous to argue from this instance to a general principle, as to reason that because Dr. Witherspoon was a great statesman, and swayed even the Congress of the revolution by his eloquent wisdom, without tarnishing his ministerial character, therefore it would ordinarily be safe for clergymen to enter actively into political contentions.

While we thus cordially sustain the policy which led to Dr. Woolsey's ordination, there is one feature of the proceedings which we do not understand. He was ordained by Congregationalists to be a Congregational minister in a Congregational college. We suppose of course that the ceremony was intended

to be performed in the Congregational way. But we also have supposed it to be a settled and cardinal principle of Congregationalism, that all rightly constituted councils whether for ordination or other public ecclesiastical business, consist of ministers and lay-delegates of the churches, and that no council is regular, of which such lay-delegates are not members, at least by appointment, whether they attend or not. We believe this to be the view sanctioned by the practice, and the standard writers of that denomination.* Indeed if it be otherwise, much as it glories in its republican characteristics, it is so far forth less democratic than Presbyterianism; whose church courts are invariably composed in part of laymen who are the representatives of the people; and while all concede that the structure of any of these courts would be fatally vitiated, if laymen were not at liberty, and appointed to attend them, others go the length of making it well nigh *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*, that there can be no quorum in these bodies for the lawful transaction of business, without the actual presence of ruling elders. This being so, we wonder that the council for the ordination of Dr. Woolsey was composed exclusively of the clerical Fellows of the College, no churches being invited to send delegates to it. We marvel the more at this, in consideration of the standing of the men concerned in it, and especially as some of them are prominent as champions of Congregationalism, particularly, its popular and democratic features. We think that, in these days, when so much labour is spent to prove that ministerial authority is a kind of charm transmitted by "tactual succession" from hand to hand and from head to hand, every unprelatical denomination should abide by its principles, lest they afford occasion to such as seek occasion, to say they have no principles.

The rightful supremacy of the Christian religion in seats of learning, being the great truth, that had been rendered prominent in all the transactions connected with Dr. Woolsey's elevation to the Presidency, it very naturally became prominent in the different discourses and addresses delivered in connection with his ordination and inauguration.

Dr. Bacon's sermon is characterized by his usual vivacity and brilliancy; and by more than his usual depth of thinking and

* Upham's Ratio Disciplinae, Chap. xv. Sec. 146.

scholarship. Indeed it bears every mark of a carefully studied and elaborated performance. Such it ought to have been. Anything short of this would have been unjust to himself and to the occasion. His subject founded on the text, Acts xvii. 18, was, the truths before unknown or in doubt, which the Bible reveals and makes certain; the relation of these truths to science; or generally, "the bearing of the Christian revelation on the intellectual progress of mankind." Without implying an assent to every position taken in this discourse, we do not hesitate to avow our strong approbation of the main doctrine it sets forth, and of the ability with which it is unfolded and vindicated.

The new truths which Dr. Bacon specifies as brought to light by Christian revelation, he finds "included either expressly or by some strong implication, in the outline which we have of Paul's discourse" on Mars-hill. They are, 1. "The existence of one God the creator of the universe; 2. The universal presence and perpetual providence of God, caring for the happiness of men; 3. The unity of the human race; 4. The true dignity of human nature as made in God's image for intelligent communion with God; 5. God's interposition to recover men from the degradation and misery of their universal apostacy; 6. God's moral government over the world." These truths thus declared by the Apostle to the Athenians, had they heartily received them, Dr. B. observes, "in their confused chaotic minds, would have been, if I may borrow the strong phrase of another, 'like a sun shot into chaos.'"

Dr. B. next proceeds to trace out the relations of these truths, thus disclosed or first made certain to us, to the whole circle of sciences.

The views advanced in this discourse, were peculiarly appropriate to the occasion of its delivery—the ordination of one to the Christian ministry as a prerequisite to his induction to the presidency of a great literary institution. Well was the theme chosen, and well was it handled by a Christian minister in connection with, and in vindication of this solemn transaction, which, according to his own representation of it, signifies, "that he who is to preside over all these studies and teachings, may not enter into that high place, till he has given to Christ and the church those pledges, and taken upon his soul those vows, which are involved in his being set apart, in the apostolic form, to the

ministry of Christian truth, and the defence of the gospel." p. 36.

Well does he state the two opposite, but equally fatal results of that science which isolates itself from the truths of revelation. "On the one hand, it becomes gross materialism and atheism. On the other side it runs off into pantheistic views; and is sublimated at last into the transcendentalism which makes every thing subjective, and which regards God and the universe as a mere phantasmagoria produced in its own addled brain.

"In like manner, the science which disconnects itself from Christianity, is liable to either of two opposite tendencies in relation to utility and the welfare of society. On the one hand it is in danger of shutting its eyes to all that is moral and spiritual in the universe, all that concerns man's highest and most substantial interests; and so it degenerates into a coarse, sensual, Epicurean utilitarianism. Or if it falls under the opposite influence, it withdraws from sympathy and friendly connection with mankind at large; it grows ashamed of ministering to the homely wants of human nature; it seeks its own elegant amusement and intellectual enjoyments; it discusses trifles with a languid and gentlemanly air; and it sinks into contempt in its proud seclusion." p. 33.

If the doctrine of this discourse be true—if it be so, as for the most part, we assuredly believe it is—that the philosophy which is unenlightened by revelation, is unavoidably erroneous and incapable of progress: that "the world by wisdom knew not God," and not knowing the central and supreme object in the universe, knows nothing else aright; if Christianity pours its light, as Dr. Bacon contends into all other, not excepting even the physical sciences, and corrects their aberrations; then there is one conclusion from all this that is irresistible. That Christianity which illuminates and rectifies every other science, cannot itself be corrected, improved, overruled, or in any manner modified, by such science. This, by the very supposition, except as it is regenerated and illuminated by this same Christianity, is ever vain and erratic. It walks in darkness and knows not at what it stumbles; or in the emphatic and reiterated phrase of Dr. B. it "knows nothing." This makes an end of all alleged improvements in theology and the science of interpreting scripture, by means of human speculation, discoveries in metaphysics, especially mental and moral philosophy, and more than all, by enthroning

the human mind under the specious title of the Reason, over the Bible, with powers plenipotentiary to decide oracularly what it may, and may not teach. If the doctrine of the discourse under review is correct, all attempts to amend or perfect the obvious teachings of the Bible, by the supposed discoveries of human philosophy, are like attempts to illuminate the sun by rays shot up to it from the earth. It is essaying to illuminate that which gives light to all, and borrows it from none. Dr. B. justly says that religion, "renouncing, (at the reformation,) in part at least, the usurped dominion of metaphysics, had fallen back on God's facts in the Bible for the knowledge of God and things divine." We hope that these intruders into the hallowed precincts of divinity will never be permitted to resume this "usurped dominion," and that the boastful genius of innovation now glorying in its metaphysical astuteness, and now in its "common sense" simplicity and palpableness, will be speedily exorcised from the church; that we shall not soon be again annoyed with those vaunted improvements in theology, which have been the fruitful source of aggravated disorders and divisions, and have circulated the counterfeit fervors of artificial excitement, for true celestial fire, till the feverish fanaticism they kindled, has subsided into the chill of spiritual lethargy and death.

The interest of the discourse is heightened by the address to the candidate for ordination with which it closes. This was the more impressive from the fact, that Dr. Woolsey and Dr. Bacon, having been schoolmates in boyhood, and then classmates in college, and now for many years, neighbours and intimate friends, were also the two most prominent candidates before the public for the Presidency.

After adverting to Dr. W's. peculiar superiority as a scholar in youth at school and in college, so that if "it had been announced that one of the class of 1820 would be President, all eyes would have been turned to him *facile princeps;*" to his subsequent opportunities for enriching his mind with the largest learning and perfecting it by the finest culture; his experience in the instruction and government of the college, his foreign travel and consequent personal knowledge of the great seats and men of learning in Europe; nay, to the severe discipline of excruciating affliction, which is of the highest utility in preparing men for great stations and services, in all of which he had incon-

sciously been furnishing himself for this high and unexpected vocation. Dr. B. proceeds, to tell him "some particulars in which his preparation might have seemed more perfect." Having supposed him to have known in boyhood "the harsh discipline of poverty;" to have been taken "while yet a stripling to some high post of militant service for the church;" and then to have suffered the hatred and reproaches usually awarded to able and faithful ministers by all sorts of unreasonable and wicked men—he proceeds to say, "then though doubtless you would have had some qualifications which as yet you have not, you would have gained these qualifications at the expense of something of that accurate and thorough scholarship; and not only so, but you might have been, perhaps, in some respects too much of a man for us: we might have feared and wisely feared, to put you in this place; we might even have thought, and you might have thought with us, that your influence had grown too high to be transplanted, and that you had shaped for yourself a sphere of light and power from which you could not well be spared." pp. 38–9.

This leads us to ask, who is "too much of a man" to preside over the largest college in the country, the education of multitudes of young men, some hundred of whom are annually sent forth, and distributed over the land, and destined ultimately to fill its highest places of influence and power? A Dwight did not deem himself "too much of a man" for it, nor did the Trustees "fear to put him" there, even when the college had not grown to half its present magnitude. What other "sphere of light and power" can be compared to this, if properly filled, as it has been, by the illustrious series of men who have hitherto adorned it? Is any man so "great" that the corporation would have "feared" to summon him to it, if they had judged him best qualified for it? Moreover, how does it appear, that the new President could have acquired more of that high sort of manhood which his office needs, by any different training? That his abilities and opportunities have been of the highest order; that he has faithfully made the most of them; that he has long been employed in the instruction and government of the college, the best possible training for his office; that he has had the rugged discipline of affliction, and profited thereby; that he has endured the still severer ordeal of ample pecuniary resources, and

instead of being enervated by them, has made them tributary to the perfection of his scholarship and other accomplishments for his high calling, appears from Dr. B's representation. What process then could have made him more, above all, "too much of a man" for his station? On the whole, we think this closing address to Dr. W. the least felicitous part of the discourse.

As we pass onward to the charge by Dr. Porter, we find it a well-wrought production, replete with just views of the nature, and judicious counsels as to the right discharge of the sacred office, when conferred upon the President of a college. We should be glad to make some extracts, if we had space. The address by Mr. Smith in connection with giving the right hand of fellowship, is as happy as it is brief.

Next we come to the brief inaugurating address to the new President, followed by an address to the audience on "the appropriate duties of the President of a college," by Dr. Day, the ex-President. It is characterised by that mellow wisdom which has distinguished his whole career. After showing what a college is in the American sense; that its object is not to *finish* but merely to lay the foundation of a liberal education; that this object is much thwarted by the imperfect preparation of many of the students who enter college; that the whole course should be brought, as far as practicable, under the guidance of moral and religious principle; that the finances of the institution demand the strict and ceaseless vigilance of the presiding officer, to prevent the accumulation of expenditures exceeding its income; that all empirical expedients in education must in the end be disastrous to the college that adopts them, whatever transient popularity and patronage they may command by their dazzling and meteoric glare; he comes to what he evidently most burdens his mind in leaving, as it had done during his administration of the college. He says, "the most difficult problem by far, in the management of a college, is its discipline. Were there no necessity for this, the business of the instructors might justly be ranked among the most eligible of all employments. . . . There was good reason for the deep solicitude of that most distinguished instructor and guardian of youth, President Dwight, on this subject. When, in his last hours, he was inquired of, whether he had any directions to give respecting the

college, he merely expressed his desire that its discipline might be preserved." p. 66.

All who have any acquaintance with colleges, will feel that Dr. Day has not overstated the importance of the subject. The very extensive prevalence of idleness and dissipation in our best regulated institutions; the vast number of bright, hale, and promising young men, who are sent to colleges to be educated, and are sent away from them absolute wrecks, with shattered constitutions, debilitated minds, depraved appetites and profligate habits, renders this whole subject unutterably important. He who should devise any method of rendering college discipline more efficient in its working and benign in its results, who should contrive a way of effectually preserving from contamination, the bands of ingenuous and inexperienced young men that enter our academic halls, would in our opinion, achieve a triumph more glorious than the inventor of the cotton gin or the steam engine. But as there neither is, nor is likely to be any such specific discovered, it devolves on the trustees and instructors of colleges to task their wisdom, and exercise the utmost vigilance and assiduity on this subject, that so the evil may be abated, if not eradicated.

Dr. Day justly maintains that as the government of colleges takes the place of that of the families from which the students are withdrawn, so like this latter, it is "not mainly a government of restraint and terror, but of mild and persuasive influence, . . . yet this is not to be relied on as superseding *entirely* the necessity of punishment. In seminaries of learning, as well as in political communities, there are refractory spirits, which nothing but the penalties of the law will restrain. . . . It has been said, by an eminent philosopher and statesman, with a near approximation to the truth, that the great art of government consists in *not governing too much.* It would be more correct to say, that it consists in governing *just enough;* neither too much nor too little; and still more exactly true, that it consists in conducting the government in *such a way,* that it shall be as *little felt* as possible, except in its successful results. . . . All *display* of power, all discipline proceeding from the love of power, is to be scrupulously avoided." pp. 67-8-9.

These sage maxims, which may be taken for the conclusions, reached after a long career of successful experience, speak their

own importance. There is another resource on which Dr. Day evidently places great reliance in the government of a college. It consists in multiplying the inducements for poor students to resort to it for a liberal education. "The best materials for a seminary of learning, are the youth who are dependent on their education for professional success, and elevation in society. The point in which a college, situated as ours is, is in most danger of failing, is in the preservation of good order, sobriety, industry and economy. . . . As the government is one of influence, not of restraint and terror, it is essential to its preservation, that there be a majority of the students on the side of good order and assiduous application. It is the wise policy of our Northern colleges, to give special encouragement to those who are in moderate or indigent circumstances." p. 63.

While we heartily approve of the general system advocated in these extracts, we question whether there is not sometimes an infelicity in carrying it into practice. Are not "moderate and indigent circumstances" sometimes treated as being an almost sufficient and exclusive ground of favour, irrespective of industry, scholarship, and character? In addition to the qualification of indigence, ought there not also to be a fair measure of talents, diligence and general propriety of deportment, as a condition of receiving "special encouragement?" We suppose that it cannot tend to put the majority of the students "on the side of good order and assiduous application," to encourage those who have not these qualities, however indigent they may be. We do not suppose this to be the theory of Dr. Day, or the intent of any of the special provisions made for the assistance of poor students in any of our colleges. But we think we have some times observed, in the carrying out of the system, a too exclusive regard to the sole qualification of poverty, which of course defeats the very end in view.

Last in order—as it is inferior to none of them in merit—among these productions, is the inaugural discourse by Dr. Woolsey. As his tastes and pursuits have been those of the scholar, and he has never been addicted to popular speaking, although he has never secluded himself from sympathy and intercourse with the world, his high gifts and qualifications, if known to scholars, have been unknown to the people at large. But we think that this discourse has satisfied those who have read it, however ignorant

of him they may have been before, that the corporation have not misjudged in the selection they have made. It is every way of a high order. It shows a depth and scope and justness of thought, a thoroughness and refinement of culture, a strength and warmth, a purity and delicacy of moral and Christian feeling which put its author in the first rank of our literary men.

We limit ourselves to a few extracts which will serve for a brief synopsis of the discourse. The object of the discourse is to show the result which a Christian teacher should seek to accomplish by his instructions; or in other words, that a sound education produces an intellectual state at once analogous and propitious to that moral and spiritual state which genuine Christianity fosters. He first shows that religion may be viewed as spending itself either in self-purification, or in exertions for the good of others; as self-discipline or benevolence; as consisting either in active or passive virtues; but maintains that the true idea of it comprises and blends into harmony both these views; and that it becomes morbid and degenerate, when it has its being in one of these things to the exclusion of the other. In the man of well-balanced piety,

"Neither the passive nor the active element will predominate. He will feel that passive virtue is not the whole of virtue; that contemplation and solitude not being the state for which man was made, will prevent rather than further his perfection; that truth itself needs the contact of society to be tested and rendered impressive. And yet, on the other side, we will feel that self-purification in itself considered, is a most important thing, that deep principles and frequent meditation upon them, are necessary even to sustain active habits of an elevated range; and that perhaps, the worst state into which a man or a nation can be brought, is to become exclusively practical; since without constant recurrence to fundamental truths, the good pursued becomes earthly instead of heavenly, and the mind loses its faith and its power.

"If our remarks are just, the Christian teacher will try to avoid both of these extremes—that of over valuing theory and the improvement of the individual; and that of ascribing value only to the practical results of education in society. . . . . For let it not be imagined that Christianity, in its highest manifestations, despises the useful. Even the philosophy of Plato did

not go so far as that. The useful properly understood, is the very point at which Christianity aims. The truly useful is the good, or the means to attain the good." pp. 78–9.

In this view of Christianity, which puts true goodness first, making the useful a means to, and happiness a fruit of its supremacy, and which discards that grovelling utilitarianism, that debases morals, religion, science, literature, education, indeed whatever it touches, we see the great features of that teaching which corresponds to it. These Dr. W. points out and advocates with great ability. He says,

"In the first place, the Christian instructor will value training more than knowledge. For every use which we can make of our minds, a principle is worth far more than the knowledge of a thousand applications of the principle; a habit of thinking far more than a thousand thoughts to which the habit might lead; the increase of a power far more than a multitude of things accomplished by that power. . . .

"The mind too, as trained, is fitted to explore higher truths with safety, while mere knowledge puffs up, leads to nothing better, and indeed in the early periods of life, tends to exclude better things. The highly disciplined man never thinks that he knows every thing, never thinks that every thing can be known, and is therefore modest, teachable, and believing. The man who has stores of knowledge without a well trained mind can hardly escape from self-conceit, and is liable to credulity or skepticism. It is needless to say which of these habits is most allied to the truly philosophical spirit or most favourable to Christian faith—to the reception of the gospel as a little child." pp. 80–1.

These principles he applies to correct some contrary views of education more or less current in society. Among these he specifies the aristocratic notion that the great end of a liberal education is to acquire a certain polish of mind derived chiefly from familiarity with the ancient classics; the proposal of some to have taught and studied, "chiefly or exclusively, the natural sciences on account of the stores of knowledge they contain;" the idea of many students, that "the reading of works of genius, rather than study is to be the occupation of each passing day." Such persons "bear blossoms when they ought to be gathering

internal strength. They not only do not grow, but positively weaken their minds and moral powers."

Dr. W. next insists that the Christian teacher will study to improve all the parts of the mind. "If God has formed all the powers and capacities of the soul, Christianity must evidently recognize it as his will, that they should all be cultivated so as to go on toward perfection together."

To a want of this symmetrical culture, he justly attributes much of that "*one-sidedness* in religion, politics and taste" which mark the present age. "What we call ultraism in this country —where the abundance of the thing seems to have given birth to the name—is but the one-sided tendency of minds not fully educated in all their parts, in which truths have not yet found their order and due proportion." (p. 84.) That part of the mind which he considers now most neglected is the sense of the beautiful, the taste, the faculty of "literary criticism." The evil as yet admits of no "complete remedy." But he would make it felt, in order that the cure may be attempted. A radical difficulty lies in the want of satisfactory treatises on the true prineiples, and in the various departments of æsthetics. There is great and striking truth in the following passages.

"The result of all this is, that the logieal faculty has too much preëminence in our education; we train up those who will reason correctly, and it may be forcibly at the bar and the pulpit; but they become hard dry men, men who will neither receive nor give pleasure from their elegance of taste, and refined appreciation of art. This evil is not likely soon to be corrected, as is made probable by its universality and by the fact that the still reigning philosophy has another end—the useful—almost exclusively in view. But we still can make some resistance, even if it be an imperfect one, to the evil. We can teach the elassics more with reference to style and artistic arrangement. We can bring the fine arts within the range of education. . . . A body of men, of tastes at once delicate and healthy, would mitigate the fierceness of political and theological strife in our country, and by their elevated standard would tend to make us feel that kind of cultivation to be necessary in which we are now most deficient." p. 88.

Dr. W. next applies the principle of his discourse to refute the low utilitarianism, which is so widely corrupting and degrading education. As according to the Christian system, true goodness is

to be prized for its own sake, even if we could suppose it would be followed by no rewards, so according to our author, the Christian teacher "will value science to some extent for its own sake. He will value it also as a necessary means for the formation of a perfect mind, and of an individual fitted for high usefulness. As for such results as success and reputation he will by no means despise them, but regarding other ends as nobler and more important, he will believe that according to the system of God in this world, the attainment of the better will involve that of the less worthy. Just as we secure our happiness when we are most willing to sacrifice it, while he who saveth his life, shall lose it, just so do we make most certain the lower purposes of education when we aim at the higher. And if we fail of the lower, there is still remaining after all, the priceless mind, all ready for usefulness, strong in its love of truth, imbued with the knowledge of principles, unwilling to stoop to what is low, and containing within itself a fountain of happiness.

"Few will question, I think, that these views are in accordance with the principles of Christianity." p. 89.

As the heresy that virtue or holiness is valuable not in itself, but only for the sake of the happiness or gratification of self-love, of which it is a means, goes to vitiate and destroy all moral goodness, inasmuch as the end will re-act upon, and determine the means employed to gain it; so Dr. Woolsey justly argues, that if science and the knowledge of the truth be not counted a good *per se*, but be prized solely as means to other ends, especially such ends as worldly success, honour, and emolument, they themselves will grow corrupt and wither and die. Thus, if knowledge be prized only as a means of self-aggrandizement, then falsehood will be quite as readily espoused as truth, if it be found more conducive to the same end. Thus the great object of desire and pursuit becomes not what is true; but as with the analogous heresy in morals, what is profitable. Of course all science which is nothing else than the knowledge of truth, and with it all real education, expire. Dr. W. adduces a fine illustration of these views in the case of the Grecian sophists who shaped their instructions solely with reference to making them subservient to such mercenary ends. In this aim they succeeded. "But then they educated in such a way, that the young lost all moral principle under their instructions, and became frivolous

shallow and skeptical; that ancient reverence and fidelity disappeared; that chicanery increased; that the creative principles of literature died out." p. 93.

The discourse detects the mischievous effects of these degrading views of science and education, in the extravagant estimation in which many hold "ready and fluent speaking and writing." He objects to making such attainments a prominent and paramount object before the mind is qualified by sufficient training and knowledge to make a just use of them. He contends that acquired thus prematurely, they will lead the youth to undervalue truth, and over value the instrument by which he can flourish at once. "And with his reverence for the truth, must he not lose his modesty, seeing that he has an instrument that he can wave about and make glitter in every body's eyes? And with the two, must he not lose his solidity of mind and character, his patience of labour, his faith in the far-reaching value of a thorough education?" p. 94.

However, some may deem all this too sublimated, too ideal, too contemptuous of the practical, we have no doubt of its justice. We have known the education, and ultimate practical efficiency and success of many young men impaired by their excessive and premature cultivation of this fluency of speaking and writing. They were betrayed by it into the neglect of more solid acquirements, and in after life were outstripped in this very respect, by those more thorough students, who in college, were far behind them in every thing pertaining to rhetoric and oratory. We remember the remark of an eminent jurist, that it is a great calamity to a young man to be able to appear to advantage without effort, and our observation has confirmed its truth.

The same cause, according to Dr. W., "inclines many to introduce into the college course, studies which belong to the professional life." This premature studying of principles, which students have not as yet been qualified by academic training to master, fills the professions with unripe, superficial men, who lament their error when it is past remedy. With a similar spirit, some contend that a professional man, if he would succeed, should pay no attention to any branch of study but his own. Against this course Dr. W. protests with great earnestness as tending to narrowness and illiberality. He insists that the pursuit of other knowledge, "as a subordinate thing," need consume no time, because it may serve for relaxation from the monotony of one

pursuit; and that it "need not interfere with progress, by cultivating other habits of mind, for every power of mind is needed in every profession for the highest usefulness." We think these suggestions of great importance to all professional men, and they may be verified by striking examples within the sphere of every man's observation.

We cannot forbear transcribing a part of his answer to the objection, that such a system of education as accords with the foregoing views, does not fit men for successful political manoeuvreing. "Far be from us such a tendency in education. Rather than train so, I would—to use Plato's words—whisper to two or three young men in a corner, or even walk through empty halls. I should not like to die with this weight on my soul, that I had taken into my hands a block of the finest marble, and cut it into the form of a demagogue." p. 92.

He concludes with the position, "that a Christian instructor will, as far as lies within the range of his department, lead the minds of his pupils up to God. . . . He will connect science or learning, wherever it has a connection with the author of science and our minds." Thus, "nothing appears fortuitous or arbitrary or irrational. The perception of great designs in the universe, makes the mind unwilling to act without a plan worthy of its capacities. It is unable any longer to feel astonishment at the puny efforts of man; and instead of that hero-worship, that stupid gaze at men of genius, which is so common and so much fostered at this day, it worships the almighty architect, the author of beauty the law-giver of the creation." p. 98.

It surely augurs well for the interests of sound science, morality and religion, when men of principles so elevated, are selected to preside over our largest colleges. We see in this discourse religion enthroned over science, while science becomes the handmaid of religion. We see conservatism without stagnation, and enterprise which perfects without destroying whatever is good in existing systems. We see a noble elevation of moral principle which will not stoop to debase the culture of the mind for mercenary purposes. We see broad and profound views of the true nature and ends of a liberal education. We close with one extract, which suggests various reflections, while our limits oblige us to leave it to speak for itself.

"It might be asked here, whether a corps of Christian teachers having thus guided their pupils in the study of divine wisdom,

as displayed in the universe, ought not to go beyond the vestibule, and enter in procession into the inner temple, which is full of the presence of Christ. Or must they, as profane, stop without, and leave it to other guides, whose calling it is, to show the wonders within? Is it a fruit of the lamentable jealousies among Christian sects, that instruction *ex professo* in the Christian religion cannot be given in colleges unless we seem to make them sectarian, and thus increase distinctions, which are great enough already. These are grave questions, which it comports not with this time to answer fully. At present, the science of sciences lies neglected by almost all except ministers of the gospel. It forms, properly speaking, no branch of education; even the scriptures themselves are little studied out of voluntary classes. Meanwhile, causes are at work to undermine the religious faith with which young men have been imbued by their fathers, causes too, which must have the more influence, as the literary cultivation of our young men increases. The tendency to materialism on one side, and to pantheism on another, the literature of atheistic despair and sensualism, and the historic engines battering the walls of facts, must cause a multitude of minds in the next age to be assailed by religious doubts; and snares seem to be set for faith in revelation on every side. How desirable, if all this be not mere alarm, if the fears of many portending some crisis, in which the old shapes of things shall be broken up, be not entirely idle; how desirable, I say, that our educated young men should be taught a theology so liberal if that might be, as not to pertain to the party, but to universal Christianity, and so majestic in its outlines as to recommend itself to the consciousness, and make it own the presence of God." pp. 98–9.

Art. III.—*History of Romanism, from the earliest corruptions of Christianity to the present time, &c.* By John Dowling, A. M., Pastor of the Berean church, New York. New York: Edward Walker, 114 Fulton Street. Sixth edition. pp. 671.

So widely extended is the reading, and even the religious, public in this country, and composed of so many different classes, that there is a demand for books on all subjects and of very

diverse characters. Because a particular class of books, is distasteful to us, we should not hastily conclude that it must be so to our neighbours. We may think that superficial statements, and flaming pictures, are not the most effectual or rational means of opposing error; and yet there may be a multitude of minds ready to be excited and instructed by such instruments. So long as books contain truth and are free from an evil spirit, we may hope for good from their circulation, even when they are not of a kind to suit ourselves. Romanism is now, throughout the world so much an object of attention that its character and history, are matters of universal interest. Rome still claims, with whatever justice, the exclusive authority to speak in the name of Christ on earth; she speaks of the forgivness of sins, with whatever meaning; and adores the blessed Trinity, with whatever purity. The image of the cross of Christ itself, with its sacred and affecting associations, is a sort of shibboleth of hers; perched on the summits of her houses of worship, in the place of the weather-vane; gilded on the backs of her priests, where soldiers bear their knapsacks; erected on high-ways for the benefit of travellers who need repose; set in the tiara of her pontiff, that he may display afar, the assertion of authority higher than that of the kings of the earth; traced on the foreheads and breasts of her votaries at every coming-in, and going-out, on clothing or shoeing themselves, when they wash or sit to the table, when they light a candle, or retire to bed; as if they had heard a voice, like Constantine, assuring them of the talismanic virtue of that sign alone, in all circumstances of life, however they may feel in relation to the thing signified. If the persons who are thus perpetually crossing themselves, were as full of the spirit of Christ; and if the history of their predecessors, in days that are past, was as full of that spirit, as their gestures are of the airy images of the cross, these latter would not be so strange things as they are: nor should we be required to ponder so deeply their true significancy, in the providence of God.

But when bodies are seen moving about over the face of the earth, the more frequent, the more totally life and living souls are absent from them, we may well enquire into laws of life so strange; when shadows appear so numerous as to chequer the ground, and there are no substances by which they are cast, men will look up to the sky, to discover how and whence they come.

Indeed in the whole history of Papal Rome these half ghastly and half ludicrous incongruities often make their appearance. Men who traced the cross upon their foreheads, often had the stiletto in their bosoms; and presenting to the eyes of their neighbours by day, the emblem of salvation, they made them feel the blade of the assassin by night; they withheld the cup of wine from the people in the holy communion, but often administered it, drugged with poison, at the social festival; a line of pontiffs, claiming to be vicegerents of the blessed Saviour, next to God, and all but gods on earth, is polluted, the purest charity must admit, with almost, if not altogether every human crime; in hearts vociferously devoted to the Prince of Peace, and arrogating His exclusive favour, murder and malice appear full-grown, and revelling, as giants refreshed with wine; a gospel which was given to enlighten the world, as Rome propagates it, shrouds the nations in darkness; the whole band of human virtues was to follow in its footsteps, but, as she gave it to men, the whole band of vices and woes and miseries were its more ordinary attendants. So that we seem morally impelled, not only by its constant exhibition of the sacred symbol of the cross, but also by most of the other substantial features it exhibits to view, to regard it as simply an ingenious CARICATURE of Christ, his kingdom, and his truth; planned with great wisdom, and executed with much skill and consistency, from step to step and from age to age.*

The design of this article is to present some examples and illustrations, from a wide field in which many might be gathered, which seem to show the religion of the Bible and that of the Papacy, as standing in the relation of truth and caricature, where they are not in the more decisive attitudes of truth and falsehood. The points to be adverted to, are, the worship of saints, the popedom, the catholicity of the church, the rule of

* In the history of the suppression of the Knights Templars, by Philip the Fair, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, there are strong reasons to believe that the inexpiable sin of that order was, their dislike to the cross-idolatry of the Papists; that they bound their novices "to redeem the spirit of religion" from that mockery; and that this is the real meaning of the weighty charge: "abnegationem Christi et spuitionem super crucem;" especially as they were chargeable in addition, with such blasphemies as "la croisade va selon la croix (a coin) des Francois," and "des legats qui vendent Dieu et les indulgences."

faith and regeneration. The scriptures make clear statements, in relation to the communion of living saints, in the prayers of one another; where St. Paul describes himself, as bowing his knees to God, in the fervour of love, to pray for spiritual blessings on the Ephesian Christians; where he requests the prayers of his brethren for himself; and where he exhorts that prayers and intercessions be made for all men; in which places, and other parallel ones, it is too plain for argument, that prayer to God, by the living, for the living, is meant; of which the periodical concerts of prayer, at present observed among several denominations of Christians, is a happy exemplification, as sublime as it is simple and scriptural, expanding pious sympathies, and solacing the heart, without bewildering the mind of the worshipper with unrevealed and incomprehensible mysteries.

Instead of this divine arrangement, it is recommended to Romish families, to request, morning and evening, the prayers of St. Mary, St. Lucy, St. Agnes, St. Bridget, St. Cecily, St. Dominic, St. Anthony, St. Patrick, St. Jerom, St. Augustine, all holy virgins and widows, all holy monks and hermits, all holy doctors, all holy bishops and confessors, all holy priests and levites, all holy apostles and evangelists, all holy patriarchs and prophets, all holy angels and archangels and all holy orders of blessed spirits: some of them real persons, now in the church triumphant above, whose audience of earthly requests we might doubt, and whose omnipresence we must deny, (did we undertake to reason at all, against the broad comedy of such superstition;) mingled with the heroes of dreams and prodigies, the wizards and jugglers, the Merlins and Fausts and Mesmers, of ages of moral and intellectual darkness; which objects indeed have a show of reverence in will-worship and humility, but present a horizon to the spirit's eye of the devotee, as different from the clear horizon of the word of God, as the sky filled with shadowy armies, wheeling and charging in spectre-warfare, said to have been seen during the siege of Jerusalem, differs from the fair sky of that Italy itself, where nature is yet bright, though the spirit of man is so dark.

It is not very surprising that such men as Basil and Eusebius, in such an age as that in which they lived, should broach such things; and speak of the spirits of the dead saints and martyrs, as present at the graves where their bodies were buried, or as

standing around living men, like "well-arranged bulwarks" to guard them from invisible foes; nor that Origen should think he had a quite sufficient proof-text in the words which frightened Moab applies to the children of Israel, in the twenty-second chapter of Numbers; "Now shall this company lick up all that are round about us, as the ox licketh up the grass of the field;" to show that the company of saints, before the throne of God, could overcome with their tongues, the adverse company of evil spirits and accusers; though Eusebius is more downright and honest, and relies on the authority of Plato. The stronger sense of Augustine is perplexed with doubts, and almost opposes the new hagiology: "quomodo mortui vivorum rebus atque cognoscendis adjuvandisque miscentur? ista questio vires intelligentiae meæ vincit." "Res haec altior est quam ut a me possit attingi, et abstrusior quam ut a me valeat perscrutari." Vigilantius, as far as can be gathered from his fierce antagonist, Jerome, openly opposes it, and on correct principles.

It was a stroke of no feeble policy, when instead of salutary truth, so imposing a superstition took complete possession of the imaginations of men. It would last long, and acquire fresh strength from age to age; it would eventually stop altogether, one means of drawing down divine blessings upon man. It is manifest caricature indeed; and may excite a smile, as well as demand a tear; but it displays the skill of a master spirit of evil, with a more distant vision into the future than man; a more perfect knowledge of the springs of evil in the human soul; a greater willingness to work them; and more consummate powers of plan and combination.

Some have thought that in Barabbas, who was released from prison at Jerusalem in preference to the Saviour, a caricature of the person and character of Christ himself, was permitted to be attempted. There are reasons to think this culprit's name was also Jesus; and the cognomen by which he is called, obviously means, Son of the Father. It would seem as if the fiends who wrought the wires, in those memorable scenes, wished to play off, for the view of future ages, a kind of theatrical jeer, more degrading even, than the scarlet robe, the sceptre of reed, and the crown of thorns; and would seem to say by it, see, this is a better Jesus than that! this is to be released—that must go to the cross. The wisdom of the city of Solomon directs it to be

so. This illustration, as it may be conceived to be, is suggested, on passing to our next point, the Popedom. The Pope of Rome, and the office which he holds, as it has been administered ever since its creation, resembles the real Head of the Church and His office, as defined in his word, as little as Barabbas deserved precedence of him at Jerusalem. That such men as the Popes of Rome, could be supposed to stand before the world, in any manner whatever representing Christ, in his stead as representative, ambassador, prime-minister, vicar or vicegerent; or as his locum tenens in any capacity whatever; that men were to think it was as if they saw Christ on earth, when they looked upon Hildebrand, or Innocent, or Julius, or Alexander Borgia, or any one of a score of others who might be named; that this was the papa of the world, as God is our Father in Heaven; the visible head of a church of which the immaculate Son of God is the invisible head; the chief of a kingdom of righteousness; and especially that the prophecies of universal dominion and superiority over other potentates, written in the scriptures for Christ, should be applicable also to the Pope of Rome, on account of the oneness of the official and personal rights of the visible and invisible heads of the church, would be as ludicrous as any simile can make it appear, if it had not been too closely connected with the calamities of mankind for sport, and if it was not still the instrument of an extensive and melancholy delusion. Perhaps there is a more appropiate analogy for the Popedom in Virgil, when he tells us that in his visit to the infernal regions, his hero saw there, the company of the giants, suffering punishment for invading heaven with violence; and that there was a Greek among them, who had not participated in that crime; but had gone exulting through the cities of Greece, in a brazen chariot drawn by four horses, and waving a torch, to ape with his torch, his brazen wheels and the trampling of his horses, the lightning and inimitable thunder of Jupiter. The poet Dante, an Italian and a good Catholic, sees in his vision more than one of the Popes who had lived before him, in the same location in the eternal world.

It was a maxim of the times in which the Papacy originated, that "the importance of a bishop depended on the political consequence of the city in which he lived." And on this ground, a precedence of rank, not of office, had been allowed to the bish-

ops of Rome. But near the close of the sixth century, when the seat of the imperial government had been removed to Constantinople, and that city was therefore become superior to Rome in civil dignity, John, the bishop of the rising see, and the new capital, thought himself entitled to assume, and did for a while assume, the title of "universal bishop." This was before Rome had so well understood her inheritance of the primacy of St. Peter, and while her ambition was fed with honours given upon another pretext, of course the assumption was peculiarly offensive to the humility of Gregory, bishop of Rome, who then rejoiced only in the sheep-skin title: "servant of the servants of God;" and in letters to his ambassador at court, to the Emperor Mauritius, and to John of Constantinople himself, he pronounced that the style which the bishop of Constantinople was assuming, was "blasphemous"—"infernal"—"diabolical"—and "whoever adopts or affects the title of universal bishop, has the pride and character of anti-Christ." This seems an interposition of the high providence of God, mightier than the powers of darkness, compelling this man to write a superscription for his successors; that, strangely enough, their character and doom, pronounced by one of the most noted of their vaunted apostolic line, might be visible to men, until the end of time. And it reminds us of the secret, overruling power, which seems to have constrained Pilate at the crucifixion, perhaps by an impulse mysterious to himself, to write in direct terms: This is the king of the Jews—instead of what he was desired to write: He saith, I am the king of the Jews—and to adhere to it immoveably when it was done, saying: What I have written, I have written; in both cases the hand of Omnipotence is visible, advertising man of truth, traced by those who meant it not so, and preparing the means to return the scoff, at some future day, to those who prepare it for himself.

That which stands for the church in the Romish system, is as much a caricature of the church of God, as the pope is of the Divine Head; probably more, if possible. The Redeemer declares to his disciples, that the kingdom which he would erect *in* this world, was not to be *of* this world; not to come "with observation," but to be situated "within them." He confesses to Pilate that He is a king; but says that the function of His royalty is "to bear witness unto the truth." The word of truth

is the sword of the Spirit; it is also the sceptre of the Son of God. His people were to be "one as his Father and himself are one;" their national costume, love, joy, peace, gentleness, meekness, temperance, faith. The person possessing the spirit of Christ would be one of his people; a member of his mystical body; a branch of the true vine; a living stone in the great temple, builded together, in the unity of the Spirit, and of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to be a habitation of God through the Spirit. And the visible church consists of those whom human judgment, applying these scriptural tests, and expressing itself in an organized and orderly manner, shall pronounce to be the children of God, together with their baptized offspring. But instead of the kingdom of truth, we have the states of the church, St. Peter's patrimony, as it is called, marked out on the map of Italy, with its capital city, and the whole circle of the appurtenances of civil government; instead of the "garments of salvation" clothing the human soul, fit for the holy eyes of its creator, we behold cardinals in scarlet, bishops in purple, priests and monks in cowls, surplices and ghostly gowns; for the "robes of pure innocency," we have those "of pure linen, with other deformed and fantastic dresses, in palls and mitres, gold and gewgaws fetched from Aaron's old wardrobe, or the flamin's vestry;" for the unity of the faith, there is presented to the deluded nations, a similarity, constrained by the mercenary bayonet, of dead forms, and wild wizard shows and processions on multitudes of so-called holy-days; for the unity of the knowledge of the Son of God, a unity of immoral maxims concerning implicit obedience, and blind submission, or at best a unity of reliance on uncomprehended salve reginas, ave marias and pater nosters; and in the place of a unity of spirit, we have a unity of pledge, and vow, and awful irrevocable oath to be Rome's liege and slave, soul and body, irrespective of the question of right or wrong, against all causes, whether that of the open bible, civil freedom or personal well-being, and against all men, saint or sinner, apostle or father, patriot or sage.

We presume indeed to think the day is coming, when this whole claim of Rome to be the universal church, (what else does *Catholic* mean?) which in ages past, has invested the thunder of the Vatican with such terror, will be clearly seen by men, as it probably is now, by angels, looking into the church of God, to

be a mere pun; not even artfully eonstrueted upon any niee analogy between the two meanings of the word. The catholieism of the bible is founded in the grace of Omnipotence whieh attends ordinations, saeraments, and means of graee, but whieh is as entirely different from them in its nature, as the rays of the sun are from the lens, whieh by their aid, beeomes a burning-glass, or as the vigour of the soldier's right arm is from the sword with whieh he performs his deeds of valour; the Catholieism of Rome (even the phrase implies as mueh a self-eontradietion as "the world of London," or the "universe of the United States,") is founded on the ordinations, saeraments and means of graee themselves. Aeeording to her, the lens has power ex opere operato to be a burning-glass, and the sword, like Maebeth's air-drawn dagger, has power to go about and slay, without the hand and muscles of a bearer. The one is a religion, where a religion well may be, in the lovely attitudes of the soul; the other is a religion, where it is simply fareieal, when understood, to say that any sueh thing as religion can be, in the regimen, the vestments, and the attitudes of the body. The two things resemble one another about as mueh as the metes and boundaries treated on in Cieero's book, De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum resemble the forty-ninth parallel of latitude, dividing the territories of the United States from those of British Ameriea, on our Oregon border, or the line run by Mr. Featherstonaugh on our North-eastern.

But the gates of hell were not to prevail against the *visible* chureh; they have not prevailed against Rome; therefore Rome is the visible ehurch. It is no eompliment to the reader whose eye will at onee detect the sophistry here, to dwell at any length on this famous syllogism. Would not the reasoning be equally sound? to say: the gates of hell were not to prevail against the visible ehureh; they have not prevailed against the pyramids of Egypt, the sphynx, or the hieroglyphics; therefore the pyramids of Egypt, the sphynx, or the hieroglyphies, is the visible ehureh. Or thus: the gates of hell were not to prevail against the visible chureh; they have not prevailed against the throne of the Almighty in heaven; therefore the throne of the Almighty in heaven is the visible ehureh?—or thus: the gates of hell were not to prevail against the visible ehureh; they have not prevailed against the invisible ehurch; therefore the invisi-

ble church is the visible church? The following passage from Chillingworth's answer to the fifth chapter of his Romish antagonist, will probably be read with pleasure in this connection, as entirely satisfactory and conclusive on this point; for indeed it is at least sufficiently liberal admitting Rome to be *a* visible church, and reasoning on that ground:

"Whereas you say, that protestants must either grant that your church then was the visible church, or name some other disagreeing from yours, and agreeing with protestants in their particular doctrine, or acknowledge there was no visible church; it is all one as if (to use St. Paul's similitude) the head should say to the foot, either you must grant that I am the whole body, or name some other member that is so, or confess that there is no body. To which the foot may answer, I acknowledge there is a body; and yet that no member beside you is the body, nor yet that you are it, but only a part of it. And in like manner say we, we acknowledge a church there was, corrupted indeed universally; but yet such a one as we hope, by God's gracious acceptance, was still a church. We pretend not to name any one society that was this church; and yet we see no reason that can enforce us to confess that yours was the church; but only a part of it, and that one of the worst then (at the Reformation) extant in the world. In vain, therefore, have you troubled yourself in proving that we cannot pretend that either the Greeks, Waldenses, Wickliffites, Hussites, Muscovites, Armenians, Georgians, Abyssines were then the visible church. For all this discourse proceeds upon a false and vain supposition, and begs another point in question between us, which is, that some church of one denomination and one communion (as the Roman, the Greek, &c.) must be always, exclusively to all others, the whole visible church. And though perhaps some weak protestant having the false principle settled in him, that there was to be always some visible church of one denomination, pure from all error in doctrine, might be wrought upon and prevailed with by it, to forsake the church of protestants; yet why it should induce him to go to yours, rather than the Greek church, or any pretenders to perpetual succession as well as yours, that I do not understand; unless it be for the reason which Æneas Sylvius gave, why more held the pope above a council, than a council above the pope; which was because popes did give bish-

opricks and archbishopricks, but councils gave none; and therefore suing *in forma pauperis* were not like to have their cause very well maintained. For put the case, I should grant of mere favour, that there must be always some church of one denomination or communion free from all errors in doctrine, and that protestants had not always had such a church; it would follow, indeed from hence that I must not be a protestant; but that I must be a papist, certainly it would follow by no better consequence than this—if you will leave England, you must of necessity go to Rome." *Chil.* p. 355.

Rome plead in proof of her catholicity, in other days, more than she now does. The maxim that that is truth "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum"—which has been believed always, everywhere, and by all—a maxim from which sound argument might be drawn in favour of principles propagated by Galilean fishermen, without the aid of the civil arm and even against its influence. But those are just the circumstances under which it has never had any application to her. A man's reasoning powers would be no object of temptation to the covetousness of his neighbour, who could not see the futility of such a plea in behalf of principles propagated by the influence of the crown, the sword, or the statute-book. The church in such cases, is just what king, queen, emperor, exarch, chieftain, or parliament may have chosen to make it; and not what the judgment of Christian consciences guided by the lively oracles of God, would make it; so that whatever other institution may plead a "jus divinum," such a one never can; for it is not established by God, guiding men into truth by his word and Spirit, but by might and by power, always under foreign influence, from supposed exigencies of the times, or from civil policy, or the irresponsible will of the earthly potentate. And yet the fantastic notion of saying *the* church, concerning some one denomination, which, in the best judgment of charity, can only be *a* church, and that too here, where sword and statute-book are not placed in the scale in such matters, with the vain hope that some ray of meaning in such an expression, drawn from legal establishments in other countries, may dawn on feeble minds, by means of some apparent analogy, where a clearer judgment would see that there is obviously none, is a notion, comical as it may be, much in favour, not only with the American children of Rome,

but with the interesting daughter of Lambeth and of Oxford, that is among us. In fact this maxim of Rome could be true only when it was useless as an auxiliary in argument; for when it is true of any system of principles, then manifestly, there is no opposer of them remaining, with whom to argue; the system is of course every where prevalent. Under the only circumstances in which it can be of any service: when there are opponents or unbelievers, then by the very terms of the statement, it is false; and its falsehood as applied to Romanism in every age, is proclaimed by the most notorious features of her history; by not one but thousands of struggling and martyred opponents; by Donatists, Arians, Paulicians, Albigenses, Lollards, Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, at whom she has ever arbitrarily hurled the charge of heresy, and with whom she has had a perpetual struggle for existence; by Vigilantius, Berenger, Wickliff, Huss, Zuingle, Luther, Calvin, Knox, and Cranmer; by the fierce anathemas with which even her addresses to Almighty God are bespotted; by her crusades, her inquisitions, and her auto-da-fes; by almost every peculiar characteristic of her progress from its beginning until now. Owing her pre-eminence over Jerusalem, the metropolitan church of the apostles, where an apostolic synod was held; over Antioch, where the Christian name originated; over Alexandria, and over Constantinople, to the wane and sad decay of the nations of which those cities where capitals; to the civil grandeur which the throne of the heathen Cæsars had imparted to the ancient and renowned city of Rome; to the famous boon of Constantine to Sylvester—if indeed that itself is not a forgery;—to the consequences of a quarrel between the tyrant Phocas and the bishop of his civil metropolis; to the wheedling of Charlemagne by means of the pretended deed and example of Constantine; to the inordinate and unscrupulous ambition of Hildebrand; (*Dowling*, pp. 44, 174, 184, 246) to the intrigues of courts; the eloquence of gold; the prowess of armies; the favours of emperors; to every circumstance which may define a progress to power by carnal instruments and means; to none which ordinarily characterize the progress of mighty truth in the hearts of men; she was still rarely acknowledged any thing like universally even in Europe, except when the cells of her inquisitions were crowded with martyrs to conscience, or when her armies had produced solitude in some smouldering

province, and called it peace; and she still continues to bribe, to anathematize, to send and receive temporal ambassadors; to bear about the metal keys of St. Peter; to wear a crown; to muster an army of soldiers, and to call herself the Catholic church of Christ!

Another point, nearly akin to the foregoing, in regard to which the same plan of caricature has been as signally put in execution, is the papist expedient concerning the Rule of Faith. It is a short task to find in the Bible the right guaranteed to every individual, to go to the Law and to the Testimony, for himself concerning himself, in all matters of faith and conscience. The duty of searching the scriptures is expressly enjoined; a congregation of people are unequivocally praised for the daily exercise of private judgment, in comparing even apostolic preaching with the Bible; there is a case mentioned where the person must (comparatively) hate father and mother, husband or wife, brothers and sisters, to obey the word of God, speaking in his own conscience; and the whole evangelical system, with its individual responsibility, its direct intercourse between individual souls and God, and its distribution of personal rewards and punishments, has the right and the duty of private judgment, for its foundation, a foundation most honourable to God, because it recognizes His word as an intelligible book, adapted to illuminate the human mind, not as a bundle of enigmas, a wizard's lamp, whose various and many coloured rays are more confounding than darkness itself. But according to Rome, the inspired writers are obscure philosophers, whose words and thoughts cannot safely be entrusted to man, lest, as says the immaculate Council of Trent, "his temerity should cause more evil than good to arise from it;" for not Matthew, nor Paul, nor Luke, nor John, nor even Prince Peter himself, inspired by the Spirit of God, has been able to bring his words down to men's business and their bosoms with sufficient clearness, nor "to paint out and describe with a solid and treatable smoothness," the doctrines which God addresses to human souls, without the infallible decrees of Popes and Councils, the authoritative judgments of Bellarmine and Baronius, and the luminous sentences of the Fathers, in his aid. She claims that the living oracles speak in her favour; but their voice is dangerous, without her infallible interpretation upon it; she must be the oracle of oracles, interpreter of the Interpreter's house, revealer

of Revelation, corrector of the proof-sheets of the Divine Spirit. or else, (more cowardly than Philip of Macedon himself, who bribed the oracle to Philippize, but placed no perpetual guard around the pythoness) she will neither hear, nor allow to be heard the testimony of those oracles; if it can be prevented, not only by her claims of infallible interpretation but by declaring a loose, inferior translation of the Bible to be authoritative; by inserting into the sacred canon, books containing weak and silly things, and making no pretensions to inspiration; by mangling the sacred text itself; by appending to it notes and comments obviously incongruous with its meaning, and sometimes even flatly contradictory to it; and actually in one of her decrees, (that which forbids wine to laymen at communion,) where the knot cannot be untied by legerdemain, but must of necessity be cut, she declares that she so decrees, notwithstanding (non obstante) the different teachings of scripture. And still, after all this moving of heaven and earth to drown the testimony of the scriptures against herself, and to make them Romanize if possible, her victims may not enjoy, unlicensed by authority, even the ruined image of, the word of God which she abides by. This is Rome's substitute for that mental freedom, which is one of the best gifts of the Spirit of the Lord; and for that personal responsibility to Himself, under which the revealed will of the Creator lays his creature, man. And yet she cannot make a solitary aggressive movement, even so far as to proselyte and pervert one poor, sliding Puseyite, without fairly abandoning her principles, and appealing to his private judgment, between herself and her sister of Lambeth and Oxford, concerning the true bearing of those dim medieval rays of evidence in which they both profess to bask. Her logic is not locomotive at all. It is a wheel upon a fixed axle, ever returning upon itself. She can argue with no one out of her own pale, without becoming involved in self-contradiction; with her weapons, no warfare can safely be waged, except upon men already dead; her first principles beg every important point; her reasonings must meet with previous unquestioning faith, before they become at all conclusive. When Dr. Wiseman and Dr. Brownson spread their nets, they must either appeal to the individual judgment of the unhappy persons whom they find floundering in patristic darkness, or else they must find themselves in the less eligible and comfortable predica-

ment (but for the oblivion of the means which success produces,) of asking them to believe that Rome is the true church, because Rome says she is the true church; and when the scriptures are alluded to, preferring the still farther, and equally reasonable request, that Rome be permitted infallibly to interpret the scriptures, so as not to interfere with her claims. The jugglery is perfect, when Cardinal Bellarmine tells the world that if the Pope should enjoin vice and prohibit virtue "we ought to believe vices to be good and virtues evil." The prince of the powers of the air caricatured the voice of God with the mutterings and ravings of Delphi and Dodona, in earlier times; can we avoid the perception of his handiwork in this caricature of the later times?

Many other points in her system appear to have been managed on the same plan; the development of which would require more space than is left for the present article. As she caricatures the truth, so also does she its application to the human heart; and in the Romish baptizer, as he stands at the font, with his exorcisms and signs of the cross administering, as the only regeneration which his communion knows, one of those sacraments of the new law, as she calls them, which he is accursed who does not admit "to contain and confer the grace which they signify," we behold what we can hardly view otherwise than as a mimic and ape of the Spirit of God, pretending to exhibit in visible and tangible form, that awful mystery of regeneration, which the Saviour declared, man could no more intelligibly explain, than he could open the mysteries of the invisible winds.

The whole scheme is not only preposterous, but there is about it something uncouth and satyr-like, reminding us of the lurid scene in the witch's laboratory in the Faust, where a magic mirror is set before the eyes of the mortal, for purposes of delusion, and a draught of liquid flame given him, that

> "With this drink, what'er she be
> He may in her a Helen see."

And there is in it a coherency of plan from age to age, a consistency and unity of purpose, extending over scores of the life-times of men which are of too great grasp and size, to be attributed merely to human ingenuity. In addition to the well known passages, in the Thessalonians, concerning the "man of sin," and in the Apocalypse, concerning the doomed city on seven hills, there is also a remarkable passage of scripture in the Second Co-

rinthians, in which the Spirit of God, speaking by St. Paul, saw and spoke of a systematic caricature of the church of Christ, then commencing, by false apostles and deceitful workers, transforming themselves, in appearance, into ministers of righteousness and apostles of Christ; and declared it not to be a wonderful thing since Satan himself, the leader of the party, and the head of the mimic church, had succeeded in accomplishing the more difficult transformation of himself into the form of an angel of light—the practicability of the inferior and less difficult work being proven by the actual accomplishment of the superior and more difficult. By the same reasoning there is no ground for incredulity as to the issue of a complete series of coinage from the same mint—a perfect anti-church—a complete ecclesiastical organization, with any necessary multiplicity of ranks and orders of ministry, with a ritual more imposing and more burdensome than the Jewish; a superstition grosser and more impenetrable than the heathen, yet having the name of Christ and the language of religion ever in its mouth. And for the deliverance of the vitals of the world, from this worse than the vulture of the Promethean fable, in unceasing, unresting warfare with every weapon of truth, we have prayerfully to look to the "wise and holy bounding and governing" of that providence of God, which is of a power above that of the evil Prince who wrought this system, and to the going forth of the residue of the Spirit from him, to turn the hearts of the deluded nations to the Lord Jesus.

Art. IV.—*Reading of History.*

Every one must be sensible that far less interest, as a general thing, is taken in history, than its importance demands; and that much less advantage is commonly derived from the perusal of historical works, than might reasonably be expected. Both these facts are no doubt in a measure to be attributed, to the entire want of any definite object in the mind of the reader. He reads history as he would a story, for the mere narrative. We wish to urge the importance of every student reading with his eyes open, and his mind awake, examining the causes, rela-

tions, and consequences of the events which the historian details.

It must be admitted, that it is often difficult to discover the causes of the facts of history; because when men are under the influence of corrupt passions, there is a great temptation to conceal their real purposes. The plans of statesmen are often shrouded in mystery. Men shrink back from the open acknowledgment of motives which are considered dishonourable, or which would be disapproved by the wise and virtuous. In all such cases there is a presumption, that there will be a studious concealment of the ultimate end; and unhappily many such examples are found in history. This temptation to cover evil with the guise of goodness and to deck crimes with names of virtue, increases the difficulty of which we have spoken. But still some progress may be made towards a just and rational conclusion, and we may at least approximate the truth. We are not at liberty however, to assume that certain motives exist without proof. We are no more at liberty to slander the dead than the living; and evil motives which are charged on an individual, when there is no evidence to prove their existence, constitute the essence of slander. We are under no obligations to believe, or to assert what we cannot prove, and if the evidence to establish a given fact does not exist, we may safely excuse ourselves from forming any opinion about it.

In all successful enterprises, men of course accomplish their purposes. Here then, it would seem, we have a clue to the motives of men. If the end is good the design must also be good. But even here we are embarrassed with difficulty. A good action may proceed from a bad motive, and *vice versa*. The man who establishes civil liberty among his countrymen, may do so from mercenary and selfish motives. Besides due allowance must be made for human plans thwarted, and human hopes disappointed. Men may be the unwilling instruments of doing good, because restrained and governed by influences which they cannot resist. There is a power which often says to the wicked man, Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther. In all cases however, there is a presumption that a good deed proceeds from a pure principle; and an evil deed from an unholy principle. Corrupt passions, like Christian graces, are gregarious. They are not often found alone. The existence of one therefore, may lead us to expect to find others also. Indeed the uncontrolled dominion of one sometimes proves the existence of

another. Envy cannot exist without ambition; for pain at the good of another implies a desire to possess that good ourselves. He who slanders his rival, may safely be regarded as having an inordinate thirst for fame: for he detracts from a rival's influence because it either does, or is supposed to detract from his own. Suspicions and jealousies generally spring from too ardent a desire for popular favour, and too much sensibility to our own reputation; for it is of the nature of disappointed ambition to charge on others the cause of its disappointment. Power acquired may be used for a benevolent or a selfish end; and we may safely draw the conclusion that power and influence, which are used for selfish ends, were acquired that they might be thus used. The poor may be oppressed, and the claims of justice may be disregarded, and human rights wantonly set aside; and he who does it, need not complain, if he be charged with a want of benevolence, of compassion, and of a sense of justice. There are certain results, which men are generally agreed, cannot be brought about by any but unholy passions. We may select as examples which will illustrate this truth, Hildebrand and Leo I., two men to whom the papacy is as much indebted as to any others, for the vast accumulation of power in the head of the Roman Catholic Church. They assumed authority unheard of before their day: they pretended to superiority over men who were their equals in many things, and their superiors in whatever ought to adorn the character of a minister of the meek and lowly Jesus. They discovered such a tenacity of newly gotten power, so much irritability and impatience of all opposition, and even reasonable remonstrance, and withal a disposition so intolerant, and tyrannical, that it is difficult to conceive by what other influence they could have been governed than a selfish ambition. There is also an external exhibition of temper, which proves the existence of the interior passion. Anger can be seen as well as painted; indeed it can be painted because it is seen. The same remark will apply to some other passions. Contemporaries, therefore, have the best opportunities of judging of the characters of men; and when they possess the means of knowing the secret purposes of the men whose actions they describe, and are men of candour, and sound judgment, their testimony is entitled to great weight. These are some of the principles by which we can ascertain the springs of human action. In our

humble judgment, Hume has violated them, in the estimate which he has formed of the character of Cromwell and the Puritans. They are charged with ambition, hypocrisy, and fanaticism; and yet the evidence, as far as it goes, establishes exactly the opposite conclusions. They gave such evidences of sincerity as are generally considered satisfactory, in other cases, and as that holy martyr Charles the first never gave. If a just and clear sense of what true liberty is, and a consistent, self-sacrificing, and persevering pursuit of it is ambition, then were they ambitious. It is doubtful whether in Hume's judgment fanaticism and genuine piety would not have meant the same thing.

A history may be so written, as simply to detail in an entertaining manner what, in the writer's opinion, are the facts in a given case; or it may be so written as to exhibit the evidence on which the facts of history are based; the designs of the actors in the drama of human life; and the relations of the events recorded. The former may be termed popular, the latter philosophical history. Of the former Dowling's history of Romanism may be given as an example; of the latter Ranke's history of the popes. A history written in a philosophical spirit, in which the reader is led step by step from premises to a conclusion, meets the wants of the scholar, and the controvertist.

They do not enjoy all the advantages of history, who can remember facts and dates in the order in which they occurred. That would be a mere effort of memory, which may excite surprise and admiration, and in some cases tempt to an empty pedantry. But if this is all, it must be admitted that little practical wisdom is derived from the knowledge thus laboriously hoarded up. On the contrary, history becomes useful chiefly when its facts are considered in their relations. This relation may be either as cause and effect; or effects may be regarded as produced by the same or similar causes, though taking place at different periods of time, and in different regions of the earth. For example, the crusades and the French revolution are historical facts which can be, in some respects, compared together. These two wonderful and striking events resemble each other, because they were both the result of an excitement, which for depth, and extent, and results, has scarcely a parallel in the history of the race. They were vast associated outbreaks of malignant fanaticism. In the one case, crimes were perpetrated

in the name of religion; in the other, in the name of liberty. The crusades were the offspring of a superstition, which made it a Christian duty to rescue the holy land from the profane touch of the infidel; the French revolution had its origin in visionary views as to the capabilities of man, which had their root in infidelity and atheism. The course of the crusades was marked with crime and atrocity, from the Danube to the massacre of the ten thousand in the mosque of Omar, at the capture of Jerusalem, but the foundation of their cruelty was in the *Deus vult*, so often upon their lips. God's enemies were theirs; and they had a commission from an infallible source to punish them. On the other hand, such were the unheard of atrocities of the French revolution, that it seemed as if the state were attempting to perpetrate a *felo de se* on a vast scale, and as if in France, liberty meant license to do wrong; and all this was done in an age and nation professing the highest civilization, and the greatest intellectual advancement. We have made these remarks, to show that these two events may be compared in some of their aspects, but not in others. The truth is, it is very unsafe to reason by induction from a few isolated facts. General conclusions ought not to be hastily drawn. No habit ought to be more carefully guarded against, by the student of history, than this. The tendency to generalize, to deduce general principles, and even universal propositions from particular facts, is very strong in many minds. Great soberness of judgment, and patience in investigation, and discrimination are therefore necessary to prevent such persons from making the exception, the rule, and from imagining relations where none exist. We may safely infer from the French revolution, and from other portions of history, that atheism, can give no security to public virtue; and that it creates a recklessness of human life. This is not only proved in the manner just stated, but it appears from the nature of atheism itself. It has no rewards to offer to the good, nor punishments to inflict upon the wicked in another life. It cannot decide with certainty, what is either public or private virtue. This conclusion has been logically drawn out, by the late Robert Hall, in his sermon on Modern Infidelity, which is one of the most eloquent and masterly discourses of modern times. The same remarks will to some extent apply also to infidelity. But whether it would be safe to infer from the simple historical fact, without any analysis of

atheism, that such would be the case, is a question which we are not called upon to consider, as we are willing to draw light from any quarter, to illumine a dark subject.

Some maintain a kind of gradual developement of truth in the course of history. We are no believers in this theory. Its abettors speak of toleration for example as a problem, worked out for the benefit of the race, by the Puritans of Old and New England; especially those of them who where independents; at least this is true of some of them. So far is this from being true, that minorities every where naturally claim toleration, though they have been sometimes known to persecute, when they became the majority. But we think Paul teaches the true principle of toleration, as plainly as it can be taught, when he says, "If I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die." In this passage he teaches, that it ought not to be a civil offence to preach the gospel, though it was rejected by a majority of the Jewish nation, and of the Roman empire. To the same effect are all those passages in which he glories in persecution, and charges it as a crime upon civil rulers to persecute. Peter, whose pretended successors have copied his example as little in this, as in other respects, teaches the same doctrine, when he enjoins it on Christians not to suffer as evil doers, or murderers, or thieves, or busybodies in other men's matters. If those, who profess to sit in Peter's chair, had carried out the principles contained in these simple directions, very little Christian blood would have been shed by the Roman Catholics. When the apostles, therefore, spoke of persecution as a crime; and yet admitted that the persecutor was sometimes conscientious; they certainly must be regarded, as holding the doctrine that no set of men have the right to make their conscience on religion a rule for others, or to punish those who differ from them, so long as they demean themselves as good citizens. Gamaliel was also an advocate of toleration.

It is well known that Christians had no opportunity of exhibiting a tolerant spirit before the days of Constantine the great. It is remarkable that one of the first acts of this first Christian emperor was to publish an edict, granting toleration to all forms of religion, including paganism, which had persecuted Christianity for three centuries. Eusebius has preserved a Greek translation of this edict. It is worthy of the perusal of all, who

in their superabounding vanity. ascribe everything good to a particular age or class of men. It assigns as a reason for toleration the fact, that the persons tolerated were conscientious in their belief. Jam dudum quidem, cum animadvertimus non esse cohibendam religionis libertatem, sed unius cujusque arbitrio ac voluntati permittendum, ut ex animi sui sententia rebus divinis operam daret, sanximus tum caeteri omnes tum christiani, sectae religionis suae fidem atque observantiam retinerent. Eusebii Hist. Lib. 10, C. 5. It is true Licinius united in the publication of this edict; but none who know his character will hesitate to ascribe it to the influence of Constantine. We shall not enter into the question, whether Constantine was at this time, or indeed ever was a true Christian; nor will we justify every expression found in this remarkable production, especially as it bears on its face evidence of being the joint production of two men, one of whom was a pagan. It was certainly a full and fair acknowledgment of the received doctrine on the subject of toleration; and in the mystery, which shrouds the Christian character of Constantine, we are willing to put the most charitable construction on it. In the middle of the sixteenth century, the victorious Protestants, in the treaty of Passan, granted free toleration to the Roman Catholics of Germany, which they have enjoyed to this day; while protestants, who live in the catholic portions of Germany, have been persecuted. We are free to confess, that we consider the Puritans a noble race of men; the world owes them a debt of gratitude for their manly and long continued struggle, and many sufferings in the cause of religious and civil liberty. But the extravagant praise in which some have indulged is an act of injustice to others, at least by imputation, and confers no real favour on those for whose benefit glorifying harangues are made.

But before we can exhibit this subject to the readers notice, in the point of view we desire, it is necessary that we should consider the union of church and state, which is closely connected with it. Persecution in a well regulated state, without the concurrence of the ruling powers, is impossible. The state persecutes, because it regards the church as entitled to protection, under the laws and constitution. The enemies of the church thus become those of the state. Whatever detracts from the influence, or lessens the prosperity of the church established by

law, injures the state of which, in a civil sense, it is regarded as a component part. Hence laws are made, restraining the rights of others, and inflicting penalties on them for the benefit of the church, which it is deemed the interest of the state to cherish and patronize. Hence we have intolerance.

The lessons which history teaches on this subject, are most instructive; and they have been delivered in tones of startling emphasis. We look back through the church's history, for fifteen centuries; and we find, during all that period, the church and state united. Whithersoever we turn our eyes, the same state of things is discovered. In Protestant and Catholic communities, and in the Greek church every where, this has been the favourite doctrine. Persons of every variety of creed, and form of government, have adopted it, from the high calvinist, down to the lowest of the rationalistic school; and from the high churchman to the lowest Erastean. It prevails alike in enlightened, and in unenlightened communities. Our own country presents the only exception, worthy of notice, in which this alliance has been deliberately repudiated. A quasi union of church and state existed for many years after our revolution, in New England: and even in Virginia, where so much had been endured from intolerance, a bill for a general assessment, for the support of religion, was, in 1784, passed to its third reading in the lower house; but was finally abandoned, on the remonstrance of the presbyterians and baptists. These remarks are made to show how deeply rooted in human nature, is that principle which leads to this unhallowed union. The causes which have produced this result may, therefore, be regarded as amongst the most powerful which operate on man. If, as is the general conviction in this country, such a connexion with the state would be one of the most deplorable calamities, which could befall our common Christianity; then it becomes American Christians to study this subject with the greatest diligence. What are the lessons which history teaches us in relation to this matter, and what is their value?

The first act of Constantine was to restore to the church all the confiscated property, of which it had been deprived during the previous persecutions. This was simply giving to the church corporate powers. His next step was to bestow money out of the royal treasury, for the support of the clergy. This

consummated the union between the church and the state, and made every clergyman a salaried dependant on the state. So far as the reasons of these acts of the emperor appear from his edicts, which are still in existence, they seem to have been a misjudged zeal for the good of the church. It is well known that Constantine and his successors often became the active partizans of a particular creed. They assembled councils, in whose deliberations they took deep interest. This fact renders it probable, that the same feeling led to the calamitous union of which we are now speaking; and that it tended to perpetuate it is certain. In their edicts also, fears are expressed lest the unity of the church should be destroyed. Indeed they seem to have been fascinated and charmed with the idea of an external unity of the church; and to bring it about, they used civil pains and penalties without scruple. This idea of unity has dazzled more minds than those of the emperors of the East and West. It has been one of the reasons for repressing inquiry, and encouraging ignorance. In the days of which we are speaking, except those incident to the election of an emperor, no internal agitations were more violent, than those which related to religion. They threatened the peace of the empire; and sometimes ended in bloodshed. The emperors considered it their duty by means of general councils, and civil coercion, to repress these dangerous commotions; and not to trust to the church alone a task so difficult and delicate. Accordingly, when the council decided what was heresy, the civil authority punished the heretics. If such an unity as they contemplated could have been procured, it would have implied an end to all religious disputes; and it might have been worldly wisdom to seek it. This consideration, therefore, would draw the cords which bound together church and state, closer and tighter, and of its influence there is the most abundant proof. We have no doubt that designing politicians have been earnest advocates of this union, because the church by its influence has assisted to accomplish the purposes of the state or of a party in it. Manly independence is hardly to be expected of those, who are fed from the public treasury. Religious teachers have always wielded a great influence in every Christian country; and as a consequence, the state has used the best means in her power to direct that influence into such a channel, as she believed would best subserve

her interests. Thus have we given what we believe to be the chief causes which led the state to seek and continue this union. We have not given all the evidence in our possession for the statement just made: because we have deemed it unnecessary.

We now proceed to give the reasons which induced the church to consent to a union, which, in our judgment, has been disastrous to her best interests. There is no principle of the human mind stronger, than that which leads men to desire a sure and certain income for life.* To be above the common vicissitudes of fortune, to enjoy affluence or competence, secure from the fear of want, is the goal which multitudes are striving to reach. It is this that produces, in part at least, the inordinate desire of wealth, so common in our country. Now that the state gives both a more ample and a more certain support to the clergy, than is ordinarily enjoyed on the voluntary principle, we think cannot be denied. Both of these remarks can be proved by the history of established churches. Hundreds have been found in every age, who have been content to profess to receive a creed, which they did not believe, and to preach a gospel, which they have denied and renounced, that they might enjoy the revenues of a parish. Ministers of the gospel have, in large numbers, subscribed, in the course of a short period, two opposite and contradictory creeds, that they might not lose place. Facts like these are found on almost every page of history. That nothing like this state of things is found in any other circumstances, than those just referred to, we are far from affirming; but that these evils exist in a more aggravated form in religious establishments, we are ready to affirm, and to prove. Now we maintain, that this is an unnatural state of things. Some powerful principles must be at work in men's minds, before they can consent to become deliberate hypocrites for life. Such persons must know that their course is as dishonourable as it is sinful; and we must, therefore, seek for the governing principle in this case, in the charms of a wealthy church establishment to a worldly man. We do not affirm, that all these evils are to be found in every religious establishment. So far from this we are ready to admit

* Of course we shall not be understood as intimating that there is not a far deeper and nobler principle than this, at work in the minds of many who advocate this connexion. Their convictions arise from a high, but as we conceive erroneous, idea of the state, and consequently of its prerogatives and duties.

that a tithe of the evils in question does not appear in some cases. Where there is a parity among the clergy, and non-residence, and pluralities are not allowed, the same evils do not exist, which are found, when grades are multiplied, from the poor curate, to the princely archbishop; each requiring additional revenue to support his dignity. But to return: in proof of the fact that there are in human nature certain principles which tend to the union of church and state, we may mention, that to bask in the sunshine of court favour, is grateful to aspiring and ambitious men. There must be some powerful principle at work in the human breast, to induce the church and its ministers to endure the wrongs done by the state to both. How often have the rights of conscience been disregarded; and conscientious men made the reluctant instruments of executing the tyrannical and unrighteous laws of the state. If as already intimated persecution results, in part at least, from an attempt by the state to patronize and protect a particular form of religion; then this view of the matter opens a chapter of wrongs, not soon read, and not easily equalled; yet those who compose the church favoured by the public authorities, are expected to justify, and in point of fact, have generally justified the enormities thus committed. Even when the Free Church of Scotland separated from the establishment, it was with a decided protest against the voluntary principle. In the early history of the church the same ministers, when assembled in councils, have been known within a short period of time, to subscribe opposite and contradictory creeds; and to shout vociferously, first for the creed of Arius, then for that of Athanasius; first for Eutyches, who confounded the natures of Christ, and then for Nestorius, who divided them. Those therefore who regard the union of church and state as an evil, ought to watch with sleepless vigilance on this subject, lest that which seems now to be so improbable, should take place. We have made these remarks to show that deductions may be made from the facts of history which are not found in the books ordinarily studied. If nothing else is gained, a more vivid impression is made on the mind, and a conviction, previously entertained, is confirmed, by these deductions.

The general principle, to which we adverted in the beginning of these remarks, may be further illustrated, by a comparison

of Mohammedanism and Popery. We shall not discuss the question, as to the rise of the papacy. We shall assume, that it was contemporaneous or nearly so with the appearance of the false prophet in the east. We do not mean to say, that it burst upon the world as suddenly, as did the Arabian impostor; but simply that it was consummated about the same time. Yet it is not essential to our argument that we should maintain this. It is simply a coincidence somewhat striking, as the one pervaded the east, and the other the west. It is true, that Islamism is a total apostacy from Christianity, though it borrows some of its precepts and doctrines from the bible: but popery cannot be so regarded. Still these two systems may be compared together. They both owe their rise to a fallen and corrupt Christianity; the larger portion of the converts to Mohammedanism were of course nominal Christians. These two systems agree in this, that they both appeal to the senses and imagination; and are both idolatrous; and of course the services which they require are to a great extent external.

There is in the temple at Mecca, a holy stone, which the Mussulman devoutly kisses. If the Roman Catholic has holy water, the orthodox follower of Mohammed can show his well of holy water near the same temple, which he believes has an equal efficacy in healing the diseases of body and soul. The tapestry, which covers the walls of this temple, is annually divided into small pieces, and sold to pilgrims, who doubtless value them as highly, as the good catholic does the bones of a martyr, or a piece of the true cross. If pilgrimages to see the holy coat of Treves, and to other places, are considered meritorious; the Koran considers pilgrimages to Mecca no less so. If the catholic prays with his face to the altar, the followers of the false prophet pray with theirs turned towards Mecca. If a senseless and formal repetition of the same prayer, is thought by the votary of Rome to have merit; prayers many times repeated possess no less merit in the estimation of a Mussulman. If penance for sin is enjoined at Roman Catholic confessionals: every pilgrim to Mecca, on his approach to the city, does a penance, which deprives many of their lives. If the Romanist has his lent during which he professes to fast, the religion of Islam requires the fast, Ramadan, to be kept during a whole month. If a cross surmounts a Christian church, a crescent is seen on the domes

and minarets of Mohammedan mosques. Both systems have been intolerant and persecuting; both have adopted the most rigorous measures to check all adverse influences from without; and both have swayed an immense influence over an ignorant and bigoted population. The inference from all this would seem to be fair, that these two systems appeal to some common principle of our nature; and that they are adapted to human nature as it is. Of course this principle is modified by the different circumstances and influences which exist in the two cases. What this is we may not be able fully to develope. The two systems have this in common, that they appeal to the imagination and senses. What men see, and hear, and feel, makes a strong and palpable impression on them; and the senses furnish the material which the imagination works up into various forms. The imagination and the senses are therefore, closely connected; and anything which appeals to these two principles is sure to make a deep impression on the masses of men. Children have always discovered a passion for pictures; and in the dark ages, an attempt was made to teach scripture truth to those who could not read by means of pictures; and the book thus made was called the poor man's bible. But when men are taught a religion, which requires an exercise of the affections and of the understanding, it is a very different affair. The attention, the judgment, the conscience, the heart must all be exercised; and this is very different from the system which purifies by plunging in water; or pardons by eating a piece of bread; or whose devotions are acceptably performed by a heartless and formal repetition of prayers, with the proper genuflexions, and signs of the cross. The tactual succession of the Christian graces, for it amounts to this, certainly places the attainment of them within the reach of all, and upon the easiest terms possible. If seeing and hearing, tasting and touching, certainly procure blessings, and have in them an inherent efficacy as an *opus operatum;* then surely religion is an easy thing. We do not affirm, that it is in fact a part of the creed of the classes of persons, on whom we are remarking, to exclude altogether internal and spiritual emotion. We are merely speaking of that which is, in multitudes of cases, the practical result, and to which there is, in frail human nature, a very strong tendency.

Art. V.—*A History of Virginia, from its Discovery and Settlement by Europeans, to the present time.* By Robert R. Howison. Vol. I. Containing the History of the Colony to the Peace of Paris in 1763. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart. 1846. 8vo. pp. 496.

This is not a work of unmingled excellence, but it is one which bears the marks of accuracy, judgment, fairness, and scholarship. As we must be indebted almost solely to the book for our knowledge of the author, we shall enjoy the advantage of writing without prepossession.

It is wonderful that such a field should have been left so much untrodden. The old histories (always excepting Smith's own narrative) have never emerged into literary notice: they are naked annals. The carelessness of Beverly, the servility of Keith, and the fustian of Burk, might well exclude them from the first class. Stith's history, though dull and prolix, is valuable for the facts. If Campbell had aroused himself to the exercise of his latent powers, he would have produced the best work on this subject, which has ever been written. As it is, his popular little volume, which we have not seen for many years, merits far more notice than it has ever received. We rejoice to learn, that his son is working in the same mine: we know his diligence and his cultivation, and anticipate no ordinary pleasure and profit from his researches. All that we shall attempt, in regard to the work before us, is to offer a few desultory notes, on such points as strike us in the perusal.

Mr. Howison proposes to treat the history of Virginia in two volumes, of which the first is here presented. A more inviting subject could scarcely be asked; for the early annals of Virginia are all romance; and the narratives of the first voyagers and settlers are coloured with poetical fancies, which we do not find in the accounts of any northern plantations. The great part which was taken by Virginia in the Revolution gives its history a further value, on which we need not dwell; especially as it does not fall within the scope of the volume before us.

The author very judiciously begins with Columbus and the early discoveries; but he soon arrives at Raleigh, concerning whom he writes with justifiable warmth. He corrects the pre-

valent error which represents this great man as having himself visited America, and refers it to a source which is singular. Heriot's description of the new country is given in English by Hakluyt, and in Latin by De Bry. In the latter, the passage, "the actions of those who have been by Sir Walter Raleigh *therein employed*," is thus given in the Latin: "qui generosum D. Walterum Ralegh *in eam regionem comitati sunt*;" which conveys an incorrect statement. The mind of an American reverts so willingly to the first approach to these shores, that we insert a passage, which may also serve as a specimen of the author's more laboured style.

"The isle upon which they entered, was the southernmost of the two which form the mouth now known as Ocracock Inlet. In the winter season, the whole eastern line of these islands is to be approached with extreme caution, even by the most skilful navigators. Terrific storms rage around their borders, and the projecting headland of Hatteras stands out like a fearful demon, to inspire dread in the bosoms of weather-beaten voyagers. (July.) But the adventurers now approach them at a season when the sea is calm, and when the verdure of these circling islands would offer to the eye and the mind hopes of tranquillity and of plenty. They were in a special manner struck with the appearance of the country. The beach was sandy, and extended far into the land, but a dense cover of small trees and clambering vines shaded the interior, and furnished many pleasing retreats from the rays of the summer sun. The quantity of grapes was so enormous, that every shrub was filled with them: the rising ground and the valley were alike laden with their abundance. Even the waves of the ocean, as they rolled in upon the sandy beach, bore back immense numbers of this teeming fruit, and scattered them in profusion along the coasts of the contiguous islands.

"Many of the trees were odorous, and imparted to the air that healthful freshness peculiar to the fragrance of nature. The cedar, the sassafras, the cypress, the pine, were all abundant; and in the woods were found the hare and the deer, almost tame from the absence of civilized destroyers. The fabled island of Calypso could scarcely have exceeded the charms of this spot as it appeared to the adventurers, and the genius of Fenelon might, without injustice, have given to the goddess a residence in summer upon the coasts of North Carolina.

"No human being was seen by the voyagers until the third day, when a canoe, carrying three men, came by the shore. One of them landed, and, though probably filled with surprise, he evinced neither distrust nor fear. He received with apparent gratitude the gifts of his new friends, and, on leaving them, hastened with his companions to a favourable spot, whence they soon returned with the canoe laden with fish. Dividing these into two parts, he intimated, by intelligible signs, that he intended one portion for each vessel.

"This savage hospitality was followed up on the succeeding day. Several canoes arrived, bringing many of the natives, and, among them, Granganameo, the brother of Wingina, the king. The Indian monarch himself was kept from his guests by a severe wound, received not long before in a conflict with a neighbouring tribe. His brother lavished upon the voyagers all the simple kindness that

his heart could suggest. He left his boats at a distance, and, approaching with his people, invited an interview. Spreading a mat upon the ground, he seated himself, and made signs to the English that he was "one with them."

"A friendly interchange of courtesies took place. The child of nature seemed strangely pleased with a pewter dish, which he hung round his neck, and with a copper kettle, for which he gave fifty skins, "worth fiftie crowns." He brought his wife and children to his new friends; they were small in stature, but handsome, and graced with native modesty. When the trafficking was in progress, none of the savages ventured to advance until Granganameo and the other great men were satisfied. They were his servants, and were governed, while in presence of their monarch, by a rule more absolute than that exercised by the kings of civilized climes, though his dominion virtually ceased when they passed beyond his sight.

"The gentle manners of these people induced Captain Barlow, and seven others, to comply with their request, and visit Granganameo on the Isle of Roanoke. They sailed up the river Occam (now known as Pamlico Sound) about twenty miles, and arrived in the evening at the north end of the isle, where they found nine houses, built of cedar, for the families around the chief. Granganameo was absent, but he was well represented; and in the very opening of their enterprise the settlers of Virginia were to receive from the gentle nature of woman a support which afterwards preserved them from destruction. The wife of the chief ran, brought them into her dwelling, caused their clothes to be dried, and their feet to be bathed in warm water; and provided all that her humble store could afford of venison, fish, fruits, and hominy for their comfort.

"When her people came around with their bows and arrows—the usual implements for hunting,—the English, in unworthy distrust, seized their arms, but this noble Indian woman drove her followers from the lodge, and obliged them to break their arrows, in proof of their harmless designs. Though her whole conduct gave evidence of open-hearted and determined good faith, yet the adventurers thought it most discreet to pass the night in their boat, which was launched and laid at anchor for this purpose. The wife of the Indian chief was grieved by their conduct, yet she relaxed not her efforts for their comfort. Five mats were sent to cover them from the heavy dews of the season, and a guard of men and women remained during the whole night on the banks of the river. The learned and philanthropic Belknap might well propose the question, 'Could there be a more engaging specimen of hospitality?' Yet can we not blame the caution of the English, for on their safety depended the voyage; and they had not now first to learn that man in a state of nature is prone to violence and treachery.

"These Indians were represented by the voyagers on their return as gentle and confiding beings, full of innocent sweetness of disposition, living without labour, and enjoying a golden age in their western home; yet, by a singular inconsistency, the same narratives tell us of their feuds with other tribes, their fierce wars, (often urged to extermination), and of those perfidious traits which so uniformly enter into the character of the savage. It is not irrational to suppose that the enthusiasm engendered by the discovery of a clime so full of natural charms, affected the view of the adventurers as to every thing connected with this land; and suffering and cruelty, both in the settlers and in the natives, slowly dispelled the pleasing vision." p. 50—54.

As in our rapid notes, we have not the slightest intention to epitomize the history, we shall pass at once to Captain John

Smith, about whom we must be allowed to say a few words. We agree with Mr. Howison that Smith, above all others, is the hero of Anglo-American antiquity. He was as veritable a knight-errant as any in Ariosto, and seems to have had more escapes for his life than any soldier of his day. When his friends gave him ten shillings out of his own estate, "to be rid of him," they sent abroad a restless spirit which could not fail to make the world wonder, early or late. In France, in the Netherlands, in the East, wherever we find him, we seem to see one of the heroes of the old chronicles. What would have been the consternation, if he had let himself down among the godly settlers of Plymouth Bay. For a tithe of his vagaries they would probably have had him to the stocks. We sincerely wish that some competent writer would give us a *critical* edition of the life of Captain Smith. We are not ignorant of the republication of his original narrative, in 1819, under the auspices of the late Dr. Rice: it was a patriotic work, and one in which Virginians might have gained honour by sustaining him, as they did not. But we crave something more, and desire such application of research as may explain to us the topographical signification of those unpronounceable Turkish names with which his story is distended, and may give some hint as to the Turbashaws, the Bonny Mulgros, and the Mully Befferres, of whom such marvels are related. For our part, we give credence to the general story. It was an age of marvels. Smith was only two or three centuries too late. His rescues were not more hair-breadth than those of Murator Dr. Joseph Wolff, though he was often in single combat, once sold as a slave, and repeatedly at death's door. There is a middle age stalwart beauty in his portrait. That front and eye and nose could scarcely have been forged; and that beard shows better over plate-armour, than those which we meet every day beneath the faces of cits and haberdashers. We can forgive the punning poet, who appears also to have been the engraver, when in the style of the age he subjoins these verses to the copperplate.

> "These are the Lines that shew thy Face, but those
> That shew thy Grace and Glory brighter bee
> Thy Faire-Discoveries and Fowle-Overthrows
> Of Salvages, much civilized by thee,
> Best shew thy Spirit and to Glory wyn:
> So thou art Brasse without, but Golde within.

If so, in Brasse (too soft smith's Acts to beare)
I fix thy Fame, to make Brass steel outweare.

This is signed, "Thine as thou art Virtue's, John Davies" of Hereford. But we are wandering from our subject. In exhibiting Smith's life, Mr. Howison has done his part well: the narrative is clear and sufficient. The captivity and rescue of the hero very properly occupies some considerable space, and we give his account of the most romantic scene in American story, in his own words, omitting some sentences and all the notes.

"His self-possession was never lost for a moment. Discovering that Opecancanough was the chief, he presented to him a small magnetic dial, and made the simple savages wonder at the play of the needle beneath the glass surface. If they had previously regarded him as more than human, they were now confirmed in their belief; and when he proceeded to convey to them some idea of the spherical form of the earth, its motion on its axis and round the sun, and the existence of men standing opposite to them on this globe, their wonder knew no bounds. Yet the hope of crushing at once this powerful enemy seemed to prevail. They bound him to a tree, and prepared to pierce him through with arrows, when Opecancanough held up the dial, and every arm fell;—each spirit was subdued, either by fear of his power or admiration of his knowledge.

"The prisoner was then conducted in triumph to Orapaques, a hunting town on the north side of Chickahominy Marshes, much frequented by Powhatan and his court for the game which there abounded. In the march the Indians walked in single file, their chief in the centre, with the captured swords and muskets borne before him, and the captive held by three savages, and watched by others with their arrows upon the string. Women and children came forth to meet them, wild with joy at so strange an occurrence. On arriving, the whole band performed a dance of triumph around the captive, yelling and shrieking in the most approved mode, and decorated with every hideous ornament that heads, feet, and skins of animals could supply. After this performance, he was conducted to a long house, and guarded by thirty or forty vigorous warriors. Bread and venison in abundance were brought to him, for which he had little appetite. The savages never ate with him, but devoured what he left some hours after; and this, with other things, caused him to suspect a design to fatten him for their table."

"They now conceived that in the absence of the 'great captain,' they might attack Jamestown with success; and they held forth to Smith magnificent offers of as many Indian beauties as he might select, and as much dower in land as he would have, if he would aid in their schemes. But savage sovereignty had few temptations for the champion of Christendom. To deter them from an attack, he painted in glowing colours the means of defence possessed by the English, the cannon, which could sweep hundreds down by a single discharge, and the mine of gunpowder, which would instantly blow a town into the air, and scatter its fragments in utter devastation.

"The Indians were horror-stricken by these accounts; but some being yet incredulous, Smith offered to prove his veracity by sending messengers to the town. Writing a few sentences on a leaf from his tablets, he delivered it to the wondering

red men, and awaited the result. In accordance with his directions, the colonists exhibited before the embassy a display of ordnance and fireworks, which nearly bereft them of their senses; but afterwards going to a spot already designated, they found there precisely the articles which their prisoner had declared he would obtain. A man who could thus speak by a fragment of paper to people at a distance, was looked upon by savage eyes as more than mortal."

"Finally, the prisoner was conducted to the imperial seat of Powhatan. The Indian monarch so little enjoyed the neighbourhood of the English, that he often withdrew to Werowocomoco, in the county now known as Gloucester, and not far removed from the site of the military scenes, which resulted in the surrender of Cornwallis, in the war of the Revolution. Here Powhatan received his captive, and exhibited before him all the savage splendour that his court could furnish. Two hundred grim attendants surrounded him. On his either hand, sat a young girl of sixteen or eighteen years of age, and on each side of the room was a row of men, and, behind them, a corresponding number of savage ladies, with their necks and shoulders dyed with crimson, their heads bedecked with the white down of birds, and with chains of glittering beads around their persons. The noble captive was received with a shout of triumph, and Indian courtesy did not refuse him honour. The Queen of Appamaton, brought him water to wash his hands, and another damsel tendered him a bunch of feathers upon which to dry them. But among so many who regarded him with wonder and alarm, there was one heart which already began to beat with more generous feeling. Pocahontas, the daughter of the monarch, was now budding into womanhood, and cotemporary writers tell us of her beauty, her intelligence, her sensitive modesty. The noble bearing of the unhappy stranger filled her with pity and admiration. The king and his counsellors held the life of the captive in their hands, and already the voice of this gentle girl was raised in entreaties for his safety. But to suffer so formidable a foe to live, was adjudged imprudent. The sentence was pronounced, and immediate measures for its execution were commenced.

"Two large stones were brought and placed at the feet of the Indian monarch. Then as many as could grasp him, seized the prisoner and forced him down, with his head upon the fatal resting-place. The clubs of the savages were raised, and another moment would have closed the life of a hero. But at this critical instant, Pocahontas, with a cry which thrilled through the assembly, threw herself upon the prostrate captive, and clasped her arms around his neck. Her own head was interposed to receive the threatened blow, and raising her eyes, which spoke the eloquence of mercy, to her father's face, she silently awaited the result. The bosom of the monarch relented. He could not take the life of one for whom the child of his own nature thus interceded. Smith was raised from the ground and kept alive to minister to the pleasure of the generous girl who had thus preserved him."

We think we have cause to complain that antiquaries in Virginia have not used some means to ascertain and signalize the spot where this event, worthy of the Grecian buskin, took place. Localities have been pointed out to us, but not with due notes of verification. As to the fact, we love to believe it; and the extraordinary truth of Smith's surveys and maps, considering the

time and circumstances in which they were made, adds credibility to his narratives.

It is pleasing to observe, whenever a gentleman of Boston visits Virginia, or a cultivated Virginian goes to Boston, and mingles freely in society, that amidst many provincial differences in speech and habitude, there is a mutual recognition of resemblance. No marvel; for both parties are of the pure 'English undefiled,' without admixture of German, Dutch, or even Scotch or Irish blood, as is common in many of the intervening tracts. But never were two classes of the same origin more unlike, in several important respects, than the gentleman of southern adventure and the Puritan, and the impress will long endure in the posterity of each. This has been fully indicated by our author, whose language we partially make our own. In Newport's party, of 1606, there were one hundred and six settlers. Besides the clergyman, Mr. Hunt, and the council, we find the names of more than fifty cavaliers, recorded as 'gentlemen,' with but eleven professed labourers. There were however a barber, a tailor, and a drummer: it was a colony of gentlemen. Such men would scarcely have endured the wintry trials of Miles Standish and the men of Plymouth. The new arrivals of 1609 were still more loose in their habits. Gentlemen reduced by gaming and dissipation, too proud to beg, too lazy to dig—broken tradesmen—footmen—rakes—and 'unruly sparks, packed off by their friends to escape worse destinies at home'—such as figure everywhere in Beaumont and Fletcher—these were the founders of the new state. The seditious turbulence which ensued needs no elaborate explanation; it is faithfully depicted by Mr. Howison.

Throughout that portion of the narrative, in which Powhatan, Pocahontas, and the savage tribes in general, continue to appear, we recognise everywhere the elements of a historic interest, which need not shrink from comparison with the wildest stories of Herodotus. Mr. Howison does justice to the sylvan excellencies of these aboriginal heroes; and is never more felicitous than where he touches on the fortunes and the death of the famous Indian maiden. He has done well, in allowing himself full space in this part of his work, and here his ability for graceful composition displays itself to most advantage. We almost

lament the change, when the red men leave the stage, and give place to the intestine squabbles of colonial misrule.

It would be altogether aside from our purpose, to follow the chain of events, under the successive governors. Occasional jars, quarrels, oppressions, and even rebellion, do not prevent our considering the progress of the settlement, during the seventeenth century, as constant and even prosperous. In the same proportion, the material of interest in the annals is diminished; and we must not blame the historian, if the mind flags somewhat as plantations are extended, and agriculture and commerce take their shape. The conduct of the general and public narrative strikes us as being judicious; there are no abrupt chasms, and, for the most part, we coincide with the author in his reasonings and reflections. Here and there, we are led to pause, with more than usual interest, before events which project their influence into the remote future. Such, by way of eminence, is the introduction of slavery; concerning which we read as follows:

"(1620.) An incident now presents itself, upon which none who have proper feelings, can look without melancholy interest, and which few Englishmen or Americans can regard without deep humiliation. It is not a purpose here entertained to enter upon a history of slavery; to go back to the time when man first bought and sold his fellow-creatures, or when, under the Divine constitution, it first became lawful for one mortal to control another as his property. Whatever may be the ravings of fanaticism on this subject, it is certain that the father of the faithful, the chosen servant of the Almighty, owned and governed slaves in a mode as absolute as any that has ever prevailed in the Southern States of the American Union. It is also certain, that the inspired Apostle of Christ, who enjoyed more abundant revelations than any other writer of the New Testament, has laid down laws to govern the relation of master and slave; thus proving it to be lawful. For neither has the Deity, nor have righteous men, at any time given laws to regulate an unlawful relation, as that of adulterer and adulteress, receiver and thief. But upon a subject which has excited, and is still producing so profound emotion in the world, we will not enter the arena of debate. Inexorable necessity alone could induce the people of Virginia to continue an institution which, however lawful, is not desirable; which has been entailed upon them by British ancestors; which they have perseveringly struggled to mitigate; and from which they hope finally to see their land wholly delivered. It is rather the duty of the historian to trace evils to their sources, and, without fear or malice, to attach censure to those who have rendered themselves ingloriously immortal, by giving birth to ills which are destined to curse the world when their bodies have, during ages, slumbered in the dust.

"England has always held slaves under her control: villeins in the feudal ages—kidnapped Africans under Elizabeth—negroes in her American islands—white children in the mines and factories upon her own soil—conquered Hindoos in her vast East Indian domain. Nevertheless, it is true that the bondman who now

touches her soil becomes free, and may have a writ of 'habeas corpus' to secure his liberty! So skilful is she in retaining the substance without the form, in giving to her poets and orators a phantom upon which to waste their eloquence, while she relaxes not her grasp upon the enslaved spirit thus disembodied! Sir John Hawkins was the first Englishman of note, who openly engaged in the slave trade. In 1562, he visited Africa, enticed the unsuspecting negroes aboard his ship, attacked and captured a large number of a hostile tribe, promised them all much comfort under the pleasant skies of Hispaniola, sold them to the Spaniards upon that island, and returned to England 'with a rich freight of pearls, sugar, and ginger,' to excite his countrymen to emulation, and to allay the qualms of the Queen's conscience by displays of wealth, and promises of great moderation in his future kidnappings. Thus, while the Pope of Rome was steadily hurling anathemas at this inhuman traffic, a Protestant princess received it under her especial care and countenance.

But though England sanctioned the slave trade, sold her own people into servitude, after the unhappy rebellion of Monmouth, in the reign of James II., and afterwards contributed heavily to swell the number of Africans on the soil of America, yet she did not originally introduce them. James I. was content to prepare the minds of the colonists for enslaving their innocent fellow-beings, by sending guilty wretches from Britain to servitude in the settlement. In August, 1620, a Dutch man-of-war sailed up the James, landed twenty negroes from the African coast, and soon obtained a sale for them from the planters, who were willing at any expense, either of money or of feeling, to secure suitable labourers for their lucrative staple. We will not further dwell upon this circumstance, or upon its results. The number was small, but the practice was commenced; the virus was introduced into the blood of the patient, and centuries perchance will yet elapse ere she will recover from its influences."—pp. 219—222

These statements we consider just and moderate. No class of men is at this moment more wronged by an extensive public opinion, than the slaveholders of the south. That they are in the performance of all their duties, in regard to the African race, we will not aver; that the laws respecting this subject are what they should be, we dare not pretend. But that the actual proprietors of the southern states should be held responsible for the growth of a system, which they did not originate, in which they were born, and which owes its gigantic expansion to the irrepressible laws of human increase; for a system in which the merchants of New England and of Britain had full participation, with abundant gains; and still more, that they should be challenged to sever at a blow, ties which are indispensable, for a time at least, to the welfare of the very objects of this ignorant sympathy; all this is unreasonable and unjust in the highest degree. Those who have the slightest acquaintance with the history of legislation in Virginia need not be informed, that nothing has so much retarded the sure and peaceful adjustment of

this question, as the mischievous intermeddling and bitter vituperation of a small party of agitators in the north. Our sentiments on this subject have been openly expounded, and the progress of events has served only to confirm us in what we have long since written. We live in the confident expectation, that Virginia will by a process more rapid and effectual than superficial observers suppose, be drained of her slave population, and become a free state. And while we await this revolution, which pragmatical intervention does but postpone, and which is to be wrought by the mighty yet silent hand of Providence, our chief anxiety is, that the African bondman may receive in all its fulness the light and consolations of the gospel. Instead of weeping over his imagined physical privations, which are less than those of the New England sailor, we should better aid the work of true philanthropy, by seeking to extend to him the inestimable blessings of the word of God.

There is a single paragraph in the work before us, in which we take a special interest, because it is the only one which seems to allude to our church. It is as follows:

"As the minds of men became expanded by knowledge, toleration for the opinions of others on religious subjects had been gradually established. Yet the very existence of this word 'toleration' will prove how far public opinion yet fell below freedom and truth. No insolence can exceed that of human governments which have declared their purpose to 'tolerate' what the laws of God have placed beyond their control. It would be wiser in them to announce *toleration* to the course of the sun in the heavens! Governor Gooch was religiously inclined, but his religion was bounded by the rubric; he knew some Scripture, but it was all from the English Prayer Book. (1745.) In the midst of his administration, there appeared in the colony a large number of fanatics, composed of Methodists, Moravians, Quakers, and a sect known as New-light Presbyterians. What these last-named persons believed is not certainly known, but they were doubtless impressed with the delusive hope, that an immediate revelation had been made to them by the Deity—a hope which, from the death of the Apostles to the present hour, has been invariably productive of folly and crime in those encouraging it, and of relentless persecution in church authorities. These wild declaimers spread themselves abroad, preaching their doctrines to all who would listen. We do not learn that they were guilty of any deeds adverse to the substantial interests of the state. If they were disorderly, they were amenable to police regulations; if they were rebellious, Virginia had a law of treason. No unwonted rigour seemed to be required. In later and happier times, the flames of their zeal would have been permitted to expire for want of fuel. Resistance tended only to make them more determined and enthusiastic. (April 25.) But the Governor was greatly scandalized by their course, and at the next meeting of the General Court, he proceeded to deliver an edifying charge to the Grand Jury, directing their thoughts to these persons, and urging them to present or in-

diet them under the laws requiring conformity. The chief offence of these hapless dreamers seems to have consisted in the doctrine, that salvation was not to be obtained in any communion except their own. Of this the Governor complained; but he might with justice have been reminded, that such doctrine was neither unknown to nor unapproved by many in the church to which he adhered with all his powers, both of mind and body."—pp. 429, 430.

On our first perusal of this passage, we were painfully impressed with the belief that it was the intention of the author to strike at the genuine Presbyterians of Virginia, by a passing sneer; especially as the beginnings of our church are nowhere else mentioned. On a more mature examination, we acquit him of such an intention, but we still have just ground of complaint. He should have said either more or less than he has said. Having named Presbyterians, and this by a title, which however ambiguous, was often applied to our ecclesiastical predecessors, he should have added some note of discrimination, as a line between them and a supposed body of fanatics.

But over and above this, we entertain no doubts that the persons intended by Governor Gooch, in his proclamation under the name of 'New Lights,' were such men as Robinson, Tennent, Blair, and Davies. We have no evidence of the existence of any other Presbyterians, within the jurisdiction of Gooch; we have evidence that these, and such as these were denominated 'New Lights,' in Virginia; though their common appellation in the middle states, was the 'New Side.' In 1738, and again in 1745, Gooch expressed his willingness that the Synod's ministers should labour in Virginia; but we regard this as altogether compatible with his subsequent dislike of their proceedings. Indeed we may fairly presume, that a high churchman of his temper would feel little favour for the reforming and agitating piety of these preachers.

We record our dissatisfaction with the statement of Mr. Howison, as one fitted to grieve the Presbyterians of the south; yet we do not press the matter to extremity, as we have good reason to believe, that his error arose from too hasty an assent to the Episcopalian authorities, and that it is one which he will gladly correct in future editions. But for this persuasion, we could find matter in the paragraph just cited, and in the vagueness and laxity of the charges it contains, for very serious and extended animadversion.

This volume reaches far enough to include the military expe-

ditions of 1759, the capture of Fort Duquesne, Braddock's defeat, and, of course, the rise of Washington. Of these great events, Mr. Howison's narrative is succinct and pleasing. He has still before him a period which more than any other is suited to try the pen of the historian. Between the settlement of colonial peace, and the outbreak of revolutionary zeal, we must acknowledge, the tract is uninviting. Here and there a stirring incident catches our attention; but generally speaking the prosperous quiet of the "Old Colony and Dominion" is dull and dreary. It would have diversified and animated the picture, if more special and individual trials had been admitted; if the general dignity of the public story had been occasionally sacrificed; if we had been introduced to a nearer view of manners and men, of household ways, of amusements, foibles, and adventures. In all this period, no events are really more awakening, than those which relate to the spread of Christianity; the extension of the church; the struggles for religious freedom; and over these our author has passed with a singular inattention.

In regard to the manner in which Mr. Howison has executed his plan, we are disposed on laying down the volume to speak with much respect. Every contribution to our national annals deserves our considerate regard; but the present work need not shield itself under this statement merely, for it possesses intrinsic worth. We have not pursued the particular statements to their authorities, nor ransacked the alleged sources; but every page shows signs of extensive, laborious, and competent research. The margin is studded with notes of reference and citation; sometimes, even to excess; as in cases where no point is to be settled, and where all that is gained is literary allusion or embellishment. Yet we consider the abundance of historical authority as a principal excellence of the book.

The style of the performance merits remark. It is such as could have proceeded from none but a scholar and a man of taste. It is, without an exception, perspicuous. It is never slipshod and never ragged. It never approaches the voluminous, overstrained, or bombastic; and after all it is faulty. There is an excess of care bestowed on the dignified march of the period; hence a loss both of animation and simplicity. As we would far rather write Hume's worst page than Gibbon's best; so, without going to such extremes of style as these, we would barter all the

stately correctness of Robertson, for the transparent flow and exquisite naturalness of Southey's prose. To express our meaning by a single citation, we earnestly wish our author would refrain from every such form of speech, as that in which he tells us that Captain Smith "sought the shores of Caledonia." p. 94. If he is still a young writer, it is not too late for him to become one of our best; but we see a leaning towards the side of an undue, and we rejoice to say a somewhat obsolete, formality of diction. The extreme of the evil which we intend, may be seen in any page of Sharon Turner. We owe it to Mr. Howison, to admit, that in his writing the tendency is slight, and reveals itself only here and there. The great models of historical writing, we need scarcely say, are Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Cæsar; we earnestly ask attention to the directness and simplicity of their style.

So far as the matter of the history is concerned, the selection of facts is full and judicious, but there is little revelation of forgotten events. We have already hinted at a defect, the absence, we mean, of graphic details. These give charm to national story; and sometimes a single incident reveals more of the condition of a people, than the most elaborate generalities. It is remarkable how few are the occasions in which Mr. Howison leads our minds to connect great events with any striking locality; how seldom he pauses before any great wonder of nature; and how rare are the scenes which will recur to the imagination of the reader. Yet a history may be just, and even satisfactory, without these; such is the one before us.

Mr. Howison deserves well of his native state for this filial tribute. We hope he will persevere, and carry his purpose to successful completion. From the unfeigned interest which we have taken in this volume, we indulge pleasing expectations of that which is to follow.

The uncommonly accurate and beautiful typography of this work merits a special commendation; being such as fits it to be placed with the best productions of the American press.

ART. VI.—*Lectures on Systematic Theology, embracing Lectures on Moral Government, together with Atonement, Moral and Physical Depravity, Philosophical Theories, and Evidences of Regeneration.* By Rev. Charles J. Finney, Professor of Theology in the Oberlin Collegiate Institute. Oberlin: James M. Fitch. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. New York: Saxton & Miles. 1846. pp. 587.

THIS is in more senses than one a remarkable book. It is to a degree very unusual an original work; it is the product of the author's own mind. The principles which he holds, have indeed been held by others; and the conclusions at which he arrives had been reached before; but still it is abundantly evident that all the principles here advanced are adopted by the writer, not on authority, but on conviction, and that the conclusions presented have all been wrought out by himself and for himself. The work is therefore in a high degree logical. It is as hard to read as Euclid. Nothing can be omitted; nothing passed over slightly. The unhappy reader once committed to a perusal is obliged to go on, sentence by sentence, through the long concatenation. There is not one resting place; not one lapse into amplification, or declamation, from beginning to the close. It is like one of those spiral staircases, which lead to the top of some high tower, without a landing from the base to the summit; which if a man has once ascended, he resolves never to do the like again. The author begins with certain postulates, or what he calls first truths of reason, and these he traces out with singular clearness and strength to their legitimate conclusions. We do not see that there is a break or a defective link in the whole chain. If you grant his principles, you have already granted his conclusions. Such a work must of course be reckless. Having committed himself to the guidance of the discursive understanding, which he sometimes calls the intelligence, and sometimes the reason, and to which he alone acknowledges any real allegiance, he pursues his remorseless course, regardless of any protest from other sources. The scriptures are throughout recognized as a mere subordinate authority. They are allowed to come in and bear confirmatory testimony, but their place is altogether secondary. Even God himself is subordinate to "the intelli-

gence;" His will can impose no obligation; it only discloses what is obligatory in its own nature and by the law of reason. There can be no positive laws, for nothing binds the conscience but the moral law, nothing is obligatory but what tends to the highest good, and as a means to that end, which must be chosen not out of regard for God, not for the sake of the moral excellence implied in it, but for its own sake as what alone has any intrinsic value. All virtue consists "in obedience to the moral law as revealed in the reason." 301. "Benevolence (i. e. virtue) is yielding the will up unreservedly to the demands of the intelligence." 275. Moral law "is the soul's idea or conception of that state of heart or life which is exactly suited to its nature and relations. It cannot be too distinctly understood, that moral law is nothing more or less than the law of nature, that is, it is the rule imposed on us, not by the arbitrary will of any being, but by our own intelligence." p. 6. It is obligatory also upon every moral agent, entirely independent of the will of God. Their nature and relations being given and their intelligence being developed, moral law must be obligatory upon them, and it lies not in the option of any being to make it otherwise. To pursue a course of conduct suited to their nature and relations, is necessarily and self-evidently obligatory, the willing or nilling of any being to the contrary notwithstanding." p. 5. As man's allegiance is to the universe,—to being in general, and the rule of his obedience his own intelligence, God is reduced to the same category. He is "under moral law," he is bound to seek the highest good of being, and as the highest well being of the universe demands moral government, and as God is best qualified, "it is his duty to govern." p. 19. "His conscience must demand it." p. 20. Our obligation however to obey him rests neither on our dependence, nor in his infinite superiority, but simply on "the intrinsic value of the interests to be secured by government, and conditionated upon the fact, that government is the necessary means or condition of securing that end. p. 24. God's right is therefore limited by its foundation, "by the fact, that thus far, and no further, government is necessary to the highest good of the universe. No legislation in heaven or earth—no enactment can impose obligation, except upon condition that such legislation is demanded by the highest good of the governor and the governed. Unnecessary legislation is invalid legislation. Unnecessary government

is tyranny. It can in no case be founded in right." p. 24. The question is not what form of truth may be conveyed under these expressions, we quote them as exhibiting the animus of the book; we bring them forward as exhibiting what we have called the recklessness of the writer; his tracing out his principles to conclusions which shock the ordinary sensibilities of Christians; which assume, to say the least, principles inconsistent with the nature of religion as presented in the Bible and as avowed by the vast body of the people of God. The scriptures assume that our allegiance is to God, and not to being in general; that the foundation of our obligation to obey him, is his infinite excellence, and not the necessity of obedience to the highest happiness of moral agents; and that the rule of our obedience is his will, and not "the soul's conception" of what is suited to our nature and relations. According to the doctrine of this book, there is no such thing as religion, or the service of God as God. The universe has usurped his place, as the supreme object of love; and reason, or "the intelligence," has fallen heir to his authority. A very slight modification in the form of statement, would bring the doctrine of Mr. Finney, into exact conformity to the doctrine of the modern German school, which makes God but a name for the moral law or order of the universe, or reason in the abstract. It is in vain, however, to tell Mr. Finney that his conclusions shock the moral and religious consciousness; what right, he asks, has "the empirical consciousness," to be heard in the premises. "If the intelligence affirms it, it must be true or reason deceives us. But if the intelligence deceives in this, it may also in other things. If it fail us here, it fails us on the most important of all questions. If reason gives us false testimony, we can never know truth from error upon any moral subject, we certainly can never know what religion is, if the testimony of reason can be set aside. If the intelligence cannot be safely appealed to, how are we to know what the Bible means? for its is the only faculty by which we get at the truth of the oracles of God." p. 171.*

Our object at present, however, is not to discuss principles,

* The remarks quoted in the text are made in immediate reference to the author's doctrine that "moral character is always wholly right or wholly wrong," or, that every moral agent is always, either perfectly free from sin or totally depraved; or, that "they are at all times as sinful or holy as with their knowledge they can be." p. 554.

but to state the general character of this work. It is eminently logical, rationalistic, reckless, and confident. Conclusions at war with the common faith of Christians, are not only avowed without hesitation, but "sheer nonsense," "stark nonsense," "eminently nonsensical," are the terms applied to doctrines which have ever held their place in the faith of God's people, and which will maintain their position undisturbed, long after this work is buried in oblivion.* Men have other sources of knowledge than the understanding, the feeble flickering light burning in the midst of misty darkness. If deaf to the remonstrance of our moral nature, to the protests even of the emotional part of our constitution, we follow that light, it belongs to history and not to prophecy to record the issue. It really seems strange when the first sentence of his preface informs the reader that "the truths of the blessed gospel have been hidden under a false philosophy," that the author, instead of presenting those truths free from that false ingredient, should write a book which hardly pretends to be any thing else than philosophy. The attempt to cure philosophy by philosophy is a homoeopathic mode of treatment in which we have very little confidence. The gospel was intended for plain people. Its doctrines admit of being plainly stated. They imply indeed a certain psychology, and a certain moral system. The true and Christian method is to begin with the doctrines, and let them determine our philosophy, and not to begin with philosophy and allow it to give law to the doctrines. The title page of this book is not plainer than the fact, that the doctrines which it inculcates are held not on the authority of God speaking in his word, but on the authority of reason. They are almost without exception first proved, demonstrated as true, as the necessary sequences of admitted or assumed principles, before the Bible is so much as named. It is by profession a philosophy, or a philosophical demonstration of certain doctrines of morals and religion, and which might be admitted, and adopted as true by a man who did not believe one word of the scriptures, or who had never heard of their existence. The

* On p. 499, after referring to Dr. Griffin's assertion that until the heart is changed by the Holy Spirit, the gospel excites its enmity to God, Mr. Finney exclaims, "O orthodoxy, falsely so called, how absurd and false thou art! what an enemy thou art to God; what a stumbling block to man; what a leaven of unrighteousness and hell is such a dogma as this!"

only doctrines which are assumed as facts, and not deduced from assumed premises, are the atonement as a fact, and the influence of the Holy Spirit on the mind, and as to the former its nature, design and effect are all proved à priori; and as to the latter, the writer professes "to understand the philosophy of the Spirit's influence." p. 28. It is altogether a misnomer to call such a book "Lectures on Systematic Theology." It would give a far more definite idea of its character, to call it, "Lectures on Moral Law and Philosophy." Under the former title, we are authorized to expect a systematic exhibition of the doctrines of the Bible, as resting on the authority of a divine revelation; under the latter we should expect to find, what is here presented, a regular evolution from certain radical principles of a code of moral laws. We wish it to be distinctly understood, that we neither deny nor lightly estimate works of the kind just described. There can be no higher or more worthy subject of study, apart from the word of God, than the human soul, the laws which regulate its action, and determine its obligations. Nor do we suppose that these subjects can ever be divorced from theology. They occupy so much ground in common, that they never have been and never can be kept distinct. But still, it is very important that things should be called by their right names, and not presented to the public for what they are not. Let moral philosophy be called moral philosophy and not Systematic Theology.

While we admit that the philosophical and theological element, in any system of Christian doctrine cannot be kept distinct, it is of the last importance that they should be kept, as already remarked, in their proper relative position. There is a view of free agency and of the grounds and extent of moral obligation, which is perfectly compatible with the doctrines of original sin, efficacious grace, and divine sovereignty; and there is another view of those subjects, as obviously incompatible with these doctrines. There are two courses which a theologian may adopt. He may either turn to the scriptures and ascertain whether those doctrines are really taught therein. If satisfied on that point, and especially if he experience through the teaching of the Holy Spirit their power on his own heart, if they become to him matters not merely of speculative belief but of experimental knowledge, he will be constrained to make his philosophy agree with his theology. He cannot consciously hold contradictory proposi-

tions, and must therefore make his conviction harmonize as far as he can; and those founded on the testimony of the Spirit, will modify and control the conclusions to which his own understanding would lead him. Or, he may begin with his philosophy and determine what is true with regard to the nature of man and his responsibilities, and then turn to the scriptures and force them into agreement with foregone conclusions. Every one, in the slightest degree, acquainted with the history of theology, knows that this latter course has been adopted by errorists from the earliest ages to the present day. Our own age has witnessed, what must be regarded as on the whole, a very beneficial change in this respect. Rationalists, instead of coercing scripture into agreement with their philosophy, have agreed to let each stand on its own foundation. The modern systems of theology proceeding from that school, give first the doctrines as they are presented in the Bible, and then examine how far those doctrines agree with, and how far they contradict the teachings of philosophy, or—as they are commonly regarded—the deductions of reason. As soon as public sentiment allows of this course being pursued in this country, it will be a great relief to all concerned. We do not, however, mean to intimate that those who among ourselves pursue the opposite course, and who draw out that system of moral and religious truth, as they sometimes express it, which every man has in the constitution of his own nature, before they go to the Bible for instruction, and whose system is therefore essentially rationalistic, are insincere in their professions of faith in the Bible. It is too familiar a fact to be doubted, that if a man is previously convinced the scriptures cannot teach certain doctrines, it is no difficult task for him to persuade himself that they do not in fact teach them. Still there is a right and a wrong method of studying and teaching theology; there is a healthful and an unhealthful posture of mind to be preserved towards the word of God. And we confess, that when we see a system of theology beginning with moral government, we take it for granted that the Bible is to be allowed only a very humble part in its construction.*

* We were struck with an amusing illustration of Mr. Finney's reigning passion, in the last number of the Oberlin Quarterly Review. It seems a physician, Dr. Jennings, has written a medical work, which he submitted to Mr. Finney for his inspection. The latter gentleman tells the Doctor that he has long been convinced

There is one other general remark we would make on the work before us. We object not only to the method adopted, to the assumption that from a few postulates the whole science of religion can be deduced by a logical process, but to the mode in which the method has been carried out. As all truth is consistent; as some moral and religious truths are self-evident; and as all correct deductions from correct premises, must themselves be correct, it is of course conceivable that an à priori system of morals and religion might be constructed, which, as far as it went, would agree exactly with the infallible teachings of the Bible. But apart from the almost insurmountable difficulties in the way of the successful execution of such a task, and the comparatively slight authority that could be claimed for any such production, every thing depends upon the manner in which the plan is executed. Now we object to Mr. Finney's mode of procedure that he adopts as first principles, the very points in dispute. He postulates what none but a limited class of his readers are prepared to concede. His whole ground work, therefore, is defective. He has built his tower on contested ground. As a single example of this fundamental logical error, we refer to his confounding liberty and ability. In postulating the one, he postulates also the other. It is a conceded point that man is a free agent. The author therefore is authorized to lay down as one of his axioms that liberty is essential to moral agency; but he is not authorized to assume as an axiom that liberty and ability are identical. He defines free will to be "the power to choose, in every instance, in accordance with moral obligation, or to refuse so to choose. This much," he adds, "must be included in free will, and I am not concerned to affirm any thing more." p. 32. "To talk of inability to obey moral law, is to talk sheer nonsense." p. 4. Mr. Finney knows very well that he has thus taken for granted what has been denied by nine-tenths of all good men since the world began, and is still denied by no small portion of them as we verily hope and believe. This is a point that cannot be set-

that there must be some à priori method in medicine; some self-evident principle, from which the whole science of disease and cure may be logically deduced, and he encourages his friend in his attempts to discover and establish that principle. All patients have reason to rejoice that Mr. Finney is not a physician. To be doctored on à priori principles, would be as bad for the body, as it is for the soul to be dosed with à priori theology.

tled by a definition ex cathedra. He is guilty of a petitio principii when he lays it down as an axiom that liberty implies ability to obey moral law, and consequently that responsibility is limited by ability. This is one of the assumptions on which his whole system depends; it is one of the hooks from which is strung his long concatenation of sequences. We deny the right of Mr. Finney to assume this definition of liberty as a "first truth of reason," because it lacks both the essential characteristics of such truths; it neither forces assent as soon as intelligibly stated, nor does it constitute a part of the instinctive (even if latent) faith of all mankind. On the contrary, it is intelligently denied, not only by theorists and philosophers, but by the great mass of ordinary men. It is one of the most familiar facts of consciousness, that a sense of obligation is perfectly consistent with a conviction of entire inability. The evidence of this is impressed on the devotional language of all churches and ages, the hymns and prayers of all people recognise at once their guilt and helplessness, a conviction that they ought and that they cannot, and a consequent calling upon God for help. It is a dictum of philosophers, not of common people, "I ought, therefore, I can." To which every unsophisticated human heart, and especially every heart burdened with a sense of sin, replies, "I ought to be able, but I am not."* Mr. Finney would doubtless say to such people, this is "sheer nonsense," it is all a false philosophy; no man is bound to do or to be what is not completely, and at all times, in his own power. This does not alter the case. Men still feel at once their obligation and their helplessness, and calling them fools for so doing, will not destroy their painful conviction of their real condition. As the doctrine, the very opposite of Mr. Finney's assumed axiom, is thus deeply and indelibly impressed on the heart of man, so it is constantly asserted or assumed in scripture. The Bible nowhere asserts the ability of fallen man to make himself holy; it in a multitude of places asserts just the reverse, and all the provisions and promises of grace, and all the prayers and thanksgivings for holiness, recorded in the scriptures, take for granted that men cannot make themselves holy. This therefore has been and is the doc-

* Kant's favourite maxim, Ich soll, also, kann ich, for which Julius Mueller would substitute Ich sollte freilich können, aber ich kann nicht. Müller's Lehre von der Sünde, vol. ii. p. 116.

trine of every Christian church, under the sun, unless that, of Oberlin be an exemption. There is no confession of the Greek, Romish, Lutheran, or Reformed churches, in which this truth is not openly avowed. It was, says Neander, the radical principle of Pelagius's system that he assumed moral liberty to consist in the ability, at any moment, to choose between good and evil,* or as Mr. Finney expresses it, "in the power to choose, in every instance, in accordance with moral law." It is an undisputed historical fact that this view of liberty has not been adopted in the confession of any one denominational church in Christendom, but is expressly repudiated by them all. We are not concerned, at present, to prove or disprove the correctness of this definition. Our only object is to show that Mr. Finney had no right to assume as an axiom or a first truth of reason, a doctrine which nine-tenths of all Christians intelligently and constantly reject. He himself tells us that "a first truth" is one "universally and necessarily assumed by all moral agents, their speculations to the contrary notwithstanding." Now it has rather too much the appearance of effrontery, for any man to assert, (in reference to any thing which relates to the common consciousness of men,) that to be a truth universally and necessarily believed by all moral agents, which the vast majority of such agents, as intelligent and as capable of interpreting their own consciousness, as himself, openly and constantly deny. This is only one illustration of the objection to Mr. Finney's method that he gratuitously assumes controverted points as first truths or axioms.

A second objection to his mode of executing his task is that he gives himself up to the exclusive guidance of the understanding. We do not mean that he neglects the scriptures or makes them subordinate to reason. On that characteristic of his work, we have already remarked. We now refer to the fact that it is not the informed and informing soul of man, which he studies, and whence he deduces his principles and conclusions. He will listen to nothing but the understanding. He spurns what he calls the "empirical consciousness," and denies its right to bear any testimony in relation to what is truth. It is not easy indeed to determine by his definitions, what he means by the intelligence, to which he so constantly appeals and to which he as-

* Kirchengeschichte B. ii. p. 1259.

cribes such supremacy. He tells us at times, that it includes Reason, Conscience, and Self-consciousness. Of Reason, he says, It is the intuitive faculty or function of the intellect; that which gives us the knowledge of the absolute, the infinite, the perfect, the necessarily true. It postulates all the à priori truths of science. "Conscience is the faculty or function of the Intelligence that recognises the conformity or disconformity of the heart or life to the moral law, as it lies revealed in the reason, and also awards praise to conformity, and blame to disconformity to that law." "Consciousness is the faculty or function of self-knowledge. It is the faculty that recognises our own existence, mental actions and states, together with the attributes of liberty or necessity, belonging to those actions and states." To complete the view of his psychology, we must repeat his definition of the two other constituent faculties of our nature, viz.: the sensibility and will. The former "is the faculty or susceptibility of feeling. All sensation, desire, emotion, passion, pain, pleasure, and in short every kind and degree of feeling, as the term is commonly used, is a phenomenon of this faculty." The Will, as before stated, is defined to be the power to choose, in every instance, in accordance with the moral obligation, or to refuse so to choose." "The will is the voluntary power. In it resides the power of causality. As consciousness gives the affirmation that necessity is an attribute of the phenomena of the intellect and the sensibility, so it just as unequivocally gives the affirmation that liberty is an attribute of the phenomena of the will." "I am as conscious of being free in willing, as I am of not being free or voluntary in my feelings and intuitions."—pp. 30—32. Here is an analysis of the faculties of the soul in which the understanding finds no place. It is not included in the Intellect, for that is said to embrace only Reason, Conscience, and Consciousness; and Reason so defined as to distinguish it from the understanding. Here is Vernunft, but where is the Verstand? The fact is that Mr. Finney has for this once, and for once only, lapsed into transcendentalism. He has taken the definition of the Reason from Cousin, or some other expounder of the modern philosophy, without remembering that according to that philosophy, reason is something very different from the understanding. This latter faculty has thus been dropped out of his catalogue. This, however, is only a momentary weakness. Mr. Finney is

the last man in the world to be reproached with the sin of taking his doctrines at second hand from any school or individual. We do not find in this analysis, however, what we are searching for. The reader of this book perceives, on perusing the first page, that he is about to enter on a long and intricate path. He naturally wishes to know who is to be his guide. It is not Reason, as here defined; for that only gives him the points of departure, and tells him the bearing. Of course it is neither the susceptibility nor the will. What then is it? Why, under the new name of the Intelligence, it is the old faculty, familiar to all Englishmen and Americans, as the understanding. Nothing more nor less. Not reason, in its transcendental sense, as the faculty for the absolute, but the discursive understanding. The ordinary New England faculty, which calculates, perceives, compares, infers and judges. No man can read a dozen pages in any part of the book, without perceiving that it is the product of the speculative understanding, to the exclusion, to a most wonderful degree, of every other faculty. This is its presiding genius. This is the organ which is "phrenologically" developed most disproportionately in the head of the writer, and which gives character to his philosophy and theology. Now we earnestly protest against the competency of this guide. It does not belong to the understanding, as described above, and as it domineers in this book, to speak with authority on questions of religion and morals. It is not the informing faculty; nor can it be trusted as a guide. Let a man attempt to write a work on aesthetics, putting as Mr. Finney does, his mailed foot on the susceptibilities, not allowing them any voice in determining the principles of taste, and he will produce a work which no cultivated man could recognise as treating of the subject. Every such man would say, the writer had purposely put out the light in order to see by the sparks struck by his iron bound feet. In like manner if any man undertakes the task of writing on morals and religion, unchecked and unguided by the emotional part of our nature, by the susceptibilities, the "empirical consciousness," he will most assuredly find the heart, conscience and consciousness of all sane and good men against him. This task has been attempted long before Mr. Finney was born, and with much the same results. The understanding, which has neither heart nor conscience, can speak on these subjects only as informed, and guided by the

moral and religious susceptibilities, which are themselves the instinctive impulses of our higher nature. They belong to a far higher sphere than the speculative understanding, to the πνεῦμα as distinguished from the νοῦς; and are masters and not slaves. The understanding if divorced from the other faculties, may demonstrate just as it demonstrates that there is no external world, that there is no such thing as sin, or virtue, or good, or justice, what is that to the conscience? What becomes of all its syllogisms, when the sceptic comes to die? Are they unravelled, and answered by the understanding? Or do they drop from its palsied hand, the moment conscience affirms the truth? We consider it as the radical, fatal error of the "method" of this book, that it is a mere work of the understanding; the heart, the susceptibilities, the conscience, are allowed no authority in deciding moral questions; which is as preposterous as it would be to write a mathematical treatise on poetry. The whole history of the church teems with illustrations of the fact, that when men write on morals without being guided by the moral emotions; or on religion, uncontrolled by right religious feeling, they are capable of any extravagance of error. But such men say, as Mr. Finney does in a passage, already quoted, if they do not follow the intelligence they have nothing else to follow; if reason gives false testimony, or deceives them, they can never know truth from error. This is all a mistake. It is not reason deceiving them, but the understanding making fools of them, as the apostle says, φασκοντες εἶναι σοφοι ἐμωρανθησαν. This is no disparagement of the understanding. It is only saying that it is of no authority out of its legitimate sphere. It receives and gives light. It guides and is guided. It cannot be divorced from the other faculties, and act alone, and give the law to them, as a separate power. Conscience is intelligent, feeling is intelligent, the soul is an intelligent and feeling agent, and not like a threefold cord, whose strands can be untwisted and taken apart. It is one indivisible substance, whose activity is manifested under various forms, but not through faculties as distinct from each other as the organ of sight is from that of hearing. Hence intelligence may be predicated of the susceptibilities, and moral character of the acts of the intelligence. No emotion or mental passion, or feeling is a mere phenomenon of the susceptibility. Is there no difference between feeling in a brute, and feeling in a

man? Nothing but error can result from this absolute divorce of one faculty of the soul from the others; and especially from setting the intelligence in a state of perfect isolation, and then making it, in that state, the law-giver of man.

If Mr. Finney will take the trouble to look into the books of casuistry common among Romanists, or into works on what they call Moral Theology, he will be convinced that the most demoralizing of all studies is the study of morals, under the exclusive guidance of the understanding. The Romish practice of confession has created a demand for the consideration of all possible cases of conscience; and has led to the subjection of the soul to the scalpel of the moral anatomist, laying open to the cold eye of the "Intelligence" all the curious net-work of the feelings and emotions, to be judged not by their nature, but their relations. The body, when dead may stand this; the living soul cannot. And hence no set of men have the moral sense so perverted as these same casuists. Jesuitism, theoretical and practical, is the product of this method of making the soul a mere anatomical subject for the understanding; and therefore stands as a lesson and a warning.

Apart then from the radical error of making theology a science to be deduced from certain primary principles, or first truths, we object to Mr. Finney's work that it assumes as axioms contested points of doctrine; and that it makes the mere understanding, as divorced from the other faculties, the law-giver and judge on all questions of moral and religious truth. The result is that he has produced a work, which though it exhibits singular ability for analysis and deduction, is false as to its principles and at variance with scripture, experience and the common consciousness of men. We feel on reading it just as a man feels who resigns himself to the arguments of an idealist who leads him step by step to the conclusion that there is no external world, that all things are nothing. Such a reader sees no flaw in the argument, but feels no force in the conclusion. He knows it to be false, just as much after it has been *proved* to be true, as he did before. There is this difference between the cases however. We are disposed to smile at the world of phantasms to which idealism leads us; but where the conclusions arrived at are such as are urged in this book, we feel that all true religion, the very essence and nature of piety, are at stake. It is not a

question, whether the world is real or phenomenal; but whether God or being is to be worshipped; whether sin is sin, and holiness is a good; whether religion consists in loving God for his divine excellence, or in purposing the happiness of moral agents; whether men are responsible for their feeling or only for their intentions; whether there is any other regeneration than a change of purpose, or any possibility of salvation for the imperfectly sanctified. These and similar questions obviously concern the very vitals of Christianity, and if Mr. Finney is right, it is high time, the church knew that religion is something essentially different from what has been commonly supposed.

As it would be impossible to discuss the various questions presented in such a work as this, within the compass of a review, we propose to do little more than to state the principles which Mr. Finney assumes, and show that they legitimately lead to his conclusions. In other words, we wish to show that his conclusions are the best refutation of his premises. Our task would be much easier than it is, if there were any one radical principle to which his several axioms could be reduced, and from which the whole system could be evolved, but this is not the case. No one principle includes all the others, nor leads to all the conclusions here deduced; nor do the conclusions admit of being classed, and some referred to one principle and some to another, because the same conclusions often follow with equal certainty from different premises. We despair therefore of giving anything like unity to our exhibition of Mr. Finney's system, but we shall try not to do him injustice. We regard him as a most important labourer in the cause of truth. Principles which have been long current in this country, and which multitudes hold without seeing half their consequences, he has had the strength of intellect and will, to trace out to their legitimate conclusions, and has thus shown the borderers that there is no neutral ground; that they must either go forward to Oberlin or back to the common faith of Protestants.

We are not sure that all Mr. Finney's doctrines may not be traced to two fundamental principles, viz: that obligation is limited by ability; and that satisfaction, happiness, blessedness, is the only ultimate good, the only thing intrinsically valuable. As to the former of these principles, his doctrine is that free will is one of

the essential conditions of moral agency, and of course of moral obligation. By free will is meant "the power of choosing or refusing to choose in compliance with moral obligation in every instance. Free will implies the power of originating and deciding our own choices and of exercising our own sovereignty in every instance of choice upon moral questions; of deciding or choosing in conformity with duty or otherwise in all cases of moral obligation. That man cannot be under a moral obligation to perform an absolute impossibility is a first truth of reason. But man's causality, his whole power to perform or do any thing lies in his will. If he cannot will, he can do nothing. His whole liberty or freedom must consist in his power to will. His outward actions and his mental states are connected with the actions of his will by a law of necessity. If I will to move my muscles, they must move, unless there be a paralysis of the nerves of voluntary motion, or unless some resistance be opposed which overcomes the power of my volitions. The sequences of choice or volition are always under the law of necessity, and unless the will is free, man has no freedom. And if he has no freedom, he is not a moral agent, that is, he is incapable of moral action and also of moral character. Free will then, in the above defined sense, must be a condition of moral agency and of course of moral obligation." p. 26.

"It should be observed that all acts of the will consist in choices or willings. These actions are generally regarded as consisting in choice and volition. By choice is intended the selection or choice of an end. By volition is intended the executive efforts of the will to secure the end intended. . . . . All intelligent choices or actions of the will, must consist either in the choice of an end or of means to secure that end. To deny this is the same as to deny that there is any object of choice. If the will acts at all, it wills, chooses. If it chooses, it chooses something—there is an object of choice. In other words, it chooses something for some reason, and that reason is truly the object of choice. Or at least, the fundamental reason for choosing a thing, is the object chosen." p. 44.

"Consciousness of affirming the freedom of the will, that is, of power to will in accordance with moral obligation, or to refuse thus to will is a necessary condition of the affirmation of moral obligation. For example: no man affirms, or can affirm his moral

obligation to undo the acts of his past life, and to live his life over again. He cannot affirm himself to be under this obligation, simply because he cannot but affirm the impossibility of it. He can affirm, and indeed cannot but affirm his obligation to repent and obey God for the future, because he is conscious of affirming his ability to do this. Consciousness of the ability to comply with any requisition, is a necessary condition of the affirmation of obligation to comply with that requisition. Then no moral agent can affirm himself to be under obligation to perform an impossibility." p. 33.

Practicability is therefore an attribute of moral law. "That which the precept demands, must be possible to the subject. . . . To talk of inability to obey moral law is to talk sheer nonsense." p. 4.

"By what authority do you affirm, that God requires any more of any moral agent, and of man in his present condition, than he is able to perform?" p. 8. In the commands to love God with all our strength, and our neighbour as ourselves, it is said, God "completely levels his claims, by the very wording of these commandments to the present capacity of every human being, however young or old, however maimed, debilitated, or idiotic." p. 8. "If a man has willingly remained in ignorance of God, is his ignorance a moral or natural inability? If it is a moral inability, he can instantly overcome it, by the right exercise of his own will. And nothing can be a moral inability that cannot be instantaneously removed by our own volition." p. 9.

"The will is always free to choose in opposition to desire. This every moral agent is as conscious of as of his own existence. The desire is not free, but the choice to gratify it is and must be free." "Desire is constitutional. It is a phenomenon of the sensibility. It is a purely involuntary state of the mind, and can in itself produce no action, and can in itself have no moral character." p. 300, 301.

These extracts present with sufficient clearness Mr. Finney's doctrine on this point. With him it is a "first truth" or axiom that freedom of the will is essential to moral agency, moral obligation and moral character; that free will consists in the power to choose, in every instance, in conformity with moral obligation, and consequently that no man can be responsible for any thing but the acts of his will, or what is under the immediate

control of the will. Before proceeding to the second general principle on which his system rests, it may be proper to remark, in reference to the extracts given above and the doctrine they inculcate, 1. That Mr. Finney obviously uses the word will, in its strict and limited sense. Every one is aware that the word is often used for every thing in the mind not included under the category of the understanding. In this sense all mental affections, such as being pleased or displeased, liking and disliking, preferring, and so on, are acts of the will. In its strict and proper sense, it is the power of self-determination, the faculty by which we decide our own acts. This is the sense in which the word is uniformly and correctly used in the work before us. 2. Mr. Finney is further correct in confining causality to the will, i. e. in saying that our ability extends no farther than to voluntary acts. We have no direct control over our mental states beyond the sphere of the will. We can decide on our bodily acts and on the course of our thoughts, but we cannot govern our emotions and affections by direct acts of volitions. We cannot feel as we will. 3. In confounding liberty and ability, or in asserting their identity, Mr. Finney, as remarked on a preceding page, passes beyond the limits of first truths, and asserts that to be an axiom which the common consciousness of men denies to be a truth. 4. The fallacy of which he is guilty is very obvious. He transfers a maxim which is an axiom in one department, to another in which it has no legitimate force. It is a first truth that a man without eyes cannot be under an obligation to see, or a man without ears to hear. No blind man ever felt remorse for not seeing, nor any deaf man for not hearing. Within the sphere therefore of physical impossibilities, the maxim that obligation is limited by ability, is undoubtedly true. But it is no less obviously true that an inability which has its origin in sin, which consists in what is sinful, and relates to moral action, is perfectly consistent with continued obligation. Such is the instinctive judgment of men, such is the testimony of conscience, such the plain doctrine of the Bible, which no vehemence or frequency of contradiction or denial, has ever been able to convince sinful men is not true. They would often give the world to be assured they were not bound to be better, than an act of the will would make them.

The second radical principle of Mr. Finney's system is, That enjoyment, happiness, blessedness is the only intrinsic good,

which is to be chosen for its own sake. This is the only absolute ultimate good, other things are only relatively good as means to this end.—Hence "the highest good of being as such" is the ultimate end to be chosen. As this doctrine is asserted or implied on every page of the book, we hardly know what particular assertions to quote. The following passages must suffice as a statement of the author's doctrine. "The well being of God and the universe is the absolute and ultimate good, and therefore it should be chosen by every moral agent." "It is a first truth of reason, that whatever is intrinsically valuable should be chosen for that reason or as an end. It is and must be a first truth of reason, that whatever is intrinsically and infinitely valuable ought to be chosen as the ultimate end of existence by every moral agent." "The moral law then must require moral agents to will good, or that which is intrinsically valuable to God and the universe of sentient existences for its own sake or as an ultimate end." p. 43. "Good may be natural or moral. Natural good is synonymous with valuable. Moral good is synonymous with virtue." p. 45. "The law proposes to secure moral worth, not as an ultimate end, not as the ultimate and absolute good of the subject, but as the condition of his being rewarded with absolute good. The lawgiver and the law propose ultimate and perfect satisfaction and blessedness as a result of virtue and of moral worth. This result must be the ultimate and absolute good." May it not with just as much reason be said: a teacher proposes a good medal as the reward of proficiency in scholarship, therefore, the attainment of a good medal is the ultimate end of education? Our author however proceeds: "The reason why virtue and moral excellence or worth has been supposed to be a good in themselves, and intrinsically and absolutely valuable, is, that the mind necessarily regards them with satisfaction." p. 47. "If neither the subject of moral excellence or worth nor any one else experienced any satisfaction in contemplating it —if it did not meet a demand of our being or of any being so as to afford the least satisfaction to any sentient existence, to whom or to what would it be a good? . . . We are apt to say it is an ultimate good; but it is only a relative good. It meets a demand of our being and thus produces satisfaction. This satisfaction is the ultimate good of being." p. 48 "This satisfaction is a good in itself. But that which produces this satis-

faction, is in no proper sense a good in itself." "It is absurd to make that an ultimate good [viz. virtue] and to affirm that to be intrinsically and ultimately valuable, whose whole value consists in its relations to an ultimate good." p. 49. "In what sense of the term good, it can be ultimate. Not in the sense of moral good or virtue. This has been so often shown that it needs not be repeated here. . . . Good can be ultimate, only in the sense of natural and absolute, that is, that only can be an ultimate good, which is naturally and intrinsically valuable to being. . . . I come now to state the point upon which issue is taken, to wit: That enjoyment, blessedness, or mental satisfaction is the only ultimate good." p. 120. "Of what value is the true, the right, the just, &c. aside from the pleasure or mental satisfaction resulting from them to sentient existences?" p. 122. "The Bible knows but one ultimate good. This, as has been said, the moral law has forever settled. The highest well-being of God, and the universe is the only end required by the law. . . . The law and the gospel propose the good of being only as the end of virtuous intention.. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God and thy neighbour as thyself! Here is the whole duty of man. But here is nothing of choosing, willing, loving, truth, justice, right, utility, or beauty, as an ultimate end for their own sakes. The fact is, there are innumerable relative goods, or conditions, or means of enjoyment, but only an ultimate good. Disinterested benevolence to God and man is the whole of virtue, and every modification of love resolves itself in the last analysis into this. If this is so, well-being in the sense of enjoyment must be the only ultimate good." p. 123. "The idea of good, or of the valuable, must exist before virtue can exist. It is and must be the development of the idea of the valuable, that develops the idea of moral obligation, of right and wrong, and consequently, that makes virtue possible. The mind must perceive an object of choice, that is, regard it as intrinsically valuable, before it can have the idea of moral obligation to choose it as an end. That object of choice cannot be virtue or moral beauty, for this would be to have the idea of virtue or moral beauty before the idea of moral obligation, or right or wrong. This were a contradiction." p. 125. That is, virtue consists in the choice of what is intrinsically valuable; hence the idea of the valuable must exist before virtue; hence virtue cannot be the thing chosen, but the in-

trinsically valuable, which it is virtue to choose. Therefore enjoyment and not virtue must be the ultimate object of choice.

The theory, which maintains that there are several distinct grounds of moral obligation, that not only the good of being in general, but truth, justice, moral excellence, are each to be chosen for its own sake, he says, "Virtually flatly contradicts the law of God and the repeated declaration that love to God and our neighbour is the whole of virtue. What, does God say that all law is fulfilled in one word, Love, that is, love to God and our neighbour; and shall a Christian philosopher overlook this, and insist that we ought to love not only God and our neighbor, but to will the right and the true, and the just and the beautiful and multitudes of such like things for their own sakes? The law of God makes and knows only one ultimate end, and shall this philosophy be allowed to confuse us by teaching that there are many ultimate ends, that we ought to will each for its own sake? Nay verily." p. 147. "I might here insist upon the intrinsic absurdity of regarding right, justice, virtue, the beautiful as the ultimate good, instead of mental satisfaction or enjoyment; but I waive this point at present, and observe that either this theory resolves itself into the true one, namely, that the valuable to being, in whatsoever that value be found, is the sole foundation of moral obligation, or it is pernicious error. If it be not the true theory, it does not and cannot teach aught but error on the subject of moral law, moral obligation, and of course of morals and religion. It is either then, confusion and nonsense, or it resolves itself into the true theory just stated." p. 148.

From all this it is abundantly evident that the writer teaches, 1. That enjoyment, satisfaction, happiness, is the only intrinsic good to be chosen for its own sake. 2. That moral excellence is only a relative good having no value but as the means or condition of enjoyment.

On this doctrine we remark, 1. That it is readily admitted that happiness is a good. 2. That it is consequently obligatory on all moral agents to endeavour to promote it. 3. That the highest happiness of the universe, being an unspeakably exalted and important end, to make its attainment the object of life is a noble principle of action. 4. Consequently this theory of moral obligation is inconceivably more elevated than that which makes self-love the ultimate principle of action, and our own

happiness the highest object of pursuit. 5. That the error of the theory is making enjoyment the highest and the only intrinsic or real good. 6. That this error derives no countenance from the fact that the Bible represents love to God and love to our neighbour as the fulfilling of the law. To derive any argument from this source Mr. Finney must first take the truth of his theory for granted. To prove that all love is benevolence, it must be assumed that happiness is the only good. If love is vastly more than benevolence, if a disposition to promote happiness is only one and that one of the lowest forms of that comprehensive excellence which the scriptures call love, his argument is worth nothing. In accordance with that meaning of the term, which universal usage has given it, any out-going of the soul, whether under the form of desire, affection, complacency, reverence, delight towards an appropriate object, is in the Bible called love. To squeeze all this down, and wire-draw it through one pin hole, is as impossible as to change the nature of the human soul. Every man, not a slave to some barren theory of the understanding, knows that love to God is not benevolence: that it is approbation, complacency, delight in his moral excellence, reverence, gratitude, devotion. The reason then why the scriptures represent love as the fulfilling of the law, is twofold. First, because love to an infinitely perfect Being, involves in it approbation of all conceivable forms of moral excellence, and consequent congeniality of soul with it under all those forms. He who really loves a God of truth, justice, purity, mercy and benevolence, is himself truthful, just, holy, merciful and kind. Secondly, because love to God and man will secure all obedience to the precepts of the law. We may admit therefore that love is the fulfilling of the law, without being sophisticated into believing or rather saying, that faith is love, justice is love, patience love, humility love. Nothing is more foreign to the whole character of the Bible, than to make it speak in the language of a theory. It speaks in the language of the common consciousness of men, expecting to be understood as men would understand each other. Who can believe that any man undisciplined by metaphysics would believe that faith or humility is benevolence, the love of being as such, willing happiness for its own sake? We promised however not to discuss Mr. Finney's principles. We propose to

rely on the *reductio ad absurdum*, and make his doctrines the refutation of his principles.

The two principles to which all the important doctrines contained in this work, may be traced, are, First, that obligation is limited by ability; and secondly, that enjoyment, satisfaction or happiness is the only ultimate good, which is to be chosen for its own sake.

If these principles are correct, then it follows, First, that moral obligation, or the demands of the moral law can relate to nothing but intention, or the choice of an ultimate end. If that is right, all is right. The law can demand nothing more. That this is a fair sequence from the above principles is plain, as appears from the following statement of the case. The law can demand nothing but what is within the power of a moral agent. The power of such an agent extends no further than to the acts of the will. All the acts of the will are either choices of an end, or volitions designed to attain that end; the latter of course having no moral character except as they derive it from the nature of the end in view of the mind. Therefore all moral character attaches properly to the intention or ultimate choice which the agent forms.

This is one of the conclusions which Mr. Finney draws from the principles above stated, and which is perhaps more frequently and confidently asserted than any other in his book. "It is generally agreed that moral obligation respects strictly only the ultimate intention or choice of an end for its own sake." p. 26. "I have said that moral obligation respects the ultimate intention only. I am now prepared to say still further that this is a first truth of reason." p. 36. "All the law is fulfilled in one word, *love*. Now this cannot be true if the spirit of the law does not respect intentions only. If it extends directly to thoughts, emotions, and outward actions, it cannot be truly said that love is the fulfilling of the law. This love must be good will, for how could involuntary love be obligatory." p. 31. "Let it be remembered that moral obligation respects the choice of an ultimate end." p. 90. "Right and wrong respect ultimate intention only and are always the same. Right can be predicated only of good will, and wrong only of selfishness. . . . It is right for him to intend the highest good of being as an end. If he honestly does this, he cannot, doing this, mistake his duty, for in

doing this he really performs his whole duty." p. 149. "Moral character belongs solely to the ultimate intention of the mind, or to choice, as distinguished from volitions." p. 157. "LET IT BE BORNE IN MIND THAT IF MORAL OBLIGATION RESPECTS STRICTLY THE ULTIMATE INTENTION ONLY, IT FOLLOWS THAT ULTIMATE INTENTION ALONE IS RIGHT OR WRONG IN ITSELF, AND ALL OTHER THINGS ARE RIGHT OR WRONG AS THEY PROCEED FROM A RIGHT OR WRONG ULTIMATE INTENTION." p. 134. How strangely does this sound like the doctrine, the end sanctifies the means! Every thing depends on the intention; if that is right, all is right. We fear Mr. Finney has not recently read Pascal's Provincial Letters, a better book for distribution at Oberlin, we should be at a loss to select. When Pascal innocently begs his instructor in the mysteries of the new morality, to explain to him how it was possible to reconcile with the gospel, many things which the Jesuits allowed, the venerable father answered: "Understand then that this wonderful principle consists in *directing the intention*, the importance of which in our system of morality, is such that I should almost venture to compare it with the doctrine of probability. You have already in passing seen some features of it, in a few of the maxims already mentioned; for when I showed you how servants might, with a safe conscience, manage certain troublesome messages, did you not observe that it was simply taking off the intention from the sin itself, and fixing it on the advantage to be gained? This is what we term *directing the intention*. You saw, at the same time, that those who gave money to obtain benefices, would be really guilty of simony, without giving some such turn to the transaction. But, that you may judge of other cases, let me now exhibit this grand expedient in all its glory, in reference to the subject of murder which it justifies in a thousand cases. 'I already perceive,' replied Pascal, 'that in this way, one may do anything without exception.' 'You always go from one extreme to another,' returned the Father, 'pray stop your impetuosity. To convince you that we do not permit every thing, take this as a proof, that we never suffer the formal intention of sinning for the sake of sinning, and whoever persists in having no other design in his wickedness than wickedness itself we instantly discard. . . . When we cannot prevent the action, we at least aim to purify the intention. . . . Do you understand

me now?' 'O yes, perfectly well,' says Pascal, 'you allow men the external material action, and give to God the internal spiritual intention; and by this equitable division you aim to harmonize divine and human laws.' To prove that he correctly stated the principles of his society the Father appeals first to Reginaldus, who says: 'A warrior may instantly pursue a wounded enemy not indeed with the intention of rendering evil for evil, but to maintain his own honour.' This is not exactly the direction of the intention Mr. Finney would prescribe, but we are only illustrating the principle. Again, Lessius says: 'He who receives a blow must not indulge a spirit of revenge, but he may cherish a wish to avoid disgrace, and for this purpose repel the assault even with sword.' 'If your enemy be disposed to injure you,' says Escobar, 'you ought not to wish for his death through hatred, but you may to avoid injury.' Hurtado de Mendoza says: 'When a gentleman who is challenged to fight a duel, is known not to be remarkably pious, but daily commits sins, without the least scruple, plainly evincing that his refusal to accept the challenge does not proceed from the fear of God but from timidity, he may be called a chicken, and not a man. He may in order to preserve his honour, proceed to the appointed place, not indeed with the express intention of fighting, but only of defending himself if his enemy should attack him.' Sanchez goes still farther; for he not only allows a man to accept but to give a challenge, if he direct his intention aright, and Escobar agrees with him in this.' 'It is allowable,' says Molina, to kill false witnesses brought against us.' 'According to our celebrated Father Launy, it is lawful for priests and monks to kill others to prevent their design of injuriously calumniating them. A priest or monk is allowed to kill a calumniator who threatens to publish scandalous crimes of their society or themselves, if there exists no other means of prevention; as when just ready to propagate his malignities, if not instantly killed. For in such a case, as it would be lawful for a monk to kill a person who was desirous of taking away his life, so it is to kill him who wishes to take away his honour, or that of his fraternity, in the same manner as it is for the people of the world in general."

From these examples the doctrine of the Jesuits is very plain. Moral character pertains to the intention alone; and all other things are right or wrong as they proceed from a right or wrong

intention. This is the doctrine by which they sapped the foundations of morals and social order, and which procured, more than any other cause, their indignant rejection from the civilized world. How does Mr. Finney's doctrine differ from theirs? On p. 134, he says, in the passages just quoted, "Let it be borne in mind [it is a matter at once plain and important] that if moral obligation respects strictly the ultimate intention only, it follows that ultimate intention alone is right or wrong in itself, and all other things are right or wrong as they proceed from a right or wrong ultimate intention." The only difference here arises from the insertion of the word 'ultimate.' But we cannot see that this makes any real difference in the doctrine itself. Both parties (i. e. the Jesuits and Mr. Finney,) agree that the intention must be right, and if that is right, every thing which proceeds from it is right. The former say that the honour and welfare of the church is the proper object of intention, Mr. Finney says, the highest good of being is the only proper object. The latter however may include the former, and the Jesuit may well say, that in intending the welfare of the church he intends the glory of God and the highest good of the universe. In any event, the whole poison of the doctrine lies in the principle common to both, viz: That whatever proceeds from a right intention is right. If this is so then the end sanctifies the means, and it is right to do evil, that good may come; which is Paul's *reductio ad absurdum.*

An objection so obvious and so fatal to his system could not escape Mr. Finney's sagacity. He frequently notices it, and pronounces it self-contradictory and absurd. On p. 124, he says, "It is nonsense to object that if enjoyment or mental satisfaction be the only ground of moral obligation, we should be indifferent as to the means. This objection assumes that in seeking an end for its intrinsic value, we must be indifferent as to the way in which we obtain that end, that is, whether it be obtained in a manner possible or impossible, right or wrong. It overlooks the fact that from the laws of our own being it is impossible for us to will the end without willing also the indispensable and therefore appropriate means; and also that we cannot possibly regard any other conditions or means of the happiness of moral agents as possible, and therefore as appropriate and right, but holiness and universal conformity to the law of our being. As we said in a former lecture, enjoyment or mental satisfaction results from having the

different demands of our being met. One demand of the reason and conscience of a moral agent is that happiness should be conditionated on holiness. It is therefore naturally impossible for a moral agent to be satisfied with the happiness or enjoyment of moral agents except on the condition of their holiness."

The objection is, that if moral character attaches only to intention, then it follows that if the intention is right all that proceeds from it, must be right, and consequently that the end sanctifies the means, no matter what those means in themselves may be. Mr. Finney's answer to the objection is, 1. That it is nonsense. 2. That it cannot bear against his doctrine because he teaches that enjoyment or happiness is the only proper object of intention. 3. That it a law of reason that virtue is the condition of happiness. 4. And therefore, as it is impossible that a man should will the end without willing the means, it is impossible for him to will enjoyment without willing virtue which his reason tells him is its indispensable condition.

On this answer, which is substantially repeated in several parts of the work, we remark, 1. That it overlooks his own fundamental principle, viz: that nothing is virtue but intending the highest good. There is no moral excellence in truth, justice, holiness, except so far they are forms of that intention; anything therefore which is a form or expression of that intention, or as he says himself, that proceeds from it, is virtue. If therefore killing a man proceeds from that intention, it is a virtuous act. 2. Mr. Finney cannot say certain things are prohibited by the law of God, and are therefore wrong, no matter with what intention they are performed, because his doctrine is that law relates only to the intention; its authority extends no further. The will of God is not the foundation of any obligation. Here he has got into a deeper slough even than the Jesuits, for they hold that the law of God is not a mere declaration of what is obligatory, and so far as we know they never substitute obedience to the intelligence, as a synonymous expression with obedience to God. 3. Nor will it avail to say that if a man's intention is right, he cannot err as to the appropriate means of attaining it, because those means are infallibly revealed in the reason. For this is notoriously not the fact. The intelligence makes known only to a very limited extent, the means appropriate to secure the highest good. Hence this is a point on which men differ as

much as on any other that could well be mentioned. 4. It is a favorite doctrine of Mr. Finney and a necessary consequence of the maxim, that obligation is limited by ability, that a man's responsibility is limited by the degree of knowledge, or light which he possesses. Does it not then follow that if he has been perverted by education, or brought honestly to believe that persecution, private assassination, or any other abomination is an appropriate means to the greatest good, he is virtuous in employing those means? If the horrors of the French revolution were perpetrated with a right intention, with a purpose to promote happiness, they were lofty specimens of virtue, and Robespiere, Marat, and Danton must be enrolled as saints. Mr. Finney himself says: "No moral being can possibly blame or charge himself with any default, when he is conscious of honestly willing, or choosing, or acting according to the best light he has; for in this case he obeys the law as he understands it, and of course cannot conceive himself to be condemned by the law." p. 162. He does not seem to have any conception of that lowest state of moral degradation of which the prophet speaks, when he says of the wicked, they put good for evil, and evil for good, sweet for bitter, and bitter for sweet; or when a man is brought to the pass of saying, evil be thou my good. On the page last quoted he asserts that conscious honesty of intention, according to the light possessed, is entire obedience to moral law. And on p. 165, "If the intention is what it ought to be for the time being nothing can be morally wrong." This, as far as we can see, is the precise doctrine of the Jesuits. It is the doctrine which led to the justification of the murder of Henry the IV. of France, of the massacre of the Huguenots, and of thousands of similar enormities. We mean no disrespect when we say it would be well for Mr. Finney to read the works of the Jesuit fathers; let him see what his principles come to in the hands of wicked men, who are his equals in logical acumen and boldness, and know nothing of the restraints which his moral and religious feelings impose on him.

We consider this a fair refutation. If the principle that obligation is limited by ability, leads to the conclusion, that moral character is confined to intention, and that again to the conclusion that where the intention is right nothing can be morally wrong, then the principle is false. Even if we could not detect

its fallacy, we should know it could not be true. But we have already said the fallacy lies in applying a principle which is true in reference to physical incapacity, such as want of sight, to an inability which, though natural in one sense, is as to its character moral, i. e. arises out of the moral state of the soul. A fallacy just as gross as it would be to argue that because two portions of matter cannot occupy at one time, the same portion of space, therefore two thoughts cannot co-exist in the same mind.

A Second doctrine which flows from Mr. Finney's principles and which characterizes his whole system, concerns the foundation of moral obligation. We have seen that he holds that obligation is limited to intention, but on what does that obligation rest? why is a man bound to intend one thing rather than another? Mr. Finney answers this question by denying, 1st. That the will of God is the foundation of this obligation. Against this doctrine he urges such reasons as the following, 1. "This theory makes God's willing, commanding, the foundation of the obligation to choice or intent an ultimate end. If this is so then the willing of God is the end to be intended. For the end to be intended and the reason of the obligation, are identical." 2. God himself is under moral obligation, and therefore there is some reason independent of his own will, which imposes upon him the obligation to will as he does. 3. If the will of God is the foundation of obligation, he can by willing it change virtue into vice. 4. If the will of God is the foundation of moral obligation, we have no standard by which to judge of the moral character of his acts. 5. The will of no being can be law. Moral law is an idea of the reason.

Mr. Finney's book is made up of half-truths. It is true that the will of God divorced from his infinite wisdom and excellence, mere arbitrary will, is not the foundation of moral obligation. But the preceptive will of God, is but the revelation of his nature, the expression of what that nature is, sees to be right and approves. It is also true that some things are right because God wills or commands them, and that he wills other things because they are right. Some of his precepts, therefore, are founded on his own immutable nature, others on the peculiar relations of man, and others again upon his simple command. We can have no higher evidence that a thing is right, than the command of God, and his command creates an obligation to obedience, whether

we can see the reason of the precept or not, or whether it have any reason apart from his good pleasure. Mr. Finney is right so far as saying that the will of God, considered as irrational, groundless volition, is not the ultimate foundation of moral obligation, but his will as the revelation of the infinitely perfect nature of God, is not merely the rule, but ground of obligation to his creatures. So that their obedience does not terminate on the universe, nor on Reason, in the abstract, but upon God, the personal Reason, the infinitely perfect, and because he is the infinitely perfect.

2d. Our author denies that the divine moral excellence is the ground of moral obligation. This he pronounces to be absurd. Moral obligation respects the choice of an ultimate end. The reason of the obligation and the end chosen must be identical. Therefore what is chosen as an end, must be chosen for its own sake. But virtue being chosen as a means to an end, viz: enjoyment, cannot be the end chosen. This of course follows from the principle that enjoyment is the only intrinsic good, the only thing that should be chosen for its own sake, and other things only as they are the means or conditions of attaining that end.

We should like to ask, however, how Mr. Finney knows that happiness is a good, and a good in itself to be chosen for its own sake? If he should answer that is a first truth of reason; is it not a first truth of reason, that moral excellence is a good, and a far higher good to be chosen for its own sake? It is degraded and denied, if it be chosen simply as a means of enjoyment. If the moral idea of excellence, is not a primary, independent one, then we have no moral nature, we have a sentient and rational nature; a capacity for enjoyment, and the power of perceiving and adapting means to its attainment. We may be wise or foolish, but the ideas of wrong as wrong, and right as right, are lost. They are merged into those of wise and unwise. If God and reason affirm obligation, they affirm that virtue and vice are not terms to express the relations of certain things to enjoyment. They affirm that the one is a good in itself and the other an evil in itself; and this is the loudest affirmation in the human soul, and wo to the man in whom it ceases to be heard. No sophistry can render the conscience permanently insensible to the authority of God asserting that virtue is to be chosen for its own sake, and that it is not chosen at all, unless it be so chosen. Let this not be sup-

posed to conflict with the assertion that the will of God is also the ground of obligation. For what is the will of God? what is God, but the sum of all excellence, almighty self conscious reason and holiness. In choosing virtue for its own sake we choose God. It is one of Mr. Finney's hobbies that the ground of obligation must be one and simple. If it is the will of God, it is not his moral excellence; if his moral excellence it is not his will. This however may be safely referred to the common judgment of men. They are conscious that even entirely distinct grounds of obligation may concur; as the nature of the thing commanded, the authority of him who gives the command, and the tendency of what is enjoined. If these are considerations which affect the reason, they bind the conscience. They are the bond or ligament which "binds a moral agent to the moral law."

3d. Mr. Finney's own theory of the foundation of moral obligation is of course involved in his principle that enjoyment is the only intrinsic good. The fourth lecture is devoted to the consideration of this subject. In that lecture, after arguing to prove that the highest well-being of God and the universe is the ultimate and absolute good, and that their highest good, must be natural good or happiness, and not moral good or virtue, he comes to the conclusion that the intrinsic value of happiness is the sole foundation of the obligation to will it as the ultimate end. The conclusions from this doctrine, as stated on p. 148, are, 1. "Upon this theory moral obligation respects the choice of an ultimate end. 2. This end is an unit. 3. It is necessarily known to every moral agent. 4. The choice of this end is the whole of virtue. 5. It is impossible to sin while this end is intended with all the heart and all the soul. 6. Upon this theory every moral agent knows in every possible instance what is right, and can never mistake his real duty. 7. This ultimate intention is right, and nothing else is right more or less. 8. Right and wrong respect ultimate intention only and are always the same. Right can be predicated only of good will, and wrong only of selfishness."

We briefly remark on this theory, that it changes the whole nature of religion. Our whole and sole obligation is to the universe, and to God only as one of the constituent members of universal being. There is and can be no allegianceto God as God, and hence Mr. Finney substitutes perpetually, "obedience to the Intelligence," to an "idea of the Reason," as synony-

mous with obedience to God, or the moral law. In his whole system and of necessity God is subordinate to the universe. Again, it is of the essence of religion that love to God should include congeniality, complacency, reverence, and delight in his divine perfections. In other words, that his moral excellence should be loved and chosen for its own sake. Mr. Finney's system will not allow him to attach any other meaning to love than "good will," i. e. willing good or happiness to any one. Love of God therefore can, according to his doctrine, be nothing more than willing his happiness; and this obligation is entirely independent of his moral excellence. He admits that his moral goodness is the *condition* of our willing his actual happiness, but it is not the ground of our obligation to love him, or to will his good. As far as our *feelings* are concerned, there ought to be no difference between God and Satan—we are bound to will the happiness of each according to its intrinsic value—good-will being the whole of virtue, and good-will having no respect to the moral character of its object, there is no more virtue in loving God, (willing his good) than in loving Satan.* No one of course denies that benevolence is a virtue, but the slavery to system, to the miserable logic of the understanding, consists in asserting that it is the only virtue; that love to Christ, does not differ in its nature from benevolence to the devil, nor the love of the brotherhood from benevolence to the wicked.† As the es-

* In answer to the objection that we are under obligation "to love God because he is good, and that this affirmation has no reference to the good of God," he answers, "Such an affirmation if it is made, is most nonsensical. What is it to love God? Why, as is agreed, it is not to exercise a mere emotion of complacency in him. It is to will something to him," which of course is happiness. p. 64. "Should it be said that God's holiness is the foundation of our obligation to love him, I ask in what sense it can be so? It cannot be a mere emotion of complacency, for emotions being involuntary states of mind and mere phenomena of the sensibility are without the pale of legislation and morality," p. 91. The moral perfections of God do not even increase our obligation to love him. "We are under infinite obligation to love God and will his good with all our power because of the intrinsic value of his well-being, *whether he is sinful or holy.* Upon condition that he is holy, we are under obligation to will his actual blessedness, but certainly we are under obligation to will it with no more than all our heart, and soul, and mind and strength. But this we are required to do because of the intrinsic value of his blessedness, whatever his character may be." p. 99.

† Hence Mr. Finney says, "The command is, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. This says nothing about the character of my neighbour. It is the value

sential nature of religion is changed, perverted and destroyed by this theory, so also of course is the nature of sin. But this may be more appropriately noticed under the following head.

A third doctrine which flows from the two radical principles of this book, is that there is no moral character in the feelings or affections. This indeed is necessarily involved in what has already been said, but it is in itself so important, and so characteristic a part of the system, that it deserves a more distinct exhibition. If obligation is limited by ability, and therefore confined to acts of the will; and if the affections are neither acts of the will nor under its immediate control, it follows of course that we cannot be responsible for them, they lie "without the pale of legislation and morality." Again, if enjoyment is the only intrinsic good, then all virtue consists in benevolence, or in willing the happiness of sentient beings, and consequently there is no virtue in any state of the affections. So the same conclusion is reached in two different ways.

This consequence of his principles Mr. Finney presents on almost every page of his book. Moral obligation he says cannot directly extend to any "states of the sensibility. I have already remarked that we are conscious that our feelings are not voluntary but involuntary states of the mind. Moral obligation therefore cannot directly extend to them." p. 35. They have no more of a moral nature than outward actions. A man is responsible for his outward acts only as they are determined by the will, and in like manner he is responsible for his feelings only as they are produced or cherished by the will, or rather as the will yields to them. The whole of sin consists in allowing the will to be determined by them. In the feelings themselves there is nothing good or bad. "If any outward action or state of the feeling exists in opposition to the intention or choice of the mind, it cannot by possibility, have moral character. Whatever is beyond the control of a moral agent, he cannot be responsible for." p. 164. And therefore, "if from exhaustion, or any cause beyond our control the emotion does not arise from the consideration of the subject which is calculated to produce it, we

of his interests, of his well-being, that the law requires me to regard. It does not require me to love my righteous neighbour merely, nor to love my righteous neighbour better than I do my wicked neighbour." p. 95.

are no more responsible for the weakness or absence of the emotion, than we should be for the want or weakness of motion in our muscles, when we willed to move them." p. 165. Of course all self-condemnation for coldness, or hardness of heart, or want of right affections towards God, rests on a false philosophy, that is, arises from overlooking "that in which moral character consists." "Love may, and often does exist, as every one knows, in the form of a mere feeling or emotion. . . . This emotion or feeling, as we are aware, is purely an involuntary state of the mind; because it is a phenomenon of the sensibility, and of course a passive state of mind, it has in itself no moral character." p. 213. "Gratitude as a mere feeling or phenomenon of the sensibility, has no moral character." p. 278. The same thing is said of benevolence, compassion, mercy, conscientiousness, &c. &c. The doctrine is: "That no state of the sensibility has any moral character in itself." p. 521.

On this subject we would remark, 1. That there is a form of truth in this as in most other parts of this system; but a half-truth when presented as the whole, and especially when accompanied with the denial of the other elements which enter into the proposition, becomes a dangerous error. It is true that character depends more upon fixed purposes and principles, than it does on feelings. It is also true that the tenor of a man's life, as evincing his governing principles, is a better test of his character than mere emotions. But then what determines these fixed purposes of the soul? Unless they are determined by moral and religious considerations, they are not themselves either moral or religious. Unless our fixed determination to obey God; to devote ourselves to the promotion of his glory, flows from a due appreciation of his excellence, and from a sense of our obligations to him, it is not a religious purpose. And unless our determination that it shall be Christ for us to live, arises from an apprehension of the glory of his person and of our relation to him as the purchase of his blood, it is not a Christian purpose. It may be philanthropic or benevolent, but it is neither religious nor Christian. But 2. The scriptures, our own consciousness, and the universal judgment of men recognise those affections which terminate on moral objects as having a moral character, and therefore any theory which denies this must be false. The love of God, is essentially the love of the divine perfections, complacency and

delight in him as the infinitely good, which leads to adoration and obedience. It can hardly be denied that this is the constant representation of the Bible, and especially of its devotional parts. The Psalmist speaks of himself as longing after God, as a hart pants for the cooling waters. Whom have I in heaven, he exclaims, but thee, and there is none on earth I desire besides thee. All this Mr. Finney pronounces delusion or selfishness. When a moral agent," he says, "is intensely contemplating moral excellence, and his intellectual approbation is emphatically pronounced, the natural and often the necessary result is, a corresponding feeling of complacency and delight in the sensibility. But this being altogether an involuntary state of the mind, has no moral character." p. 224. "Indeed it is perhaps the general usage now to call this phenomenon of the sensibility love, and for want of just discrimination, to speak of it as constituting religion. Many seem to suppose that this feeling of delight in and fondness for God, is the love required by the moral law." p. 224. "It is remarkable to what extent religion is regarded as a phenomenon of the sensibility and as consisting in feeling." p. 225. "Nothing is of greater importance than forever to understand that religion is a phenomenon of the will." p. 227. The legitimate and sufficient answer to all this is that it contradicts the common consciousness of men. They know it cannot be true. If Mr. Finney says it is a first truth of reason, that it is right to will the highest good, which we admit, we say, it is a first truth of reason that compassion, benevolence, love of God, conscientiousness, gratitude, devotion, reverence, humility, repentance, as states of feeling, have a moral character. He is forced to admit that this is the common judgment, and recognised in what he calls "the popular language of the Bible." A philosophy which leads to a denial of this plain fact of consciousness, this first truth of reason, is a false philosophy.

It is obvious that a theory which reduces all virtue and religion to a simple act of the will, must lead to the same view as to the nature of sin. If virtue has no place in the affections, neither can sin have. If all religion is centred in one intention, all sin must be confined to another. If all virtue is benevolence, all sin is selfishness. But as benevolence is not an affection, but a purpose, so selfishness must be an intention. It cannot consist, the author tells us in malevolence; "it cannot consist in any state of

the intelligence or sensibility, for these, as we have seen are involuntary and depend on acts of the will." p. 286. "It must consist in the choice of self-gratification as an end." Or "sin consists in being governed by the sensibility instead of being governed by the law of God as it lies revealed in the reason." p. 287. This is a frequently recurring definition. "Benevolence is yielding the will up unreservedly to the demands of the intelligence." p. 275. "As the will must either follow the law of reason, or the impulses of the sensibility, it follows that moral agents are shut up to the necessity of being selfish or benevolent." p. 290. "Men naturally desire their own happiness and the happiness of others. This is constitutional. But when in obedience to these desires they will their own or others happiness, they seek to gratify their sensibility or desires. This is selfishness." p. 290. Of course it makes no manner of difference what the nature of the feeling is that determines the will. The sin does not lie in the nature of the feeling, but in the will's being determined by any feeling. "It matters not what kind of desire it is, if it is desire that governs the will, this is selfishness." p. 301.* It may be a desire of our own salvation, the desire of holiness, of the salvation of others, of the good of the world, of the glory of God, of the triumphs of the Lord Jesus. It matters not. It is just as selfish and as wicked to have the will determined by such desires, as by avarice, envy or malice. "The choice of any thing because it is desired is selfishness and sin." p. 305. "Some writers have fallen into the strange mistake of making virtue to consist in the gratification of certain desires, because, as they say, those desires are virtuous. They make some of the desires selfish and some benevolent. To yield the will to the control of the selfish propensities is sin. To yield the will to the control of the benevolent desires, such as the desire of my neighbours' happiness, and the public happiness, is virtue, because these are good desires, while the selfish desires are evil. Now this has been a very common view of virtue and vice. But it is fundamentally erroneous. None of the constitutional desires are good or evil in themselves. They are all alike involuntary and terminate on their correlated objects. To yield the will to the

*The sinner may "feel deeply malicious and revengeful feelings towards God; but sin does not consist in these feelings or necessarily imply them." p. 296.

control of any one of them, no matter which, is sin." p. 503. Mr. Finney is beautifully consistent in all this, and in the consequences, which of necessity flow from his doctrine. He admits that if a man pays his debts from a sense of justice, or feeling of concientiousness, he is therein and therefor just as wicked as if he stole a horse.* Or if a man preaches the gospel from a desire to glorify God and benefit his fellow men, he is just as wicked for so doing as a pirate.† We may safely challenge Hurtado de Mendoza, Sanchez, or Molina to beat that.

It passes our comprehension to discover why the will being determined by the desire to honour God is selfishness and sin, while its being determined by the desire of the highest good is virtue. It is as much determined by desire in the one case as in the other. Mr. Finney says indeed that in the one case it is determined by the intelligence, and in the other, by the sensibility. But reason as much dictates that we should honour God, as that we should seek the happiness of the universe. And the will is as much decided by the intelligence in the one case as in the other. The only way in which the intelligence can determine the will is, that the truth which the intelligence contemplates, whether it be the value of the well-being of the universe, or the excellence of God, awakens the corresponding desire or feeling of right, fitness or obligation, and that determines the will. If the will is not determined by a desire to secure the happiness of the universe, what benevolence is there in such a determination?

Mr. Finney's principles lead him to assert that there is no difference in their feelings between the renewed and the unrenewed, the sinner and the saint. "The sensibility of the sinner," he says, "is susceptible of every kind and degree of feeling that is possible to saints." p. 521. He accordingly goes on to

*"He may be prevented (committing commercial injustice) by a constitutional or phrenological conscientiousness, or sense of justice. But this is only a feeling of the sensibility, and if restrained only by this, he is just as absolutely selfish, as if he had stolen a horse in obedience to acquisitiveness." p. 317.

†"If the selfish man were to preach the gospel, it would be only because upon the whole it was most pleasing or gratifying to himself, and not at all for the sake of the good of being as an end. If he should become a pirate, it would be for exactly the same reason. . . . Whichever cause he takes, he takes it for precisely the same reason; and with the same degree of light it must involve the same degree of guilt." p. 355.

show that sinners may desire sanctification, delight in the truth, abhor sin, have complacency in good men, entertain feelings of love and gratitude to God, and in short, be as to feeling and conduct, exactly what saints are. The only essential difference is in the will, in their ultimate purpose or intention. The sinner's ultimate intention may be to promote the glory of God, from a sense of duty, or from appreciation of the loveliness of moral excellence, and he be no better than a pirate; if his ultimate end is to promote happiness because happiness is intrinsically valuable, he is a saint.*

A Fourth doctrine flowing from Mr. Finney's fundamental principles, is that every man must, at any given moment, be either totally depraved, i. e. as wicked as it is possible for him, with his knowledge, to be, or perfectly holy. This is a conclusion which it would appear he finds some difficulty in persuading his friends to adopt. They receive the premises, they admit the validity of many other sequences from them, but this is rather more than they are prepared for. Mr. Finney is right, and he knows it. He has them in his power, and he commands them to follow wherever he and the "Intelligence" lead. If the Intelligence deceives us here, we can never know truth from error. If obligation is limited by ability; if ability extends only to acts of the will; if the acts of the will are confined to the choice of ends and means; and if the choice of means has no moral character but from the nature of the end chosen, it follows that all morality is confined to the choice of an end. If the right end is chosen, the agent discharges his whole duty; he fulfills the single command of law and reason. If he chooses the wrong end, he commits all the sin, of which he is capable. The only respect in which one moral agent can be either better or worse than another, is as one has more ability than another. A child has not the knowledge or strength of a man, nor a man of an

* "Whether he [the unrenewed man] preach and pray, or rob and plunder upon the high seas, he does it only for one end, that is for precisely the same reason, [viz. to gratify some feeling;] and of course his sinfulness is complete in the sense that it can only be varied by varying light. This I know is contrary to the common opinion, but it is the truth and must be known; and it is of the highest importance that these fundamental truths of morality and of immorality should be held up to the minds of all." p. 355. On the same page we are taught, that if a man abstains from any thing "because it is wicked" it is selfish, because the will is determined by "phrenological conscientiousness."

angel. It is not required therefore, of the child to have so high an estimate of the value of "the good of being," as a man should have, nor of a man that he should have the comprehensive and consequent strength of intention of an angel. If ability limits obligation, all that can be required is, that a moral agent should will the highest good with an intensity proportioned to his honest conviction of its value. That is "with conscious honesty of intention." This is all an angel can do, and it is perfection in him. It is all a converted pirate can do, and it is perfection in him.

Again, if happiness or enjoyment is the only real good, to intend the highest enjoyment of sentient beings is the whole of virtue, to intend our own gratification is the whole of sin. It is impossible that these intentions should co-exist in the mind. If a man intends the one, he does not intend the other. If all morality centres in this ultimate intention, he must, therefore, at any given moment, be perfectly sinful or perfectly holy. This is a severe dose of logic, but Mr. Finney will not tolerate even a wry face in swallowing it.

"The new or regenerate heart cannot sin. It is benevolence, love to God and man. This cannot sin. These are both ultimate choices or intentions, they are from their own nature efficient, each excluding the other, and each securing for the time being, the exclusive use of means to promote its end. To deny this, is the same absurdity as to maintain, either that the will can at the same time choose two opposite ends, or that it can choose one end only, but at the same time choose the means to accomplish another end not yet chosen. Now either alternative is absurd. Then holiness and sin can never co-exist in the same mind. Each, as has been said, for the time being, necessarily excludes the other. Selfishness and benevolence co-exist in the same mind! A greater absurdity and a more gross contradiction was never conceived or expressed." p. 310. This is sound logic, and therefore we must either admit that every man is either perfectly holy or entirely sinful, at any given time, or we must deny that moral obligation is confined to intention; and if we deny that, we must of course admit, that feelings or states of the sensibility may have a moral character, and if we concede that point, we must concede that obligation is not limited by ability, and then the great Diana of the Ephesians has fallen.

This doctrine of the simplicity or unity of moral character is

very prominently presented in this work. In Lecture xi. the main proposition contended for is: "Moral character is wholly right or wholly wrong, and never partly right and partly wrong at the same time." p. 156. In Lecture xxviii., he says: "This conducts us to the conclusion or truth to be demonstrated, namely: That moral agents are at all times either as holy or sinful as with their knowledge they can be." p. 354.

We have little space to devote to remarks on this subject, and surely little need be said. The doctrine of course rests on a false apprehension of the nature of sin and holiness, and of the grounds and extent of our obligations. Our own conscience and the Bible teach us that we are bound to be completely conformed to the law or image of God; that in whatever respect or degree we fall short of that standard of excellence is sin; and that the law of God exhibits what rational beings ought to be, not what they can be, not what they have plenary power at any moment to make themselves, but what they would be and would at all times have power to be, were it not for their sinfulness. No man, according to the standard of conscience and the Bible, is perfect, who is not perfectly like Christ, or has not attained to "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ;" who has not the same love, reverence, humility, patience, long-suffering, mercy, that were in him. It shocks the moral sense of men to say that a pirate, with all his darkness of mind as to God, and divine things, with all his callousness, with all the moral habits of a life of crime, becomes perfectly holy, by a change of will, by forming a new intention, by mere honesty of purpose. If the demands of God thus rapidly sink with the increasing depravity of men, as has often been remarked, the shortest road to perfection is the most debasing course of crime. 2. Need any reader of the Bible be reminded that the consciousness of sin, of present corruption and unworthiness, is one of the most uniform features of the experience of God's people as there recorded? 3. Or is there any one point in which Christian experience in all ages of the church is more strongly pronounced, than in this sense of sin and consequently humiliation under it? In opposition to the common consciousness of men, to the plainest teachings of the scriptures, and to the experience of the people of God, we are called upon to believe that "honest intention" is the whole of duty and religion, if we have that, we are perfect. If this is a

false doctrine, no one can fail to see, what its effects must be. If a man thinks himself perfect, if he says, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knows not that he is wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked, his situation is most deplorable. Mr. Finney is well aware that his doctrine changes the whole nature of religion; and hence his frequent denunciations of the false philosophy and pretended orthodoxy, by which religion has been perverted and the church corrupted. And certain it is that religion, as represented by him, is something exceedingly different from what good people in all ages have commonly regarded it. We should have to provide a new language, new hymns, new prayers, and especially a new Bible. It is useless however to continue these remarks. If a man can believe that every human being is either perfectly sinful or perfectly holy, he can believe anything. And a theory that leads to this conclusion, is thereby exploded, and its fragments need hardly be looked after.

Of course Mr. Finney teaches that full or perfect obedience to the moral law is the condition of salvation, now and ever. There is not a passage in the Bible he says, which intimates that men are saved or justified "upon conditions short of personal holiness or a return to full obedience to the moral law." p. 366. Any man, therefore, conscious of coming short of perfection, has sure evidence that he is not justified. "As the moral law is the law of nature, it is absurd to suppose that entire obedience to it should not be the unalterable condition of salvation." p. 364. Regeneration therefore is declared to be "AN INSTANTANEOUS CHANGE FROM ENTIRE SINFULNESS TO ENTIRE HOLINESS." p. 500.

This work has interested us principally on two accounts. First, as an illustration of the abject slavery to which the understanding, when divorced from the Bible, and from the other constituents of our nature, reduces those who submit themselves to its authority. One would think that history furnished examples enough of the consequences of following such a guide, to deter others from repeating the experiment. Secondly, Mr. Finney's book is the best refutation that can well be given of the popular theology current in many parts of our country. How long have we been accustomed to hear that inability is incompatible with obligation, and that happiness is the highest good. Grant Mr. Finney these principles, and he need ask you no further favours.

You must follow him to all his conclusions. He has had the strength and the boldness to carry them out to their legitimate consequences. And here they are. You must either take them, or give up the principles whence they flow. We heartily thank our author for having brought matters to this alternative.

SHORT NOTICES.

ART. VII.—*The Bible, the Rod, and Religion in Common Schools.—The Ark of God on a New Cart;* a Sermon by Rev. M. Hale Smith.—*A Review of the Sermon,* by Wm. B. Fowle, Publisher of the Mass. Common School Journal.—*Strictures on the Sectarian Character of the Common School Journal,* by a member of the Mass. Board of Education.—*Correspondence between the Hon. Horace Mann, Secretary of the Board of Education, and Rev. Matthew Hale Smith.* Boston. 1847. 8vo. pp. 59.

THE copious title of this pamphlet furnishes an accurate catalogue of its contents. Its history may be stated somewhat more fully thus. Mr. Smith, who is well known as a convert from Universalism, preached a sermon in Boston on the 10th of October, 1846, which was reported at considerable length in the Boston Recorder. The text (2 Sam. vi. 3, *And they set the ark of God upon a new cart,*) creates an expectation of quaintness which the sermon does not realize, the text being simply used to introduce the sentiment that "a right thing must not be done in a wrong way." This is specially applied to the modern separation of moral reforms from religion. The increase of crime is affirmed upon the ground of the growing profanation of the Sabbath, a general relapse into intemperance, a new boldness in crime, especially among the young. After denying that all this evil can be attributed to "rumselling," the preacher assigns as it real causes, the divorce of temperance from religion, a morbid sympathy with crime, the absence of domestic instruction, and the irreligious character of public education, as evinced by the effort to exclude the Bible and the rod from public schools, in

which the Massachusetts Board of Education is charged with aiding, through its Agent (Horace Mann,) and through its Library, in which evangelical doctrines are proscribed and Universalism taught. In further illustration of the fruits of this decline, the preacher mentions the decay of parental authority, the delivery of atheistical lectures in the Boston Lyceum, and the actual corruption of morals in the public schools.

This sermon called forth a violent reply from the publisher and joint-editor of the Common School Journal, in which it is described as "a tissue of impudence and ignorance," and its author as "a knave or an idiot, or both;" "the Abinadab" who, instead of the ark, "should have had the ride in a cart," i. e. as he explains it afterwards, "in a cart that would leave him standing, as his whole sermon stands, on nothing." The unusual ferocity of this attack may perhaps be explained by one of its allusions to the Hebrew code, according to which "a renegade was to be stoned." As to the matter in dispute, it is alleged that the Board of Education is composed of two Orthodox Baptists, four Orthodox Congregationalists, one Episcopalian, one Unitarian, and one Universalist; that the Board has required the Bible to be used in the only schools under its direct control; that it has never recommended the entire disuse of the rod; that more than half the public teachers in Boston, and nineteen-twentieths out of it, are Orthodox and under Orthodox control; and that no such books as Mr. Smith describes are among those recommended by the Board. This, with reiterated charges of "unfairness," "falsehood," and "a weakness common to changelings," makes up Mr. Fowle's reply.

Before its appearance Mr. Mann had written to Mr. Smith, calling upon him to avow or disavow the report of his sermon, and to substantiate or withdraw his charges, in the meantime affirming that the whole influence of the Board of Education had been to get the Bible into the Common Schools instead of out of them, and to uphold the use of the rod when other measures of restraint had failed.

Mr. Smith, in reply, disclaims any personal attack on Mr. Mann, but vindicates his right to question his proceedings as a public servant and the organ of the Board. As authorities for his own allegations he refers to Mr. Mann's reports, journals, lectures, and speeches in conventions. On this authority he

charges him with aiming to change the system of common school education, so as to exalt the intellectual above the moral, and man above God, with excluding the Bible as a whole, while admitting parts, with discountenancing "religious instruction" in the sense attached to those words by nine-tenths of professing Christians, and with furnishing books for "Sabbath reading" from which all that savours of evangelical truth is carefully removed.

In his second letter, Mr. Mann complains that Mr. Smith had only repeated when he should have proved his charges, and again affirms that the Bible was never so extensively used in the common schools as at the present time. To Mr. Smith's question whether he approves of the whole Bible as a school-book, he replies that he has no right to ask it, and that he believes the Bible to make known the rule of life and the means of salvation. To the question whether he admits the rod as a principal means of correction, he dwells chiefly on an error of orthography (*principle* for *principal*,) affecting to be doubtful which was meant, but after all admits the truth of Mr. Smith's statement. Of "religious instruction" he declares himself in favour, "to the extremest verge to which it can be carried, without invading those rights of conscience, which are established by the laws of God, and guarantied to us by the Constitution of the State." As to the charge of teaching Universalism, he still calls for proof, if the accuser would hereafter be believed; as to the exclusion of evangelical truth, he says, "what then must 'evangelical religion' be?"

Mr. Smith in his second letter, takes for granted that the Board of Education is responsible for its Agent and its Library, and then declares, on the authority of private testimony, that Mr. Mann does not acknowledge the whole Bible to be the inspired word of God, or all its parts proper to be read in schools. As to the rod, he avails himself of Mr. Mann's concession, and further shows from his reports, that corporal punishment is always represented as a necessary evil, the necessity of which we should endeavour to remove. As to religious instruction he quotes from the publications of the Board their language with respect to the Sabbath and the doctrine of depravity, and from a private conversation of Mr. Mann, his admission that all appeal to a future state of rewards and punishments must be excluded

as sectarian. Similar charges are made against the common school library and backed by quotations. The rest of the letter is occupied with an assertion of the right to call these acts in question, and an appeal to secular authorities in favour of thorough Christian education.

We have thought that an abstract of this correspondence might be interesting to our readers, who are fully aware of the importance of the questions at issue, and can appreciate the arguments here urged, without the aid of any comment upon our part.

The ability and power of writing, manifested upon both sides, are greatly above mediocrity. Even the furious assault of Mr. Fowle is a strong and pointed composition. That Mr. Smith should reckon it "so foul a production" as to soil his pages, is entirely natural. The style of Mr. Mann is clear, deliberate and dignified. Our readers are already acquainted with the point and terseness of Mr. Smith's. Its faults lie chiefly in the figurative passages, as when he speaks of a system planted on a base and there outriding storms and convulsions. (p. 49.) But that he can excel, even in this style, is clear from the felicitous allusion which concludes the correspondence. Speaking of the charge of opposition to improvement and antiquated prejudice, he says it might as well be alleged, "that all who censure the conduct of Capt. Hoskins in the wreck of the Great Britain, disparage the model of that steamer, deride all improvement in naval architecture, and wish to throw navigation back to the point it had reached in the time of Christopher Columbus." He then carries out the illustration thus suggested. "Her model is splendid—her equipments of the first order—her destination hopeful. Safe hands are not at the tiller—the chart is unstudied—rash experiments are made—the open sea, the usual, the safe path, is abandoned for a shorter cut and a quicker trip. Her speed at the outset promised well; but when no one thought of danger—while all on board were buoyant and joyous in the confident belief that their route was the safest and the best—the good ship, in all her glory, was hard and fast in Dundrum Bay—a splendid wreck on the Irish coast." We sincerely wish that the end in the ideal case may be as satisfactory as that which seems, by the latest advices, to be anticipated in the real one.

Sketches of North Carolina, Historical and Biographical, Illustrative of the principles of a portion of her early settlers, By Rev. Wm. Henry Foot. New York: Robert Carter, 58 Canal Street. 1846.

We have been greatly entertained, and instructed by these sketches of North Carolina History. Of the leading events, we had some knowledge before; but we find them here more minutely stated, and derived from more authentic sources than any to which we have had access. Some of the scenes described are of a very interesting and stirring nature; and they are given by Mr. Foot, in a very lively style. The size of the volume, at first intimidated us; but when we commenced reading, we found so much to engage attention, that we could not be satisfied without going over the whole.

The plan of the author has necessarily led to considerable repetition; as he brings the same actors on the stage, in very different connexions; but though this swells the size of the volume, it can scarcely be said to be a fault; for we become so deeply interested in the leading personages brought on the stage, that we are glad, after some acquaintance, to meet them again. We are surprized at the amount of authentic information which Mr. Foot has been able to collect; much of which would soon have been irrecoverably lost. The future historian of that state, will find in this volume a rich treasure of facts, on the authenticity of which dependence may be placed.

So much has been written and spoken respecting the Pilgrims of New England, and so little about people of a different origin; that the impression on the public mind seems to be, that all that was valuable in our population was to be ascribed to this single source. It was, therefore, gratifying to us who claim our descent from the Caledonian race, to find a son of the Pilgrims coming forward with noble disinterestedness to do justice to another race of people, nearly as numerous as the Pilgrims, and in intelligence, stern integrity, and indomitable energy and patriotism, not surpassed by any people in the United States.

The number of the people of this country, who have derived their origin from the Scotch Irish, cannot be easily ascertained, for two reasons; first, because they did not settle in a body, like

the people of New England, and lower Virginia, but in various parts of the country; and secondly, because they have possessed, in an uncommon degree, an emigrating spirit. They have been the pioneers in the settlement of most of our territories and new states, in the south and west. We are acquainted with some places in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, which at first were almost entirely populated by immigrants from the North of Ireland, in which, at present, there is scarcely to be found a family of that race. This has been owing to the disposition of this people to emigrate in quest of new countries and more fertile lands. This, it must be acknowledged, has had a tendency to retard the march of improvement, and often to break up religious societies in the older states. There has been, however, a compensation in the benefits conferred on the new countries, by the settlement of enterprizing, religious, and industrious men. The progress of the Scotch Irish race, and the number of the descendants from this stock, may, in some degree, be measured by the progress and numbers of the Presbyterian church, in the United States; for it may be asserted, that nine-tenths of this large denomination, including all its branches and divisions, are of the Scotch Irish race. The immigration of this people into America, did not commence until nearly a century after the arrival of the Cavaliers in Virginia, and the Pilgrims in New England. Their first settlement was in the states of Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. The great majority of the first settlers in the south-eastern counties of Pennsylvania, were of this race; and when the Cumberland Valley could be safely inhabited by the whites, it was speedily filled up by this enterprising people. The same population pushed along this fertile valley through Maryland and Virginia, where for a while, they had almost entire possession. And various settlements were formed by them in other parts of Virginia, as on Rockfish, Cub Creek, Buffalo in Prince Edward, and in the county of Campbell, where a large congregation, named Concord, made an early settlement.

North Carolina, in its upper parts, opened a wide field for the numerous emigrants of this restless people; and a very full account is given in this volume of their settlement in various parts of that state. One reason why so many resorted to that state was, that there were no hostile tribes of Indians in that region; but on the western borders of Pennsylvania and Virginia, the incursions of

the savage foe were frequent, and their massacres heart-rending. Whole congregations, after fixing their abode in the Cumberland Valley, were driven off by the Indians, and obliged to seek another home. Mr. Sankey's congregation, who settled with him in Prince Edward county, Va., were obliged to fly from their homes near to Harrisburg or Carlisle, by the frequent incursions of the savages. And Mr. Craighead's congregation on the Cowpasture river, in Virginia, were under the necessity of removing to North Carolina.

But when the French war was ended, and peace made with the Indians, or the more hostile tribes driven beyond the Ohio, the tide of emigration turned westward, and the counties in the west of Pennsylvania were rapidly filled up with a Scotch Irish population; and in this region there is now, probably, a more dense and unmixed population of this race, than anywhere else in the United States; unless the counties of Rockingham, Augusta, Rockbridge and Bottetourt, &c., in the Great Valley of Virginia, be an exception. But a large portion of the first settlers in Georgia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Ohio, were of Scotch Irish descent. In short, with a few exceptions, wherever you find Presbyterians, there you find the descendants of the Scotch Irish.

It has often occurred to us, that it would be a desirable thing, to have prepared, an accurate account of the people of the different nations, who have contributed to the population of these United States; and the peculiar traits of character which belong to each race. Unless this work be undertaken soon, the materials for it will be out of reach: and we cannot think of any person who would be likely to perform such a work more satisfactorily, than the author of these sketches. And we are of opinion, that it would be found very interesting in the execution. We want a better account, than has yet been given, of the origin and character of our German population, which, next to the English, is the most numerous; and the prospect, from the abundant emigration of late years is, that the descendants of the Germans will equal those of any other nation in these United States.

The Dutch or Hollanders, are also a very interesting people, and form a compact body along both sides of the Hudson; but the Dutch have not been actuated, like the Irish, with a migratory spirit;

they remain, for the most part, on the soil first occupied on their arrival in this country.

In such a view of the origin of the American people, no class would deserve a more particular attention than the Huegonots and their descendants. They are more numerous, than at first view would be supposed. Driven from their homes in France by a cruel persecution, solely on account of their firm adherence to the Protestant religion, they found an asylum in several of the states of this Union; in South Carolina, Virginia, and New York, they were numerous, and the names of some of our most honored families, indicate a descent from this race. Many years since, we heard a sensible man observe, that a special providence seemed to attend this persecuted race; and he enumerated a great many men of distinction, several of whom had risen to high stations in the government, who were descendants of the Huegonots, and as far as is known, they have been uniformly the friends and supporters of the Christian religion, and of civil liberty.

Personal Declensions and Revivals of Religion in the Soul. By the Rev. Octavius Winslow, author of the Experimental and Practical view of the work of the Holy Spirit, and the Atonement, &c. Robert Carter, 58 Canal street, New York, and 56 Market street, Pittsburg.

We have not, in the multitude of books which issue from the press, many works on experimental and practical religion. All the publications of Mr. Winslow seem to be of this description; and are written with judgment and feeling. They will be relished by the experienced Christian; and the little volume, now noticed, can scarcely be read by any professor without benefit. In this age of declining spirituality, it is a very seasonable work; and the Christian public are much indebted to Mr. Carter for giving wide circulation to this and other sound treatises, calculated to be eminently useful to the churches in this land.

Thomae Bradwardini, Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, De Causa Dei, Contra Pelagium et De Virtute Causarum, Tres Libri.

Bradwardine lived in the early part of the fourteenth century. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford, and was

justly esteemed one of the most learned men of the age; for he was not only a great theologian, but was distinguished for his mathematical and philosophical science. This book, when published, was received with universal applause; and while Thomas Aquinas obtained the title of the *angelic* doctor, and Scotus, that of the *subtle* doctor, Bradwardine was honoured by the pope, with that of the *profound* doctor; which he well deserved, for he has discussed the abstruse subjects of Predestination, Free-will, the nature and necessity of grace, and the operation of second causes, with profound wisdom, and clear discrimination. The reading of this Augustinian work against Pelagius, would change the opinion of many respecting the state of learning in the fourteenth century.

De Veritate Christianae Religionis Liber, Adversus Atheos, Epicureos, Ethnicos, Judæos, Mahumedistas, et Caeteros Infideles, a Philippo Morneo, Plessiei Domino, Nobili Gallo, Gallicè primum Conscriptus, nunc autem ab eodem. Latine Versus. Antwerp, Ex officina Christopheri Plantini. A. D. 1583.

Mornay Duplessis, was a Frenchman, and by the acknowledgment of all, one of the ablest defenders, and greatest ornaments of the Reformation. He was born in 1549, was descended from an ancient and noble family. His father died when he was a child, and his mother having openly embraced the reformed religion, had her son carefully educated in the principles of the same. He was also furnished with the best teachers in every department of literature and science; and as his genius was extraordinary, his proficiency was uncommon. At first he made choice of the military profession, but having received a serious bodily injury, he relinquished the pursuit of arms. And France being exceedingly disturbed by civil wars, he retired, first into Switzerland, then went into Italy, and spent some time at Rome, where he was in much peril, on account of his religion. For some time he sojourned at Frankfort, but made excursions to all the principal cities of northern Europe. In 1572 he passed over into England, and was well received by Elizabeth and her court. In 1579, Mornay married and settled himself in his native country. Henry, Prince of Navarre, invited him to his court, and paid great attention to his advice. He also employed

him to go to England, to solicit the aid of queen Elizabeth to the Protestant cause. He was also sent as the ambassador of the Prince to the diet of Augsburg, in 1579. And when Henry, for political reasons, was inclined to become a Roman Catholic, Mornay steadily opposed the measure; and when the prince actually went over to the cause which he had so zealously fought against, this distinguished man withdrew from his court. Though so much occupied with public business, much of his time was spent in severe study. This great work, "De Veritate," he published about 1580; and it was the first work in defence of Christianity, written after the reformation; and in learning it is surpassed by none which succeeded it.

Hieronymi Epistolæ. The copy of this work, which has recently been added to the library of the Theological Seminary at this place, is a curiosity on account of its age and its perfect state of preservation. For, although it has no title page, the date of the impression is given at the close of the book; and the year is 1480, just three years before Luther was born. It is a large folio, the paper very thick and strong, and what is very remarkable, although the book is now 367 years old, the paper retains its white colour without stains, and is not in the least worm-eaten. The present binding is very strong, but evidently not the original covering of the book. Judging from the past, we see no reason why this volume may not last a thousand years to come, if taken good care of. The type is large, and very distinct and regular, with the usual abbreviations of that period.

An Address, delivered on the evening of the twenty-second of February, 1847, before the Young Men's Association of the city of Albany. By William B. Sprague, D.D. Published by request of the Executive Committee. Albany: Printed by Joel Munsel. 1847.

This address, like the other writings of its author, is written in an easy, perspicuous, and flowing style. Its object is to hold up Washington as an object of study and contemplation to young men of the present generation. The traits of character of this great man, selected for consideration, are such as are prominently exhibited in his "Farewell Address," and are happily calculated to make a salutary impression on the audience to whom they were addressed.

The Explanatory Bible Atlas and Scripture Gazetteer, Geographical, Topographical, and Historical, containing maps of all the Countries and places mentioned in the Old and New Testament, drawn from the latest authorities, and engraved expressly for the Work, with Illustrative Essays for each map, and accurate local descriptions in the Gazetteer; a coloured Missionary Map of the World; a Dictionary of the Natural History of the Bible, with Engravings, Tables of Time, Weights, Measures, Tabular Views, &c. By the Rev. William Jenks, D.D., Editor of the Comprehensive Bible, and Vice President of the American Oriental Society. Boston: Published by Charles Hickling. 1847.

This work, from the pen of the laborious and learned Dr. Jenks, of Boston, supplies an important desideratum in Biblical literature. It will be found to afford great facilities to the theological student, and to the expositor of the sacred scriptures. Matters, which the student of the Bible had to search for in many volumes, are here presented in a condensed form, in a volume of moderate size. We think, therefore, that it will find its place on the table of all those who aim at an accurate acquaintance with the various contents of the holy scriptures.

The Revival in School; a sequel to "the Great Secret Discovered" by Joseph Alden, D.D., author of "the Light Hearted Girl," "the Burial of the First Born," "Elizabeth Benton," "Example of Washington," &c. New York: M. W. Dodd, Publisher, Brick Church Chapel, opposite the City Hall. 1847.

The great excellence of this book consists in its happy mode of imparting to young persons, correct views of important theological truths. Without some knowledge of these, there can be no religion. Parents and teachers should remember this, and carefully select and place before the children committed to their care, such aids as would enable them when under the Spirit's influence, to look to "the Door" at the entrance of the narrow way. The little volume before us, is admirably adapted to this end; and though unpretending, is evidently the offspring of a highly gifted and discriminating mind. We should be glad to see a second sequel delineating in the same pleasing style, the ingathering and subsequent deportment of the converts.

The Wycliffites, or England in the Fifteenth Century. By Mrs. Colonel Mackay, authoress of "the Family at Heatherdale," etc., etc. New York: Robert Carter. 1847. 12mo. pp. 424.

This is a fictitious narrative, intended to display the principles and influence of the early English reformation, rather than the personal history of Wiclif. It appears to be written with an evangelical spirit, and with a sincere desire to procure entrance for the truth into minds which will not attend to dissertations or sermons.

Tales of the Scottish Peasantry. By the Rev. Henry Duncan, D.D., and others. New York: Robert Carter. 1847. 18mo. pp. 321

A book of true stories, relating to common life and to religion, is always welcome. Such is this volume, chiefly from the pen of the late excellent Dr. Duncan. The narratives are interesting and instructive; and the book will be eagerly sought by the young. No peasantry in the world is more deserving of study, than that of Scotland. The reader may be assured that he will meet with nothing to offend sound morals or scriptural belief.

History of the American Lutheran Church, from its commencement in the year of our Lord 1685, *to the year* 1842; *etc., etc.* By Ernest L. Hazelius, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Lutheran Synod of South Carolina. Zanesville, O: 1846. 12mo. pp. 295.

It is sufficient to name the subject and the author, in order to gain respect for this volume. The large and increasing branch of the church, which is here portrayed, must awaken more and more attention, every day. Such is the extraordinary growth of the German population, that he who continues to neglect it must be an ignorant or a selfish man. Dr. Hazelius has given us a perspicuous view of the rise and progress of American Lutheranism; and has done this in a spirit of marked liberality. We earnestly hope that the opinions which he expresses, on the use of the English Language, may command the attention of those to whom they principally relate. It is to be regretted, that the author has not presented more fully, in a tabular form, suited to easy reference, the whole statistics of the Lutheran Church. As it is, the volume is our best extant resource, on this point.

Select Treatises of Martin Luther, in the original German, with Philological Notes, and an Essay on German Etymology. By B. Sears. Andover: Allen, Morrill and Wardwell. 1846. 12mo. pp. 382.

The idea of this book is felicitous. We regard it as the most valuable aid to German studies which has appeared in America. In every language, the true method is to begin with the fountains of literature. Luther is not only the master-mind of Germany, but the moulder of the modern German tongue. The tracts have the highest intrinsic value, and are elucidated by the annotations of a genuine scholar. We would not for an instant hesitate to give this book the preference to any manual for beginners, which we have ever seen.

Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans; with remarks on the Commentaries of Dr. Macknight, Professor Moses Stuart, and Professor Tholuck. By Robert Haldane, Esq. From the fifth Edinburgh edition. New York: Robert Carter. 1847. 8vo. pp. 746.

The fact that five editions of this work have been demanded in Scotland, indicates the estimation in which it is there held. The character of the exposition is well known to the religious public. It is not one of the critical commentaries for the learned, in which reference is constantly had to the original text, but rather a book for continuous perusal; and it is well adapted to this end. Mr. Haldane was a Calvinist of the old stamp. In no single instance known to us, does he accede to any lax interpretation. His interest is everywhere a dogmatical one, hence in a text or two, he interprets in a manner which though eminently orthodox is to our mind inexact. Yet the volume presents as we think, not only a sound, but an able vindication of the Pauline argument; and presents it in a way suited to arrest and convince the common mind, even more than erudite commentaries. We would point out the exposition of the seventh chapter, as an unanswerable vindication of the orthodox interpretation.

As might be inferred from the title page, Mr. Haldane gives no quarter to the errors of Professors Tholuck and Stuart. On almost every page he strikes at them, and we think with effect: but so determined is he that not a particle of good shall be admitted in an errorist, that he finds fault with some of our hum-

ble labours, in which we praise the learned Professor, while he cites and adopts our animadversions. We can pardon the unrelenting zeal of Mr. Haldane against Arminian and kindred errors. His long-continued and successful labours for the truth, on the continent of Europe, had brought him to the fullest view of that progress towards Neology, of which we see the beginnings in America, as he did even in Scotland. As early as 1816, Mr. Haldane visited Geneva, then almost in total darkness. Good Mr. Malan however raised his voice about this time. Mr. Haldane became the instructor of a number of young students, using this very Epistle as his text-book. During the winter of 1816-17 almost all the theological students attended his expositions, thrice a week. Of these a number seem to have been truly converted; some of whom, as Rieu, Gonthier, and Henri Pyt, have entered into rest. The tone of Mr. Haldane's teachings (which is also the tone of this volume) might be judged from the following characteristic sentences: "It was not by avoiding controverted subjects, and simply dwelling on truths common to professing Christians, as some good men have recommended as the proper course to be pursued on the Continent, that I laboured to raise up the fallen standard of the gospel at Geneva. It was, on the contrary, by not shunning to declare the whole counsel of God, so far as I was enabled to do so; it was by dwelling on every doctrine of the Bible, whether it was controverted or not, or however repulsive to the carnal mind, and by confronting and bringing to the test of scripture every argument levelled at my instructions by both pastors and professors." In a word, Mr. Haldane is a genuine Scottish Calvinist, with all the strong traits, which go to make up that character. Though a Baptist, he dos not urge his opinions indecorously. Where he thinks a man in error, he makes conscience of never giving him a good word. On the other hand he manifests an overweening fondness for Dr. Carson, an inflated and arrogant writer. These are specks, however, on the surface of a mirror, which reflects broadly the light of free, sovereign, abounding grace. The argumentation of the work is masculine. Its uniform tendency is to depress man, and exalt Christ. Its circulation among us will do good, in uprooting new divinity, and counteracting false views of this epistle. By throwing into one compact volume, that which fills three in the British editions, Mr. Carter has done a good service to his readers.

In one respect, Mr. Haldane's book is eminently deserving of commendation: it is fitted to be read uninterruptedly, in private or aloud, as much as any sermon or essay. It is everywhere strong, everywhere interesting. For this reason, and because it presents the genuine gospel, it is suited for the library of any layman, who can appreciate powerful reasoning, or who loves the message of free grace.

Memoirs and Correspondence of Jane Taylor. By Isaac Taylor, author of "Natural History of Enthusiasm," etc. New York: Robert Carter, 1847. 18mo. pp. 274.—*The Contributions of Q. Q. to a Periodical Work: with some pieces not before published.* By the late Jane Taylor. In two volumes. R. Carter: 1847. 18mo.—*Essays in Rhyme, or Morals and Manners, with the Poetical Remains of the late Jane Taylor.* New York. 18mo. 1847. pp. 180.

Delightful books, from the pen, or concerning the life of an admirable Christian woman. We would gladly see them circulated without limit. If our notice is brief it is not hesitating or careless. Miss Taylor was a true genius, and possessed the extraordinary art (unknown to her more splendid brother) of saying the greatest things in the simplest language. In her biography, we have learned to love her, as much as we admired her before. In prose and in verse she is equally happy, equally vivacious, and equally evangelical. Her letters between a Mother and Daughter, from the same press, are full of acceptable counsels. Such a union of feminine sensibility and gentleness, with manly vigour and originality, we scarcely find in any female author of our day.

Report on the Establishment of one or more Union Schools in Philadelphia or its Suburbs, similar, in their general design, to the Ragged Schools of London. Philadelphia. 1847. 8vo. pp. 30.

The Sunday Schools of England were originally instituted for the benefit of those who were without the means of instruction at home, and they still continue, as at first, to a great extent schools for the neglected poor. The difference of our social state, combined perhaps with other causes, has so far modified the system among us, that some complain of Sunday Schools as

having superseded the old practice of religious instruction in the family. It is found, however, in the large towns both of England and America, that the Sunday School system fails to reach a growing class of the younger population, to which many of our public disturbances are owing. To bring even this class under Christian influence is the object of the "Ragged Schools," of London, a somewhat figurative designation founded on the fact that the pupils are received just as they are, or in other words that poverty and even dirt will not exclude them. The corresponding class among ourselves is harder to be dealt with in England, from the very fact that they can generally read, and from the license generated by abuse of our free institutions. It is an interesting question, therefore, whether these objects can be most effectually reached by an extension of the Sunday School System as it now exists, or by the introduction of a new one, more or less exactly corresponding to the Ragged Schools of England. To aid in the solution of this problem is the object of the excellent report before us, which seems to favour a bold experiment by opening a School upon a larger scale than any known among us, for the special benefit of the more neglected classes. Although printed pending a discussion of the question by the Sunday School Teachers of Philadelphia, and therefore exhibiting no definite result, it is highly worthy of attention for its valuable practical suggestions, for the soundness of the principles which it maintains, and for the clear strong style in which it is composed. As a sample of these qualities and for its own sake we insert the following paragraph.

"Children and youth are quick discerners of every thing that favours unbridled liberty; and while newspapers are so cheap and so common as they are among us, and where comments upon the acts of public authorities are so unrestrained as they must be under our government, it is not strange that they should seize upon these marks of imbecility or timidity in those who are the sword-bearers of the State, and presume that their parents and teachers are made of the same metal. It is not, perhaps, descending too minutely into particulars to say, that the boy or youth who trundles a wheelbarrow on the sidewalk, or lights a squib or cracker in the street, or defaces a wall, or girdles a shade tree, knowing that it is in violation of public law, and being emboldened to do so by seeing other and perhaps greater

offences winked at, or committed with impunity, is far less likely to obey his parents or his teacher, than he would be if he were made to feel his responsibility to public law, and saw others held to the like account. And when the temptation comes, to venture upon some high-handed offence, to mingle in scenes of plunder and carnage, or even to turn the muzzle of a cannon upon the dwellings or persons of unoffending and helpless citizens, such a youth may be relied on to do that fearful deed, and will have been nerved to it by those who winked at his earlier and comparatively venial violations of wholesome laws. In the old cities of Europe dreadful experience has led to the correction of some of the evils to which we have just alluded. The end of them has been more than once revealed in scenes that make humanity shudder. However anti-republican it may be, necessity has been laid upon them to provide for the public peace and safety by stringent enactments, and a severe administration of them. If groups of boys and idle youth upon the public walks, or at places of public resort, are found to lead or even tempt to violations of law or to disturbances of peace and quiet, they are not left to grow and extend till they become unmanageable. Whatever may be said of 'the right to stand where we choose,' and 'the right to keep what company we please,' the evil is nipped in the bud. If voluntary associations for some public service, as the extinguishment of fires, &c. are found to be inconsistent with the peace and order of the community, such associations are not left to strengthen themselves and gain the ascendancy over the popular will. The evil is nipped in the bud. The associations are quietly dissolved, and the duty is assumed by the government. The grand feature of a wise system of police is its preventive efficacy. It makes the law supreme and active at those points where the evil design is matured and the early experiments in crime are attempted. With us, such a use of authority would be impatiently borne, if not boldly resisted; and hence, if we had schools for the very class of youth that are provided for by the Ragged Schools of London, it is quite problematical whether the attempt to control them would not involve us in difficulties too serious to be encountered; yet it cannot be disguised, that this very fact furnishes the most deplorable evidence of the need of such schools, or of some other kindred influence."

The Genius of Scotland; or Sketches of Scottish Scenery, Literature and Religion. By Rev. Robert Trumbull. New York. A. Carter. 1847. 12mo. pp. 379.

Mr. Trumbull is a minister of the Baptist Church in Hartford, favourably known as a preacher and author. His volume upon Scotland is highly interesting, and will be a welcome gift to all Scotsmen and to their descendants or admirers. The biographical sketches of Knox, Burns, Wilson, Chalmers, Bruce, Hogg, and Scott, are particularly to be noted. Mr. Trumbull writes like a scholar, a man of refinement, and a Christian.

Thankfulness, and other Essays. By the Rev. James Hamilton. New York. R. Carter. 1847. 18mo.

To those who are acquainted with Mr. Hamilton's writings, his name will be enough: to those who are not, we say, that he is one of the most pleasing religious writers of the age, and that these are among his happiest effusions. His delightful sketch of McCheyne reminds us, that the works of this gifted servant of Christ are about to be issued from the same press, in two octavos.

Meditations on the Lord's Prayer. By A. Bonnet, author of the "Family of Bethany," etc. Translated from the French by the Rev. William Hare. New York. Robert Carter. 1847. 18mo. pp. 241.

From the former works of this author, and from such inspection of this volume as we have been able to bestow on it, just before going to press, we are disposed to believe it a simple, attractive, scriptural, and affectionate exposition of the Lord's Prayer.

The Christian Pulpit the rightful guardian of Morals, in political no less than in private life. A discourse delivered at Gettysburg, November 26, the day appointed by the Governor, for public humiliation, thanksgiving and prayer. By S. S. Schmucker, D.D. Published by a committee of the audience. Gettysburg. 1846. 8vo. pp. 32.

In this discourse upon Paul's reasoning before Felix, (Acts xxiv. 25,) the preacher undertakes to show "the obligation of the Christian pulpit" to act as the guardian of political no less

than of personal morality, and "to exhibit the prominent instructions which it is her (?) duty to inculcate." The obligation is argued from the fact that Christianity is "enthroned above all science," "as the handmaid of universal knowledge;" from our relation to God as the fountain of our political rights no less than of others; from the responsibility extending to political as well as other action; from the political instructions of the Bible itself. These are described as consisting not in directions as to mere party politics, nor in the inculcation of an indiscriminate and unprincipled patriotism, nor in that of a blind valour or bravery; but in the revelation of God as the ruler of all nations, and the consequent duty of thanksgiving and humiliation; and the precedence due to the divine over human laws. The second duty to be inculcated is that of recognising the universal brotherhood and equality of man in civil rights, including impartiality in selecting the best qualified men for office and also in the enactment of laws, as well as abstinence from all encroachments on the rights of others. The Christian pulpit is also to inculcate the obligation of moral principles on public men, especially the inviolability of official oaths and national engagements, as well as the doctrine of national retributions in the present life. In the conclusion of the sermon, the duty of Christians in relation to this matter is urged with great solemnity.

Remonstrance against the course pursued by the Evangelical Alliance on the subject of Slavery. New York. 8vo. pp. 16. 1847.

This is a protest and remonstrance addressed "to the Christian Abolitionists of Great Britain and Ireland, who met at Freemasons' Hall, London, August 18, 1846, to form an Evangelical Alliance." The remonstrants are the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, among whose names are those of Arthur Tappan, Lewis Tappan, S. S. Jocelyn, William Jay, Arnold Buffom, Samuel E. Cornish, and Theodore S. Wright. The leading points of the address are, that the writers reckon this the great work of the present age, and regard as the great difficulty in its way the settled policy of the churches to let slavery alone; that a marked advance in public opinion here has been produced by the non-intercourse of British Christians, not only with slaveholders, but with all who cannot give

satisfactory assurance of their zealous adhesion to the anti-slavery cause; that in order to neutralize this effect it was necessary to separate Christians in Great Britain from American Abolitionists; that this, if not the original design, has become one of the objects of the Evangelical Alliance; that the first resolution of that body on the subject, shields the conscience of the slaveholder by an undue concession; that the final abrogation of it must be regarded as an open triumph of slavery over the religious principles of the age; that the British abolitionists were deceived by the American delegates, who did not represent the active and effective Christian anti-slavery feeling, but the leading ecclesiastical and political influence, of the United States; that they have not come home prepared to do any thing effectual for the overthrow of slavery; that they will do nothing religiously because slavery is political, nothing politically because it is religious; that in forming the alliance, the British members have virtually consented to hold fellowship with slaveholders, and to tolerate "the embruting of the image of God, the chattelizing of the representatives of Christ;" that the British organization has retrieved its error, but cannot extricate the General Alliance from the difficulty in which irresolution has involved it; that the lost opportunity can never be recovered; and as a practical conclusion of the whole, that there had better be no attempt at an organized alliance of Christian union until that auspicious period, &c. &c. The only thing new in this "remonstrance" is its decency and moderation, which would seem to show how British authority, even when exerted on the wrong side, can paralyze the boldest tongues and pens.

The Character of the Gentleman. An Address to the students of Miami University, on the evening before Commencement Day, in the month of August, 1846. By Francis Lieber, Professor of Political Philosophy and Economy in South Carolina College, author of Political Ethics, &c. Columbia and Charleston. 1847. 12mo. pp. 110.

The republication of an Academical address so soon after its appearance, is a strong proof that its subject was well chosen and well treated. We refer to the notice in a former number, simply adding for the present that the learned author appears to have spared no pains to improve upon himself, and that the execution of the work is highly creditable to the Southern press.

The Relations of Christianity to War, and the Portraiture of a Christian Soldier. A discourse delivered on occasion of the first Commencement of the Citadel Academy. By the Rev. Thomas Smyth, D.D. Charleston. 1847. 8vo. pp. 33.

The double text of this discourse is Matthew xxiv. 6, and Jeremiah xlvii. 6, 7, from which the doctrine is derived, that war is inevitable, not only as the result of the divine counsel, but also as a means to an ultimate end, and that war is under the direction of Divine Providence. In opposition to the "ultraism" of the day, it is maintained that both the physical and moral world are full of strife; that this is the fruit of man's corruption and inseparable from it; that war, though in itself an evil and arising from evil, may be considered an ordinance of God; that self-defence is as much an ordinance of God as civil government; that war is punishment; that the Bible does not absolutely condemn war for purposes purely civil; that Christianity nevertheless provides for the ultimate cessation of war; that it acts upon war just as it acts upon despotism; that all men are bound to contribute to this blessed change; that in the meantime the profession of a soldier must continue; that its highest perfection is dependent upon Christian influence; that true patriotism is, like true politeness, the offspring of true piety; in proof of which we are referred to the example of General Burns, Colonel Blackader, Colonel Gardner, and General Washington. It is gratifying that such sentiments as these should have been so received at a military school as to lead to the publication of the sermon which contained them.

The Christian Sabbath. An Argument from the New Testament for the Divine Authority of the Christian Sabbath. By Alfred Hamilton, Minister of the Presbyterian Church at Faggs' Manor. Philadelphia. 12mo. pp. 20.

This is a clear and compact piece of reasoning. After denying that the observance of a religious day can be obligatory without scriptural authority, and asserting that without the Sabbath the new dispensation is inferior to the old, Mr. Hamilton explains the want of any new enactment on the subject by our Saviour, from the permanence of all the ancient moral institutions, and proves the moral character of this from its conjunction with other moral precepts and from the moral effects of its vio-

lation. The recoginition of the Sabbath as already existing and still binding he infers from our Saviour's not reproving the Jews for their observance of it, from his general recognition of the moral law, and from his own example in keeping the day as one of religious worship and benevolent activity, which must either have been an accommodation to the prejudices of the people or obedience to the letter and spirit of the law. The same thing is shown from the writings of the apostles, who do not specifically mention this command, any more than the first three, because none of these were then rejected or explained away; and because their immediate object was to enforce the duties of man to man. With these apostolical teachings agrees the apostolical practice, both in Palestine and elsewhere. The change of the day is explained as belonging to the change of dispensations and a fulfilment of prophecy, but chiefly as an honour to the day of Christ's resurrection. That he sanctioned it himself, is argued from the practice of the twelve before his ascension, from the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the first day of the week, from the usage introduced by the apostles in the first Christian churches, and from the early application of the name "Lord's Day." The terms in which Paul has been supposed to teach the abrogation of the Sabbath, are shown to have reference to the temporary festivals of the old economy, and the argument closes with a few testimonies from the Fathers. There is scarcely any way in which our ministers could better employ themselves occasionally than in popular summaries of argument on important points of doctrine or practice. Even where nothing new is added, the results of more voluminous discussions may be thus thrown into general circulation, with an advantage to the public far outweighing any trivial errors of detail or faults of execution.

Remarks on the Mode of Christian Baptism. By J. W. Moore. Little Rock. 1847. 8vo. pp. 13.

We have here another exemplification of the remark just made, and from a very different quarter. It is gratifying that Arkansas should afford a market or a public for a treatise on the meaning of a Greek word, when that word is so important in its bearing, and that a minister there writing should be able or willing to say, "I have now five Greek lexicons before me."

We hope that this kind of armour will be still carried out by the champions of the truth into the heart of our remotest settlements, and that none of our ministers will so far neglect the original scriptures as to be frightened at the sound of Greek and Hebrew. The positions combated by Mr. Moore are the familiar ones, that *bapto* and *baptizo* always mean to immerse; that John baptized where "there was much water;" that Philip and the Eunuch went down into the water and came up out of it; that we are buried with Christ in Baptism, etc. As to the last it is contended that that there is no more allusion to the mode of burial than to that of crucifixion, death, or planting, all which occur in the same context. The argument from the primary meaning of baptize, without regard to usage, is compared with an analogous argument to prove from etymology that a *villain* may be an honest man, and that when A is said to have *prevented* B from stealing, it means that he *came before* him from so doing.

The Great Supper, or an Illustration and Defence of the leading Doctrines of Grace in Three Discourses on Luke xiv. 16—24. By the Rev. Ashbel G. Fairchild, D.D. With an introduction by the Rev. Alexander T. McGill, D.D., Professor in the Western Theological Seminary.

Instead of repeating what we have already said, we quote the words of the striking and instructive introduction. "There the reader will find admirable moderation, combined with clear and energetic defence of truth, as it is in the Bible. We rejoice in the call for a new edition of this little book. It testifies the approbation of the public in such a manner as will cheer, we hope, many another minister to stand in defence of the gospel. A work that originated in a modest determination to guard the author's flock against the incessant efforts to beguile and proselyte them, has taken its place with the solid literature of our day, and will descend a benefit and blessing to our children." The historical and doctrinal position of Dr. McGill himself is well defined in the following brief sentences. "Semi-pelagianism, having crept out from the exclusive keeping of Monkery and Molinism, was detected in efforts to penetrate the heart of the Protestant Reformation. Arminius was the man for such a work. Gifted, plausible, and restless, having purity enough in his life

to inspire confidence, and perfidy enough in his heart to practice any kind of means, he succeeded, by vamping it anew, in giving his own name to the system of John Cassian." Wesley's reformation consisted in a divorce which he effected between Arminianism and Socinianism. The former became the subject of a revival. Ardent, energetic, and popular, it could no longer abide the speculative indifference of its old companion, and a separation ensued. Are we wrong in thinking that the old affinity returns as often as Arminianism proves cold and falls a little from its grace? that the only possibility of keeping it from falling back into Socinianism is a constant blowing of the bellows to keep up its heat, and sublimate away this congenial gravitation? This we honestly believe, and to say it is infinitely mild, compared with the denunciations of Calvinism by Arminian pulpits and pens."

The Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism, with which is incorporated a Scripture Catechism in the method of the Assembly's, by the Rev. Matthew Henry, V. D. M. Carefully transcribed from the last London Edition of the Miscellaneous Works of that venerable author. The first complete American Edition, in which the errors of the Press, found in the London Edition, are carefully corrected, by the Rev. Colin McIver, V. D. M. Princeton. 18mo. pp. 220.

Matthew Henry's work is an arrangement of the proof-texts to the Shorter Catechism in the form of question and answer. The edition published at New York in 1835 is described by Mr. McIver as a meagre collection of extracts from what was originally published by the author. Even in the London Edition there are some few deviations from the language of the Westminster Divines, but none of them are such as to affect the sentiment, with the exception of a single answer, which the present editor has wholly omitted, as containing a palpable misapplication of a text and conveying an erroneous sentiment flatly contradicted in other parts of Mr. Henry's published works, and therefore probably a spurious interpolation. In the prefatory note by Dr. Alexander, the book is cordially recommended to all pastors, parents, and others engaged in religious instruction.

Memoirs of the Rev. John Newton, formerly Rector of St. Mary Woolnoth, etc. With selections from his correspondence. Revised by the Committee of Publication. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 356.

The memoirs of John Newton heretofore consisted of his autobiographical sketches in different publications and of the life by Cecil, in which a knowledge of the first was presupposed. Between these two biographies, it seems the public mind in England has long vibrated, the one being preferred as the most full and interesting so far as it went, the other as more complete in bringing the history to a close; till at last people came to neglect each as deficient in a material respect. To remedy this evil, the compiler of the present work has adopted Mr. Cecil's outline and endeavoured to make his work what he would have made it if Newton's own narratives had been then unpublished, at the same time enriching it from sources which have been since opened, and throwing the whole into that form which the public have sanctioned as the proper one for such biographies. Of Newton himself or of the interest belonging to his life it would be superfluous to say a word. The Introductory Observations by Bickersteth are dated in 1835. The American edition is without a date, according to the practice of our leading book-concerns, a practice the advantages of which can scarcely counterbalance the unpleasantness and even inconvenience of this return to the usage of the fifteenth century. The books, it is true, are stereotyped, but even the date of the successive impressions may, at some future time, be a matter of interest, and is therefore worth preserving, even at the cost of telling the book's age which can seldom hurt its sale, and certainly ought not to be the subject of such squeamishness as sometimes exists in the human subject.

The Church. A Sermon preached at the opening of the Synod of the German Reformed Church at Carlisle, October 15, 1846. By the Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D. Published by request of the Synod. Chambersburg. 1847. pp. 28.

As Dr. Nevin is at present the theological representative of his Church, and this discourse was published by a vote of the Synod, we shall give a few of his most striking thoughts, as nearly as may be in his own words, even at the risk of doing him injustice

by the fragmentary form of our citations. The motto of the discourse is Eph. i. 23; its theme is the article of the creed, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." Although formally divided into two parts, it is occupied throughout with a description of the church, which is considered in two aspects, as the Ideal and the Actual church. Idea is here explained to mean the very inmost substance of that which exists, in which sense all life is ideal, that is, exists truly in the form of possibility before it can become actual. The ideal church is the power of a new supernatural creation which has been introduced into the actual history of the world by the incarnation of Jesus Christ, who is himself the principle of this new creation. The ideal church is the highest possible form of humanity itself. There may be many states in the world, but there can be only one church. In her ideal character the church is absolutely holy and infallible free from error and free from sin. The church is the necessary and only form in which Christianity can have a real existence in the world. Christianity and the church are identical. The idea of the church includes visibility, just as the idea of man supposes a body. The Actual Church includes the past along with the present, as well as a reference also to the future. The Actual Church is a *process*, not only covering a large field in space, but reaching over a long tract in time. The historical church is always the true church, but never a pure or perfect church. A visible unity of organization and worship is not indispensable to the truth of the church as alleged by Romanists and high-church Episcopalians. If separation from a particular communion, the Episcopal for instance, be supposed to work a forfeiture of all interest in God's covenant, it is hard to see why the want of any other attribute of a perfect church should not do the same thing. If division be contrary to the idea of the church, the same thing is true of all error and sin. The ideal church can have no reality save under the form of the historical, and the actual or historical church can have no truth, except through the power of the ideal. The actual is the body of the ideal in growth; the process, constantly changing and flowing, by which it is externalized and so made complete, as the great world-fact of redemption. The church is the historical continuation of the life of Jesus Christ in the world, not as a transient phenomenon, but in the character of a grand world-fact. There can be no church without Christ; but we may reverse

the proposition also and say, no Church, no Christ. In honouring the church we honour Christ; to believe in the church, according to the creed, is to believe in Christ; to lean upon the church is to lean upon Christ. The church comprehends and upholds the truth in her own constitution, as being in the fullest sense the depository of the life of Christ himself. The first requisite towards catholic unity, after the painful sense of existing disease, is faith in the church itself, not in the ideal church or the actual church separately taken, but in the first as comprehended always in the second, and constituting with it the presence of a single life. The church of the creed is visible. The church of the creed is catholic. Our sects, so far as they belong to the church at all, belong to it organically; not as loose transports in its service simply, by which some of God's elect may happen to be conveyed to the heavenly Jerusalem; but as component portions of the one universal body of Jesus Christ in the world, representing collectively for the time, not separately, its life as a whole. Our sects, however necessary, are something wrong, a most defective, abnormal condition of the body of Christ, an interimistic abomination, in the church, not of it. The church of the creed is historical. To suppose a chasm in its continuance at any point is in fact to overthrow its existence altogether. To suppose that it might take an entirely new start, in the fourteenth century, or the sixteenth, or at any other time, springing directly from the bible or from heaven—its old life having either failed altogether or run out into universal apostacy—is most assuredly to belie its existence as a real church entirely. The church of the creed is life-bearing. Christianity is not a system of doctrines, nor a code of ethical rules, nor a record of events, but a perpetual fact, and as such includes life-powers which cannot be sundered from its history. These powers are comprehended in the outward visible historical church, and spring perpetually from Christ himself by the power of the Holy Spirit. The church is not the aggregation of the individual actings of piety but the power of a divine constitution which lies at the ground of all individual piety. The ministry is a necessary organ of the body of Christ, and as such the bearer of a divine supernatural power. Ordination does, in this sense, convey objective virtue or force, such as no man, in the ordinary course of things, can be allowed to possess without it. Church services involve

the force of a true liturgical sacrifice, which serves of itself to bring man near to God. The sacraments in particular have living power in themselves, and are not signs and shadows only, like the symbols of Freemasonry or Odd-Fellowship. Faith in the church is necessary, according to the creed, to complete our faith in the Holy Trinity and in the great fact of the Incarnation. An unchurchly spirit of bold individualism is full of danger, the more because extremely plausible and insidious. It magnifies the inward and spiritual, and affects to call the soul away from a religion of forms and outward show, under the pretext that religion is a personal thing, and that all reliance on church privileges and church ordinances is to be deprecated as full of peril to the soul, thus pretending to exalt Christ and magnify repentance and faith at the cost of all that is comprehended in the idea of the church. This unchurchly, Gnostic, Nestorian spirit tends to poverty and starvation, and will leave us without a liturgy, without sacraments, without history. The spiritualism, which thus turns all religion into a mere idea, is emphatically the Antichrist, who will not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh; that is, it refuses practically to acknowledge a real historical Christ by denying the existence of a real historical church, without which we can have no real Christ.

Eighteenth Annual Report of the Inspectors of the Eastern State Penitentiary of Pennsylvania. Transmitted to the Senate and House of Representatives, Feb. 1847. Philadelphia; Printed by Edward Barrington and George Haswell. 1847.

It seems strange, that so much argument should be necessary to convince wise and humane men, that it is desirable to prevent the association of criminals, during the term of their imprisonment. It would seem too clear to admit of argument at all, that such association must be substantially a school, in which those who have already manifested their propensity and capacity to learn, are trained under the most accomplished masters in crime. And yet, in its last analysis, this is the real question so fiercely disputed by those who oppose, what is now known all over the world as the Pennsylvania or Separate System of Prison Discipline, chiefly through the organ of the Boston Prison Discipline Society, or rather of its Secretary, Mr. Dwight. That the contami-

nating effects of criminal association cannot be prevented,—although they may be partially mitigated, by an attempted compulsory silence, among a gang of some hundreds of adroit villains, is too plain to be argued. Indeed it may be regarded as conceded by the advocates of the congregated and silent system, because they insist that communication cannot be prevented, even by confining the convicts in separate cells. Of course therefore if the constant intervention of a stone wall two feet thick, aided by the vigilance of ward keepers, cannot prevent communication, this is perfectly out of the question, where they are congregated in the same room in crowds, even though silence be enjoined under the lash of the supervisor.

The probabilities of reformation under the two systems, are so manifestly in favour of the separate plan, that we deem it needless to say a word on the subject. And this surely is a legitimate ground of preference: for while the interests of society, and not those of the criminal, are the primary object in civil punishments, yet it is obvious that those interests will be best secured by a plan of imprisonment, which, while serving as a punishment and terror to evil doers, will restore the criminal to society at the close of his term, uncontaminated and untrammelled by association with worse men, and which furnishes every possible means of bringing him to repentance and reformation. And we confess farther, that we are not of the number of those, who think that society has no interest in the moral welfare of criminals, for their own sake.

But the standing objection of Mr. Dwight, Mr. Dickens, and the philanthropists of that school, is the inhumanity of the system. *Solitary confinement;*—the very name has bred as many moral spectres in the imagination of the former, as the vivid fancy of Dickens educed from the loom of the poor weaver, in the Philadelphia prison. We are perfectly serious in saying, that the whole argument of Mr. Dwight and his friends is founded on a misconception of the system, due in a great measure to the word *solitary*. It is separate, not solitary imprisonment. The convicts are separated from one another; but beyond this, which is the grand characteristic of the system, there is nothing in it which calls for their being doomed to absolute solitude, any more than in any other system of imprisonment. And in point of fact, the convicts are visited as often as it is

proper they should be. Besides the visits of the keepers every day, and the Warden, the Moral Instructor, the Physician and the Schoolmaster, almost as often, and in some cases oftener, a committee of the Inspectors spend two afternoons every week, in visiting them in turn. The Judges of the court, the Grand-juries, and the Sheriffs of all the Counties, we believe, are also, ex officio, visitors. A committee of the Prison Discipline Society is likewise authorized by law to see them weekly. And by the card of an Inspector, and with the permission of the Warden, strangers or friends of the prisoner, are allowed the same privilege, within any reasonable limits.

We say thus much merely for the purpose of correcting impressions which are unfounded in fact; and adapted to awaken prejudice in the minds of humane persons. It is a curious fact that so far from *solitude* being the common condition of imprisonment in this penitentiary, it is the severest method of punishment in use for infractions of the discipline; and it is never found necessary to prolong it beyond a few days. In view of the actual condition of the prisoners, in well lighted, well ventilated rooms, with good fare and moderate employment, with frequent visits from kind and humane persons, and constant access to the officers, the moral instructor and the schoolmaster, with the use of good books from the prison library, and with stated exercise in the open air, in small yards attached to each cell, it may well be questioned whether any farther mitigation, would be compatible with the ends of punishment.

We had no intention, however, of entering into discussion of any branch of this great subject, in this connexion. If any one has honest doubts about the humanity of this system of imprisonment, either in regard to the discipline of the prison, or the effect upon the bodily or mental health of the prisoners, we earnestly recommend to his attention the report before us, embracing, as it does, that of the intelligent medical officer of the prison, Dr. Given.

We are sorry that so many of the intelligent philanthropists of the Boston Society, have unfortunately identified themselves with the views of their Secretary. And we are glad to see, by the report of the proceedings, that some of the members are disposed to make a timely escape. We commend their wisdom for we regard the question as virtually settled by all the enlight-

ened nations of the world. It is well known that the principal European governments have sent commissioners to examine the merits of our rival systems of Prison Discipline; and that the verdict in favour of the separate plan, has been nearly unanimous. During the last year, a Congress was held at Frankfort on the Maine, made up of seventy-five distinguished men, interested in the subject, from England, France, Prussia, Sweden, Holland, Denmark, Belgium, and various parts of Germany; and after the most thorough and able discussion, resolutions were adopted, with remarkable unanimity, covering not only the great principle of separate imprisonment, but the substantial details of the Pennsylvania system, as at present administered in Philadelphia, and the best Prisons in our country. They have adjourned to meet at Brussels next September to complete their views, about the internal regulations of Prisons, and discuss some of the provisions of the criminal law of Europe.

The connexion of insanity with crime and its punishment, is a subject of great interest and difficulty. We wish to commend the facts and suggestions in the pamphlet before us, to the attention of the enlightened and the humane. We have not time to say more at present on the subject, except that we regret to notice a single unguarded sentence, which savours quite too strongly for our taste, of the language of the radical, demoralizing, phrenological school, which refers crime to an "imperfection in the physical organization." We are persuaded, however, that the real principles and sentiments of that school, find no countenance among the intelligent and benevolent gentlemen, who are devoting their time and efforts gratuitously to the cause of Prison Discipline.

History of the Presbyterian Church, in the State of Kentucky, with a Preliminary Sketch of the Churches in the Valley of Virginia. By the Rev. Robert Davidson, D.D., author of an "Excursion to the Mammoth Cave," and "Notices of the early settlement of Kentucky." Late President of Transylvania University; Corresponding Member of the Kentucky Historical Society; Honorary Member of the New York Historical Society; Honorary Member of the National Institute, &c. New York: Robert Carter, 58 Canal Street. Pittsburg, 56 Market Street. Lexington, Ky.: Charles Marshall. 1847.

This volume comes to hand too late to admit of as extended

a notice as would be desirable. It is, in our opinion, a work of real merit. The author has spared neither time nor pains to acquire accurate knowledge of facts, and has availed himself of all the accessible sources of information. We think that impartiality and fidelity characterise this history. When there do not exist written records, absolute correctness in matters of fact, is scarcely attainable; and persons acquainted with particular transactions or persons, here described, may find some inaccuracies in the details; yet we are of opinion, that Dr. Davidson has performed an acceptable and useful service to the Presbyterian church, in the preparation of this volume. It contains a great variety of interesting matter; and many of the transactions here recorded, may be said to be of an extraordinary character. The biographical sketches are in the main well drawn; though in some instances, the portraiture is not perfect. The style of this history is perspicuous and neat; and there is a vivacity diffused through the narrative, which prevents tedium in the perusal.

The faults of this history, in our judgment are, compared with its excellencies, small. We think, however, that in some cases, there is too much minuteness of detail, as in describing certain irregularities; and in others, there is what may be called too rigid a fidelity, in recording facts which might have been better left in perpetual oblivion. We have no objection to holding up the faults of ministers, as a warning to those who may come after us; but when the publication of facts of this kind will be likely deeply to affect the feelings of worthy persons now living, unless some necessity require it, such facts had better be suppressed. We mention this, because, in one or two instances, the faults of certain persons are here dragged from obscurity into public view, and yet their descendents and near relatives, are now living, and of very estimable character. We think that the rule which should regulate the disclosure of facts, in common life, applies to history; those truths should not not be published which can do no good, and which may prove injurious to the feelings or reputation of any person. Although Dr. Davidson is undoubtedly a gentleman of refined taste, yet we are of opinion, that in attaching such an array of titles to his name in the title page, his usual good taste forsook him; and in the enumeration, the most important office which he ever held is omitted; namely, that he is the *pastor of a Christian church.* This, though

a mere trifle, deserves the author's attention, and may be corrected in a second edition. The very last paragraph in the book is likewise not to our taste; it would be better omitted. Upon the whole, we predict, that this volume will be much read, especially by the Presbyterians of the west, and no doubt corrections and improvements will be suggested.

The Deaconship. By Robert Boyte C. Howell, D.D., Pastor of the Baptish Church, Nashville, Tenn. Author of "Sacramental Communion," &c. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publica tion Society. 1847.

Very little, to our knowledge, has been written on the subject of the office of deacon in the Christian church. All denominations admit that there is divine authority for this office, and most of them, that it was not intended to be temporary, but perpetual in its duration; yet the Romanists, Episcopalians, and the Episcopal Methodists, make it an order of the preaching ministry. This, our author, by a critical and scriptural investigation, shows to be without the shadow of foundation in the New Testament. The chief reason of the institution was to exempt the apostles from attendance on secular concerns, that they might devote their whole time to "prayer and preaching the word." If those were deacons whose election and ordination is recorded in the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, their business undoubtedly was not to preach, but to attend to the wants of the poor, and to the fiscal concerns of the church.

It is a matter of surprise, that the author, living among Presbyterians, should be ignorant, that according to their "Form of Government," deacons are necessary to the complete organization of a church. See chap. xiii. 2. The election of deacons has also been required by repeated resolutions of the General Assembly; and now, probably, most Presbyterian churches are supplied with them. One chief reason of the disuse of this office, in this part of the country, has been that trustees are incorporated to hold the property and manage the fiscal concerns of the churches; but it would certainly be more orderly, for the deacons of a church to become its trustees, than for this office to be held by persons, who often are not even members of the church. The Reformed Dutch Church, in New Jersey, obtained a law,

providing, that in the incorporation of their churches, the deacons should always constitute the board of trustees.

On the duties of deacons, the author is very full, and his views in general, appear to be scriptural. He takes occasion, however, to introduce some irrelevant matters, which cannot but have the effect of limiting the circulation and diminishing the usefulness of his work. In the 3d chapter we have a defence of the independency of churches on one another. This, as it appears to us, has nothing to do with the office of deacon. And if all Christian churches are united to one Head and pervaded by one Spirit, it is strange, if when collected in particular congregations, they should be independent of each other. If all could form one assembly on earth, as they do in heaven, would there be any claim of independence of one portion of the "Body of Christ," on the rest? And although Christians cannot, while in this world, meet and worship in one assembly, and enjoy personal communion with one another, yet ought they not to approach as near to it as practicable? We once lived in the vicinity of a large and respectable Baptist church, which enjoyed, once a month, the labours of an able and evangelical minister; when well qualified ministers were much fewer in that society than at present; but this church was *kept for years*—we know not how many—in a state of turmoil, by two deacons who headed two factions. At one church meeting, the majority would be on one side, but by the next, the other would get the ascendancy; and we were told this was by no means a singular case; that many other churches of the same denomination were in a similar state of wretched division and turmoil. It is alleged, that it infringes on Christian liberty for one church of Christ to be governed by the will of other churches: why then, we ask, does it not trench equally on Christian liberty, for a majority in a single church, to rule over the minority? And where in Scripture do you find any such principle inculcated, by precept or example, as a church governed by a majority of votes? We seriously regret, that Dr. Howell when making so good a book on the deaconship, thought proper to introduce so many of the peculiarities of his own sect. Had it not been for this, we should have cordially recommended the treatise as Scriptural and as indicative of a discriminating mind. But interlarded as it is, with denominational peculiarities, we can only say, that it is adapted for Baptist readers; but does not suit Presbyterians.

That part of this little volume on which we feel constrained to animadvert, is the peremptory denunciation of the office of ruling elders, which forms a part of the organization of every Presbyterian church; not only as "unauthorized, but as injurious, and detrimental to all concerned." But we will cite the author's own words. (p. 79.) Speaking of discipline he says, "This department, substantially, has, in some denominations, been put in charge of '*Elders who rule, but do not preach.*' Their office, however, is a human device, has no authority in the word of God, infringes the rights of others, and cannot, consequently be exercised without detriment to all concerned." It is much easier to make such round assertions than to establish their truth; and mere assertion, however positive, goes with us for nothing. We should be pleased to see from the pen of the author an interpretation of 1 Tim. v. 17, "*Let the Elders who rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in word and doctrine.*" A large majority of Protestant writers have believed that here was full authority for the office of *ruling elders*, who did not preach. And although we have seen many attempts to give the text a gloss which would avoid this conclusion, we must confess that we have never met with one that satisfies us; or that appears as consistent with the original, as the obvious meaning, adopted not only by Presbyterians, but by some of the most eminent Independents, as for example, John Owen, and Thomas Goodwin, and others. We do not require others to agree with us on the subject of ruling elders; but we cannot approve of Dr. Howell's peremptory method of treating the subject.

In the seventh chapter of this little work, the author discusses the subject of *deaconnesses*, and comes to the conclusion that there were such in the primitive church. But as we have no directions as to the election and ordination of females to any office, it would seem that no permanent office of this kind was contemplated, for as to the widows mentioned by Paul to Timothy, we believe they were such as were received on the funds of the church to be supported, in their old age. As a deaconness is a female servant or minister of the church, there are many such in our day, who serve the church, by visiting the sick and administering to their necessities, and often by aiding efficiently in collecting funds for benevolent purposes; and by destributing religious tracts in our cities and villages. And pious women would not perform this

service better than they do, if some were solemnly set apart for such works of mercy. Let pious females act with assiduity and energy in their appropriate sphere, and they may effect much good, but whenever they leave this, confusion ensues.

We were amused with some of the duties which our author attributes to deaconnesses, and which in his opinion render the office necessary in the Baptist church. "They are'" says he, "to attend the neophyte sister to baptism; and to be companions of her toilet before and after her baptism." If we should insist on scriptural precept or example for this, the Doctor would be hard put to it to refer us to chapter and verse. "In most of the denominations," says he, "this office is rendered unnecessary, partly by their having abolished baptism, and partly, by aristocratic propensities, on account of which, they themselves confess that they have almost no poor among them." We venture to make no remarks on these last citations from our author. Let them pass for what they are worth.

On the whole we entertain a respectful opinion of the learning and critical accumen of theauthor of this little volume, and we regret that while we approve of it in the main, we cannot give it unqualified commendation.

Lectures on Theology. By the late Rev. John Dick, Professor of Theology to the United Secession Church. Published under the superintendance of his son, with a Preface, Memoir, &c. By the American Editor. In two vols. New York: M. W. Dodd, Brick Church Chapel. 1846. pp. 532 and 576.

This edition is in large octavo size, on good paper and with a clear type. The volumes are strongly and neatly bound. Recommendations of no small value. The character of the work is well and extensively known. It is a sound, judicious, comprehensive system of Theology, the best we know of in the English language; well adapted to the wants of theological students and of intelligent readers generally. Having received the book just as our last sheet is going to press, we have not time to say more, and more is not necessary as the work has an established reputation.

NOTE.

In our number for January of this year, we gave a short notice of Rev. J. R. Boyd's Eclectic Moral Philosophy, in which, after expressing a very favourable opinion of the work as a text book, we stated in pretty strong terms our dissent from the author's remarks on American slavery. We learn that the respected writer thinks that we misapprehended his meaning, and have done him great injustice. Instead of regarding all slave-holding as sinful, and a bar to church fellowship; instead of dissenting from the decisions of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, on this subject; or from the ground taken by the American delegates to the Evangelical Alliance, and the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland; he informs us that he "decidedly and most explicitly" teaches that all slave-holding is not sinful, and that he "does not dissent from the proceedings of the American Board, &c., just referred to, but considers them wise, appropriate and Christian." This being the case, we have certainly greatly misapprehended his position. We know not how we can more effectually repair any injustice we have done our friend, than by copying from his letter to us, his own account of the ground taken in his book on the subject of slavery.

"My plan is," he says, "to exhibit American slavery, as defined by slave laws, as defined by the wisest legislators of the South —the entire South,—as defined by a very prominent anti-abolitionist, in a very orthodox anti-abolitionist periodical, the African Repository (see p. 365). Having thus shown the nature, or essential characteristics of American slavery as a system established by law, all my remarks bear upon it as such, professedly and designedly—as such it is contrasted with the spirit and letter of the Eighth Commandment, and proved to be criminal—opposed to scripture precept and to the benevolent tendencies of the gospel.

"Having proceeded thus far, and plain scripture light having guided me thus far, in the articles 770, 771, 773; I have taken ground in direct opposition to 'the embodied fanaticism of England,' and altogether diverse from that which a large mass of our northern abolitionists would approve. I have asserted accordingly that 'it seems not to be fair or right to denounce every man

as wicked, unjust, and unchristian, who occupies the relation of a slave-holder; and we cannot doubt that there are hundreds, whose sentiments and practice, under the system of slavery, virtually abolish the relation, and who are not, therefore proper objects of censure,—the real difficulties also which are attendant upon immediate and general emancipation ought to be fairly considered.'"

As Mr. Boyd naturally wishes his book to have access to the schools and colleges of the South, it is specially due to him, that any misrepresentation of his real sentiments on this difficult and exciting subject, should be corrected. We are happy, therefore, to have it in our power, on his own authority, to state that, contrary to our first impression, he does not take common ground with the Abolitionists in asserting that all slave-holding is sinful, and that he approves of these decisions of the American Board of Commissioners and other public bodies, against which the abolitionists are constantly directing their most violent assaults.

An explanation somewhat similar is due to Dr. Schaf, whom we are understood by some as having charged with plagiarism in our article on Historical Theology. The first impression made upon us by a few slight coincidences both of thought and language, was corrected by observing that even these did not extend beyond the first part of the two productions, and by due consideration of the ease with which the most original and independent thinker may be guilty of unconscious imitation, as to trifles, after reading a congenial writer on a favourite subject. As to the absence of all reference to Kliefoth, had we known, as we now know, but had then no right to take for granted, that Dr. Schaf had not read Kliefoth's work on Dogmengeschichte, nor any of his papers in the Repertorium but the first, we should no doubt have avoided even that ambiguity of language which has undesignedly conveyed, to some minds, this unpleasant imputation on a writer, whom we verily believe to be morally as much above the meanness, as he is intellectually above the necessity, of literary theft.