THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL 1848.

No. II.

Lyman Atwater

ART. I.—1. *The Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge.* Boston. Hilliard, Gray & Co. 1835.

2. *Aids to Reflection by S. T. Coleridge,* with a preliminary essay, and additional notes, by James Marsh, President of the University of Vermont. Burlington: Chauncey Goodrich. 1829.

3. *The Friend: a series of essays to aid in the formation of fixed principles in politics, morals, and religion, with literary amusements interspersed.* By S. T. Coleridge, Esq. Burlington: Chauncey Goodrich. 1831.

4. *The Statesman's Manual, or the Bible the best guide to political skill and foresight:* by S. T. Coleridge, Esq. Burlington: Chauncey Goodrich. 1832.

5. *Biographia Literaria; or biographical sketches of my literary life and opinions.* By S. T. Coleridge. Two volumes in one. New York: Leavitt, Lord, & Co. 1843.

6. *On the Constitution of the Church and State according to the idea of each,* by S. T. Coleridge, Esq., R. A., R. S. L. Second edition. London. Hurst, Ebance, & Co. 1830.

7. *Specimens of the Table Talk of the late Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1835.

8. *The Literary Remains of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, collected and edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, Esq., M. A., in four volumes. London: William Pickering. 1836.
9. *The Life of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, by James Gillman. Vol. I. London: William Pickering. 1838.
10. *Reminiscences of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southey.* By Joseph Cottle. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 1847.

Of course our readers will not expect in any single article a critical review of this formidable catalogue of books. Nor is it our purpose to give a detailed and complete analysis of any single work in the list. The man who was the author of most of them, and whose life and character are delineated in the residue, was undeniably one of the most remarkable men of his time, whatever opinion may be formed of his merits or demerits. Nor can any one at all acquainted with the present state of literature, metaphysics or theology in Great Britain and especially in this country, doubt that he has left his impress upon them, and that his writings are now exerting, and are destined yet to exert a strong moulding influence upon many of the younger class of educated men among us. Indeed his biographer, Dr. Gillman observes (p. 165.) "The Western world seems to have better appreciated the works of Coleridge, than most of his countrymen: in some parts of America, his writings are understood and highly valued." And his admiring and eloquent posthumous editor, exaggerates, only by putting a partial in the form of a general truth, when he says that the writings of his master have been "melted into the very heart of the rising literature of England and America."

What the character is of this influence thus wide, powerful and permanent upon so considerable a portion of these educated and intellectual classes, who in the end, shape and determine the prevailing opinions in the various ranks of society,—and for these almost exclusively Coleridge wrote—is still sharply contested. Many have been so charmed by the originality, the depth, the vigour, the density, the mingled truth, beauty and magnificence of some of his finer passages, that they are spell-bound, wholly overmastered and enslaved by him. They are perfectly blind to the crudities and errors, by which his works are so seriously deformed. They think of him only to admire

and extol him. They indignantly resent all criticisms which take exceptions even to his grossest faults, and most palpable heresies. They revere him as a sort of oracle, whose all-penetrant mind saw through the universe, into the inmost penetralia of truth, and gave forth not merely the corruscations of genius, but the sure light of inspiration. And hence, no matter how absurd or preposterous any of his statements may be on their face, such will believe and ardently contend, that the absurdity is only seeming to his readers on account of their short-sightedness, and that, if they did but possess the author's "vision and faculty divine," they would see it to be truth sublimed into its purest essence, its most ideal and supersensuous form.

An equal if not larger number have not only justly recoiled from this blind and perilous idolatry, but have also suffered themselves to be repelled to the contrary extreme, which if less perilous, is scarcely less blind. Affrighted by the shadowy mysticism, the abysmal transcendentalism, the occasional leaven now of rationalism, now of ritualism, and other unfortunate idiosyncracies, with which his writings are more or less disfigured, they put them all under the law of absolute, indiscriminate, unrelenting reprobation. They pronounce them not only unprofitable but dangerous. They condemn the temperate, discriminating, independent mastery of his writings, as well as the being mastered by them. The only course of safety, they think, lies in total abstinence. Putting him in the same category with Hegel, Strauss *et id genus omne*, their motto is, *Procul, O procul, este profani.*

While between these two extremes, there are all shades of thinking and feeling, we also will undertake to show our opinion. On the one hand, we call no man, and least of all Coleridge, master. On the other hand, we believe that the cause of truth and religion will be best promoted by giving to all their due, and especially by a candid appreciation of the real merits of any author, who is taking strong hold of the minds of any worthy and respectable class of men. If that blind admiration of him, which swallows and pretends and honestly strives, to digest, the shell as well as the kernel, ought to be repudiated as most foolish and mischievous; on the other hand, nothing so tends to kindle and inflame it, as that equally blind prejudice and denunciation, which refusing to see and acknowledge his eminent, conspicuous and undeniable excellencies, declare all his works no better than

dross, because so much of it envelops or encrusts the silver and gold and precious gems, which every where show themselves in strange profusion and brilliancy. The feeling that such a wrong has been done to a favourite author, to whom they are conscious of being indebted not only for refined pleasure, but for high and lasting benefits to their intellectual being, rouses all their generous sentiments in his defence. It creates a revulsion of feeling, which so far from acquiescing in the injustice, disposes them, if possible, to repair it, not merely by mantling and extenuating obvious faults and errors, but by metamorphosing them into excellencies. A fair and impartial estimate then of an author whose influence is so decidedly felt in the great departments of literature, mental and moral philosophy and religion, is highly desirable. This is what we propose to attempt. For this purpose we have placed at the head of our article his published works, and such memoirs of him as have hitherto appeared, not because we design in form to review any of them, but because we may see cause to quote from them all, in illustration of our views. In what light then are we to regard Coleridge as a genius, thinker, scholar, poet, critic, metaphysician, moralist and theologian, who has won for himself a name as extensive, and probably as enduring as English literature, and who has shown, in an extraordinary degree the power of impregnating that literature with the living gems shot forth from his own mind?

In order to an intelligent answer to this question, and to a just conception of his peculiarities, a brief view of his peculiar early training and developments, and subsequent circumstances and habits, is indispensable. This will be mostly derived from Dr. Gillman's memoir.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge was born at Ottery, England, October 21st, 1772. His father was vicar of the parish, and head master of the King's School, a man of most guileless character, exemplary habits, distinguished alike for his great learning, and his want of worldly tact and common sense. Samuel was the youngest of ten children, all by his second wife, who, though unrefined, had a prudence and energy in domestic concern, which in a good degree compensated for her husband's deficiency in this respect. When the son was nearly seven years old, his father died, and according to a previous arrangement, he was transferred to the guardianship of a friend, who procured for him

admission to the school of Christ's Hospital, the preceptor of which was Rev. James Bowyer, a most admirable instructor, but a most savage and merciless disciplinarian. Previous to this, however, he had been, owing to a freak in the nurse, kept from the society of other children, so that he says of himself, "I was huffed away from the enjoyments of muscular activity, from play to take refuge at my mother's side, on my little stool to read my little book, and to listen to the talk of my elders." . . "Alas! I had all the simplicity, all the docility of the little child, but none of the child's habits. I never thought as a child, never had the language of a child." On entering the school, he represents himself as being "depressed, moping, friendless, poor, orphan, half-starved," for the food at this establishment was miserably scanty and coarse. Delicate and suffering from disease, the barbarous regimen of this institution must have been unfriendly to his health, and the culture of the genial affections and sympathies. Hence all circumstances conspired with his previous training at home, to lead him to find his recreation not so much in boyish sports, as in gratifying his naturally voracious appetite for books. With a full supply of these he was furnished in a singular way. A gentleman meeting him in the street was so struck by his conversation, that he procured for him free use of a circulating library. "From eight to fourteen," says he, "I was a playless day-dreamer, a *belluo librorum*." Whatever may have been the effect of these things on his intellect, it is obvious how they tended to implant and aggravate those maladies in a constitution naturally morbid, which so greatly embittered his life, and deprived him of that blessing to all scholars so invaluable, of the *mens sana in sano corpore*. This evil was at this period also greatly increased by imprudence in bathing, almost the only recreation out of doors in which he indulged.

Middleton, who afterwards became known to fame, being in a higher department of the school, had often observed Coleridge absorbed with books during play-hours. Inquiring of him on one occasion what he was reading, he found that he was studying Virgil for pleasure, not having yet reached it in the school-course. The attention of the head-master was instantly turned to this extraordinary fact, and he at once conceived the purpose of training him to eminent scholarship. Always at the head of his

class without any desire or effort to be so, or any sense of emulation whatever, he was still incomparably more above his mates in miscellaneous knowledge, or as he himself styles it, "the wide, wild wilderness of useless, unarranged book-knowledge and book-thoughts." Getting his two volumes daily from the library, at all hazards, he describes himself as having been at fourteen in a continual low fever. "My whole being was, with eyes closed to every object of present sense, to crumple myself up in a corner and read, read, read."

About this period, he imbibed infidel sentiments from reading Voltaire's Philosophical Dictionary. Seeing that with such views he could not enter the ministry, and having become weary of his school, he sought to be apprenticed to a shoe-maker in the neighbourhood, who with his wife had become much attached to him on account of the gentleness of his spirit and the sprightliness of his mind, and had in turn won his affection by their kindness to him. When he stated the case to Bowyer, and informed him that he was an infidel, without further parley, this veteran castigator whipped him severely, and thus according to the uniform testimony of Coleridge, exorcised the foul spirit. Indeed he acknowledged that this was the only remedy that would have reached the disease, as all reasoning would rather have flattered his vanity, than convinced him of his error.

But notwithstanding the barbarous, and in most instances, wholly unmerited severities he suffered from this master, who was wont to preface these inflictions by saying that the fundamental maxim of the Peripatetic school was, "*Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu*," and to translate it, "you must flog a boy before you can make him understand,"* Coleridge ever acknowledged his high obligations to him for the incomparable intellectual discipline he imparted. He not only made his scholars thorough linguists; he also exercised them laboriously in composition, and the cultivation of a just taste. In this, his standard was high and severe. Says Coleridge, (*Biog. Lit.* pp. 11, 12,) "He early moulded my taste to the preference of Demosthenes to Cicero, of Homer and Theocritus to Virgil, and again of Virgil to Ovid. . . I learnt from him that poetry, even that of the loftiest and seemingly wildest odes, had a logic

* *Lit. Remains.* Vol. iv. p. 148.

of its own, as severe as that of science. . . In our own English composition, (at least for the last three years of our school education) he showed no mercy to phrase, metaphor or image, unsupported by sound sense, or where the same sense might have been conveyed with equal force and dignity in plainer words."

While we see in these facts how much the most splendid genius owes to faithful academic training, for its subsequent power to realize its own aspirations, there is another less pleasing circumstance, which shows the permanent injury resulting even to the finest minds, from any material defect in early education, while it also illustrates the barbarous caprice which ruled at this school. When commencing Euclid, Coleridge objected to the definition of a line, that it "must have some breadth, be it ever so thin." For this he received a box on the ear, and was sent to his seat. Succeeding no better with his next recitation, he was given over as hopeless in this department, and his mathematical studies were neglected. Coleridge ever regretted this deficiency, and on grounds which we shall hereafter show, we think with reason, although his admiring biographer thinks his natural logical powers were such as completely to make good this vacuum in his education.

During his stay at this school, he wrote occasional fugitive poems, which betokened his future eminence as a son of song. And while yet a school-boy he displayed that passion for metaphysics, by which he was distinguished through life. It was even then his delight, in his holiday excursions, to meet any stranger who would converse with him, and he would quickly turn the interview into discussion upon

> "Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,
> And found no end in wandering mazes lost."

In 1791, at the age of 19, he was transferred from Christ's Hospital to Jesus College, Cambridge. Here his ignorance and inaptness in money matters at once involved him in pecuniary embarrassments, which afterwards increasing, greatly annoyed him through life. Although an unrivalled linguist, yet his distaste for mathematics and his desultory habits of reading and studying as much out of the college routine as in it, prevented his gaining or even aspiring to, a fellowship, which by a proper concentration of his powers he might easily have won. He was the focus of social companies for conversation upon literature,

on the great topics of the day; and others had no occasion to read the latest pamphlets; for Coleridge having read them in the morning, would repeat them to the company gathered about him in the evening.

While at college he became interested in the trial of a Socinian, which had the effect of leading him to espouse this barren faith to which he adhered till he was twenty-five years old.

Another circumstance which strongly evinces his propensity to yield blindly and passively, to the capricious impulses of the moment, even to the length of the most foolhardy recklessness of consequences, is his enlistment in the army. For the amusing details of this affair we must refer the reader to Mr. Cottle's book, p. 209, et seq. It appears that having been foiled in a love suit, he recklessly left the college and went to London and enlisted in a cavalry company, under the assumed name of Silas Tompken Cumberbatch. His inveterate distaste for bodily exertion, and unequalled awkwardness in every thing of the sort, made his new duties intolerable to him. He at length surmounted his worst difficulty, by bribing a fellow-soldier to groom his restive horse, in consideration of his writing for him love-ditties to send to his sweet-heart. Often tumbling from his horse, the butt of the whole regiment for the sorry figure he made in all martial exercises, he was yet a favourite and a wonder with them, on account of the richness, humour and charm of his conversation. These circumstances being observed by some of the officers, they relieved him from some of his troubles by removing him to the hospital service. This was not more fortunate for Coleridge than for the miserable patients. The charm of his conversation quickly emptied the sick-beds, and attracted their occupants into a group around him, and they said it helped them more than all the doctor's physic. After some months, he was discovered by some of his friends, who extricated him from his sad predicament, so that he returned to Cambridge.

His theological views precluding him from the honest exercise of the office of the ministry in the established church, no arena seemed open to him, but the pursuit of literature. For this purpose he left Cambridge, and in 1794 went to Bristol, where with Southey, and a small coterie of enthusiastic literary youths, he warmly espoused, if he did not originate, the visionary project of forming a colony, composed of themselves and such con-

genial spirits as they might induce to join them, which was to emigrate to this country and set up a new social organization on the banks of the Susquehannah, called Pantisocracy. Here they were to rid themselves of the social and political evils which have so long scourged our race, and regain that Paradisaic felicity of which it has so long been despoiled. It appears that all that determined them to the selection of this spot, was the romantic beauty of the name. Southey's good judgment soon cooled his zeal in the enterprise. Coleridge's enthusiasm was more enduring; but poverty disabled him from following its impulses, till he saw its folly. At this time he supported himself by delivering popular lectures on various topics, political, literary, moral and religious, by some income derived from poetry, and in some degree by the generosity of friends, on which through life he was sadly dependent. Here he published the "Watchman," a weekly periodical, which, if for no reason but his own sluggish irregularity and failure to issue it according to his engagement, speedily expired, as did every such enterprise in which he engaged; and involved him in serious pecuniary loss.

In the year 1795, he married Miss Sarah Fricker, the sister of Southey's wife, and domesticated himself in a rural cottage in the vicinity of Bristol, with the expectation of supporting himself by writing poetry, for which his publisher agreed to pay him at the rate of a guinea and a half for every hundred lines. His habitual tardiness and delinquency in fulfilling his engagements, however, still clung to him, and brought him in arrears. But through the kindness and forbearance of an attached publisher, and the munificence of numerous friends who had been enchanted by his brilliant productions and matchless conversation, his wants were supplied. In all circles, in all positions, in the society of the most eminent men, his prodigious intellectual power displayed itself and won for him not vulgar, but choice admirers and most devoted friends. All, however, soon found that his want of method, punctuality and fidelity to his engagements, was equal to his genius, and that in the strong language of Southey, "no dependance could be place upon him," (*Cottle*, p. 301.) Whether he announced a lecture, or pledged himself to furnish matter for the press; or accepted an invitation to dine, he was exceedingly liable to fail, and gave tokens thus early, of

what became a besetting sin, and grievous injustice to himself through life.

About this period, the Socinians hearing that he was of their faith, and felicitating themselves on so important an accession of strength to their cause, made arrangements with him to preach in one of their chapels. Great was the eclat with which they heralded the appearance of this extraordinary genius in their pulpits. A meagre assembly however, convened. And the sermons were feeble repetitions of two lectures he had previously delivered in Bristol, one on the "Corn Laws," and the other on "Hair Powder Tax." *Cottle, p.* 71.

But it appears that not long afterward he began to be agitated with doubts, and to yearn for a more life-giving system. "I was at that time," says he, (*Biog. Lit.*, p. 103,) "though a Trinitarian, (i. e. ad norman Platonis) in philosophy, yet a zealous Unitarian in religion." And again, (ib. p. 117) referring to a later period, "Doubts rushed in, broke upon me from the fountains of the great deep, and fell from the windows of heaven. The fontal truths of natural religion, and the books of revelation alike contributed to the flood; and it was long ere my ark touched on Ararat and rested."

While his religious opinions were in this fermenting and chaotic state, he was enabled by the munificence of two affluent friends to repair to Germany to complete his education. He went to that country in the year 1798, and besides acquiring the language, studied some of the great authors of the country, especially the writings of Kant and Schelling, and became highly enamored of that Transcendentalism, for which he was predisposed by the native bent of his mind, although he had previously been for a time so fascinated with Hartley and other writers of an opposite school that he named his first born after him. And the influence of his new metaphysical views is palpable in all his subsequent writings. In politics, criticism, morals and religion, his doctrines and reasonings, whether true or false, are always, as far as possible, shaped in the mould of the Transcendental philosophy, sometimes brightened and glorified by the poetry and eloquence in which he arrays it, sometimes modified by his English feelings and prejudices, and his Christian belief, and sometimes in all its naked abstractness,

and barbarous nomenclature, lowering upon us with "darkness visible."

After an absence of fourteen months he returned to England, and took charge of the literary and political department of the Morning Post, a leading London Journal. He consented to undertake it, on condition that the paper should be conducted on fixed principles, previously announced, not deviating from them out of regard to persons or parties. Some specimens of the prodigious power displayed in his articles, may be found in his analysis of the character of Pitt, and report of one of his speeches which Canning afterwards said "did more credit to the author's head than his memory." (*Gillman*, p. 195, et. seq.) In such labours for this Journal, and afterwards for the Courier, he was occupied several years, during "the prime and manhood of his intellect." Nor was his influence unfelt. Even Buonaparte marked him as a victim, having been stung by the caustic of his Anti-Gallican articles; and sent an order for his arrest when he was visiting Italy for his health, which he narrowly escaped. After his return, he published the "Friend" in periodical numbers, or rather printed it, since it scarcely retained enough subscribers, or at the time, gained enough readers, to make it fairly a publication.

Little is brought to light concerning him for the four or five succeeding years. There is every reason for the conjecture that he was to a great extent paralyzed during this period, by that most fatal habit, which it must not be concealed was his blackest stain, and which it was his highest honour that he renounced, as he saw the crisis at hand, when further persistence in it would have rendered death inevitable or life intolerable. We need not say that we refer to his enormous opium-eating; of the extent, and debasing and withering effects of which upon this prodigy of genius, and of the monitory example thus furnished, it is due to the fidelity of Mr. Cottle that the world does not remain ignorant. We do not find in any of the biographical notices, or of Coleridge's confessions, information as to the time when he began the practice which he afterwards carried to extreme intemperance. But the following passage in a letter to Mr. Wedgwood one of his benefactors, in the year 1800, excites the suspicion that he had already been accustomed to it, and that it probably commenced early in life. "Life were so flat a thing

without enthusiasm, that if for a moment it leaves me, I have a sort of stomach sensation attached to all my thoughts, *like those which succeed to the pleasurable operations of a dose of opium.*" (*Cottle*, p. 319.)

His own account of the origin of the wretched practice is as follows: "I was seduced into the accursed habit ignorantly. I had been almost bedridden for many months, with swellings in my knees. In a medical Journal, I unhappily met with an account of a cure performed in a similar case, or what appeared to me so, by rubbing in of laudanum, at the same time taking a given dose internally. It acted like a charm, like a miracle! I recovered the use of my limbs, of my appetite, of my spirits, and this continued for near a fortnight. At length the unusual stimulus subsided, the complaint returned,—the supposed remedy was recurred to—but I cannot go through the dreary history." (Ib. p. 272.)

This was in the year 1814, when his old friend and patron Mr. Cottle, to whom this disclosure was made, first learned, although many of his friends had long been painfully aware of the real cause which had made his body a very incarnation of disease, paralyzed his will into utter impotence, thrown his conscience into alternate fits of apathy, bewilderment and remorse, and reduced his intellect to a mere capacity for wild, capricious and abortive effort. This was the darkest crisis of his life. At times he felt that he must die in a week; and yet, such is the infatuation of intemperance, he felt constrained to ward off the supposed danger, by larger doses of the drug which had caused it, and the continued use of which, he knew would aggravate it! It is with no pleasure that we depict this melancholy self-degradation of one of the loftiest minds ever bestowed on man. But it is material to a just estimate of the man and his works. It had much to do with his mental idiosyncrasies; with the incomplete and fragmentary character of his published writings; and beyond a doubt, aggravated those fitful and desultory intellectual habits, which we have already seen, were inherent in, and ever fostered by him. Nor were the effects of this intemperance, either on his mind or body, ever wholly obliterated, even after after he abandoned it.

We have another motive, the same which governed Mr. Cottle in making the fearful disclosure. This case is a terrific

warning to all who may be venturing on this species of sensual indulgence, on any pretext whatever, which should be held up in all its odiousness, in these days, when, as we are informed, Turkish and other tobacco prepared with an infusion of opium, is becoming fashionable either as an addition to, or a substitute for, the more vulgar means of intoxication, among youth in some literary institutions, and doubtless elsewhere! And we think that Mr. Cottle did but discharge a solemn duty to the cause of letters, morals and religion, when he divulged the revolting truth, not regarding the temporary sensitiveness of relatives, friends, extravagant admirers, and servile disciples.

We must therefore proceed to disclose the worst of this matter. According to a statement of Southey, (Cottle, p. 276), at one time his "ordinary consumption of laudanum was, from *two quarts a week* to a *pint a day*." To this was added "a frightful consumption of spirits." (p. 279.) Describing attempts made by himself to abandon it, Coleridge says that his spirits rose, "till the moment arrived, the direful moment, when my pulse began to fluctuate, my heart to palpitate, and such falling abroad as it were, of my whole frame, such intolerable restlessness, and incipient bewilderment, that in the last of my several attempts to abandon the dire poison, I exclaimed in agony, which I now repeat in seriousness and solemnity, 'I am too poor to hazard this.' Had I but a few hundred pounds, but £200, half to send to Mrs. Coleridge, and half to place myself in a private madhouse, where I could procure nothing but what a physician thought proper, and where a medical attendant could be constantly with me for two or three months (in less than that time life or death would be determined,) then there might be hope. Now there is none!! O God! how willingly would I place myself under Dr. Fox in his establishment. For my case is a species of madness, only that it is a derangement, an utter impotence of volition and not of the intellectual faculties. You bid me rouse myself: go bid a paralytic in both arms to rub them briskly together and that will cure him. 'Alas,' he would reply, 'that I cannot move my arms is my complaint and my misery.'" (Cottle p. 273.)

To these humiliating confessions of bondage and impotence, must be added the still direr out-breakings of REMORSE, which he elsewhere declares, "the implicit creed of the guilty." He

says in this same letter, "for ten years the anguish of my spirit has been indescribable, the sense of danger staring, but the consciousness of GUILT worse, far worse than all!" In another, "you have no conception of the dreadful hell of my mind, conscience and body." In yet another, "conceive of a poor miserable wretch, who for many years has been attempting to beat off pain by a constant recurrence to the vice that reproduces it. Conceive of a spirit in hell, employed in tracing out for others the road to that heaven, from which his own crimes exclude him! In short, conceive of whatever is most wretched, helpless and hopeless, and you will form as tolerable a notion of my state as it is possible for a good man to have. . . . In the one crime of opium, what crime have I not made myself guilty of! Ingratitude to my Maker! and to my benefactors—injustice! *and unnatural cruelty to my poor children!* self-contempt for my repeated promise—breach, nay, too often, actual falsehood!

"After my death, I earnestly entreat that a full and unqualified narration of my wretchedness and its guilty cause, may be made public, that at least some little good may be effected by this direful example." (*Cottle*, p. 292.)

While we have here the fullest warrant for spreading out the whole of this painful case, we see clearly intimated the cause of his separation from his wife and family. This drug poisoned domestic and conjugal affection at its fountain. It consumed his income, costing him, according to Southey, some twelve dollars a week, and indisposed and disabled him for any systematic and lucrative literary effort. His wife and three fine children were wholly neglected by him. He did not even write to them or open their letters to him. They were taken in and mostly provided for by Southey at his own home. And we can scarcely wonder at or censure the indignation of the latter at Coleridge's mad persistence in this suicidal vice, as he vents it in the following terms. "He leaves his family to chance and charity, with good feelings and good principles as far as the intellect is concerned, and an intellect as clear and as powerful as was ever vouchsafed to man, he is the slave of degrading sensuality and sacrifices every thing to it. The case is equally deplorable and monstrous." (*Cottle*, p. 286.)

The completeness of this bondage is seen in another circumstance. As the idea continued to haunt him, of going to a mad-

house to obtain the assistance requisite to reformation, a friend, a Mr. Wade, took him into his family, procured for him the constant attendance of a physician, and (when he had so long abstained, and so far recovered from the consequent prostration, that it was deemed prudent for him to walk abroad,) also hired a respectable man to attend him in his excursions, and prevent him, when tempted, from procuring the fatal drug. Despite all this, he dexterously contrived to procure it by stealth, while apparently reforming, and taxing the generosity of his friends to ensure his reformation. (*Cottle*, p. 284-5.)

It is not surprising that the patience of Coleridge's friends expired with their hopes. And while numerous opulent admirers were ready to contribute to any extent needful for his relief, comfort and usefulness, they became tired of benefactions which were only abused to his own harm and ruin, in ministering to this degrading appetite.

But we now come to a more pleasing part of the record, which should efface that already past, were it not that the good of others, and the right comprehension of Coleridge as a public man, demanded its preservation. He at length became satisfied, that there was no ray of hope for him, except in utterly and forever abandoning the dire poison. For this purpose he sought admission to the family of an intelligent physician, who could prescribe judiciously for his ailments arising from the stoppage of his opium doses, without permitting a recurrence to them, and who by taking a friendly interest in his case, and engaging in conversation with him, could mitigate the severity of the experiment, and relieve the dreadful ennui to which he was exposed. A gracious Providence led him to Dr. Gillman, a flourishing physician in a village in the vicinity of London. This gentleman and his lady were at once fascinated with the splendour of his genius, the brilliancy of his conversation, the gentleness and sweetness of his spirit, while they compassionated his infirmity, and sympathized with his desires, and were ready to second his efforts, for deliverance from it. They welcomed him to their hospitable home, where he went to reside in April, 1816, and continued till his death, which occurred July 25, 1834. Here he conquered his dreadful habit. And it was owing to the constant kindness and devotion of these new friends, their generous provision and untiring ministries for his comfort and welfare, prolonged through

near twenty years, most of them years of disease and exquisite pain, when he needed the laborious attentions required in sickness—and which their unmixed love and admiration of him, alone could have prompted—that he was both enabled to rise from his degradation, and send forth most of those important productions by which he has left his impress on the world. Soon after his resort to their house, he published the *Biographia Literaria;* then, though whether in this precise order of succession we are uncertain, the *Friend* revised, the *Aids to Reflection*, and the *Church and State.* Here too he uttered, in magnificent discourse, his *Table Talk*, which was given forth impromptu, much of it from a sick couch, without any thought of publication, during the visits of his admiring and accomplished nephew, who wrote it out and published it after his death. Here he composed a large part of the contents of his *Literary Remains*, amounting to four large volumes. Hence Dr. Gillman became his biographer, and with his posthumous editor, and the author of the "Reminiscences," has acquired a notoriety in the world of letters, which is wholly borrowed from the splendours of that great luminary, for some of whose beams they became the medium of transmission. Like Boswell, these satellites will have a celebrity as lasting as that of the fixed stars in the firmament of letters, about which they revolve.

And we think our readers will agree with us that there must be elements of matchless power and transcendent superiority in the productions of a man, who notwithstanding his great and glaring infirmities native and acquired—infirmities beyond all others adapted, and actually working, to prevent his doing justice to his own faculties, has made for himself a name coextensive with English literature, and waked an interest in his character and writings, which raises from obscurity to fame, those who, however accidentally, are able to shed a fresh ray of light upon either. Johnson once said, "*no man was ever written down but by himself.*" Coleridge was incessantly ridiculed and lampooned by the reviewers of all grades, from the ephemeral scavenger to the "dirty passions" of the vulgar, to the authoritative censors of the Edinburgh and Quarterly. It was observable, however, that their tone of bitterness and unmitigated contempt gradually softened during his life, as, despite their assaults, his reputation, friends, and admirers increased, while, after his death, it passed

into unmeasured eulogy of him, as a genius altogether peerless and unique. But whether it had changed or not, there must have been some vitality in that which, after being thrice slain, still rose before them in full vigour, and provoked renewed attacks. Or, as he himself expresses it, "there must be something more than usually strong and extensive in a reputation, that could either require or endure so long-continued and merciless a cannonading."

And yet, these causes explain, if they do not justify, the strongly variant and opposite views which have been, and are still, to some extent, entertained and expressed in regard to Coleridge. That he has great, and in his own way, unrivalled merits; that in power and richness of imagination; in depth and energy of thought; in mastery over language; in the originality and force with which he has brought out new, or previously unnoticed or unregarded principles, or illuminated old and familiar truths, he has had few compeers in this or any age, few who have carefully studied him, will question. This accounts for the extraordinary and enthusiastic admiration, often resulting in blind servility, which he has often excited, in many of the finest, especially, of youthful minds.

On the other hand, these excellencies are in strange and grotesque combination with faults equally prominent and glaring. These faults, except when they arose from or consisted of, errors of opinion, arose from what we shall venture to call (we hope his admirers will take no offence) the *undisciplined* state of his intellect. In saying this, we mean no more than what his posthumous editor has more felicitously expressed, when he represents him as having been "mastered by his genius, instead of mastering it." He had no command over his stupendous powers, but was rather at the mercy of their spontaneous and fitful workings. Hence he delivered the vagary, the dream, or the inspiration of the moment. And true inspiration it very often was; but alas, scarcely less often it was a dream, a crudity, a perfectly baseless and not seldom unintelligible conceit. Hence too his essays and disquisitions, as well as his poems, are for the most part unfinished; they are fragments, germs of grand thoughts, or reasonings which he had projected, and which required to be expanded and perfected, before they were published, if the author would do justice to himself, or his subject.

Hence, too, there is little pains-taking or elaboration in his writings to adapt them to the common mind, or even to the ready comprehension of educated men. Hence his passages of beauty, and power, and unmarred and unmatched excellence, which are scattered in heedless profusion through his writings, are found in the most awkward intimacy with the strange, the crude, the fantastic, the bewildering, the unintelligible, the absurd. In truth his writing was extemporaneous, the outbursting of what entered his mind at the moment; and his conversation was discourse, scarcely less sustained, brilliant, and perfect than his composition, as his Table Talk under all the disadvantage of coming to us filtrated through a reporter, abundantly shows. There was in it, for those who listened intelligently to it, a strange enchantment. It seemed like inspiration. His writings were all *improvisations*. His *improvisations* would seem to have been previously meditated, were it not, that during their delivery, one could see the living and formative processes of their conception, birth, and growth going on in his mind. Hence the comparison we have somewhere seen between him and Sir James Mackintosh, his only rival as a converser, was undoubtedly just. Sir James brought forth his thoughts from a repository in which they had been previously stowed away, assorted, and labelled for this very purpose. And when he presented them, they were most apt and beautiful, but they seemed like dried specimens taken from a *hortus siccus*, where they had been previously laid up and numbered for the occasion. But in Coleridge though there was less of fluency and promptness, there was manifest, the originating and forming process. One saw the actual birth-throes of genius, and was overcome by the mighty spell. It was quickening; it was electric; it was creative.

And from this great mental infirmity—great in proportion to the greatness of his powers—of having his mind in no sense under the control of his will, but his will a mere passive thing swayed absolutely by the spontaneous and wayward flights of his mind, and moods and impulses of feeling, another serious defect arises to deform some of his finest compositions. He would often be seduced from the main topic of his discourse, or essay, before he had proceeded any length with it, to some collateral, or even unrelated subject, and instead of that perfect development of the first topic, which he intended or perhaps promised at the

starting point, the reader finds himself treated to a series of passages on different topics, crowding upon each other like wave upon wave. Into these divergencies he would be led by following out an illustration, and forgetting the thing to be illustrated, or by some fortuitous association of ideas, or by the mere capricious dartings of his thoughts in another line. His warmest admirers have partially acknowledged, while they partially deny this representation. Thus the editor of the Table Talk in his preface (p. 10,) speaks of the "seeming remoteness of his associations, and the exceeding subtlety of his transitional links," in discourse or reasoning, as interfering with his intelligibleness. So Mr. De Quincy, as quoted by him on the same page, says that Coleridge "to many people seemed to wander. . . . They continued to admire the separate beauty of the thoughts, but did not see their relations to the dominant theme." Yet while we have given our own solution of this fact, we do not wonder at theirs, which is that in all this he had "a logic of his own," of the highest and severest kind, but which could not be detected by ordinary listeners or readers, without protracted meditation. We are glad to believe that this was sometimes so. But we believe that much also must be put to the account of his want of mastery over his intellect, and that in too many such instances, there was no real logical concatenation between the parts of his discourse. We think with Sir Humphrey Davy his early friend, and in another department, an intellectual compeer, who speaking of Coleridge in 1803, said, "His will is less than ever commensurate with his ability. Brilliant images of greatness float upon his mind, like images of the morning clouds upon the waters. Their forms are changed by the motion of the waves, they are agitated by every breeze, and modified by every sun beam." (*Cottle*, p. 218.)

Hence we see why it is, that, while Coleridge shows as much creative power as any man of his age, and while there is the most profuse affluence of magnificent imagery, and profound, original, soul-stirring thoughts, there is so much that is crude, shadowy and obscure: that when from the electric light he flashes upon one in the opening of his disquisition, his expectations had been raised of a masterly clearing up of a subject that ever before baffled him, he is disappointed either by finding it suddenly dropped with the introduction, or *in medio:* or ex-

changed for some glorious excursion into another realm of thought, or perhaps for some flight into those nebulous altitudes when the various objects are too remote to be distinctly seen by poor mundane mortals, unless their vision can be armed with that transcendental telescope, which none can borrow from the master, but those who catch his *esoteric* inspirations. Hence too the great number of his projected works on the *prima philosophia*, in which he proposed to reduce the *omne scibile* to unity and harmony, and to which he so often refers his reader as about to appear, and contain a fuller explication of a topic of which he thus takes leave, works which however were never completed or published; although his accomplished editor observes, that all his prose works actually published were "little more than feelers, pioneers, disciplants, for the last and complete exposition of them." In all these circumstances too, we find the secret of the aversion, amounting in many cases to absolute disgust and contempt, which has so extensively been shown toward his works, the feeling which is just toward particular portions and qualities of them, being transferred to the whole indiscriminately.

And this faulty habitude of his mind is both explained and confirmed by the great points developed in his biography. We shall not here stop to recite his own confessions and lamentations and explanations regarding this great defect. He however often speaks of his want of self-control, his feebleness of will in failing to execute the dictates of conscience and reason, as not only the great cause of his moral faults, but of his failure to realize that fame and emolument, which his genius was capable of commanding. But his philosophy of the fact, (see *Biog. Lit.* p. 25) showing that such a tendency is among those traits of genius which distinguish it from mere talent, is such assuredly, as it must have taken a genius to invent. We think, however, that this weakness of will as compared with his emotive, intellectual, and imaginative powers, is shown by his whole biography to be a native quality, fostered and aggravated by his whole subsequent training and habits. We see it not only in his frequent suicidal yielding to the shapeless impulses of the moment: but as it vitiated his intellect, in that huge mass of undigested reading in which he run wild, to the neglect of methodical mental discipline and self-control, both in early and later life. But this deficiency was greatly aggravated by that almost entire

omission of mathematical studies which unfortunately characterised his education, a discipline which beyond all else, marshals the faculties into subjection to the will of their possessor. His prodigious natural logical acumen, was no offset to this *one-sidedness* in his education. As well might it be said that the want of a classical education would have been balanced by his native insight into language. What Coleridge was deficient in, was not penetration, or logical acumen, or the power to exhibit these with a skill and felicity unsurpassed by uninspired man, in detached passages and insulated trains of thought; but he wanted the power of chaining his mind to any single subject, point, or work, as well of poetry as metaphysics till he had finished what he designed to do, acccording to his original projection of it. This is just that power which the study of mathematics, besides training the logical faculty, imparts. The very nature of every exercise in mathematics is such, that the mind must stick to it with dogged perseverance, till it masters it completely. There is no stopping place between this "rapturous EUREKA" and utter failure. Lastly, we need not stay to show, how that bewitching narcotic which so long enslaved him, by causing paroxysms of phrenzied and preternatural intellectual excitement to alternate constantly with utter prostration and flatness of mind, contributed to aggravate a pre-existing mental defect, into utter deformity.

And yet we believe it is owing to this very peculiarity, that Coleridge has obtained his most powerful hold, and wrought most effectually upon the minds of men. These incomplete fragments which he poured forth so profusely both in writing and conversation, contained embryonic thoughts, so powerful, so splendid or so novel, that they would seize as with a vice-grasp, inquisitive and thoughtful minds. Yet being imperfectly developed, represented too by the author conscious of this fact, as the mere vestibule of the great temple of truth, which yet remained to be entered and explored, the reader would at once be excited to thought, and study, and every sort of tentative effort, to track out the germinant thought to its full proportions, and realize all the hidden treasures it embosomed. It shot into his mind the dawn of a new idea; he cannot rest till he has clarified that twilight apprehension or imagining, into meridian clearness. Now this operates at once as the effective stimulus and discipline

of the intellect. And provided only that it does not lead to a servile adoption of the author's tenets, its influence is every way salubrious and invigorating; and a vastly higher benefit is gained by studying such a writer, than one who does not awaken such mental strivings to work out for ourselves the problem that he has rather suggested than solved. And those who have, especially in youth or opening manhood, received such a lofty impulse and incalculable benefit from any author, will not soon forget their obligations to him, whatever they may think of his specific or peculiar doctrines. In strict consonance with this view of the secret of his power over other minds, his most important work, that by which he first became known and felt in theological circles in this country, is constructed and named. It is entitled "Aids to Reflection." And this is its precise character. Its contents are styled "Aphorisms," of which, with notes and comments upon them it wholly consists. It is really, as it is avowedly, rather an excitant of reflection and study upon various doctrines, than a systematic and thorough defence of them. Hence it was a performance well fitted to set forth in strong relief the author's distinctive excellencies, without attracting attention to his faults. But the fact is, that all those portions of his prose-writings that have laid an abiding grasp upon the minds of men, are aphorisms, fragments, "aids to reflection." They are so many scions, immense in number and variety, that have inserted themselves in other minds, and in various degrees shaped them after their own individual forms, and made them to bear fruit after their own kind. The sort of growth and fruit produced has been according to the particular scion from among the manifold diversity, which happened to be engrafted, and the sort of stock in which it was set, in any given instance. Here, too, we have the solution of that amazing diversity of sentiment which marks those who profess to have derived their incipient tendencies from Coleridge, from the baldest Swedenborgianism to the narrowest Ritualism. Here, too, we can hear the answer which he occasionally makes to the charge of wasting his powers, that he had done more by conversation to waken and mould the finest intellects, than most authors had done by their publications, might be just, and probably was so. We can understand and sympathise with him when he says, "I have laid too many eggs in the hot sands of this wilderness, the world, with

ostrich carelessness and ostrich oblivion. The greater part, indeed, have been trod under foot, and forgotten; but yet no small number have crept forth into life, some to furnish feathers for the caps of others, and still more to plume the shafts in the quivers of my enemies; of them that unprovoked, have lain in wait against my soul." (*Biog. Lit.*, p. 34.)

That intellectual wealth, which despite such thriftless and wasteful management, still continues to give celebrity to its author in both hemispheres, a celebrity that brightens with time and spreads as his parasitic admirers grow fewer and more temperate in their eulogies, cannot be contemptible or insignificant. And while he has dealt it out to us in the crude ore and scattered fragments for the most part, not perfected and enchased by art, yet this method as we have seen, has not been without its advantages; especially as it has been in a form more facile and safe for others to work up and appropriate, whether by digestion and assimilation, or by downright plagiarism, it is not always easy to determine. Any one familiar with the writings of Coleridge, will have observed in them the germs of the principal productions of a numerous circle of review writers and anniversary orators and sermonizers, who have quite astounded the public by their ORIGINALITY. But we are happy to conclude this branch of our subject, with a word of confirmation from so high an authority as Lord Bacon. He says, (*Adv. of Learning*, Dove's. ed., pp. 175–6,) "Aphorisms, except they should be ridiculous, cannot be made but of the pith and heart of sciences: . . . therefore no man can suffice, nor in reason will attempt to write aphorisms, but he that is sound and well grounded. . . . And lastly, aphorisms representing a knowledge broken, do invite men to inquire further; whereas methods which carry the show of a total, do secure men as if they were at farthest."

We perceive that the pressure of our thoughts in regard to this wonderful man threatens to crowd us beyond the utmost tolerable limits of a review article, and therefore will omit much that we intended to say respecting the poetry of Coleridge, as not being so much within our immediate province. We may say, however, that if he had published nothing but his poetry, his name would probably have been imperishable in English literature; so exuberant and splendid is he in his imagery, so profound and original in his thoughts, so tender and sweet, and

ofttimes devotional in sentiment, so compact and chaste, yet smooth and mellifluous in his language and versification. If we were to criticise at all, our complaint would be that of Sir Walter Scott, "on account of the caprice and indolence with which he has thrown from him as in mere wantonness, those ununfinished scraps of poetry, which, like the Torso of antiquity, defied the skill of his poetical brethren to complete them." And yet, like his prose works, they interest, "by what they leave untold," and give us,

> "Sweet echoes of unearthly melodies,
> And odours snatched from beds of amaranth."
> *Religious musings.*

Nor can we question the great services which Coleridge has rendered in the department of literary criticism, a subject also at which we can scarcely glance. It will be at once perceived that all his mental habits were suited to this occupation; since criticism of books, in the nature of the case, consists of fragmental observations upon them, and upon detached passages in them. Then his reading was immense not only in his own, but other languages, and his memory as retentive as his intellect was capacious. And he was familiar with all departments of literature. Then he had a thoroughly reflective and philosophic mind, and was himself a distinguished author. Moreover he was led to give special attention to the true principles of criticism, in consequence of the savage injustice meted out to himself by its then recognized tribunals. Accordingly, in his *Biographia* he propounded what he esteemed the true principles of the art, and illustrated them by actual specimens especially in reference to Wordsworth, who had shared with himself, and on similar grounds, much of the merciless abuse of the critics. His celebrated passage upon Shakspeare and Milton, which want of space only prevents us from reprinting entire, may safely be pronounced, in its own way, without a rival in the language. (*Biog. Lit.*, pp. 185–6.) From the publication of this work may be dated a new era in criticism. It is more principled, philosophic and liberal than before. Moreover, his "Aids" are but a continuous criticism upon Leighton and other eminent divines of England. His Literary Remains are but an immense repository of criticism on different authors literary and theological, and his prose works abound in them. And one effect pro-

duced by them has been, that a large body of the choicest writers in literature and religion, that had sunk into unaccountable neglect and oblivion, are now appreciated, and have found their way into the libraries of scholars and clergymen, and to some extent have become current among the "reading public."

After all, it cannot be doubted, that Coleridge's favorite field, was metaphysics, whether considered as a separate science by itself, or in its applications to politics, morals, and eminently, to theology. In these "quicksilver mines" as we have already seen, he instinctively began to delve in early youth; to them he consecrated his later life and maturer efforts: with these subjects his prose works are chiefly occupied. This constitutes the theme of his great posthumous work, which is understood now to be in the process of completion by another hand, in order to future publication; even his poetry becomes at times condensed into metaphysics, and satirizes the sensual school as,

> "Themselves they cheat
> With noisy emptiness of learned phrase,
> Their subtle fluids, impacts, essences,
> Self-working tools, uncaused effects, and all
> Those blind Omniscients, those Almighty slaves,
> Untenanting creation of its God.—(*Sibylline Leaves.*

By these most obviously he expected to confer the most lasting benefits, and make the most durable impression, upon mankind.

It is due to Coleridge and to a just understanding of his productions in this department, especially in metaphysical theology, toward which all his other metaphysical labours converged as their ultimate end, to say distinctly, what otherwise would be to our readers matter of inference merely, that he not only gave up his Unitarianism, but embraced most of the great doctrines of the evangelical system, before he was thirty years old: that his writings abound in expressions of Christian feeling of the purest and loftiest kind, set forth in his own inimitable beauty and force of style; and that as he advanced in life, and approached the grave, these expresions became more accordant with the language of the saints in all generations. All this is true and should be duly appreciated, however difficult it may be to reconcile his utterances with each other, or to harmonize the conflicting accounts of his reporters, or to account for his allowing so much error to remain in his acknowledged works.

We think also, that in approaching this part of the subject, it deserves consideration, that Coleridge possessed the separate and opposite powers of the poet and metaphysician, in a degree which is seldom, if ever, paralleled. There have been as great and greater poets. There have been as great and greater metaphysicians. But we do not now remember the instance of one who was so extraordinary both as a poet and metaphysician. By some these two opposite qualities, are deemed not only opposite, but contradictory, or at least repugnant, to each other. It was quite natural that Coleridge should deem them mutually auxiliary and completive. "No man," says he, "was ever yet a great poet without being at the same time a profound philosopher." However this may be,—and we shall not stop to discuss it—the effect of this equipoise of the imagination and ratiocinative powers in Coleridge, was, not only, as we have seen, sometimes to render his poetry metaphysical, but still more frequently, to render his metaphysics poetical. This characteristic combining with that waving, fragmentary habit of mind, of which we have before spoken, often results in a sudden or gradual breaking away from a most close, rapid, iron-linked argument, which promised to conduct the reader to the most satisfactory conclusion, and running into a poetical digression, at once both finis and climax, and which though beautiful in its place, serves here only to vex the logical inquirer, who had been tantalized, by so admirable a beginning. Hence too, it often occurs, that the driest and abstrusest doctrines of metaphysics are set forth in the most sublime and thrilling strains, of poetic eloquence, for some gorgeous specimens of which, let the reader consult the "Statesman's Manual." (pp. 30—45.) Hence also it sometimes happens that his subtlest metaphysical lucubrations are the mere creations of what he rightly names the "philosophic imagination," and elsewhere "the shaping and modifying power;" mere phantoms, now fairy and now grotesque, but like saponaceous bubbles, vanishing into utter vacuity, as soon as we attempt to catch and grasp them, by any act of distinct intellection. For examples of this, let the reader, *inter alia*, look at the appendix to the aids to reflexion, and we will venture to add, at some of his processes for proving *a priori*, that the doctrine of the Trinity is necessarily evolved from the very idea of God. (*Lit. Remains.* Vol. III. pp. 1—3.) Nevertheless, there are certain great doctrines ur

metaphysics and theology, which Coleridge deemed of unalterable importance, that are almost always presupposed in his writings, and which, in different ways, and with great frequency and earnestness, he attempts to vindicate and enforce. Upon these we will now bestow, what, if it must be a cursory, we hope will be a candid notice.

And first, of his metaphysics. These were reputedly and avowedly Transcendental. But this is no certain designation. For Transcendentalism itself has undergone so many modifications, at the hands of successive masters, each of whom has constructed some new system out of the fabric reared by his predecessors, as jugglers are wont to spin ribbons out of nut-shells, that the word conveys no definite meaning. The most that can be understood by it is, that it is a system whose birth-place and proper home is Germany, at the opposite pole from that of Locke and Hume, ideal rather sensual, Platonic rather than Aristotelian. These traits undoubtedly marked Coleridge's system. So far he was a Transcendentalist. But although thus explained, he deserves and claims this title, it would be the rankest injustice, to put him in the same category with Hegel, Strauss, or others whose very names suggest the loathsome triad of scepticism, pantheism, and every other *ism* that saps the very foundation of religion and morals: heresies against which he contended earnestly and manfully all his days. In his (*Biog. Lit.* p. 143,) he describes pure philosophy to be transcendental, because it results from that artificial self-knowledge which the metaphysician gains by laborious philosophic self-inspection, and which therefore *transcends* the natural spontaneous consciousness of mankind. We have tried to give his idea in our own language. In this sense, every metaphysician must by the necessity of the case, be a transcendentalist. On the other hand, he says that "those flights of lawless speculation, which, abandoned by *all* distinct consciousness, because transgressing the bounds and purposes of our intellectual faculties, are justly condemned as *transcendent*. He thus distinguishes *toto coelo* between a *transcendental* and a *transcendent* philosophy. But we fear that allowing him the utmost benefit of this distinction, not a few of his own rhapsodical, poetico-metaphysical flights must fall under his own definition of the latter kind, and, as such, be "justly condemned." On the other hand, he clearly indicates in the same

work (p. 90,) that he early rejected the sceptical element in Kant's philosophy. His most ruinous avowals are those in which he speaks of a "genial coincidence" between himself and Schelling; and when (pp. 153-4,) he speaks of the "philosopher as being compelled to treat as nothing more than a prejudice," the belief "that there exists things without us," and to regard such existence of things without us, as "one and the same thing with our immediate self-consciousness." This, with some other mystic utterances in the same chapter, show that his mind was for a time warped by the influence of these Germans, to a leaning towards sceptical idealism. But as the general tone of his writings is at war with this scheme, so the chief evil of these passages is not in any power which they possess in themselves, they are so few and indistinct, but only as they may lead, here and there, a hoodwinked votary to follow up their obscure suggestions by the study of the German originals, keeping his bandages still over his eyes, that he may not fail of being led by such eminent guides. But even in so doing, he would violate the counsel of his master who a few days before his death made the following declaration.

"The metaphysical disquisition at the end of the first volume of the "Biographia Literaria" is unformed and immature. It contains the fragments of the truth, but it is not fully thought out. It is wonderful to myself to think how infinitely more profound my views now are, and yet how much clearer they are withal. The circle is completing; *the idea is coming round to, and to be, the common sense.*" (*Table Talk*, Vol. II. p. 169.)

In short, Coleridge's metaphysical system was German transcendentalism, tempered by his intense English partialities, modified by his faith in Christianity, and the established church, adorned and perfumed with the "blossom and fragrance" of his poetry, and chastened with the advance of age.

The great tenet derived from the transcendentalists on which he ever insisted as being fundamental to all just conclusions and reasonings in Ethics and Theology, was that of the distinction between the Reason and the Understanding. And this view of the paramount importance of this distinction to all sound Metaphysics and Theology, was earnestly and skillfully advocated in the "preliminary essay" prefixed to the "Aids to Reflection," by Dr. Marsh, by far the most distinguished of Cole-

ridge's American followers, and most efficient in introducing his works to public notice in this country. And so far as we have seen, such is the sentiment of all who adopt the Coleridgeian or German metaphysics. Now, though we should grant some such distinction in the powers of the human mind, we do not understand how such vast consequences hang upon the recognition of it, as these persons imagine. It is doubtless good to know the truth, and the whole truth. But then all truths are not equally important, as this school virtually confess, by the incomparable importance which they attach to this. Well, if these faculties exist, may they not do their proper office with all promptness and celerity, whether we have in form drawn the line of demarcation between them or not? Does our faculty of vision depend upon our knowing scientifically the various lenses and humours of the eye? And do they not see equally well, who never surmised that their eye-balls were not one, identical, undistinguishable substance? And do not they rightly remember, and compare, and judge, and reflect, and obtain knowledge by sensation and intuition, who never once heard or dreamed of a classification of the faculties of the mind into those of memory, judgment, etc? The case is too plain to require an answer. How then can this or any other analysis of the faculties of the mind be so fundamental to a just insight into the truths of religion? Is reason the organ of the "supersensuous," by which we discern spiritual truth, and does it belong to all men, as this school contends? Be it so. And may it not, and will it not see the truths of religion when they are exhibited to it, whether it have, in the mind of the beholder, been scientifically, distinguished from the understanding or not? A truce then, to this favourite dogma of Transcendental, Pelagian and Metaphysical theologians, that there can be no just understanding of the Bible, without an antecedent critical analysis of the faculties of the mind of man, to which it speaks.

Nor do we think Coleridge more fortunate in his attempts to impress the older divines and metaphysicians of Britain into the support of this distinction. Who supposes, for example, that Milton was not speaking with poetic license rather than philosophic precision, when he penned the lines so often quoted by our author and his followers in this behalf:

> "Give both life and sense,
> Fancy and understanding; whence the soul
> Reason receives. And reason is her being,
> Discursive or intuitive."

It is not in direct contradiction to the views of these writers, that "reason" is in any sense derived from the fancy and understanding? Thus, too, in quoting Leighton as authority for it, he is obliged to torture his language, so as to make "supernatural faith" stand for reason, and "natural reason," for understanding, (*Aids, p.* 135). In a like way, in a passage quoted from Harrington for this purpose, he is obliged to make "Religion" mean reason, and "reason," understanding, (*Friend, p.* 130.) Indeed he acknowledges that "though there is no want of authorities, ancient and modern, for the distinction of the faculties, and the distinct appropriation of the terms, yet our best writers often confound the one with the other." This indeed is his constant complaint in his reviews of the elder, and even the Platonic divines, whom he most admires. And as to the "authorities" he speaks of, we have not seen the first one cited by him, out of Germany, that is at all in point. And is it so, that a just comprehension of Christian doctrine is impossible, without the knowledge of a distinction, of which the great masters of English theology have been ignorant?

But what is the alleged distinction? "Reason," says Coleridge, "is the power of universal and necessary convictions, the source and substance of truths above sense, and having their evidence in themselves." (*Aids*, p. 137.) Now that there is a faculty by which we see some truths, above sense in their own self-evidencing light, it is to be presumed none will dispute. It cannot be denied by any who do not hold that the soul is originally a mere blank, a *rasa tabula.* Nor do we now know of any reputable theologian who carries the maxim, "*Nihil in intellectu, quod non prius in sensu,*" so far as to deny the existence of original, intuitive, self-affirmed beliefs in man, which so far from being products of reflection or argument, are themselves the ultimate proofs and tests to be appealed to, in all argument. Nor should we trouble ourselves to contend with any who think that reason may with propriety and advantage, be employed to designate the organ by which we obtain these intuitions. But how the organ can be likewise the "substance" of such truths, is not so evident. What is understanding, according to this school?

This is variously described, as the "faculty judging according to sense," the "faculty of reflection," the "faculty of selecting and contriving means to ends," the faculty of intelligence which animals have in common with us. Now none will question that the human mind has such a faculty, or such faculties as are thus described. But the question is, is there aught in them, which renders it necessary or important, that the word should be applied to denote them and them exclusively? And has Coleridge or any one else so clearly drawn the boundary between the respective provinces of Reason and Understanding, that there can be no apology in future, for that confusion of the words, which he so fervently deplores in the past? If so, we confess, that after no small study of his profuse and eloquent reasonings on the subject, we have been unable to trace it with certainty. We are aware that the fault will be imputed to ourselves. No matter whose it is. The fact itself is reason enough, why we should leave the subject.

Kant finding himself urged by his system over the precipice of scepticism, invented the "Practical Reason," in addition to the Speculative, in order to escape this dread consequence. This he contended was the organ of moral and religious truths, or convictions, and that it commanded us unconditionally to attribute reality to its objects and revelations. Coleridge has adopted this part of his system. He speaks, (*Aids*, p. 115,) of "the Practical Reason of man, comprehending the Will, the Conscience, the Moral Being with its inseparable interests and affections." Now that we have a will and conscience and moral being, who will dispute? But what good ground has he assigned, or can any man present, for naming these, the "Practical Reason?"

Passing now to those moral and religious truths, which Coleridge prominently inculcated and enforced, and whose due vindication he supposed greatly to depend on the preceding distinction, we come first to the grounding principle in morals, the nature of righteousness. And here he brings all the resources of his mighty intellect to bear with crushing annihilating force upon Paley's doctrine of general consequences; or that righteousness consists in following the dictates of an enlightened self-love, and doing those acts which promise on the whole to be the best expedient for promoting our own highest happiness. On

this system, righteousness is not an ultimate good in itself. It is simply a means of procuring happiness; wholly secondary and auxiliary to happiness. Nay, according to a famous Doctor of this school, the very word itself has its origin in this fact! Righteousness is the RIGHT way to the highest happiness. Upon this heresy, Coleridge bears down with an overwhelming torrent of "red-hot logic," and excoriating invective, in one of the noblest essays in our language, (*Friend*, p. 273, *et seq.*) He pronounces it one of his chief aims in the "Aids to Reflection" to inculcation the doctrine that "Moral Goodness is other and more than Prudence or the Principle of Expediency;" and in all his works contends for the "love of the Good as Good, and of the True as True." He well argues that the desire of happiness "can never be made the principle of morality," and that otherwise than as a regulated, and of course therefore, a *subordinate*, propensity, it can never be fulfilled or realized," (*Aids*, p. 259.) Again, "Pleasure I say, consists in the harmony between the specific excitability of the living creature, and the exciting causes correspondent thereto, considered therefore exclusively in and for itself, the only question is, quantum? not, quale? How much on the whole? . . . The quality is a matter of taste." (*Ib.* p. 24.) This is undeniable, and shows unanswerably the necessity of regulating the desire of happiness, by subordination to a higher principle, viz. the love of righteousness. But what is this righteousness? asks the sapient metaphysician, bent on explaining away the plainest dictates, nay, the very ground and possibility of conscience. How do you define it? We ask in turn. How do you define white and black? Do you say that these are simple ideas, and therefore undefinable, because derived from, and therefore resolvable into, nothing beyond themselves? So we say of the idea of righteousness, holiness, moral goodness. It is simple, uncompounded, intuitive and self-evidencing. For him who does not understand it without definition, no definition can make it intelligible.

It is obvious then, that on Coleridge's system this is one of those truths that enters the mind through the reason as distinguished from the understanding. And believing as he did in the importance of a recognition of this distinction, in order to a just perception of self-affirmed truths; and feeling the magnitude and preciousness of the truth here at stake, bearing as it

does on the very nature and essence of morality and religion, we can scarcely wonder at the estimate he puts upon this distinction. And yet as he himself observes, the fallacy of the whole scheme of a morality based on general consequences, had been previously shown by Bishop Butler and others, who were utter strangers to it. We think, however, that Coleridge's writings on this subject have accomplished great good in our country. They have contributed to render gross utilitarianism odious, and to exorcise it from many superior minds. They have helped to foster a pure and elevated tone of moral principle and feeling, an honourable, generous, disinterested, self-sacrificing spirit, with a scorn and detestation of the selfish, the mean, and the base. They have done much to counteract that self-love scheme of morals, which is distinctive of what was a popular system of theology, and vitiates the entire circle of Christian doctrine and experience. Had he written nothing else, he would have been entitled to the gratitude of the friends of truth and righteousness. With regard to the divine origin and authority of the scriptures, Coleridge insists with great eloquence, on the importance and efficacy of the internal evidence of their truths in opposition to that class of men who rely on miracles and the historical argument exclusively. He urges eloquently (*Friend*, p. 381,) that the doctrine must show itself to be worthy of God, in order to vindicate the miracle and distinguish it from a "lying wonder," before it can be authenticated by such miracle. He allows and insists that miracles are necessary in their place, but claims that true faith sees an "in-evidence" in the truths themselves, of their divine original. This view we regard as substantially true and highly important. This is the doctrine of the soundest theologians, and of the Reformed confessions. And on what other ground, could the scriptures command all to whom they come, to believe them instantly on pain of eternal death, if they did not bear upon themselves the palpable impress of divinity, and "speak as never man spake"?

This doctrine, however, if liable to gross perversion, unless it be connected with another, viz: the need of illumination by the Holy Spirit, in order to a right discernment of spiritual truths, a doctrine assuredly taught in scripture, and maintained by evangelical divines. What Coleridge's views on this point were does not distinctly appear. Sometimes they seem scriptural, and some-

times tainted with rationalism. Probably his sentiments were unsettled and vague. But it is obvious, that if the human understanding be set up as the infallible judge and arbiter of Christian truth, or of what it is competent and becoming for God to reveal as truth; and if men feel authorized to reject or explain away whatever does not harmonize with their own predilections, or pre-conceived opinions, no embankment remains to hinder the most devastating inundations of the rankest rationalism. Theodore Parker and Hegel ask for nothing more. The Bible is no longer a divine revelation, an authoritative guide to man. Instead of coming to amend and perfect him, it comes to be amended and perfected by him. But, it is asked, does not the Bible address itself to the mind of man, and must not this mind trust its own perceptions, in order to be capable of receiving, or of crediting it? And if so, where shall it stop short of accepting what appears to it reasonable, and rejecting the residue? We answer, that the mind undoubtedly must and will trust its own perceptions to a certain extent; but it may, and it ought, in this process, to learn its own short-sightedness and obliquity of vision; its need of a better light and a purer vision—of precisely such aid and illumination as the Bible affords in itself or directs us to seek from above. Certainly we act reasonably, when trusting our bodily eyes, we nevertheless conclude that they need the help of optical instruments to see aright, the remote, the vast, and the minute; or of artificial lenses to make amends for their own decays, infirmities, or mal-formations. And surely do we not place a just and rational confidence in our own understanding of the Scriptures, when we learn from them to distrust our own faculties in regard to the things of God, except as they are divinely clarified and guided, because they are originally too narrow to span the infinite, and have been too much perverted and blinded by sin to appreciate fully the beauty and the demands of holiness and justice? The Bible teaches nothing more explicitly and abundantly than the blindness and folly of the mind of fallen man in things pertaining to to God. And therefore it demands of men that they be disciples, learners. Take the yoke and learn of me, says Christ. If any man will be wise, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. This being so, we see at once the hollowness of that boastful philosophy, which undertakes to sit as an umpire in judgment upon the scriptures, instead of being meekly guided

by them. We believe indeed in philosophy; but at the same time, we think it must be a "regenerate philosophy," and not the product of man's native wit alone, else it will prove not a handmaid to our faith, but a proud mistress over-ruling it. THE WORLD BY WISDOM KNEW NOT GOD.

We accept, too, Coleridge's favourite maxim, that "Christian faith is the perfection of human reason;" not, however, because it conforms to the reason as it is corrupted and darkened in unregenerate man, but because it purifies and restores this into harmony with God, the Supreme Reason. We appreciate the high aim of those who are labouring to "justify the ways of God to man." But we fear that in many cases their efforts are dangerous, because one-sided. They will surely be led off upon a false scent unless they have a still higher zeal and anxiety as to the way of JUSTIFYING MAN BEFORE GOD. For the tendency of exclusive efforts to obviate the objections which man may raise to the gospel and its author, is to dwarf and attenuate God to our own model; to make Him "altogether such an one as ourselves." It makes man the standard, and runs into anthropomorphism. But, in truth, God is the only standard of perfection. All else must be measured from its relations to Him. Man has fallen. The great end and effect of the gospel is to restore in him the lost image of his Maker. It is the work of heathenism, not of Christianity, to "change the glory of the incorruptible God into an image of corruptible man."

While Coleridge deals out frequent and ponderous blows upon Socinians, and all others who pick and choose their faith out of the Bible, virtually disowning its supreme authority, and accepting its teachings only so far as "it is an echo of their own convictions." We think that he at times attributes too great infallibility to reason as distinguished from understanding, and forgets that it has shared in the lapse of our nature. Certain it is that he questions or denies the canonicity or inspiration of some of the books of scripture, and of portions of others. (Table Talk, vol. i. p. 109. *Lit. Remains*, vol. iii. p. 161, iv. 410.) He also denies verbal inspiration. (*Table Talk*, vol. ii. pp. 18, 19.) His most objectionable passages of this kind appear in his Posthumous Works. But as they consist of assertion and suggestion merely, without proof or argument of any moment, they admit of no answer. In another posthumous work, entitled

"The Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," which we have not been able to find, it is said that his views on this subject are more fully set forth. He was fond of stigmatizing the common veneration for the letter of the Bible, as *bibliolatry*. But the details of exegesis were wholly alien from the habits of his mind. He never made it a systematic study. And we have no doubt of the justness of the suggestion of Arch-deaeon Hare, that the study of Eichhorn's Lectures in Germany, gave a bias to his mind on these subjects from which he never fully recovered. Certain it is that no portion of his writings display more numerous and intolerable crudities, than his occasional interpretations of texts and passages of scripture.

But his capital error in this department, was in his claim that the scriptures teach the transcendental philosophy. Thus he says, (*Aids*, p. 96), "What the eldest Greek philosophy entitled the *Reason* (ΝΟΥΣ) and *Ideas*, the Philosophic Apostle names *the Spirit* and *Truths spiritually* discerned." Again, (p. 324), and often elsewhere he styles the Apostles φρονημα της σαρκος or carnal mind the understanding. It is scarcely necessary to remark upon this and much else like it. Its statement is its confutation. There is not the smallest reason for supposing that the Apostle, in using these terms, had the slightest allusion to any distinction between reason and understanding. Perhaps the doubts which he intimates, but scarcely defends, in his posthumous writings, of the personal existence of Satan, and of the sanctity of the Sabbath, may be properly mentioned under this head, though they require no refutation.

But let us proceed to the doctrines which he deduces from the scriptures. What are his views of original sin and grace? What he has to say of free-will is so interlinked with these topics, that it may be best noticed in connection with them. From sundry vehement expressions which he utters, affirming the self-determining power of the will, and in condemnation of Edwards as a fatalist, it would at first be inferred, that his system must turn out to be unmitigated Pelagianism. But on further scrutiny, we find the reverse true. His doctrine is, that the will, in order to be responsible, must originate its own acts, that to be capable of this, it must be a spirit, and that whatever is under the law of cause and effect, is nature, as contradistinguished from spirit. (*Aids*, pp. 41, 105, 273). Thus con-

trasting the will to nature, he makes it "the supernatural in man"—proof enough, that the profession of supernaturalism in these days, is no test of a man's attitude towards the doctrines of grace. As to his round assertions of the fatalism of Edwards, it will be in time to answer them when they are sustained by a solitary proof or quotation. Meanwhile we observe, and appeal to all acquainted with Edwards' treatises, who will read what follows, if the observation be not just, that all that Edwards contended for, was a will possessing such properties as did not render utterly impossible such truths respecting sin, providence and grace, as we shall now show that Coleridge fervently and often ably maintains. And it was simply because the very nature of the will as a self-determining power was alleged to be incompatible with the doctrines of grace, that he wrote his masterly "Inquiry," which after the lapse of a century, still seems to live, although scarcely a year passes, in which some new assailant does not undertake to slay it.

Coleridge argues (*Aids*, pp. 42-3-4), for the possibility of "a pre-disposing influence on the will from without," which shall not impair its freedom, in order to remove objections to the doctrine that the Holy Spirit may work *in* it, without infringing on its liberty. On the other hand he insists, (p. 163), that man by the fall, has admitted a nature into his will, thus subjecting it to the law of cause and effect, and destroying its power to become truly good, without the inworking of the Spirit. Still further, we find the following memorable passage:

"The elements of necessity and free-will are reconciled in the higher power of an omnipresent Providence, that predestinates the whole in the moral freedom of the integral parts. Of this the Bible never suffers us to lose sight. The root is never detached from the ground. It is God everywhere; and all creatures conform to his decrees, the righteous by performance of the law, the disobedient by the sufferance of the penalty." *Statesman's Manual*, p. 42.

Again, (*Aids*, p. 185), he represents obedience as following from faith and love, "by that moral necessity which is the highest form of freedom." This is sufficiently near Augustine's view of the nature of liberty, as given by Neander, viz: that "on the highest point of moral elevation, freedom and necessity coincide." We think, indeed, if Coleridge had carefully exam-

ined Edwards, he would have found that he contended for no other than a "moral necessity" in the acts of the will, and that this was "the highest form of freedom." That view of the will which admits of its so becoming enslaved to evil, or attempered to goodness, as to sin or obey, by a "moral necessity," which is compatible with a predestinating Providence, to whose decrees "all creatures conform," the righteous and the wicked, is quite as high a style of Necessitarianism as has ever found favour among any reputable Calvinists or Edwardeans.

Our readers are prepared by this time to find Coleridge an advocate of the doctrine of original sin in some form. No theologian ever affirmed more strenuously or uniformly than he, the universal moral corruption of mankind, and their need of renovation by supernatural grace, or more valiantly met all classes who impugn it. He gets from the Germans his method of explaining and vindicating it, which he thinks puts it on a vastly higher vantage ground than the common methods of theologians.

He names it *Original Sin*, because every man *originates* it for himself by the act of his own will. According to his view, if it had any other origin, its possessor could have no responsibility or guilt on account of it. (*Aids*, p. 173). Hence he regards the account of the fall given in Genesis as an allegory, in which the serpent represents the understanding, appealing to the desire represented in its turn by the woman, and thus seducing the will, representing the "manhood" of our nature, from its allegiance to the reason! Thus every man falls for himself, Adam being no otherwise the representative of mankind than as he was first in the historic chain of instances! This surely would seem to be ultra-Pelagian. And yet he says:

"Now let the grounds, on which the fact of an evil inherent in the will is affirmable in the instance of any one man, be supposed equally applicable in *every* instance, and concerning all men; so that the fact is asserted of the individual, *not* because he has committed this or that crime, or because he has shown himself to be *this* or *that* man, but simply because he is *a* man. Let the evil be supposed such as to imply the impossibility of an individual's referring to any particular time at which it might be supposed to have commenced, or to any period of his existence at which it was not existing. Let it be supposed that the subject stands in no relation whatever to time, can neither

be called *in* time nor *out* of time. * * * Let the reader suppose this, and he will have before him the precise import of the scriptural *doctrine* of original sin; or rather of the fact acknowledged in all ages, and recognized, but not originating, in the Christian scriptures." (*Aids*, p. 173).

It is obvious that he considers the true solution of this doctrine to be found, in placing it among those transcendental "ideas of the reason" which admit of no explanation beyond themselves. How then does this surpass the orthodox mode of handling this doctrine? In no respect whatever that we can see. Both agree, that the will of man in every period of his existence before regeneration is enslaved to evil. And the Westminster confession, as well as Coleridge, makes this a consequence of man's "being left to the freedom of his own will." But they differ, as the latter accepts the scriptural solution, according to which the race fell in the fall of its progenitor and representative; while he rejects the scriptural history as a myth, and attempts to find the origin of human corruption in a transcendental, timeless, incomprehensible fiction of his own, and not obscurely intimates that the true solution is to be found in "a spiritual fall or apostacy *antecedent* to the formation of man." (p. 177). Surely this explanation of original sin needs no further comment from us. While he thus maintains a just view of the actual corruption, and bondage of human nature, coupled with wholly visionary explanations of its origin, he presses one view of the subject with great prominence, and, as we think, with high advantage to the cause of Christianity in its conflict with those who would assail it with entangling objections derived from this doctrine, viz: that sin exists in all its direness and universality independently of all revelation, and that the Bible has no peculiar concern with it, except as it is connected with that redemption from it, which is the great article of Christianity. "Beware of arguments against Christianity, that cannot stop there, and consequently ought not to have commenced there." (pp. 176-7.)

With this view of the enslavement of the will, we are prepared to find him, as he is, uniformly sound, and earnest, on the necessity of spiritual regeneration, and the insufficiency of human nature to attain true holiness without it. On this subject we will barely cite a passage from the "Aids to Reflection," which,

soon after its publication, met the eye of a young theological student who had begun to be captivated by the Pelagian speculations of the day, and started a most beneficial revolution in all his views of theology.

"Often have I heard it said by the advocates for the Socinian scheme—True! we are all sinners; but even in the Old Testament God has promised forgiveness on repentance. One of the fathers, (I forget which) supplies the retort. True! God has promised pardon on penitence; but has He promised penitence on sin? He that repenteth shall be forgiven; but where is it said, he that sinneth shall repent? But repentance, perhaps, the repentance required in scripture, *the passing into a new mind*, into a new and contrary principle of action, this Metanoia, is in the sinner's own power? at his own liking? He has but to open his eyes to the sin, and the tears are at hand to wash it away! Verily, the exploded tenet of *transubstantiation* is scarcely at greater variance with the common sense and experience of mankind, or borders more closely on a contradiction in terms, than this volunteer *transmentation*, this self-change, as the easy means of self-salvation." (pp. 82-3.)

We believe indeed, that Coleridge has done a good service in counteracting the Pelagian tendencies of many young men, in a state of mind, in which they would have given no respectful heed to any reasoner, who did not gain their attention, by making high pretensions to new discoveries in metaphysics and metaphysical theology. As a consequence of his principles already exhibited, he holds "that the doctrine of election is in itself a necessary inference from an undeniable fact; necessary at least for all who hold that the best of men are what they are through the grace of God." (p. 113.) At the same time he gives some just and valuable cautions against the practice of overlooking the practical bearings and uses of this and similar truths, and of pressing them into all the possible logical consequences, detrimental to religion, which may seem to flow from them, in our imperfect comprehension of the premises they furnish. This faulty mode of treating this doctrine, is the real secret of the repugnance to it, felt by many good men. They thus encumber it with monstrosities which are no part of it, and mistake their abhorrence of these for abhorrence of the doctrine "once delivered to the saints."

Coleridge also (p. 203,) repudiates the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and indeed seemed to go the extreme length of questioning the scriptural grounds for Infant Baptism, although he allowed and practised it, as lawful and edifying.

We are sorry to find, along with this orthodoxy on correlative doctrines, the grossest error respecting the atonement, the central doctrine of the Bible. He distinctly denies its vicarious nature. Here is another foul residuum of his Unitarianism, that clung to him through life. He disposes of all those scriptural phrases which represent it as vicarious, by making them mere metaphorical descriptions of its beneficial effects upon the sinner, and not at all indicative of its nature. Here again he illustrates the aptness and the need of his transcendental "ideas of reason." He describes the act of Christ which causes our redemption, as "a spiritual and transcendent mystery that passeth all understanding," and "the effect caused, as the being born anew," (p. 200,) and again as "a regeneration." (p. 193.)

Now that one great result of Christ's death, is the regeneration through the Spirit, of those who partake of its efficacy, cannot be doubted. But as a condition of this, and especially of its resulting in salvation, we hold it to have been requisite that our sins should be expiated, by the transfer of their penalty to another, suffering in our stead, and accepted of God for this purpose. And we hold that no doctrine is taught in the Bible with greater clearness, frequency, and force, than the necessity of vicarious suffering by others in order to the pardon of sin. Clearly imaged forth in all the sacrifices of the ancient ritual, more fully announced in the distincter unfoldings of prophecy, implied in all the figurative descriptions of the atonement, as a ransom, a payment of a debt, or purchase, it is most explicitly asserted in all formal statements and reasonings on the subject which the Bible contains, especially in Rom. iii. iv. v. which Coleridge has not even noticed. Moreover it is just that provision which the conscience stricken sinner needs, and without which he can neither obtain peace nor hope. For his conscience assures him that his sin must awaken the abhorrence of a righteous God, and likewise require a manifestation of that abhorrence, in the award of proportionate penal suffering. And he sees no way of escape from this, except in the transfer of it to an accepted substitute, who bore our sins, and suffered the just for the unjust. We are

happy to find that Coleridge, when he utters his own practical feelings as a Christian, so often and so fervently speaks in the common Christian dialect on this subject; thus illustrating his own favourite maxim, that a right heart often neutralizes and cures speculative errors; that "Christianity is not a theory, or a speculation; but a *life*. Not a *philosophy* of life, but a life and a living process." (p. 131.)

It is a sufficient reply to his arguments against a vicarious atonement, that they all proceed upon two assumptions, 1. That it is the "payment of a debt," in the commercial and literal sense; and 2. That it procures the justification, but not the sanctification of those who are saved by it. They of course demand an answer from those only, if any there be, who adopt such views of it.

We think that his later works indicate a growth in Coleridge of that peculiar mood, which it has become fashionable in various quarters to laud as the "churchly feeling." He evidently came to attribute a high life-giving energy to the church and the eucharist. How far this was connected with his theory of the atonement, as having a purely quickening and regenerating virtue, we cannot say. We know however that there is a school of "churchly" theologians, who are no strangers to Coleridge and the German transcendental theology, and who descant largely upon the office of Christ as a quickening, or according to their more expressive rendering a "life-making" spirit. These hold that this quickening virtue is deposited in the church, and comes forth to men in the sacraments. And they profess to occupy some mid-point between the Romanists and Protestants on this subject, though it is not always easy to find the boundary that separates their view from the Papal. Coleridge clearly occupied similar ground respecting the eucharist, as he has "defined his position" in his posthumous works. He says (*Table Talk*, Vol. I. pp. 102-3,) "That sacramentaries have volatilized the eucharist into a metaphor; the Romanists have condensed it into an idol." In his Literary Remains (Vol. III. pp. 78, 336, 391,) he shows that he does not deem the Romish theory encumbered with any absurdity, and that the Protestant arguments against it are unsatisfactory. A body according to him, consists of its visible, or "phenomenal" particles and its invisible substrate or "noumenon." And in his view there is no absurdity in suppo-

sing that the visible material and form of the bread should remain unchanged, while its invisible substrate is removed, and its place supplied by that of the body of Christ. These views it is true he does not defend. But whether they may not have been put forth as "feelers and pioneers" to prepare the way for further progress, is a question. It is not a question however, whether they have not acted as such upon some who were predisposed this way, and started them on their march towards that extreme ecclesiasticism, which scarcely knows how sufficiently to vent its disgust at Puritanism. We have merely indicated the route by which we suppose some, once styling themselves Coleridgeians, have been conducted to ultra-ritualism.

Some other crude conceits, uttered but not defended, and many other fine thoughts upon religion, scattered throughout his writings, might with great propriety be noticed, if we had room. We have however accomplished our main design. We have attempted to furnish our readers the means of forming a fair estimate of Coleridge as a man and as an author, especially in those departments, which are more particularly within our immediate province. We have not been unaware of the difficulty and delicacy of the task, which none can understand, so well as those who undertake it. That our labour should satisfy *all* is not to be expected. If it shall enlighten *any*, our brightest hopes will have been realized. We trust we have made it evident that his works abound in "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," to an extent that will render them precious to the lovers of mental, moral and theological science, of poetry and elegant letters. On the other hand, they are so incomplete, so deformed by large mixtures of error, of crude, extemporaneous conceits, of dreamy, transcendental mysticism, that to become a servile follower or imitator of Coleridge is a degradation; an injury for which all the advantages gained by the study of him is no compensation. So far as they have led our young preachers and theologians to profounder studies, to a more generous culture, to a broader acquaintance and more intimate communion with the noblest authors, to a more robust mental discipline, to the adoption of a pure and lofty standard in morals, and cordial belief in the necessity of grace in order to realize that standard, their influence has been good. So far as they have raised up a distinct Coleridgeian, German, or transcendental school of blind ad-

mirers or eulogists; so far as they have given birth to a set of conceited and scornful sciolists, bandying the barbarous phrases of this school of metaphysics, and belabouring those for their shallowness, who do not understand it, despising "every thing but their own contemptible arrogance;" so far as they have trained up a race of preachers, who in place of the kindly verities of the gospel, deliver chilling and icy literary or metaphysical essays however brilliant, so far they have wrought evil. Coleridge though furnishing the richest treasures with which to stock our mind, if only he be mastered by, instead of mastering us, has faults so numerous and gross as utterly to disqualify him for being a model. These however are relieved and even dignified by their conjunction with his amazing genius and mighty intellect. But misproportions which are endurable in a giant, become insufferable in a dwarf. The transition from the great master to the miniature Coleridges, making a show like him of

> "Piercing the long-neglected holy cave,
> The haunt obscure of old philosophy,"

is a complete plunge from the sublime to the ridiculous, and presents us all "the contortions of the Sibyl without its inspiration."

Art. II.—*A History of Virginia, from its Discovery and Settlement by Europeans, to the present time.* By Robert R. Howison, Vol. II. Containing the History of the Colony and of the State from 1763 to the Retrocession of Alexandria, in 1847, with a Review of the Present Condition of Virginia. Richmond: Drinker & Morris. New York and London: Wiley & Putnam. 1848. 8vo. pp. 528.

Nothing is easier than to say how a history ought to be written, and nothing harder than thus to write it. It is easy to say that a history ought to give a graphic picture of the inner life as well as the outward progress of a nation; that it ought to conduct us to the firesides and wardrobes of a people as well as to their courts, their cabinets and their battle-fields; that it should lay bare the great causes that gave shape to a nation's destiny, and deduce the great lessons that are taught by a nation's fate; that it should compress the facts and reasonings

needful for this purpose into a space small enough not to weary, and yet large enough to embrace all that is essential for future reference; that this should be done in a style that will be elevated without pomposity, clear without dullness, and lively without frivolity; in a word that it should present the finest exhibitions of the artist, the philosopher and the scholar; but the fact that this combination has never yet been found proves that the powers of human conception exceed the powers of human performance; and that there are intrinsic difficulties in the work, peculiar to itself. Every branch of art has been brought nearer to perfection than history, for the reason, perhaps, that it lays every other branch under contribution, and requires for its complete success not only excellence in one department, but to some degree in all.

When, therefore, we undertake to judge a historical work, we may apply to it either the rule of absolute or relative excellence. Applying the one it may be open to many objections. The artistic mind may object to the grouping and delineation of facts and persons; the philosophic, to the development and discussion of principles; the statistical mind, to the details of the work, and the grammatical, to its style. Applying this canon, no history that has ever been written could pass the ordeal unscathed. But it is manifestly unjust to subject every historical work to this test, for it is to demand what the experience of centuries has failed to furnish. Hence it is but an act of fairness to a work of this kind to apply to it the rule of relative excellence, and judge it by comparison with other works on the same subject.

Judged by this standard, the work of Mr. Howison deserves high commendation. It is, as a whole, incomparably the best history of Virginia that has ever been written, and would not suffer even by comparison with works of higher pretension and wider range. The first volume of the work was reviewed on its appearance, in the number of this journal for April, 1847. The points commended in it are equally manifest in the volume before us. And in the defects that were noted in it, there is in this a manifest improvement, amounting in some cases to their entire removal. The typography and general execution of the book are in the highest style of modern art, and rank it with the best productions of the day. There is the same apparent indus-

try in quoting authorities; the same judicious selection of facts; and the style, whilst it preserves the dignity of the first volume, has somewhat of an easier flow. The omission of religious history noted in the former part of the work, appears from this volume, to have been part of the plan, and is remedied by a sketch, which although not as full in some respects as we could have desired, is perhaps as full as was compatible with the limits necessarily prescribed to a general history.

The error into which the author fell in speaking of the "New Lights," in the first volume, is very ingenuously acknowledged and corrected in this; and any seeming unfairness to the pioneers of Presbyterianism then perpetrated, receives an atonement that proves it to have been only seeming and unintentional.

The author divides the history of Virginia into four periods. Two of these are contained in the first volume: the period from the settlement to the dissolution of the London Company, in 1624; and thence to the peace of Paris, in 1763. The second volume contains the remaining two, from 1763 to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, in 1788; and from that period to the retrocession of Alexandria, in 1847, together with a review of the present condition of the state. The latter portion of the history of Virginia lacks the romantic interest that belongs to the early years of her existence, but it embodies lessons of value and interest to the thoughtful reader, that amply compensates for the absence of that stirring incident that throws such a charm about her early annals. It embraces the scenes and actors of the revolution; the war of giant intellects that followed the clash of arms; the adjustment of the principles and forms of civil and religious liberty; and the development of the agencies at work to determine her present social condition. This opens out a field of most inviting interest to a thoughtful mind, embodying as it does some of the most important problems in the future history of our common country; but a field too wide for our present limits. We cannot follow our author minutely in his delineation of this part of his subject, but must content ourselves with taking him partly as a companion and partly as a guide in glancing briefly at the religious history and social condition of Virginia.

The religious history of Virginia is one of peculiar interest,

on several accounts. She possessed the first, and we may add the worst religious establishment among the colonies. She was the battle-ground of the most earnest and protracted contest for religious liberty that was ever waged on the soil of America. And she exhibits, in their clearest form, some of those results of the union of Church and State, which lead us to regard that union as so great an evil to both religion and good government. This field deserves a more extensive and careful cultivation than it has yet received.

In looking over the third chapter of this volume, which contains the principal part of the religious history of the state, we see much to commend, and but little to disapprove. We admire the reverence and piety which pervade this author's remarks on the general subject of religion, and the fearless honesty with which he avows his convictions on controverted topics. As an illustration of these remarks, we subjoin a few paragraphs, omitting the notes. After discussing the nature of religion in general, and presenting a condensed view of the external evidences of Christianity, he remarks as follows, pp. 143–146:

"The Author of Christianity designed that it should carry with it power to convince by its intrinsic authority. The man who will apply his mind to its teachings will believe as certainly as the man who will open his eyes in the sun's rays will see the light around him. It is because it provides an adequate remedy for every ill, that the recipient of its benefits knows it is from the Author of good. Pardon for sin; purity for corruption; comfort for sorrow; unerring precepts for doubt in duty; a life of usefulness; a death of peace, and an eternity of happiness; these are gifts offered by the religion of Christ, in a form which no man resists who desires to know the truth. But to accomplish its object it must be pure as when it was first taught by its inspired originators. Mixed with human devices, it loses its force for good, and becomes the more dangerous because of its exalted claims.

"Among the unhallowed inventions which have been applied to this system, none has produced so unhappy results as its union with civil government. Christianity, if truly possessed, will make a man a good citizen, but the law of the land can never make a man become a Christian. It was a sad day for religion when the Emperor Constantine adopted the Church as his ward,

and began to enforce his lessons by the arm of civil authority. The fires of persecution were better than the splendours of a seeming prosperity, which deadened her soul and threatened to destroy it. From this time we trace the decline of virtue and the growth of corruption; but power was too sweet to be rejected: and in the old world Christianity has not yet thrown off the shackles which have so long confined her. The church is linked to the state and like the dead body chained to the living victim, it gains no vitality for itself, and gradually destroys its hapless companion.

"At the time when the settlement of Virginia commenced, England had laid, broad and deep, the foundations of her Episcopal church establishment. The dominion of Rome had been rejected, Popery was discarded, and English reformers had striven to give to their country a system of religious rule which would secure her welfare. But their reformation fell below the demands of liberty. We may not be surprised at this when we remember how long the human mind had been moulded by habit, and how far the boldest reformers of Europe then sank beneath the principles of true religious freedom. Two remnants of a corrupt age were unhappily retained in remodelling the ecclesiastical system of England. These were first, the principle of Church establishment, the King himself became the head of Christ's Kingdom on earth; clergymen as such, sat among the peers of the land, and voted for her laws; and men, whatever might be their opinions, were compelled to pay tithes to support their spiritual teachers. Secondly, an order of clergy superior to the rectors or pastors, who overlook particular congregations. This superior order has long been distinguished by the title of bishops, but they are not the bishops designated and appointed by the New Testament; they are the successors of the Apostles of the primitive church. It is true the Apostles were all inspired men; were all distinguished by having seen Christ in bodily form, and were so exalted in their duties and character, that, to a common understanding, it would seem impossible that they should have successors; but this difficulty has been removed in England and in Rome. The bishops of the Episcopal church bear the same relation to the Apostles that the Pope does to Peter, and few who acknowledge the exclusive claims of the first will be long disposed to deny those of the other. History

whose province it is to search for the truth, discovers with surprise that there was a time when the claims of each were equally unknown; that in the first and purest ages of Christianity, Pope and Prelate had no existence; that *bishops* were then what the New Testament requires them to be—overseers of a single flock—humbly ministering the bread of life to a single congregation, and uniting together when the interests of the church required it; and that centuries of darkness and vice were necessary to make men believe that the Apostles needed successors, and that the Pope held the keys of St. Peter."

We quote this episode not because of its special relevancy to the history of Virginia, but because it contains much valuable truth, and furnishes a fair specimen of the author's style, and because it is the longest discussion of abstract principles in the volume.

Were we disposed to be fastidious, we might object to the arrangement of the religious history of the state as lacking somewhat the clearness and method of the civil history; and to the want of prominence given to some facts that we regard of material importance; but we deem it ungracious and unfair to dwell on minor blemishes or errors, when there is so much to approve that is more important.

The ecclesiastical history of Virginia naturally divides itself into three periods; the first, reaching from the settlement at Jamestown, to the entrance of Dissenters into the colony; the second, from that time to the downfall of the establishment and the complete acknowledgment of religious liberty; and the third, from thence to the present time. Each of these periods is marked by peculiar characteristics, worthy of special note.

The first period exhibits in the most striking manner the inherent evils of a religious establishment. The first colony that settled on the banks of the James river, then the Powhatan, brought with them a minister of the established church of England; and the royal instructions of the crowned pedant, under whose authority the settlement was made, required the same ecclesiastical establishment in the colony that existed in the mother country. Soon after the settlement of the first colony, a system of ecclesiastico-military law of the most stringent character was adopted, which in the relentless severity of its precepts and penalties, will not suffer comparison, even with the

blue laws of Connecticut. Whipping, mutilation, and death were the punishments annexed to the most common offences. Although this draconian code was not long in operation yet the laws by which it was supplanted were of the most rigid and tyrannical character, responding in the colony to the spirit and efforts of Laud and Stafford in England. During the Protectorate a milder spirit pervaded the colony; but on the restoration of Charles II. the ancient intolerance revived with more intense vigour. In 1663 the laws were rendered still more severe. Not only was conformity required, but attendance on meetings of dissenters punished with severe fines, and heavy penalties laid on shipmasters for bringing dissenters into the colony. Thus for a hundred years was uniformity of worship maintained in the colony, by the rigour of law. We condense from our author a delineation of the working of the establishment during this period, pp. 154—160.

"There had long been, and was still, an appearance of prosperity thrown like a veil over the Church in Virginia, which might have deceived a casual observer. But with this seeming life there was actual death, and not death merely, but all the ghastly consequences of death—the bones of the whited sepulchre—the corruption beneath the gilded tomb—the worms that prey upon the corpse when the soul is gone.

"Let the evils attendant upon the Church establishment of Virginia be fairly stated. First, it deprived men of the free exercise of the rights of conscience. It is vain to say that men may think as they please, when they are compelled by law to attend on the ministrations of one religious sect, or to endure fines for non-compliance. The privileges of citizenship itself were denied to dissenters, and the person who chose to depart from the requirements of the established religion, was met by innumerable vexations which would goad almost to madness a soul sensitive to freedom. It was with delay and reluctance that the courts of Virginia construed the "toleration laws" of England to have any operation in the Colony, and when they were admitted, their efficacy was confined within the narrowest limits possible.

"Secondly, it compelled every man, whatever might be his opinions or his scruples, to contribute to support the Episcopal ministers. He might be a Quaker, or a Baptist, or an Indepen-

dent, but his fate was the same. After *induction* by the Governor, the rector had a freehold claim upon his glebe, and a right to demand at law the stipend granted to him by enactments of the Assembly. The effect was obvious; on no subject are men less willing to be forced than in religion, and many who would voluntarily contribute to its support, feel it to be tyrannous, that they shall be compelled to pay teachers with whose ministry they would willingly dispense.

"Thirdly, it produced many overt and shameful acts of intolerance. Stripes, fines and imprisonment were often inflicted. It is vain to say that the church was not responsible for these cruelties. The establishment unquestionably was, for without it there could have been no such thing as dissent, and therefore no laws against it. These oppressive acts affected strongly, though silently, the whole body of the people, and contributed, with other causes, to reconcile nearly all men to the heavy strokes that finally levelled the Established Church with the ground.

"Fourthly, it introduced into Virginia a body of ministers without piety, and by necessary reaction, the people were as graceless as their pastors. It is a point beyond denial, that the great body of the Episcopal preachers in Virginia were men whose lives were any thing but illustrations of the gospel. They frequented the race-field and the ball-room. They baptized children amid scenes of hilarity, where wine flowed in streams, and the dance enabled them better to display their clerical grace. Many of them betted freely at cards, and rattled dice in a way which would havo put Governor Fauquier to shame. One clergyman was known for a long time to be president of a jockey-club, and doubtless his services in this capacity were adjudged more important than in the pulpit. One reverend gentleman laid aside his spiritual armour, and having taken carnal weapons, fought a duel within sight of the very church where his own voice had often been heard praying to be delivered "from battle, murder, and sudden death."

"The effect of such a ministry on the people may be readily conceived. An utter want of the spirit of piety, and a hatred of the truth, can be detected in many of the manifestations of this period. If a minister ever rose above the *dead level* of his peers, and preached against popular vices, vestry and people both fell

upon him, and ceased not to annoy him, until he was driven from his place. So glaring was the wickedness of the clergy, that the General Assembly, at an early period found it necessary to enact, that 'ministers shall not give themselves to excess in drinking or riot, spending their time idly by day or night.' Thirty years ago, eye-witnesses were alive who had seen ministers of the church enter the pulpit in a state of intoxication, so disabling that their tongues refused to pronounce the oft repeated words of the liturgy.

"Thus the religious establishment of Virginia was weakened by its own inherent vices. It had the sanction of law, the support of learning, and the countenance of men in high places. Nevertheless, it tottered to its fall, and even had it not been attacked by other sects, it would at last have been crushed in the general struggle between tyranny and freedom, of which America was the scene."

In ecclesiastical relation, Virginia was under the diocesan jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. We learn from a note in Neal's History of the Puritans,* that in the reign of Charles II. it was determined to place a bishop in Virginia, and that the letters patent for this purpose are yet extant. But the design failed in consequence of financial difficulties connected with the endowment. Had it been successful, its influence on the ecclesiastical history of the state, might have been of some moment.

The evils of a religious establishment are sufficiently manifest during the first period, but we will notice them still further as we examine the second period; which reaches from the introduction of dissenters to the downfall of the establishment, and is marked by the struggle for religious liberty.

We find early traces of dissenters in the colony, in the form of Puritans and Quakers; but their influence was speedily checked if not extinguished by the enforcement of the intolerant laws then in operation. It was not until near the beginning of the eighteenth century, that the dissenting interest could be said to have an existence, as an active and vital element in the ecclesiastical history of the times. It first appeared thus, in the form of a colony of French Huguenots, in 1690, followed by another, in 1699. They were driven by the bloody scenes

* Harper's Edition, vol. ii. p. 311.

that followed the revocation of the edict of Nantz, to plant the seeds of religious liberty on the banks of the same river that had witnessed the growth of religious intolerance and persecution in the settlements at Jamestown. Thus the storm that had seemingly prostrated the vine and scattered its fruit to wither and die, was found to have carried its seed over mountain and ocean to spots it could never have reached in sunshine and peace. We believe that there never was an act of persecution more signally overruled for good; or one to which England and America, and even Europe, through the French Revolution, owe more under God than the revocation of the edict of Nantz. It was thus to Presbyterianism that the honour was assigned by God, of first implanting the principles of religious freedom on the soil of the mother colony, as it was to Presbyterianism that in after years the burden and heat of their defence was assigned, in the hour of deadly struggle.

A few Baptists were settled in Virginia, near the beginning of the century, but it was not until after the great awakening that they appeared in any considerable force, or excited any considerable attention. In 1760, the first Separate Baptist Church was established, and it proved a nucleus for many fervent and earnest spirits. Coming forth as they did, all eager and burning with the zeal that had been kindled by the fire-words of Whitfield, Davenport and Edwards, we can well conceive the amazement that their untiring energy and fervid appeals would excite in the apathetic incumbents of the establishment. Religion had hitherto been as gentle as "a sucking dove;" giving no man any trouble, unless he omitted to pay his tithes, or wanted to hear a dissenter. But these men made it quite a serious matter, and were setters forth of strange things concerning new births, spiritual experiences, and other new-fangled and Puritanical notions. As we would naturally expect, this zeal excited the spirit of persecution, and the results of this persecution is thus given by our author, p. 170:

"Religious tyranny produced its accustomed effect: the Baptists increased on every side. If one preacher was imprisoned, ten arose to take his place; if one congregation was dispersed, a larger assembled on the next opportunity. Twenty years before the revolution, few of this sect could have been found in the colony, and yet, in 1774, the *Separates* alone had thirty churches

south of James River, and twenty-four on the north of it; and the Regulars, though not so numerous, had grown with rapidity. The influence of the denomination was strong among the common people, and was beginning to be felt in high places. In two points they were distinguished. First, in their love of freedom. No class of the people of America were more devoted advocates of the principles of the revolution; none were more willing to give their money and goods to their country; none more prompt to march to the field of battle, and none more heroic in actual combat, than the Baptists of Virginia. Secondly, in their hatred of the church establishment. They hated not its ministers, but its principles. They had seen its operation and had felt its practical influence. Common sense pointed out its deformities, and clamored against its injustice. To a man they were united in the resolve never to relax their efforts until it was utterly destroyed."

Prior to the settlement of the Baptists, we trace the first germs of the Presbyterian church in the colony. The pioneer of Presbyterianism, Makenzie, had planted several churches in Maryland and Virginia before his death, in 1708, but in a letter from the Presbytery of Philadelphia, to the Presbytery of Dublin, under date of September, 1710,* we learn that there was but one congregation on Elizabeth river, and several Presbyterian families on the Rappahanock and York; and in the minutes for 1712, we see signals of distress from this one congregation, which is the last intimation we have of its existence.

In Western Virginia we find a more vigorous ecclesiastical growth. In the records for 1719, we find an application made to the Synod, for the services of a minister, whose labours resulted in the establishment of a church. We afterwards find repeated notices of the Virginia churches in the minutes; and in 1738 and 1739, we find the correspondence with Gov. Gooch, that produced a full permission granted to the ministers of the Presbyterian church, to labour west of the mountains, in conformity with the Act of Toleration. And although the success of these pioneers, was not so brilliant as that of Robinson and his successors, yet the epithet "drones" applied to them by a venerable historian of our day, is, we think, a needlessly harsh description of their character and labours.

* Records of Presb. Church, pp. 17, 18.

About the middle of the eighteenth century, we find in Eastern Virginia, a most wonderful manifestation of the power of God. We see it first in "the reading-house" of Samuel Morris, where men came together in crowds to hear those wonderful truths from the pages of the dead, that they were forbidden to hear from the lips of the living. The copy of Luther on Galatians that God directed to this man's house, deserves to rank side by side with the memorable Bible in the library of Erfurth, that let in the light to the soul of the great reformer. The jealous spirit of the establishment sought to crush this strange movement, but the work was of God, and it went on. Soon these hungering souls were permitted to receive the bread of life from the hands of the fervent Robinson, and the four days of his preaching were memorable days in the religious history of the colony. The wind, and the earthquake, and the fire were there; but there was also the still small voice, and to many souls it uttered accents of strange melody that had never thrilled their hearts before. Again was the spirit of persecution evoked, and the man who unveiled this "new light," so blinding and offensive to those optics accustomed to "the dim religious light" of the establishment, was obliged to flee in order to escape the rigorous grasp of the law. But before he left this interesting people, he was led by one of those mysterious combinations of circumstances that show the guiding hand of Providence, to connect their fate with that of a thoughtful young student, who was afterwards to become the Paul of the Presbyterian church in Virginia.

Samuel Davies was one of those spirits that God always raises up in the exigencies of his cause on the earth. He was dedicated to God, like the seer whose name he bore, from the womb, and the prayers of a pious mother were answered by seeing her son take up the cross at the age of fifteen, and turn his face steadfastly toward the ministry. Poverty and pain were the stern tutors whose teachings were to fit him for the hallowed work before him. Brought down at the outset of his career to the very borders of eternity, he seems to have come back like one who had seen and heard unutterable things, and on whose face there lingered some of that strange light that had streamed in upon his spirit as it looked into the unseen and the eternal. He was learned, but it was not his learning that broke

down the strongholds that fell before him. He was eloquent, but it was not the spell of his eloquence that wrought the mighty transformations that marked his career. Men were smitten to the heart by the simple utterance of the text, before another word had come from the lips of the speaker. It was the deep and earnest spirit of the man, that breathed like flame through every word and act; a spirit kindled at the living word and the eternal throne, and fanned into brightness by the breathings of the Holy Ghost; it was this that made him so pre-eminently "a burning and a shining light." It was this that caused the people to hang in crowds on his words, and go away thoughtfully, feeling that a new era had begun in their history. It was this, that made his words the conductor that kindled a flame in the young hearts of Patrick Henry and James Waddel, which glowed and grew until it burst forth in the thrilling eloquence of the American Demosthenes, and the Blind Preacher. And it was this that gave such power to his words, when he battled for liberty of conscience, and gave indirectly such stunning blows to the establishment. We cannot follow him through his brief but splendid career without feeling that if there is one man to whom, more than another, Virginia owes the enjoyment of a free pulpit and a pure gospel, that man was Samuel Davies.

The storm that had so long been provoked by the unjust and persecuting spirit of the establishment, at length burst upon it, at the first session of the free legislature of Virginia, in 1776. Men of all creeds and men of none, united in demanding the repeal of laws, that the common feeling of mankind declared to be unjust and oppressive. Among the most powerful attacks made upon it was that of the Hanover Presbytery, in a memorial which is a model of argument, elegance and truth. The contest on the floor of the legislature was long, strenuous and bitter. Prejudice, interest, policy and even piety arrayed themselves to support what seemed to many to be identical with religion itself. But at length the spirit that had flamed out in resistance to civil oppression prevailed against religious tyranny, and an ordinance was passed relieving dissenters from the obligation of attending or supporting the established church; and extending their privileges in several respects. But important as were the concessions of the ordinance of 1776, the establishment was not yet

overthrown. In 1784 and 1785, the contest was renewed and after several able memorials from the Hanover Presbytery, and after hearing a member of the Presbytery for three successive days at the bar of the House of Delegates, the Act of Religious Freedom was passed, drawn up by the pen of Jefferson, and embodying substantially the principles and reasonings contained in the forementioned memorials. In 1787, another step was taken in the overthrow of the establishment, by repealing the law incorporating the Episcopal Church, that had been passed in 1784. It was not, however, until 1799, that the final blow was struck. The statute of that year repealed all previous laws on the subject, and planted the religious liberties of the people on the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and the Act of Religious Freedom. Thus was the last tie cut, and the church sundered finally, and we trust forever, from the state.

One further step was needful to retrieve the injustice of those laws that had built up one church at the expense of all others, and this was taken in 1802, by ordering the sale of the glebe lands as they became vacant by the death of the incumbents and the application of their proceeds, first, to the liquidation of all debts against the parish, and then to the poor, or to any other object not strictly religious, that a majority of the freeholders should designate.

This law was denounced as unconstitutional, and the issue carried to the highest appellate court. Of the five members of the court qualified to sit, three believed the act unconstitutional, among whom was the president judge; but the very day that the judgment was to be rendered, *the president died.* A re-organization of the court being thus made necessary, the cause came up again for argument in 1804, when the court being equally divided, it was lost. Still not satisfied, an effort was made in 1830, to quash the law, which in 1840 was finally settled by an *unanimous* decision of the Court of Appeals, that the act of 1802 was constitutional.

Thus at last was the struggle, that began essentially with the memorable tobacco case, which first called forth the powers of Patrick Henry; that was carried forward through so many years of earnest, bitter contest, crowned with complete success, in the establishment of religious liberty on the widest possible foundation.

But although the legislature could remove the legal consequences of the establishment, we fear there are others equally to be lamented, that are beyond their control. We doubt not that religion received an injury in the heat and strife of this prolonged contest, which it will require years to repair, and the extent and depth of which are known only to the Omniscient.

We see the traces of this influence in the extreme jealousy that marks all the legislation of Virginia bearing on the subject of religion; in her rejection of a legislative chaplaincy; in her exclusion of clergymen from a seat in the legislature; in the enactment in the amended constitution of 1830, that "no religious society shall even "levy *on themselves* any tax for the erection or repair of any house for public worship, or for the support of any church or ministry;" and her steady refusal to grant acts of incorporation to any religious society. Whatever may be thought of the policy of this course, it plainly involves a suspicious jealousy of religion, and a want of confidence in its purifying and controlling power that is clearly traceable to the experience of the evils of an establishment.

But there are other results still more serious, which we think are fairly chargeable, in part at least, to the influence of the establishment. If there was any one man in Virginia whose influence for evil, in the matter of religion, is to be compared with that of Samuel Davies for good, that man was Thomas Jefferson. Of his talents, his influence, and his services to the cause of civil liberty, we need not speak. They are enshrined in monuments which the world will not soon suffer to perish. But it is the very greatness of his merit and power in what he did understand, that makes his influence so disastrous in that which he did not understand. In statesmanship he had the intellect of a giant, in religion that of a child. But by a natural error of the human mind, his greatness in the one department was transferred to his credit in the other, and his influence thus became one of the most disastrous elements in the religious condition and history of Virginia. In tracing the causes that tended to form his opinions, we are forced to recollect that his mind received its first impressions of religion from an establishment that was trampling in the dust, what he knew to be the most sacred rights of men, that he received the first teachings of it from men many of whom were found arrayed against the struggling colonies in their noble efforts to be free; and that he encountered the

teachers and defenders of that religion in repeated and bitter struggles to retain a power that he knew was unjust in its origin, unjust in its exercise; and unjust in its nature. Can we wonder then, that he associated with the abuses and tyrannies of the past, that religion which he found in its most respectable and influential form, steadily maintaining those abuses and exercising those tyrannies? Can we wonder that in his intercourse with the zealots of France, he learned to identify the corrupt priesthood of the old world with the ministry of the new, when he found them holding some of the same tyrannical doctrines, and indulging in some of the same unjust practices? And if, as we think is most clearly demonstrable, the infidelity and therefore the blood of the French Revolution are to be charged greatly if not mainly to the monstrous corruptions of the established church of France, is it surprising that a similar process of causation and reasoning should obtain during the scenes of the American Revolution, in the mind of Jefferson? When, therefore, his sneering scepticism and bitter sarcasms against priests and churches were thrown out and circulated among the young, ardent and cultivated minds of Virginia, they received an irresistable confirmation in scenes that were fresh in their memories, or transacting before their eyes. And we cannot but believe that had the mild and liberal policy of a Penn or a Baltimore prevailed in the Old Dominion, and a purer and better type of Christianity been before the minds of Jefferson and his contemporaries; if their infidelity had not been entirely prevented, at least its deadly and blighting power, that is still felt with mournful potency, would have been much more circumscribed in its extent and temporary in its duration.

The third era of the religious history of Virginia, properly dates from the beginning of the century, when the establishment was substantially overturned. Having consumed so much of our limits on the first two, we cannot even epitomise in the briefest manner, this portion of her history. Compared with the preceding periods, it has been one of prosperity and growth.

Our author presents at some length the present condition of the churches in Virginia, from which we condense a few statistics. The Baptists have about 673 church edifices; 357 ministers; 85,143 communicants; and 35 associations, of which 23 are favourable to missionary effort, and 12 opposed. The Metho-

dists possess 156 church edifices; 298 local preachers, and 59,660 members. The Episcopalians have a bishop and assistant bishop; 95 parishes; 112 church edifices; 112 clergymen; and 4305 communicants. Of several other denominations no particular statistics are given. Of our own church he thus speaks, p. 484.

"The Presbyterian church in Virginia has not been false to the promise made by its auspicious beginnings. Its progress has been steady; and though inferior in numbers, and in some other respects, to the Baptist and Methodist, it probably yields to none in the influence which, when required, it is capable of exerting. Its ministry, as a body, have been learned men; and from time to time, it has been adorned by minds as brilliant in talents as they were devoted in piety. The names of James Waddel, Moses Hoge, John Holt Rice, Conrad Speece, George Baxter, and William Armstrong, will long be remembered and revered. Of the distinguished living, it would not be proper to speak. For many years of its existence this church in Virginia, was harmonious. But the unhappy division of 1837–38, extended itself into this state. The *Old School* portion maintained great ascendancy in numbers, but the *Constitutional* Presbyterians were active and determined. For a time embittered feeling prevailed, and scenes occurred which produced a painful impression on all minds in love with true piety. But as years have passed away, bitterness has subsided; the parties have learned to regard each other as sister churches, separate in name, and perhaps in some doctrinal opinions, yet united by many common sympathies. Within a very short time past, a coalescing tendency has exhibited itself, the full result of which is yet to be developed." The Old School statistics are 170 churches, 137 ministers, and 13,048 communicants; the New School, 49 churches, 43 ministers, and 4,138 communicants.

In turning to the social state of Virginia, we enter upon ground of some delicacy and difficulty, but ground which we cannot avoid at least touching before taking leave of this work. The portion of the book bearing on this subject has perhaps less clear and logical analysis than is found in other parts of the work. The social system of Virginia is marked by clear and definite peculiarities. The two prominent facts in her civilization are, first, the striking development of individual character; intellec-

tually, in the great names that adorn her annals; socially, in the fine domestic feelings, the courtesies and hospitalities of life; the indifference to proper economy amounting often to prodigality; the high sense of honour, and punctilious adherence to certain principles. Secondly, the tardy development of social and physical greatness, thus expressed by our author, p. 510. "It must therefore, be regarded as a truth but too fully established, that Virginia has fallen below her duty; that she has been indolent while others have been laborious; that she has been content to avoid a movement positively retrograde, while others have gone rapidly forward. Her motion, compared with that of Massachusetts or Ohio, might, in familiar terms, be likened to the heavy stage-coach of the past century, competing with the flying steam-car of the present."

For the latter fact, our author assigns three causes, the want of popular education; the want of Internal Improvement, and Slavery. The first two of these, are rather effects, and part of the very phenomena they are adduced to explain. They demand, in a free government, a certain advancement of population and labour, before they can be successfully carried into operation. The want of them in Virginia is the result of anterior causes. The one fact that explains most of the phenomena, is the comparative absence of a producing middle class; from whose ranks the rich, the powerful, and the great, are constantly coming forth, leaving room for those next in order, and creating thus an upward and onward movement that reaches the humblest producer; and stimulates each to the most strenuous effort, by the hope of improving his own condition and that of his family. This is the mighty mainspring of energy in modern civilization, and it is the comparative absence of this fact, that explains the particulars adduced by our author. The causes producing this fact, and the first peculiarities of social condition mentioned above, lie in the past; in the character and circumstances of the original settlers; in the causes that led to the settlement; in the preference of the colonists for an isolated, country life, and their unwillingness to settle in dense and compact bodies; in the laws of entail and suffrage; and other minor facts; but mainly in a cause that has been to many of those mentioned a *causa causans*, and which we give for several reasons in the words of our author, pp. 517—520.

"The last and most important cause unfavorably affecting Virginia which we shall mention, is the existence of *Slavery* within her bounds. We have already seen the origin and progress of this institution. As to its evils, we have nothing new to offer; they have long been felt and acknowledged by the most sagacious minds in our state. 'It is the common remark of all who have travelled through the United States, that the free states and the slave states exhibit a striking contrast in their appearance. In the older free states are seen all the tokens of prosperity; a dense and increasing population; thriving villages, towns and cities; a neat and productive agriculture; growing manufactures, and active commerce. In the older parts of the slave states, with a few local exceptions, are seen, on the contrary, too evident signs of stagnation, or of positive decay; a sparse population, a slovenly cultivation, spread over vast fields that are wearing out, among others already worn out and desolate; villages and towns few and far between, rarely growing, often decaying, sometimes mere remnants of what they were; sometimes deserted ruins haunted only by owls; generally no manufactures, nor even trades, except the indispensable few; commerce and navigation abandoned as far as possible, to the people of the free states; and generally, instead of the stir and bustle of industry, a dull and dreary stillness, broken, if broken at all, only by the wordy brawl of politics.'*

"Were we called to declare what we believe to be the sentiments of a large majority of our people on the subject of slavery, we would attempt it under two heads. First, we hold that this institution, as it exists among us, is lawful, and that *we only* have the right to control it. The Constitution of the United States has solemnly guarantied the rights of slaveholders in their property. Any interference by the general government, or by particular states, or by classes of individuals in other states, with her right to this property will be resisted by Virginia to the end. A dissolution of the Union is an evil which she regards with horror, but a dissolution of the Union would be preferable to submission to measures which would violate the most solemn pledges on which the Union was founded.

"Secondly, we apprehend that, in general, the people of Vir-

*Quoted from Dr. Ruffner's Address to Western Va.

ginia hold slavery to be an enormous evil, bearing with fatal power upon their prosperity. This sentiment has been gaining ground during many years. Within a very short time past, a citizen of east Virginia, intelligent, highly educated, and possessed of great wealth in this species of property, has spoken out plainly and urged owners to get rid of their slaves as rapidly as possible. And in west Virginia, expressions of opinion have been even more decided, and incipient means have been adopted to provide for the gradual destruction of the evil.

"Under these circumstances we hail with pleasure any indications that this part of our population is decreasing in number, and that the time shall come when Virginia shall be a free state. . . . During the last ten years they have *diminished* 4.5 per cent.

"The principal source of decrease in our slaves is in the number *exported* to cultivate the cotton and sugar lands of the south. Hardly a day passes in which large companies may not be seen traversing the roads of Virginia, on their way to her southern frontier. Melancholy as may be the thoughts suggested by such scenes, they will at least bring with them some solace. The condition of the slaves in the south is not probably worse than upon the impoverished plantations of our state, and their gradual removal by this means, gives place to a better population. Already German and New York farmers have occupied large tracts of land in Fairfax county, and an English company has been formed, whose professed design is to transport emigrants from Great Britain to the inviting fields of Virginia. In her latter days as in her infancy, our state seems destined to draw her inhabitants directly from the mother country."

These frank and manly statements indicate that Virginia comprehends her social condition, and that the only boon she asks in regard to her main difficulty is, to be let alone. The removal of this evil has already been retarded by foreign interference in the past, and no other result can be expected from it in the future.

Virginia has thus passed through several distinct social phases. The first was the period of struggle with the forest, the soil and the savage; producing the hardy and intrepid virtues of border life, and moulding those daring and heroic spirits that adorn the early years of her annals. The second, was the period of con-

quest over these opposing elements, when a teeming soil and a genial climate poured plenty at her feet; when her peculiar system of labour was adjusted to the exuberant richness of the land; and when all the courtesies and elegancies of human life had reached their highest and most exquisite cultivation. The third was the period of exhaustion; when the tree that was cut down for the sake of its fruit, was found withered and leafless; when the relations of labour and soil became reversed: and the evils of her system of labour became apparent. The fourth, is her present state, the period of transition. When she is throwing off the peculiarities of the past; ridding herself of her slave population; inviting the influx of free labour; and preparing, in the words of our author, to become "a free state.' If this process be not arrested by fanatical meddling or unexpected obstacles, she will speedily enter a fifth phase, which will be one of prosperity, power, and greatness, such as are indicated by her peerless advantages of climate, soil, position and natural resources.

We take leave of Mr. Howison's volume, with high respect for the ability, candour, and piety, manifested in his work. And whilst he himself would be the first to object to our assigning to his history a place beside the master-pieces of historic literature, that often owe as much to the greatness of the subject, as the powers of the writer; yet we freely assign to it a high place among the contributions now making to the episodes of history: and would be glad to see them all marked by the scholarship, taste, and high moral spirit that pervade this History of Virginia.

Art. III.—*The Bible not of Man: or the Argument for the Divine Origin of the Sacred Sceiptures drawn from the Scriptures themselves.* By Gardiner Spring, D.D., Pastor of the Brick Church, New York. Published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau strect, New York.

Every speculative mind has had its difficulties attending belief in Christianity; and sometimes when reflecting on the momentous consequences of God's Revelation to man, we are

prone to ask, Why has he not accompanied his Revelation with stronger evidences? Again; while reflecting on the character and condition of the world around us, the same inquiry sometimes obtrudes itself on our solitude, Why is there not evidence sufficient to carry resistless conviction to every mind? How much toil might the heralds of the cross be spared? From what painful anxieties might Christians themselves be relieved? What a different aspect might this so sinful and weeping world at once present?

The author of the work, which we propose to review, has evinced his wisdom in reserving his published thoughts on this subject, to the full maturity of his powers. Coming from one who is venerable in age, and revered for his worth; who has become distinguished not less by the tone and style of his several volumes, than by the prolonged and concentrated devotion of his intellect and affection to the spiritual interests of a single congregation; who has not only retained and adorned his pulpit for more than thirty-five years, but more than all, maintained an exemplary and consistent walk; this work will be received with wide spread interest and appreciated by all who regard the testimony of age and experience. As the piety of a man who has passed through the temptations and trials of a long life, gives to us a stronger impression of the reality of personal religion, than all the ardent professions and active devotion of youth; so the experience of a Christian minister who through a long series of years has studied, and preached, and loved, and lived the truths of the Bible; who amid the changing circumstances of life has either himself tested, or seen others test, the truths of the Bible, is calculated to exert a deeper and more lasting influence.

The manner in which the subject of the Christian Evidences is treated in this work, serves to convey the impression so much needed; or rather which cannot be too deeply fixed in the mind of the community, that Christianity is manifest by its own light, and presents itself to be judged of by its own evidence.

Similar views on almost every topic here discussed have been advanced by other writers on the subject; nor does its author lay claim to originality; but to him belongs the merit of presenting the subject to the general mind with all those lucid divisions and subdivisions—those full and flowing periods, and that

beauty of diction, which characterise the order of his thoughts and the style of his writing; above all, with the additional advantage of a matured experience of the tendency and power of divine truth.

There are not a few beautiful, and some most touching passages in the volume; passages in which we recognise the preacher on whose lips we have often hung in rapt and solemn attention, and whose spirit in prayer has often subdued us to its own harmony and tone.

But though we respond to the sentiment of a heathen critic,

> ——————ubi plura nitent—non ego paucis
> Offendar maculis.

here and there, is a paragraph, divested of the strength belonging to the thought or the argument it unfolds, by a diffuseness of expression bordering on repetition. This verbal expression of some particular thought, for aught we know, may have been intentional on the part of the author; as the opinion is not uncommon among preachers, that it is ofttimes necessary to the effective inculcation of religious truth on the general mind.

It admits of a question, perhaps, whether the end which the author proposed to himself, in writing on the Internal Evidences, may not be in a measure interfered with, by his mode of reasoning from the, so called, "Distinguishing doctrines of the Bible?" Whatever may be our creed as a denomination; though all evangelical Christians may in general agree with us; yet when we attempt to evince the divine origin of the scriptures from their own teachings, it is certainly unnecessary, if not hazardous to the successful issue of our reasonings, to introduce any doctrinal point which having been identified with a particular school in theology, or associated with bitter controversies, may awaken prejudice or provoke incredulity. If through love for certain theological views, or from the persuasion that such views are in accordance with the teachings of scripture, we assert, that "such doctrines could never have originated with man," and therefore the book that teaches them must be from God; why may not they who put a different construction on the very passages of scripture from which we profess to derive our peculiar tenets, avail themselves of a similar mode of reasoning at once to establish the claims of the Bible, and to advance the interests of their sect?

It were to be expected that a theologian would attach the last importance to his didactic system; and when he comes to investigate the internal evidences of the Bible, that all his conclusions might be, to a greater or less degree affected by his belief in what he regards as its peculiar doctrines. Such is the nature of the mind, that the wonted associations of studious thought, are apt not only to direct the mode of our inquiries, but to bias our conclusions; or as Locke observes,* "let a man be given up to the contemplation of one sort of knowledge, and that will become every thing. The mind will take such a tincture from a familiarity with that object, that everything else, how remote soever, will be brought under the same view. A metaphysician will bring ploughing and gardening immediately to abstract notions. An alchemist, on the contrary, shall reduce divinity to the maxims of his laboratory." It is on the same principle, that a theologian of any school might be in danger of reducing the evidences of the Bible to the marks and lines of his system of doctrine.

All we object to is the making those doctrines about which true Christians differ, the ground of an argument for the divine authority of the Bible. The argument may be valid; it may have great cogency for those who believe the doctrines; but so far as books of evidence are designed either for Christians in general for the confirmation of their faith, or for the conversion of infidels, we are compelled to doubt the wisdom of adopting this line of argument. We do not object to the assumption that the human mind could never have discovered the system of doctrine revealed in the Bible. Even if it could be, for a moment, admitted that the human mind could in a long course of ages evolve anything approaching the Christian system, that the analogy between natural and revealed religion, as exhibited by Butler, were so clear, that the latter could proceed as a natural growth out of the former, still we want in a religion something more than truth. We need certainty and authority. Even if all the doctrines of our scriptures were within the range of the human mind, they would still need the seal of God. The only legitimate ground of argument against the Bible, is not its doctrines, but its evidences. Speculative objections cannot be ad-

* Locke's Works, vol. iii. p. 240.

mitted where positive facts are concerned. Men may question its authenticity, or disparage its credibility, or impugn its divine authority, but they have no right to deny its teachings, if they cannot disprove its evidences. The very fact that the Bible does contain some things respecting which we have no means of judging, because they come not within the range either of our observation or experience, is conclusive, that for aught the human mind can decide, they may be true, or they may be false.

As a reason for confining the argument to those doctrines which are admitted by all true Christians, though we may say with Dr. S., that the language of scripture is "cautious, well-selected and emphatic;" we are to take into view the various educational influences which have so to speak, swayed the laws of biblical interpretation, and the countless biases to which the mind is unconsciously subject. We can never be so sure that our own ununderstanding of the meaning of a particular portion of scripture is right, as we may be, from its general evidences, that the Bible contains a revelation from God. The apostle himself admitted that there are some things in scripture "hard to be understood." Now all thinking minds must and do agree in relation to the essential attributes of Deity. If there be a God, He must be holy, just and good; these conclusions follow from the very admission of God's existence. So all thinking minds may agree in relation to the nature of that government which God exercises over his creatures; but when we come to reason *a priori*, as to all the doctrines which a revelation from such a being should contain, or as to the character of any special divine dispensation, we shall differ in our conclusions just in proportion to the partial or imperfect manner in which we may apprehend the premises of our argument.

What can man know of the councils of an Infinite Being? or how can he determine the various methods of God's dealings with his fallen creatures? Here, then, is the obvious propriety of limiting the internal evidence, and of confining it to those simple points, the necessity and propriety of which, human nature has in all ages, both felt and acknowledged—which certain doctrines of Christianity directly respect; doctrines founded on a few prominent facts; which no effort of reason could have discovered, but of which, when once presented to the mind, any one may judge and that upon proof the most direct and satisfactory to

himself—drawn from his intuitive perception of the adaptedness of such doctrines to his moral wants and woes; and from the involuntary testimony of his own heart to his need of just such a pardon, such assistance and consolation as Christianity offers; and the moment we go beyond these doctrines, which meet the universal necessities of man; such as the fall, the incarnation, the redemption, the necessity of holiness in heart and life, to happiness after death; and which relate to the prominent duties and lovely spirit of Christianity; to humility before God and reliance on the grace and merits of Christ; we go beyond those doctrines where all true Christians are united in view and feeling and practice, and trench on the debateable points of theological controversy; we lose all the advantage of the general consciousness of men, of the testimony of the experience and feelings and conscience of all men, to which our argument, to be successful, must be addressed.

It is certainly one thing to illustrate the truth of the Bible from its own simple and undisputed teachings, and distinctly another to prove our own creed from the Bible. We believe, of course, that ours is "the system of doctrine taught in the holy scriptures;" but in our solicitude to rescue men from the abyss of infidelity, it appears to us that we should studiously avoid any position which may divert attention from the essential and irrefragable evidences of a divine revelation.

It is remarkable, however, and may be regarded as a favourable omen—indicating the nearer approach of the several evangelical denominations to similarity of view in relation to a point once carefully avoided, that the Executive Committee of the American Tract Society, should have published in a volume on the internal evidence of the Bible, all the prominent proof texts in favour of the doctrine of election.

In examining the chapter on the "Moral Rectitude" of the Bible, it has occurred to us, that the author through his profound impressions of the holiness of God's law, has been too general in his strictures on the ethical views of the heathen. Nothing is to be gained by either "depreciating," as Robert Hall once remarked, "the value of those discoveries and improvements to which reason really attained, or charging the picture of its aberrations and defects with deeper shades than justly belong to it." Though the heathen were far from being either consistent or

uniform in their theories of virtue, and though we may prove from their writings that reason by itself is inadequate to furnish man with all needed light and strength to the attainment of the great end of his being; yet there is no subject on which men of all ages have so generally coincided, as in relation to the rules of conduct and those qualities of the human character which deserve esteem. (See Mackintosh's View of the Progress of Ethical Philosophy, sec. 1.) Though the idea of right and wrong may be modified or perverted by education and custom, yet all false notions and erroneous practices do but pre-suppose the existence in the mind, of a power of moral judgment, together with the notion of right and wrong; nor could education have produced those effects to which Dr. S. alludes, (p. 98), leading them to "regard conduct as sacred of which the Bible speaks as infamous, to treat as religious and honourable what the Bible treats as debasing and flagitious," without the instrumentality of the moral faculty.

We advert to this, because unless the idea of right and wrong be inseparable from the human mind, or there be some power in the mind of discerning moral relations, we can have no fixed criterion by which we can judge of the Christian code of ethics, or even of the rectitude of the divine nature. If "right and wrong with them were arbitrary distinctions, and depended for the most part on custom, &c.," may not this be the case with our own notions, though dependent on outward revelation? and must not men's views of right and wrong now vary with their unequal degrees of knowledge, or the changing influences of society? If "human reason, untaught of God, has never been able to discover to any such extent as is available for practical purposes, the difference between what is right and what is wrong;" how can we meet one of the prominent arguments of the materialist? not to speak of the position of atheism!

To say, with our author, that the "natural universe has to some extent recognized the distinction," does not, to our mind, relieve the difficulty. The question properly is, does reason give us the idea of right and wrong? is it not an universal and a necessary conception of the reason? If not; then how can we judge of "the truth and justness of its moral distinctions?" how can we know that the "Bible system of morals strikes its roots so deep in the great principles of God's moral government

and the moral constitution of man?" or how can Dr. S. further remark, as on p. 268, in referring to the book of nature and the book of Providence, "these instructions are valuable in proportion to their plainness and extent. They are so because they utter the voice of God; they are a revelation of his will; they constitute some of the forms in which he himself addressed truth to the minds of his creatures," &c.

To suppose that man's ignorance of his duties to the Author of his being, is total, without a supernatural revelation, is to close our eye to the fact, that all nature cries aloud to the existence of a holy and just God. The apostle declares the heathen to be inexcusable because the invisible things of God, his eternal power and Godhead, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made. It admits of the amplest testimony that they had the idea of right and wrong, of truth and falsehood, of justice and injustice, and by consequence of merit and demerit, the dread of retribution; hence, we are able to rebut all presumptions against some of the fundamental principles of revealed religion. Hence Grotius* says, "There is less reason for the heathens to oppose the Christian religion, because all the parts of it are so agreeable to the rules of virtue, that by their own light they do in a manner convince the mind; insomuch that there have not been wanting some amongst the heathen who have said *those things singly*, which in our religion are all put together. For instance, that religion does not consist in ceremonies, but in the mind; that he who has it in his heart to commit adultery, is an adulterer; that we ought not to return an injury; that a husband ought to have but one wife; that the bonds of matrimony ought not to be dissolved; that it is every man's duty to do good to another, especially to him that is in want; that as much as possible, men ought to abstain from swearing; that they ought to be content with what is necessary to supply nature."

There is no necessity for "inscribing barrenness on the soul of unenlightened reason," in order to evince the superiority of Christian morality. To establish the doctrines of the Bible, we need not deny the principles of natural religion; and in like manner, should we admit all that the most enthusiastic students

* Book IV. sec. xii.

of antiquity have claimed in behalf of the ethical notions of heathen sages, it would not follow that no better code was needed; much less does it follow, that because they endorsed many false virtues, they had no clear conceptions of either truth, justice, integrity, faithfulness, chastity, obedience to parents, or reverence for the Supreme Being. Enough for us to know, that Christianity, though including all that was really good in pagan ethics, or conformable to the dictates of natural religion, excludes all that is false and evil; while re-enacting all the principles of natural virtue with greater clearness and force, and introducing some virtues wholly unknown to the ancients, has given us a code which is at once complete, consistent, spiritual and authoritative. We need not, therefore, undervalue the teachings of the Porch, to show the inspiration of Paul. The greater the evidence of any truth or principle having been discovered by the unassisted mind, the more do we feel our indebtedness to the teachings of the Bible—the more profound homage do we render to divine inspiration.

In attempting to show the accordance of the truths of the Bible with reason, Dr. Spring has pursued a train of remark which though it has been generally adopted and is perhaps most adapted to the popular mind, is liable to some exceptions. Whether he has relieved the difficulties which are apt to press on the mind when steadily contemplating the Christian mysteries; whether some of his positions might not be as readily assumed by a believer in transubstantiation; whether he has furnished us with an effective mode of reasoning in answer to sceptical objections, will be decided by his readers according to their frame of mind, or habits of thinking. No advance can be made in our attempts to show the accordance of Bible truths with reason, unless we come to a definite understanding as to the sense of the term *reason*. Dr. Spring defines it as "that faculty of the mind by which it distinguishes truth from falsehood, and enables us to deduce truths that are unknown from those that are known; a faculty which exists in different power in different minds;" and if this be so, then there is no alternative—what is perfectly reasonable in view of one, may be less so to another, and wholly unreasonable to a third; and such may be the judgment of different minds in relation to some of Dr. Spring's positions. "Those very truths," he says, "which

to the slight inspection of the Rationalist appear the most objectionable to human reason, are truths which human reason *might well presume* such a revelation would contain." It is reasonable to his mind that a revelation should contain "mysterious features," to another mind it is altogether unreasonable; so in relation to different doctrines; and hence it is evident, that an *appeal to reason*, if it were to avail aught in the settlement of disputed points, or can with any logical propriety be made, implies that there is some universal and necessary standard of moral judgment and conviction; and that men do not all see alike, or arrive at the same conclusions, is not because they have not "the opportunity and the means of reasoning," but because they either call that reason which is not so, or moral causes have obscured the perceptions of reason.

To reason justly, we must be free from all the causes of error, as well as "enjoy the opportunity and means of reasoning;" but to decide a point according to reason, is to decide it according to certain intuitive perceptions of the human mind. Thus, we cannot believe what we see to be contradictory to reason, and we cannot divest ourselves of belief in our intuitive convictions. We cannot believe the same proposition to be at once true and false; nor admit the truth of a proposition which contradicts some other proposition already seen to be true; much less any propositions knowing them to be contradictory. Thus also, we cannot conceive that what is true to us, should be false to another being, endowed with the same rational faculty with ourselves; much less, that which we in the exercise of reason see to be false, should be true in the divine mind.

In reasoning, the mind employs itself about those things which reason perceives; and hence, reason has been regarded by various modern philosophers, as the power of universal and necessary conceptions—the source and substance of truths above sense, and having their evidence in themselves—such as have been generally termed *first truths*, or self-evident propositions.

It is on this ground, we think, it may be made to appear, that though faith has its foundation in authority, it is the perfection of human reason, even faith in the mysteries of revealed religion, since the primary ground of all truth is mysterious; and reason, though it cannot admit a proposition in theology, which is contrary to its clear intuitive perceptions, may and does

believe what passeth all understanding. Reason may tell us what the evidences of a revelation should be, and are; but as it did not discover its doctrines, so it does not presume to tell us, nor can tell us what these doctrines are, except that they cannot contradict our intuitive knowledge of what is true and right. If any doctrine (so called) does thus contradict the necessary convictions of the mind, we must presume that there has been some interpolation or misinterpretation; if it does not, then its incomprehensibility to our understanding, is no bar to true faith.

But there is one other position in this part of the book, to which we would briefly advert. It is in reply to the author of the discourses on "The Nature and Danger of Infidel Philosophy." "Whatever depends," says Dr. S., "on probable evidence only, can never produce the conviction of certainty." (p. 308). We highly appreciate his motive in questioning the remark of the author to whom he alludes, "that no Christian can certainly *know* that the gospel itself is of divine inspiration." The propriety or impropriety of that expression depends entirely on the sense given to the word *know*. If knowledge is taken in the wide sense for assured conviction, without reference to the ground of that conviction, the expression is certainly incorrect. Job could properly say, I know that my Redeemer liveth; and Paul, I know that he will give me a crown of righteousness. But if knowledge is distinguished from faith, as is often and perhaps generally done, the remark above cited only means that the evidence on which our conviction of the truth of Christianity is found, is not argument, but authority; it is not that which produces knowledge, but faith. The decision of the question must turn altogether on the *nature* of the Christian evidences. As it is absurd to require demonstrative evidence of that which we learn by sensation; or intuitive proof of that which we learn by demonstration; so it is equally unreasonable to demand either sensitive, demonstrative or intuitive proof of that which in its own nature is incapable of any other than moral evidence, or the testimony of authority. As demonstration establishes a mathematical proposition, with like certainty may moral evidence establish a series of historical facts. In the latter case there is no more room for reasonable doubt than in the former, so that we ourselves, on the ground of probable evidence, may respond to the declaration of the very men who had seen the Lord, "We

know in whom we have believed." "The word probable," remarks Mr. Stewart,* "does not imply any deficiency of proof, but only marks the particular nature of that truth, as contradistinguished from other species of evidence. It is opposed not to what is certain, but to what admits of being demonstrated after the manner of mathematicians." If any other authority were needed, we might adduce Grotius, who in answer to those who require more and stronger arguments, remarks, "They ought to know that different things must have different kinds of proof. And it is the will of God that those things which he would have us believe, so as that faith should be accepted from us as obedience, should not be so very plain as those things which we perceive by our senses, and by demonstration; but only so far as is sufficient to procure belief, and persuade a man of a thing, who is not obstinately bent against it, so that the gospel is as a touch-stone to try men's honest dispositions by.†"

What is here meant by probable or moral evidence, is all the evidence that the *nature of the case* admits of—it is of the same nature, and not less strong in degree, than the evidence of those facts and truths which mankind not only readily admit, but on which they confidently rely in the conduct and management of life. Hence also, it is in unison with the very conditions of moral trial in which man is placed by his Maker. We must change the nature of the present state, and the structure of Christianity as a system whose efficient influence rests on faith, if we demand for it any other kind of evidence. Instead of moral evidence, let it be accompanied with evidences which shall produce that kind of conviction which arises from the evidence of the senses, and what room will there be for the exercise of a faith which lifts us above the evidence of sense, and the decisions of the understanding? Where are those illustrious exhibitions of patience and meekness, those disinterested charities, those heroic virtues, those noble sacrifices to truth and duty, those sublime triumphs of faith over sense and sin?

In the very nature of its evidences, not less than in its doctrines and precepts, we see the adaptedness of Christianity to man's rational and moral constitution—to the proper culture of

* Book II. s. 19. See also in this connection a valuable note by Le Clerc.
† Elements of Philosophy, vol. III. ch. iv. s. 4.

his heart—to the development and elevation of his mind; nor do we deem it difficult to trace the virtues which, under God's good spirit, have adorned the Christian character, to belief probable evidence—the intellect which has irradiated the pages of Christian authors, to their belief in probable evidence—the unnumbered tomes of modern learning and knowledge which crowd the libraries of Christians, to belief in probable evidence.

With these exceptions, if with all deference to the judgment of our respected author, we may in any wise dissent, the mode of reasoning throughout the volume is such as carries with it an argument which to be appreciated, needs but to be understood; though it will be more readily understood and felt by those who have been brought to the practical belief and acknowledgment of the truth as it is in Jesus. It is the internal argument drawn from the views which the Bible unfolds respecting God, creation, providence, redemption, &c., from the spirit of the Bible, its moral rectitude, its distinguishing doctrines, the nature and tendency of its religion, the unity of its parts, its adaptation to the character and wants of man, and also from the fact that it is attested by Christian experience, and accords with human reason. If we may be allowed to express our preference, we should say, that we have been more especially gratified by the chapter which illustrates the superhuman spirit of the Bible, and that also, which evinces the adaptedness of the Bible to man's character and wants.

The preliminary dissertation is a fine specimen of the author's felicitous manner of arranging and presenting familiar points of knowledge; but if instead of this, or rather in addition to this, he had given us his views on the several questions: How far human reason may judge or is capable of judging of the internal evidence of revealed truth? What are the criteria of its judgments? And what the relative strength and importance of the arguments as drawn from the external and internal evidences? he might have rendered a still greater service to the cause of the Bible

There are those who deny, the power of reason to judge in any safe degree of the truth and worth of a revelation from the character of its doctrines and precepts. Dr. Chalmer at one time maintained the absolute insufficiency of natural reason to pronounce upon the intrinsic merits of a revelation: "It

is not," he says, "from the nature of the facts themselves that we would pronounce upon their credibility, but from the nature of that testimony by which they are supported," thus resting the authority of Christianity exclusively upon "its external evidences and upon such marks of honesty in the historical portions of its sacred books as would apply to any human composition."

Le Clerc regarded the faith of Christians as "depending purely on the testimony of men," while several divines of the Hutchinsonian school placed the foundations of Christianity solely on its miracles and prophecies, maintaining that these external evidences of its truth, rendered an implicit assent to its doctrines imperative to the exclusion of all abstract reasoning as to their probability and fitnesses. Locke, in the spirit of his philosophical system, which led him to ascribe the origin of our ideas to sensation and reflection, may be said, notwithstanding his forcible remarks on the morality and reasonableness of Christianity, to have given more weight to the external, than to the internal evidences. Men of that class have been slow to attach importance to any inferences in favour of the divine origin of the gospel, drawn from the moral consciousness of an individual, or from the hopes and fears, the joys and sorrows, of individual believers. Distinct outward evidence in favour of the claims of Christianity to a divine revelation, has generally been relied on as abundant and triumphant proofs independently of all consideration of the nature of its communications. Hence, the origin, and the wide spread influence of Paley's evidences; and it must be admitted that the want, or even the deficiency of such external proof, would be a positive argument against the truth of such a system as the Christian religion.

On the other hand, many writers on the evidences, from Lactantius to Grotius; or from Arnobius to Pascal, may be said to have attached the greater importance to the character and efficiency of Christianity, as furnishing the most convincing argument for its divine authority. This too, is the ground which has been generally assumed by more recent writers, especially by evangelical preachers of the gospel; while reviewers and essayists in imitation of Addison, and even not a few writers of fiction, have seemingly loved to descant on the simple morality and beneficent spirit and remedial adaptedness of the Christian system.

This is a question then, that obviously cannot be decided by authority, or precedent; and yet though great and good men have differed in their views, may be easily and satisfactorily answered, by simply avoiding the extreme positions which on either hand, have been assumed.

What is worthy the name of religion which does not work a true and firm conviction in the mind—inducing a willing reception and cordial obedience in subservience to the improvement of our nature and faculties? If Christianity were nothing more than the expression of an arbitrary will, or the mere authoritative enunciation of truths and rules by an omnipotent sovereign, it might control, but it could never satisfy a being so constituted and endowed as man. But what is it else? How can it be ever proved to be a matter of deep and vital import, if, besides its external evidence, it does not by its internal excellence, address itself to our reason, conscience and religious feelings? That man, through the force of his earth-born appetites and passions, may be in danger of rejecting a revelation which teaches doctrines abhorrent from his preconceived notions, and at war with his lusts, is evident; his passions too, may at all times and in reference to any spiritual subject becloud his judgment, and prejudice his conclusions; but it does not therefore follow that reason has in itself no possible capacity of judging of the essential truth and excellence of such a system as Christianity unfolds. Other considerations aside; we know from our own consciousness, that the same faculty by which we judge of the force and value of external testimony, enables us also to discover the relations of facts and truths: that it has certain necessary, inherent and immutable conceptions which are always developed in the natural exercise of our mental powers. Hence our natural notions of right and wrong, of merit and demerit, of moral obligation; our consciences bear witness as our thoughts accuse or else excuse one another. Hence, "Natural Religion," so called, comprising as it it does certain sublime truths relating to the being, attributes and moral laws of God, which the mind has attained through the workings of its own irrepressible thoughts, or which have been developed in the process of experience and observation on the course of things. Admit that the world by wisdom knew not God; that a revelation of his mind and will was absolutely essential to the true knowledge of himself

in the world, still it is animating to reflect, as well as important to maintain, that so far as this revelation bears on our essential interests, He has given us faculties which despite the blinding force of selfish passions and worldly allurements enable us, to understand its structure, to perceive its excellence, to respond to the propriety of its moral rules, to feel our need of its provisions of mercy and grace, as well as to sit in judgment on the whole range of its outward and documentary evidence.

If the Bible be not of man; is it *for* man? If it can be proved that it is not of man; why may it not admit of equally conclusive evidence, that it is for man? It is certainly of equal importance; and if we are capable of judging that it is not of man, we may, to say the least, as conclusively judge whether it is for man. If in the one case, the evidence is convincive, in the other it should be satisfying—completely so, to the exclusion of all conscious doubts, or misgivings; it must be so, if the Bible is *for* man. Besides this faculty of reason, with which man has been endowed, he has warm sympathies and social affections, and a susceptibility to all the emotions of love and gratitude, of veneration and devotion; there is, too, something within him which sometimes enables him to outstrip the slow and hesitating conclusions of the understanding; hence, a religion for man must be felt as well as understood; it must come with its evidences to his heart as well as to his head.

Yet Christianity must have some other foundation than feeling, or even the conclusions of the human mind respecting its internal construction and adaptedness. Without external attestation, it might be readily pre-judged and condemned; for reason as we may respecting its internal features, it must be admitted that some of its teachings are not of a nature to be speculatively allowed by men who have not yet been brought to see their sins, or feel their need of pardon. It is now the great effort of many who cannot disprove its evidences, to pervert or modify its teachings.

The conclusion therefore to which we may come, is this: that neither kind of evidence by itself is sufficient, if we would frame our argument at once complete, satisfactory and irrefragable. The difference between the external and the internal evidence, is that which may be expressed by the difference between the defence and the inculcation of truth—between the

preparation of the mind for truth, and the receiving of it—between knowledge and experience, perception and feelings.

The external is important just in proportion as one values the divine authority of his creed, the internal as one realises his need of a divine teacher. The former bears testimony to the whole truth; the latter respects only those points which being in congruity with man's moral nature, affect the heart and meliorate the character; the former, though it may not exclude doubt, silences objections; the latter, though it cannot obviate diversities of opinion or exclude error, furnishes relief to the toiling mind and rest to the aching breast. The internal, may strike the mind at once—flashing the conviction that "these are the true sayings of God;" but the external evidence always requires a process of thought and study: it cannot be compassed without that candid and laborious attention which is necessary to a just estimate of any complicated chain of proofs, while it requires accurate definitions, logical statements, and the solution of difficulties; but the internal, being simple and direct, is often felt before it is comprehended, because it appeals to the first principles and moral instincts of our nature. The one kind of evidence can induce no more than a speculative faith, though it may predispose to the heartfelt reception of the truth; the other, if its perception does not imply the existence of faith in the heart, is always connected with an experience of its power. As in investigating the external evidences, we go back in imagination to the period of Christ and his apostles; so in contemplating the internal, we as it were, shut ourselves up with God and conscience, and think of death and eternity—seriously asking ourselves, 'Whence we are? and whither going?' Hence, though the external may silence the sceptic, it is only the internal proofs that can satisfy the man who has waked up to the great problem of his being. In view of the external evidences, we may authoritatively call on all to believe; but from the drift of the internal proofs, we may say, that whatever may be one's faith in the historical verity of Christianity, all is in vain, as far as the end of this heaven-sent volume is concerned, without that faith which works by love, and purifies the heart, and overcomes the world.

Thus it is, that while learning is necessary to master the one kind of evidence, nothing more is needed to the comprehension

of the other, than an honest humble heart; that while but few comparatively may be able to go over the whole ground of its outward proofs, there is no one who need be without evidence equally satisfactory, though less palpable; equally profound in its sources, though less fortified by acute distinctions and logical inferences. The sceptic may always demand the former; the believer will seldom look beyond the latter kind of evidence—his subjective faith implying an objective reality.

The more the evidences of the Bible are scrutinized, the more clearly will it be perceived, that the same harmony which characterises the works of God, appertains also to his word.

Thus we may go back to the sublime announcement of the book of Genesis—to the original promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent—to the sacrifices of divine appointment all typical of the Lamb of God —to the various prophecies which announced the coming and delineated the characteristics of the Messiah; and then by all the aids of literature and criticism examine the history which records the life and death and resurrection of Jesus; and though in the course of our investigation, we meet with thirty various authors, living at various periods of the world, belonging to different classes of society, from kings and legislators to fishermen and tent-makers; representing also, different orders of mind, uttering themselves in history, in poetry, in biography, in hortatory epistles—now in accents of devotion, and again in tones of fearful prediction; yet in all their productions on the great subject of revealed truth, there is neither confusion, nor disagreement. But wonderful as is this harmony which runs through all the various parts of which this book is composed, it were of little account, did not all the communications of this book harmonize with man's spiritual relations; were there not to be discovered in man's breast, something which tells us that this wonderful revelation of God's mind and will was imperatively needed, and that this book supplies the mighty void, at once meeting all the wants and woes of our moral nature, and promoting the ends of God's moral government. And thus it is that every man may discover in himself the surest evidences of the Bible in his mental and moral capacities, so strangely contrasted with his evil desires and earth-born pleasures; in his breathings after immortality, with those

vices which so often merge his lofty spirit in the lusts of the flesh; in his occasional though dim conceptions of all that is great and good, true, beautiful, infinite and eternal; in his habitual and humiliating experience of all that is low and grovelling; his own ignorance and folly, guilt and misery; aye, his need of mercy, as a sinner against God!

It is, however, but seldom the mind takes in the whole array of the Christian evidences; nor is it necessary to the conviction of revealed truth, as it is not necessary to count all the indications of design in the universe of matter, before we can legitimately refer the world to one common designing mind, or arrive at the being of a God. Much less is it necessary to a full and constant belief, that we should retain all these evidences within the range of mental vision; they are of such a nature that when conviction is once wrought in the mind, it remains long after its power of reasoning, or even its memory of general facts, has been impaired by physical causes. Nor indeed is it indispensable to a well-grounded and operative faith, that we should have taken all the points of evidence into view, or even be acquainted with all; and the reason is found in the fact, that the arguments in favour of the Bible are at once numerous and various—adapted to all classes of mind—all conditions of society, so that what may fail to convince one, may satisfy another; and the reverse. With one, it may be the fact, that the Sacred Writers had no motive to deceive; with another, the tenor of their writings. With one, the miracles which Christ wrought, or more especially his own resurrection; with another, Paul's conversion, or perhaps the character of Christ will, by itself, serve to convince. It would be a matter of curious though not unprofitable interest, for any twelve reflective persons to trace the origin of their faith in the Bible; and it is not improbable that in every individual instance some one point has seemed sufficient by itself; perhaps the singular exactness of the Mosaic economy, or the difficulties which attend the supposition that Moses was either an imposter or an enthusiast; perhaps the countless links of connexion between the Old and New Testaments, or even the undesigned coincidences between the Pauline Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles; perhaps, the fulfilment of a prophecy, the devotional language of a Psalm; it may have been some particular doctrine, or by simply pondering some saying that

fell from the lips of Him who spake as never man spake: the force with which any particular view may strike the mind, all depending on one's mental training, or prevailing disposition. Hence, to a great degree, the unequal value which is attached to different works on the evidences of Christianity; each reader being predisposed to judge of any work on the subject, according as it may coincide with his peculiar habits of reasoning; or answer objections by which his secret thoughts are most embarrassed.

Even when all the various evidences have been duly pondered, it is difficult to decide which now among such a multiplicity of points, impress the mind with the greatest force: or imparts the most effective relief in our occasional moments of doubt; yet amid all our doubts, there is always some position on which, if we may be allowed the expression, the soul falls back; and from that, as from a first principle intuitively perceived, argues rapidly to a favorable conclusion. This arises from two causes: first, from the fact that it is a subject where every man must, in a good degree, furnish for himself the materials for his own judgment—his judgment being always affected by moral causes; and secondly, from the fact, that the argument in favour of Christianity is *cumulative*—thus affording advantages to minds of unequal degrees of strength and cultivation; and at the same time defying the consequences of defeat from infidelity on any one point. In this respect, it admits of no parallel with any false system, while challenging to itself all the marks of a Heaven-born religion.

He who framed the Bible knew best how to arrange its evidences, so that each might satisfy his own mind in believing, while none could ever feel at ease in rejecting. It is never wise, therefore, to place one kind of evidence in opposition to the other; much less to adopt either of the extremes which have been taken by different writers on the evidences. It is to violate that harmony which characterizes the word as well as the works of God—to disregard the appeal which Christianity itself makes in support of her claims, at once to the miraculous nature of her works, and the spiritual power of her words. Unlike that shield of Numa which though it was said to be derived from heaven, was undistinguishable from those fabricated on earth, Christianity appears before us in her own strongly marked and

distinctive features, standing on the broad pedestal of facts. With uplifted eyes, she intimates the consciousness of her heavenly origin; and while with one hand she points to works which no man can do; and with the other marks out with the accuracy of prescience the shadows of coming events, we hear a voice breaking from the overshadowing glory, and declaring that if any man will do her will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God.

Hence, while Christianity has no cause to shrink from the scrutiny of those who have disciplined their minds to inductive reasonings or metaphysical inquiries, it is within the scope of the feeblest or most uncultivated powers, to imbibe its spirit, and abound in its fruits, and rejoice in its promises; while its documentary proofs may triumph over scepticism, a full and firm conviction of its truth can flow only from experience. "Evidences of Christianity," said Coleridge, "I am weary of the word. Make a man feel his want of it; rouse him, if you can, to the self-knowledge of his need of it, and you may safely trust it to its own evidence." The true doctrine on this subject, as we believe, is fully stated in the following beautiful and comprehensive paragraph in the Westminster Confession:

"We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church, to an high and reverend esteem for the Holy Scriptures; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole, (which is to give glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word, in our hearts."

The argument drawn from Christian experience is in perfect keeping with the whole drift of revelation; and this also, Dr. Spring has expanded and illustrated in his usual interesting and impressive manner of treating any practical topic. For ourselves, we thank him for his embodied experience; his work will tend to confirm the faith and animate the hope, and comfort the heart of many a believer.

ART. IV.—*The Mystical Presence. A Vindication of the Reformed or Calvinistic Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.* By the Rev. John W. Nevin, D.D., Prof. of Theo. in the Seminary of the Ger. Ref. Church. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1846. pp. 256. C. Hodge

WE have had Dr. Nevin's work on the "Mystical Presence" on our table since its publication, some two years ago, but have never really read it, until within a fortnight. We do not suppose other people are quite as bad, in this respect, as ourselves. Our experience, however, has been that it requires the stimulus of a special necessity to carry us through such a book. Being called upon to investigate the question, What was the real doctrine of the Reformed church on the Lord's Supper? we naturally turned to Dr. Nevin's work, and we gratefully acknowledge the assistance derived from it. We differ from him indeed, essentially, as to the whole subject, not only as to the historical question, but as to what is the true doctrine. We are, however, on that account only the more disposed to give him credit for the diligence with which he has collected materials (though almost entirely on one side) for the proper decision of the question. So much has of late been said by Dr. Nevin of the apostacy of the Reformed church; his uniform tone is so disparaging, if not contemptuous, when speaking of all the branches of that church, except his own; the charge of Puritanism and Rationalism is so constantly flowing from his pen, that he has reason, we think, to be surprised that all this has been so long endured in silence. We, however, do not purpose on this occasion to travel out of the record, or do more than endeavour to answer the question, What is the true doctrine of the Reformed church on the Lord's Supper? Having done this, however, we shall give our reasons for thinking that Dr. Nevin is tenfold further from the doctrines of our common fathers, than those whom he commisserates and condemns.

It is confessedly a very difficult matter to obtain clear views of what was the real doctrine of the Reformed church on the Lord's Supper, during the sixteenth century. This difficulty arises from various sources. The subject itself is mysterious. The Lord's Supper is by all Christians regarded as exhibiting.

and, in the case of believers, confirming their union with the Lord Jesus Christ. Whatever obscurity rests on that union, must in a measure rest on this sacrament. That union, however, is declared to be a great mystery. It has always, on that account, been called the mystical union. We are, therefore, demanding too much when we require all obscurity to be banished from this subject. If the union between Christ and his people were merely moral, arising from agreement and sympathy, there would be no mystery about it; and the Lord's Supper, as the symbol of that union, would be a perfectly intelligible ordinance. But the scriptures teach that our union with Christ is far more than this. It is a vital union, we are partakers of his life, for it is not we that live, but Christ that liveth in us. It is said to be analogous to our union with Adam, to the union between the head and members of the same body, and between the vine and its branches. There are some points in reference to this subject, with regard to which almost all Christians are agreed. They agree that this union includes a federal or representative relation, arising from a divine constitution; and on the part of Christ, a participation of our nature. He that sanctified and they who are sanctified are all of one. On this account he calls them brethren. Inasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. (Heb. ii. 11–14). It is in virtue of his assumption of our nature that he stands to us in the intimate relation here spoken of. It is agreed, further, that this union include on our part a participation of the Spirit of Christ. It is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ, and dwells without measure in him as our head, who dwells also in his people, so that they become one body in Christ Jesus. They are one in relation to each other, and one in relation to him. As the human body is one by being animated and pervaded by one soul, so Christ and his people are one in virtue of the indwelling of one and the same Spirit, the Holy Ghost. It is further agreed that this union relates to the bodies as well as the souls of believers. Know you not, says the apostle, that your bodies are the members of Christ; know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, who dwelleth in you? The Westminster Catechism, therefore, says of believers after death, that their bodies being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves until the re-

surrection. This union was always represented as a real union, not merely imaginary nor simply moral, nor arising from the mere reception of the benefits which Christ has procured. We receive Christ himself, and are in Christ, united to him by the indwelling of his Spirit and by a living faith. So far all the Reformed at least agreed.

Do the scriptures teach, besides all this, that we are partakers of the human nature, of the real flesh and blood of Christ? This question Romanists and Lutherans answer in the affirmative. They teach the actual reception and manducation of the real body of Christ. This the whole Reformed church denied, in England, Belgium, and Germany, as well as in Switzerland. But as Christ speaks of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, and we are said to have communion in them, the question is in what way this is to be understood? All the Reformed answered, that by receiving the body and blood of Christ, is meant receiving their virtue or efficacy. Some of them said it was their virtue as broken and shed, i. e., their sacrificial virtue; others said, it was a mysterious, supernatural efficacy flowing from the glorified body of Christ in heaven; and that this last idea, therefore, is to be taken into the account, in determining the nature of the union between Christ and his people. Apart, therefore, from the mysteriousness of the subject, the diversity of views among the Reformed themselves, is one reason of the difficulty in determining the real doctrine of the church, on this subject. In some of the confessions we have the one, and in some the other of these modes of representation, brought to view.

Another source of difficulty is found in the fact, that almost all the Reformed confessions were framed for the express purpose of compromise. One great object of Calvin's life, was to prevent the schism between the two branches of the Protestant church. He and the other authors of these symbols, therefore, were constantly endeavouring to frame a statement of this doctrine, which all parties, Lutheran, Zuinglian, and Calvinistic, could adopt. Union was at that time a matter of the last importance, not only on religious and ecclesiastical grounds, but for reasons connected with their political well-being and safety. The question about the Lord's supper, was the only one which kept the parties separate. Here Luther was inflexible and

most unreasonably violent. The Lutherans were at this time far more numerous and powerful than the Reformed. To conciliate Luther was, therefore, a constant object of desire and effort. Conference after conference was held for this purpose. The Reformed on all these occasions, and in all their confessions, went as far as possible to meet the views of the Lutherans. It is not wonderful therefore that their language, should at times, be hard to reconcile with what was in fact the real doctrine of the Reformed church. We find Bucer signing a formula which satisfied Luther, and Beza signing another, which satisfied the Romish commissioners, at Poissy. It is fair to infer from these historical circumstances, that while the Reformed held a doctrine which admitted of expression in the language adopted, it might be much more simply and intelligibly expressed in other terms. And we find in fact, that as soon as this pressure from without was removed, all ambiguity as to the Reformed doctrine as to the Lord's supper ceased. No one pretends to misunderstand the language of Turretin and Pictet, the contemporaries or immediate successors of Beza. This suggests a third source of difficulty on this subject, the ambiguity of the terms employed in these confessions. The words, presence, real, true, flesh and blood, substance, &c., are all employed, in many cases, out of their ordinary sense. We are said to receive the true body and blood, but nothing material; the substance, but not the essence; the natural body, but only by faith. It is not easy to unravel these conflicting statements and to determine what they really mean. Besides all this it is hard to tell where to look for the authoritative exhibition of the Reformed doctrine. Shall we look to the private writings of the Reformers, or to the public confessions? If to the latter, shall we rely on those of Switzerland or on those of the Palatinate, France or Belgium? These, though they have a general coincidence, do not entirely agree. Some favour one interpretation, and some another. Dr. Nevin chooses to make Calvin the great authority, and pronounces the confessions of the Swiss churches "chaotic and contradictory." The most satisfactory method of proceeding, as we conceive, will be to quote in the first instance, those authorities which represent the Swiss views; secondly, those which present the views of Calvin; and thirdly, those symbols in which both parties concurred. Having done this, we propose to analyse

these statements, and endeavour to determine their meaning.

First then, the Zuinglian view.

*Zuingle says: "The Lord's supper is nothing else than the food of the soul, and Christ instituted the ordinance as a memorial of himself. When a man commits himself to the sufferings and redemption of Christ, he is saved. Of this he has left us a certain visible sign of his flesh and blood, both which he has commanded us to eat and drink in remembrance of him." This is said in a document, presented to the council of Zurich, in 1523. In his LXVII Articles published in 1523, he says, briefly on this subject, in art. 17, "Christ who offered himself once upon the cross is the eternally sufficient offering and sacrifice for the sins of all believers. Whence it follows that the mass is not a sacrifice, but the commemoration of the sacrifice made upon the cross, and, as it were, a seal of the redemption effected by Christ." In the "Expositio Chr. Fidei," written just before his death and published by Bullinger, 1531, he says: "The natural substantial body of Christ in which he suffered, and in which he is now seated in heaven, at the right hand of God, is not in the Lord's supper eaten, corporeally, or as to its essence, but spiritually only. . . . Spiritually to eat the body of Christ, is nothing else than with the spirit and mind to rely on the goodness and mercy of God through Christ. . . . . Sacramentally to eat his body, is, the sacrament being added, with the mind and spirit to feed upon him."† And afterwards, "We assert therefore that the body of Christ is not eaten in the supper in a gross carnal manner as the Papists pretend, but spiritually and sacramentally, with a devout, believing and holy mind, as St. Chrysostom says." In his Epist. ad princip. German. (Op. II. p. 546,) he uses this language: "When the bread and wine, consecrated by the very words of Christ are distributed to the brethren, is not the whole Christ, as it were sensibly (if words are required, I will say more that I am wont to do) presented to the senses? But how? Is the natural body handled and eaten? By no means; but offered to the mind to

* We use the name of Zuingle to characterize the form of doctrine which he actually taught, and which was adopted in the church of Zurich of which he was the pastor; not in the sense in which the term Zuinglian is popularly used, to designate what was really the Socinian or Remonstrant doctrine on the Sacraments.

† Niemeyer Col. Conf. p. 44, 47.

be contemplated, for the senses we have the sacrament of this thing. . . . We never have denied that Christ is sacramentally and *in mysterio* present in the Lord's supper, as well on account of believing contemplation, as the whole symbolical service."

The confessions which most nearly conform to this view are the Confessio Tetrapolitana, The First Basel, and The First Helvetic Confession. All these are apologetic. The last named protests against the representation that the Reformed regard the sacraments as mere badges of profession, asserting that they are also signs and means of grace. In art. 22, the Lord's supper is called *cœna mystica*, "in which Christus truly offers his body and blood, and hence himself, to his people; not as though the body and blood of Christi were naturally united with the bread and wine, or locally included in them, or sensibly there present, but in so far as the bread and wine are symbols, through which we have communion in his body and blood, not to the nourishment of the body, but of the spiritual or eternal life."

The most concise and perspicuous statement of this form of the doctrine is to be found in "The Sincere Confession of the ministers of the church of Zurich," dated 1545. Those ministers say: "We teach that the great design and end of the Lord's supper, that to which the whole service is directed, is the remembrance of the body of Christ devoted, and of his blood shed for the remission of our sins. This remembrance however cannot take place without true faith. And although the things, of which the service is a memorial, are not visible or present after a corporal manner, nevertheless believing apprehension and the assurance of faith renders them present in one sense, to the soul of the believer. He has truly eaten the bread of Christ . . . who believes on Christ, very God and very man, crucified for us, on whom to believe is to eat, and to eat, to believe. . . . Believers have in the Lord's supper no other lifegiving food than that which they receive elsewhere than in that ordinance. The believer therefore receives both, in and out of, the Lord's supper in one and the same way; and by the same means of faith, one and the same food, Christ, except that in the supper the reception is connected with the actions and signs appointed by Christ, and accompanied with a testifying, thanksgiving and binding service. . . . Christ's flesh has done its work on earth hav-

ing been offered for our salvation; now it no longer benefits on earth and is no longer here."* This is a remarkably clear and precise statement, and should be remembered; for we shall find Calvin and others whose language is often so different, avowing their concurrence with these ministers of Zurich, or at least uniting with them in the statement of this doctrine.

Views of Calvin and of the Confessions formed under his influence.

Inst. iv. 17, 10. "We conclude that our souls are fed by the flesh and blood of Christ, just as our corporal life is preserved by bread and wine. For the analogy of the signs would not hold, if our souls did not find their aliment in Christ, which, however, cannot be the case, unless Christ truly coalesce into one with us, and support us through the use of his flesh and blood. It may seem incredible indeed that the flesh of Christ should reach us from such an immense local distance, so as to become our food. But we must remember how far the secret power of the Holy Spirit, transcends all our senses, and what folly it must be even to think of reducing his immensity to our measure. Let faith embrace then what the understanding cannot grasp, namely, that the Spirit unites things which are totally separated. Now this sacred communication of his flesh and blood, by which Christ transfuses his life into us, just as if he penetrated our bones and marrow, he testifies and seals in the holy supper; not by the exhibition of a vain and empty sign, but by putting forth such an energy of his Spirit as fulfils what he promises. What is thus attested he offers to all who approach the spiritual banquet. It is however fruitfully received by believers only, who accept such vast grace with inward gratitude and trust."

In 1561 Calvin wrote, in answer to the Lutheran Hesshuss, and with a view to unite the two parties, his Tract de vera participatione carnis et sanguinis Christi in sacra coena. In an appendix to that Tract, he says: "The same body then which the Son of God once offered in sacrifice to the Father, he daily offers to us in the supper, that it may be our spiritual aliment. Only that must be held which was intimated as to the mode, that it is not necessary that the essence of the flesh should

* Gueriche: Symbolik. s. 452.

descend from heaven, in order that we may feed upon it; but that the power of the Spirit is sufficient to penetrate through all impediments and to surmount all local distance. At the same time we do not deny that the mode here is incomprehensible to human thought; for flesh naturally could neither be the life of the soul, nor exert its power upon us from heaven; and not without reason is the communication, which makes us flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, denominated by Paul a great mystery. In the sacred supper we acknowledge it a miracle, transcending both nature and our own understanding, that Christ's life is made common to us with himself, and his flesh given us as aliment."

Again, "these things being disposed of, a doubt still appears with respect to the word *substance;* which is readily allayed, if we put away the gross imagination of a manducation of the flesh, as though it were like corporal food, that being put into the mouth, is received into the stomach. For if this absurdity be removed, there is no reason why we should deny that we are fed with Christ's flesh substantially, since we truly coalesce with him into one body by faith, and are thus made one with him. Whence it follows we are joined with him in substantial connexion, just as substantial vigour flows down from the head into the members. The definition must then stand that we are made to partake of Christ's flesh substantially; not in the way of carnal mixture, or as if the flesh of Christ drawn down from heaven entered into us, or were swallowed by the mouth; but because the flesh of Christ, as to its power and efficacy, vivifies our souls, not otherwise than the body is nourished by the substance of bread wine."

We prefer giving these extreme passages as selected by Dr. Nevin, instead of others of a different character, which could easily be gathered from Calvin's works. Those of the latter class, will turn up in their appropriate places. We proceed to quote some of the confessions, which most manifestly bear the impress of Calvin's hand or spirit.

The Gallican Confession was adopted by the Protestants of France, in 1559. In the 36th art. it is said: Quamvis (Christus) nunc sit in coelis, ibidem etiam remansurus donec veniat mundum judicaturus, credimus tamen, eum arcana et incomprehensibili Spiritus sui virtute nos nutire et vivificare sui corporis

et sanguinis substantia per fidem apprehensa.* Dicimur autem hoc spiritualiter fieri, non ut efficaciæ et veritatis loco imaginationem aut cogitationem supponamus, sed potius, quoniam hoc mysterium nostræ cum Christo coalitionis tam sublime est, ut omnes nostros sensus totumque naturae ordinem superet, denique quoniam sit divinum ac coeleste, non nisi fide percipi at apprehendi potest.

Art. 37. Credimus, sicut antea dictum est, tam in coena quam in baptismo, Deum nobis reipsa, id est vere et efficaciter donare quicquid ibi sacramentaliter figurat, ac proinde cum signis conjungimus veram possessionem ac fruitionem ejus rei, quae ita nobis offertur. Itaque affirmamus eos qui ad sacram mensam Domini puram fidem tanquam vas quoddam afferunt, vere recipere quod ibi signa testificantur, mempe corpus et sanguinem Jesu Christi, non minus esse cibum ac potum animæ, quam panis et vinum sunt corporis cibus.

This is perhaps the proper place to state, though not in chronological order, that at a meeting of the National Synod of France, in 1571, Beza being president, an application was made by certain deputies to have the clause in Art. 37 altered, which asserts that we are nourished with the "substance of Christ's body and blood." The synod refused to make the alteration, and explained the expression by saying, they did not understand by it, "any confusion, commixture, or conjunction . . . but this only, that by his virtue, all that is in him that is needful for our salvation, is hereby most freely given and communicated to us. Nor do we consent with them who say we do communicate in his merits and gifts and spirit, without his being at all made ours; but with the apostle (Eph. v. 23), admiring this supernatural, and to our reason incomprehensible mystery, we do believe we are partakers of his body delivered to death for us, and of his blood shed for us, so that we are flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, and that we receive him together with his gifts, by faith wrought in us by the incomprehensible virtue and efficacy of the Holy Spirit."† This decision was considered by the ministers of Zurich as involving a condemnation of their doctrine, and

* Why Dr. Nevin, in his translation of this passage, should refer *apprehensa* to *virtute*, instead of *substantia*, we cannot tell.

† Quick's Synodicon, I. p. 92.

they complained of it accordingly. The following year, 1572, therefore the Synod decided, that though they chose to retain the word *substance* in the sense explained, they did so "without prejudicing those foreign churches, which for reasons best known to themselves do not use the word substance." And instead of saying as they had done the year before, "that we must truly participate in the second Adam, *that we may derive life from him*;" they substitute for the last clause the words: "that by mystical and spiritual communication with him, we may derive that true eternal life." "And the Lord's Supper," they add, "is principally instituted for the communication of it; though the same Lord Jesus be offered to us both in his substance and gifts, in the ministry of the word and baptism, and received by faith."*

In the articles adopted by the Synod of London, in 1552, and sanctioned by the authority of Edward VI., the article on the Lord's Supper, gives in the first clause the scriptural language, "To those who receive it worthily and with faith, the bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ," &c. The second clause rejects transubstantiation. The third denies the Lutheran doctrine, and asserts that as Christ is heaven, non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus et sanguinis realem et corporalem (ut loquantur) præsentiam in eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri.

In the Thirty-nine Articles of the church of England, adopted in 1562, the article on the Lord's Supper corresponds in purport exactly in the first three clauses, with the article of Edward VI. Then follows these words: Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in coena, tantum coeleste et spirituali ratione. Medium autem quo corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in coena fides est. It is a remarkable fact that the Anglican confessions have decidedly a more Zuinglian tone than those of any other of the Reformed churches. This may in part be accounted for by the consideration that they were not irenical, drawn up to conciliate Lutherans.

In the Scotch Con. of 1560, the language of Calvin is in a great measure retained. The only sentence that need be quoted is the following: "We confess that believers in the right use of the Lord's supper thus eat the body and drink the blood of Jesus

* Quick's Synodicon, I. p. 104.

Christ, and we firmly believe that he dwells in them, and they in him, nay, that they thus become flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones. For as the eternal deity gives life and immortality to the flesh of Christ, so also his flesh and blood, when eaten and drunk by us, confer on us the same prerogatives."

In the Belgic Conf. adopted in 1563, the following words occur, Art. 35. Christus testificatur, nos, quam vere hoc sacramentum manibus nostris accipimus et tenemus, illudque ore comedimus et bibimus, (unde et postmodum vita nostra sustentatur) tam vere etiam nos fide (quae animae et manus et os est) in animis nostris recipere verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi, unici servatoris nostri ad vitam nostram spiritualem. Nequaquam erraverimus dicentes, id quod comeditur esse proprium et naturale corpus Christi, idque quod bibitur proprium esse sanguinem. At manducandi modus talis est, ut non fiat ore corporis, sed spiritu per fidem. It is not necessary to quote from other Confessions language of the same import with that already quoted. All the symbols above cited contain more or less distinctly the impress of Calvin's views, if we except perhaps those of the church of England, which as before remarked, are more of a Zuinglian cast. We come now to

Those symbols in which both Zuinglians and Calvinists agreed.

Perhaps the most interesting and important document of this class is the Consensus Tigurinus. Switzerland had long been greatly distracted by the controversy on the sacraments. After much persuasion on the part of his friends, Calvin was induced to go to Zurich and hold a conference with Bullinger in 1549. The result of that conference was the adoption of the articles previously drawn up by Calvin himself, and afterwards published with the title: "Consentio mutua in re sacramentaria Ministrorum Tigurinae Ecclesiae, et D. Joannis Calvini Ministri Genevensis Ecclesiae, jam nunc ab ipsis authoribus edita." We have, therefore, in this document the well considered and solemnly announced agreement of the Zuinglian and Calvinistic portions of the Reformed church. This Consensus was soon made the object of vehement attack by the Lutherans. Four years after its date, Calvin felt himself called upon to publish an explanation and defence of it. In his letter, prefixed to that defence, and addressed to the ministers of Zurich and other Swiss

churches, he says: The Lutherans now see that those whom they denounce as Sacramentarians agree, and then adds, Nec vero si superstites bodie essent optimi et eximii Christi servi Zuinglius et Oecolampadius, verbulum in ea sententia mutarent.*

This Consensus embraces twenty-six articles, all relating to the sacraments, and especially to the Lord's supper. In these articles there is not a word, which any of the evangelical churches of the present day would desire to alter. We should like to print them all as the confession of our own faith on this whole subject. The first four are introductory. The fifth declares the necessity of our union with Christ, in order that we should partake of his life. The sixth declares that union to be spiritual, arising from the indwelling of the Spirit. The seventh sets forth the design of the sacraments. They are declared to be badges of profession and Christian communion, excitements to thanksgiving and to the exercise of faith, and to a holy life, and *syngraphae* binding us thereto. Their principal end, however, is said to be that God therein may testify his grace to us, represent and seal it. For though they signify nothing not announced in the word, still it is a great thing, that they present, as it were, living images before our eyes, and which affect our senses and serve to lead us to the thing signified, while they recall to mind the death of Christ and all his benefits, that our faith may be called into exercise; and besides this, what God had by his mouth declared, is here confirmed and sealed. The eighth declares that God inwardly works or communicates by his Spirit, the blessings signified by the sacraments. They are therefore, as stated in the ninth article, not naked signs, but as it is there expressed, "Though we distinguish, as is proper, between the sign and things signified, we do not disjoin the truth (or reality) from the signs; since all who by faith embrace the promises there presented, receive Christ with his spiritual gifts." In the tenth article, it is, therefore said, we should look at the promise rather than the signs. The signs without Christ, are declared in the eleventh article,

* Compare with this the language of Dr. Nevin, who endeavours to represent the doctrine of Calvin and Zuingle on this subject to be as wide apart as the poles. He even says: "If Calvinism, the system of Geneva, *necessarily* runs here into Zuinglianism, we may, indeed, well despair of the whole interest. For most assuredly no church can stand, that is found to be constitutionally *unsacramental*." p. 74.

to be *inanes larvae.* The articles from the twelfth to the seventeenth, both included, relate to the efficacy of the sacraments. It is denied that they have any virtue in themselves, all their efficacy is referred to the attending power of God, which is exercised only in the elect, and therefore, it is added, the doctrine that the sacraments confer grace on all who do not oppose the obstacle of mortal sin, falls to the ground. In the eighteenth it is stated that the reason why the sacraments fail to benefit unbelievers is to be referred to their want of faith, and neither to the sacraments which always retain their integrity, nor to God. The nineteenth teaches that the blessings received in the sacraments, are by believers received on other occasions. And moreover, as is said in the twentieth, the benefit received from the sacraments, is not to be restricted to the time of administration, but may follow long afterwards. Those baptized in infancy are often regenerated in youth or even old age. In the twenty-first art. all local presence of Christ in the Eucharist is denied. As a man he is in heaven, and is present only to the mind and faith. The twenty-second states that the words of institution, 'This is my body,' must be understood figuratively. In the twenty-third, it is taught that manducation of Christ's body implies no mixture or transfusion of substance, but the derivation of life from his body and blood as a sacrifice. The last three articles are directed against transubstantiation, the Lutheran doctrine of the local presence, and the adoration of the host.

The force of this document as an exhibition of the true doctrine of the Reformed church on this whole subject is greatly impaired in this meagre outline. We shall, however, have occasion to refer to its more explicit statements, in the progress of this investigation. The next witness to be cited is the *Heidleberg Catechism.* It was prepared at the command of Frederick III. elector of the Palatinate, by Caspar Olevian, a disciple of Calvin, and Ursinus, a friend of Melancthon, and adopted by a general synod held at Heidleberg in 1563. This catechism having symbolical authority, both in the German and Dutch Reformed churches, is entitled to peculiar respect as a witness to the faith of the Reformed church.

In answer to the 66th question the sacraments are declared to be "Sacred visible signs and seals, instituted by God, that through them he may more clearly present and seal the promise of the

gospel, viz. that he, for the sake of the one offering of Christ accomplished on the cross, grants to us the forgiveness of sin and eternal life."*

In answer to the following question, it is stated, that the design both of the word and sacraments is to direct our faith to the sacrifice of Christ on the cross as the only ground of our faith.

Question 75. "How art thou reminded and assured, in the holy supper, that thou art a partaker of the one offering of Christ on the cross, and of all his benefits? Ans. Thus, that Christ has commanded me to eat of this broken bread, and to drink of this cup and has promised first, that as surely as I see with my eyes the bread of the Lord broken for me, and the cup handed to me, so surely was his body broken and offered for me on the cross, and his blood shed for me. Second, that he himself as certainly feeds and nourishes my soul to eternal life with his crucified body, and shed blood, as I receive from the hand of the minister, and after a corporal manner partake of the bread and wine, which are given as the symbols of the body and blood of Christ."

Ques. 76. "*What is it then to eat the crucified body and drink the shed blood of Christ?*

"Ans. It is not only to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain the pardon of sin and eternal life; but also, besides that, to become more and more united to his sacred body, by the Holy Ghost who dwells both in Christ and in us; so that we, though Christ is in heaven and we on earth, are notwithstanding, flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones; and that we live and are governed forever by one Spirit, as the members of the same body are by one soul."

In the answer to the 78th, it is said that as in baptism the water is not changed into the blood of Christ, nor is itself the ablution of sin, but the symbol and pledge of those things, so in the Lord's supper the bread is not the body of Christ, though from the nature of a sacrament and usage of scripture, it is so called.

* There is some slight variation as to phraseology, between the German and Latin copies of this catechism. We unfortunately have not the authorized English version at hand, and therefore are obliged to translate, except where Dr. Nevin has given the English version, from the originals.

In answer to Ques. 79th, it is said the bread is called Christ's body, &c., "Not only thereby to teach us that as bread and wine support this temporal life, so his crucified body and shed blood are the true meat and drink whereby our souls are fed unto eternal life; but more especially, by these visible signs and pledges, to assure us, that we are as really partakers of his true body and blood (by the operation of the Holy Ghost), as we receive by the mouths of our bodies these holy signs in remembrance of him; and that all his sufferings and obedience are as certainly ours as if we had in our own persons suffered and made satisfaction for our sins to God."

In the following question, What is the difference between the Lord's supper, and the Popish mass? the first clause of the answer is: "The supper of the Lord testifies to us that we have perfect remission of all our sins, on account of the one sacrifice of Christ which he himself made once for all upon the cross; and also that we, by the Holy Spirit, are united to Christ, who according to his human nature is only in heaven at the right hand of the Father, and is there to be adored by us."

There is nothing in this account of the Lord's supper to which exception would even now be taken. There is something in the answer to the 75th question, which seems evidently intended to cover Calvin's peculiar opinion of a miraculous influence from the body of Christ in heaven, but it is also as evidently intended to cover Bullinger's view on that subject. It is language to which Zuingle and Œcolampadius, as Calvin says on another occasion, would not object. This is the more remarkable when we consider the historical circumstances under which this catechism was drawn up, and its decidedly irenical object. No part of Germany was more distracted by the sacramentarian controversy than the Pilatinate. Nowhere was greater exertion made to conciliate the Lutherans by framing expressions which they could adopt. Yet this catechism, framed under these circumstances, teaches nothing to which the ministers of Zurich would be unwilling to subscribe.

The only other public symbol which it is necessary to cite, is the Second Helvetic Confession. This on some accounts is the most authoritative of all the confessions of the Reformed church. It was drawn up by Bullinger in 1562. In 1565, the Elector Frederick, above mentioned, alarmed by the furious contentions

in his dominions, and annoyed by the misrepresentations of the Lutherans, wrote to Bullinger to send him a confession which would if possible unite the parties, or at least silence the clamours of the Lutherans, and which the Elector might present at the approaching diet of the empire to refute the calumnies directed against the Reformed. Bullinger sent this confession which he had prepared some years before. The Elector was perfectly well satisfied. To give it weight it was then sanctioned by the Helvetic churches, and soon became one of the most generally recognised standards of the Reformed in all parts of Europe. What it teaches on the Lord's supper is entitled to be regarded as a fair exhibition of the real doctrine of the church. The fact that it was written by Bullinger, the successor of Zuingle at Zurich, the great opponent of what was considered peculiar in Calvin's views of this subject, would lead us to expect to find in it nothing but what the Zurich ministers could cordially adopt.

In the 19th ch. it is taught concerning the sacraments in general, 1. That they are mystic symbols, or holy rites, or sacred actions, including the word, signs, and the things signified. 2. That there were sacraments under the old as well as under the new economy. 3. That God is their author, and still operates through them. 4. That Christ is the great object presented in them, the substance and matter of them, the lamb slain from the foundation of the world, the rock of which all our fathers drank, &c. 5. Therefore as far as the substance is concerned, the sacraments of the two dispensations are equal; they have the same author, the same significancy and effect. 6. The old have been abolished, and baptism and the Lord's supper introduced in their place. 7. Then follows an exposition of the constituent parts of a sacrament. First, the word, by which the elements are constituted sacred signs. Water, bread and wine, are, in themselves, apart from divine appointment, no sacred symbols. It is the word of God added to them, consecrating or setting them apart, which gives them their sacramental character. Secondly, the signs, being thus consecrated, receive the names of the things signified. Water is called regeneration, the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ, i. e. the symbols or sacraments of his body and blood. They are not changed in their own nature. They are called by the names of the things signified, because the two are sacramentally united, that is,

united by mystical significance and divine appointment. 8. In the next paragraph the confession rejects, on the one hand, the Romish doctrine of consecration; and, on the other, the opinion of those who either make the sacraments mere common signs, or entirely useless. 9. The benefits signified are not so included or bound to the sacraments, that all who receive the signs receive the things signified; nor does the efficacy depend on the administrator; nor their integrity, upon the receiver. As the word of God, continues his word, whether men believe or not, so it is with the sacraments.

The 21st chapter is devoted to the Lord's supper. The following passages, which we prefer giving in the original, will suffice to exhibit the doctrine here taught:

Ut autem rectius et perspicacius intelligatur, quomodo caro et sanguis Christi sint cibus et potus fidelium, percipianturque a fidelibus ad vitam aeternam, paucula haec adjiciemus. Manducatio non est unius generis. Est enim manducatio corporalis, qua cibus in os percipitur ab homine, dentibus atteritur, et in ventrem deglutitur. . . . Nothing of this kind, of course is admitted with regard to the Lord's supper.

Est et spiritualis manducatio corporis Christi, non ea quidem, qua existimemus cibum ipsum mutari in spiritum, sed qua, manente in sua essentia et proprietate corpore et sanguine Domini, ea nobis communicantur spiritualiter, utique non corporali modo, sed spirituali, per spiritum sanctum, qui videlicet ea, quae per carnem et sanguinem Domini pro nobis in mortem tradita, parata sunt, ipsam inquam remissionem peccatorum, liberationem, et vitam aeternam, applicat et confert nobis, ita ut Christus in nobis vivat, et nos in ipso vivamus, efficitque ut ipsum, quo talis sit, cibus et potus spiritualis noster, id est, vita nostra, vera fide percipiamus. . . . Et sicut oportet cibum in nosmetipsos edendo recipere, ut operatur in nobis, suamque efficaciam exerat, cum extra nos positus, nihil nobis prosit; ita necesse est nos fide Christum recipere, ut noster fiat, vivatque in nobis, et nos in ipso. . . . Ex quibus omnibus claret nos, per spiritualem cibum, minime intelligere imaginarium, nescio quem, cibum, sed ipsum Domini corpus pro nobis traditum, quod tamen percipiatur a fidelibus, non corporaliter, sed spiritualiter per fidem. . . . Fit autem hic esus et potus spiritualis, etiam extra Domini coenam, et quoties, aut ubicunque homo in Christum crediderit.

Quo fortassis illud Augustini pertinet, Quid paras dentem et ventrem? crede, et manducasti.

Praeter superiorem manducationem spiritualem, est et sacramentalis manducatio corporis Domini, qua fidelis non tantum spiritualiter et interne participat vero corpore et sanguine Domini, sed foris etiam accedendo ad mensam Domini, accipit visibile corporis et sanguinis Domini sacramentum.

We have thus furnished, as it appears to us, adequate materials for a clear and decided judgment as to what was the real doctrine of the Reformed church as to the Lord's Supper. We propose now to review these materials and apply them to the decision of the various questions agitated on this subject.

In what sense is Christ present in the Lord's Supper?

The authorities above cited, and the private writings of the Reformed theologians, are abundant in teaching that Christ is present in the Lord's supper. They represent it as a calumny, when the Lutherans asserted that the Reformed regarded the bread and wine as representing the body and blood of Christ in no other sense than a statute represents Hercules or Mercury. Zuingle says, we have never denied that the body of Christ is sacramentally and mystically present in the Lord's supper. They admitted not only that he is present as God and by his Spirit, but in an important sense as to his body and blood. The whole controversy relates to this latter point, viz., to the mode in which the body and blood of Christ are present in the Lord's supper. In deciding this point, the Reformed theologians are very accurate in determining the different senses in which a thing may be said to be present. The word *presence*, they say, is a relative term, and cannot be understood without reference to the object said to be present, and the subject to which it is present. For presence is nothing but the application of an object to the faculty suited to the perception of it. Hence, there is a two-fold presence, viz., of things sensible and of things spiritual. The former are present, as the word imports, when they are *prae sensibus*, so as to be perceived by the senses; the latter, when they are presented to the intelligence so as to be apprehended and enjoyed. Again, presence even as to sensible objects is not to be confounded with nearness. It stands opposed not to distance, but to absence. The sun is as near to us when

absent at night, as when present by day. A thing therefore may be present as to efficacy and virtue, which is at a great distance locally. In which of these senses are the body and blood of Christ present in the Lord's supper? All the Reformed, in answer to this question, say that it is not in the sense of local nearness. The bread is neither transmuted into the body of Christ, as Romanists say, nor is his body locally present in, with and under the bread, according to the Lutheran doctrine. The presence is to the mind, the object is not presented to the senses, but apprehended by faith. It is a presence of virtue and efficacy not of propinquity. All these statements, both negative and positive, are found in the authorities referred to in the preceding pages. The Helv. Conf. chap. 21, says: "The body of Christ is in heaven at the right hand of God. . . . Yet the Lord is not absent from his church when celebrating his supper. The sun is absent from us in heaven, nevertheless it is efficaciously present with us; how much more is Christ, the Sun of righteousness, though absent as to the body, present with us, not corporally indeed, but spiritually, by his vivifying influence." Calvin, in the Consensus Tigurinus, art. xxi. says: "Every imagination of local presence is to be entirely removed. For while the signs are here on earth seen by the eyes and handled by the hands, Christ, so far as he is a man, is no where else than in heaven; and is to be sought only by the mind and by faith. It is therefore an irrational and impious superstition to include him in the earthly elements." In the 10th art. it is taught that he is present in the promise, not in the signs.

Ursinus, the principal author of the Heidleberg Catechism, in his exposition of that formulary, says: "These two, the sign and the thing signified, are united together in this sacrament, not by any copulation, or corporal and local existence of one in the other, much less by transubstantiation, or changing the one into the other; but by signifying, sealing and exhibiting the one by the other. That is, by a sacramental union, whose bond is the promise added to the bread, requiring the faith of the receivers. Whence it is clear, that these things in their lawful use, are always jointly exhibited and received, but not without faith of the promise, viewing and apprehending the thing promised, now present in the sacrament; yet not present or included in the sign as in a vessel containing it; but present in the

promise, which is the better part, the life and soul of the sacrament. For they want judgment who affirm that Christ's body cannot be present in the sacrament, except it be in or under the bread; as if forsooth, the bread alone, without the promise, were either the sacrament, or the principal part of the sacrament."*

There is, therefore, a presence of Christ's body in the Lord's supper; not local, but spiritual; not for the senses but for the mind and to faith; not of nearness but of efficacy. This presence (as Zuingle said, "if they want words"), the Reformed were willing to call *real;* if by real was understood not essential or corporal, but true and efficacious, as opposed to imaginary or ineffective. So far as this point is concerned there is no doubt as to the doctrine of the Reformed church.

What is meant by feeding on the body and blood of Christ?

This question does not relate to the thing received, but simply to the mode of receiving. What is intended by sacramental manducation? In reference to this point, all the Reformed agreed as to the following particulars: 1. This eating was not with the mouth, either after the manner of ordinary food, which the Lutherans themselves denied, or in any other manner. The mouth was not, in this case, the organ of reception. 2. It is only by the soul that the body and blood of Christ are received. 3. It is by faith, which is declared to be the hand and the mouth of the soul. 4. It is by or through the power of the Holy Ghost. As to all these points there is a perfect agreement among the symbols of the Reformed church. Con. Tig. art. 23. "That Christ feeds our souls with his body and blood, here set forth, by the power of the Holy Ghost, is not to be understood as involving any mixture or transfusion of substance, but that we derive life from his body once offered as a sacrifice, and from his blood shed as an expiation." Belgic Con. art. 35. God, it is said, sent Christ, as the true bread from heaven, "which nourishes and sustains the spiritual life of believers, if it be eaten; that is, if it be applied and received by the Spirit through faith." *Ursinus*: "There is then in the Lord's supper a double meat and drink, one external, visible and terrene, namely, bread and wine; and another internal. There is also a double eating and receiving; an external and signifying, which is the corporal receiving of the

* Quoted by Dr. Nevin, p. 91.

bread and wine; that is, that which is performed by the hands, mouth and senses of the body; and an internal, invisible, and signified, which is the fruition of Christ's death, and a spiritual ingrafting into Christ's body; that is, which is not performed by the hands and mouth, but by the spirit and faith."

As to the question whether there is any difference between eating and believing, the authorities differ. The Zurich confession, and the Helv., quoted above distinctly say there is not. The former says: "Eating is believing, and believing is eating." The latter says: "This eating takes place as often and whenever a man believes in Christ." So the Belgic confession, just quoted. Calvin, however, makes a distinction between the two, eating, he says, is not faith, but the effect of faith. "There are some," he says, "who define in a word, that to eat the flesh of Christ and to drink his blood, is no other than to believe on Christ himself. But I conceive that in that remarkable discourse, in which Christ recommends us to feed upon his body, he intended to teach us something more striking and sublime; namely, that we are quickened by a real participation of him, which he designates by the terms *eating* and *drinking*, that no person might suppose the life which we receive from him to consist in simple knowledge. . . . At the same, we confess there is no eating but by faith, and it is impossible to imagine any other; but the difference between me and those whose opinion I now oppose, is this . . . they consider eating to be faith itself, but I apprehend it to be rather a consequence of faith." We do not see the force of this distinction. It all depends upon the latitude given to the idea of faith. If you restrict it to knowledge and assent, there is room for the distinction between eating and believing. But if faith includes the real appropriation of Christ, it includes all Calvin seems to mean by both terms, eating and believing. This question is of no historical importance. It created no diversity of opinion, in the church.

The question, whether eating the flesh of Christ, and drinking his blood is confined to the Lord's supper; in other words, whether there is any special benefit or communion with Christ to be had there, and which cannot elsewhere be obtained, the Romanists and Lutherans answer in the affirmative; the Reformed unanimously in the negative. They make indeed a distinction between spiritual and sacramental manducation. What

is elsewhere received by faith, without the signs and significant actions, is in the sacraments received in connexion with them. This is clearly taught in the confession of Zurich, 1545, quoted above; also in the second Helv. confession as has already been shown. That confession vindicates this doctrine from the charge of rendering the sacrament useless. For, as it says, though we receive Christ once, we need to receive him continually and to have our faith strengthened from day to day. Calvin teaches the same doctrine in the Con. Tig. art. 19, "The verity which is figured in the sacraments, believers receive *extra eorum usum.* Thus in baptism, Paul's sins were washed away, which had already been blotted out. Baptism was to Cornelius the laver of regeneration, though he had before received the Spirit. And so in the Lord's supper, Christ communicates himself to us, though he had already imparted himself to us and dwells within us." The office of the sacraments he teaches is to confirm and increase our faith. In his defence of this Consensus, he expresses surprise that a doctrine so plainly proved by experience and scripture, should be called into question. (Niemeyer's Col. p. 212). In the decree of the French National Synod of 1572, already quoted, it is said, "The same Lord Jesus both as to his substance and gifts, is offered to us in baptism and the ministry of the word, and received by believers."

We find the same doctrine in the Book of Common Prayer of the church of England. In the office for the communion of the sick, the minister is directed to instruct a parishioner who is prevented receiving the sacrament, "that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death for him on the cross, and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefor, he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, though he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth." On this point there was no diversity of opinion in any part of the Reformed church. There was no communion of Christ, no participation of his body and blood, not offered to believers and received by them, elsewhere than at the Lord's table and by other means. This is exalting the grace of God without depreciating the value of the sacraments.

What is meant by the body and blood of Christ as received in the sacrament?

The language employed in answer to this question is very various. It is said, we received Christ and his benefits, his flesh and blood, his true body, his natural body, his substance, the substance of his flesh and blood. All these forms of expression occur. Calvin says, we receive the substance of Christ. The Gallican Confession says, "We are fed with the substance of his body and blood." The Belgic Confession, That we received "his natural body." The question is, What does this mean? There is one thing in which all parties agreed, viz., that our union with Christ was a real union, that we receive him and not his benefits merely; that he dwells in his people by his Spirit, whose presence is the presence of Christ. Though all meant this, this is not all that is intended by the expressions above cited. What is meant by saying we receive his flesh and blood, or the substance of them? The negative answer to this question given by the Reformers uniformily is, they do not mean that we partake of the material particles of Christ's body, nor do they express any mixture or transfusion of substance. The affirmative statement is, in general terms, just as uniform, that these expressions indicate the virtue, efficacy, life-giving power of his body. But there are two ways in which this was understood. Some intended by it, not the virtue of Christ's body and blood as flesh and blood, but their virtue as a body broken and of blood as shed, that is, their sacrificial, atoning efficacay. Others, however, insisted that besides this there was a vivifying efficacy imparted to the body of Christ by its union with the divine nature, and that by the power of the Holy Ghost, the believer in the Lord's supper and elsewhere, received into his soul and by faith this mysterious and supernatural influence. This was clearly Calvin's idea, though he often contented himself with the expression of the former of these views. His doctrine is fully expressed in the following passages. "We acknowledge, without any circumlocution that the flesh of Christ, is life-giving, not only because once in it our salvation was obtained; but because now, we being united to him in sacred union, it breathes life into us. Or, to use fewer words, because being by the power of the Spirit engrafted into the body of Christ, we have a common life with him; for from the hidden

fountain of divinity life is, in a wonderfully way, infused into the flesh of Christ, and thence flows out to us." Again: "Christ is absent from us as to the body, by his Spirit, however, dwelling in us, he so lifts us to himself in heaven, that he transfuses the life-giving vigour of his flesh into us, as we grow by the vital heat of the sun." From these and many similar passages, it is plain, Calvin meant by receiving the substance of Christ's body, receiving its virtue or vigour, not merely as a sacrifice, but also the power inherent in it from its union with the divine nature, and flowing from it as heat from the sun.

The other explanation of this matter is that by receiving the substance of Christ's body, or by receiving his flesh and blood, was intended receiving their life-giving efficacy as a sacrifice once offered on the cross for us. This view is clearly expressed in the Zurich Confession of 1545. "To eat the bread of Christ is to believe on him as crucified. . . His flesh once benefited us on earth, now it benefits here no longer, and is no longer here." The same view is expressed by Calvin himself in the Con. Tig. 1549. In the 19th article we are said to eat the flesh of Christ, "because we derive our life from that flesh once offered in sacrifice for us, and from his blood shed as an expiation." With equal clearness the same idea is presented in the Heidleberg Catechism, 1560. In question 79, it is his crucified body and shed blood which are declared to be the food of the soul. The same thing is still more plainly asserted in the Helv. Confession 1566, c. 21. In the first paragraph, it is said, "Christ as delivered unto death for us and as a Saviour is the sum of this sacrament." In the third paragraph this eating is explained as the application, by the Spirit, of the benefits of Christ's death. And lower down, the food of the soul is declared to be *caro Christi tradita pro nobis, et sanguis ejus effusus pro nobis.* Indeed as this confession was written by Bullinger, minister of Zurich, the great opponent of Calvin's peculiar view, it could not be expected to teach any other doctrine. In what is called the Anglican Confession, drawn up by Bishop Jewell 1562, the same view is presented. It is there said: "We maintain that Christ exhibits himself truly present. . . that in the supper we feed upon him by faith and in the spirit (fide et spiritu) and that we have eternal life from his cross and blood." To draw life

from the cross is here the same as to draw it from his blood, and of course must refer to the sacrificial efficacy of his death.

The question now arises which of the two views above stated is entitled to be regarded as the real doctrine of the Reformed? The whole church united in saying believers receive the body and blood of Christ. They agreed in explaining this to mean that they received the virtue, efficacy or vigour of his body and blood. But some understood, thereby, the virtue of his body as broken and of his blood as shed, that is, their sacrificial efficacy. Others said that besides this, there was a mysterious virtue in the body of Christ due to its union with the divine nature, which virtue was by the Holy Spirit conveyed to the believer. Which of these views is truly symbolical? The fairest answer to this question probably is, neither to the exclusion of the other. Those who held to the one, expressed their fellowship with those who held the other. Calvin and Bullinger united in the Consensus Tigurinus from which the latter view is excluded. Both views are expressed in the public confessions. Some have the one, some the other.

But if a decision must be made between them, the higher authority is certainly due to the doctrine of sacrificial efficacy first mentioned. 1. It has high symbolical authority in its favour. Its being clearly expressed in the Con. Tig. the common platform of the church, on this whole subject, and in the Second Helv. Con. the most authoritative of all the symbols of the Reformed church, and even in the Heidleberg Catechism, outweighs the private authority of Calvin or the dubious expression of the Gallican, Belgic, and some minor Confessions. 2. What is perhaps of more real consequence, the sacrificial view, is the only one that harmonizes with the other doctrines of the church. The other is an uncongenial foreign element derived partly from the influence of previous modes of thought, partly from the dominant influence of the Lutherans and the desire of getting as near to them as possible, and partly, no doubt, from a too literal interpretation of certain passages of scripture, especially John vi. 54—58, and Eph. v: 30. It is difficult to reconcile the idea that a life-giving influence emanates from the glorified body of Christ, with the universally received doctrine of the Reformed Church, that we receive Christ as fully through the ministry of the word as in the Lord's supper. However strongly some of the Reformed

asserted that we partake of the true or natural body of Christ, and are fed by the substance of his flesh and blood, they all maintained that this was done whenever faith in him was exercised. Not to urge this point however. All the Reformed taught, Calvin perhaps more earnestly than most others, that our union with Christ since the incarnation is the same in nature as that enjoyed by the saints under the old dispensation. This is perfectly intelligible if the virtue of his flesh and blood, which we receive in the Lord's supper, is its virtue as a sacrifice, because he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. His sacrifice was as effectual for the salvation of Abraham as of Paul, and could be appropriated as fully by the faith of the one as by that of the other. But if the virtue in question is a mysterious power due to the hypostatical union, flowing from Christ's body in heaven, it must be a benefit peculiar to believers living since the incarnation. It is impossible that those living before the advent could partake of Christ's body, in this sense, because it did not then exist; it had not as yet been assumed into union with the divine nature. We find therefore that Romanists and nominal Protestants, make the greatest distinction as to the relation of the ancient saints to God and that of believers since the advent, between the sacraments of the one dispensation and those of the other. All this is consistent and necessary on their theory of the incarnation, of the church and of the sacraments, but it is all in the plainest contradiction to the doctrine of the Reformed Church.* Here then is an element which does not accord with the other doctrines of that church; and this incongruity is one good reason for not regarding it as a genuine portion of its faith.

Another good reason for this conclusion is, that the doctrine almost immediately died out of the church. It had no root in the system and could not live. We hear nothing from the immediate successors of Calvin and Beza, of this mysterious, or as it was sometimes called, miraculous influence of Christ's heavenly body. Turrettin, Beza's contemporary, expressly discards it. So does Pictet, who followed Turrettin, and so do the Reformed theologians as a body.† As a single indication of this fact we refer to

* If any one doubts this assertion, let him read Calvin's Institutes B. iv. c. 14. § 20—25. This subject however will come up in another place.

† We had transcribed various authorities as to this point, but are obliged to exclude them for the want of space. We refer the reader only to Turrettin's statement

Craig's catechism, written under an order of the General Assembly of the church of Scotland, of 1590, and sanctioned by that body in 1592. It will be remembered that the Scotch confession of 1560, before quoted, follows the very language of Calvin on this particular point. In Craig's catechism however, we have the following exhibition of the subject. "Ques. What signifieth the action of the supper? Ans. That our souls are fed spiritually by the body and blood of Jesus Christ. John vi. 54. Ques. 71. When is this done? A. When we feel the efficacy of his death in our conscience by the spirit of faith. John vi. 33. . . . Ques. 75. Is Christ's body in the elements? A. No, but it is in heaven. Acts i. 11. Ques. 76. Why then is the element called his body? A. Because it is a sure seal of his body given to our souls?" In the "Confession of Faith used in the English congregation of Geneva," the very first in date of the symbols of the Scotch church, it is said: "So the supper declareth that God, a provident Father, doth not only feed our bodies, but also nourishes our souls with the graces and benefits of Jesus Christ, which the scriptures calleth eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood."

It is of course admitted that a particular doctrine's dying out of the faith of a church, is, of itself, no sufficient evidence that it was not a genuine part of its original belief. This is too obvious to need remark. There is, however, a great difference between a doctrine's being lost by a process of decay and by the process of growth. It is very possible that a particular opinion may be engrafted into a system, without having any logical or vital union with it, and is the more certain to be ejected, the more vigorous the growth and healthful the life of that system. The fundamental principles of Protestantism are the exclusive normal authority of scripture, and justification by faith alone. If that system lives and grows it must throw off every thing incompatible with those principles. It is the fact of this peculiar view of a mysterious influence of the glorified body of Christ, having ceased to live, taken in connection with its obvious incompatibility with other articles of the Reformed faith, that we urge as a collateral argument against its being a genuine portion of

of the question as between the Reformed and Lutherans, where he will see this whole matter ventilated with that masterly discrimination for which Turrettin is unrivalled. Theol. Elenct. III. p. 567.

that system of doctrine. According to the most authoritative standards of the Reformed church, we receive the body and blood of Christ, as a sacrifice, just as Abraham and David received them, who ate of the same spiritual meat and drank of the same spiritual drink. The church is one, its life is one, its food is one, from Adam to the last of the redeemed.

What is the effect of receiving the body and blood of Christ?

This question is nearly allied to the preceding. In general terms it is answered by saying, that union with Christ, and the consequent reception of his benefits, is the effect of the believing reception of the Lord's supper. In the Basel confession, it is said, "So that we, as members of his body, as our true head, live in him and he in us." The Geneva catechism says the effect is "That we coalesce with him in the same life." The Scotch Confession says, "We surely believe that he abides in them (believers) and they in him, so that they become flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones." The Heidleberg catechism has much the same words, adding, "and ever live and are governed by one Spirit, as the members of our body by one soul." The Second Helv. Confession says, the effect of the Lord's supper is, such an application of the purchase of Christ's death, by the Holy Spirit, "that he lives in us and we in him." So the Ang. Confession and others.

In explaining the nature of this union between Christ and his people, the Reformed standards reject entirely, as we have already seen, every thing like corporeal contact, or the mixture or transfusion of substance. The proof of this point has already been sufficiently presented. We add only the language of Calvin. He says in opposition to the Lutherans: "If they insist that the substance of Christ's flesh is mingled with the soul of man, in how many absurdities do they involve themselves?"* See also his Inst. iv. 17, 32. In this negative statement, as to the nature of this union, all the Reformed agreed. They agreed also in the affirmative statement that we receive Christ himself and not merely his benefits. The union with Christ is a real, and not an imaginary or merely moral one. This is often expressed by saying we receive the substance of Christ, i. e. as

* See his Defence of the Consensus Tigurinus.

they explain it, Christ himself, or the Holy Spirit, by whom he dwells in his people.* Their common mode of representation is that contained in the Con. Tig. Haec spiritualis est communicatio quam habemus cum filio Dei, dum Spiritu suo in nobis habitans faciat credentes omnes, omnium, quae in se resident, bonorum compotes. The mode in which this subject is represented in scripture and in the Reformed standards, is, that when the Holy Spirit comes to one of God's chosen with saving power, the soul is regenerated; the first exercise of its new life is faith; Christ is thereby received; the union with him is thus consummated; and on this follows the imputation of righteousness and all saving benefits.

The only question is whether besides this union effected by the Holy Spirit, there is on our part any participation of Christ's human body or of his human nature as such. This takes us back to the question already considered, relating to the mode of reception and the thing received, when it is said in scripture, that we eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man. As to these questions, it will be remembered the Reformed agreed as to the following points: 1. That this reception is by the soul. 2. Through faith, not through the mouth. 3. By the power of the Holy Ghost. 4. That this receiving Christ's body is not confined to the Lord's supper, but takes place whenever faith in him is exercised. 5. That it was common to believers before and after the coming of the Son of God in the flesh. We have here a complete estoppel of the claim of the authority of the Reformed church in behalf of the doctrine that our union with Christ involves a participation of his human body, nature, or life. If it be asked, however, in what sense that church teaches that we are flesh of Christ's flesh, and bone of his bones? the answer is, in the same sense in which Paul says the same thing. And

* All these forms of expressions, illustrated and interchanged as they are in the Confessions, occur also in the early Reformed theologians. Thus Turrettin says: "The union between Christ and us is never in scripture spoken of as bodily, but spiritual and mystical, which can only be by the Spirit and faith." Tom. III. p. 576. "The bond of our union . . . is on the part of Christ the efficacious operation of his Spirit, on our part, faith, and thence love." p. 578. This union he adds, is called substantial and essential in reference to its verity. He asserts that we receive "the substance of Christ." "Because Christ is inseparable from his benefits. The believers under the Old Testament are correctly said to have been made partakers of Christ himself, and so of his body and blood, which were present to their faith; hence they are said to have drunk of that rock, which was Christ." p. 580.

his meaning is very plain. He tells us that a husband should love his wife as his own body. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. His wife is himself, for the Scriptures say, they are one flesh. All this he adds, is true of Christ and his people. He loves the church as himself. She is his bride; flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones. If the intimate relationship, the identification of feelings, affections and interests, between a man and his wife, if their spiritual union, justifies the assertion that that they are one flesh, far more may the same thing be said of the spiritual relation between Christ and his people, which is much more intimate, sublime and mysterious, arising, as it does from the inhabitation of one and the same Spirit, and producing not only a union of feeling and affection, but of life. The same apostle tells us that believers are one body and members one of another, not in virtue of their common human nature, nor because they all partake of the humanity of Christ, but because they all have one Spirit. Such as we understand it is the doctrine of the Reformed church and of the Bible as to the mystical union.

What efficacy belongs to the Lord's Supper as a Sacrament?

On this point the Reformed, in the first place, reject the Romish doctrine that the sacraments contain the grace they signify, and that they convey that grace, by the mere administration, to all who do not oppose an obstacle. Secondly, the Lutheran doctrine, which attributes to the sacraments an inherent supernatural power, due indeed not to the signs, but the word of God connected with them, but which is nevertheless always operative, provided there be faith in the receiver. Thirdly, the doctrine of the Socinians and others, that the sacraments are mere badges of profession, or empty signs of Christ and his benefits. They are declared to be efficacious means of grace; but their efficacy, as such, is referred neither to any virtue in them nor in him that administers them, but solely to the attending operation or influence of the Holy Spirit, precisely as in the case of the word. It is the *virtus Spiritus Sancti extrinsecus accedens*, to which all their supernatural or saving efficacy is referred. They have, indeed, the moral objective power of significant emblems and seals of divine appointment, just as the word has its inherent moral power; but their efficacy as means of grace, their power, in other words, to convey grace depends

entirely, as in the case of the word, on the co-operation of the Holy Ghost. Hence the power is in no way tied to the sacraments. It may be exerted without them. It does not always attend them, nor is it confined to the time, place or service. The favourite illustration of the Lutheran doctrine is drawn from the history of the woman who touched the hem of our Saviour's garment. As there was always supernatural virtue in him, which flowed out to all who applied to him in faith, so there is in the sacraments. The Reformed doctrine is illustrated by a reference to our Saviour's anointing the eyes of the blind man with the clay. There was no virtue in the clay to make the man see, the effect was due to the attending power of Christ. The modern rationalists smile at all these distinctions and say it all amounts to the same thing. These three views however are radically different in themselves, and have produced radically different effects, where they have severally prevailed.

All the points, both negative and positive, included in the statement of the Reformed doctrine, above given, are clearly presented with perfect unanimity in their symbolical books. In the Gall. Conf., art. 34, it is said, "We acknowledge, that these external signs are such, that through them God operates by the power of his Holy Spirit." Helv. Conf. ii. c. 19, "We do not sanction the doctrine that grace and the things signified are so bound to the signs or included in them, that those who" receive the signs receive also the blessings they represent. When this fails, the fault is indeed in the receiver, just as in the case of the word, God in both offers his grace. His word does not cease to be true and divine, nor do the sacraments lose their integrity, because men do not receive them in faith and to their salvation. See ch. 21, at the end. The Consensus Tigurinus teaches, as we have already seen, that the sacraments have no virtue in themselves, as means of grace: *Si quid boni nobis per sacramenta confertur, id non fit propria eorum virtute. . . Deus enim solus est, qui Spiritu suo agit.* Art. 12. In the following articles it is taught that they benefit only believers, that grace is not tied to them, that believers receive elsewhere the same grace, and that the blessing often follows long after the administration. The Scotch Conf. ch. 21, teaches that the whole benefit flows "from faith apprehending Christ, who alone renders the sacraments efficacious." In the Geneva Cat. the question is asked:

"Do you believe that the power and efficacy of the sacrament, instead of being included in the element, flow entirely from the Spirit of God? Ans. So I believe, that is, should it please the Lord to exercise his power through his own instruments to the end to which he has appointed them." It is not worth while to multiply quotations, for as to this point, there was no diversity of opinion. We would only refer the reader to Calvin's Inst. iv. 14, a passage, which though directed against the Romanists, has a much wider scope. He there declares it to be a purely diabolical error to teach men to expect justification from the sacraments, instead of from faith; and insists principally on two things, first, that nothing is conferred through the sacraments beyond what is offered in the word; and, secondly, that they are not necessary to salvation, the blessings may be had without them. He confirms his own doctrine by the saying of Augustin: Invisibilem sanctificationem sine visibili signo esse posse, et visibile rursum signum sine vera sanctificatione.

Such then, as we understand it, is the true doctrine of the Reformed church on the Lord's supper. By the Reformed church, we mean the Protestant churches of Switzerland, the Palatinate, France, Belgium, England, Scotland and elsewhere. According to the public standards of these churches: The Lord's supper is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, as a memorial of his death, wherein, under the symbols of bread and wine, his body as broken for us and his blood as shed for the remission of sins, are signified, and, by the power of the Holy Ghost, sealed and applied to believers; whereby their union with Christ and their mutual fellowship are set forth and confirmed, their faith strengthened, and their souls nourished unto eternal life.

Christ is really present to his people, in this ordinance, not bodily, but by his Spirit; not in the sense of local nearness, but of efficacious operation. They receive him, not with the mouth, but by faith; they receive his flesh, not as flesh, not as material particles, nor its human life, but his body as broken and his blood as shed. The union thus signified and effected, between him and them is not a corporeal union, nor a mixture of substances, but spiritual and mystical, arising from the indwelling of the Spirit. The efficacy of this sacrament, *as a means of grace*, is not in the signs, nor in the service, nor in the minister, nor in the word, but solely in the attending influence of the Holy Ghost.

This we believe to be a fair statement of the doctrine of the Reformed church.

*Dr. Nevin's Theory.**

Having already exceeded the readable limits of a review, we cannot pretend to do more in our notice of Dr. Nevin's book, than as briefly as possible state his doctrine and assign our reasons for considering it a radical rejection of the doctrine and theology of the Reformed church. It is no easy thing to give a just and clear exhibition of a theory confessedly mystical, and which involves some of the most abstruse points both of anthropology and theology. We have nothing to do however with any thing beyond this book. We do not assume to know how all these things lie in Dr. Nevin's mind; how he reduces them to unity, or reconciles them with other doctrines of the Bible. Our concern is only with that part of the system which has here cropped out. How the strata lie underneath, we cannot tell. Dr. Nevin, in the full consciousness of the true nature of his own system, says the difficulties under which Calvin's theory of the Lord's supper, labours, are "all connected with psychology, applied either to the person of Christ or the persons of his people." p. 156. The difference then lies in the region of psychology. That science has assumed a new form. It has made great progress since the Reformation. "Its determinations," he says, "have a right to be respected in any inquiry which has this subject for its object. No such inquiry can deserve to be called scientific, if it fails to take them into view," p. 162. There may be truth in that remark. It is, however, none the less significant as indicating the nature of the system here taught. It is a peculiar psychology applied to the illustration and determination of Christian doctrine. It is founded on certain views of "organic law," of personality, and of generic and individual life. If these scientific determinations are incorrect, the doctrine of this book, is gone. It has no existence apart from those determinations, or at least independent of them. Our first object is to state, as clearly as we can, what the theory is.

* In calling the theory in question by Dr. Nevin's name, we do not mean to charge him with having originated it. This he does not claim, and we do not assert. It is, as we understand it, the theory of Schleiermacher, so far as Dr. Nevin goes.

There is an organic law of life which gives unity wherever it exists, and to all the individuals through which it manifests itself. The identity of the human body resides not in the matter of which it is composed, but in its organic law. The same is true of any animal or plant. The same law may comprehend or reveal itself in many individuals, and continually propagate and extend itself. Hence there is a generic as well as an individual life. An acorn developed into an oak, in one view is a single existence; but it includes a life which may produce a thousand oaks. The life of the forest is still the life of the original acorn, as truly one, inwardly and organically, as in any single oak. Thus in the case of Adam; as to his individual life, he was *a* man, as to his generic life, he was the whole race. The life of all men is at last one and the same. Adam lives in his posterity as truly as he ever lived in his own person. They participate in his whole nature, soul and body, and are truly bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. Not a particle of his body indeed has come down to us, the identity resolves itself into an invisible law. But this is an identity far more real than mere sameness of particles. So also in the case of Christ. He was not only *a* man, but *the* man. He had not only an individual but a generic life. The Word in becoming flesh, did not receive into personal union with himself the nature of an individual man, but he took upon himself our common nature. The divinity was joined in personal union with humanity. But wherever there is personality there is unity. A person has but one life. Adam had not one life of the soul and another of the body. There is no such dualism in our nature. Soul and body are but one life, the self-same organic law. The soul to be complete to develop itself as a soul, must externalize itself, and this externalization is the body.* It is all one process, the action of one and the same living organic principle. The same is true as regards Christ. If he is one person, he has one life. He has not one life of the body, another of the soul, and another of his divinity. It is one undivided life. We cannot partake of the one without partaking of the others. We cannot be united to him as to his body, without being united also with his soul and divinity. His life is one and

* To be sure the separate existence of the soul after death, and absent from the body, is an ugly fact. But we know so little of the intermediate state, it would be a pity to give up a theory, for so obscure a fact.

undivided, and is also a true human life. This is communicated to his people. The humanity of Adam is raised to a higher character by its union with the divine nature, but remains, in all respects, a true human life.

The application of these psychological principles to the whole scheme of Christian doctrine is obvious and controlling. In the first place, the fall of Adam was the fall of the race. Not simply because he represented the race, but because the race was comprehended in his person. Sin in him was sin in humanity and became an insurmountable law in the progress of its development. It was an organic ruin; the ruin of our nature; not simply because all men are sinners, but as making all men sinners. Men do not make their nature, their nature makes them. The human race is not a sand heap; it is the power of a single life. Adam's sin is therefore our sin. It is imputed to us, indeed, but only because it is ours. We are born with his nature, and for this reason only are born also into his guilt. "A fallen *life* in the first place, and on the ground of this only, imputed guilt and condemnation." p. 164, 191, &c., &c.

In the second place, in order to our salvation it was requisite that the work of restoration should not so much be wrought for us and as in us. Our nature, humanity, must be healed, the power of sin incorporated in that nature must be destroyed. For this purpose the Logos, the divine Word, took our humanity into personal union with himself. It was our *fallen* humanity he assumed. Hence the necessity of suffering. He triumphed over the evil. His passion was the passion of humanity. This was the atonement. The principle of health came to its last struggle with the principle of disease, and gained the victory. Our nature was thus restored and elevated, and it is by our receiving this renovated nature, that we are saved. Christ's merits are inseparable from his nature, they cannot be imputed to us, except so far as they are immanent in us. As in the case of Adam, we have his nature, and therefore his sin; so we have the nature of Christ and therefore his righteousness. The nature we receive from Christ is a theanthropic nature. For, as before remarked, being one person, his life is one. "His divine nature is at the same time *human*, in the fullest sense." p. 174. All that is included in him as a person, divinity, soul and body, are embraced in his life. It is not the life the Logos separately

taken, but the life of the Word made flesh, the divinity joined in personal union with our humanity; which is thus exalted to an imperishable divine life. It is a divine human life. In the person of Christ, thus constituted, the true ideal of humanity is brought to view. Christ is the archetypal, ideal man. The incarnation is the proper completion of humanity. "Our nature reaches after a true and real union with the nature of God, as the necessary complement and consummation of its own life. The *idea* which it embodies can never be fully actualized under any other form." p. 201.

In the third place, Divine human nature as it exists in the person of Christ, passes over into the church. He is the source and organic principle of a new life introduced into the centre of humanity itself, A new starting point is found in Christ. Our nature as it existed in Adam unfolded itself organically, in his posterity; in like manner, as it exists in Christ, united with the divine nature, it passes over to his people, constituting the church. This process is not mechanical but organic. It takes place in the way of history, growth, regular living development.* By uniting our nature with the divine, he became the root of a new life for the race.. "The word became flesh; not a single man only, as one among many; but flesh, or humanity in its universal conception. How else could he be the principle of a general life, the origin of a new order of existence for the human world as such?" p. 210. "The supernatural as thus made permanent and historical in the church, must, in the nature of the case, correspond with the form of the supernatural, as it appeared in Christ himself. For it is all one and the same life or constitution. The church must have a true theanthropic character throughout. The union of the divine and human in her constitution, must be inward and real, a continuous revelation of God in the flesh, exalting this last continuously into the sphere of the Spirit." p. 247. The incarnation is, therefore,

* Schleiermacher says, in his second Sendschreiben to Lücke "Wo Uebernatürliches bei mir vorkommt, da ist es immer ein Erstes; es wird aber hernach ein Natürliches als Zweites. So ist die Schöpfung übernatürlich; aber sie wird hernach Naturzusammenhang; so ist Christus übernatürlich seinem Anfang nach, aber er wird natürlich als rein menschliche Person, and ebenso ist es mit dem heiligen Geiste und der christlichen Kirche. Somewhat to the same effect, Dr. Nevin somewhere says, The supernatural has become natural.

still present and progressive, in the way of actual, human development, in the church.

There are two remarks, however, to be here made. First, according to this system, the mystical union implies a participation of the entire humanity of Christ, for if we are joined in *real* life-unity with the Logos, we should be exalted to the level of the Son of God. Still it is not with his soul alone, or his body alone, but with his whole person, for the life of Christ is one. Second, This union of Christ and his people, implies no ubiquity of his body, and no fusion of his proper personality with theirs. We must distinguish between the simple man and the universal man here joined in the same person, much as in the case of Adam. He was at once an individual and the whole race. So we distinguish between Christ's universal humanity in the church, and his humanity as a particular man, whom the heavens must receive unto the restitution of all things. p. 173.

The incarnation being thus progressive, the church is in very deed, the depository and continuation of the Saviour's theanthropic life itself, in which powers and resources are continually at hand, involving a real intercommunion and interpenetration of the human and divine. p. 248. It follows also from this view of the case that the sacraments of the church, have a real objective force. "The force of the sacrament is in the sacrament itself. Our faith is needed only to make room for it in our souls," p. 183. "The things signified are bound to the signs by the force of a divine appointment; so that the grace goes inseparably along with the signs, and is truly present for all who are prepared to make it their own." p. 62.

In the fourth place, as to the mode of union with Christ, it is by regeneration. But this regeneration is by the church. If the church is the depository of the theanthropic life of Christ, if the progress of the church takes place in the way of history, growth, living development, it would seem as unreasonable that a man should be united to Christ and made partaker of his nature, otherwise than by union with this external, historical church, as that he should possess the nature of Adam by immediate creation, instead of regular descent. It is by the ministrations of this living church, in which the incarnation of God is progressive, and by her grace-bearing sacraments, that the church life, which is the same as that of Christ, is continually carried over to new in-

dividuals. The life of the single Christian can be real only as born and sustained to the end by the life of the church, which is the living and life-giving body of Christ. The effect of the sacraments, therefore, is thus to convey and sustain the life of Christ, his whole divine-human life. We partake not of his divinity only, but also of his true and proper humanity; not of his humanity in a separate form, nor of his flesh and blood alone, but of his whole life, as a single undivided form of existence. In the Lord's supper consequently Christ is present in a peculiar and mysterious way; present as to his body, soul and divinity, not locally as included under the elements, but really; the sign and thing signified, the inward and outward, the visible and invisible, constitute one inseparable presence. Unbelievers indeed receive only the outward, because they lack the organ of reception for the inward grace. Still the latter is there, and the believer receives both, the outward sign and the one undivided. theanthropic life of Christ, his body, soul and divinity. The Eucharist has therefore "a peculiar and altogether extraordinary power." It is, as Maurice is quoted as asserting, the bond of an universal life and the means whereby men become partakers of it.

Such, as we understand it, is the theory unfolded in this book, It is in all its essential features Schleiermacher's theory. We almost venture to hope that Dr. Nevin will consider it a fair exhibition, not so satisfactory of course, as he himself could make, but as good as could well be expected from the uninitiated. It is at least honestly done, and to the best of our ability.

It is not the truth of this system that we propose to examine, but simply its relation to the theology of the Reformed church. Dr. Nevin is loud, frequent, often, apparently at least, contemptuous, in his reproaches of his brethren for their apostacy from the doctrines of the Reformation. We propose very briefly to assign our reasons for regarding his system, as unfolded in this book, as an entire rejection not only of the peculiar doctrines of the Reformed church, on the points concerned, but of some of the leading principles of Protestant, and even Catholic, theology in general.

First, in reference to the person of Christ. Dr. Nevin denies any dualism in the constitution of man. Soul and body, in their ground, are but one life. So in the case of Christ, in virtue of the hypostatical union, his life is one. The divine and human are so united in him as to constitute one indivisible life. "It is

in all respects a true human life." p. 167. "His divine nature is at the same time *human*, in the fullest sense." p. 174.

That this is a departure not only from the doctrine of the Reformed church, but of the church universal, seems to us very plain. In one view it is the Eutychian doctrine, and in another something worse. Eutyches and afterwards the Monothelites taught, that after the hypostatical union, there was in Christ but one nature and operation. Substitute the word life, for its equivalent, nature, and we have the precise statement of Dr. Nevin's. He warns us against the error of Nestorius, just as the Eutychians called all who held to the existence of two natures in Christ, Nestorians. Eutyches admitted that this one nature or life in our Lord, was theanthropic. He was constituted of two natures, but after their union, had but one. Ὁμολογω, he says, ἐκ δυο φυσεων γεγεννησθαι τον κυριον ἡμων προ της ἑνωσεως· μετα δε την ἑνωσιν, μιαν φυσιν ὁμολογω. And, therefore, there was in Christ, as the Monothelites say, but μια θεανδρικη ἐνεργεια. What is the difference between one theanthropic life, and one theanthropic operation? We are confirmed in the correctness of this view of the matter, from the fact, that Schleiermacher, the father of this system, strenuously objects to the use of the word *nature* in this whole connection, especially in its application to the divinity, and opposes also the adoption of the terms which the council of Chalcedon employed in the condemnation of Eutychianism.* This, however, is a small matter. Dr. Nevin has a right to speak for himself. It is his own language, which, as it seems to us, distinctly conveys the Eutychian doctrine, that after the hypostatical union there was but one φυσις, or as he expresses it, one life, in Christ. He attributes to Calvin a wrong psychology in reference to Christ's person. What is that but to attribute to him wrong views of that person? And what is that but saying his own views differ from those of Calvin on the person of Christ? No one, however, has ever pretended that Calvin had any peculiar views on that subject. He says himself that he held all the decisions, as to such points, of the first six oecumenical councils. In differing from Calvin, on this point, therefore, Dr. Nevin differs from the whole church.

But in the other view of this matter. What was this one

* Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre, §97.

life (or nature) of Christ? Dr. Nevin says: "It was in all respects a true human life." p. 167. "Christ is the archetypal man, in whom the true idea of humanity is brought to view." He "is the true ideal man." Our nature is complete only in him. p. 201. But is a perfect, or ideal man, any thing more than a mere man after all? If all that was in Christ pertains to the perfection of our nature, he was at best, but a perfect man. The only way to escape Socinianism, on this theory, is by deifying man, identifying the divine and human, and making all the glory, wisdom and power, which belong to Christ the proper attributes of humanity. Christ is a perfect man? But what is a perfect man? We may give a pantheistic, or a Socinian answer to that question, and not really help the matter—for the real and infinite hiatus between us and Christ, is in either case closed. Thus it is that mysticism falls back on rationalism. They are but different phases of the same spirit. In Germany, it has long been a matter of dispute, to which class Schleiermacher belongs. He was accustomed to smile at the controversy as a mere logomachy. Steudel objects to Schleiermacher's christology, that according to him "Christ is a finished man." Albert Knapp says: "He deifies the human and renders human the divine."* We, therefore, do not stand alone in thinking that to represent Christ's life as in all respects human, to say he was the ideal man, that human nature found its completion in him, admits naturally only of a pantheistic or a Socinian interpretation. We of course do not attribute to Dr. Nevin either of these forms of doctrine. We do not believe that he adopts either. But we object both to his language and doctrine that one or the other of those heresies, is their legitimate consequence.

In the second place, we think the system under consideration, is justly chargeable with a departure from the doctrine of the Reformed church and the church universal as to the nature of our union with Christ. According to the Reformed church that union is not merely moral, nor is it merely legal or federal, nor does it arise simply from Christ having assumed our nature, it is at the same time real and vital. But the bond of that union, however intimate or extensive, is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, in Christ and in his

* F. W. Gess: Uebersicht über Schleier. System. p. 225.

people. We receive Christ himself, when we receive the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ; we receive the life of Christ when we receive his Spirit, who is the Spirit of life. Such we believe to be the true doctrine of the Reformed church on this subject. But if to this be added, as some of the Reformed taught, there was a mysterious power emanating from the glorified body of Christ, in heaven, it falls very far short, or rather is something entirely different from the doctrine of this book. Dr. Nevin's theory of the mystical union is of course determined by his view of the constitution of Christ's person. If divinity and humanity are united in him as one life; if that life is in all respects human, then it is this divine human life, humanity raised to the power of deity, that is communicated to his people. It is communicated too, in the form of a new organic principle, working in the way of history and growth. "The supernatural has become natural." p. 246. A new divine element has been introduced into our nature by the incarnation. "Humanity itself has been quickened into full correspondence with the vivific principle it has been made to enshrine." Believers, therefore, receive, or take part in the entire humanity of Christ. From Adam they receive humanity as he had it, after the fall; from Christ, they receive the theanthropic life, humanity with deity enshrined in it, or rather made one with it, one undivided life.

That this is not the old view of the mystical union between Christ and his people, can hardly be a matter of dispute. Dr. Nevin says Calvin was wrong not only in the psychology of Christ, but of his people. Ullmann, in the essay prefixed to this volume, tells us Schleiermacher introduced an epoch by teaching this doctrine. This is declared to be the doctrine of the Church of the Future. It is denied to be that of the Church of the Past. There is one consideration, if there were no other, which determines this question beyond appeal. It follows of necessity from Dr. Nevin's doctrine that the relation of believers to God and Christ, is essentially different, since the incarnation, from that of believers before that event. The union between the divine and human began with Christ, and from him this theanthropic life passes over to the church. There neither was nor could be any such thing before. This he admits. He therefore teaches that the saints of old were, as to the mystical union, in a very different condition, from that of the saints now. Hear what he

says on that subject. In arguing against the doctrine that the indwelling of Christ, is by the Spirit, he says: "Let the church know that she is no nearer God now in fact in the way of actual life, than she was under the Old Testament; that the indwelling of Christ in believers, is only parallel with the divine presence enjoyed by the Jewish saints, who all died in the faith 'not having received the promises'; that the mystical union in the case of Paul and John was nothing more intimate and vital and real than the relation sustained to God by Abraham, or Daniel, or Isaiah." p. 195. "In the religion of the Old Testament, God descends towards man, and holds out to his view in this way the promise of a real union of the divine nature with the human, as the end of the gracious economy thus introduced. To such a *real* union it is true, the dispensation itself never came. . . . The wall of partition that separated the divine from the human, was never fully broken down." p. 203. It was, he says, "a revelation of God to man, and not a revelation of God in man." Again, "That which forms the full *reality* of religion, the union of the divine nature with the human, the revelation of God in man, and not simply to him, was wanting in the Old Testament altogether." Let us now hear what Calvin, who is quoted by Dr. Nevin as the great representative of the Reformed church, says on this subject. He devotes the whole of chapters 10 and 11 of the Second Book of his Institutes, to the refutation of the doctrine that the Old Testament economy in its promises, blessings and effects, differed essentially from that of the New. The difference he declares to be merely circumstantial, relating to the mode, the clearness, and extent of its instructions, and the number embraced under its influence. He tells us he was led to the discussion of this subject by what that "prodigiosus nebulo Servetus, et furiosi nonnulli ex Anabaptistarum secta," (rather bad company), taught on this point; who thought of the Jews no better, quam de aliquo porcorum grege. In opposition to them, and all like them, Calvin undertakes to prove, that the old covenant "differed in substance and reality nothing from ours, but was entirely one and the same; the administration alone being different." 10: 2. "What more absurd," he asks §10, "than that Abraham should be the father of all the faithful, and yet not have a corner among them? But he can be cast down neither from the number, nor from his high rank among believers, with-

out destroying the whole church." He reminds Christians that Christ has promised them no higher heaven than to sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Dr. Nevin ought surely to stop quoting Calvin as in any way abetting the monstrous doctrine, that under the old dispensation, God was only revealed *to* his people, while under the new, the divine nature is united in them with the human nature, as in Christ, ("the same life or constitution,") in the way of a progressive incarnation.

What however still more clearly shows the radical difference between Dr. Nevin's theory and that of the Reformed church, as to this point, is what he says in reference to the sacraments of the two dispensations. Romanists teach that the sacraments of the Old Testament merely prefigure grace, those of the New actually confer it. This doctrine Calvin, as we have already seen, strenuously denies, and calls its advocates miserable sophists. He asserts that "whatever is exhibited in our sacraments, the Jews formerly received in theirs, to wit, Christ and his benefits;" that baptism has no higher efficacy than circumcision. He quotes the authority of Augustin for saying, Sacramenta Judæorum in signis fuisse diversa; in re quae significatur, paria; diversa specie visibili, paria virtute spirituali.* Dr. Nevin, however, is constrained by his view of the nature of the union between Christ and his people, since the incarnation, to make the greatest possible difference between the sacraments of the two dispensations. He even goes further than the Romanists, teaching that the passover, e. g. was properly no sacrament at all. "Not a sacrament at all indeed," is his language, 'inthe full New Testament sense, but a sacrament simply in prefiguration and type." p. 251. In the same connexion, he says: "The sacraments of the Old Testament are no proper measure, by which to graduate directly the force that belongs to the sacraments of the New. . . To make baptism no more than circumcision, or the Lord's supper no more than the passover, is to wrong the new dispensation as really," as by making Christ nothing more than a levitical priest. Systems which lead to such opposite conclusions must be radically different. The lowest Puritan, ultra Protestant, or sectary in the land, who truly believes in Christ, is nearer Calvin than Dr. Nevin;

* Institutes v. 14: 23—26.

and has more of the true spirit and theology of the Reformed church, than is to be found in this book.

In the third place, Dr. Nevin's theory, differing so seriously from that of the Reformed church, as to the person of Christ and his union with his people, may be expected to differ from it as to the nature of Christ's work, and method of salvation. According to him, human nature, the generic life of humanity, being corrupted by the fall, was healed by being taken into a life-union with the Logos. This union so elevated it, raised it to such a higher character, and filled it with such new meaning and power, that it was more than restored to its original state. This however could not be done without a struggle. Being the bearer of a fallen humanity, there was a necessity for suffering in order that life should triumph over the law of sin and death. This was the atonement. See p. 166.

The first remark that suggests itself here, is the query, what is meant by a "fallen humanity"? Can it mean any thing else than a corrupted nature; i. e. our nature in the state to which it was reduced by the fall? How else could its assumption involve the necessity of suffering? It is however hard to see how the assumption of a corrupt nature, is consistent with the perfect sinlessness of the Redeemer. Dr. Nevin, as far as we see, does not touch this point. With Schleiermacher, according to whom, absolute freedom from sin was the distinguishing prerogative of the Saviour, this was secured, though clothed with our nature, by all the acts or determinations of that nature, being governed in his case, by "the God-consciousness" in him, or the divine principle. This is far from being satisfactory; but we pass that point. What however are we to say to this view of the atonement? It was vicarious suffering indeed, for the Logos assumed, and by the painful process of his life and death, healed our nature, not for himself but for our sakes. But there is here no atonement, that is, no satisfaction; no propitiation of God; no reference to divine justice. All this is necessarily excluded. All these ideas are passed over in silence by Dr. Nevin; by Schleiermacher they are openly rejected. The atonement is the painfully accomplished triumph of the new divine principle introduced into our nature, over the law of sin introduced into it by Adam. Is this the doctrine of the Reformed church?

Again, the whole method of salvation is necessarily changed

by this system. We become partakers of the sin of Adam, by partaking of his nature; we become partakers of the righteousness of Christ, by partaking of his nature. There can be no imputation of either sin or righteousness to us, except they belong to us, are inherently our own. "Our participation in the actual unrighteousness of his (Adam's) life, forms the ground of our participation in his guilt and liability to punishment. And in no other way, we affirm, can the idea of imputation be satisfactorily sustained in the case of the second Adam." "Righteousness, like guilt, is an attribute which supposes a subject in which it inheres, and from which it cannot be abstracted without ceasing to exist altogether. In the case before us, that subject is the mediatorial nature or life of the Saviour himself. Whatever there may be of merit, virtue, efficacy, or moral value in any way, in the mediatorial work of Christ, it is all lodged in the *life*, by the power of which alone this work has been accomplished, and in the presence of which only it can have either reality or stability." p. 191. This is very plain, we receive the theanthropic nature or life of Christ; that nature is of a high character, righteous, holy, conformed to God; in receiving that life we receive its merit, its virtues and efficacy. On p. 189, he is still more explicit: "How can that be imputed or reckoned to any man on the part of God, which does not belong to him in reality?" "This objection," he says, "is insurmountable, according to the form in which the doctrine of imputation is too generally held." "The judgment of God must ever be according to truth. He cannot reckon to any one an attribute or quality, which does not belong to him in fact. He cannot declare him to be in a relation or state, which is not actually his own, but the position merely of another. A simple external imputation here, the pleasure or purpose of God to place to the account of one what has been done by another, will not answer." "The Bible knows nothing of a simple outward imputation, by which something is reckoned to a man that does not belong to him in fact." p. 190. "The ground of our justification is a righteousness that *was* foreign to us before, but is *now* made to lodge itself in the inmost constitution of our being." p. 180. God's act in justification "is necessarily more than a mere declaration or form of thought. It makes us to be in fact, what it declares us to be, in Christ." *Ib.* Here we reach the very life-

spot of the Reformation. Is justification a declaring just, or a making just, inherently? This was the real battle-ground on which the blood of so many martyrs was spilt. Are we justified for something done for us, or something wrought in us, actually our own? It is a mere playing with words, to make a distinction, as Mr. Newman did, between what it is that thus makes us inherently righteous. Whether it is infused grace, a new heart, the indwelling Spirit, the humanity of Christ, his life, his theanthropic nature; it is all one. It is subjective justification after all, and nothing more. We consider Dr. Nevin's theory as impugning here, the vital doctrine of Protestantism. His doctrine is not, of course, the Romish, teres atque rotundus; he may distinguish here, and discriminate there. But as to the main point, it is a denial of the Protestant doctrine of justification. He knows as well as any man that all the churches of the 15th century, held the imputation not only of what was our own, but of what though not ours inherently, was on some adequate ground set to our account; that the sin of Adam is imputed to us, not because of our having his corrupted nature, but because of the imputation of his sin, we are involved in his corruption. He knows that when the doctrine of mediate imputation, as he teaches it, was introduced by Placaeus, it was universally rejected. He knows moreover, that, with regard to justification, the main question was, whether it was a declaratory or an effective act, whether it was a declaring just on the ground of a righteousness not in us, or a making just by communicating righteousness to us. Romanists were as ready as Protestants to admit that the act by which men are rendered just actually, was a gracious act, and for Christ's sake, but they denied that justification is a forensic or declaratory act founded on the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, which is neither in us, nor by that imputation communicated as a quality to our souls. It was what Romanists thus denied, Protestants asserted, and made a matter of so much importance. And it is in fact the real keystone of the arch which sustains our peace and hope towards God for if we are no further righteous than we are actually and inherent so, what have we to expect in the presence of a righteous God, but indignation and wrath?

In the fourth place, the obvious departure of Dr. Nevin's system from that of the Reformed church, is seen in what he teach-

es concerning the church and the sacraments. The evidence here is not easy to present. As he very correctly remarks with regard to certain doctrines of the Bible, they rest far less on distinct passages which admit of quotation, than on the spirit, tenor, implications and assumptions which pervade the sacred volume. It is so with this book. Its whole spirit is churchy. It makes religion to be a church life, its manifestations a liturgical service, its support sacramental grace. It is the form, the spirit, the predominance of these things, which give his book a character as different as can be from the healthful, evangelical free spirit of Luther or Calvin. The main question whether we come to Christ, and then to the church; whether we by a personal act of faith receive him, and by union with him become a member of his mystical body; or whether all our access to Christ is through a mediating church, Dr. Nevin decides against the evangelical system.

It follows of necessity, as he himself says, from his doctrine of a progressive incarnation, "that the church is the depository and continuation of the Saviour's theanthropic life itself, and as such, a truly supernatural constitution, in which powers and resources are constantly at hand, involving a real intercommunion and interpenetration of the human and divine." p. 248. The church with him, being "historical must be visible." "An outward church is the necessary form of the new creation in Christ Jesus, in its very nature." p. 5. With Protestants the true church is "the communion of saints," the "congregatio sanctorum," "the company of faithful men;" not the company or organization of professing men. It would be difficult to frame a proposition more subversive of the very foundations of all protestantism, than the assertion that the description above given, or any thing like it belongs to the church visible as such. It is the fundamental error of Romanism, the source of her power and of her corruption, to ascribe to the outward church, the attributes and prerogatives of the mystical body of Christ.

We must however pass to Dr. Nevin's doctrine of the sacraments, and specify at least some of the points in which he departs from the doctrine of the Reformed church. And in the first place, he ascribes to them a specific and "altogether extraordinary power." p. 118. There is a presence and of course a receiving of the body and blood of Christ, in the Lord's supper,

"to be had nowhere else." p. 75. This idea is presented in various forms. It is, however, in direct contravention of the confessions of the Reformed churches, as we have already seen. They make a circumstantial distinction between spiritual and sacramental manducation, but as to any specific difference, any difference as to what is there received from what is received elsewhere, they expressly deny it. In the Helv. Conf. already quoted, it is said, that the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood takes place, even elsewhere than in the Lord's supper, whenever and wherever a man believes in Christ. Calvin, in the Consensus Tigurinus, Art. xix. says: What is figured in the sacraments is granted to believers extra eorum usum. This he applies and proves, first in reference to baptism, and then in reference to the Lord's supper. In the explanation of that Consensus he vindicates this doctrine against the objections of the Lutherans. "Quod deinde prosequimur," he begins, "fidelibus spiritualium bonorum effectum quae figurant sacramenta, extra eorum usum constare, quando et quotidie verum esse experimur et probatur scripturae testimoniis, mirum est si cui displiceat. The same thing is expressly taught in his Institutes iv. 14. 14.

The second point on which Dr. Nevin differs from the Reformed church relates to their efficacy. All agree that they have an objective force; that they no more owe their power to the faith of the recipient than the word of God does. But the question is what is the source to which the influence of the sacraments as means of grace, is to be referred? We have already stated that Romanists, say it is to be referred to the sacraments themselves as containing the grace they convey; Lutherans, to the supernatural power of the word, inseparably joined with the signs; the Reformed, to the attending power of the Spirit which is in no manner inseparable from the signs or the service. Dr. Nevin's doctrine seems to lie somewhere between the Romish and the Lutheran view. He agrees with the Romanists in referring the efficacy to the service itself, and with the Lutherans in making faith necessary in order to the sacrament taking effect. Some of his expressions on the subject are the following: Faith "is the condition of its (the sacrament's) efficacy for the communicant, but not the principle of the power itself. This belongs to the institution in its own nature. The signs are bound to

what they represent, not subjectively simply in the thought of the worshipper, but objectively, by the force of a divine appointment. . . . The grace goes inseparably along with the sign, and is truly present for all who are prepared to make it their own." p. 61. "The invisible grace enters as a necessary constituent element into the idea of the sacrament; and must be of course objectively present with it wherever it is administered under a true form. . . It belongs to the ordinance in its own nature. . . . The sign and thing signified are by Christ's institution, mysteriously tied together. . . . The two form one presence." p. 178. In the case of the Lord's supper, the grace, or thing signified, is, according to this book, the divine-human nature of Christ, "his whole person," his body, soul and divinity, constituting one life. This, or these are objectively present and inseparably joined with the signs, constituting with them one presence. The power inseparable from the theanthropic life of Christ, is inseparable from these signs, and is conveyed with them. "Where the way is open for it to take effect it (the sacrament) *serves in itself* to convey the life of Christ into our persons." p. 182. We know nothing in Bellarmine that goes beyond that. Dr. Nevin refers for illustration, as Lutherans do, to the case of the woman who touched Christ's garment. As there was mysterious supernatural power ever present in Christ, so there is in the sacraments. "The virtue of Christ's mystical presence," he says "is comprehended in the sacrament itself." According to the Reformed church, Christ is present in the sacraments in no other sense than he is present in the word. Both serve to hold him up for our acceptance. Neither has any virtue in itself. Both are used by the Spirit, as means of communicating Christ and his benefits to believers. "Spiritualiter," says Calvin, "per sacramenta fidem alit (Deus), QUORUM UNICUM OFFICIUM EST, EJUS PROMISSIONES OCULIS NOSTRIS SPECTANDAS SUBJICERE, IMO NOBIS EARUM ESSE PIGNORA." Inst. iv. 14. 12.

We here leave Dr. Nevin's book; we have only one or two remarks to add not concerning him, nor his own personal belief, but concerning his system. He must excuse our saying that, in our view, it is only a specious form of Rationalism. It is in its essential element a psychology. Ullman admits that it is nearly allied to pantheistic mysticism, and to the modern speculative philosophy. In all three the main idea is, "the union of God and

man through the incarnation of the first and deification of the second."* It has however quite as strong an affinity for a much lower form of Rationalism. We are said to have the life of Adam. He lives in us as truly as he ever lived in his own person; we partake of his substance, are flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones. No particle of his soul or body, indeed, has come down to us. It all resolves itself into an invisible law. This and little more than this, is said of our union with Christ. What then have we to do with Christ, more than we have to do with Adam? or than the present forests of oak have to do with the first acorn? A law is, after all, nothing but a force, a power, and the only Christ we have or need, is an inward principle. And with regard to spirits, such a law is something very ideal indeed. Christ by his excellence makes a certain impression on his disciples, which produced a new life in them. They associate to preserve and transmit that influence. A principle, belonging to the original constitution of our nature, was, by his influence, brought into governing activity, and is perpetuated in and by the church. As it owes its power to Christ, it is always referred back to him, so that it is a Christian consciousness, a consciousness of this union with Christ. We know that Schleiermacher endeavoured to save the importance of an historical personal Christ; but we know also that he failed to prevent his system taking the low rationalist form just indicated. With some it takes the purely pantheistic form; with others a lower form, while others strive hard to give it a Christian form. But its tendency to lapse into one or the other of the two heresies just mentioned, is undeniable.

We feel constrained to make another remark. It is obvious that this system has a strong affinity for Sabellianism. According to the Bible and the creed of the church universal, the Holy Spirit, has a real objective personal existence. There are three distinct persons in the Godhead, the same in substance and equal in power and glory. Being one God, where the Spirit is or dwells, there the Father and the Son, are and dwell. And hence, throughout the New Testament, the current mode of representation is, that the church is the temple of God and body of Christ, because of the presence and indwelling of the Holy Ghost, who

* Preliminary Essay. p. 45.

is the source of knowledge, holiness and life. What the scriptures refer to the Holy Spirit, this system refers to the theanthropic nature of Christ, to a nature or life "in all respects human." This supercedes the Holy Spirit. Every reader, therefore, must be struck with the difficulty Dr. Nevin finds from this source. He does not seem to know what to do with the Spirit. His language is constrained, awkward and often unintelligible. He seems indeed sometimes to identify the Spirit with the theanthropic nature of Christ. "The Spirit of Christ," he says, "is not his representative or surrogate simply, as some would seem to think; but *Christ himself under a certain mode of subsistence;* Christ triumphant over all the limitations of his moral (mortal?) state (ζωοποιηθεις πνευματι), received up into glory, and thus invested fully and forever with his own proper order of being in the sphere of the Holy Ghost," p. 225. The Spirit of Christ, is then Christ as exalted. On the following page, he says: "The glorification of Christ then, was the full advancement of our human nature itself to the power of a divine life; and the Spirit for whose presence it [the glorification of Christ] made room in the world, was not the Spirit as extraanthropological simply, under such forms of sporadic and transient afflatus as had been known previously; but the Spirit as immanent now, through Jesus Christ, in the human nature itself—the form and power, in one word, of the new supernatural creation he had introduced into the world." Again, "Christ is not sundered from the church by the intervention of the Spirit. . . . No conception can be more unbiblical, than that by which the idea of Spirit (πνεῦμα) in this case, is restrained to the form of mere mind, whether as divine or human, in distinction from body. The *whole* glorified Christ subsists and acts *in the Spirit.* Under this form his nature communicates itself to his people." p. 229. But according to this book, the form in which his nature is communicated to his people, is that of "a true human life;" it is a human nature advanced to a divine power, which they receive. The Spirit is, therefore, not the third person of the Trinity, but the theanthropic nature of Christ as it dwells in the church. This seems to us the natural and unavoidable interpretation of these passages and of the general tenor of the book. We do not suppose that Dr. Nevin has consciously discarded the doctrine of the trinity; but we fear that he has adopted a theory which de-

stroys that doctrine. The influence of his early convictions and experience, and of his present circumstances, may constrain him to hold fast that article of the faith, in some form to satisfy his conscience. But his system must banish it, just so far as it prevails. Schleiermacher, formed under different circumstances, and less inwardly trammelled, openly rejected the doctrine. He wrote a system of theology, without saying a word about the Trinity. It has no place in his system; he brings it in only at the conclusion of his work, and explains it as God manifested in nature, God as manifested in Christ, and God as manifested in the church. With him the Holy Spirit, is the Spirit which animates the church. It had no existence before the church and has no existence beyond it. His usual expression for it is, "the common spirit" (Gemeingeist) of the church, which may mean either something very mystical, or nothing more than we mean by the spirit of the age, or spirit of a party, just as the reader pleases. It is in point of fact understood both ways. Burke once said, he never knew what the London beggars did with their cast-off clothes, until he went to Ireland. We hope we Americans are not to be arrayed in the cast-off clothes of the German mystics, and then marshalled in bands as the "Church of the Future."

We said at the commencement of this article, that we had never read Dr. Nevin's book on the Mystical Presence, until now. We have from time to time read other of his publications, and looked here and there into the work before us; and have thus been led to fear that he was allowing the German modes of thinking to get the mastery over him, but we had no idea that he had so far given himself up to their influence. If he has any faith in friendship and long continued regard, he must believe that we could not find ourselves separated from him by such serious differences, without deep regret, and will therefore give us credit for sincerity of conviction and purpose.

Art. V.—1. *Das Leben Johann Calvin's. Ein Zeugniss für die Wahrheit, von* Paul Henry, *Dr. der Theologie, Prediger und Seminar-Inspector zu Berlin.* Hamburg and Gotha. 1846. 8vo. pp. 498.

2. *Das Leben Johann Calvin's des grossen Reformators; u. s. w. von* Paul Henry, u. s. w. Dritter Band. Hamburg. 1844. pp. 872.

Eleven years ago we called attention to the life of Calvin, by Dr. Henry of Berlin, whose labours had not then attracted much notice in America.* In the two articles which were called forth by the first two volumes, we fully expressed our judgment of the biographer, and moreover presented a copious abstract of his narrative. When at length the third and closing volume made its appearance, there was less reason for reviewing it with so much detail as the others because the public had begun to be familiar with Dr. Henry's labours. An additional reason is now given in the appearance of an abridgment by the author, in a single volume, of which we have given the title above.

A likeness of Calvin serves as the frontispiece to this volume which we should like to see reproduced in America; for it is new, and varies in important respects from those cadaverous cuts of the great reformer, which in successive copies of copies have come to be about as authentic as John Rodgers in the New England Primer. In this one we behold a younger comelier visage, with the characteristic whisker and pointed beard, and cap, but with an upward gaze of pensive devotion. Dr. Henry regards this as the only accurate likeness. The original is one of two ancient paintings, preserved in a church on the Rhine; the other is the only extant portrait of Calvin's wife, Idelette de Bures. The well-known symbol is below; a heart in a hand; the legend, *Cor meum velut mactatum Domino in sacrificium offero.* The motto on the title is in the reformer's own words: "Shall a dog bark when his master is attacked, and shall I be silent when God's truth is impugned?"

Mr. Henry tells us in the Preface, that after having completed his large Memoir with documents, he was led to make this shorter one for the use of intelligent private Christians. A strong reason for this was also the zeal of ultramontane papists to stab the reformation in its principal defender, by such false and defamatory books as the lives of Luther and Calvin, by Au-

* Princeton Review, Jan. 1837. See also a subsequent notice of the second volume, July, 1839. p. 339.

din.* These volumes, which have been sedulously placed in most of the public libraries of our cities, are repositories of all the most inspissated filth and gall which were gendered by monastic hate in the sixteenth century. Erasmus early told us where Luther had touched the monks, and why they were roused. Calvin shot arrow after arrow, at their ignorance, treason and lust, till they entered on a revengeful warfare of calumny which their successors keep up. The reformers told tales on the holy fathers: *hinc illae lacrumae.* Hence the language of the shaveling might well be—"An accursed creed! it turneth him out of more dormitories than were contained in the palace of Priam, and strippeth from him the supervisorship of more kitchen-stoves than smoked for Elagabalus." Mr. Audin's mixture of romance and lies has been even translated into Germany, and well received by the party there. But here as elsewhere we see the union of Herod and Pilate, of infidelity and superstition. Next to the hatred of popery John Calvin has earned the hatred of neology. Audin the Romanist is not more bitter than some so-called Protestants and Genevese. Mr. Henry gives one of these some credit for earnestness, but boldly rejects his statements. The principal reference however is to Mr. Audin, who is in our day the champion of the crusade against the memory of this fearful and never-to-be-forgiven foe. It is wonderful how free-thinkers and no-thinkers of all hues, and libertines and heretics of all degrees, unite in vituperating this particular reformer. One would think he had been the only man of his age to maintain God's sovereign absolute decree. Who but children, do not know that it was equally though not so ably, maintained by all the heroes of the reformation? One would think that Calvin only had sinned in regard to the punishment of blaspheming heretics; and that there had never been an Anglican Cranmer, or an anabaptist victim. But modern heresy could no more forgive Calvin than ancient Rome could forgive Hannibal. Malign Calvin, and you not only carry the populace but hide a multitude of sins. Vamp up an old distortion of the story of Servetus, and your fortune is made, with every Pelagian, Socinian, and Atheist in the land.

* Histoire de la vie, des ouvrages et des doctrines de Calvin, par M. Audin, auteur de l' histoire de Luther. Paris 1841.

In the matter of Servetus, we have fully discharged our conscience in a monograph in this work, published in our January number for the year 1836. To that article we refer all readers who may desire to know how far Calvin participated in that sin of his age; nor shall we at present re-open this extensive question.

It is not unworthy of notice, that while Dr. Merle at Geneva has been depicting Luther, Dr. Henry at Berlin has been depicting Calvin. Our author is a native of Germany, but of French descent. Being educated for the ministry in a time of great coldness he was attracted to Geneva, by the traditionary glories of that evangelical centre, but when he arrived there he was no less amazed and disappointed than young Martin Luther when he visited Rome. At the tomb of Calvin all was wintry rationalism. The young German lodged in a street where the reformer had once dwelt, and preached in the pulpit where his eloquence had sounded, and resolved to endeavour something for evangelical truth. In this he was encouraged by good Dr. Malan, then in the early part of his remarkable career, in which he has since been followed by many with blessed results. We give in a condensed abstract, the author's reasons for loving, honouring and describing Calvin; for this our readers will thank us:

"My own father was librarian as well as pastor. He once brought me Drelincourt's Vindication, adding that when he was a youth he had himself thought of defending Calvin, as the world had done him injustice. My father was a man of marked and glowing character: he was born on the 27th of October, the day of Servetus's death, and was ordained on the 24th of August, the day of the Bartholomew-massacre. Though attached to his Prussian home, he was an enthusiast for the Reformed church. In fancy, he lived in Languedoc, in Nismes, whence our family emigrated. He preached after the old French models, and was remarkable in the pulpit for his fine apostolic bearing. My eyes were for these reasons early directed to the south of France, the preachings in the wilderness, the martyr-history of our church, and I learnt to live over those days of suffering. Fain would I have written a history of the whole Reformed Church, but materials were wanting; yet I saw the basis of it all in the life Calvin, and hoped that others would collect something towards the further edifice. In this I was not disappointed. Major

Polenz of Peilau has with unwearied zeal made journeys to gather documents for this great undertaking, connected with a part of church-history as yet neglected. When once, somewhat later, I found the works of the great reformer aloft in our little library, I felt myself transported to the Geneva lake and the encircling Alps, where Calvin lived. Here also were a number of old editions, among the rest the *Opuscules de Calvin* in old French, which are extant in no other library, not even in that of Geneva, and which thus seemed put into my very hands as if I had been destined to the labour. I afterwards talked over the matter with our celebrated church-historian Neander; and he lamented that the manuscripts which were lying unemployed at Geneva (and which were transcribed for Dr. McCrie) were not in my hands. I therefore took measures for securing not only these, but all those which were in Switzerland, Paris and other places. These preparations took up some time, meanwhile the McCries, both father and son, died, and the life of Calvin became the reigning thought of mine. By little and little he stood out before me a very different man from all that is depicted in the histories of the day. His correspondence, which is indeed his Diary, filled me with love for his pure and simple nature. Drawn as I was by his quiet and immoveableness, I saw how significant his character for our day of vacillation. His presbyterial church-government struck me as a model for our disturbed Prussian church. Notwithstanding all this, his life was unwritten."

From one who enters upon his labours in this affectionate and reverent spirit every thing is to be expected. The writings of Dr. Henry have been extensively read, and have excited opposition from several quarters. From the old high-and-dry Lutherans, the Breslau men, who make Consubstantiation as essential to grace, as your good Episcopalian zealot does the figment of three orders and a bishop's touch, this memoir of Calvin has had no quarter. From the latitudinary Genevese pastors it can expect as little. But all this makes it more acceptable to us. We once had the honour of hearing an eminent fellow-townsman of our great subject, the learned and venerable Mr. Gallatin, cite a passage from Guizot, in which this celebrated Protestant thus expresses himself. "Zuingle was the martyr of the Reformation—Luther was the champion of the Reformation—Calvin was

the legislator of the Reformation." While no church is ever named after Zuingle; and while the affection of Germany clings more to the personality than either the creed or ritual of Luther; they who honour John Calvin have ever been ready to forget the man in the doctrines, the argument, and the polity. So that if you would behold the impress of the Reformer of Geneva, you must look at the Confessions and the Cultus of the entire Reformed Churches,—one excepted—the Anglican, once allied, having now chosen to draw off with a "tendimus in Latium."

With the indulgence of gentle readers, we would take up the slender thread of story which we laid down nine years ago,* and would under Dr. Henry's guidance survey for a little the labours of Calvin towards the unity and confirmation of the Church. The period is from 1550 to 1564. This includes his vindication of the unity of truth against a host of schismatic and heretic enemies.

Luther is less hated than Calvin. To protest and fight against abuses is less offensive than to settle an antagonist body on calm foundations. The champion was less annoying than the legislator. Dr. Henry offers some acute remarks on the remarkable prevalence of Calvin's constructive genius, even, in some instances, over Lutheranism. In America, he might have said, both Prelatists and Lutherans have adopted the Geneva tenet in regard to lay-representation; while all the Huguenots, Dutch, German, and Scotch Presbyterians, and all the Puritans adopted his doctrines. Even during his lifetime this wonderful potency of the truth which he wielded began to appear. Amidst a storm of conflicting opinions, such as no succeeding age has equalled, the theological pilot was unquestionably John Calvin. He was equally looked to, by Swiss pastors, Scottish lords of the congregation, and English dignitaries. In our days these last quote him only when they can sift out of his writings some grain of allowance toward any *tolerabiles ineptias*, some sufferance of liturgy, some inkling of confirmation. It was otherwise with Cranmer and Somerset.

Amidst this acknowledged predominance he bore his honours meekly, and like a child bowed himself to the word of God. His friends, the martyrs, and his fellow-labourers, saw in his deter-

* See Princeton Review, 1839. p. 369.

mination not pride but fear of God. But he was called to endure hatred. "Rather would I burn at the stake of the Papists," said he, "than daily be torn thus by the slanders of my neighbours. My only consolation is, that death will soon free me from this hard soldiership." Yet there was not only hate, but love; and love not only from Farel, Viret, Beza, Renata,* Joanna, and Coligni, but from others more remote still. There was a certain Augustinian, Spina, or l'Espine, whom we afterwards find at Poissy, and who distinguished himself as a theologian. He had seen Calvin on a journey and could no longer live without him. He writes to the reformer, in a letter which Dr. Henry gives entire, and which breathes the most admiring enthusiasm. It reveals some glimpse of that amazing personal influence which Calvin exercised over those who came within his immediate circle. L'Espine had seen Italy, once the mistress of the world, and there had resolved next to see Calvin. Having so done, he writes: "In that brief interview, thou didst so increase my love to thee, by a certain mysterious fascination in thy words, that I still long after thee, now that we are separated. The Lord Jesus Christ preserve thee safe and unhurt--thee, the truest and most needful of his servants in this evil time."

It was the earnest desire of Calvin to oppose to the pretended unity of Rome, a real evangelical alliance of sound protestants. He urged this on, with indefatigable effort, during all the closing periods of his life, by books, by discourses, and especially by correspondence. No man ever lived who more vehemently longed for the union of the reformed churches than he who has been perpetually calumniated as a divider and a bigot. This it was which brought him into a seeming connexion with Cranmer. Calvin nowhere fully declares his judgment of the archbishop. It should seem, as Henry observes, that the strong man discerned the weak; but let us not forget that the latter recanted his recantation and suffered for Christ's truth. The writing is extant in which Calvin says to Cranmer, that the hope of his soul is in the union of protestants in an orthodox confession; and in which he adds, concerning unity: "but the Lord will know how to maintain unto us the unity of a true faith, in a wonderful man-

* For a valuable notice of Renata, or Renée, Duchess of Ferrara, the firm friend of the persecuted Protestants in Italy, see Dr. Baird's "Protestantism in Italy," p. 61.

ner, and by means wholly unknown to us now, as he hath been wont to do from the foundation of the world, so that we be not rent asunder by the strifes of men." It was in reference to this subject of Unity, which again has come up for earnest discussion in our time, that Calvin wrote his work upon Scandals. Among these scandals he instances Servetus and the Libertines, of whom we have formerly spoken.*

It is impossible to write the life of Calvin without treating of Predestination and Election. Dr. Henry has shown no disposition to shun them. The doctrine of God's Sovereignty is the base of the theological column. Men may sneer or rage, according to their respective temperaments, but this point still continues to exercise all deep-thinking minds. The feud between the Jesuits and the Jansenists turned on the same. The Reformer knew it was in vain to parley or play with the foils; he drove his weapon to the enemy's heart; he aimed to slay all human self-exaltation. He gave God the spoils of glory won from man. His doctrine, as Dr. Henry well says, is that of Paul, of Augustine, and of Jansenius. The heat of the reformation-conflict on this topic was in and after the year 1551.

Geneva has been a favourite asylum for exiles. This was eminently true in the sixteenth century. Among resident great men was the good Marquis of Vico, or Galeazzo Carriaciolo; who left beautiful Naples, delightful connexions, an aged father, a beloved wife, his children and palace, to enjoy freedom of creed and worship in Geneva. It was he who uttered the immortal saying, when invited to return to his possessions: "Let the money of all such perish with them, as esteem all the gold in the world worth one day's society with Jesus Christ and his Holy Spirit!" Another noble exile was a Frenchman, the lord of Bourgogne and Falais, who after a long correspondence, came with his wife, to Geneva. He had in his retinue a physician named Bolzec. This Bolzec, once a Carmelite friar, sank from one degree to another, till he became the reviler of Calvin, in a work of which all the calumny and vileness are kept embalmed by the papists, to be used whenever it is necessary to blaspheme the memory of their tormentor.

On a certain 16th of October, John Andreas was preaching

*Princeton Review, 1836. p. 74.

the Friday sermon in the cathedral. In those free days permission was given to discuss matter of doctrine, when the sermon was over. Andreas had exercised on John viii. 47, and had somewhat uncompromisingly brought out the doctrine of Election. When he ended, there came forward a man from the assembly, who loudly and bitterly denounced the said doctrine as derogatory to the character of God. This was none other than the Carmelite, Bolzec. He reviled the clergy and summoned the people to forsake them. Calvin was not in his usual place; but from among the people he had listened to the assault upon a truth he held so sacred. Scarcely had the monk done speaking when the reformer pressed through the crowd, and fell upon the adversary with all the force and sharpness of his argumentation. Farel was also present, and admonished the people, with his characteristic fire and majesty. Bolzec, according to what was universally considered legitimate in that age, was subjected to process, but the ministers besought the council not to adjudicate, but to refer the question to their Swiss brethren. This they did. According to Henry, answers came from Zurich, Berne and Basle; all against Calvin's mode of stating the doctrine. Indeed the heroic man was sometimes in situations where he had against him Melancthon and the Germans, Bullinger, Musculas, and all whom he revered, except Farel, Viret and Beza. One cannot but think of the adage, *Athanasius contra mundum.*

On the 18th of December, 1551, Calvin delivered a sermon on eternal election, and all the preachers, twelve in number, signed it. After this all the preachers spoke on the same point and Calvin invited such as had doubts to express them, so that they might come to an agreement. A few added something, and Calvin closed with prayer. Out of these materials he wrought a particular treatise, dedicated to the council, January 1, 1552; all the preachers signed it, and this is the famous Consensus of the Geneva ministers.

One Troillet, lately an Eremite in Burgundy, but now a protestant and a member of the great council, threw up against Calvin the objection common to all his opponents, that he made God the author of sin, and that his Institutiones contained false doctrine. This was uttered in the taverns, the usual rendezvous of the Libertines; their hope was now at length to expel him from the town. The confusion was such that the council

had to beg Farel and Viret to come to town to make the peace. Yet all resulted advantageously to Calvin; the recorded decision being that his book is good and holy and his doctrine conformable to the Word of God. When Troillet lay dying, he sent for Calvin, and said he could not die in peace till he had his forgiveness; and Calvin staid by him till his last breath. But the conflict went on in strange cities. In Berne, Calvin was called a villain and a heretic. Preachers anathematized him from the pulpit. The Bernese tradesmen were forbidden to partake of the communion at Geneva. Much of all this arose from the jealousy between Berne and Geneva. Through all these debates, Beza, then professor at Lausanne, fought side by side with Calvin, and gained over to the same side the clergy of his canton. He undertook journeys on foot to bring over persons of note. He compassed that by love which Calvin failed to accomplish by storm. The keenest opponent of Calvin was Castellio, at Basle; his principal work appeared anonymously, in 1554. The piquant irony of this man was not without its influence. The Lutherans had begun to lapse from the strict doctrine of their leader, on the election of grace. Some of them appeared to forget that Luther, Zwingle and Calvin were as one on this point; and that Calvin had only set it in a clearer light, by his surpassing logical genius. There were Lutherans, says Dr. Henry, who taught (much as Wesley and the Unitarians have since taught) that the God of Calvinists is a tyrant, a murderer, and even worse than the devil.

The foulest page in the history of the Reformation is that which contains the sacramentarian controversy; it reveals the darkest shade in the character of the noble and lovely Luther. That the two great arms of the protestant host should have been torn asunder on such a question would be scarcely credible, if we were not familiar with another sacramentarian controversy, which has divided the Lord's table in twain, walling off those who have been immersed from those who have not. Such a dead fly in the ointment of a great and noted leader is not simply of "a stinking savour:" it is poisonous. Polemical history offers few specimens of such revilings as were lavished on Zwingle and Calvin by Martin Luther; and the enmity spread far and wide. On the death of Edward the Sixth, the reformation was arrested

in England. Peter Martyr fled. In 1553, Lasky, Laski, or Alasco, the Polish nobleman who had forsaken all for Christ, and who was the pastor of a flock in London, escaped to the continent with one hundred and seventy-five of these. Scattered by storms they at length reached the Danish port of Helsingör. The event is memorable. The king of Denmark was favourable; but these poor exiles and confessors met opposition in a strange quarter. The king's chaplain was a bigoted Lutheran. With unchristian insolence, he chose an occasion when Lasky by royal invitation was present, to inveigh against the Reformed church. The exiles were forced, winter as it was, again to take up their pilgrimage, and seek a home; not even tender mothers, nor those who were soon to be such, could be suffered to remain. The fugitives resorted to Hamburg. There they were delivered to the tender mercies of that great and notorious disputant, Joachim Westphal. Westphal, according to Dr. Henry, was one of those inflated characters, theologians without Christ, who think they are like Luther, when they assume his roughest ways; those whom Calvin used to call "apes of Luther." He resolved that the Reformed exiles should be denied entrance to Hamburg. They did not believe in the real presence. They were told that Hamburg could better endure papists than them. Only Lasky's children were allowed to remain until spring. Westphal denominated the refugees "martyrs of the devil;" and this rage of hate spread through and beyond Germany like a plague. Even Bugenhagen would not recognise these sufferers as Christians; and the enmity of the Lutherans pursued them not only in Hamburg, but in Lubeck and in Rostock, whither they afterwards went; Danzig only received them. Lasky went to Emden, and was received with honour, and he was invited to Sweden by Gustavus Vasa. Here transpired the dreadful fact, that there were high-church Lutherans, so like papists, as to hold that there was no being saved out of their body, or without a conformity to every tittle of their creed; and that he who did not believe in the real presence was a child of the devil. Both Henry and Merle d'Aubigné assure us that this fanatical infatuation is not altogether extinct; and we know enough of the phrensy of Anglo-catholic arrogance, in regard to other externals, to credit the statement. Notwithstanding these

enmities, the Reformed faith made extensive progress in the German states.*

In 1552, Westphal sent his first firebrand into the Lord's harvest. He declared the error of the Reformed touching the eucharist to be one on which the magistrate should lay his hand. In a second writing, he blew a loud blast of summons to all the sons of bigotry. The news had now reached the Swiss mountains, that the poor exiles from England had been driven away by Danish and Hamburg Christians, because they were in fellowship with Geneva and Zurich. Peter Martyr conveyed the tidings to Calvin. Need any one doubt how it was received by such a soul as his? Roused beyond measure at the brutal ferocity of the man, more than at the absurdity of the tenet, he despised all limits of reserve. Somewhat later, he takes this retrospect of it: "It is a clear proof of Westphal's cruelty, that he clamours against poor fugitives. As if it were not enough to hinder them from gaining a rest, and to scatter them, some in one direction and some in another, amidst the cold of a severe winter, begging meanwhile a little pause to take breath, he does all that in him lies to forbid their reception into other cities." "If I have transcended the limit, I hope the justice of my cause will secure me mild and forgiving judges." Calvin afterwards owned that the tone of his first publication against Westphal was too severe; it was prepared in the heat of his fresh indignation, a few days after the news arrived, and was dictated with rapidity to a scribe. The effect on Westphal was unfortunate. His rage was quickened towards Lasky and the refugees; whom he was now minded to thrust out of Frankfort. He avows, that "he complains of them, not merely as of thieves, incendiaries and poisoners, but worse, as of those who by false doctrine destroy souls." This drew out from Calvin a second and a third reply, after which he was silent. But he wrote about the same time his conviction, that if the great and good Luther were alive, he would never have countenanced such enormity. We cannot follow the sacramentarian controversy into its ramifications, which are traced with sufficient exactness in the larger work.

We are not composing a life of Calvin, and therefore we pass directly to the interesting period, from 1553 and onwards, in

* Merle d'Aubigné's "Germany, England and Scotland," page 35.

which his influence was felt over all the Reformed churches. Our attention is particularly drawn by his relations to Knox. Dr. Henry censures the Scottish reformer for giving a political basis to the church of Scotland, and thinks him much inferior to Calvin herein. In this we regard him as unjust. He ascribes to Knox likewise a sterner opposition to the prelacy and the Anglican forms, than existed in Calvin. He says justly that the leading English reformers would have reformed much more nearly after the Geneva model, if it had not been for their state enemies. Knox fled to Switzerland during the brightest period of Calvin's life; for, attracted by the fame of his works, good and learned men were streaming towards Geneva from all parts of Europe. The two reformers were of the same age, but the austere and indomitable, Knox treated his great coeval with filial reverence, and finding his ideal of a church realized, he gave himself, at the age of fifty years, to the guidance of an acknowledged superior. English refugees flocked during Mary's reign to Strasburg, Basle, Zurich, Geneva, and other places, where they founded churches. In all these the predominating influ ence of Calvin was felt."*

The history of French Presbyterianism has never been presented as it deserves to be, in flowing and coloured narrative. The old writers were dry annalists, and Dr. Merle d'Aubigné has not yet fully treated the period. We have on a former occasion offered an humble contribution to this great topic.† Dr. Henry's memoir contains much that is of stirring interest concerning Calvin's influence on the reformation in France. He was a Frenchman, and he never forgot it; no Protestant in the kingdom was offended that Calvin burned not. French Protestantism had to contend against the combined courts of Rome, Paris and Madrid; against Jesuits, and assassins, and courtezans. The year 1553 was signalized by numerous martyrs, especially the five students of Lyons. Every prison witnessed to the zeal of Calvin. Hear a Romanist, Pasquier, on this point: "We sometimes saw our gaols overflowing with poor abused creatures, whom he incessantly exhorted, comforted, and confirmed by his letters, as well as by messengers, who found entrance in spite of every effort of the gaolers."

* No reader should fail to make himself acquainted with the lately printed Zurich Letters.

† See our volume for 1840, p. 71.

It was during this dark time that an event occurred which has escaped the notice of many American antiquaries and historians. We mean the emigration of French Protestants to Brazil. To call this a mission, Dr. Henry thinks inaccurate.* Yet it appears from the letters of Richer, the preacher of the refugees, that they were not without some thoughts of converting the heathen. Villegagnon, a knight of Malta, gave the great Coligni reason to believe that he was about to secure a spot in America, where the persecuted protestants might find a refuge. The admiral was won by the benevolent prospect. A small island, we suppose it to have been near Rio de Janeiro, was occupied by Villegagnon, in the name of Coligni. Ministers of the word were now demanded, and Richer and Chartier were sent from Geneva. But, by a hideous treachery, these poor non-conformists of the South, less favoured than their later brethren of Plymouth, were fiercely pursued under the French edicts. Four of them witnessed a good confession, and were cast into the sea: the rest escaped to France. Jean de Lery, afterwards a minister at Berne, was an eyewitness of these atrocities, which he described on his return.

The unusual interest which attaches to this somewhat obscure chapter in history justifies us in adding a few more particulars. Nicolas de Villegagnon was vice-admiral in Brittany, under Henry II. Being disappointed and chagrined, because his services were not sufficiently recognised, he put himself at the head of the expedition aforesaid. There were two excellent ships, and they set sail in 1555. The river Coligni, at which they made settlement, is sufficiently pointed out by the rude approximative statement of the latitude.† The natives were kind, but the settlers had more than the usual trials of colonists. Richer, whom we just now named, was fifty years of age, and Chartier about thirty. Even on their voyage they were ill-treated by the people of Villegagnon. They landed on the 7th of March, 1556, and showed their letters, to which was appended the name of Calvin. The perfidious governor did not at first throw aside the mask, but even went so far as to partake of the Lord's supper, according to the protestant rite, as appears from Richer's letter to Calvin. In this letter are several things worthy of

* Guericke, Kirchengesch. p. 1151.

† Où le pole antarctique s'élève sur l'horizon 23 degrés quelque peu moins.

more special notice than we can here bestow. There is much naïveté and piety in the good missionary's report. The people are rude, he says, though he knows not assuredly that they are cannibals. They have no sense of right and wrong, and no idea of God, so that there is little hope of making Christ known to them. The language is a chief hinderance. Nothing can be hoped until there are more settlers, by whose converse and example the Indian people may be christianized. A certain learned doctor Cointiac used the preachers ill, and declared himself an enemy of the Huguenot worship. In this he was now joined by Villegagnon, who suspended Richer from his functions. Chartier was sent to Europe to represent the matters in contest. Villegagnon now began to persecute, and forbade the wretched exiles to escape. Richer and his companions retired to the forest, where they were humanely treated by the savages. But others, who endeavoured to get off by ship, were seized and imprisoned. Villegagnon, in his new zeal for popery, condemned five Huguenots to death, under the ordonnances of Francis I. and Henry II. One Bordel was cast into the sea, to die as a martyr: so died also Vermeil and Pierre Bourdon. Villegagnon returned to France, and wrote against the gospel, but was answered by Richer. The persecutor died wretched and impenitent.

We love to view the name of Calvin in its just connexion with those of Coligni and Condé, the leader of the Reformed party. There is something noble in the tone which prevails in his admonitions of these great men. He before whom the fearless Knox stood in filial awe, was not to be terrified by men-at-arms, or even by princes. Well did he know how to approach these frank and valiant natures. Writing to Coligni, then a close prisoner in the Low Countries, he assures him that something more than courage is demanded, and suggests that God has brought him into this afflictive seclusion on purpose to gain his ear. "Wherefore, Monseigneur, I pray you, seeing God hath given you this opportunity to profit in his school, even as if he would speak with you privily in the ear, that you would be attentive, the better to taste how valuable his doctrine, and how precious and lovely it should be to us; and that you would diligently give yourself to read his holy word, to receive instructiou, and to have a living root of faith, to the end that through life,

you may be firm to do battle against all temptations. In our day every thing is allowable, save only the pure honouring of God." So also, with all the frankness and fearlessness which we observe in Knox and Latimer, he addressed himself to Condé, in 1563, warning him against his sins, and particularly against his amours.* Indeed Calvin was now at an elevation which was never reached by any reformer, not excepting even Luther and Knox: we mean in the deference paid to his opinion. To be in his correspondence was an honour. For him to retract or change a dedication (as he did in several well-known instances) was a penalty that was felt†. The helm of the Reformation was fairly in his hand. The Papists might well be alarmed, and be meditating their great Carlist and Medicean treatment, for the Presbyterians of France came to be reckoned by millions. So rapidly spread the seed, that in 1561 labourers were demanded beyond all power of supply at Geneva, for new harvests in and about Lyons, Nismes, Gap, Orleans, and Poitiers. In the region of Tournon, there were three hundred parishes at once, which had set aside the mass, and were without preachers. Meanwhile the personal labours of Calvin in teaching and preaching were unwearied. The hearers of his lectures amounted to thousands. Some of his best Commentaries were now going abroad. These as is well known were in great measure the publication by the press of his oral discourses and expositions. When it is considered that these comprise interpretations of the whole of the New Testament, except the Apocalypse, the reader will judge how much respect is due to an absurd charge recently printed against Calvin, namely, that during the twenty years "he ruled Geneva," he preached nineteen hundred and twenty-five ser-

*"Or nous serions traistres en Vous dissimulant les bruits qui courent. Nous n' estimons pas qu'il y ait du mal ou Dieu ne soit directement offensé, mais qu'on orra dire que Vous faictes l'amour aux Dames, cela est pour deroger beaucoup à votre authorité et reputation."

†In Calvin's day a dedication was a serious affair; no marvel, in this case, when we consider that the inscription to any one of a work by the Reformer, was eqnal to a monumental marble; equally enduring and more widely known. The changes of these compositions are curious. For example, the commentary on Genesis was dedicated, first, in 1554, to the sons of the elector of Saxony, and then rn 1563, to young Henry of Navarre. The work on the Acts of the Apostles was dedicated, in the first edition, to king Christian of Denmark and his son; but in the second, to Prince Nicholas Radziwill. The Corinthians, first to Burgundy, then to Vico. We have examined, during our preparation of these pages a fine black-letter folio of the Institutes, in English, printed in London, in 1562. It contains the famous Dedication to Francis.

mons, of which not a single one is founded upon a text taken from either of the gospels.*

It is better to pass by certain invaluable portions of this volume, than to destroy their force by mutilation. Otherwise we might fill many pages with accounts of the Convention of Poissy, in 1561; the first religious war; the League; and the clear, decided declaration of Calvin, against taking up arms for the gospel; the massacre at Vassy; the Confession of the Reformed, presented to the Diet at Frankfort; the battle of Dreux; the fall, remorse and assassination of the Duke of Guise; the heroism of Coligni, and the peace of Amboise. But all these should be studied in detail, and as preparations for the coming Bartholomew's Day, and *Strages Hugonottorum.* The rapid description of this first religious war, (for Calvin did not live to see the second) is given in the abridgment, with a graphic liveliness which Dr. Henry has not reached in his more elaborate work; it is one of the noblest chapters in history.

The closing years of Calvin's life were overhung with external clouds, strongly in contrast with the tranquillity of his bosom. His position was too public for any great event even to take place in the reformed countries without affecting him in some degree; and it was a season of great events. The commanding minds of France were perpetually borrowing his lights; they knew that no man living surpassed him in coolness, perspicacity, constructive logic, statesmanship, and intrepidity. But there is gross injustice in the vulgar charges of seditious or even ambitious intermeddling with politics, and in the histories which make him responsible for every violence even of the exasperated Huguenots. A page may be allowed us on this topic, especially as we do not look at the facts from the same point of view with Dr. Henry; his medium is decidedly German, rather than Anglo-

* This amusing statement is quoted in the Literary World, for 1847, No. 40, page 321. We will not offer our readers the disrespect of arguing upon it. The works of Calvin are sufficiently known to the learned world, and none more so, than his elaborate and affectionate exposition of the four Gospels. We will seize this occasion however to add a bibliographical remark. The Commentary on John appeared first in 1553. both in Latin and French. The Harmony of the other three evangelists appeared first in 1555. In all subsequent editions, the whole were conjoined. They appeared, in Latin, in successive editions, of 1560, 1563, 1572, and 1582; and in French, 1559, 1561, 1563. The German translation, Heidelberg, 1590; and the Dutch, Dort, 1625. Most of these were in folio, and the earlier ones were from the press of Robert Stephens.

American. Writers in countries where the imputation of republicanism is disgraceful or dangerous, have found it good policy to load Calvin and Presbyterians with the charge of being anti-monarchical. It was the corner-stone of king James's structure: *No bishop, no king.* To prove the dangers of presbytery, Geneva and the French insurrections have been diligently pointed out. Calvin, they have said, was the author of the civil wars. Romish pamphleteers have propagated it, with as little question as the liquefaction at Naples or the apostolical succession. The great Bossuet makes Calvin the guilty person in the conspiracy of Amboise and the murder of Guise.* The thing has been taken for granted; Calvin is the foe of kings. He strove to republicanize the people. The elective forms of presbytery foreshadowed popular government.† Even protestant writers have blamed the reformer as allowing his reform to degenerate into a worldly policy. Thus Sayous, as quoted by Henry, charges him with pressing the alliance of the protestant cantons, Savoy and France, and thus abandoning his noted watchword, The weapons of our warfare are not carnal. Such historians willingly forget that millions of Frenchmen, including some of the oldest houses in the kingdom, and personages of royal blood, were protestants; that the Guises were pushing them to the very precipice of destruction; that to arm themselves and fight to the death, with the chivalry of Old France, was an instinctive impulse which a thousand Calvins and Bezas could not have turned aside; and that the political agitations in which they were engaged were forced on them by their persecutors. Passive non-resistance has never been a part of the Presbyterian creed; our enemies, we believe, are apprized of this. But Calvin was no propagandist in politics. He held all forms of government to be compatible with Christianity. He allowed resistance to tyrants. He declared his preference for a free commonwealth. In the Institutiones, inscribed as they were to the king of France, he discusses with a noble independence the three forms of polity, and with a reserve and caution truly singular in that day, pronounces that while monarchy tends towards

* See History of Edict of Nantes, London, 1694. p. 23.

† "Les écrits clandestins que l'école de Calvin lança, prouvent, qu'elle cherchoit à introduire les idées républicains parmi le peuple. Les formes du Calvinisme s'y prêtoient admirablament, tout étoit en electif, la nouvelle Eglise posoit toute sa force dans le principe de l'égalité." See Vol. III. p. 541.

despotism, popular rule tends as clearly towards sedition. But he prefers a republican form, as that in which man shall be more fully a check on man, and as that which, somewhat modified by the aristocratic element, was prescribed for Israel.* But in all this he avoids every exaggeration, and enjoins obedience to magistrates. We challenge the production of an equal fragment of political wisdom from any work of the sixteenth century.

War for civil rights is one thing; lawless bloodshed is another. Bossuet fails to make Calvin accountable for the latter, when he parades his proof of the former. The arming against the Guises, was a defensive war, entered upon in due form; the image-breaking violence of Adretz was an unauthorized freak of passion, declared by Calvin to be an offence, "un horrible scandale pour diffamer l'Evangile." So vehemently did he oppose the Amboise conspiracy, that at first he considered himself as having quashed it. When sounded about it, a second time, he expressed abhorrence. And when a third time questioned, he called his colleagues together, and made an open protest. He thundered from the pulpit, saying, "It were better a hundred times we should all perish, than be the cause of such a stigma on the name of Christians and the Gospel."

But the conquering party has not been able to corrupt all history. Every successive search into archives will bring forth more truth and glory for the Presbyterians of France. Though many of their descendants in America have chosen to abandon the liberal tenets of these great men, they are not willing to forget all their heroism. We own that there is no page in all our history over which we are stirred to a more indignant animation and admiring love. After the massacre of sixty poor Calvinists at Vassi, in 1562, the king of Navarre complained to Beza, forsooth, that the Protestants went armed to Church. Then spake that true son of John Calvin: "Sire," replied Beza, "most true it is, that God's church, in whose name I speak, is bounden to take blows, rather than give; for she serves unto Christ, under the cross, and yields her neck to persecutors. Yet, may it please your Majesty to remember, that *she is an anvil that hath already broken many hammers.*"† A few years later, when Calvin was in paradise, the popish tyranny displayed the

* Instt. lib. iv. §, cap. 20, § .8

† Laval, ii. 33.

very temper and results which he had predicted. Sum up in memory a few of these facts. In 1581, when contradiction would have been easy, it was stated, that there had been slain by the sword, or in massacres for Christ's sake, from the church of Caen above 15,000; from that of Alençon, 5,000; from Paris, 13,000; from Rheims, 12,000; from Troyes, 12,000; from Sens, 9000; from Orleans, 8,000; from Poitiers, 12,000. In Paris alone more than ten thousand perished within a fortnight. The Bartholomew's massacre numbered by papist reckoning 30,000; according to others 100,000.* The Revocation and the Dragonades are only consistent results of the same policy; it is that of hierarchy and Rome; it flows from the demand of Uniformity. No protestant church so nearly lost its visibility as that of France. Persecution, exile, extermination; this was the series. At the beginning of our century one had to search for a protestant assembly. How wonderfully is God rekindling the fire on these altars, and verifying the legend around the burning-bush on the public seal of the National Synod of the Reformed in France, as adopted in 1583, Flagror non Consumor.

It is time for us to approach the last days and dying-bed of Calvin; and in doing this it is our desire to give some representation of Dr. Henry's narrative and reflections, without confining ourselves to his words. The life of the great reformer had been a struggle amidst storms, but the storms were driving him into the haven. He could look back with joy and thankfulness on a work that was done. His iron persistence abode to the very last. This was evinced in his friendship, not only for Farel and Viret and Beza, but for Melancthon. His resolution was greatly tried by bodily pains, which were so severe as at times almost to deprive him of reason. Thus he writes to the Queen of Navarre, that he was almost dissolved by excruciating distresses which continued for a fortnight. In the midst of these sufferings he was burdened with great public cares. Just then, the fearful league of the popish states was in progress, and Calvin used every conceivable means to procure protection for the reformed churches. He dragged himself from his bed to the desk, and it was marvellous how a spirit so mighty could be retained by so crazy a habitation. Every word, so Beza tells us, even in his most poignant sufferings, showed the joy and power of his

* Laval, iii. lib. 5.

soul. Lifting his eyes to heaven he would often say, "O Lord, how long!" an expression which had been frequent with him, especially when he heard of any sufferings of the brethren. At length he was forced to keep his bed, though he still retained the power of speech. When advised to intermit his labours his common answer was: "What! would you have my Lord when he comes to find me idle?"

On the 10th of March, 1564, when the council heard of his danger, it was unanimously resolved to commend him to God in prayer. They also sent him his stipend of twenty-five gold pieces, as a help in his illness. But, true to his character, even here, he declined this, saying that as he could no longer render service his conscience forbade him to receive emolument.

"When all of us came together, the clergy of town and country, on the 10th of March," says Beza, "we found him out of bed, and sitting by a little table, at which he was accustomed to write or meditate. We were surprised at the shortness of his breath. When he saw us coming, after he had been sometime silent, with his head leaning on his hand, as his manner was when musing, he at length spoke, lifting himself up, with a broken voice, but an indescribable cheerfulness of countenance: Beloved Brethren, I give you great thanks for your tender care towards me. In a fortnight I think I shall meet with you for the last time (meaning the day of the stated fraternal *Censura*), and then the Lord will reveal what he has decreed, and will take me to himself. On that day, accordingly, he was present. After the censures had been peacefully disposed of, which occupied two hours and a half, he said that some reprieve appeared to be vouchsafed to him of the Lord; and, asking for a French New Testament, he read aloud the notes in the margin, and asked the opinions of the brethren; for he was proposing correction of the annotations. The day following he was not so well. Yet on the 27th he caused himself to be carried to the door of the Council-House, and ascended the stairs, supported by two attendants, to the assembly-room. He there nominated to the council a new rector for the Gymnasium, to whom the usual oath was administered. Upon this Calvin rose from a lower place where he had been, and removing his cap, thanked the lords for the kind offices which he had received from them, especially for their kindness during his illness, for he felt that he had 'come hither for the

last time.' These words he could scarcely utter, for failure of voice. Then he bade farewell to the lords of council, who were in tears- The first day of Easter-week came on (it was the 2d of April), Calvin was very weak, but he wished to celebrate the festival of the resurrection with the church. He was taken to the house of God in a chair, listened to the whole sermon, received the Lord's supper," continues Beza, "from my hand, and joined with the congregation in the last hymn. It was the song of Simeon, 'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace.' His voice trembled, but his countenance showed that peace which only the gospel can bestow."

On the 25th of April he was engaged about his last will and testament. He left about 225 crowns, dying a poor man. The instrument is the product of an humble heart; it contains also much paternal affection. The solemnity moreover with which he adheres to the legal form is observable and edifying.

The last will and testament of Luther is no less characteristic of the man. "Well known am I," he writes, "in heaven, earth and hell, and I hold my standing such that I may be fully believed; inasmuch as God, out of his fartherly mercy, hath committed to me, although a corrupt and miserable sinner, the gospel of his Son, and hath caused me to be true and faithful therein, so that many in the world have received it through me, and have known me as the teacher of truth, seeing I have despised the ban of the pope, emperor, princes and priests, with the hate of all the devils. How then shall it be less than credible, if the witness of my hand stands for it, and if it is said: thus hath written Doctor Martin Luther, God's notary, and the witness of his Gospel?" If we admire the loftiness of Luther, says Henry, we must love the humility of Calvin. "First of all," says the will, "I render thanks to God for that he hath not only had pity on me his poor creature, drawing me out of the abyss of idolatry wherein I was plunged, and bringing me to the clearness of his gospel, and making me a partaker in the doctrine of salvation, of which I was wholly unworthy; and in continuing his mercy to sustain me, amidst so many sins and infirmities, which well deserved that I should be rejected of him a hundred thousand times; but, what is more, for that he hath so far extended to me his mercy, as to employ me and my labours, to bear and proclaim the truth of his gospel. Meanwhile, I protest my wish

to live and die in this faith which he hath given me; having no other hope nor refuge but in his gratuitous adoption, in which all my salvation is founded; embracing the grace, which he hath given me in our Lord Jesus Christ, and accepting the merit of his death and passion, to the end, that by this means all my sins may be buried; and praying him so to wash me and cleanse me by the blood of the great Redeemer, shed for all poor sinners, that I may appear before his face, bearing his image. I further protest, that I have endeavoured, according to the measure of grace which he hath given me, purely to teach his Word as well in sermons as in writing, and faithfully to expound the Holy Scripture. Yea also in all the disputes which I have had with the enemies of the truth, I have used neither craft nor sophistry, but have gone forward frankly to maintain his cause.* But alas! the will which I have had, and the zeal (if such it may be called) have been so cold and slothful, that I feel myself a debtor in all, and by all; and were it not for his infinite mercy, all the affection I have had would be but as nothing; yea the very favours he hath done me would render me more culpable; so that my recourse is to this, that being the Father of mercy, he would be, and show himself to be, the Father of so miserable a sinner."†

About this time he was visited by a gentlewoman from France, who had heard him preach the gospel many years before, in her own country, and would gladly now have heard him again. A wealthy nobleman, who had been his fellow-student at the university and had never seen him since, came also to renew his acquaintance. Calvin exhorted both these persons to abide faithful.

Two days after executing his will, he sent word to the syndics and counsellors, that he desired on the next day to meet them in their hall, whither he meant to be carried. The Senate thereupon resolved to go to him; which took place on Thursday, April 27th, in very solemn circumstances. The lords of the council thanked him for the service which he had always rendered to their church, adding the assurance that they would continue to be mindful of his family. Then the dying saint lifted up his feeble voice, and uttered that memorable valediction,

* "Mais ay procedé rondement à maintenir sa querele."

† It must be observed, that we have here followed the French original, rather than Beza's Latin, or Dr. Henry's German.

which contains the most solemn reiteration of all the truths he had taught. Towards the close, he said, "I well know the character of every one of you, and am sure that ye need the admonition. There is not one, not even the best, to whom somewhat is not lacking. I admonish the elder, that they envy not the younger who may be adorned with God's gifts; the younger, that they be not puffed up. Beware of personal enmity and all bitterness. In administering justice, I adjure you let there be no thought of favour or of hatred. Let none pervert the right by sleights and chicanery; let none seek to weaken the force of the laws. Finally, I pray you this once, forgive me my weaknesses, which I willingly own and confess, honoured sirs, here before you, as they are known to God and his angels." After this he prayed that the great and good God would more and more endow them with his gifts, and lead them by his Holy Spirit for the welfare of the republic. He extended his hand to each, and dismissed them bathed in tears, as though they had bidden adieu to a father.

On Friday, the 28th of April, he called together all the ministers of the Geneva district at his bedside; and addressed them in a grave and touching discourse, which also is recorded. On the 2d of May, the month in which he died, Calvin learned that his aged friend Farel was about to visit him; (Viret was absent at Lyons). Calling for ink and paper he penned these words in Latin, the last which ever proceeded from his prolific pen, "Fare thee well, best and frankest brother! and since it is God's will that thou shouldst outlive me, live mindful of our inward attachment, which will both be useful to the church, and bring us abiding fruit in heaven. I would not that thou shouldst weary thyself for me. My breath is weak, and I hourly look for it to leave me altogether. It is enough that I live and die in Christ, who is gain to his people, both in life and death. Yet once more, farewell to thee and the brethren! Geneva, May 2, 1564." Notwithstanding this, the venerable man actually came to Geneva; they discoursed, and even supped together, in memory of their long friendship and unity in the work of the Lord. The next day Farel preached in the assembly of the brethren, and then, taking his farewell and parting embrace, he returned to his church at Neufchatel. Not only did he survive Calvin, but as we have elsewhere recorded, he lived to do good service in

the wars of the Lord, and at the age of seventy-six hastened to Metz, where he preached the gospel like a youth.* The days which followed Farel's departure were spent by Calvin in almost constant prayer; but his voice from great weakness had become little else than a sighing whisper. The eye shone like a coal to the last; and when he looked heavenward, one could almost read in his countenance the zeal and hope of his soul. But his life was well nigh melted in anguish. Often did he say: "I was dumb, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it!" (Isa. xxxviii. 14). "I mourn as a dove!" Beza, who watched by his dying bed, relates that, on one occasion, he cried out: "Thou crushest me, O Lord! but it is enough for me, that it is thy hand!"

The 19th of May was the regular day for the *Censura*, or inspection of the doctrine and life of the ministers; when they used to meet and enjoy a repast together in token of mutual love, a beautiful custom in both its parts: the Lord's supper was to follow two days later. When Calvin knew that preparations were making for this assemblage, in his large apartment, he summoned all his remaining powers, and caused himself to be carried thither in a chair. "Brethren," said he, "I have come to you for the last time; I shall never sit down with you again." Such was the beginning of the melancholy banquet. Yet he asked a blessing on the food, partook of a morsel, and showed tokens of cheerfulness in his countenance. But his strength was not sufficient for the effort, and he was forced to leave the table and to be carried back into his chamber. From this place, with a still beaming countenance, he said, "This partition shall not hinder me from being present with you in spirit, even though absent in the body." What he foretold came true; he was confined to his couch from that time; his countenance was little changed, but his body so emaciated that nothing seemed left but the spirit.

It is this serene, believing and heavenly death-bed, which has been especially selected by the papist calumniators, to be defiled with their mockings. Lest we be thought to misrepresent Audin, we give his words: *Jusq' au moment de paroître devant*

* The reader is referred, for an extended account of Farel's life, to articles in our volumes for 1833, page 145; 1834, page 224.

Dieu il fit de la finesse. Son acte de candeur dicté au notaire Chenelat, son murmure de colombe devant Bèze sont des traits profonds de caractère. Peut-être croyoit-il tromper Dieu comme il avoit trompé ses concitoyens. Il n'y a pas dans l'histoire de la Réforme de comédien plus habile. "Up to the moment of appearing before God, he acted with craft. His testamentary deed dedicated to Chenelat the notary; his moaning like a dove before Beza, are deep traits of character. Perhaps he thought he could deceive God, as he had deceived his fellow-citizens. In all the story of the Reformation there is not a better player."

Returning to the sacred spot, we follow Beza, in saying that on the day of his death, which was May 27th, he seemed to speak more strongly and easily. But it was nature's last effort; for about eight o'clock in the evening, there came on undeniable symptoms of impending death. "Being summoned," says Beza, "for I had gone away for a little, I found him to have breathed his last so gently, that there could have been no convulsion of the hands or feet, nor even any difficult breath, nor any loss of consciousness or even voice, until the very last. He looked more like one sleeping than one dead. Thus, with the going down of the sun, this great light was also removed from us."

Dr. Henry does well in confining himself very much to the words of Theodore Beza, in regard to the close of a life which, with a son's faithfulness, he had watched to its expiring ray. None knew Calvin better, no one has more accurately delineated him: the narrative is in a succinct and graceful latinity, resembling that of the Reformer himself. "He lived fifty-four years, ten months and seventeen days, half of which period he spent in the holy ministry of the gospel. He was of middle stature, of a dark and somewhat pale complexion, with eyes of a brightness which lasted even till death, and testified the penetration of his genius. In regard to personal neatness he was neither fine nor slovenly, but remarkably modest. In living so temperate, as to be equally remote from meanness and any degree of luxury; so sparing in food, that for many years he took but one meal a day, pleading weakness of the stomach; sleeping scarcely any; of incredible memory, so that he instantly recognised those whom he had seen but once, many years before, and so that he could, after an interruption of hours, return to what he had been dictat-

ing and take up the words where he had left off, without any prompting; and never, even though oppressed by diversified and endless cares, forgetting any of those things which it was his duty to remember. Of judgment so clear and exact, whatever were the topic on which he was consulted, that he often seemed to be almost prophetic; nor do I remember one who erred by following his counsel. He despised mere oratorical diction, and was frugal in words, but was so far from being an inelegant writer, that without disparagement of any I may affirm there has been no theologian to this day, who has written with more purity, dignity or judgment, though no one, in our memory or that of our fathers, has written more. He had attained such a point by the vigils of his youth, confirmed by acumen of judgment and constant practice in dictation, that he never seemed to be at a loss for something weighty and apposite to utter; nor did his oral discourse much vary from his writing. In the doctrine which he delivered at first, he remained firm to the last, and changed nothing; which has happened to few theologians of our day. As to his manner of life, though nature formed him to be grave, there was no man who had more sweetness in common intercourse. His prudence was admirable, in bearing with those faults of men which come of infirmity, so that he neither shamed and terrified weak brethren by unseasonable objurgation, nor cherished these faults by connivance and adulation. He was as keen and vehement an enemy of flattery, simulation and insincerity, especially in religious matters, as he was a friend of truth, simplicity and candour. In natural temperament he was undoubtedly choleric, and the fault had been increased by his most wearisome mode of life; but the Spirit of God had taught him so to moderate anger, that he never uttered a single word unworthy of a good man, still less offended in act; nor was he ever hasty, except when the cause of religion was at stake, or when he had to deal with men of violent character. Having sincerely examined the history of his life and death, of which for sixteen years I was an eye-witness, I think I have the utmost right to testify, that it offers the most beautiful exemplar of truly Christian life and death; which it were as easy to defame as hard to emulate."*

* See the larger work, vol. iii. pp. 593, 599; but we have gone to the original Latin.

The Appendix contains the glorious Preface to the Institutions. It is one of those Dedications which will live as long as men read Latin and admire heroic greatness. Our ears thrill with some of its trumpet-like passages. How full of distrust in man and trust in God! *At, ut nihil de nobis, ita omnia de Deo, praesumenda sunt.* How boldly keen against the zeal for masses and other priestly gains at a time when to beard a priest was to hazard life or limb! *Cur? nisi quia illis deus venter est, culina religio: quibus sublatis, non modo non Christianos, sed ne homines quidem futuros se credunt?* How confident that faith which seems to us the peculiarity of the reformation period, and which not only despises foes, but ventures in filial affiance to the very judgment! *Longe alia nostra fiducia est, quae nec mortis terrores, nec adeo ipsum Dei tribunal formidat.* How instructive the assertion of Satan's perpetual enmity to the doctrine of grace! *Est hic divini verbi quidam quasi genius ut nunquam emergat, quieto ac dormiente Satana.*

SHORT NOTICES.

Art. VI.— *The Philosophy of Christian Perfection.* Embracing a psychological statement of some of the principles of Christianity on which this doctrine rests; together with a practical examination of the peculiar views of several recent writers on this subject. Philadelphia: Sorin & Ball. 1848. pp. 159.

This is apparently the work of a Wesleyan, though he differs from Wesley at least as to the mode of stating the doctrine of perfection. He sets forth what he conceives to have been the perfection of Adam in paradise, under the law originally given to him. That law he maintains is still the standard of duty, and therefore the perfection to which men by the gospel are enabled to attain, is the same as that which Adam possessed before the fall. This view differs from the theory presented by Wesley, Dr. Peck, and, as we understand them, the great body of Methodist writers, which represents the demands of the law on fallen men, as much lower than those which rested on Adam before he fell; and it differs from the Oberlin theory, in denying

to man in himself ability to keep the law, referring that ability, as all Methodists do, to the grace of God. The work is written in a remarkably candid and Christian spirit.

The Unaltered Augsburg Confession, as the same was read before and delivered to the Emperor, Charles V., of Germany. June 25, 1530; and the Three chief Creeds of the Christian Church: with Historical Introductions and critical and explanatory notes. By Christian H. Schott, pastor of St. Peter's Church, Leipzig. Carefully translated from the German. New York: H. Ludwig & Co. 1848. pp. 203.

This is a welcome publication. We rejoice in every manifestation of interest in the events of the Reformation, and in the works of the men whom God then raised up. We rejoice in every thing which serves to bring before the Protestants of the present generation the faith of the original Protesters against Romish error and tyranny. Romish doctrine is the natural growth of human nature, and under one form or another is constantly reappearing. It is not to be torn up violently by the roots, but withered by letting in upon it the pure light of truth. It can live only in the dark, or under the artificial light of the wisdom of this world. The Introduction by Pastor Schott, is a very interesting survey of the historical circumstances under which this confession was originally presented, of the various alterations which it underwent, and of the translations and editions under which it has at different times been published. Altogether the work is not only intrinsically valuable, but both seasonable and interesting.

An Oration, delivered before the Society of the Sons of New England, of Philadelphia, December 22d, 1847, the Anniversary of the Landing of the Pilgrims, By William H. Dillingham. Philadelphia: 1848.

Nations have their genealogies, as well as individuals. National character is transmissible as much and as surely as human nature in its generic features. We can neither understand the present, nor anticipate the future, without a knowledge of the past. If you know what were the people who settled any country, or founded any government, you may, within proper

limits, as certainly determine the character and destiny of their descendants, as you can foretell the character of a forest, from the seedlings which first occupy the ground. America is what it is, under God, in virtue of the character of the original settlers on its fruitful shores. It is therefore essential that we Americans should often revert to our origin, and study the character of our forefathers in order to know ourselves, or to learn what is the work God has given us to do. The influence of the Puritan settlers of New England has been so pervading and predominant, that their history is a matter of national interest. Their sons are so widely scattered over the union, that from Portland to New Orleans, the 22d of December, is a sacred festival. They do well to celebrate the day, to endeavour thus to keep fresh in the minds of their children and neighbours, the knowledge of the character, of the principles and of the history of the men to whom this whole continent owes so deep a debt. Mr. Dillingham's oration is worthy of his reputation, and well suited to the interesting occasion on which it was delivered.

The Works of President Edwards, in four volumes; a reprint of the Worcester Edition, with valuable additions, and a copious general index. To which, for the first time, has been added, at great expense, A Complete Index of Scripture Texts. New York, Leavitt, Trow & Co., 191 Broadway. 1848.

The value of the works of President Edwards is too well known to need any recommendation from us. We would say, however, that this appears to be the completest edition of the writings of this eminent theologian, which has been given to the public. Besides containing all which is found in the Worcester edition, the following valuable treatises have been added. 1. Distinguishing marks of a work of the Spirit. 2. God's Moral Government, a future state, and immortality of the soul. 3. The necessity and reasonableness of the Christian doctrine of satisfaction for sin. 4. The perseverance of the saints. 5. The endless punishment of those who die impenitent. 6. Fourteen sermons. This edition can also be recommended for its comparative cheapness.

Notes on the Gospels, Critical and Explanatory, so prepared as

to accompany the Questions of the American Sunday School Union, and incorporating with the notes, on a new plan, the most approved Harmony of the Gospels. Designed for teachers and scholars, and for family instruction. With illustrations from Kitto's Biblical Cyclopedia, &c., &c. By Melancthon W. Jacobus. Matthew. New York. 1848. Robert Carter. 12mo. pp. 314.

We view with complacency every new attempt to make the historical scriptures, and especially the Gospels, more familiar as a subject of popular instruction. But we are particularly pleased to see this responsible work in the hands of those who combine the advantages of literary training and pastoral experience. The handsome volume now before us we know to be the fruit of no sudden impulse or hurried compilation, but of long continued and frequently repeated efforts, in the course of active ministerial duty. We can also bear witness to the author's advantages for such a task, arising from habitual familiarity both with the older and the more modern literature of the subject. Under the influence of these considerations, we feel ourselves justified in calling the attention of our readers to the book, even before we have had time for so thorough an examination as would enable us to make it the subject of minute and formal criticism. We shall only mention further, in this brief announcement, as a distinctive feature of the work, the unusual labour which the author has bestowed upon the harmonizing of the parallel narratives, with an original method of notation, which, if once fairly mastered by the reader, cannot fail to aid the memory and facilitate the understanding of the sacred history. We sincerely hope that the success of this work may be such as to encourage Mr. Jacobus in the prosecution of so laudable an enterprise.

An Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the Nineteenth Century. By J. D. Morrell, A. M. Complete in one volume. From the last London edition. R. Carter. 1848. 8vo. pp. 752.

We may safely predict for this work a very wide circulation. So great is the avidity of American students to explore the mysteries of German metaphysics, and so meager and insufficient

have been all the accounts of these speculations, that every one who professes to study such matters, will provide himself with Mr. Morrell's book. It has the reputation of being able and satisfactory, and has been honoured by a review from the pen of Dr. Chalmers. His just strictures on the work led, as we are informed, to certain emendations, which appear in this edition. Whether it is as safe as it is interesting and learned, we dare not pronounce until we have given it a more thorough examination; it would be worse than affectation to declare a judgment on a matter so grave, without careful perusal.

A Practical Exposition of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, in the form of Lectures. Intended to assist the practice of domestic instruction and devotion. By John Bird Sumner, D.D., Bishop of Chester. New York. Robert Carter. 1848. 12mo. pp. 404.

An additional interest is conferred upon this book of Dr. Sumner's since its publication, as it is understood that he has been elevated to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury. It appears, on a cursory examination, to be a plain, sensible, grave and pious exposition, exceedingly well suited by its simplicity and brevity for use in family worship. In its general character it is evangelical, without however those clear and decided avowals of the richer and more nutritious doctrines of grace, which we should expect from our own writers.

The Convent; a narrative, founded on fact. By R. McCrindell, authoress of 'the School-girl in France,' the 'English Governess,' etc. New York. 1848. 12mo. Carter. pp. 317.

The intention of this narrative is to set forth the soul-destroying power of the peculiar doctrines of popery. The author spent part of her life in Roman Catholic countries, and had opportunities of knowing much about priests, nuns, confessionals, and conventual life. She has accordingly dipped her pencil in strong colours, and produced a picture of Romish intolerance, which will abide in the reader's mind.

Memoir of the Rev. David Abeel, D.D., late Missionary to China. By his nephew, Rev. G. R. Williamson. New York. R. Carter, 58 Canal st. 1848. 12mo. pp. 315.

The author of this memoir has done his part with affectionate care and great modesty, making the pen of his revered kinsman perform the work of biography. His estimate of Dr. Abeel's talents and character, we consider just; and the extracts which are given from his private papers justify the universal opinion of his spirituality and missionary zeal. Having been acquainted with the subject of this memoir, we take a melancholy satisfaction in testifying to his remarkable devotion of mind and heart to the cause of the Lord Jesus. During all the latter years of his life, he was walking perpetually on the brink of death; having had the causes of certain, speedy and perhaps sudden dissolution pointed out to him, by the best medical advisers. Never was there a man less terrified by such monitions. We never saw him, when he did not seem to be awaiting his departure with joyfulness. His decline towards the grave was attractive and edifying in the highest degree. None could come near him without feeling that he was more in heaven than on earth. A constant smile was on his countenance, and under the most sickening weakness and racking cough, he rejoiced alway. We trust this unpretending volume will be read by all our young ministers.

Introduction to the History of the Colony and Ancient Dominion of Virginia. By Charles Campbell. In one volume. Richmond. B. B. Minor, Publisher. 1847. pp. 208.

Under this modest title we have a valuable work; the product of uncommon industry and of sincere zeal for the interests and honour of a noble state. Mr. Campbell comes honestly by his taste for Virginian annals; his father published a work on the same subject, which we remember to have read with pleasure many years ago. His uncle, also, the late Dr. Samuel L. Campbell, of Rockbridge county, wrote a memoir of the Battle of Point Pleasant, and the Indian wars just preceding our Revolution: this is incorporated in the present volume, and does great honour to its learned author. Dr. Campbell was a man of many eccentricities, but of singular skill in his profession, and of vigorous understanding and original genius. The memoir here given shows what he might have accomplished, if he had chosen to cultivate historical composition.

The author of the work before us has been long engaged in

antiquarian researches, respecting his native state. It is now some years since he rescued and published the Bland Papers, which are now of established reputation among the materials for future historiographers. He has likewise detected and preserved other valuable documents, on the same and kindred subjects.

We are of those who love a straight-forward, unvarnished, chronicle: we therefore like Mr. Campbell's book. We are comforted by his numerous authorities in the margin, and delighted with the antique and authentic phraseology, which, ever and anon, he gives us from old records. These things savour of exactness, and happily characterize the best histories in our day. Sceptical criticism, in regard to traditionary narrative, has reached such a height, that the greatest masters in this kind are coming more and more to resort to the simple modes of verifying their statements. We therefore find no fault with the author for giving us chapter and verse, even for seemingly unimportant statements. We could wish that in carrying out his plan he had allowed himself a little more room. Many places might be pointed out, in which a more generous amplification, from authorities of undoubted credit, would have added to the sprightliness and value of the narrative. As it is, the work abounds in fact, and is free from redundant observations; it has taught us much, on a subject which was not altogether unknown to us. With a more attractive exterior, and a filling up of the outline, it would command wide attention.

Letter on the Public School System of New Jersey. By Lucius Q. C. Elmer. Trenton: 1848.

This letter is addressed to the Governor of New Jersey. Mr. Elmer here expresses an opinion decidedly unfavourable to the system of parochial schools, and avows himself an advocate of the state system. The opinions of such a man are entitled to great respect, and we doubt not the views which he has here expressed will receive serious consideration. We are however happy in believing that the difference between him and the advocates of parochial schools, is not so great as would at first sight appear. They agree in the absolute necessity of religious instruction in our primary schools. The question is, can this end be adequately

attained under what is called the state system? How is this question to be answered? How can we tell whether religion can be adequately taught in our public schools or not? This question cannot be answered by confining our attention to New Jersey, or to any one state. It may be that our school law is so liberal as to give the supporters of any school full liberty, to introduce as much of religious instruction into the public schools, as they think proper. It may be that public opinion is so united here as to allow the religious portion of the community, to control this matter just as it ought to be. But we must remember that the plan of parochial schools is designed for the whole country, and not for any one favoured state. Though public schools may be religiously conducted here, it does not follow that they can elsewhere be so conducted. Much less can we wisely determine the answer to be given to the above question, from the experience of any one district or neighbourhood. Mr. Elmer may live in a community so imbued with right sentiments, that he and his associates may have no difficulty in giving a suitable direction to the instructions in the district school. His experience however may be peculiar, or differ at least from that of far the greater portion of the friends of religious instruction. Neither can this question be answered by a mere inspection of the school laws of the several states. There may be no express enactments forbidding the teaching of religion, and yet public sentiment, usage, or other causes, may prove as effectual a barrier as a positive legal prohibition.

We know of no fair way of getting an answer to our question, other than by an appeal to facts. The public school system is not a thing of yesterday. It has been in operation for many years and over a wide extent of territory. What then is the fact on this subject? Has religion been so taught in public schools as to satisfy, not the wishes, but the conscience of the good people of this country? As far as we know, the answer is universally in the negative. It is not in point of fact so taught in the public schools of Massachusetts, nor in those of Connecticut, nor in those of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, nor of any one state in the whole union. If this be the fact, and we presume it cannot be disputed, it is decisive. There must be something radically wrong in the system, to lead to a result so

uniform and so disastrous as this. There may be, and doubtless are special exceptions, here and there in particular communities, but as a general fact it is undeniable that the instruction given in the public schools in every state in the union, is so little of a religious character, that good people ought not to be contented with it. Mr. Elmer would be one of the last men to be satisfied with the instruction given in ninety-nine hundredths of the public schools in the country. This experiment has been tried long enough, and on a scale sufficiently extensive to test the true nature of the system; and to show that it cannot be altered by the partial or combined efforts of the religious portion of the community. It is not getting better, but worse. It is passing every where from a matter of fact, into a matter of principle, that state education must be secular, that other provision must be made, by those who wish it, for the religious instruction of the young. This is not a fortuitous result, but one to which the school system necessary tends from the very nature of our institutions, and therefore it cannot be counteracted. Every child within a given district has a right to go to the public school, and neither the state authorities nor the majority of his neighbours, have the right to say, if he does, he must be taught a given system of religion. The two rights, therefore, that of free access to the public schools, and that of freedom from the imposition of a religious creed or instruction, cannot be reconciled, in any other way, than by banishing all religion from schools supported by the state. There is a reason, therefore, for that uniform result to which the experiment of state schools has led, and is every where more and more leading.

But supposing that we could retain in all our public schools, what is retained in some of them, the reading of the Bible and a certain amount of doctrinal instruction, is that enough? Is that all God requires of us? all the church is bound to impart to those for whom she is responsible? It is very evident that Christians feel that it is not enough. This is proved by the universal effort to supply the deficiency, by sabbath schools, and other similar means. And it is the conviction that the system of sabbath schools, is a very imperfect substitute for that thorough scriptural training to which the children of a Christian country are entitled, and which the church is bound as one of her very highest duties to impart, that has led to the clear, strong and all

but unanimous expression of opinion by one General Assembly after another, and by one episcopal convention after another, that the several denominations must have schools under their own care, in which at least their own children may be properly taught.

Mr. Elmer, however, anticipates great evils from this plan. These evils are increase of sectarianism, leaving multitudes of children unprovided for, and the withdrawal of the influence of religious men from the control of the public schools. On the first of these objections, we presume he would not lay much stress. It is far better that children should be brought up strict presbyterians, episcopalians or baptists, than educated in the sceptical latitudinarianism of our state schools. The second and third objections are more serious. They are founded however upon the erroneous assumption that the parochial system is antagonistic to the state system, and intended to supersede it. This is not the case. It is subordinate and supplementary. If every presbyterian and episcopal church in the land had one or more parochial schools under its care, this would be no impediment to the operations of the state. Let the state go on and do her best; let her plant a school-house and a teacher wherever the people call for them; let her gather all the children she can, and teach them all the good she can; the friends of parochial schools, will bid her God speed, but they will never feel that nothing remains for them to do. They see that the state does not and cannot teach all that they believe God has commanded to be taught, and therefore they must have other schools in which they can gather their own children and all who choose to join them, and where they can fully inculcate the truths of the Bible. This is no interference with the state. The state would be glad, if all her children could be thus provided for. But as this is not likely ever to be the case, there is no danger that she will not have enough to do, in this department of labour.

But it may be said that if the religious part of the community set up parochial schools, it will throw the state schools under the control of irreligious men. We do not believe this for various reasons. In the first place the religious portion of the community would retain all their rights in reference to the public school, they had before. They would have the right of voting for school commissioners and directors and teachers, in short of doing all they do now. And it would be their duty to exer-

cise that right. Because we feel bound to have a religious school under the care of the church, is that any reason why we should either abstain from voting, or vote for immoral or irreligious men to have the direction of the public school? In the second place, irreligious men do not like to be left to themselves. They are not half so respectable in their own eyes, when alone, as when associated with the intelligent and good. Then they like to assert their rights, and to outvote the more religious members of the community, and force them into their measures. That is something worth contending for. But to be thrown off by themselves, would not suit them. They would never therefore wish to have the state schools given up to their undivided management. In the third place, the very best method to elevate the state schools, in our judgment, is to establish good parochial schools among them, as models and stimulating examples. If you had a good presbyterian or episcopal school in a neighbourhood, its natural and certain effect would be to make all the other schools, within the sphere of its influence, better. They would be forced to improve to retain any character or to command scholars. People are not so sectarian in this country, that if made to choose between a good denominational school, and a bad school where no religion, or only religion in general is taught, they would prefer the latter. Ninety in a hundred of all sensible people would say, let us have the good school though it is taught by a presbyterian or a baptist, rather than a bad one.

The friends of parochial schools cannot afford to have such men as Mr. Elmer against them, and they would gladly shed much ink, if that could avail, for their conversion. We respectfully contribute our quill-full towards that end.

Our National Pre-eminence and its True Source. A Sermon preached on Thanksgiving day, Nov. 25, 1847, in the seventh Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. By the Pastor, Willis Lord, D.D. Philadelphia: William S. Martien. 1848.

The custom of appointing annually by our State authorities, a day for the special and public acknowledgment of the mercies of God, is one which, springing up in New England, has extended itself gradually over almost the whole country. It is a sublime spectacle, to behold twenty millions of people, voluntarily laying aside their ordinary avocations, and flocking to the temples of

God, to acknowledge him as ruler among the nations, and as the sovereign dispenser of judgments and mercies. The influence of such a custom must be in all respects salutary, and we rejoice in its extension beyond the limits to which it was for a long time confined. One of the good effects of this annual observance is, that it calls forth from so many hearts and minds, effusions such as that which is now before us. It stimulates our ministers to take up and exhibit to the people great moral truths which have a special bearing on the social and political well-being of the country. Right principles are thus extensively disseminated, and find a permanent lodgement in the public mind. It often happens that such discourses are of such marked excellence, that those who hear them, are anxious that others may share in the benefit they themselves have received, and take measures to have them committed to the press. Thus it was in the case of the sermon delivered on last Thanksgiving day, by Dr. Lord. His hearers felt that "the sentiments it embodied were so important and seasonable as to justify their presentation in a more permanent and accessible form." In this judgment we doubt not the readers of the sermon will concur.

Daily Communion with God; Christianity no Sect; The Sabbath; The Promise of God; The Worth of the Soul; A Church in the House. By Matthew Henry. With life of Henry, by the Rev. James Hamilton. Scotch Church, Regent Square, London. New York: Robert Carter. 1848. 12mo. pp. 320.

These choice treatises of Matthew Henry have a new value, from the brilliant prefatory composition of Mr. Hamilton. Himself one of the most joyous and effervescent writers of the nineteenth century, he has a good claim to introduce the sprightliest and raciest of the eighteenth.

Human Nature in its Fourfold State. By the Rev. Thomas Boston, late Minister of the gospel at Ettrick. New York: R. Carter. 18mo. pp. 508.

We welcome with right good will a new and cheap edition of the Fourfold State. It has, more than most works, been the family-book of Scottish Presbyterians; and he who is familiar with its contents is versed in sound theology. It is a system in

itself. Beyond all common treatises which occur to our minds it combines doctrinal fulness, exactness, and plainness, with convictive pungency and gracious invitation. We would earnestly commend it to young ministers, who will strengthen their hands by giving it to inquirers and catechumens and sunday-school teachers, especially in times of revival, when numerous minds are prepared to receive matter much more solid and germinant than the watery stuff which is poured over them by many a well meant declaration.

Lectures on the Law and Gospel. By Stephen H. Tyng, D.D., Rector of St. George's Church, N. Y. Sixth Thousand. R. Carter. 1848. 8vo. pp. 404. (With the author's likeness.)

This is a reprint of a work which has been justly popular, for its evangelical truth and fervency. In looking through its pages we have found nothing which inculcates episcopacy, but we have found the clear gospel testimony expressed with a clearness and a boldness, which we sometimes long for in preachers called Presbyterian and Calvinistic. It is the old reformation-doctrine, of death by the law and life by the gospel; of imputed guilt and imputed righteousness.

Address before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 28th January, 1848. On the occasion of opening the Hall in the Athenæum. By William B. Reed. Phila. 1848. pp. 51.

Among what are called occasional pamphlets, we have found none more agreeable than this. It is full of learning, wisdom, and wit, thrown out with that negligent profusion and colloquial ease, which mark the upper ranks of scholarship. Mr. Reed knows his mother-tongue, and prizes her treasures, so as not to hesitate about a good round-about English idiom, because it happens to spoil the Rhodian softness of a period, or violate the canons of "Schoolmaster English." The tone of the Address is free and patriotic. Some of the incidental defences of Pennsylvanian credit are both novel and keen. Mr. Reed has already fixed his place as a historian; we hope his labours are only begun.

Germany, England, and Scotland; or Recollections of a Swiss Minister. By J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, D.D. New York. R. Carter. 1848. 12mo. pp. 371.

Dr. Merle d'Aubigné paints with colours so striking, and has so remarkable a talent for singling out the great points in history, that his pictures never fail to seize the mind: his works are easily read and long remembered. Hence we are always glad when he indulges his taste for narrative, especially when the subject chosen by him is one which it is important that the public should not neglect. His notices of Germany are highly entertaining and instructive. With the Scottish history we are more acquainted; but he places the most familiar objects in a new light. It is true we do not always give unqualified approval to the means used by this great author for the purpose of awakening attention: for example, there is a mannerism and an affectation in the titles of the subdivisions, which we trust will never become British or American. Nevertheless, we honour his ability, we rejoice in his Calvinistic and Presbyterian fidelity, and we love his Christian piety. The book will do good and only good, and in a high degree, and with extensive diffusion. May the reverend author be long spared as an ornament and champion of the Reformed Church!

A Journey over the Region of Fulfilled Prophecy. By the Rev. J. A. Wylie. Dollar, Scotland. New York. R. Carter. 1848. 18mo. pp. 168.

An imaginary traveller, with the Bible in his hand, here goes over the Bible countries, and shows the fulfilment of prophecy, in regard to them. The plan is a happy one: in carrying it out, we take our departure from the plains of Nineveh and Babylon, traverse Arabia, Egypt, Edom, Moab, Ammon, Gilead, Bashan, Phenicia and Judea. Such a little book is a valuable addition to school-libraries.

The Prize.—The Caves of the Earth.—Simple Stories, first printed on a parlour printing-press.—The Grand Defect; or Helen and her cousin Julia. Written for the American S. S. Union by a deaf and dumb lady.—*William Allen, or the Boy who told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.*

Such are the names of some of the books which the prolific presses of our Sunday School friends have given to the world since our last number. Most of them are ornamented with cuts, and part of them are published simultaneously in London and

Philadelphia, by an arrangement with the Religious Tract Society. So far as we have examined the volumes, we find them still such as we can unhesitatingly commend.

The Czar, his Court and People: including a Tour in Norway and Sweden. By John T. Maxwell. New York. Baker & Scribner. 1848. 12mo. pp. 368.

A volume of uncommon excellence, upon a region of the earth hitherto not much treated by Americans. Mr. Maxwell's diplomatic position gave him remarkable opportunities for observing men and things in Russia, and his scholarship and sound judgment have given to these observations a shape which must secure high esteem for the book. It is full of information and exempt from every suspicion of tediousness or egotism. The picture of the noble Scandinavian countries, with which the volume opens, is fascinating to a degree for which we confess we were unprepared.

The Middle Kingdom; &c. &c. By S. W. Williams, Author of "First Lessons in Chinese," English and "Chinese Vocabulary," &c. In two volumes. 12mo. 1848. Wiley & Putnam. New York and London.

Nothing on China has appeared in America, which at all approaches this elaborate and interesting work of Mr. Williams. We have space only to say, that we should prefer it to all other single books, to put into the hands either of the missionary or the general reader.

Lectures on the Physical Phenomena of Living Beings. By Carlo Matteucci, Professor in the University of Pisa. With numerous wood-cuts. Translated under the superintendance of Jonathan Pereira, M. D., F. R. S., Vice President of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1848.

It is refreshing to get hold of such a book. The author is perfectly master of his subject; and shows his mastery, not by pretending to know everything, but by the accuracy and confidence with which he points out the line of separation between what is known and what is unknown; and again, in the latter case, between what we may hope to discover, and what is clearly

beyond the ken of the human mind. One breathes freely in passing from point to point of the wonderful domain of physiological science, because he feels that his guide is treading over these curious and amazing phenomena, with the confidence which nothing but assured safety, ascertained by experience, could give him. And when he comes to the limit of his knowledge, he does not, with the foolish vanity which characterizes so many men of less information, deny that there is anything beyond: nor does he, with the absurd presumption of those who know still less, proceed to people that unknown region with fancies and hypothetic laws, of his own creation. With the modesty and frankness of true knowledge, he points over this vast and mysterious tract; and indicates where, and how far, the curious mind of man may hope to explore it, with the light of a better science; and then reverently acknowledges that the divine Intelligence alone, can ever penetrate the darkness, and be at home amid the inscrutable mysteries which lie beyond. To those of our readers who wish to know all that is known, of the amazing phenomena of life, we strongly recommend this little volume. They will see at once, that the author is teaching them not beautiful theories, but ascertained and exact knowledge; and they will find a very large part of their own vague conceptions of these phenomena supplanted by clear and tangible, because demonstrated, science. They will also be surprised to find what light, the brilliant discoveries of modern research, especially in the physico-chemical department, have thrown upon the hidden functions of living beings.

It is scarcely necessary to add that Matteucci is not a parlour-philosopher, but an investigator, distinguished for laborious and successful research. Indeed the principal drawback to the pleasure of reading some parts of his volume, arises from the repulsion which the uninitiated feel, towards the mere record of experiments made upon living creatures. At the same time it is true, that some of the most interesting parts of the volume, are those which detail the results of the author's investigations; particularly those upon the nature and laws of the nerve-power, of living beings.

History of Architecture from the earliest times; its present condition in Europe and the United States; with a Biography of

Eminent Architects, and a Glossary of Architectural Terms. By Mrs. L. C. Tuthill. With numerous Illustrations. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1848.

We dare not do otherwise than commend this goodly and beautiful volume to the attention of our readers. It is comprehensive, as the title-page itself indicates; while as a descriptive work, it is clear and satisfactory; and it is impossible even to look over its numerous plates and illustrations, without feeling oneself refined as well as instructed. We, are always glad to welcome such books; and particularly so in the present case, because we trust and believe, that it will tend to stimulate and guide the waking attention of our people, in the study and practice of the arts of taste. The large proportion of the volume dedicated to American Architecture, will be likely to favour this desirable tendency.

To prevent any misapprehension, we would add, that this is a book, not for artists, but for the people. It is too comprehensive and general to answer any high artistic purpose. The authoress herself claims for it its appropriate place, by inscribing it "to the ladies of the United States of America." It is sent forth on a good mission, and has our best wishes for its success in accomplishing its object. We should have been glad, however, to find in it a much clearer exposition of what we regard as the true origin and spirit of genuine art, in architecture, viz. the expression of religious sentiment and feeling. We no more believe in the doctrine so often taught us by writers on historical architecture, that the Grecian temple is only an ornamented copy of a log-cabin with upright posts, than we believe in the teachings of an equally numerous school of political writers, that all human government sprang from an original voluntary compact among men. True art is instinct with a higher life than it is possible to derive from such an origin. But we have neither space nor inclination to offer any criticism on the work before us. It is good:—may it do good.

An Introduction to the Study of Natural History, in a series of Lectures delivered in the Hall of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York. By Professor Agassiz. Illustrated with numerous engravings. Also, a Biographical Notice

of the author. New York. Greeley & M'Elrath, Tribune Buildings. 1847.

We may safely take for granted, that the name and reputation of Agassiz, are familiar to our readers. We cannot refrain from expressing our thanks, that the munificent liberality of the Lowell Institute, has been the means of giving us the pleasure of forming a closer acquaintance with one, whom we have so long honoured for his industry and zeal in the cause of science, not less than for his distinguished talents and moral worth.

These Lectures of Agassiz are to Natural History, very much what the work of Matteucci is to Physiology; we mean in point of merit. They are little more than a syllabus of this extended and interesting branch of knowledge: but it is a syllabus which no one could make, who was not perfectly familiar with the minutest details. We presume they will furnish all the knowledge of the subject, which nine out of ten of our readers will deem it necessary to obtain; and yet we are sure there is not one, who will not be a better and more useful, as well as a wiser, man, for knowing thus much.

We need only add farther, that the pamphlet before us contains a corrected and accurate report of the Lectures as delivered by the Professor, together with the drawings and diagrams used by him; for which we are indebted to the enterprizing proprietors of the New York Tribune: and which our readers can procure for the trifling sum of *twenty-five cents.*

The Past, the Present, and the Future. By H. C. Carey, author of "Principles of Political Economy," &c. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart. 1848. pp. 474. 8vo.

This volume has come into our hands almost at the moment of going to press. It would be absurd to attempt to crowd a criticism of a single one of the profound and complex problems in political economy of which it treats,—even if we were prepared to offer one,—into the little corner of space now left us. To some of the author's views, we are not prepared to subscribe, but we are heartily glad to find him throughout doing valiant and successful battle, against the cold, cheerless,—we had almost said inhuman—hypothesis of Malthus, as to the universal tendency of population to outrun the supply of food; and the remedies provided by nature for checking this wretched excess, by

war, pestilence, famine, vice and misery. We fully agree with Mr. Carey that whatever the future may realize, neither the past nor the present, has furnished us an example where the capabilities of the earth to supply food have been fully developed, and much less exhausted. The tendencies of society have always been to disperse, by emigration to new countries; and there is still abundance of room. Mr. Carey is right, moreover, in maintaining that the natural process in this case, is to cultivate first the poorest lands, because they are the cheapest, and require the least capital and resources at the beginning; and that it is only when the population increases, and crowds together, so that the number of consumers of food, exceeds that of producers, that the richer lands come to be drained, cleared and cultivated. As labour bestowed upon these is far more productive, and far more profitable when it is once established, the true tendency of this process, under the influence of religion, education and political freedom, is not to starvation and vice, but to wealth, happiness and power. Of course, also, this view of the matter overturns the whole hypothesis of Malthus, Ricardo, and others of the same school, as to the doctrines of rent, wages, &c.

We have no space, however, to do more than commend the book, as furnishing a complete refutation of the Malthusian hypothesis in all its forms, which goes to justify the wretched abuses and evils, existing more especially in some parts of the old world, because it regards them as the necessary result of the application of those Providential laws, which are intended to check the over-growth of population, instead of referring them to their true cause in the degradation of the people, growing out of bad social institutions, and the want of moral and religious culture.

Remarks on a paragraph in the Rev. Doctor Davidson's History of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky.

In the 117th page of Dr. Davidson's valuable History of the Presbyterian church in Kentucky, unmerited obloquy is cast on the memory of Mr. John Lyle, the elder; who is represented as

indulging a very unchristian spirit, and pursuing an unnatural severity towards his son John, when he formed the purpose of preparing for the holy ministry. The descendants and other friends of the elder John Lyle have felt aggrieved on account of their reflection on a man whom they have always heard spoken of with respect and veneration. They have therefore felt it to be a sacred duty to vindicate from undeserved reproach, the character of a man, whose reputation for consistent and fervent piety was maintained for nearly half a century without a blot. And as I am one among the few persons who were intimately acquainted with Mr. Lyle, who still survive, I have been requested to express my opinion respecting his general character, and also respecting the particular charge which is here alleged against him; which I feel to be an incumbent duty; as I have always considered myself under real obligations to this excellent man for his wise and pious counsels when I was young, and first entered on a religious life.

The friends of Mr. Lyle, senior, after correspondence with Dr. Davidson, are fully convinced that the paragraph referred to was penned with no unfriendly feelings towards the family; and that he was misled by information, which he supposed was authentic. And it is fully believed that when a new edition of his valuable work is called for, that he will either expunge or alter the paragraph, by which, unintentionally, he has done injustice to one of the most excellent of the earth.

Elder John Lyle, as he was commonly called, to distinguish him from others of the same name, was in my opinion, a man of eminent piety. In the period succeeding the war of the revolution, vital piety had sunk very low in the valley of Virginia. Most professors seemed to have little of the genuine spirit of religion; and fell into undue conformity to the world, and its fashions and amusements. But during this time of general declension, John Lyle and his wife stood forth as shining examples of vital godliness, and holy living. By many, no doubt they were thought to be "righteous overmuch"; but their zeal for God, and fidelity in maintaining his cause, served as a testimony, that there was a reality in religion; and that they were pursuing a truly Christian and consistent course.

When the revival occurred in the year 1789 it was like life from the dead, to this pious couple. They greatly rejoiced in

the progress of this gracious visitation of God to his desolate church, and were animated with renewed zeal in the service of God; and had the pleasure of seeing two of their own sons brought under the converting influence of the divine Spirit. One of these, their first born, and a very promising young man, was called away just when he was preparing to enter the ministry. The second son John, was possessed of excellent mental endowments, fully equal to his brothers; but he did not possess the same advantages of person and manners. Mr. Lyle had made great exertion to give his oldest son a liberal education; and had never thought that it was in his power to extend the same advantage to any other of his sons. But when John embraced religion, his views were uncommonly clear, and his religious feelings very ardent. From the first he enjoyed assurance of the divine favour; and was led to entertain a strong persuasion that God had called him to the work of the ministry. People of the world thought that he was enthusiastic, but his feelings, though strong, were scriptural. His father, at first hesitated—not on account of any mental or bodily defects—but merely because he did not see how he was to get the means of support, through so long a course of study as would be necessary to enter the ministry in the Presbyterian church. What conversation passed between the father and son, on this subject, I do not pretend to know; but I am well assured from the character of the former, that whatever he said or did, was dictated by piety and prudence. And as soon as he found that the purpose of his son was fixed, he made no farther opposition; but encouraged and assisted him as much as his circumstance would permit. It may be remarked, however, that the mother of young Lyle, from the beginning was in favour of his going forward; and being strong in faith as well as ardent in zeal, said "If God had called him to the work, He would provide the means for his education." I am persuaded that no "bitterness" or unfriendly feelings were ever entertained, by the father toward his son; and no one I believe, rejoiced more in the success of his son, both in preparing for the ministry, and in his efficient and successful exercise of the sacred office, than the father.

As a faithful and efficient elder of the Presbyterian church, I have never known his superior, if I have his equal. He had furnished his mind by diligent reading, with knowledge in all

branches of theology; and was especially thoroughly conversant with the most judicious and spiritual authors on experimental religion. A. ALEXANDER.

The following letters have been written to contradict the erroneous statement in Doctor Davidson's History, by the surviving children of elder John Lyle; but before these are inserted it will be proper to insert the offensive paragraph from Dr. Davidson's History. The writer had just before, been speaking of Andrew Lyle, his oldest son, in the most laudatory terms, when he introduced John, of whom his description is by no means accurate, as will appear from the letters of his surviving brother and sister.

"John, on the contrary, had been, from his birth, a feeble child, and had received, in his infancy, accidental injuries which affected his appearance; and being very taciturn and reserved, none gave him credit for even ordinary intellect. His lengthened visage, his ungainly form, and his awkward gait, made him the butt of ridicule in the family, the school, and the neighborhood. His father could not bear the idea of his entering the ministry; and never spoke of it without bitterness, as destined to disgrace the family by a certain failure. He offered to leave him his farm on condition of renouncing his intention; but in case of persistence, he refused to extend the least aid; and true to his word, even after the death of his promising son Andrew, he never gave him so much as a shilling. John inherited all his father's pertinacity, and resolved to achieve his object by his own exertions. He taught a country school, and thus procured the means of a liberal education at Liberty Hall. While in college, he was much persecuted by the looser sort of students, who were addicted to gambling, and hated piety; but his courage and firmness at last secured his peace."

Paris, Ky., June 16, 1847.

The Rev. Dr. Davidson,

Dear Sir: In your "History of Presbyterianism, in Kentucky," on page 117, I find the following extracts relative to my grandfather and uncle Lyle. . . . .

I believe from information in my possession, derived from Dr. Alexander, of Princeton, and my father of this vicinity, that

the above extract cast an unjust imputation upon the memory of my grandfather, whom I have been taught from my youth to regard as a man of public spirit, of just and honourable principles, and of devoted piety.

As your work will be regarded in the light of history, I beg to know on what authorities, you have your statements, whether from uncle's diary and papers, or from other sources of information?

I desire a full avowal of your authorities, as I feel interested in knowing and *having* known the truth on this family subject.

A speedy answer will very much oblige,

Very respectfully,

W. C. LYLE.

—

New Brunswick, June 28, 1847.

Sir: Permit me to assure you that nothing has been further from my thoughts than to cast unjust imputations on any one, or to wound the feeling of any relative, in the publications I have made. Surely in this case you will exonerate me, when I inform you, that I received my materials, for the notice of your uncle's biography, from his widow and John his son, residing in the Walnut Hill congregation, whom I visited for the purpose. I still have in my hands the MS. notes, which I took down from their lips. Such is the authority on which I made my statements, and they know the purpose for which I desired information.

Very respectfully,

Yours, &c.

R. DAVIDSON.

W. C. Lyle, Esq.

—

My father, John Lyle, of Rockbridge county, Va., was in limited circumstances. He owned no slaves, and his farm had to be cultivated by his sons—and it was as much as I and a little brother could do to make the two ends of the year to meet. My father was an officer of the church, and being engaged in other public business, laboured but little on the farm, but spent a great portion of his time in visiting the different congregations in the county, and attending to other business. He educated his eldest son, Andrew, for the ministry, but was not able to give ano-

ther son, an education, in justice to himself and family. Brother John, never laboured on the farm, but was always treated as a *son* and *brother*. After he had obtained such an education as qualified him to teach school, he by that means paid his way and succeeded in preparing himself to enter Lexington Presbytery. During all this time, he lived a part of the time at home, and when engaged in teaching, came frequently home to see the family and to enjoy their society.

I lived during the time at my father's and managed his farm for him, until some time after brother John left for Kentucky. I do not recollect, and I defy any one to prove that in all this time he was treated "with bitterness," or opposed in his studies or wishes by my father. It was his constant wish to see all his children pious and doing well. He considered the office of the ministry the most important ever bestowed upon any human being, and was therefore far from throwing obstacles in his way, or treating him with roughness or inhumanity.

I never knew until I saw it in print, that brother's personal appearance, "made him the butt of ridicule in the family, the school, and the neighborhood"—nor did I ever hear of my father's offering him his farm, on condition of his renunciation of his purpose to enter the ministry.

After brother John's removal to Kentucky, he twice visited his parents in Virginia, and they made him presents, while there, and sent others to him.

After brother John married, and engaged in preaching and teaching, his circumstances were favorable, and my father thought, I suppose, for I had removed to Kentucky—he could not do better than to divide his small patrimony among his other children—leaving his farm to brother William, who remained at home and supported his parents, in their old age, and requiring him to pay small legacies to his other children. He did this, no doubt, without having the least dislike to brother John.

JOEL R. LYLE.

Near Paris, Dec. 1847.

—

Tipton, Iowa, Aug. 25, 1847.

Dear Nephew:—I received your letter, containing extracts from Dr. Davidson's "History of Presbyterianism in Kentucky," in which are several statements that have no foundation in truth.

That brother John received in his infancy, accidental injuries, which affected his appearance, is not true, nor is it that there was anything in his appearance, so ridiculous as to excite the ridicule "of the family, the school and the neighborhood." He was naturally taciturn, and reserved, and when he was about 17 years old, became very deaf and could not take part in conversation, except it was in a louder voice, than common, and being for this reason sometimes silent, it might be supposed by those not well acquainted with him, that he was very reserved in his manners.

The writer states that father could not bear the idea of brother John's entering the ministry, and never spoke of it without bitterness, and that he offered him his farm if he would renounce his intention, and if he persisted, would not give him a shilling—every word of which is false.

I never heard my father say any thing against his obtaining an education for the ministry, and I know he aided him as far as his means would permit, for he was a farmer, of but moderate circumstances. He was willing to do what he could, and furnished all his clothing, and paid his board while at Liberty Hall. I think, brother paid the most of his tuition after the first, by teaching a class not as far advanced as himself. The reason father gave for not leaving him anything in his will, was that he had expended in his education as much as he could leave to his other children.

Though young at the time, I believe the above to be correct. Your father will perhaps know more of some of the statements, and if wrong can correct mine.

Yours, &c.

WM. R. LYLE.

In a letter addressed by Mrs. Martha McCutchen, to her nephew at Princeton, N. J., bearing date of November the 24th, 1847, in relation to her father, Elder John Lyle, she writes thus.

"He was very often sent to Presbyteries, and Synods, and once to the General Assembly. That was a great hindrance to his success in his worldly business. When Andrew was sixteen he was sent to a classical school, and father paid his board and tuition, for four years, which was as much as he was able to do. Andrew then commenced teaching school, to enable him to finish

his education. About this time John embraced religion, and received the impression that he had a call to preach the gospel, and I have no doubt it was the case. But how could he be spared, and how was the money to be raised to pay for his education? I have no recollection of father's opposing him, but I have no doubt he felt unable to do much for him. But I remember of hearing mother say, that she thought that if he had a call to the ministry, there would be some way provided.

"John came twice to see us after he settled in Kentucky. He was then in very good circumstances and did not need assistance. Father had four other children to provide for, which accounts for his leaving him nothing at his death.

"As to his being the butt of ridicule in the family, it is entirely false. I believe he was ridiculed by some of the people of the neighborhood. And some of his relations were very much opposed to his receiving an education.

"I have now given you a statement of the facts as near as I can recollect them. You can make what use you think proper of them."

CONTENTS OF NO. II.